



Scan the code above or visit [www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings) for a full copy of the agenda.

Meeting	<b>CABINET</b>
Time/Day/Date	5.00 pm on Tuesday, 26 May 2020
Location	Remote Meeting using Microsoft Teams
Officer to contact	Democratic Services (01530 454512)

## AGENDA

Item	Pages
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
<b>2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>	
Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring disclosable interests you should make clear the nature of that interest and whether it is pecuniary or non-pecuniary.	
<b>3. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION</b>	
<b>4. MINUTES</b>	
Minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2020.	<b>3 - 6</b>
<b>5. APPLEBY MAGNA CARAVAN PARK</b>	
Report of the Strategic Director of Housing and Customer Services Presented by the Housing, Property and Customer Services Portfolio Holder	<b>7 - 30</b>
<b>6. MARLBOROUGH SQUARE FUNDING</b>	
Report of the Strategic Director of Place Presented by the Leader of the Council	<b>31 - 42</b>
<b>7. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</b>	
The officers consider that the press and public should be excluded during consideration of the following items in accordance with Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 as publicity would be likely to result in disclosure of exempt or confidential information. Members are reminded that they must	

have regard to the public interest test and must consider, for each item, whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption from disclosure outweighs the public interest in making the item available.

**8. FUTURE HIGH STREETS FUND SUBMISSION PROPOSALS**

Report of the Strategic Director of Place  
Presented by the Leader of the Council

**43 - 150**

MINUTES of a meeting of the CABINET held in the Board Room, Council Offices, Coalville on  
TUESDAY, 3 MARCH 2020

Present: Councillor R Blunt (Chairman)

Councillors R Ashman, R D Bayliss, T Gillard, N J Rushton and A C Woodman

In Attendance: Councillors D Everitt, C A Sewell and S Sheahan

Officers: Mr A Barton, Mr J Arnold, Mrs T Bingham, Mrs B Smith, Miss E Warhurst and  
Mrs C Hammond

**96. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**97. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no interests declared.

**98. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

There were no questions received.

**99. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings held on 4 February 2020 and 18 February 2020.

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

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meetings held on 4 February 2020 and 18 February 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**Reason for decision:** To comply with the Constitution

**100. REVIEW OF DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF POLICY AND GUIDELINES**

The Corporate Portfolio Holder presented the report to Members.

He advised Cabinet that the policy provided relief for predominantly charitable organisations and that the existing policy had not been reviewed for six years. He noted that there were a number of minor changes and enhancements to the new policy, of which the biggest enhancement was the new criteria list. He highlighted that should the policy be approved it would be applied from April 2021, which would allow a twelve month notice period for organisations that currently awarded relief to reapply.

In response to comments from Councillor R Blunt, the Head of Finance advised that there would be no change to the categories or awards given except for one category where the relief is enhanced. She informed Cabinet that the authority would be writing out to all organisations that would be affected along with a new application form, which had been simplified.

Following a request from Councillor R Blunt, Councillor N J Rushton advised that, along with the Head of Finance, he would monitor the implementation period and report back any issues.

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

RESOLVED THAT

The draft policy be approved.

**Reason for decision:** Cabinet approval of the policy required.

## 101. REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE POLICY

The Housing and Customer Services Portfolio Holder presented the report to Members.

He began by recognising the recent awards ceremony that he had attended, where the housing repairs team had finished in the top 4 in one of the categories. He congratulated the team on the recognition.

He advised that the current policy had been adopted in 2013 and that the latest review would ensure that the policy would now be relevant to the repair activity; and the standards reflected the tenants changing expectations. He highlighted the changes to the priority groupings, following consultation with the Landlords Services Working Group, and the responsibilities of both the landlord and tenants.

Councillor T Gillard advised that he had been asked to pass on the thanks of a resident in Thringstone, to the repairs team, following a very swift response and high standard of customer service they had received after reporting an issue with taps in their home.

Following a request from Councillor R Blunt, Councillor R D Bayliss advised that he would monitor the implementation of the new policy and keep Cabinet colleagues informed of any issues.

