

SUMMONS TO ATTEND A MEETING OF THE
NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Time/Date 6.30 pm on TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 2015
Location Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville
Officer to contact Democratic Services (01530 454512)

Christine E. Fisher

.....
Chief Executive

All persons present are reminded that the meeting may be recorded and by attending this meeting you are giving your consent to being filmed and your image being used. You are kindly requested to make it known to the Chairman if you intend to film or record this meeting.

The Monitoring Officer would like to remind members that when they are considering whether the following items are exempt information under the relevant paragraph under part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 they must have regard to the public interest test. This means that members must consider, for each item, whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption from disclosure outweighs the public interest in making the item available to the public.

AGENDA

Item	Pages
PRAYERS	
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
Members are reminded that any declaration of interest should be made having regard to the code of conduct. In particular, members must make clear the nature of the interest and whether it is 'pecuniary' or 'non pecuniary'.	
3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	
4. LEADER'S AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS	
Members are reminded that under paragraph 11.1 of part 4 of the Constitution, questions can be asked of the Leader and Cabinet Members without notice about any matter contained in any address. Questions shall be limited to five minutes in total for each announcement.	



Item	Pages
5. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION	
To receive questions from members of the public under procedure rule no.10. The procedure rule provides that members of the public may ask members of the Cabinet any question on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties which affect the District, provided that three clear days' notice in writing has been given to the Head of Legal and Support Services.	
6. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS	
To receive members' questions under procedure rule no.11. The procedure rule provides that any member may ask the chairman of a board or group any question on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties which affect the District, provided that three clear days' notice in writing has been given to the Head of Legal and Support Services.	
7. PETITIONS	
To receive petitions in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme.	
8. MINUTES	
To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 24 February 2015.	3 - 18
9. PROPOSED COUNCIL DELIVERY PLAN 2015/16	
Report of the Chief Executive Presented by the Leader	19 - 38
10. MINUTES OF LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE	
Report of the Director of Services Presented by the Regeneration and Planning Portfolio Holder	39 - 74
11. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015/16	
Report of the Chief Executive Presented by the Leader	75 - 84
12. INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL - PROTOCOL	
Report of the Head of Legal and Support Services Presented by the Corporate Portfolio Holder	85 - 88

MINUTES of a meeting of the COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2015

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Deputy Chairman) (in the Chair)

Councillors R D Bayliss, R Blunt, A Bridges, N Clarke, P Clayfield, J Cotterill, D De Lacy, D Everitt, J Geary, T Gillard, J Houlton, P Hyde, R Johnson, G Jones, C Large, J Legrys, L Massey, C Meynell, T Neilson, T J Pendleton, V Richichi, J Ruff, N J Rushton, A C Saffell, S Sheahan, N Smith, A V Smith MBE, M Specht, L Spence, D J Stevenson, R Woodward and M B Wyatt

Officers: Mr S Bambrick, Mr R Bowmer, Ms C E Fisher, Mr G Jones, Mr C Lambert, Mrs M Meredith, Mr J Newton, Mr P Padaniya, Mrs M Phillips, Mr J Richardson and Miss E Warhurst

50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Adams, G A Allman, J G Coxon, R Holland and D Howe.

The Deputy Chairman advised that he had been in contact with Councillor G A Allman and he was due to be released from hospital imminently. On behalf of all members he extended best wishes and support to Councillors R Adams, D Howe and their families. He wished them a speedy return to health.

51. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor S Sheahan declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 – Budget and Council Tax 2015/16, as a member of Leicestershire County Council.

Councillor J Legrys declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 – Budget and Council Tax 2015/16, as a volunteer at Hermitage FM.

Councillor M B Wyatt declared a non-pecuniary interest in any items relating to Coalville in item 9 – Budget and Council Tax 2015/16, as an owner of a local business.

Councillor T Neilson declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 – Budget and Council Tax 2015/16, as a secretary of DE12 SK8, being one of the groups which had received funding from the £20,000 for seven initiative.

52. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Deputy Chairman reminded members of the civic charity dinner taking place at Yew Lodge, Kegworth on Thursday, 23 April 2015. He added that the event would be very worthwhile and entertaining, and would raise a good amount of money for the Chairman's charities. He urged all members to attend.

The Deputy Chairman referred to the 'get well soon' cards that had been circulated prior to the meeting for Councillors R Adams, G A Allman and D Howe. He invited any members who wished to sign the cards to do so following the meeting.

53. LEADER'S AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor R Blunt echoed the best wishes to members as conveyed by the Deputy Chairman.

Councillor R Blunt referred to the Pick and Shovel application, for which permission had been granted in January, and development would commence at the end of March. He

commented that the Council had provided additional funding to ensure the development went ahead. He added that this would remove an eyesore, improve a gateway site in the town centre, and would provide 14 new good quality homes.

Councillor R Blunt highlighted the shop fronts scheme, whereby the Council would be investing in improving the shop fronts on Hotel Street. He added that this was just the first phase, and would be a shop by shop, street by street way of improving Coalville. He stated that the scheme would be rolled out further in Coalville and other town centres going forward.

Councillor R Blunt announced that Ruth Mulvany and Jacqui Sykes were shortlisted at the Keep Britain Tidy awards and were highly commended for their work. He highlighted that Friends of Thringstone had won an award and he congratulated all involved.

Councillor R Blunt referred to the £20,000 for seven scheme which had provided funding for 17 community projects; 7 of which had received £20,000 and a further 10 had received £10,000. In particular he highlighted the project for a skate park submitted by Measham Parish Council, which had received £20,000 funding and had now been ordered; and the new pavilion at Castle Donington which was scheduled to be completed in April. He added that all schemes would have a big impact.

Councillor R D Bayliss highlighted two recently approved housing policies which would have very positive implications for the district. In November, Cabinet approved the Council's Tenancy Policy to continue to offer two types of tenancy – a 12 month introductory tenancy for new tenants, followed by a lifetime secure tenancy. He stated that the Localism Act had provided the opportunity to consider offering fixed term tenancies, and this was a matter of balance and not a straightforward decision. However he had decided to recommend to Cabinet to continue with the principle of lifetime secure tenancies as it was his view that a transient population should be avoided and tenants should not be treated as commodities. He added that by offering lifetimes tenancies, the Council was helping to foster stable communities.

Councillor R D Bayliss advised that earlier this month, the Council had also approved an Acquisitions Policy which would allow the Council to purchase assets, be it land or housing or other buildings. This policy would see the Council buying land or existing housing to bring into use as affordable housing. He drew attention to the fact that an additional £400,000 was proposed in next year's budget for the provision of affordable housing, meaning that the Council would be investing over £1.3 m next year towards increasing the supply of affordable housing in the District, which would allow people in housing need on the Housing Register to be rehoused into high quality homes.

Councillor R Woodward added his congratulations to Friends of Thringstone, especially Nita Pearson who chaired the group. He stated that the idea had originated from Councillor P Clayfield in 2005 and the group had gone from strength to strength since then, and was supported by the current ward members as well as himself and Councillor P Clayfield. He extended thanks to the group and to Nita Pearson for what they had done for the local community.

Councillor J Legrys thanked the Leader for his kind words about two of his colleagues. He stated that unfortunately this morning, social media had been rife with the news that Councillor D Howe had passed away. He assured members that he had spoken with Councillor D Howe and he was very much alive and was due to be released from hospital imminently. He also passed on best regards from Councillor R Adams.

Councillor J Legrys stated that Friends of Thringstone, in particular Nita Pearson, were out every day picking up many dozens of bags of litter. He added that it was unfair to blame

communities for litter when the likes of KFC and McDonalds made no efforts to clear up the messes they made.

As the ward member, Councillor J Legrys welcomed the Pick and Shovel initiative; however he stated that there would unfortunately be some difficulties with the construction phase. He asked that the Coalville and Snibston ward members be involved in discussions in detail with Leicestershire County Council about minimising disruption when the works commenced. He commented that the last thing he wanted to see was Memorial Square being turned into a works area.

Councillor J Ruff stated that any additional affordable housing was most welcome for the district as there had been a shortfall for many years. She commented that the SHMA stated that 35% of all development should be affordable housing, and to get this action was very good news. She also felt that it was better for tenants to have long term tenancies and felt the government was wrong to recommend a fixed term of 5 years as this was not good for tenants.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that he had had the privilege of attending the ceremony for the £20,000 for seven scheme and it had been a great experience. He added that Labour had always believed that some of the money from home building should go back to the community, and Steve Peace had been a great advocate of that. He congratulated the Leader for acknowledging that this spending had come from a planning windfall and was the result of an idea from the officer.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that the SHMA states that over a third of all housing should be affordable. He welcomed this policy but highlighted that there had been other policies which had reduced the level of affordable housing, and some developments had been permitted with 0% affordable housing. He requested a report to the Local Plan Advisory Committee on whether the Council was anywhere near the target figure for affordable housing, as he felt this would really inform decisions on the Local Plan.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that he was surprised by the announcement on the Pick and Shovel as he was not aware that the Leader had been involved in the initiative. He highlighted the recent comments on a Liberal Democrat leaflet on the scheme.

54. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

There were no questions received.

55. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillor J Legrys put the following question to Councillor R Blunt:

“How many negative comments, formal complaints, threats of litigation and/or actual litigation have tenants made against this Council and/or its Contractors regarding housing since the commencement of the Decent Homes Contract?”

As the question related to the Housing portfolio, Councillor R Blunt invited Councillor R D Bayliss to respond on his behalf. Councillor R D Bayliss gave the following response:

“As at 31 January 2015 we had completed decent homes improvement works to 3,468 properties through our partnership with Kier and Lovell. The vast majority of this work has been both complex and disruptive and has been undertaken around tenants and their families within their homes. The programme has included replacing:

- kitchens to 2,011 homes;
- bathrooms to 1,520 homes;

- new heating systems to 988 homes;
- full electrical rewiring to 536 homes;
- new doors or windows to 3,117 homes;
- new roof to 415 homes.

Since September 2012 when the contracts commenced, 1,065 tenants have returned questionnaires upon the completion of work, with 97% indicating that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the service. Only 29 tenants indicated some form of dissatisfaction. During this period there have been 85 complaints, one housing ombudsman enquiry (for which a decision is still pending). To date £27m has been invested in improving the Council's stock and recompense of £2,156 has been paid to tenants for issues relating to the service".

As a supplementary question, Councillor J Legrys stated that he was aware of at least two people in his ward who he had been told were taking litigation against the Council and its contractor due to their dissatisfaction with the Decent Homes Improvement Programme. He thanked officers for providing these statistics, however he stated that he had not been given an answer and asked again how many people were taking litigation against the Council or its contractors.

Councillor R D Bayliss responded that he was unable to expand upon the answer which had already been given. He added that if Councillor J Legrys was convinced that there were two people who were taking litigation against the Council, he would make it his business to find out who they were and what the likely outcome was. He reiterated that as far as he was concerned, no one was taking litigation against the Council or its contractors.

Councillor J Geary put the following question to Councillor A V Smith:

"Three anaerobic material lagoons have been constructed on land belonging to Hall Farm at Piper Lane Ravenstone. These lagoons take waste from anaerobic treatment plants and other liquid organic waste which is then stored in the open lagoons until required for agricultural use. The County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority have deemed that the lagoons are Agricultural Permitted Development and do not require Planning Permission. The Environment Agency has granted temporary waste storage licences for the site.

The lagoons now radiate strong smells and odours resulting in many complaints from residents in the current Snibston, Hugglescote, Ravenstone/Packington and Valley Wards.

As an affected resident, I ask what is this Council doing to insist that the owner of these lagoons takes steps to mitigate and eradicate the smell under its Environmental Health Controls".

Councillor A V Smith gave the following response:

"The Council is aware of the construction of the Ravenstone lagoons and following complaints of odour nuisance has been in regular liaison with the Environment Agency (EA).

The EA have agreed a permit for the land spreading of specified waste for agricultural benefit for specific fields in the local area. The permit allows for the import of specified waste and temporary storage of this waste in the lagoons prior to spreading at the appropriate times. This permit lasts for a year and expires on 10 September 2015.

The permit holder who undertakes the spreading of the waste has a generic odour management plan which mainly relates to minimising odours produced at the time of spreading.

However, as the storage of waste in the lagoons has started to prompt reports of odours in the local area, they have been asked by the EA to produce a site specific odour management plan.

The EA are the primary Authority for the site and as such all complaints are being reported to or re-directed by NWLDC to the EA and there is an incident hotline number for such complaints which is 0800 807060.

The District Council however does have powers under statutory nuisance and is currently logging all complaints received, compiling evidential reports and liaising with complainants to assess the extent of the problems. The District Council cannot exercise its power in relation to statutory nuisance without the approval of the Secretary of State and has previously requested a joint meeting with Leicestershire County Council and the Environment Agency to ensure a considered and joined up approach to any proposed action on this matter. Once that meeting has taken place I would be happy to update Councillor Geary”.

Councillor J Geary thanked Councillor A V Smith for a full and comprehensive answer. He stated that those who live in the country expected to put up with country smells, especially where livestock was concerned. However he stated that effluent was being stored and transferred to the lagoons in Ravenstone and this was now an industrial scheme. He added that those who lived downwind had concerns as it was impossible to work outside for any length of time. He stated that he was pleased to see the contact number in the response and that a meeting was planned. As a supplementary question, he requested a designated officer contact for dealing with the logging of complaints.

Councillor A V Smith responded that as a resident of Ravenstone herself, she was aware of this issue. She agreed to provide the contact details of the officer. She commented that lagoons were becoming a problem in North West Leicestershire and the Council would continue to work with the Environment Agency to resolve this.

56. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

57. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2014.

It was moved by Councillor J Bridges, seconded by Councillor T Gillard and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

58. BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2015/16

Councillor N J Rushton presented the report to members. He stated that fantastic efforts had been made with spending in Coalville. He added that this had been a period of austerity; however for the sixth year in a row, front line services had been protected and Council Tax had been frozen. He stated that continuing to increase efficiency had ensured a balanced budget. He outlined the initiatives in next year's budget, including

£400,000 to acquire sites for affordable housing projects, £150,000 to pump-prime sustainable transport between the north and south of the district, and £100,000 to extend free Wi-Fi in towns. He added that this was on top of over £3,000,000 of projects made possible through underspendings in previous years, as outlined in the Cabinet report at Appendix 1, which included £1,000,000 to support affordable housing, £500,000 for a business bidding fund, £360,000 to improve the environment in Coalville and around the district, £350,000 for investing in our communities, £300,000 for phase two of Improving the Customer Experience (ICE), £250,000 for round two of £20,000 for Seven, and £216,000 for rural broadband. He stated that he was proud that the General Fund reserve had increased from £1,137,000 to £2,414,000, which reflected some of the current risks. He added that under a Labour government, the New Homes Bonus would be stripped, so the reserve needed to be maintained in order to prepare for dealing with a loss of £2,400,000. He felt that members should be proud of what the Council was doing in terms of long term assured tenancies, and added that tenants would be pleased with this. He highlighted that the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2015/16 required a rent increase for tenants next year, however in return for this they had seen a massive investment in improvements to their homes bringing them up to the Decent Homes standard, which would be maintained through continued investment each year.

Councillor J Legrys sought to raise a point of order in that he found some of the terminology used by Councillor N J Rushton with respect to the opposition to be offensive.

The Deputy Chairman reminded Councillor N J Rushton to confine his comments to the matter under debate. He asked him to conclude his speech as he had spoken for almost five minutes.

Councillor N J Rushton summarised that this was a sound budget, and a great budget to present to the electorate in the run up to the elections. He moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

Councillor R Blunt seconded the motion and reserved his comments.

The Deputy Chairman referred to the amendment submitted by Councillor D De Lacy which had been circulated in the additional papers. He invited Councillor D De Lacy to put forward his amendment.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that it was a shame that Councillor N J Rushton did not take the same credit for the County Council's budget. He referred to the planned increases in car parking charges and the staff redundancies, which had been retracted due to the increases in underspend. He commented that the Council's finances were in good shape; however he questioned whether this was due to the competence of the Conservative administration or the massive unbudgeted increase in planning income as a result the lack of a five year housing land supply.

The Deputy Chairman reminded Councillor D De Lacy to confine his comments to the amendment.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that the income from planning fees this year had been £1,250,000 instead of the £500,000 which had been budgeted for. He referred to Councillor N J Rushton's comments on the New Homes Bonus.

The Deputy Chairman asked Councillor D De Lacy to conclude his speech.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that the Council was in a situation where reserves needed to increase because of possible reductions in the New Homes Bonus. He added that if Leicestershire County Council got their way, the New Homes Bonus and business funding would be taken away. He concluded that the proposals put forward by the Labour group

were fairly moderate and clearly affordable, however they would make a big difference to families in North West Leicestershire. He moved the amendment as set out in the additional papers.

Councillor T Neilson seconded the motion and reserved his comments.

