

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **BABERGH CABINET** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Monday, 7 November 2022

PRESENT:

Councillor: John Ward (Chair)

Councillors: Jan Osborne Clive Arthey
David Busby Elisabeth Malvisi
Alastair McCraw Mary McLaren

In attendance:

Guest(s): Shirley More – Chief Executive of Befriending Scheme
Francis Torrington – the Befriending Scheme

Councillors: John Hinton – Chair of Overview and Scrutiny

Officers: Chief Executive (AC)
Deputy Executive (KN)
Monitoring Officer (IA)
Director – Corporate Resources and Section 151 Officer (ME)
Director – Assets and Investments (EA)
Director – Planning and Building Control (TB)
Housing Transformation Manager (DW)
Professional Lead – Key Sites and Infrastructure (CT)
Spatial Planning Policy Officer (RK)
Assistant Manager – Governance (HH)

Apologies:

Jane Gould

56 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

Councillor Arthey declared an Other Registrable Interest for Item 9 in relation to the Lindsey application in his role as Chair of Lindsey Parish Council. The Monitoring Officers advised that Lindsey Parish Council had not been involved in the CIL process and Councillor Arthey was therefore allowed to speak and vote on the item.

57 BCA/22/28 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 OCTOBER 2022

It was RESOLVED: -

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 3 October 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record of the meeting.

58 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME

None received.

59 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

None received.

60 MATTERS REFERRED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY OR JOINT AUDIT AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES

There were no matters referred from the Overview and Scrutiny or Joint Audit and Standards Committees.

61 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST

There were no comments made for the Forthcoming Decisions List.

62 BCA/22/29 TENANT ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

62.1 The Chair, Councillor Ward invited the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Osborne to introduce the report.

62.2 Councillor Osborne provided an introduction to the report and moved the recommendations as detailed. This was seconded by Councillor Malvisi.

62.3 Councillor McCraw queried why postal and online responses had been separated in the presentation of data. The Housing Transformation Manager clarified that the separation was done for transparency purposes, and to highlight the similarities between online responses and postal responses.

62.4 Councillor McLaren questioned what form the 4-yearly routine inspection would take. The Housing Transformation Manager responded that the Regulator could carry out inspections, and that the new regulations had reduced the 28- days-notice to 48 hours. Whilst details on the format were not yet available it would involve consumer standards and evidencing that these standards were met, and the regulator would have a wider remit and punitive measures.

62.5 In response to Councillor McLaren's questions regarding the memberships of the Tenancy Board Councillor Osborne detailed the arrangements for meetings memberships and the work undertaken to increase membership and to engage with younger people.

62.6 In a response to further questions from Councillor McLaren regarding the Tenancy Board the Housing Transformation Manager explained that a role profile had been developed as part of the strategy, and that the board

currently operated as both a consultative body and a scrutiny body, which tenancy experts had stated should be separate. Therefore, the tenant board and terms of reference require further development.

- 62.7 Councillor McLaren questioned how tenants did not have digital literacy would be able to access the My Home Bulletin and retrieve reports. The Housing Transformation Manager explained that the My Home Bulletin was introduced in 2019 in a response to a tenant satisfactory survey. The bulletin was produced electronically on a monthly basis and paper copies were available upon request.
- 62.8 Members debated the issues surrounding the Tenancy Engagement Strategy including the dark colours on the heading of the dashboard and that the cost-of-living crisis might be a reason why some people disengage with online activities and that the government's Social Housing White Paper, and the resulting legislation would feed into the strategy.
- 62.9 Councillor Osborne stated that the strategy strengthened communication with tenants, and whilst the strategy would not resolve the issues surrounding antisocial behaviour it would be a supporting factor in resolving these issues.
- 62.10 Members continued the debate on the issues including that tenants should not have ownership of the Councils performance and that it was for managers to know and mitigate performance targets, however the purpose and function of the Tenancy Board was to provide an opportunity for tenants to engage with the Council and to express their views and that public services needed the views of its users. Tenants had a lot to offer in contribution to the tenant service.