It was moved by Councillor R D Bayliss, seconded by Councillor T Gillard and

RESOLVED THAT

The revised Housing Repairs and Maintenance Policy v4 be adopted.

**Reason for decision:** To adopt the policy as a framework for the Housing Repair and Maintenance Team.

## 102. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED THAT:

In pursuance of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act and that the public interest in maintaining this exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**Reason for decision:** To enable the consideration of exempt information.

### 103. PROCUREMENT UPDATE ON TELEPHONY PROJECT

The Housing and Customer Services Portfolio Holder presented the report to Members.

He highlighted the background of the report to Members and updated them on the current position.

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

RESOLVED THAT

1. Authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Housing and Customer Services in consultation with the Corporate Portfolio Holder to procure and award a replacement telephony and contact centre platform over 5 years, with authority to extend for a further 2 years;
2. The allocation of funds, as detailed in the report from the General Fund unallocated reserves, to fund the additional capital amount and year 1 revenue costs of the contract, as detailed in the report, be approved.

**Reason for decision:** To revise the delegation level to enable the procurement of a replacement telephony and contact centre platform over a contract term of up to 7 years.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5.18 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET – TUESDAY, 26 MAY 2020**



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>APPLEBY MAGNA CARAVAN SITE</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Roger Bayliss Housing, Property and Customer Services Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#"><u>Report to Community Scrutiny – 6 May 2020</u></a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
		<b>Key Decision:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Budget provision of £724k across 2019/20 and 2020/21 (capital programme) exists to fund improvements to the site and the potential creation of a development site opportunity	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	Legal advice has been sought in the preparation of this report and the report takes account of the advice	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	None	
	<b>Signed off by the Deputy Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To seek approval from Cabinet for the proposal for Appleby Magna Caravan Site to be improved following consideration of the matter by Community Scrutiny Committee on 6 May and associated delegated authority for the Strategic Director to implement the proposal	
<b>Reason for Decision</b>	To allow the improvement work to the caravan site at Appleby Magna to be progressed, using the existing approved budget.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>THAT CABINET;</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. NOTE THE COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 6 MAY 2020</b></li> <li><b>2. APPROVE THE PROPOSAL FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF APPLEBY MAGNA CARAVAN PARK USING OPTION E AS DETAILED IN THIS REPORT AND SUPPORTED BY THE COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 6 MAY 2020.</b></li> <li><b>3. DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR TO ENGAGE ARCHITECTURAL, BUILDING AND RELATED SERVICES TO ALLOW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OPTION E, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIOHOLDER AND SECTION 151 OFFICER.</b></li> </ol>	

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Appleby Magna Caravan Site is a general fund asset managed by the Housing Service. The site originally consisted of fifteen plots, with each occupier holding a licence only for the plot. Each licensee owns the caravan/structures on each plot.
- 1.2 The caravan site is 0.84 acres in size and the adjacent piece of HRA land is 1.18 acres in size, which equates to a combined site of approximately 2.02 acres. The site is illustrated in Appendix A.
- 1.3 Management of a caravan site such like Appleby Magna is not a core business of the Council, and it is not clear from the records available how the land that is owned by the Council became a caravan site.
- 1.4 The Mobile Homes Act 1983 provides the caravan owners as licence holders with full security of tenure similar to tenants living in Council homes. Each of the remaining caravan licence holders pay £34.14 p/w licence fee and the current net deficit to the General Fund from operating the caravan site is circa £5k per annum. This is mainly because of the reduction in income from the number of caravans reducing from fifteen to five and the value of the site fixed costs remaining constant.
- 1.5 The site does not currently meet the Model Standards 2008 for Caravan Sites in England, which is something we intend to achieve through any remodelling, as although not a legal requirement for Council owned sites, this does represent the industry standard for all other sites, which we are required to enforce on other site operators.
- 1.6 Immediately adjacent to the caravan site there is a piece of Council land that is used by the 1<sup>st</sup> Appleby Magna with Measham Scouts, on which they have erected their own storage facilities and meeting room. This land has been leased to the Scouts since 1 October 1979 for a period of 21 years, which expired in 2000. The arrangement has therefore been holding over on the terms of the original lease since 2000. The annual income from the Scout association for the use of the land is a peppercorn rent of £1.
- 1.7 In June 2014, a representative of the Scouts contacted the Council and requested a new lease, and in March 2015, heads of terms were agreed with the Scouts for a new lease of the site. The draft lease was sent to the Scouts' representative in April 2015. Until the current proposals began to be developed, the Council's legal services team had been pursuing the Scouts for a response on a monthly basis. The last response from the Scouts was in June 2016 when they advised that the lease had been sent to the Scout Trust for approval.
- 1.8 Whilst it is acknowledged that without a signed lease in place we have no legal duty to provide land for the Scouts, it's recognised that they bring a significant social and community benefits to the wider local community and we are therefore anxious to work with them to allow them to remain in the local area.
- 1.9 The future use of this wider site needs to be addressed, and there is clearly a case for considering the future of both the caravan site and the area leased to the Scouts in a comprehensive manner.