Councillor R Blunt thanked Councillor D De Lacy for saying that the Council was in good financial shape. He added that he was very proud of this and it was a real credit. He reminded members that the five year housing land supply was brought in by the previous Labour government and was not a Conservative policy. He stated that the proposed amendment was disappointing and felt that an alternative budget should have been put forward. He commented that to make a couple of amendments to score points was disappointing. He stated that he would be opposing the amendment and he hoped his colleagues would do so also.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that free swimming was one of the last policies brought in by the previous Labour government and was tragically one of the first things cut. He stated that Councillor T J Pendleton had been quoted as saying that the funding cut from central government was very disappointing as the scheme had been very popular. He highlighted the health benefits of swimming and stated that there was evidence that swimming could reduce the prevalence of asthma symptoms. He made reference to the number of children suffering from asthma and the number within the district who were rushed into hospital each year following an asthma attack. He added that swimming gave children something to do during the holidays and there was a good chance that this would reduce antisocial behaviour. He concluded that free swimming was a great idea, and if the Council could afford it, it should be reinstated.

Councillor N J Rushton stated that most of the amendments proposed by the Labour group took money from the reserves. He commented that with an election coming, he would have thought a full, properly costed budget would have been put forward.

Councillor M B Wyatt stated that he would not be supporting the amendment as it was nothing but a hypocritical attempt to tackle the parking fiasco. He invited the members who took the opportunity to receive a free parking permit to justify this. He also asked the Monitoring Officer to give her view on declaring interests in this matter.

The Deputy Chairman stated that it was unfair to bring this matter forward now, and commented that it would have been helpful to raise it sooner to enable a response.

Councillor N Clarke stated that he was a big advocate of the living wage and he emphasised his support for the amendment. He added that research suggested that nearly 25% of workers were earning less than the living wage, and these people would also be claiming benefits to top up their income. He commented that it was unfair on taxpayers having to subsidise employers in this way. He added that little or nothing had been done to enforce employers paying the minimum wage, let alone the living wage. He stated that a task group could be set up and the Council could become an accredited living wage employer by getting contractors to sign up to the scheme. He added that the Council should be leading the way on this issue and promoting prosperity for all.

Councillor J Ruff highlighted the benefits of free swimming, which could be an absolute lifesaver. She commented that there were plenty of under 16s who were carers. She added that if you had no money to do activities, being able to go swimming was a must. She stated that the benefits of free swimming, especially for poorer children, could not be emphasised enough. She added that there was a need and for this and it should be supported.

Councillor A V Smith pointed out that the Council ran Club Activ8 and the Leisure Link scheme, both of which offered free swimming and other activities. She added that an estimated 6,500 children were currently in receipt of free swimming in the district.

Councillor J Legrys referred to the amendment in respect of the proposed allocation for the provision of free Wi-Fi. He acknowledged that times were tight but he added that it was not known what would happen with the New Homes Bonus, which was the reason that such a low amount had been proposed in the amendment. He stated that as a member of the Coalville Special Expenses Working Party, he felt that more money needed to be put in for events such as picnic in the park, particularly if £100,000 could be found for something as frivolous as free Wi-Fi, which was already provided by many businesses. He added that this money should be used to ensure such events took place and to secure better cohesion with communities. He also felt that there should be a thorough investigation of the car parking situation, and this needed to be reviewed with traders and the people of the town.

Councillor M Specht stated that he could not support the amendment. He referred to the rates of car parking charges elsewhere and felt that the charges in Coalville were more than reasonable. He highlighted the availability of Wi-Fi via hotspots and businesses.

Councillor D Everitt stated that he felt Councillor M B Wyatt's comments were entirely petty and he was quite happy to have free parking; however he had never claimed for travelling expenses in all his time as an elected member. He commented that the Conservative group had always been quite happy to go along with Labour's proposals in the past and they were trying to let people know that there was still a political party that still cared about people. He stated emphatically that swimming really did save lives. He stated that the amendment showed the Labour group supported the living wage and spending money sensibly. He added that people did not share the same enthusiasm about how they had been treated.

Councillor J Geary acknowledged that it had been the Labour group who had introduced car parking charges. He added that at this time, the Council was facing large bills for maintaining and resurfacing, and it was felt to be only right that the people who were using the car parks contributed to this. He commented that he was surprised that Councillor M B Wyatt, who had always opposed car parking charges, could not set out where he stood and what he wanted to do about this issue. He stated that car parking charges were having an impact upon footfall in the town centre, and last year the Town Team came up with an innovative scheme to subsidise car parking charges. He added that businesses needed to be engaged to establish if this was the way forward in terms of reappraising the situation.

Councillor T J Pendleton stated that as the Portfolio Holder at the time, he was proud to champion the Activ8 scheme, as it involved children with swimming and was done through the school curriculum. He added that the Conservative group supported the living wage, but was not happy to meddle with how other companies paid their employees. He commented that free Wi-Fi in village halls would be welcome. He added that car parking charges in the district had not been increased and the charges were reasonable. He stated it should be asked who broke the bank in the first place, and it would be more prudent to save first rather than spend at the first piece of good news. He added that it was not known what was on the horizon.

Councillor T Neilson commented that this had been a good debate and the transformative benefits of free swimming had been expertly outlined. He added that he believed the people who would benefit from this would find it an exciting proposition and he was disappointed that this was not supported by the Conservative group. He welcomed the living wage, which had been introduced by the Conservative group; however the Labour group had said at the time that they wished it could go further, hence the proposed

amendment. He expressed disappointment that Councillor M B Wyatt did not see fit to support the proposed amendment in respect of car parking charges. He suggested that he might also want to declare an interest in this matter as a trader. In respect of free Wi-Fi, he commented that there were many businesses that attracted people due to offering free Wi-Fi. He added that the Conservative group's proposal would remove that commercial opportunity and also encourage people to contact the Council to complain if the free Wi-Fi was not working. He explained that it was proposed to use this money for community events, which would actually increase footfall for businesses. He concluded that he was happy to support the amendment and he hoped that others saw fit to do so.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that the Labour group's proposals would increase the reserves from £1,100,000 to £2,340,000, and he felt that it was important for people to understand this. He added that the Labour group was conscious that finances could be very volatile going forwards, as it was not known what the funding settlement would be. He commented that if the Conservative County Council had their way, the New Homes Bonus would be taken away. He stated that it was imperative that people understood the Labour group were not proposing a budget with a lot of spending commitments, and he did not accept the allegation of irresponsibility. He reiterated that whilst the Labour group recognised that the Council's finances were good, this was as a result of a free for all feeding frenzy for developers. He added that the spending as a result of the increase in planning income was not sustainable. He also made reference to the removal of waste recycling credits. He summarised that the proposal was clearly affordable, was responsible, and he hoped members would support it.

The Deputy Chairman then put the motion to the vote.

A recorded vote being required in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors N Clarke, P Clayfield, D De Lacy, D Everitt, J Geary, P Hyde, R Johnson, J Legrys, L Massey, T Neilson, J Ruff, S Sheahan, L Spence and R Woodward (14).

Against the motion:

Councillors R D Bayliss, R Blunt, A Bridges, J Bridges, J Cotterill, T Gillard, J Hout, G Jones, C Large, C Meynell, T Pendleton, V Richichi, N J Rushton, A C Saffell, A V Smith, N Smith, M Specht, D J Stevenson and M B Wyatt (19).

The motion was declared LOST.

The Deputy Chairman then directed members to the debate on the substantive motion, as set out in the report.

Councillor T Neilson stated that this was the first stage in presenting their manifesto on 4 March, and the Labour group had tried to put forward a moderate budget. He commented that the Council had been riding the coattails of the developer free for all and relying on the New Homes Bonus. He stated that this blatant last gasp election spending spree was too late to win the votes of residents, especially in Coalville. He made reference to some of the literature which had recently been circulated and Leicestershire County Council's decision to increase Council Tax. He commented that the Conservative group were clearly trying to rely on the worst kind of screensaver politics. He concluded that the Labour group were no longer in a position to support the recommendations.

Councillor J Legrys referred to the shop front improvement scheme which had been delayed due to the lamented loss of the Council's conservation officer. He highlighted the inaccuracies in the report and the amount of money which had been wasted on projects such as the monorail. He stated that the Council had wasted almost £5,000,000 in the

last eight years. He commented that £1,500,000 had been wasted on the failed Core Strategy, which could have been spent on gritting, as Leicestershire County Council refused to do this, and the money wasted on the proposed move to the Stephenson College site could have provided many a free swim. He added that the £5,000,000 which had been wasted could have been spent or put into the reserves.

Councillor J Ruff stated she could not support the proposed rent increases, as they were well above inflation and would have a massive impact upon the standard of living for working families. She added that this was just a step too far and was too great an increase. She acknowledged that rent rises were inevitable, but these were too steep. She questioned the 10% increase in heating charges when energy costs were reducing. She commented that it was a sad fact that this was why many families were choosing between heating and eating.

Councillor N Clarke stated that Councillor R D Bayliss had made it clear his legacy was the improvements made through the Decent Homes Improvement Programme. He questioned how long residents were going to have to pay for the mismanagement of this project through rent increases. He concluded that he could not support the proposals.

Councillor J Geary made reference to the shop front improvement scheme and the similar scheme which had been a success in previous years. He hoped that this project would also be a success. He asked how much the expertise from Leicestershire County Council was costing.

The Deputy Chairman advised that this information would be provided after the meeting.

Councillor J Geary referred to the recent meeting of Policy Development Group, the purpose of which was discussing the proposed budget. He commented that unfortunately the Corporate Portfolio Holder was unable to attend due to other commitments. He stated that it was imperative for the lead member to attend such meetings, and he hoped that if he was unable to do so in future, the meeting would be rearranged.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that he would be voting against the budget because the amendment had not been accepted. He referred to the Council Tax funding cut of 10% which had been passed on to those residents who could least afford it, and it was clear that this Council had not needed to do so. He added that this would have been incorporated into the proposed budget, however officers had advised that it was too late to do so. He added that this would be done once the Labour group was in power. He stated that if you were on benefits in the district, you would have had them reduced; however if you were a millionaire, you would have gained. He added that when you took into account the rent increase, this was much more than the average for a lot of people. He stated that the Labour group did not agree with this and would certainly be looking at this for next year's budget as the group did not feel these increases were justifiable to tenants. He expressed grave concerns about the leadership of the District Council, a party which supported the recommendation from Leicestershire County Council that 80% of the New Homes Bonus should be removed. He added that there seemed to be a growing conflict of interest with Leicestershire County Council and he felt that it was wrong for Councillor R Blunt and Councillor N J Rushton to hold the positions they did, whilst supporting proposals that would destroy the Council's finances.

Councillor R D Bayliss referred to the comments made in respect of the rent increases and commented that these were necessary as a result of the Labour group not charging the economic rate for years. He added that this had resulted in 70% of the housing stock being non-decent before the recent improvement programme. He commented that if the electorate were ever foolish enough to allow the Labour group to undermine this rent policy, it would quickly condemn tenants to living in non-decent homes as the investment could not be maintained. He stated that the budget included £9,000,000 provision for the

Decent Homes Improvement Programme, maintenance and affordable social housing. He commended the budget, particularly the measure for achieving convergent target rents in the next financial year. He stated that the business plan was sustainable, would defend against the unknown over the next 27 years, and would pay off debts.

Councillor N Smith commented that the Labour group were expressing pity for the poor tenants; however they did not feature in their amendment. He stated that the Conservative group were the only ones who cared about tenants.

The Deputy Chairman called for order at this point in the meeting.

Councillor D J Stevenson commented that he had been an elected member of the Council for 42 years, and most of this time had been under a Labour administration, who had got the housing stock into the terrible state it was previously in. He added that tenants were now thankful for the changes that had been made. He stated that the Labour group wanted to pull the rug from underneath them and this was hypocritical. He declared vehemently that the Labour group did not dare put forward a budget.

The Deputy Chairman called for order at this point in the meeting.

Councillor D J Stevenson commented that the electorate could see through the lies. He added that the Labour group had never spent a penny on Coalville during his time as an elected member.

Councillor R Blunt stated that he would like to hear the Labour group's scheme for Coalville. He commented that the Conservative group had done the things that the Labour group should have. He stated that buying in the expertise from Leicestershire County Council was a good use of the Council's money. He made reference to the economic downturn and the situation over the past four years, adding that the Council had been run prudently in that time. He stated that officers were crucial to this. He added that everyone understood the logic of the New Homes Bonus, and the £20,000 for Seven project was a result of this. He stated that Coalville was crucial to the Conservative group's plans and he was proud of this. He added that it was morally imperative to lead on this issue. He reminded members that one of the first decisions made by the Conservative group had been to cancel the proposed transfer of the housing stock, as tenants had been terrified. He commented that homes had been restored one by one. He stated that services had been retained in house and the Council had been run economically and sensibly. He commented that he felt sure the electorate would agree.

Councillor N J Rushton made reference to Councillor J Geary's comments in respect of the Policy Development Group meeting and explained that he had only been informed on the morning of the meeting. He apologised that he had been unable to attend. He concluded that this was a considered, targeted budget which invested in our houses, our future, our economy and our people.

The Deputy Chairman then put the motion to the vote.

A recorded vote being required in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the voting was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors R D Bayliss, R Blunt, A Bridges, J Bridges, J Cotterill, T Gillard, J Houlst, G Jones, C Large, C Meynell, T Pendleton, V Richichi, N J Rushton, A V Smith, N Smith, M Specht and D J Stevenson (17).

Against the motion:

Councillors N Clarke, P Clayfield, D De Lacy, D Everitt, J Geary, P Hyde, R Johnson, J Legrys, L Massey, T Neilson, J Ruff, A C Saffell, S Sheahan, L Spence, R Woodward and M B Wyatt (16).

The motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Section 151 officer's comments on the robustness of the estimates and adequacy of reserves be noted.
2. The district Council Tax for 2015/16 be frozen.
3. The transfer of any surplus income over expenditure in 2015/16 to the General Fund balance at 31 March 2016 be approved.
4. The HRA rent increase for 2015/16 be approved.
5. The increase in the rent of garages for 2015/16 be approved.
6. The increase in the HRA service charges for 2015/16 be approved.
7. The ground rent increase at Appleby Magna caravan site be approved.
8. The increases in lifeline charges be approved.
9. The General Fund and Housing Revenue Account budgets for 2015/16 be approved.
10. The special expenses budgets for 2015/16 be approved.
11. The special expenses precepts for 2015/16 be approved.
12. The proposed Coalville Special Expenses and HRA Capital Programmes for 2015/16 and planned financing be approved.
13. Capital expenditure in 2015/16 and capital expenditure in 2016/17 for the vehicle replacement programme only be approved.
14. The remainder of the Capital Programmes 2016/17 to 2018/19 be approved as indicative only at this stage.
15. The following amounts be approved for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Section 31b of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended:
 - (1) 29,664 being the amount calculated by the council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as its Council Tax Base for the year.
 - (2) The amounts specified in table 1 of this report being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
16. The following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31a and 31b of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended:

- (1) District / Parish Gross Expenditure
£60,294,940 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31a (2) of the Act.
 - (2) Income
£53,542,411 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in section 31a (3) of the Act.
 - (3) District / Parish Net Expenditure
£6,752,529 being the amount by which the aggregate at 16(1) above exceeds the aggregate at 16(2) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31a (4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - (4) Basic Amount of Tax (Including Average Parish Precepts)
£227.63 being the amount at 16(3) above, divided by the amount stated as the Council Tax Base in parts of the Council's area, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31 b of the Act as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
 - (5) Parish Precepts/Special Expenses
£ 2,048,344 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 35(1) of the Act.
 - (6) Basic Amount of Tax (Basic Council Tax – District)
£158.58 being the amount at 16(4) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 16(5) above by the amount as stated as the Council Tax Base for the whole of the Council area, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.
 - (7) Basic Amount of Tax (Parished Areas)
The amounts listed in column 5 of table 2 to this report, being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 16(6) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned, divided in each case by the amount stated as the Council Tax Base in parts of the Council area, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
 - (8) District /Parish Council Tax Rates
The amounts set out in table 3 to this report being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 16(6) and 16(7) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwelling listed in different valuation bands.
17. Major Precepting Authorities
It be noted that the amounts set out in table 4 to this report are the amounts notified by Leicestershire County Council, Leicestershire Police and Crime Commissioner and the combined Fire Authority in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as their precepts for 2015/16 for each of the categories of dwellings listed.

18. Council Tax Rates – All Bands

Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 16(8) (table 3) and 17 (table 4) above, the Council in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 hereby sets the amounts of Council Tax for the Council's area for the year 2015/16 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown in table 5.

19. Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases

It be noted that the relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2015/16 is not excessive.

20. Treasury Management Strategy

The Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2015/16, Prudential Indicators 2014/15 (revised) and 2015/16 – 2017/18, and annual minimum revenue provision statement 2015/16 be approved.

59. STREET TRADING POLICY

Councillor A V Smith presented the report to members. She stated that the Council's first street trading policy had been introduced in 2009 to create a street environment which complimented premises-based trading, to provide diversity and consumer choice and to enhance the character and safety of the local environment. She advised that a significant review of the content of the policy and procedures had been carried out in 2013, which included a change from a zonal approach to the whole district being a consent area. She added that the changes previously made had a positive impact; however a further review had been carried out. She highlighted the proposed changes to the policy.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he was happy to serve on the Licensing Committee and was therefore well versed in the development of the policy. He commended the Portfolio Holder and officers as the process had been very transparent and he was happy to see that all comments from the Licensing Committee had been taken on board. He added that the changes would make a big difference and would have an impact. He expressed concerns about decisions being delegated to officers, and stressed the importance of open and transparent decision making. He felt that recommendation 3 was contrary to that principle. He moved that recommendation 3 be removed from the motion.