It was RESOLVED: -

That Cabinet approved Option 1 - The strategy in its current form and acknowledge the changing landscape of social housing regulation in terms of the significance of good tenant engagement.

REASON FOR DECISION

The strategy has been co-designed with tenants through a consultation exercise with the Tenant Board, the wider tenant population, portfolio holding members and some key staff.

It is important for the councils to have a Tenant Engagement Strategy to set out how we, as a landlord, ensure that tenants are given a wide range of opportunities to influence and be involved in the formation of their landlord's housing-related strategic priorities. This includes decision making about how services are delivered, performance scrutiny and the management of their homes as required in the Regulator's Tenancy Involvement and Empowerment consumer standard.

PROGRAMME NOVEMBER 2022

- 63.1 The Chair invited the Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Arthey to introduce the report. The Chair also introduced the Chief Executive of the Befriending Scheme Shirley Moore and Frances Torrington.
- 63.2 Councillor Arthey provided an overview of the first two CIL bids to Members. Shirley Moore was invited to present the Befriending Scheme to the Members.
- 63.3 Councillor Arthey then provided an overview of the third CIL bid and suggested that recommendations 3.1 and 3.2 be taken separately due to his declared interest in recommendation 3.3
- 63.4 Councillor Arthey proposed recommendations 3.1 and 3.2 as detailed in the report which was seconded by Councillor McLaren
- 63.5 Councillor Ward proposed recommendation 3.3, which was seconded by Councillor Osborne.
- 63.6 Councillor Osborne queried whether the car parks would be free of charge. Councillor Arthey responded that as this was from a CIL bid there would be full public access to the car parks with no charge.
- 63.7 In response to Councillor Malvisi's questions regarding the maintenance of car parks, Councillor Arthey confirmed that the applicants would maintain the car parks.
- 63.8 In response to questions from other members attending the meeting Councillor Arthey advised that in Great Waldingfield there had been issues with parking on verges and loss of car parking spaces to EV charging points
- Note: All remaining items refer to bid 3- The Befriending Scheme.
- 63.9 Councillor J. Osborne commented that the object was not to increase capacity but accessibility of the services.
- 63.10 Councillor Ward advised Cabinet that planning permission had already been granted and that highway issues had been resolved with Suffolk Highways.
- 63.11 In response to Councillor Osborne's questions regarding access to the site and the number of uses of the service the Chief Executive of the Befriending Scheme confirmed that a minibus service was provided for people using the site, and that traffic to the site would be minimal for drop off and pick up. It was anticipated that 25 people per day would make use of the services provided.
- 63.12 In response to further questions from Members, the Chief Executive of the Befriending Scheme confirmed that the service would be available to other

organisations within the District. Councillor McCraw queried the size of the plot and was advised it was a numerical land increase from 1.47 to 4.4 acres.

- 63.13 In response to further questions from Councillor McCraw the Chief Executive of the Befriending Scheme confirmed that the organisation was financially viable and accepted the clawback clause, as set out in the CIL bid offer.
- 63.14 Councillor Arthey added that the CIL funding would go towards the infrastructure on the site and provided a breakdown of the cost for the project.
- 63.15 Councillor Malvisi sought clarification on what had happened at the previous site in Assington. Councillor Arthey advised that a break clause was initiated, and that CIL funding required a lease of 25 years minimum, the funding itself was allocated for permanent infrastructure. However, some permanent structure was able to be transported to Lindsay.
- 63.16 Councillor Malvisi stated that that not owning the land would always present a risk to which Councillor Arthey replied that Cabinet was aware of the risks related to potential future failure. The Chief Executive of the Befriending Scheme advised that the new landlord was supportive of the Scheme and had confirmed that the 5-year ?? would not be enforced.
- 63.17 In response to Members' questions the Chief Executive of the Befriending Society detailed the nature of the services provided by the organisation and how the Society was funded.
- 63.18 Councillor McCraw stated that the safeguards had been put in place to prevent a repeat failure.
- 63.19 Councillor J. Osborne stated that the risk was outweighed by the benefits provided by the Befriending Society and benefitted those who had critical needs.
- 63.20 Councillor Ward was concerned about the impact on the local community and the issues raised by the Parish Council however, the Chief Executive of the Befriending Society reassured him that steps had been taken to work closer with the Community.
- 63.21 Councillor Ward voiced agreement that obstacles had been overcome and that the Council must help improve the health and wellbeing of their residents.