## **2.0 RECENT HISTORY**

- 2.1 Following a caravan fire in 2011, an independent Fire Risk Assessment was completed which made a number of recommendations both in the short and medium/long term for the future of the site. These related to the spacing of caravans and their proximity to the various access roads on and around the site.



- 2.2 The erection of non-combustible sheds, removal of wooden structures between caravans and construction of concrete fireproof fencing between plots formed the core of this work. The total cost of implementing these recommendations were included as a provision totalling £185k in the 2014/15 capital programme. Approval for these works was obtained from Cabinet on 22 September 2015, and the works were completed by the summer of 2016 at a cost of £150,000.
- 2.3 Since the completion of these works, ten of the fifteen residents have voluntarily left the site having accepted the offer of being rehoused elsewhere by the Council, for which they received the level of statutory home loss payment applicable at the time. This has left just five residents now remaining, all of whom have expressed a clear desire to remain on the site on a long-term basis.
- 2.4 This reduction in the number of residents has created the opportunity to consider a reduction in the size of the caravan site as well as the amount of land currently used by the Scouts and create a development plot for up to 12 new homes.

### **3.0 CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 The land occupied by the scouts and the caravan site is located within the developable area of the village of Appleby Magna. This means that any area of land that became surplus because of reconfiguring the overall site could be considered for housing development.
- 3.2 Over the past two years officers have regularly met with the residents of the caravan site, and the adjacent houses on Measham Road, representatives of the Scouts and Parish Council to discuss the future of the site. The caravan site residents have objected to any plan requiring them to move from their homes, which most of them have occupied for many years.
- 3.3 The option of moving the Scouts away from the site to an alternative site within the local area has been investigated, however with no suitable available location could be found. As a result of this, five layout options have been produced for the potential redevelopment of the site as detailed in Appendix A, all with the Scouts remaining.
- 3.4 As the site residents enjoy security of tenure from the Mobile Homes Act, any redevelopment completed without their agreement would require an order of the Court to enforce their cooperation with the works. This would require the Council to put forward a robust case to convince the court that our proposals were of no detriment to the residents. This process would be costly to the Council, take a period of up to 18 months, and could cause significant stress to the residents. It may also ultimately not be successful as no precedent has been able to be identified for successful action of this type in these circumstances.
- 3.5 The brook running the rear of the site is linked to the River Mease, and runs along the eastern boundary of the caravan site. The Environment Agency flood risk area associated with this encompasses approximately one third of the total developable land that could be created by a redevelopment. Additionally, the current Planning restrictions linked to the River Mease area would have to be considered as part of any planning application process, which is highly likely to reduce the number of properties that could otherwise be developed on a site of this size.
- 3.6 There are access tracks to both the 'north' and to the 'south' of the site that serve the caravan and Scout sites, and provide rear access to many of the properties on Measham Road. There are eighteen properties in total on Measham Road, four of which are still in Council ownership. Following surveys and discussions with Leicestershire County Council Highways Department, it has been confirmed that neither access road could be upgraded to meet adoptable standards, but could continue to be used as an upgraded private drive to service a new development.