The Deputy Chairman stated that he had been advised that this did not constitute an amendment as it negated the position in the recommendations.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he believed the main thrust of the recommendations was to adopt the policy, and the amendment did not impact upon the policy.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that all that the amendment was seeking was for the status quo to be maintained. He could not see how this negated the motion and he felt this seemed entirely reasonable.

Councillor D De Lacy referred to the Constitution which stated that an amendment could remove words. He added that the main thrust of the changes set out in the recommendation were being supported and he felt the amendment did not negate the motion.

The Deputy Chairman stated that he would put the amendment to the vote. The motion was declared LOST.

The Deputy Chairman referred members to the substantive motion as set out in the report.

Councillor M Specht congratulated officers and members on a very transparent policy. He stated that he was happy to support it.

It was moved by Councillor A V Smith, seconded by Councillor M Specht and

RESOLVED THAT:

- a) The draft Street Trading Policy at Appendix 1 be approved.
- b) The Head of Service in consultation with the Portfolio Holder be delegated authority to amend the list of mandatory conditions within the Street Trading Policy.
- c) The Head of Service in consultation with the Portfolio Holder be delegated authority to approve changes to the Street Trading Policy.

60. APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

Councillor N J Rushton presented the report to members. He advised it would be in the Council's interests to extend the term of office, as a joint county-wide recruitment process would take place next year.

Councillor T Neilson stated that he was happy to support the recommendation.

It was moved by Councillor N J Rushton, seconded by Councillor R Blunt and

RESOLVED THAT:

The term of office of the independent persons be extended to the end of the 2015-2016 municipal year.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Deputy Chairman closed the meeting at 8.27 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2015

Title of report	PROPOSED COUNCIL DELIVERY PLAN 2015/16
Contacts	<p>Councillor Richard Blunt 01530 454510 richard.blunt@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Chief Executive 01530 454500 christine.fisher@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Housing 01530 454819 glyn.jones@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To endorse the Council's Delivery Plan for 2015/16 and consider any recommendations from Cabinet.
Reason for Decision	To formally adopt the Council Delivery Plan for 2015/16.
Council Priorities	This report delivers an update and actions on all of the Council's priorities.
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	The implementation of the Council Delivery Plan has been resourced through the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.
Link to relevant CAT	Improvements contained within the Delivery Plan
Risk Management	Improvements contained within the Delivery Plan
Equalities	Equality impacts will be continuously monitored
Human Rights	None discernible at this time
Transformational Government	Improvements contained within the Delivery Plan
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory.

Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Consultees	CLT; Strategy Group on 10/2/15; and Cabinet on 3/3/15.
Background papers	Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015/16 to 2018/19 (Cabinet 23 September 2014) General Fund and Special Expenses Revenue Budgets – Draft Proposals 2015/16 (Cabinet 10 February 2015) Proposed Council Delivery Plan 2015-16 (Cabinet 3 March 2015)
Recommendations	<p>IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT COUNCIL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. APPROVES THE PROPOSED COUNCIL DELIVERY PLAN 2015/16. 2. AUTHORISES THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, TO MAKE ANY FINAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE PLAN PRIOR TO PUBLICATION.

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The council adopted its first Council Delivery Plan (CDP) in April 2005. Since then, the CDP has evolved annually to reflect the changing environment in which the council is operating.
- 1.2 Previously, the CDP was used as evidence towards the Council's Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) inspection, and was a lengthy and highly detailed document of several volumes designed to meet the requirements of the Audit Commission inspection process. With the abolition of the Audit Commission, the National Indicator set and the CAA during 2010, the council is able to determine locally how performance is reported.
- 1.3 Since 2011/12, the CDP format has been designed to suit our customers with an accessible overview of the council's plans for the new financial year, including priority outcomes and high level actions. Performance against the plan is reported quarterly to Cabinet. The most recent CDPs have a strong customer focus, and several sections of the reports were included largely for the benefit of readers outside the council.
- 1.4 The council's priorities for 2015/16 are: Value for Money; Business and Jobs; Homes and Communities and Green Footprints Challenge.

1.5 A number of key frontline services, which matter most to customers, were agreed at Cabinet in the *General Fund Revenue Budget – Draft Proposals 2014-15 and 2015-16* report of 24 September 2013. These are:

- Waste Services
- Housing Services
- Leisure Centres
- Revenues & Benefits
- Planning Services
- Environmental Health

2.0 PROPOSED COUNCIL DELIVERY PLAN 2015/16

2.1 The 2015/16 CDP is attached at Appendix 1 and follows the same format as plans from the past few years.

2.2 The Council's priorities and frontline services have been used to shape the content of the Council Delivery Plan, which also details key projects planned for each priority area.

2.3 The outcomes and actions listed in the Plan have a detailed set of quarterly milestones and indicators listed in Team Business Plans, and quarterly performance monitoring against these plans will continue as it does at present. In addition, it is proposed that performance against key corporate projects will be reported quarterly to Cabinet as part of the Quarterly Performance Report.

This page is intentionally left blank



Council Delivery Plan 2015/16





“We are very fortunate to live in an area full of character, thanks to our busy market towns, close-knit rural villages, rolling farmland and wooded countryside”

Introduction...

Welcome to our Council Delivery Plan for 2015/16, which sets out the council's focus for the year ahead.

We are working harder than ever to provide value for money in these challenging financial times and, while this sometimes means taking tough decisions, our focus for 2015/16 remains on providing high quality frontline services for our customers. While we are reducing our overall expenditure, we will make funding available to maintain, invest in and make essential improvements to services for the communities in our district.

We're proud of our achievements during the past year:

Value for money

- Our customers now have better access to our services 24/7, through our investment in a new website, providing self-service options
- We have continually made efficiencies in services. Due to this success; we've been able to put money back into the community through our £20,000-for-Seven grant scheme.

Business and jobs

- We have invested £268,000 in Coalville Market – both in its physical appearance, inside and

out, and in bringing new events, like the popular Farmers Market

- We are making good progress with our Local Plan, which will set out how the district will grow over the next 20 – 25 years – in terms of employment, infrastructure and homes. This process has been guided by a cross political party advisory group, who represent the views of residents, and we aim to have an adopted plan in place by 2016.

Homes and communities

- Our tenants are benefiting from council homes with modern standards, as our Decent Homes Improvement Programme reaches the 3,000th property mark - the whole programme will be complete by April 2015
- We're helping to provide more affordable housing for local people by investing in key flagship schemes – like bringing the Pick and Shovel site in Coalville town centre back into use as affordable housing with East Midlands Homes and the Homes and Communities Agency.

Introduction...

Green Footprints

- For the first time, we're helping our tenants access cheaper electricity with renewable technology installed in their homes. Our Green and Decent Homes Project will generate an income for the council when any surplus energy is sold to the grid, so we can reinvest in services, as well as being kinder to the environment
- Around 150 volunteer litter pickers across North West Leicestershire are now helping us to keep the district a cleaner, greener place, thanks to our recruitment drive
- We've been recognised nationally for our green focus – a networking and skill sharing event for community groups and businesses won national gold at the Green Apple Awards, and our Street Action Team was highly commended in two MJ Local Government Awards for its roadside litter campaign.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Blunt'.

Cllr Richard Blunt
Leader
North West Leicestershire
District Council

The future

Having achieved the decent homes standard, a key focus for the council next year is to build new, affordable homes. We will continue to improve our services to enable us to be responsive to the changing funding environment of local government.

We are dedicated to making our services better and more accessible through the second phase of our Improving the Customer Experience Programme which will use customer feedback to make sure we develop services that meet the needs of both residents and businesses in North West Leicestershire.

We would like to thank all our staff, customers and partners that have worked with us to shape and deliver our services throughout 2014/15.

We look forward to building on our successes during 2015/16 and beyond.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Christine E. Fisher'.

Christine E Fisher
Chief Executive
North West Leicestershire
District Council

What we plan to do in 2015/16



Family bike ride at Hicks Lodge
Photo courtesy of the National Forest Company - Jacqui Rock

Our vision for the future

'North West Leicestershire will be a place where people and businesses feel they belong and are proud to call home.'

Delivering this vision is the focus of our four priorities and ensures that we concentrate on using our resources to provide services that really matter to local people and businesses.

Council priorities for 2015/16

• Value for money

We aim to provide council services that people feel provide good value for money

• Business and jobs

We aim to make the district a better place to invest, work and visit

• Homes and communities

We aim to improve the wellbeing of people living in North West Leicestershire

• Green Footprints

We aim to make people feel proud to be part of a greener district



Our people

At North West Leicestershire District Council we know our staff is our biggest asset. Providing excellent service for our customers means developing and supporting our staff to be their best; we measure success not only by delivering great results, but also in the way we achieve them. The council promotes five core values for its employees as part of its Best Employee Experience (BEE) programme:

- **Spend our money wisely** – Our staff ensure they deliver value for money in everything they do
- **Support what is possible** – Our staff agree and provide the best possible outcomes for all customers
- **Be fair and proud** – Our staff show pride in

their work and take individual responsibility for delivering what is agreed

- **Listen carefully** – Our staff listen and respond to the needs of customers and colleagues – both internally and externally
- **Deliver agreed quality** – Our staff ensure they deliver within agreed timescales and to the expected quality

During 2015/16 our staff will continue to deliver on our core values through regular appraisals, monitoring of feedback from customers and training and development. We will celebrate the achievements of staff that consistently demonstrate outstanding service and will use feedback from our customers to identify staff providing exceptional customer experiences.

Value for money

People feel council services provide good value for money

What we want to achieve

- Customers are happier with key services provided
- People feel the council is spending money wisely

How we will achieve it

Providing high quality frontline services

To provide fair and supportive services for our customers through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Customers are supported within the framework of Universal Credit and feel that the transition is managed effectively	Work in partnership with the Department for Work and Pensions and other local authorities for the introduction of Universal Credit
People feel that the council is using its resources efficiently	Review the procurement plan to ensure that the council maximises value for money
	Develop strategy to manage our assets (like buildings and land), making sure that this supports the overall direction of the council
People are confident that the council can respond to the changing picture of local government finance	Empty council properties will be allocated and re-let quickly
	Address the Government's spending review in Autumn 2015 by reviewing our Medium Term Financial Strategy

Value for money

People feel council services provide good value for money

Delivering high priority corporate projects	
Outcome	Action
Customers of the revenues and benefits service receive a more efficient service	Implement the second phase of recommendations from the Institute of Revenues, Ratings and Valuation (IRRV)
Customer satisfaction is improved and customers can interact with the council at a time and place that suits them	To deliver phase 2 of the Improving the Customer Experience (ICE) programme
Council performance is improved through staff development	To develop a co-ordinated and targeted learning and talent development programme with full evaluation of its effectiveness
Frontline services are maintained	Investigate further opportunities to maximise income to support those services

Other 'Value for money' measures we will monitor and report to Cabinet

- Quarterly updates on managing our finances
- Quarterly updates on managing sickness absence



Business and jobs

Our district is a better place to invest, work and visit

What we want to achieve

- Businesses choose to locate and remain in our district
- People find suitable employment within the district
- The council supports sustainable development and growth

How we will achieve it

Providing high quality frontline services

The Business Focus Team will provide a proactive support for businesses through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Local businesses feel supported and make positive investment decisions within the district that ensures income from business rates is maximised	Develop and implement innovative ways to help businesses thrive within the district Introduce a £500,000 funding pot for small businesses to bid for funding
The council attracts new businesses and employers to the district and delivers an increase in inward investment that ensures business rates income is increased	Consolidate service provision through a review of the Business Focus team to provide an effective and seamless support package to businesses that require interaction with several council departments
Partnership working delivers new jobs, investments and infrastructure which deliver growth across the district	The council proactively engages with pan-Leicestershire business support through the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership



The council proactively engages with pan-Leicestershire business support through the LLEP

Business and jobs

Our district is a better place to invest, work and visit

To provide a fair and timely planning and development service through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Customers are happier with the service provided	The Planning and Development Team will review and refresh the agents forum and streamline current processes and practices
Customers understand and appreciate the council's design aspirations for residential development	Develop a design guide for planning applications in the district including feedback from the customer survey on future affordable housing

To provide a robust and supportive environmental health service through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Businesses view the environmental health service as an effective and efficient service that supports business growth	To deliver customer led improvements to the service through the work of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Regulatory Services Partnership and Better Business for All work programme
Food produced or sold in the district is safe to eat	To provide an enhanced level of support to food businesses identified as 'high risk'

Delivering high priority corporate projects

Outcome	Action
Residents will have access to good quality homes, leisure and shopping facilities and new job opportunities	Develop the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State by 2016
	Refine the local growth plan including the development of an action plan to facilitate the delivery of priority projects
Coalville town centre will be an attractive place to visit, shop and trade	Continue to improve Coalville town centre through various projects including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 2 of the market hall improvement plan; • Redevelopment of the Pick and Shovel in partnership with East Midlands Housing • Use the Coalville conservation area to attract funding for high quality developments, including improvements to Marlborough Square • Shop front improvement scheme.

Homes and communities

The wellbeing of people in North West Leicestershire is improved

What we want to achieve

- People feel proud of their homes and communities
- People feel safe in their community
- Families in need are supported by the council

How we will achieve it

Providing high quality frontline services

To provide a fair and supportive housing service through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
There is a smooth transition to Universal Credit for affected council tenants	Council tenants affected by Universal Credit have access to services to help become financially independent and suitable rent payment arrangements are in place
A high quality responsive repairs service for which there are high levels of tenant satisfaction	Review the current priorities and operations of the responsive repairs service and implement any changes
Tenants can effectively scrutinise the housing service and their feedback is taken on board	Tenant scrutiny panel is supported in carrying out comprehensive inspections of the housing service and providing two inspection reports to Cabinet
People feel proud of their homes and communities	Introduce customer satisfaction survey to obtain customers views on design and layout of new homes to inform future affordable developments
People feel that the council acts fairly in meeting the diverse housing needs of local residents	Publish a district lettings plan for 2015/16
People feel that their needs are being met and the council is spending money well	Publication of a new housing strategy for 2016-2021 that is sensitive to emerging local and national issues, plans and policies
	Collect more information about our customers, identify any hidden needs and use profiling information to offer new services or vary existing services

Homes and communities

The wellbeing of people in North West Leicestershire is improved

To provide a dynamic and customer-focused Leisure service through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Residents help us improve our customer service in leisure	To co-design service improvements following customer listening week and visits from industry assessors
Residents have access to sporting opportunities from grass roots to elite levels	To support and develop local sports clubs, athletes, volunteers and opportunity pathways

To provide a stronger and safer community through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
Reduced crime and anti-social behaviour through partnership working	Manage the district's community safety strategy and delivery plan
Families in need are effectively supported to make positive, long lasting change to protect them from risk of harm and to enable them to engage in education and employment	Assist the delivery of Supporting Leicestershire Families by continuously developing relationships between families and their support services and agencies
Parish councils and community organisations feel engaged with the Council and that we are working together to provide services that their communities want	To further develop effective and efficient working practices between parishes and district council to deliver improved services in localities

Delivering high priority corporate projects

Outcome	Action
The affordable housing needs of local people are met, improving their well-being	Develop and implement the council's strategy for facilitating new homes in the district
Residents and businesses are satisfied that the council is making best use of its resources and assets to achieve a balance between supply, demand and budgets whilst seeking to improve the prosperity of the district	Develop an updated Housing Revenue Account Asset Management Strategy and deliver the capital investment programme for 2016-17
	Use the evidence available to us to make sure that we coordinate decisions about our assets (like buildings and land) to the benefit of the local economy
The council offers fully integrated services that meet the needs of vulnerable groups	Delivery of the Hood Park Leisure Centre well-being centre

People feel proud to be part of a greener district

What we want to achieve

- To enable others in the district to help us make it a greener and cleaner place

How we will achieve it

Providing high quality frontline services

To provide a reliable and efficient waste collection, recycling and cleansing service through the following actions:

Outcome	Action
That the district is cleaner and greener	To undertake environmental improvement campaigns relating to dog fouling, fly tipping and littering
Residents are motivated to become involved in making their community greener	Increase the number of environmental volunteers To empower community groups to develop a series of projects that make a difference to residents quality of life and the environment
Residents feel that the council is spending money wisely	Continuously improve the efficiency of the waste collection and street cleansing services
Tenants homes are energy efficient	Roll out renewable energy technology across the council's housing stock based on the results of the Green and Decent Homes pilot programme



People feel proud to be part of a greener district

Delivering high priority corporate projects	
Outcome	Action
Residents receive improved value for money from their recycling efforts	To install and commission material separating technology for recyclable plastics and cans



An ambulance created from dumped fridges and washing machines was constructed in Coalville to raise awareness of the real cost of fly-tipping.

Managing the council's finances - 2015/16 to 2018/19

Continuing to ensure that we provide value for money in our services is more important than ever in the current economic climate as the Government continues to move forward with its deficit reduction programme. The Government has reviewed the funding of local authorities and it is clear that the overall level of national funding will continue to fall.

The Council is doing all it can to maximise its locally determined income including New Homes Bonus and Retained Business Rates.