It was RESOLVED: -

- 1.1** That the CIL Expenditure Programme (November 2022) and accompanying technical assessment of the CIL Bids B22-07, B22-08, and B22-09 (forming Appendices A and B) which include decisions on these CIL Bids for Cabinet

to make as follows be approved:

Decisions for Cabinet to approve: - Ringfenced Infrastructure Fund

CIL Bid, Location and Infrastructure Proposed	Amount of CIL Bid and total cost of the infrastructure	Cabinet Decision
<p>B22-08</p> <p>GREAT WALDINGFIELD</p> <p>Village Hall Car Park Extension</p>	<p>Amount of CIL Bid £30,824.92</p> <p>Total cost of the project £41,099.89 including VAT</p> <p>Total of other funding Great Waldingfield Village Hall Reserves £10,274.97</p>	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Cabinet to approve CIL Bid B22-08 for £30,824.92 from Ringfenced Infrastructure (Great Waldingfield)</p>

Decisions for Cabinet to approve: - Local Infrastructure Fund

CIL Bid, Location and Infrastructure Proposed	Amount of CIL Bid and total cost of the infrastructure	Cabinet Decision
<p>B22-07</p> <p>GREAT CORNARD</p> <p>Upgrade of parking facilities at the Great Cornard Allotment Car Park</p>	<p>Amount of CIL Bid £55,927.50</p> <p>Total cost of the project £74,870.00</p> <p>Total of other funding Parish Council £18,942.50</p>	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Cabinet to approve CIL Bid B22-07 for £55,927.50 from Local Infrastructure Fund</p>
<p>B22-09</p> <p>LINDSEY</p> <p>Red Rose Friends Community Farm</p>	<p>Amount of CIL Bid £100,000.00</p> <p>Total cost of the project £141,981.59</p> <p>Total of other funding</p> <p>Portacabin Grant Funding £16,500</p> <p>Colchester Catalyst £10,000</p>	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Cabinet to approve CIL Bid B22-09 for £100,000.00 from Local Infrastructure Fund (subject to imposition of a back provision that if the use within 10 years (Lindsey) all monies will be clawed back through a condition on CIL Bid offer letter)</p>

	Fundraising £3,500 The Befriending Scheme Funding £11,981.59	
--	--	--

1.2 Cabinet are also asked to note and endorse this CIL Expenditure Programme which includes the position in respect of approved CIL Bids from Rounds 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 (September 2022). (Appendix A Section B) together with details of emerging infrastructure /CIL Bids (Appendix A Section C).

REASON FOR DECISION

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies have been collected since the implementation of CIL on the 11th April 2016. The CIL Expenditure Framework (originally adopted in April 2018) has been reviewed with amendments adopted in March 2019, April 2020, March 2021, and 21st July 2022 (Mid Suffolk) and by Babergh on the 6th October 2022. The CIL Expenditure Framework requires the production of at least two CIL Expenditure Programmes for each District (per year) and contains decisions for Cabinet to make or note on CIL Bids for CIL expenditure. These decisions relating to the expenditure of CIL monies form one of the ways in which necessary infrastructure supporting growth is delivered.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 3:37pm.

.....
 Chair