- 3.7 Future development along the A42/M42 corridor supported by the recent planning approval for the Jaguar Land Rover parts centre, and the expected route for the HS2 rail link means that there will be significant inward investment into the area including a £350k community fund established through S106 funding. Earmarking the use of these monies is outside of Council control and as a result has not been considered as a funding stream in the redevelopment of Appleby Magna Caravan Site.
- 3.8 A recent review of currently known housing needs in the area by the Affordable Housing Enabling Officer has concluded that there is only a limited need to develop additional affordable housing in Appleby Magna given the recent new build activity in the area.

#### 4.0 POTENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT LAYOUT OPTIONS (Appendix A)

- 4.1 Five layout options for the future layout of the whole site have been developed in conjunction with the appointed specialist architects Baily Garner LLP and are illustrated in Appendix A. These have been shared with the local residents, the Scouts and the Parish Council. The table below seeks to compare the five options and summarises feedback from consultation regarding the options.

Option	Officer View	Consultation Feedback	Maximum New Build (Subject to planning permission)
A	Maximises the developable land for housing. In the event of a decision being taken to build new homes on the site, this is the most economically advantageous option.	This option is most strongly opposed by the caravan residents as they will be required to move their caravans twice and they will be located closer to the pumping station which can be noisy & intrusive.	6x2 bed 6x3 bed  (12 units)
B	Reduces the developable land for housing and places additional traffic through northern access road which is narrower and offers less opportunity to widen than southern access road. Caravan park can be fully developed before the vans are required to be moved saving costs temporarily rehousing the caravan residents.	Not supported by the caravan residents who would be unhappy at being sited directly adjacent to Scout hut that can be noisy during the weekends and in the evenings therefore does not provide comparable plots. Use of the same access road will also have the potential to create 'bottlenecks' at certain times and in the view of the residents reduce security of their homes.	6x2 bed 4x3 bed 2x1 bed  (12 units)
C	Reduces still further the developable land for new homes and as well as arguably having the greatest impact on the properties on Measham Road. Significant amount of new development within the flood plain of the River Mease. This option is not supported by officers.	This option is not supported by either the caravan residents or the residents of Measham Road as both will be overlooked by the new development. Building new homes will have significant impact on the caravan residents.	10x2 bed  (10 units)
D	Released land for development of new homes impinges on flood plain Council support will be made	Supported by the caravan residents and also by the Scouts who intend to extend use of new facility for the community.	6x2 bed 6x3 bed  (12 units)

	available to support grant funding bids for a new Scout facility, as the current hut cannot be moved. The most expensive, but if option to develop new homes were to be chosen by Members, this would be the only one supported by the caravan residents.	Caravan residents benefit by only needing to move the caravans once the new park has been built. Caravans sited furthest point from the pumping station.	
E	Modernisation of the site broadly as it currently stands and ensures that it fully complies with current legislation. As there will be no change in the footprint of the land currently occupied by the caravan and Scout sites, the opportunity to recover investment costs by selling land for development will no longer exist.	This option is strongly supported by the caravan residents as it maximises the land space that the caravans are sited on thereby reducing the site maintenance implications for the Council. It also maintains the aspects that the caravan residents currently enjoy. Least intrusive option for the residents, Scouts and Measham Road residents.	No development

4.2 Comparing the various options and evaluating them against each other to determine a way forward represents a complex matrix of factors to be considered and weighed against each other.