For 2015/16 our mainstream Government grant allocation was reduced by more than 14% compared with 2014/15. Through our medium term financial planning, the council anticipated such a reduction and has continued to identify and deliver savings to meet overall expected funding reductions up to the end of 2018/19. This has also allowed the Council to freeze its Council Tax again in 2015/16.

The council will continue its drive for efficiency, economy and effectiveness in everything it does and will also continue with the regular monitoring of income and expenditure and recording efficiency savings made. The Council will update its four year Medium Term Financial Strategy in the Autumn in anticipation of further reductions in Government funding as part of a 2015 Spending Review.



Stenson House: included in the Coalville Conservation Area, which was designated in June 2014

Building confidence in the council's performance

Leading the way - a flagship council

The council is committed to developing first class service provision for residents, businesses and visitors. Our performance was very strong across the council during 2014/15, and we continue to strive to improve performance across all services.



Tree planting to support the National Forest

Photo courtesy of the National Forest Company - Ross Hoddinott

At the heart of our work to further improve the services that people value will be a learning and talent programme focusing on developing all staff in providing excellent service. As part of our drive to improve we will be:

- Actively engaging our customers and communities in shaping our services
- Investing in and supporting our local councillors to carry out their duties
- Valuing the views of our partners and customers to improve our performance
- Engaging external best practice and benchmarking to challenge what we do and how we do it
- Working as one council and one team to be the best we can
- Releasing talent, growing capacity and expertise within the staff of the council

Each of the actions set out in this plan will be monitored quarterly by members of the council's Cabinet to make sure we are achieving the high standards we have set.

You can check our progress on our website www.nwleics.gov.uk/performance.

Useful information

If you would like more information about the Council Delivery Plan or any council service, please use the contact details below:

Website:

www.nwleics.gov.uk

Email:

customer.services@nwleicestershire.gov.uk

Twitter:

@nwleics

Post:

North West Leicestershire District Council,
Council Offices,
Coalville,
Leicestershire,
LE67 3FJ

Telephone:

01530 454545 (Main switchboard)

If you have an emergency outside of normal hours,
please call 01530 454789

Fax:

01530 454506 (Reception)



“Local people are at the heart of our services, and during 2015/16 we will continue to work closely with you to improve the services you value.”

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2015**

Title of report	MINUTES OF LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration 01530 454782 jim.newton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	For Council to agree the minutes and recommendations of the meetings of the Local Plan Advisory Committee
Council Priorities	<p>Value for Money</p> <p>Business and Jobs</p> <p>Homes and Communities</p> <p>Green Footprints Challenge</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	The cost of preparing the Local Plan is met from within existing budgets.
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	A risk assessment of the project has been undertaken. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise these risks, including monthly Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed.
Equalities Impact Assessment	As part of the process of preparing the Local Plan an assessment of the potential impact of the policies and proposals of the Local Plan from an equalities perspective will need to be undertaken.
Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory

Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	Minutes of meetings of Local Plan Advisory Committee dated 9 September 2014, 15 October 2014, 21 November 2014 and 17 February 2015 as set out in Appendix A , Appendix B, Appendix C and Appendix D respectively of this report.
Recommendations	<p>THAT COUNCIL:</p> <p>(I) RECEIVES THE MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 9 SEPTEMBER 2014, 15 OCTOBER 2015, 21 NOVEMBER 2014 AND 17 FEBRUARY 2015;</p> <p>(II) AGREES THAT THE NEW LOCAL PLAN HAVE A PLAN PERIOD OF 2011-2031 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE;</p> <p>(III) NOTES THE AGREEMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO DEFINE LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT FOR THOSE SETTLEMENTS LISTED AT PARAGRAPH 2.9 OF THIS REPORT;</p> <p>(IV) NOTES THE VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE IN RESPECT OF THE SUGGESTED LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES AS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPH 5.6 OF THIS REPORT.</p>

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of Council on 25 February 2014 it was agreed to establish a Local Plan Advisory Committee to work with officers on the new Local Plan.
- 1.2 Since the last report to Council on 1 July 2014 the Advisory Committee has met on five further occasions on 9 September 2014, 15 October 2014, 21 November 2014, 17 February 2015 and 4 March 2015. The purpose of this report is to consider the outcome from the first four of these meetings.
- 1.3 Minutes for the meeting of 4 March 2015 were not agreed at the time of preparing this report and have yet to be agreed by the Advisory Committee and so will be reported to a subsequent Council meeting.

2.0 MEETING OF 9 SEPTEMBER 2014

- 2.1 The meeting considered reports in respect of:
- an update of progress on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA);
 - risk management of the Local Plan;
 - an update on the plan period and;
 - the suggested approach to defining Limits to Development

A copy of the minutes is attached at Appendix A of this report.

- 2.2 In terms of the SHMA the Advisory Committee noted the intention to agree a Memorandum of Understanding with the other local authorities in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) and that separate housing forecasts for the Housing Market Area had been prepared in support of development elsewhere in the HMA.
- 2.3 Members will recall that a Memorandum of Understanding was subsequently agreed by Council at its meeting on 11 November 2014.
- 2.4 Since then the outcome of the SHMA has been supported by Inspectors on appeal and also at the examination in respect of the Charnwood Local Plan/Core Strategy.
- 2.5 In respect of risk management, the Advisory Committee noted that a robust risk assessment had been prepared which sought to identify the risks that were being managed as part of preparing the Local Plan, some of which were external to the Council.
- 2.6 The issue of the plan period had previously been considered at an earlier meeting of the Advisory Committee when it had been agreed to recommend a plan period of 2011-2036. The Advisory Committee was advised by officers that following discussions across the HMA in connection with the (then) proposed Memorandum of Understanding it was being suggested that the end date should instead be 2031 to provide consistency across the HMA. The Advisory Committee were also advised that Cabinet had considered this issue at its meeting on 29 July 2014 when it had asked the Advisory Committee to reconsider this matter.
- 2.7 The Advisory Committee therefore agreed that the end date of the plan should be changed to 2031 and this is therefore recommended to Council.
- 2.8 On the issue of Limits to Development a report was considered which set out that it was proposed to define new Limits to Development in the most sustainable settlements across the district. The Advisory Committee agreed with this suggestion and to the suggestion to hold a workshop for Members to provide an input in to the defining of the Limits to Development.
- 2.9 The Advisory Committee was advised that it was the intention to define Limits to Development for the most sustainable settlements only as set out in the list below:

Albert Village, Appleby Magna, Ashby de la Zouch, Belton, Blackfordby, Breedon on the Hill, Castle Donington, Coalville Urban area, Coleorton (the Lower Moor Road area only), Diseworth, Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Ibstock, Kegworth, Long Whatton, Measham, Moira (including Norris Hill), Oakthorpe, Packington, Ravenstone, Swannington, Worthington.
- 2.10 The Advisory Committee agreed that Limits to Development should be defined for these settlements.
- 2.11 This workshop was held on 9 October 2014. Following agreement at the meeting of the Advisory Committee on 15 October 2014 the proposed Limits to Development (and town

centre boundaries) were then subject of consultation with Parish and Town Councils and other interested groups between 17 November 2014 and 9 January 2015.

3.0 MEETING OF 15 OCTOBER 2014

- 3.1 The meeting considered a report in respect of proposals for town centre boundaries for the main settlements of Coalville, Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham. A copy of the minutes is attached at Appendix B of this report.
- 3.2 The Advisory Committee was advised that the town centre boundaries set out in the existing Local Plan had not been reviewed for over 20 years and were in need of review. In most cases the suggested town centre boundaries were proposed to be smaller than the existing boundary to reflect the changes which had occurred and to provide more vibrant, viable and robust town centres in the future.
- 3.3 The Advisory Committee noted the need to review the boundaries and that the boundaries were to be the subject of consultation with parish and town councils and the town teams in Coalville and Ashby.

4.0 MEETING OF 21 NOVEMBER 2014

- 4.1 The meeting considered reports in respect of:
- Development strategy;
 - Affordable housing and;
 - the Statement of Community Involvement

A copy of the minutes is attached at Appendix C of this report.

- 4.2 In terms of the development strategy, the Advisory Committee was advised that it was being recommended to include some form of flexibility allowance in respect of housing due to concerns regarding the deliverability of sufficient housing to ensure that the needs identified in the SHMA would be met. This allowance would also provide some comfort to an examining Inspector that the Council would be in a position to meet its identified housing need during the plan period. In addition, two options for a settlement hierarchy were outlined, with officers suggesting the following preferred option:
- Coalville (Principal Town)
 - Ashby/Castle Donington (Main Towns)
 - Ibstock/Kegworth/Measham (Rural Centres)
 - Sustainable Villages
 - Rural Villages
- 4.3 The Advisory Committee was also asked to note a number of guiding principles which it was suggested be used when considering potential site allocations for development.
- 4.4 There was some concern at the suggestion that additional housing may be required and the Advisory Committee also raised concerns regarding whether the suggested settlement hierarchy was appropriate. Furthermore, there were concerns regarding the scale of development suggested in some of the settlements with Members suggesting that development should be capped to maintain their separate identities.

- 4.5 In view of these concerns it was agreed by the Advisory Committee to take a further report back to a future meeting of the Advisory Committee on these matters.
- 4.6 In respect of affordable housing, the Advisory Committee noted that there was a need for a policy and that there were options available to the council in terms of whether any thresholds and targets should be the same across the district or whether they should vary depending upon location. There was no clear consensus and it was agreed that a further report on this matter be considered by a future meeting of the Advisory Committee.
- 4.7 In respect of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the Advisory committee was advised of the responses to the recent consultation and the intention that a report proposing a new SCI would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 13 January 2015. This was subsequently agreed and adopted by Cabinet in January 2015.

5.0 MEETING OF 17 FEBRUARY 2015

- 5.1 The meeting considered two reports in respect of the following:
- Responses to the consultations in respect of proposed Limits to Development and town centre boundaries and
 - An update on other recent local examinations.

A copy of the minutes is attached at Appendix D of this report.

- 5.2 In respect of the consultations the Advisory Committee noted that a number of changes were proposed to some of the Limits to Development in response to comments received.
- 5.3 The Advisory Committee was advised that a number of representations had been received which considered that the methodology used to define the Limits to Development should be amended to include matters such as playing fields, allotments and protected open space. It was recommended by officers that no change be made to the methodology as these were matters which required separate consideration and, potentially, separate policies.
- 5.4 Some of the representations also suggested that Limits to Development should be defined for smaller settlements. As discussed and agreed at the Advisory Committee meeting of the 9th September it was felt that the most appropriate way forward was to define Limits to Development for sustainable settlements only, as the new Local Plan would be prepared in accordance with the NPPF, with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 5.5 In respect of town centre boundaries the Advisory Committee was advised that some amendment to the boundaries in Ashby and Kegworth were recommended in response to the consultation.

- 5.6 The Advisory Committee agreed to recommend to Council that the draft Limits to Development and revised town centre boundaries be included as part of the new Local Plan, with the exception of:
- i) Ashby town centre boundary
 - ii) Castle Donington town centre boundary
 - iii) Coalville town centre boundary
 - iv) Ibstock town centre boundary
 - v) Packington limits to development
- 5.7 In respect of other recent Local Plan Examinations the Advisory committee noted the contents of the report.

6.0 NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Whilst Cabinet are responsible for overseeing the drafting of the Local Plan, the final decision is the responsibility of Council.
- 6.2 Officers are currently in the process of preparing a draft Local Plan for consultation purposes. It is intended that this be reported to Council as soon as practical following the upcoming local elections.
- 6.3 Council will be asked to approve the draft Local Plan for consultation purposes. The consultation will commence as soon as practical after the agreement of Council and will be for a period of 12 weeks to ensure that sufficient opportunity is provided for people to consider and comment on the draft plan.
- 6.4 A further report will be brought to Council which considers the responses received to the consultation and how the plan may need to be amended accordingly. At this point Council will be asked to agree the Council's 'final' version which will then be published for consultation before being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination purposes.

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2014

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors R D Bayliss, D De Lacy, C Large, J Legrys, V Richichi and S Sheahan

In Attendance: Councillors R Adams, D Everitt, J Geary, D Howe, G Jones, T Neilson and T J Pendleton

Officers: Mr M Sharp (Consultant), Mr S Bambrick, Mrs C Hammond, Mr I Nelson and Mr S Stanion

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

22. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor S Sheahan declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 6, Local Plan – Risk Assessment, as a property owner who could be affected by the proposed route of HS2, due to the fact that HS2 was mentioned in the report, but only insofar as to indicate that it did not have any bearing on the Authority's planning policies prior to the final route being announced.

23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2014.

Councillor J Legrys requested that Councillor T Neilson be added to the attendance list for the meeting, as he had attended the meeting and was mentioned in the minutes.

Councillor D De Lacy queried if the SHMA figures had been agreed and what was the position of the 5 year land supply.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the SHMA figures had not yet been agreed and this would be covered in item 5. He added that the district had a 5 year plus supply using the SHMA figures and that if the Authority was to use the old figures a 5 year supply would be tight.

Councillor D De Lacy asked for clarification that any applications that had been submitted for the Green Wedge would be recommended for refusal.

The Director of Services advised Members that he was unable to comment on individual applications, but officers would take into account the policy when considering them.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor R D Bayliss and

RESOLVED THAT:

Subject to the amendment above, the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

24. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Councillor J Legrys queried with the terms of reference which states that the Advisory Committee would meet at least once every two months, it had now been three months since the last meeting and wanted to know why this was.

Councillor J Bridges stated that the Advisory Committee had agreed to meet when there was business to discuss.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that two months from the last meeting would have been August and it was felt that as this was the main holiday period, it would be more appropriate to hold the meeting in early September.

Councillor J Legrys stated that the Advisory Committee had a criteria and that it should stick to it. He felt that if they were going to be laid back about this condition what other conditions would they be laid back about.

25. UPDATE IN RESPECT OF THE STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT

The Director of Services presented the report to Members. He reminded Members that they had considered a report on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) at the last meeting. He advised Members that at a meeting of the Members Advisory Group (MAG) in July it was proposed that a Memorandum of Understanding be agreed in respect of the amount and distribution of housing across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA), as there was a consensus that up until 2031 there would be no need for any authority to redistribute. He went on to inform Members that the report identified risks should the SHMA be challenged. He added that one authority had already been challenged and that a second would be examined later in the year. He advised Members that the Packington Road appellant would be presenting evidence against the SHMA, and that this would be monitored closely. He stated that the advice that the Authority had received remained the most up to date and that would be used in creating the plan and making planning decisions.

Councillor S Sheahan expressed his concern over the alternative SHMA and moved to incorporate an additional recommendation that the Advisory Committee reaffirms support to the SHMA endorsed by the MAG on the 17 July. This was seconded by Councillor J Legrys.

Councillor C Large asked if there were any examples of previous figures being successfully contested.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that some Local Plans had fallen down on the issue of housing numbers where they had not demonstrated to an Inspector's satisfaction that the evidence was robust. However, he was not aware of any instances where an alternative SHMA had been produced and supported.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he was thankful that the GL Hearn work had been done and that this was recognised. He expressed concerns over the risk that the Council had taken with a countywide approach as the district would be affected if issues were to arise. He added that he would like to see the Memorandum of Understanding and it would be wrong if the Committee did not see it, and that he was hopeful that it would be signed. He stated that he was confident that the SHMA would be challenged and that Members needed to take into account that the authority would be working on a much lower figure. He asked officers to emphasise which SHMA they were talking about.

The Director of Services reminded Members that this did not relate to just North West Leicestershire, but to the whole of the market area.

Councillor J Legrys acknowledged the statement, but expressed concerns that there was a possible risk at County level, as they could challenge their own figures.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that the alternative SHMA could only be a critique and that it should be reported as such and that greater weight should be given to the GL Hearn figures.

Councillor J Legrys stated that it was unfortunate to have an alternative SHMA and that the Advisory Committee should focus on the GL Hearn figures, if that was approved policy.

The Legal Advisor informed Members that it was inaccurate to describe the alternative SHMA as such.

Councillor D De Lacy supported the recommendation as there was a big difference between the two and that at this stage the Council's position should be that of the GL Hearn and that the agreement should be signed. He added that the position should have cross party support to ensure that doubts weren't raised over the supply.

Councillor J Bridges supported the additional recommendation

It was moved by Councillor S Sheahan, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee notes;

1. The proposal to agree a Memorandum of Understanding in respect of the amount and distribution of housing.
2. The fact that an alternative SHMA had been produced;

And reaffirms support to the SMHA that was endorsed at the Members Advisory Group on the 17 July 2014.

26. LOCAL PLAN - RISK MANAGEMENT

The Director of Services presented the report to Members. He advised Members that to develop the plan, it was being done as a project and therefore there was a need to bring the risk assessment to Members to give them an opportunity to comment and add to it.

Councillor J Legrys expressed gratitude that officers had undertaken the necessary work. He stated that HS2 couldn't be taken into account however he was disappointed that Roxhill was not included as it was live and happening. He raised concerns at how the risk of a challenge on the SMHA had gone down from 12 to 4 and how the risk of insufficient budget had lowered from 16 to 1. He also questioned how the risk of local politics had been assessed. He stated that a lot of this had been built on the expertise of officers and external consultants. He added that he understood politics could be unfair, but if the Members showed trust and were open there would not be a need to discuss.

The Director of Services advised Members that the process was about managing a project built on judgement. He explained that the project team would contribute experience and knowledge, but it was not black and white, and for this reason it was being reported to Members for the opportunity to debate. He stated that in relation to HS2 this was more of a generic risk if it was to materialise and he felt that the Roxhill would not be a project risk as this had been submitted to the Inspectorate.

Councillor D De Lacy felt that local politics could still be high risk, even though it talks about the working party, there were chances that views would not be listened to and that more members should be consulted.

Councillor J Bridges agreed that Councillor D De Lacy had made a good point as at the first meeting of the Advisory Committee, Members had discussed feeding back to other colleagues the progression on the plan.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that as the Plan was still going through the process, it could not be assumed that it would be agreed.

Councillor S Sheahan welcomed the report and stated that it covered everything, and showed that the authority was watching its back.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee notes the current risk assessment.

27. PLAN PERIOD UPDATE

The Director of Services presented the report to Members. He reminded Members that at the first meeting of the Advisory Committee, Members had agreed to recommend to Council that the period of the plan covered 2011-2036. He informed Members that since then, with the SHMA being agreed and as a result of the proposed Memorandum of Understanding that all authorities in the Housing Market Area could accommodate their housing requirements to 2031, it was now being suggested that 2031 be the plan end date. He advised Members that whilst 2031 raised the issue of the plan not hitting the time horizon, it was less of a risk than to commit to 2036. He stated that this was the Cabinet preferred option and that it had requested the Advisory Committee to reconsider this.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he understood the need for the report and the date coming down, however he was aware that some neighbouring authorities were looking at a 2028 end date. He added that the three year period between 2028 and 2031 would make a difference and questioned the inconsistency. He highlighted that the NPPF makes clear the period length and that he could not understand why all authorities could not be consistent. He added that whatever the Authority chose, once the plan was approved, it would need to be reviewed.

The Director of Services advised Members that in looking at an end date of 2028, Leicestershire County Council had tested the likely highway impacts but that should the Authorities in the HMA go to 2031, it would require a small piece of work, but they would be looking at each authority meeting its needs. He added that the Authority needed to progress the plan as soon as possible, and should they go to 2036, it would require more work and possible redistribution as the City would not meet their needs. He added that some authorities may go to 2036 as they were comfortable to do this. He reminded Members that the district needed a robust plan soon.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he was not suggesting 2036, but he felt that consistency was required across the whole market area. He added he was aware that the City would struggle past 2030, but wanted the district to be consistent with neighbouring authorities in going for 2028.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the Authority would struggle with 2028.

The Consultant added that it would be a big risk to go with an end date of 2028.

Councillor C Large expressed her concerns with 2028. She stated that the Director of Services had explained the reasoning well and that she was happy to move the recommendation to amend the plan period. This was seconded by Councillor R D Bayliss.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that it was a big call and that Members had just considered the risks involved with preparing the plan. He advised Members that it would not take much of a delay for the risks to increase. He added that he could not judge risks and therefore would go with officers, but stated that if it went wrong it would be a big disaster.

The Legal Advisor informed Members that it was a big call and that the plan should be drawn up over an appropriate timescale and that this was an informed risk.

It was moved by Councillor C Large, seconded by Councillor R D Bayliss and

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee recommends to Council that the Local Plan Period be amended to cover 2011-2031.

28. LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to Members. He advised Members that they were now starting to get down to the potential detail of the plan. He explained that the existing proposed limits to development were prepared twenty years ago and that they needed to be reviewed. He stated that having boundaries was the right way to go as it gave certainty. He informed Members that they were taking the Core Strategy as a starting point in terms of which settlements might require the identification of limits to development. He suggested that a workshop be held to allow all Members to provide comments.

Councillor C Large queried what the role of the SHLAA was in terms of identifying limits to development?

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the intention was to look at what was on the ground and that if more sites were required then they would look at the SHLAA when allocating sites.

Councillor J Legrys welcomed the report, but did not agree with sections three and four. He raised concerns about changing Limits to Development as this was understood by most. He stated that the report sets out pros and cons, but it was not clear leaving some settlements with no boundaries and it did not talk about overlaps with the South Derbyshire District areas. He advised that he was not happy with recommendation 2 stating that changing the name would lead to confusion. He added that it was not clear in what the Authority was trying to achieve and requested that limits were put on the Green Wedge and Charnwood Forest, and would put this as an amendment.

The Planning Policy Team Manager reminded Members that they were looking at what was on the ground now and that Charnwood Forest would need to be reviewed and a boundary defined separately. Following an additional question from Councillor J Legrys about the Green Wedge, he advised that the western section of the wedge was outside of limits in the existing Local Plan, but the central and eastern section were within the limits as it was surrounded by development.

Councillor R D Bayliss stated that whatever it was called, it would be criteria based on a case by case reason. He added that it would be difficult for criteria based to work in tandem with a neighbourhood plan.

The Director of Services stated that criteria based did not give certainty on judgements, however having a boundary did.

Councillor C Large stated that the authority should not change the name and that the Green Wedge Limits to Development could be amended.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this could be looked at and what was behind the policy as the Green Wedge was not considered as countryside, but Members could now decide that it would be outside the limits.

Councillor J Legrys stated that recommendation 2 needed to be amended. He went on to ask officers for a timescale for the process and that the workshops were held at suitable times. He added that Town and Parish Councils should also be invited to the workshops as he had been lobbied by many over the process.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that it was hoped to find a suitable date before the next meeting and that the workshops would be held between 4pm and 8pm. He went on to advise Members that it was envisaged that the workshops would be held for District Councillors first before rolling out to Town and Parish Councillors.

Councillor D De Lacy expressed that he felt the current plan was a waste of space as it had been ignored, due to the 5 year housing land supply, as many applications had been submitted outside the limits and that limits were needed in the new plan with a rigid approach. He added that he supported the idea that the name shouldn't be changed and that he agreed that each settlement should have a boundary. He went on to state that the workshops were crucial and that decisions should not be made before consultations.

Councillor R D Bayliss requested that when Town and Parish Councils were invited to attend workshops, this be extended to non elected members of any neighbourhood plan groups.

Councillor C Large stated that if the limits were being drawn using the SHLAA and based on the current applications, it was not showing the growth or predictions and therefore would be out of date very quickly.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that allocations would be done as part of the plan and that the workshop would cover the areas of development as they were now, but in the event of allocations being made it would be necessary to tweak the limits from those proposed.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he was unclear on what was trying to be achieved and stated that they could not put approved sites in as they were currently outside. He added that the authority needed 7,000 homes and that currently the council had approved 5,500, therefore the authority only needed to find 1,500. He added that he preferred the limits in the 2002 plan.

The Director of Services advised that allocating sites would provide a tool to be used on applications over the next 25 years and that part of the preparation of the plan would be revisiting the Limits to Development if it was required during the process.

Councillor C Large stated that consultation was needed on the Limits to Development and that they needed to look at sites, but it did not require two rounds.

Councillor V Richichi asked officers if a site was put forward that was brownfield, but outside the limits to development would it get planning permission.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that each application would be considered on its own merit and as it stood it may not be granted it was not sustainable.

Councillor J Legrys stated he was unable to vote as he thought it was very misleading and that he preferred Councillor C Large's approach that it needed to be clear and precise.

The Consultant advised Members that he understood that they were trying to involve everyone and helping officers to go forward as soon as possible, however if the Limits to Development were not agreed it would delay and be hard to keep to the programme.

Councillor S Sheahan asked officers what the consequence of not agreeing the limits now and if there was another way of progressing.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that when a draft plan had been formulated and a complete picture formed it would be put out to consultation.

Councillor J Bridges agreed with going to the next stage and that in deciding the limits it was a case of picking up what the authority already had and see what was left, he added that Members did not want to slow down the process and they were not intending to block the process, but felt that they could not commit.

Councillor C Large stated that she agreed with the wording change, but was concerned at just looking as it currently stands and then looking at it again a few months down the line.

The Planning Policy Team Manager confirmed with Members that they wished to amend the recommendations to read "Limits to Development".

Councillor J Legrys expressed concern that the Authority be abundantly clear to all during the process and agreed with Councillor C Large that it should all be wrapped up in one process. He stated that there was a lack of trust in the planning process and added that Members needed to be clear that officers were trying to kick start the process.

Councillor S Sheahan felt that the issue was not being presented right and that Members should consider deferring the decision to the next meeting if they weren't sure it was right. He asked what the implications would be if it was deferred.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that limits needed to be in the plan and that he was happy with recommendations 1 and 2, however if there was to be big changes he agreed that it should be deferred, if there were to be no changes then it should go forward for officers to prepare the plan and then bring back to Members.

Councillor J Bridges raised concerns if there was a delay in bringing the report back at a later date.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the next meeting would be in October.

The Director of Services advised Members that they needed to prepare bespoke issues and focus attention on this, discussing with others at a later stage, otherwise they were in danger of going back to the old process whereby officers prepared a draft plan in isolation from members and then it was issued for consultation.

Councillor S Sheahan suggested that the workshops be held for the District Councillors and that a further report be brought back to Committee following the outcome.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee:

1. Notes the limitations of settlement boundaries, particularly where there is no up to date plan or the lack of a 5 year supply of housing land;
2. Recommends that the Limits to Development settlements be defined as part of the new local plan;
3. Agrees that officers prepare draft Limits to Development for those settlements listed in paragraph 4.5 of this report:
4. Notes that workshop(s) will be arranged to allow all Members to be involved in discussion and guidance on the preparation of settlement boundaries.
5. Following the Member workshop(s) a report be brought back to the Advisory Committee to agree the next steps.

Councillors D Everitt and J Geary left the meeting at 7.10pm.

Councillors R Adams and G Jones left the meeting at 7.15pm.

Councillor D Howe left the meeting at 7.50pm.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.25 pm

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2014

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors D De Lacy, C Large, J Legrys, V Richichi and S Sheahan

In Attendance: Councillors R Johnson and T Neilson

Officers: Mr M Sharp (Consultant), Mr S Bambrick, Mrs M Meredith, Mr I Nelson and Mr S Stanion

29. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

30. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor J Legrys declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 – Town Centres – Review of Boundaries, as a volunteer at Hermitage FM which was located within Coalville town centre.

31. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Councillor D De Lacy asked if there was any progress or setbacks to report on the agreement of the SHMA figures and the housing land supply.

The Director of Services advised that in respect of the SHMA figures, a memorandum of understanding was undergoing agreement across Leicestershire; there would be a report to Cabinet in October and to a meeting of Council in November. He added that ours was the last Council to agree, therefore subject to that, there would be an agreement in respect of the housing requirements across the Housing Market Area. He advised that as reported at the last Planning Committee, the Council was currently achieving a 6.2 year housing land supply provision.

The Consultant commented that these processes all took so long that the position was bound to change. He referred to comments made by a planning inspector that local authorities should not ignore the housing implications of economic development aspirations. He added that the differences between economic aspirations and housing needs were at odds in some authorities. He advised that the housing need issues would need to be considered and compared against the aspirations. He added that it would be a matter for local authorities to convince an inspector how robust the housing need figures were in light of reality and aspirations. He stated that as far as the Local Plan was concerned, he felt that there was time to undertake this work and officers were talking to others in the area to see if this issue would affect the robustness of the housing land supply.

Councillor J Bridges stated that he understood officers were looking into this however he felt that further discussion was required with Members. He expressed concern regarding aspirations and felt the situation should be monitored.

Councillor J Legrys concurred with Councillor J Bridges' comments and felt there were a number of issues that Members needed to keep on top of. He referred to the Packington Mill and Charnwood inquiries. He stated that he had taken the personal view that the SHMA was only as good as inspectors were prepared to sign it off. He requested a written briefing to all Members to explain the situation.

Councillor V Richichi sought clarification whether more weight would be given to economic aspiration or housing need. He commented that this was a chicken and egg situation in his opinion.

The Consultant commented that the aim of planning was to balance the demand for one against the other. He added that SHMAs were built up from demographic projections and some economic assumptions, however inspectors were now saying that if you have high economic aspirations, you need to have enough housing to satisfy this. He commented that it was a question of balancing aspirations and reality, and the aspirations needed to be carefully considered to ensure that housing was not oversupplied.

Councillor V Richichi agreed with those comments and felt that houses should be built to encourage people to come to the area.

Councillor D De Lacy sought clarification on why the Parish Councils were not being consulted on the limits to development, and why this was being treated differently to the town centre boundaries. He felt that the limits to development issue was equally as important.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that as part of the report on the limits to development, consultation was suggested. He stated that his recollection was that Members had wanted to delay the consultation until after the workshops had taken place. He referred to the last resolution which agreed that a report be brought back to the Advisory Committee to agree the next steps. He stated that his advice was that the consultation should still take place.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that he welcomed this.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor S Sheahan and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

32. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Terms of Reference be noted.

33. TOWN CENTRES - REVIEW OF BOUNDARIES

The Director of Services presented the report to Members. He advised that the current town centre boundaries were set out in the existing Local Plan and had not been reviewed for over 20 years and were clearly in need of review. He explained that in a number of cases, there were uses which would no longer be regarded as town centre use, and in most cases the suggested town centre boundary was significantly smaller than the existing boundary. He sought comments from the Advisory Committee on the report and each of the settlement boundaries suggested by officers. He advised that it was proposed to undertake an informal consultation with the Town and Parish Councils.

Councillor J Legrys asked that Ward Members be included in the consultation. He commented that there may be other organisations that could be included in the consultation and felt that this should be considered.

Councillor D De Lacy asked if the results of the consultation would be reported back to the Advisory Committee.

The Director of Services advised that the results could be reported back if desired, subject to the timings.

Members agreed that they would want the results of the consultation to be reported back to the Advisory Committee in the first instance.

Councillor S Sheahan pointed out one property in Measham which had been marked as residential, which was currently being fitted out for a shop unit. He sought clarification on whether function or form was the primary consideration. He commented that it was very difficult to say where the town centre began and ended. He also sought clarification on the significance and implications of defining the town centre.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that in defining the town centre boundary, this would be the area where officers would seek to direct retail and town centre type uses to initially. He added that this was a way of trying to maintain town centres as the main concentration of retail and other town centre uses.

Councillor S Sheahan commented that it seemed officers were trying to stop the decline of town centre areas, and it was a hard judgement.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this was the case; the boundaries had shrunk in many cases and it was about maintaining a concentration. He commented that the fringe areas were transitional zones and this was a matter of judgement.

Councillor J Bridges commented that he was sure the Parish Councils may express different views when the matter was out for consultation.

Councillor C Large commented that it would have been useful to have had sight of the policies that would be applied to the town centre boundaries. She asked for example if a shop that was just outside the boundary would have any restriction on how they could erect signage.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that in that particular circumstance there would be no restriction, as this would relate to an already established use. He advised that the policies would impact upon new applications for a change of use.

Councillor J Legrys commented that town centres such as Ashby de la Zouch would be more critical. He asked what the position would be if a premises was just outside of the town centre boundary and applied for a change of use. He expressed concerns as a lot of properties in Coalville in particular were changing from residential to retail use. He asked what would happen in this circumstance.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the policy would require a sequential approach and as such the applicant would be asked to demonstrate whether there were any premises within the town centre which would accommodate the business, whether these were appropriate. He advised that the evidence provided by the applicant would be taken into consideration in the officer's recommendation, and proximity to the boundary would also be a factor. He added that applications would be determined on a case by case basis.

Councillor J Legrys referred to the existing shops along James Street and commented that he had received a complaint from the owner of one of the shops that he was unable to be a member of the Coalville Town Team as he was not classed as being within the town centre. He asked if those shops would be converted to residential use once they became vacant.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that already established uses would not be affected. He referred to the current ongoing DCLG consultation outlined in the report which, if agreed, would significantly reduce the Council's ability to resist applications for a change of use.

In response to a question from Councillor J Legrys, the Planning Policy Team Manager confirmed that a change of use to a fast food establishment would still require planning permission and such applications outside of the boundary could be refused subject to the wording of the policy.

Councillor J Legrys referred to the Ford garage site and noted that this had been included within the town centre. He stated that he was pleased that this had been included considering the forthcoming planning application. He expressed disappointment that the market hall had not been included because this was located in the primary shopping area. He commented that this would lead to criticism. He asked if there was any flexibility in light of that application being approved and implemented.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that bearing in mind a further report would be brought to the Advisory Committee following the consultation, any changes in the interim could be picked up at that point. In respect of the market, he stated that this was a different type of retail use as it was a more concentrated use, and only open for part of the week. He commented that it could be included in the consultation, or left out to see what comments were received.

Councillor J Legrys commented that the Belvoir Centre was declining and was likely to lose more units. He added that to the west of Memorial Square, there was a large retail unit which probably had a greater footfall than the town centre itself, which had not been included. He added that he would be lobbying for Snibston Museum to be included in the town centre and sought clarification on why this had not been included.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that it had not been included for the simple fact that it did not relate that well to the town centre and was not what would be classed as town centre use.

Councillor J Legrys expressed disappointment that Snibston Museum had not been included in the town centre, particularly with the regular running of the railway from the museum to the town centre to increase footfall. He agreed that town centres needed to shrink but residential properties also needed to be put into town centre to increase footfall. He asked if research had been properly done in respect of the actual current situation within town centres.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the research had considered a concentration of uses, however there was no footfall data available. He clarified that it was the use which had defined the town centre area. He added that the Asda site did not fit in with the definition of a Primary Shopping Area when looking at the surrounding area.