- Planning considerations – any new development of any homes on the site will be challenging, given the flood risk area, access road limitations, and the River Mease development restrictions. The number and type of properties would also need to be the subject of further discussions to ensure the site is not overdeveloped.
- Housing need levels – indicated housing needs in the village are not excessive due to the level of recent historic development. Whilst this would not be a direct consideration for a commercial proposal but any development for affordable or social housing would normally need to meet a housing need that had been identified.
- Preference of the caravan site residents – the sites existing residents have expressed a very clear desire for minimal change, and therefore their clear preference is for Option E.
- Supporting the local Scouts – all the options continue to provide a location for the Scouts, with options A to D offering the potential for a new accommodation facility subject to being able to identify the funding. Option E provides stability and security on their existing location.
- Financial considerations – although a budget provision has been made based on indicative scheme costs, this should not drive the choice of the most appropriate option. Given the complexity of delivering any of the redevelopment options (A to D) and the uncertainty of any income from redevelopment, the lowest risk option financially is Option E.

4.3 On balance, considering the various factors referred to above, it is Officers recommendation that Option E be pursued

## 5.0 DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

5.1 If a redevelopment option were to be selected, there are several ways of implementing the new-build option, the receipts from which may help subsidise the cost of the caravan and Scout relocation. This will of course be subject to planning requirements and potential legal action being needed to secure the site as explained in section 3.4.

These options include;

1. Disposal to a developer with outline planning permission, in so doing this would maximise capital income to the Council.
2. Retain and develop the remaining land ourselves for new Council housing. Retains control of the asset and allows consolidated contractor activity across the site re groundworks and subsequent construction.
3. Enter into a partnership Housing Association to develop which will minimise costs to the Council.

In the event of the decision being taken to develop new properties on the land released in options A, B, C or D, officers would support development option 2, retaining and developing the land ourselves for council housing.

## **6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (Appendix B - Confidential)**

- 6.1 Some aspects of the financial details relating to the future of the site are considered to be commercially confidential. This includes potential land valuations, and other costs, and are therefore included in a separate confidential Appendix B. This approach has been taken in preference to making the whole report confidential in order to maximise transparency regarding decision making about the future of the site. In the event that members of Cabinet wish to discuss the information in the confidential appendix, the meeting will need to move into a closed session without members of the public being present (virtually).
- 6.2 The existing Capital Programme provision for the re-development of the existing site is £724k split across the 2019/20 and 2020/21 capital programmes.
- 6.3 Compensation has been offered to the Scouts to remain on existing site but with a reduced land footprint, as required under options A to D. In the event of Option E being selected, this would not be necessary.
- 6.4 The caravan residents would be entitled to some level of compensation for the disruption that the redevelopment will cause. This is the subject of ongoing discussions with them and would need to be resolved prior to the commencement of any works, and budget provision for this will be made from within the overall scheme cost envelop.
- 6.5 There would be costs incurred if it was necessary to take legal action against the residents to enforce the movement of the caravans in the event of options A, B or C being adopted.
- 6.6 There is sufficient Capital budget to fund any of the options if approved, including for the Council to fully fund the build cost of the new homes should this be the recommendation made. Financial evaluations clearly show that none of the options has a positive net impact on the Councils overall financial position when comparing the Net Present value assessment of financial viability. However, there is no option to do nothing, and Option E provides a low cost, lowest disruption opportunity to reconfigure the caravan site to meet Mobile Homes Act standards, and provide a more positive environment for the residents and Scouts, so is recommended by officers as the way forward.

## **7.0 COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION 6 MAY 2020**

- 7.1 Community Scrutiny Committee received a report from Officers on 6 May 2020 regarding the re-development options for the caravan site.
- 7.2 The Committee received statements from the residents advocates who expressed strong support for the redevelopment of the site but in so doing, retaining the space and outlook that they have enjoyed for many years. The option that delivers to this requirement and that

is supported by the residents is Option E. A copy of the statement from the residents advocates is attached to this report as Appendix C, and includes officers responses to three question asked as part of their submission.