Councillor J Legrys commented that the Council's drive to deliver a rival market policy indicated that there was a push to having the market not at the market hall. He added that he felt the Walmart site had a higher footfall than what had been hatched in red on the plan.

Councillor S Sheahan commented that if the town centre boundaries were being tightened and people were being directed to look there initially, there was a risk that this could create an upward pressure in rent levels within the town centre and perversely make the fringes more attractive. He asked if changing the town centre boundary would affect the conservation area. He also commented that officers had considered the town centre boundary on the basis of the daytime economy; however insofar as the night time economy in Measham, the centre of gravity would shift.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that there would be no impact upon the conservation area, as this was covered by different legislation and was for a different purpose. In respect of the night time economy he advised that this had been considered in areas such as Ashby de la Zouch and Coalville; however the daytime economy was when most retail use took place. He added that the risk was that the area could be diluted to the detriment of the retail use. In respect of the upward pressure on rents within the town centre, he felt that this would not be significant enough to make people move out of the town centre.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that Snibston had not been graded at all on the map and there was a restaurant and a gift shop on the site. He added that it was within 300m of the town centre boundary and asked why it had been left out altogether.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this was because the shop and cafe were ancillary to the main use of the museum.

Councillor D De Lacy asked why the museum had not been included since it was classed as leisure use.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the museum was not within the existing town centre boundary.

The Director of Services asked Members to clarify for what purpose they were seeking to include Snibston museum within the town centre. He clarified that it was not located within the existing town centre boundary and the purpose of this exercise was to look at focussing on the core of the town centre.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that he had raised this issue in terms of achieving a consistent approach as some areas had been graded and not others. He commented that if there was a large supermarket just outside the boundary, surely this would not be excluded just because it was not within the existing town centre boundary.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that there were other uses in the wider area, such as retail parks, which had not been included. He added that to survey all areas in great detail would raise resource issues.

Councillor C Large commented that a lot of development had been approved in Castle Donington and so it was likely that more business use would be forthcoming. She expressed concerns about how restrictive this policy would be. She added that by concentrating the town centre so tightly, this could cause parking issues for people visiting shops.

The Planning Policy Team Manager commented that there were obviously a number of uses that were not retail uses. He added that for any applications falling outside the town centre boundary, a sequential approach would be taken, and if the application was not considered to be detrimental to the town centre it would be approved.

Councillor J Legrys stated that in his opinion, Snibston museum should be included in the town centre. He commented that they had been trying to achieve far less silo working

between the museum and the town team. He added that there was a political will to include Snibston museum within the town centre. He expressed disappointment that the town centre had not been hatched red over an existing area of retail footfall and he would be lobbying for this and Snibston museum to be included. In respect of the retail parks, he commented that these were an 'out of town' retail experience. He commented that the night time economy in Coalville was partly within and partly outside of the boundary. He made the point that a large proportion of Members believed that it should be included.

The Director of Services recognised that there may be a desire to include Snibston museum in the town centre, however his advice was that doing so would increase the alternative development options for that site.

Councillor J Bridges echoed those comments and felt that an alternative might need to be considered.

Councillor S Sheahan commented that it depended whether you considered the town centre in terms of form or function. He added that there was a difference between entity and identity, and Coalville needed to redefine itself; part of which was recognising that Snibston museum was an integral part of what Coalville has to offer. He stated that the physical separation needed to be put aside, and greater consideration be given to what Coalville is, was and hopes to be.

Councillor J Bridges stated that he took on board the comments but stood by the advice of officers. He reiterated the need to be cautious.

Councillor C Large asked if there was any guidance that the Council would need to demonstrate had been followed in drawing up the town centre boundaries.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that there was general guidance on the approach; however it was very much a matter for individual authorities to define the boundaries as they saw fit. He added that the key was having evidence to support the decisions made.

The Consultant advised that the approach taken was consistent with what was happening around the country in terms of boundaries shrinking.

Councillor D De Lacy suggested that the issues be further debated following the consultation process. He sought clarification on how the consultation with the Parish Councils and other organisations would be undertaken.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this would be done by email if possible, and by letter if not. He explained that a copy of the plans and the settlement limits would be sent to relevant organisations.

Councillor D De Lacy asked if time would be allowed for meetings of the Parish Councils to take place. The Planning Policy Team Manager acknowledged that this was an issue, and the wider timescale needed to be considered, however time would be allowed for this where possible.

Councillor C Large commented that there were more Ward Members in her area who would want to ensure they also received copies of the plans and settlement limits.

Councillor J Bridges commented that in the past, officers had been prepared to go and talk to Parish Councils and he hoped this would be the case in respect of this consultation.

It was moved by Councillor C Large, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY THAT:

The Advisory Committee;

- a) Notes the need to review the existing town centre boundaries;
- b) Notes that the appropriate Parish and Town Councils and the Coalville and Ashby town teams will be consulted on the proposed boundaries (as may be amended in the light of the comments of the Advisory Committee).

The Chairman invited Members to highlight any items they would like the Advisory Committee to consider in future.

Councillor J Legrys requested that Members be kept updated on the situation in respect of the SHMA and felt that all Members should be informed as soon as there was likely to be any change.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2014

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors R D Bayliss, D De Lacy, C Large, J Legrys, V Richichi and S Sheahan

In Attendance: Councillors D Howe, T J Pendleton and A C Saffell

Officers: Mr M Sharp (Consultant), Mr S Bambrick, Mrs C Hammond, Mr I Nelson, Mr J Newton and Mr S Stanion

34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

35. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor S Sheahan declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 5, Development Strategy, as a property owner who could be affected by the proposed route of HS2.

36. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2014.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor C Large and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

37. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Terms of Reference be noted.

Councillor J Legrys advised Members that he had been asked to put forward some questions to officers from a member of the public. Councillor J Legrys felt that it would be more appropriate for a written response to be provided to the questions, however he would ask other questions through the meeting as a result.

Councillor J Bridges thanked the member of the public for submitting the questions and felt it would be fair to all to consider the questions after the meeting.

38. DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Director of Services presented the report to Members.

He advised Members that the report before them provided a starting point for the scale and distribution of development that would be included in the plan. He stated that the information that was available would allow Members to debate and comment on what could be included and then officers could take that away, consider and bring back to the

Advisory Committee for further consideration. He informed Members that the Memorandum of Understanding had now been agreed by all authorities within the housing area.

He highlighted that Members were being asked to consider a flexibility allowance as some developments may not be delivered and the authority would need to convince the inspector that the district had sufficient provision, adding that 30% was a figure to be considered and discussed. He added that Members were also being asked to consider the settlement hierarchy. He highlighted the 2 options which were before them with Coalville being the principal town in both, but allowing Members that opportunity to consider how the other areas were treated. He advised Members that option B was the preferred option. He highlighted that Members were also provided with factors to take into account when considering the allocation of sites.

Members agreed to comment on the report in sections.

Scale of Development

Councillor S Sheahan stated that he understood an allowance was required, but questioned why it related to the 5 year land supply rather than the figure in the SHMA buffer and questioned why the allowance had not be raised previously. He asked how it linked in.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that there was uncertainty in terms of economics relating to the deliverability of sites and that an allowance would be required. He added that 20% was stated in the NPPF however the figure could be higher or lower. In addition, as outlined in the report, it was necessary to ensure that the Local Plan took account of economic strategies when assessing housing need. There was uncertainty about this at the present time and so a flexibility allowance would enable this matter to be fully considered.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that increasing the SHMA was a step too far.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that it was not an increase, but due to constant economic challenges, developments may not happen and the plan would need to provide evidence that the Council would still meet the level of housing required.

The Director of Services stated that a 20% allowance would give a six year supply and that it would be up to Council to agree the allowance. He added that the when the plan was submitted to the inspector, reliance on whether a site was deliverable within the period would be taken into account. He advised Members that the NPPF recommended 20% and that it would be a sound approach to building a flexibility allowance.

The Consultant advised Members that flexibility allowances were being used for two different planning issues. He stated that the advice officers had given was spot on and the inspector would look at the deliverability of sites.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that it was hard to believe that one phrase could have two meanings and raised concerns again as to why the need for a flexibility allowance had not been raised before. He added that he could not agree this and felt that it should come back to a future meeting.

Councillor J Legrys stated that communities needed to be told what the housing figures were and he understood the need for an allowance, but felt that the markets should be taken into account when applications were put forward. He advised that Members had agreed figures and now, when all the numbers in the report were added up it produced a figure of 9 – 12,000 houses to be built, after telling residents that the district required only

1,500 new houses. He highlighted that the LLEP called for significant job growth in the north of the district, yet houses would be built in the south of the district. He stated that he was annoyed that the allowance had not been discussed before and that G L Hearn had been paid to come up with the figures that were fixed on which were 7,000 houses with 1,500 to be built in the next 17 years.

The Director of Services advised Members that officers heard what was being said and it was always the intention to bring a further report back to for Members to consider.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that Members had agreed the position and raised concerns that an additional third was to be built in and in doing so it appeared that officers felt that a third of developments would not happen. He added that everyone could see sense in some flexibility and understood the advice Members were being given, but felt that not enough information was provided for Members to assess the risk.

Councillor J Bridges concurred with Councillor D De Lacy and questioned how the authority monitored the deliverability of sites.

The Director of Services felt that it was a valuable comment and advised that there was an ongoing history of non-deliverability of sites after they had been given permission.

In response to a query from Councillor C Large, the Planning Policy Team Manager stated that 20% was based on the 5 year supply to make the housing requirement deliverable, but Members could recommend any figure that officers could work on.

Councillor C Large stated that she would not be happy to move forward until the impact was known.

Councillor R D Bayliss stated that deciding the scale of development was not an exact science, but felt it was reasonable to build in margins. He felt that it would not be easy to produce evidence, as it would be inspired guess work and that Members should provide comments for a future debate.

Settlement Hierarchy

Councillor S Sheahan felt that it was difficult to understand how the level of hierarchy had been reached and that improvement in infrastructure should be considered.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that infrastructure needed looking at, and that table 2 was not set in stone and therefore Members could look at the issues and what role the developments would have in addressing any infrastructure issues.

The Consultant advised that the NPPF stated that authorities needed to weigh up the need for housing against the harm and that it was not enough just to say infrastructure. He stated that the need for housing was more significant than harm.

Councillor J Legrys commented that every member had their own reasons when making decisions on where developments should be. He highlighted that employment was more in the north and housing in the south and there was no commuting between the two. He added that he could not consider the options without the rationale as different settlements were at capacity. He expressed concern over the option of a new statement highlighting several big developments that had been considered in the past but had no new infrastructure included.

The Director of Services advised Members that the new settlement was in the report as an option that had been considered and that it could have been part of the flexibility allowance.

The Planning Policy Team Manager highlighted that the key point was deliverability and that if the site was not already promoted it may not be considered until the end or after the period date.

Councillor D De Lacy felt that the rankings in the two options were very confusing and that it appeared that Members would be saying who got the most development. He highlighted that Castle Donington was being promoted even though it could not take any more development.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the ranking went on the range of services and jobs which were available as these were seen as the more sustainable locations, and that Castle Donington could not take any more development than the 900 houses that had already been approved.

Councillor C Large stated that she was not comfortable with Castle Donington being classed as a main town as there was no further capacity for development and that the need for houses was so great that development would harm the likes of infrastructure.

The Director of Services stated that officers would take all the comments away including the concerns over Castle Donington and that there was no further capacity to develop there.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that before a proper debate could be had Members needed more evidence to consider whether a site was sustainable. He added that this information needed to include provision for schools and other services.

Following a comment from Councillor D De Lacy, the Director of Services stated that officers were obtaining feedback or alternative options from the Advisory Committee and Castle Donington had been mentioned.

Councillor J Legrys stated that if he had realised Members were expected to come up with a different option he would have come prepared. He felt that a cap should be put on the main towns and rural centres to allow them to maintain their identities agreeing with Councillor C Large that, if any town was put into a league style table, developers would want to seek permission to build in that town, and that Castle Donington had very little land left to develop. He added that more time and evidence was needed to develop the hierarchy.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that he would be happy to invest time with officers to work on the options.

Councillor J Legrys clarified that the amount of development needed to be capped to ensure settlements maintained their identities and avoided joining up, highlighting that Ashby was at capacity to maintain its settlement.

Allocation of Sites – Guiding Principles

Councillor J Legrys stated that Members, certainly of Planning Committee, assumed that if an application was approved then the development would be delivered. He expressed concerns that the capacity of the highways infrastructure had an impact on the deliverability of sites highlighting that contributions were required to redirect traffic into Coalville, but the highways authority was reluctant to say anything, however improvements to the highways around Castle Donington made deliverability of developments more likely.

Councillor J Bridges commented that it was incredible that some developments were not delivered when approved and questioned how the deliverability of applications was tested.

The Legal Advisor advised Members that 'deliverability' is the test laid down in the NPPF in relation to the five year supply of housing sites. Deliverability is defined as a site being available now, offering a suitable location for development now, and being achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Local Plans are, however also required to identify a supply of specific, 'developable' sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the Plan period. 'Developability' is defined as sites being in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged. The distinction between 'deliverability' and 'developability' is deliberate, and understandable given the impossibility for authorities to 'crystal ball gaze' as to the deliverability of sites beyond the 5 year period.

Councillor J Legrys stated that Members trust a site was going to be deliverable and he accepted that officers could not crystal ball gaze. He stated that authorities should follow their nose and tell developers where they should build. He expressed concerns that the factors were too vague.

Councillor J Bridges added that it may be an idea for officers to put suggestions/questions to developers to reassure Members? that the development was deliverable.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee:

1. Notes and comments on the suggestion to have a flexibility allowance;
2. Notes and comments on the suggested settlement hierarchy;
3. Notes and comments on the suggested guiding principles for allocating sites;
and
4. A further report be brought back to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

39. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Director of Services presented the report to Members.

He informed Members that there was a need for a policy to be set that would address the need for affordable housing within the district. He advised Members that paragraph 2.2 of the report could be used as a starting point and that the report gave Members an opportunity to discuss and debate what the policy would include.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that it was an interesting report and nobody would disagree that there needed to be a policy. He commented on the need for 1 bedroom properties and that if the Council agreed on 60% the developers would not like the nature of the houses. He felt that the amount would need to be fixed so that the monies from contributions could be used for other services.

Councillor J Bridges stated that he agreed with Councillor D De Lacy however he was nervous about fixing a delivery of 60% as not everywhere required that level. He highlighted that more two bed homes were required due to higher levels in assisted living. He informed Members that there were a lot of issues to consider and that they would try to agree to fix something.

Councillor R D Bayliss agreed with the views of officers and felt that it should be a flexible figure. He also stated that as outlined in the report there were other ways of providing affordable homes.

Councillor J Legrys stated that he disagreed with Councillor R D Bayliss and felt that the figure should be fixed and stuck to. He concurred that more two bed homes were required to address the need for care, but also stated that there was a need for more bungalows within the Local Plan. He stated that the authority needed to be open and honest over the number of houses that were to be built, highlighting that with the 12,000 houses that had previously been discussed and a further 3,000 social houses the total figure was slowly rising. He expressed disappointment that social housing was dismissed as it appeared homes were being built for commuters rather than local people. He agreed that there needed to be a policy, but what the policy contained was a matter for debate.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that developers would only be interested in buyers that could afford their houses. He added that there needed to be a balance between private and public sector homes provided which should be included, but highlighted that it would be hard to enforce.

Councillor J Bridges agreed that the approach should be that of working together. He added that there was nothing wrong with trade-offs between public and private sectors.

Councillor S Sheahan added that Members could not rely on developers and that local authorities and Social Landlords needed to provide affordable housing.

Councillor C Large raised a concern that at the beginning of the report it stated that 60% housing was required and further into the report it stated that the target would be significantly less than 60% which could lead to repercussions and looking like the council was underperforming.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that the SHMA identified the need but 60% could not be justified so Members would be looking at a figure between 1 and 60% and this would then be tested as part of the viability test.

The Director of Services informed Members that 60% would not be achieved so the council would need to look at what could be achieved.

Councillor R D Bayliss stated that a generation ago all houses were affordable to all but due to economic challenges this had changed.

Councillor D De Lacy reiterated that it should be a fixed flat rate and that it should be stuck to.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised Members that it was not flexible, but variable, however there would always be some negotiation on the numbers on sites.

Councillor V Richichi stated that the Council could not make decisions that could not be carried through. He added that if developers were forced into limits they would look to move to other districts that did not set numbers.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee:

1. Notes the need to include a policy in the Local Plan in respect of Affordable Housing;
2. Notes and comments on the possible contents of such a policy as outlined in the report and
3. Requests a further report be brought back to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

40. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Director of Services presented the report to Members.

Councillor J Legrys thanked the officers for attending events to help promote the Local Plan and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). He stated that a number of organisations had not commented, however Members were able to comment on the statement through Council meetings. He suggested that Members attend community events in the future to explain what was being asked and why, and to take the flack that was aimed at officers.

Councillor S Sheahan stated that the Community Engagement Strategy was being reviewed and that Members should be aware they were very similar and they should be developed in accordance with each other.

Councillor D De Lacy commented that the new statement was not attached for Members to comment on.

The Director of Services informed Members that there would not be a meeting of the Advisory Committee before the SCI was considered at Cabinet, but he would be happy to circulate it to Members.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Advisory Committee:

1. Notes the response to the recent consultation in respect of the Statement of Community Involvement;
2. Requests that the new Statement of Community Involvement be circulated to Members of the Advisory Committee; and
3. Notes that the new Statement of Community will be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 13 January 2015

Councillor A C Saffell left the meeting at 8.14pm.

Councillor D Howe left the meeting at 8.26pm.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.34 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on TUESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2015

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors D De Lacy, C Large, J Legrys, V Richichi and S Sheahan

In Attendance: Councillors R Johnson, T J Pendleton and A C Saffell

Officers: Mr M Sharp (Consultant), Mr S Bambrick, Mr D Gill, Mr I Nelson and Mr J Newton

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R D Bayliss.

42. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no interests declared.

43. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2014.

In response to a question from Councillor D De Lacy, the Director of Services advised that where there was a recommendation in a report to note the comments of the Advisory Committee and diametrically opposite views had been expressed by members, the subsequent report would contain an officer recommendation, however all views expressed would be noted within the report.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

44. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The Terms of Reference be noted.

45. LIMITS TO DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES

The Director of Services presented the report to members, which was further to the initial report considered by the Advisory Committee in September. He reiterated that members had asked for engagement to take place on the limits to development and the town centre boundaries. He advised that the report documented what had taken place and the comments received during the consultation process. He added that the maps appended to the report showed those areas where officers considered that there may be some merit to amending the boundaries as a result of the comments received, and therefore where no map was provided, there was no proposed change to the boundaries.

The Chairman advised that he had received a request to speak to this item from Councillor A C Saffell, and he would invite him to speak at the appropriate time during the debate.

Councillor S Sheahan commented that the map for Moira was missing quite a bit of the village, including Donisthorpe Lane and Measham Road. He acknowledged that it would have been difficult to fit it all in however it would have been helpful to see the whole village.

The Planning Policy Team Manager acknowledged this point, and advised that as there were no changes proposed to that part of Moira, the map had been enlarged for clarity.

Councillor S Sheahan requested that clearer maps be made available in future.

Councillor C Large highlighted the section of the report which referred to the Retail Capacity Study, which would take into account issues such as future housing growth. She stated that Castle Donington had a proposed diminished town centre boundary with future housing growth. She commented that it could be argued changing the boundary in this way was premature taking into account the proposed development. She added that in Melbourne, for example, the shops had spread up the main street as a result of increased housing, and she had concerns that such an opportunity might be missed in Castle Donington if the boundary was reduced.

The Planning Policy Team Manager stated that the approach taken followed advice in national planning policy, which was to focus on existing uses. He added that in Borough Street, there was also some residential use, so there was some scope there for retail uses to take over these premises at a future date. He advised that officers were seeking to ensure that the town centre boundary was defensible in line with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Councillor C Large asked when the results of the Retail Capacity Study would be available.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that a draft report was expected imminently. He clarified that this would be a district level study.

The Chairman invited Councillor A C Saffell to speak as the Castle Donington town centre boundaries were currently under discussion.

Councillor A C Saffell stated that a survey had been undertaken which identified the shops outside of the retail area. He stated that there was a shop at 10 Bondgate which was outside the town centre boundary, however the pub next door was within the boundary.

Councillor J Legrys sought to raise a point of order in that members did not have any plans before them with reference to the points being raised. He stated that he welcomed the debate but sought guidance on what was under discussion. He added with respect that if the discussion was being opened up to areas that were not contained within the report, he would wish to discuss Coalville town centre.

The Chairman stated that any concerns would be heard and considered by officers after the meeting. A full debate would then follow at a future meeting.

Councillor A C Saffell stated that he did not understand how the boundaries had been drawn, especially as the population of Castle Donington was likely to increase by up to 50%. He felt that there needed to be some flexibility in the plans to accommodate this. He asked why the business centre was not within the town centre boundary when it was

near to shops. He also referred to a plan which had been discussed at the Parish Council meeting and asked what had happened to this.

The Planning Policy Team Manager reminded members that determining a town centre boundary did not signify that there was no scope whatsoever for retail use outside of the boundary. He advised that what would apply instead was the sequential test, which was the approach taken with the recent supermarket application in Castle Donington. He added that the site being outside of the town centre boundary hadn't prevented this development. He reiterated that the aim of policy was to maintain the town centre for retail uses. He advised that the danger of enlarging the town centre area was that it could become diluted. He concluded that in his view, the proposals were consistent with the NPPF.

Councillor D De Lacy sought clarification in respect of the recommendation. He was advised that members were being asked to recommend to Council all limits to development and town centre boundaries, including those where no changes had been made.

Councillor D De Lacy referred to the objections made by the Parish Council in respect of the Ibstock town centre boundary and expressed concerns that the post office had been cut off from the town centre. He commented that the recommendations were causing him difficulties as if he disagreed with just 1% of the proposals, he would have to vote against the whole recommendation. He felt that there must be a better way of dealing with this.

The Director of Services advised that members could move an amendment to the recommendation, however he appreciated that they did not have the maps in front of them where no changes were proposed. Alternatively, members could agree to exclude certain settlements from their consideration and bring them back to a future meeting. He added that members could also vote against the recommendation if they were so minded.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that he agreed with the majority of the proposals and it would be silly to throw the baby out with the bathwater. He referred to Ibstock Parish Council's objection and added that people were finding it difficult to understand why the line had been drawn where it was, and as officers did not agree with the submission from the Parish Council he was finding it difficult to vote for.

The Planning Policy Team Manager clarified that the post office in Ibstock was located within the town centre boundary. He advised that officers had spent a lot of time debating the boundary as the town centre was quite spread out and there were non-retail uses on High Street. He added that it made sense to include the post office. He acknowledged that the doctor's surgery was not within the town centre boundary, however this was not necessarily a use you would expect to see in a town centre. He commented that this was not an exact science, and the proposals left scope for further town centre uses.

The Consultant urged members to consider that the boundaries were to be used for planning control. He advised that the broader the boundary, the less control the Planning Committee would have, as the edge of centre would be larger. He stated that the purpose of the boundary was to concentrate the town centre as much as possible.

Councillor J Legrys felt that it was right for the Castle Donington councillors to have made this intervention and he thanked them for doing so. He added that the report made it clear that the only maps provided showed where officers wanted to make changes. He felt aggrieved that he wasn't aware of this and that he did not have the plans in front of him. He stated that he could not vote for the recommendation as he was not prepared. He requested that it be noted that he considered this had been poorly handled, as a simple email could have addressed this. He felt that the recommendation should be deferred until further information could be provided, or it should be voted down. He stated that he

was conscious of the Planning Policy Team Manager's advice that wherever a boundary was drawn, it would be in the wrong place. He expressed his displeasure that this debate was taking place without any information before him. He stated that there were a lot of issues relating to the Ashby area that his colleague had raised which he did not consider had been properly answered. He added that he could not vote for the recommendation without any information.

Councillor V Richichi stated that he wanted to discuss the limits to development in Packington as he was not happy with the revised plan. He commented that it seemed applications were being waved through and the public were not being listened to. He made reference to the ongoing judicial review and felt that these sites should be excluded from the revised limits to development as there was currently no approval in place to develop these sites.

The Director of Services clarified that there were ongoing legal proceedings, however the current position was that the permissions were extant, and the proposals for the limits to development reflected this. He added that clearly if the position changed, it would be appropriate for members to reconsider this at a later date.

Councillor V Richichi stated that he would like it noted that the Director of Services had stated that there was no movement in the direction of quashing the decision of the Planning Committee. He sought assurances on this point.

The Chairman directed Councillor V Richichi to debate the matters before members and advised him to raise any other issues outside of the meeting.

Councillor C Large suggested that in order to move forward, any settlements where members had concerns should be excluded from the recommendation. She added that to simply vote the recommendation down would be a waste.

The Chairman felt that this was reasonable and sought the view of other members.

Councillor D De Lacy stated that with the exception of the last intervention regarding Packington, there had been no objections to the proposed limits to development.

Councillor J Legrys stated that his concerns were the Ashby and Coalville town centre boundaries. He referred to the concerns raised by colleagues regarding the Castle Donington town centre boundary and the limits to development for Packington. He felt that members should have the opportunity to walk around these town centres.

In response to a question from Councillor S Sheahan, the Director of Services advised that he would anticipate it would be early summer before any recommendations would be made to Council. He clarified that the intention was that Council would be considering a draft Local Plan, so if individual elements were deferred, they would be delayed, but would all come together as part of the draft Local Plan.

The Director of Services summarised that members had raised concerns regarding the proposed town centre boundaries for Ashby, Coalville, Ibstock and Castle Donington, and the limits to development for Packington. He suggested that a further report could be brought back to the Advisory Committee on these areas specifically with more detail.

The Chairman also requested that members receive further guidance on the purpose of the town centre boundaries, why widening the town centre might not be the best course of action, and advice on the NPPF and the sequential approach.

Councillor D De Lacy supported this as he felt it was not clear. He stated that he would like to know what the implications were of being outside of the town centre boundary.

The Chairman also requested that officers communicate more clearly with members.

RESOLVED THAT:

- a) The Advisory Committee notes the response to the recent consultation in respect of the draft limits to development and revised town centre boundaries
- b) The Advisory Committee recommends to full Council that the draft limits to development and revised town centre boundaries are approved to be included as part of the new Local Plan, with the exception of the following areas:
 - i) Ashby town centre boundary
 - ii) Castle Donington town centre boundary
 - iii) Coalville town centre boundary
 - iv) Ibstock town centre boundary
 - v) Packington limits to development

46. RECENT LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATIONS

The Director of Services presented the report to members. He recalled that this meeting had been deferred as the outcome of the Charnwood Local Plan examination was awaited. He added that officers felt it was appropriate to give an update as Charnwood was clearly of the most relevance as it was relying upon part of the same evidence base as the Council, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). He stated that using the SHMA as part of the evidence base had been tested through the Charnwood examination and there had been some challenge from developers on this point. He advised that the full view from the Inspector was not yet known, however it was telling that no specific issues had been raised regarding the validity of the SHMA. He added that this was good news as it was one of the key risks, as if the SHMA was found wanting it would have a significant knock-on effect on the Council's Local Plan. He stated that this was positive news, and the SHMA would still be utilised as the starting point, and there would be no need to revisit this work. The Inspector's final decision was still awaited, and it was not yet known what modifications he would be requesting.

Councillor J Legrys welcomed the statement from the Director of Services. He stated that he had had the opportunity to have a lengthy meeting with his Labour colleagues at Charnwood regarding and he was not as excited as the Director of Services regarding the SHMA based on their response. He commented that the SHMA was only comfortable until it was challenged by a developer and this could happen at any time. He referred to the outstanding judicial review against the Inspector's decision on the Packington Nook application, and sought clarification whether there was a challenge on the SHMA from the developer. He expressed concerns that the SHMA was fragile. He added that he was confident about dealing with any challenge, however he would appreciate clarity on the position regarding the Packington Nook application.

The Legal Advisor clarified that there was an ongoing judicial review in respect of the Packington Nook application. The Council was the second defendant and would be putting forward a robust defence.

Councillor C Large requested an update on the timescales for the Local Plan and the current position on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in respect of further assessments and deliverability.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that it was intended to recommend a draft Local Plan to Council in the early summer. A consultation would then follow and depending on the outcome of this it was likely to take a further 4 to 5 months to

recommend the final Local Plan to Council which would be submitted to the Secretary of State 3 to 4 months afterwards. He advised that the SHLAA would need to be updated. He added that deliverability was considered in a general sense, but not in as much detail as for the Local Plan.

Councillor C Large commented that SHLAAs were the first step in considering allocations in the Local Plan, and as such she would have thought deliverability was a key issue.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that this was one of the criteria, however it was simply a matter of the resources required to assess the hundreds of sites in the SHLAA. He added that when it came to the Local Plan allocation, the Inspector would want to see much more detail about the deliverability of sites.

The Chairman stated that deliverability was a major concern and was a difficult call for officers. He added that he believed officers were making headway, however this was still a relatively new concept.

Councillor D De Lacy sought clarification on the Charnwood examination, and how it could be known that the Inspector was happy with the housing figures without knowing his full opinion.

The Director of Services stated that the Inspector made some suggestions that the figures may need a slight increase, but if he had had significant concerns regarding the SHMA, the Local Plan would not have got through the inspection stage and the Inspector would have found it to be unsound even with modifications. He concluded that the principle of utilising the SHMA as part of the evidence base was sound.

The Planning Policy Team Manager added that it was important to note that the Charnwood housing requirement was slightly below what was indicated in the SHMA and the Inspector had asked officers if it would cause them a problem if the figures were increased in line with the SHMA.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.35 pm

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2015**

Title of report	PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015/16
Contacts	<p>Councillor Richard Blunt 01530 454510 richard.blunt@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Chief Executive 01530 454500 christine.fisher@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Human Resources Team Manager 01530 454518 mike.murphy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	The Council is required by the Localism Act 2011 to prepare and approve a pay policy statement in respect of each financial year, before the commencement of that financial year. This report has been produced to provide the relevant information in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Act.
Council Priorities	Value for Money.
Implications: Financial/Staff Link to relevant CAT Risk Management Equalities Impact Assessment Human Rights Transformational Government	<p>The pay policy statement will apply to all of the most senior employees in the organisation.</p> <p>There are no additional costs to the Council resulting from the information in this report.</p> <p>Not Applicable.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Has been completed. No equality issues identified. Held with the Author of the report as Background papers.</p> <p>No implications.</p> <p>This relates to the new ways in which council's are being asked to deliver their services.</p>
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory.

Comments of Deputy Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Consultees	The report and pay statement has been provided to the Senior Officers of the Council for information.
Background papers	Held in Room 127 of the Council Offices. Some of the Background papers are confidential because they relate to individual employees.
Recommendations	THAT COUNCIL APPROVES THE COUNCIL'S PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015/16, AS ATTACHED AT APPENDIX 1 OF THIS REPORT.

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Under Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011, the Council is required to produce a Pay Policy Statement for each financial year, which must be approved by full Council before the beginning of the financial year to which it relates.
- 1.2 The Statement must set out the Council's policies in relation to:
- Senior Officers
 - Its lowest paid employees; and
 - The relationship between the pay of Senior Officers and the pay of other employees
- 1.3 For the purposes of this statement 'pay' includes basic salary, bonuses and all other allowances arising from employment.
- 1.4 The proposed pay policy statement attached sets out the Council's policy and explains the processes that apply to performance management and assessment. The Policy Statement also details the other benefits payable to Senior Officers and the approach to the engagement of Interim Senior Officers who may be in receipt of a previous public sector pension.
- 1.5 In accordance with the requirements of the Localism Act, the statement details the Council's pay multiple, which is 5.7 (the relationship between the median average pay of the Council's workforce compared to the salary of the most Senior Officer (the Chief Executive)). This multiple has reduced from a factor of 5.8 in last year's pay statement.

2.0 CHANGES

2.1 The following changes are worthy of mention in this year's pay statement:-

- (Paragraph 3.2). The number of Directors has increased by one during 2014/15 with the appointment of the Interim Director of Housing. The number of posts on the Head of Service grade has increased by one due to the agreement to host the jointly-funded role of Joint Strategic Planning Manager. This will be an “arms-length” role which will work with all of the Leicester, and Leicestershire Partner Authorities and the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP). The cost of this post is being shared between the 9 local authorities and the LLEP. This partnership role will not be part of the Council's Management Team
- (Paragraph 4.4) The Car allowance rates have not changed. They remain at the same level as during 2014/15.
- (Paragraph 5.0) The Local Government Pension Scheme changed significantly from April 2014. This will mean that the Senior Officers covered by the Pay Statement are now required to pay increased employee contributions to the scheme if they elect to join or remain in the scheme. The contribution rates were previously between 7.2 and 7.5% of salary, but are now between 8.5 to 11.4% of salary.
- (Paragraph 11.2). The Council has agreed to adopt the “Living Wage” for all of its employees from 1 April 2014. The Living Wage rate changed to £14,837 per annum in November 2014 from a previous level of £14,459.

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Pay Policy Statement 2015 / 16

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement sets out the Council's policies in relation to the pay of its workforce, particularly its Senior Officers, in line with Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011. In accordance with that Act, the Statement is required to be approved by full Council each year. The statement will be published on the Council's website. The Council is committed to an open and transparent approach to the pay and benefits that apply to its workforce.
- 1.2 This Statement sets out the Council's policies relating to the payment of the workforce particularly:
- Senior Officers
 - Its lowest paid employees; and
 - The relationship between the pay of Senior Officers and the pay of other employees
- 1.3 For the purposes of this statement 'pay' includes basic salary, bonuses and all other allowances arising from employment.

2.0 Objectives of this Statement

- 2.1 This Statement sets out the Council's key policy principles in relation to pay. The Council has employment law and contractual responsibilities in relation to the pay and benefits of its existing employees and these have been taken into account when formulating the Statement.
- 2.2 This Statement aims to ensure the Council's approach to pay and benefits attracts and retains a high performing workforce whilst ensuring value for money. It sits alongside the information on pay that the Council already publishes as part of its responsibilities under the Code of Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency.

3.0 Basic Salaries of Senior Officers

- 3.1 From a legal perspective, for the purposes of this Statement Senior Officers are defined as those posts with a salary above £58,200 which is the current Senior Civil Service minimum pay band.
- 3.2 In North West Leicestershire District Council nine posts have the potential to earn a salary in excess of £58,200. We have three salary bandings which have the scope to earn more than £58,200 – a Chief Executive Band which applies to one post, A Director Band which applies to two posts, and a Head of Service Band which applies to six posts.

- 3.3 The following posts are determined to be statutory, Chief or Deputy Chief Officer posts in the Council:-

Chief Executive (Head of Paid Service and Returning Officer)
Director of Services and Deputy Chief Executive
Director of Housing
Head of Legal and Support Services (Monitoring Officer)
Head of Finance (Section 151 Officer)
Head of Housing
Head of Planning and Regeneration
Head of Community Services
Joint Strategic Planning Manager (Jointly funded Partnership post, but actually an employee of North West Leicestershire District Council)

- 3.4 It should also be noted for completeness that two other posts at Service Manager Level are also technically Deputy Chief Officers because of their functions within the Council as Deputy Monitoring Officer and Deputy Finance Officer. Their information has not been included within this statement as their total pay package is less than £58,200 per annum.
- 3.5 The Heads of Service are all located within a salary range £52,918 to £61,486 (9 incremental points), The Deputy Chief Executive / Director salary range is £72,816 to £81,586 (6 incremental points) and the Chief Executive Salary range is £112,695 to £120,651.(4 incremental points).
- 3.6 The salaries of all Senior Officers have been set previously by formal meetings of elected members. In the case of the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive/Director, these were most recently reviewed in 2008 and the existing salary ranges were determined having regard to market conditions and the responsibilities associated with the roles. The Chief Executive's performance is considered annually at a meeting of the members Appointments Panel.
- 3.7 A member review of the salaries of the Heads of Service took place in 2011, which was in response to difficulties in recruiting to the Head of Finance post. The Directors and Heads of Service are all subject to an annual appraisal process, and are required to report on their progress on Service delivery Plans to members.
- 3.8 Increments for all employees including Senior Officers are paid on an annual basis until the maximum of the scale is reached. The Chief Executive, or her nominated representative, has the discretion to award and withhold increments of officers' dependant on satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance.
- 3.9 Annual pay awards (cost of living) are decided at national level for all employees of the Council. A two year pay award of 2.2% was agreed at national level for employees on Local Government Services Conditions, and a pay award of 2% was agreed for employees at Director and Head of Service level. The pay awards were effective from 1st January 2015. No pay award has been agreed at national level for Chief Executives at the time of writing this report, although negotiations are continuing.

4.0 Car Allowance payments made to Senior Officers.

- 4.1 It is a requirement of the contracts of all Senior Officers that they be on a call-out rota to be available for Service Emergencies or to act in the event of a civil local or national emergency situation. The rotas offer 24/7 365 days a year cover.
- 4.2 Due to the need to respond to emergencies out-of-hours and being on-call, Senior Officers have retained either a Car Lease or Essential car allowance. These criteria also apply to other employees in the workforce.
- 4.3 The annual car leasing value to Senior Officers varies depending on the year renewal date of their vehicle and the relative value of "benchmark" vehicles in the Car Leasing scheme. On the basis of the current arrangements the actual current Council contributions are a range between £2,554 and £3,060 per annum (for the Senior Officers in this statement).
- 4.4 All Officers who are provided with a lease car are tied to a 4 year contract, with penalties payable if they terminate the contract prematurely. Officers are responsible for their own car insurance and petrol / diesel costs. If Officers with a lease car use the car for business mileage they are reimbursed the cost at 16.6p per mile. This rate is reviewed periodically by reference to the National Conditions of Service petrol element. This rate has not changed during the course of the 2014/15 financial year
- 4.5 The Car Allowance rates for Senior Officers are identical to those for all other employees in the Council, and these have been determined at National Level by the annual negotiations between the Employers Organisations and the Trade Unions. The current rate is a lump sum allowance of £963 per annum which is paid in monthly instalments. Officers are then paid a fixed mileage rate for any business miles undertaken which varies from 36.9p per mile to 40.9p per mile.

5.0 Local Government Pension Scheme

- 5.1 All Council employees may join the Local Government Pension Scheme. The Scheme is a statutory scheme with contributions from employees and from employers. For more comprehensive details of the local government pension scheme see:

<http://www.lgps.org.uk/>

- 5.2 Neither the Scheme nor the Council adopt different policies with regard to benefits for any category of employee and the same terms apply to all staff. It is not normal Council policy to enhance retirement benefits but there is flexibility contained within some pensions discretions for enhancement of benefits. The Council will consider each case on its merits in accordance with the discretions determined by Council at the time. There is no scope for the discretions to be applied more favourably to Senior Officers.
- 5.3 The Local Government Pension Scheme changed significantly in April 2014. The revised scheme means increased employee pension contributions for the employees covered by this pay statement. The previous employee contribution rates were a range between 7.2% and 7.5% of salary for Senior Officers, but these increased to a revised range of 8.5% to 11.4%.

5.4 The discretions that North West Leicestershire is able to apply will were revised and agreed by Cabinet on the 24th June 2014 (as a direct result of the changes to the National Local Government Pension Scheme). The discretions apply to all employees in the Council's workforce including Senior Officers and there are no special considerations for employees working at Senior Officer level.

6.0 Professional Fees

6.1 The Council will reimburse the cost of professional fees for Senior and other Officers where it is a requirement of their employment or contract. The Council will only reimburse the cost of one fee up to a maximum of £245 per annum. The annual maximum is linked to a percentage of one of the spinal column points in the main employee salary scale, so is increased when there is a nationally-agreed cost of living rise.

7.0 Electoral fees

7.1 In accordance with the national agreement the Chief Executive is entitled to receive and retain the personal fees arising from performing the duties of returning officer, acting returning officer, deputy returning officer or deputy acting returning officer and similar positions which he or she completes.

7.2 Fees for returning officer and other electoral duties are identified and paid separately for local government elections, elections to the UK Parliament and EU Parliament and other electoral processes such as referenda. As these relate to performance and delivery of specific elections duties they are distinct from the process for the determination of pay for Senior Officers. The fees are set externally by legislation and based on a formula linked to the number of electors.

8.0 Employment Stability Policy

8.1 The Council has previously determined that its "Employment Stability Scheme" will apply to all employees of the Council including Senior Officers. The Employment Stability Policy provides that actual weekly pay will be used when calculating an employee's redundancy payment and the number of redundancy weeks payable is the statutory number of weeks redundancy multiplied by a factor of 1.5. This means that the maximum number of week's payable, depending on age and service, is 45.

The National Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations provide that employees aged over 55 gain automatic payment of their pension if they are made redundant by the Council and there can then be an associated pension Capital cost payable by the Council.

8.2 The Employment Stability Policy also includes the potential for any employee (including Senior Officers) who is at risk of being made redundant to receive salary protection for 3 years on a stand-still basis if they are redeployed to a lower graded post. It should be noted that in practice, this is a rare occurrence.

8.3 Full Council will be given the opportunity to vote on severance arrangements which exceed a total value of £100,000 before they are approved. The information presented will clearly set out the components of the severance package (e.g. salary paid in lieu, redundancy compensation, pension capital costs, holiday pay and any other bonuses, fees or allowances paid).

9.0 Whole-time service

- 9.1 All Senior Officers are expected to devote the whole of their service to the Authority and are excluded from taking up additional business, ad hoc services or additional appointments without consent. Officers at a senior level are restricted from being involved in specified political activities, and all employees of the Council are bound by a code of conduct. Senior Officers are expected to work the hours required to complete the job, subject to a minimum of 36.25 hours per week. No additional payments are normally made for out-of-hours working, and there is an expectation that Senior Officer Roles will include on-call and out-of-hours meetings and duties.

10.0 Other benefits.

- 10.1 A number of the Senior Officers terms and conditions of Service are determined at National level according to the following frameworks:

National Joint Council for Chief Executives Conditions of Service
National Joint Council for Chief Officers Conditions of Service

These frameworks provide the details of conditions of service such as annual leave, sick pay, maternity allowances, training and development etc.

11.0 Pay Relationships

- 11.1 The Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to set out its policy relating to the relationship between the pay of its Senior Officers and the pay of the rest of its employees. The Council has not previously set its pay structure of any group of employees by reference to a pay multiple. The Council has previously set the pay rates for different groups through processes of job evaluation, market comparability and the prevailing economic and market conditions. These can vary enormously from time to time and between the many occupational groups comprising the Council's workforce.

- 11.2. Pay of the Council's Lowest Paid Employees

The Council has defined its lowest paid employees as those on the lowest pay grade the Council operates, who are not undergoing an apprenticeship. The Council agreed to pay the "Living Wage" rate as a minimum wage figure in April 2014, so the lowest pay rate is currently £14,837 per annum (previously £14,459 per annum).

- 11.3 The Localism Act requires Councils to calculate the pay multiples between the highest and lowest earners. The median average pay of the Council's workforce in February 2015 (including overtime payments) was £21,158, which is compared to the salary of the most highly-paid Senior Officer at £120,651 per annum, so the pay multiple factor is 5.7.

12.0 Approach to pensioners and Interim Managers.

- 12.1 The Localism Act requires an explanation of the Council's policy in relation to the arrangements that might apply where it could appear that the public sector is paying an individual twice through a salary and a pension for doing the same job. This

Council's view is that it is not good value for money for the taxpayer to make a person redundant (and pay a pension if they are aged 55 years and over) for them to then return to the same job. The Council will not condone this approach. However, it should be noted that there may be circumstances where the Council may employ individuals who are in receipt of a public sector pension for new roles where they are the best person for the job. An example of this may be the employment of ex-services or "blue-light" personnel, to a different role in this Council. It should also be noted that there might be risks of age or disability claims if the Council was to adopt a contrary position.

- 12.2 The Council has used Interim Managers to fill short-term vacancies or to undertake specific projects where there are capacity issues or a shortage of a particular skill set within the Council's own workforce. This may mean that the Council could engage Interim Managers who are in receipt of a public sector pension from other previous employment where an appropriate assessment has been completed on the value-for-money of the proposed arrangement for the Council. Such assessment will be completed by the Head of the Paid Service in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

13.0 Review and Changes

The Council will review this policy annually, or if amendments need to be made before the date of the scheduled review, in year, to full Council. Any significant amendments to the pay and benefits of Senior Officers will be determined according to the Council's constitution by the relevant Committee or Panel prior to a recommendation being made to full Council.

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2015

Title of report	INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL - PROTOCOL
Contacts	<p>Councillor Nick Rushton 01530 412059 nicholas.rushton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Chief Executive 01530 454500 christine.fisher@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Head of Legal & Support Services and Monitoring Officer 01530 454762 elizabeth.warhurst@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To approve the protocol which sets out the amended terms of reference of the Independent Remuneration Panel.
Council Priorities	Value for Money
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	There is a small saving of £200 per year by reducing the membership from five to four members plus a saving of officer and panel member time as a result of not needing to follow the recruitment process at the current time.
Risk Management	No direct implications.
Equalities Impact Assessment	No direct implications.
Human Rights	No direct implications.
Transformational Government	No direct implications.
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory.
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory.
Consultees	Members of the Independent Remuneration Panel
Background papers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the meetings of the Independent Remuneration Panel held on 8 December 2014 and 9 February 2015.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 and the Council's Constitution [www.nwleics.gov.uk]
Recommendations	<p>IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT COUNCIL:</p> <p>(1) ACKNOWLEDGES THE ONGOING WORK OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL</p> <p>(2) APPROVES THE REDUCTION IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL FROM FIVE MEMBERS TO FOUR;</p> <p>(3) APPROVES THE PROTOCOL SETTING OUT THE CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDED TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL, AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1</p>

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 It is a legislative requirement for all Councils to establish and maintain an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to make recommendations to the Council on its Members' Allowance Scheme and the nature and level of allowances to be paid to its elected members.
- 1.2 By resolution on 6 December 2005 the Independent Remuneration Panel for North West Leicestershire District Council was constituted with 5 members and a quorum of 3.

2.0 THE WORK OF THE PANEL

- 2.1 The work of the Panel includes receiving reports from officers, considering statutory guidance, interviewing councillors and using comparative evidence etc. to formulate recommendations on appropriate levels of allowances for consideration by the Council.
- 2.2 The Panel has been meeting recently to look at and review its processes and to receive updates and benchmarking data in relation to members' allowances. It has been proactive in the run up to the forthcoming local elections and has agreed to meet again in early July to consider any post election implications.

3.0 MEMBERSHIP

- 3.1 A vacancy arose during 2014 when contact was lost with one of the Panel's members. Every effort was made to establish links with this member but this proved unsuccessful.
- 3.2 The Panel met on 8 December 2014 and discussed the aforementioned vacancy. It was agreed that a recommendation be made that the membership be reduced from five members to four in order not to incur any recruitment costs on the basis that the Panel meets infrequently. However, in order to minimize the risk of a tied vote, it was felt that the chairman of the Panel should be given a casting vote.

4.0 PROTOCOL

- 4.1 At the aforementioned meeting, it was agreed that the Panel's terms of reference be amended to reflect the above changes and that these be affirmed by Council.
- 4.2 The terms of reference have therefore been updated and are set out in the appended protocol which explains the role and functions of the IRP.

Independent Remuneration Panel

Protocol

1. Background

- 1.1 It is a legislative requirement for all Councils to establish and maintain an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to make recommendations to the Council on its Members' Allowance Scheme and the nature and level of allowances to be paid to its elected members. The work of the Panel includes receiving reports from officers, considering statutory guidance, interviewing councillors as appropriate and using comparative evidence etc. to formulate recommendations on appropriate levels of allowances for consideration by the Council.
- 1.2 The Council cannot amend or update its Members' Allowance Scheme without first considering a report from the IRP, however it does not have to accept the recommendations put forward.
- 1.3 Any such report will be presented by the Chairman of the Panel to the next appropriate Council meeting.

2. Membership

- 2.1 The membership of the Independent Remuneration Panel is four members. (The regulations require at least 3).
- 2.2 The quorum is 3 members.
- 2.3 The Chairman will be appointed at the first meeting of the Panel in each civic year.
- 2.4 The Chairman will have a casting vote.
- 2.5 The Chief Executive and/or other officers may be in attendance in an advisory capacity at the request of the Panel.
- 2.6 In order to maintain the independence of the Independent Remuneration Panel, members shall not be
 - a person who has within the period of 5 years before receiving the date of appointment been a member or officer of the Authority; and/or
 - a person who is a relative or close friend of a member or officer of the Authority.
 - a person who does not either live or work in the district.
- 2.7 The term of office for members of the Independent Remuneration Panel is four years. A four year term of office ensures that the Independent Remuneration Panel benefits from stability and experience.
- 2.8 Four months prior to the expiration of the term of office, existing members will be asked to indicate whether they wish to continue for a further four year term.
- 2.9 Should recruitment be required, a process of application, short-listing, selection and appointment will be undertaken by the Panel. Suitable applicants may be identified by:
 - advertisement in newspapers circulating in the area of the Authority

- advertisement on the Authority's website or social network sites.

Any decision of the Panel will be reported to the next appropriate Council meeting for endorsement.

3. Remuneration

- 3.1 Under the Council's Members Allowance Scheme, co-opted Members of the Independent Remuneration Panel receive reasonable expenses incurred in attending meetings and in addition a small remuneration of £200.00 per annum.

4. Terms of Reference

- 4.1 The Panel's terms of reference are as follows:-

- a) to make recommendations to the authority as to the amount of basic allowance that should be payable to its elected Members;
- b) to make recommendations to the authority about the responsibilities or duties which should lead to the payment of a special responsibility allowance and as to the amount of such an allowance;
- c) to make recommendations to the authority about the duties for which a travelling and subsistence allowance can be paid and as to the amount of this allowance;
- d) to make recommendations on whether any allowance should be backdated to the beginning of a financial year in the event of the scheme being amended;
- e) to make recommendations as to whether annual adjustments of allowance levels may be made by reference to an index, and, if so, for how long such a measure should run;

5. The Panel's Adopted Approach

- 5.1 Since its establishment, the Panel's approach has been that recommendations should be formulated appropriate to the circumstances of the Council.

- 5.2 The following underlying principles form the fundamental basis of the Panel's review process:

- (a) the allowances should take account, as far as possible, of the amount of time taken by Members to fulfil their roles.
- (b) the scheme should enable, as far as practical, that as wide a range of people as possible should be able to stand for election.
- (c) the allowances are a level of 'compensation';
- (d) any increases to the scheme which might be recommended should be balanced against the interests of the council tax payers in the district.
- (e) the Special Responsibility Allowance payments should be banded to reflect both the time commitment and workload of the identified special responsibilities;
- (f) the assumption is made that all members will participate as fully as possible in council business and play an active role in their wards and the importance of these mutually inclusive roles is reflected in the level of the basic allowance.

- 5.3 The Panel will adopt a logical, evidence based approach when determining any issues which will include the consideration of benchmarking and comparative data.

6. Referrals

- 6.1 A matter may be referred to the Panel by the Council or by the Leader of a political group which has the support of all his/her members.
- 6.2 The Panel will consider such referrals on an annual basis.
- 6.3 Additional meetings may be convened at the request of the Chief Executive.