- 7.3 An extract from the minutes of the Community Scrutiny Committee on 6 May 2020 are attached as Appendix D. After a full discussion and questioning of officers, the Committee unanimously agreed to support the officer recommendation and recommend to Cabinet that Option E be adopted.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	Homes & Communities
Policy Considerations:	Local Plan
Safeguarding:	No matters arising out of this report
Equalities/Diversity:	No matters arising out of this report
Customer Impact:	No matters arising out of this report
Economic and Social Impact:	Development of caravan site to modern standard, retention of the Scouts on HRA land
Environment and Climate Change:	No matters arising out of this report
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Views and recommendations sought from the Community Scrutiny Committee
Risks:	Fire risk – significantly reduced in all five options Reputational risks – currently poor quality of site facilities. Negative impact of taking legal action against a small and specific group of residents if this is pursued.
Officer Contact	Chris Lambert Head of Housing <a href="mailto:chris.lambert@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">chris.lambert@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank



DRAFT - DRAWING SUBJECT  
TO TECHNICAL REVIEW

Site Name: Appleby Magna Caravan Site  
Site Address: Appleby Magna, Swadlincote  
Client: [Redacted]  
Date: 15/11/2023  
Scale: 1:500  
Drawing No: [Redacted]  
Sheet No: 1 of 1  
BAILY GARNER

Appleby Magna Caravan Site - Option A  
Appleby Magna, Swadlincote



DRAFT - DRAWING SUBJECT  
TO TECHNICAL REVIEW

Site Name: Appleby Magna Caravan Site  
Site Address: Appleby Magna, Swadlincote  
Client: [Redacted]  
Date: 15/11/2023  
Scale: 1:500  
Drawing No: [Redacted]  
Sheet No: 1 of 1  
BAILY GARNER

Appleby Magna Caravan Site - Option B  
Appleby Magna, Swadlincote



DRAFT - DRAWING SUBJECT  
TO TECHNICAL REVIEW

Site Name: Appleby Magna Caravan Site  
Site Address: Appleby Magna, Swadlincote  
Client: [Redacted]  
Date: 15/11/2023  
Scale: 1:500  
Drawing No: [Redacted]  
Sheet No: 1 of 1  
BAILY GARNER

Appleby Magna Caravan Site - Option C  
Appleby Magna, Swadlincote



DRAFT - DRAWING SUBJECT  
TO TECHNICAL REVIEW

Site Name: Appleby Magna Caravan Site  
Site Address: Appleby Magna, Swadlincote  
Client: [Redacted]  
Date: 15/11/2023  
Scale: 1:500  
Drawing No: [Redacted]  
Sheet No: 1 of 1  
BAILY GARNER

Appleby Magna Caravan Site - Option D  
Appleby Magna, Swadlincote





The information contained in this document is for guidance only and does not constitute a contract. It is the responsibility of the client to ensure that the information is used in accordance with the relevant regulations and standards. The information is provided on an 'as is' basis and the client accepts full responsibility for its use. The information is not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of the author.

#### Specification

- All slabs to be inspected and renewed where necessary
- All slabs to be sized to accept largest reasonable caravan
- Each plot to have handstanding parking facility within its boundary
- Each plot to have garaged area similar to recently erected at plot seven
- Central (roundabout) area to be landscaped
- Remainder of site to be cleared up, unused slabs and services to be removed
- Further consultation closer to project finalisation and potential consequences for plots of road widening
- Amenity block to be added
- Landscaping buffer to be included in any design

A2

## Appleby Magna Caravan Site - Option E

Appleby Magna, Swadlincote

#### Revisions

- C - Neighbouring houses added  
B - Additional lines shown on pumping station amended  
A - Sheet size updated to show whole site

BC  
JC  
JC

27/02/20  
26/02/20  
26/02/20

North-West Leicestershire  
District Council  
Measham Road,  
Appleby Magna,  
Swadlincote, DE12 7BL

Caravan Site Reconfiguration  
Proposed Site Plan  
Option E  
Concept

Scale 1:500  
31920

DB  
(SK) 08

26/02/20  
C





Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Statement on behalf of the residents of Appleby Magna Caravan Site.**

**NW Leicestershire District Council.**

**Community Scrutiny Committee Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2020.**

The residents would like to thank the Committee Members and Officers for the opportunity to submit a statement regarding the report for recommendations of redevelopment / modernisation of the caravan site at Appleby Magna.

### **Background:**

The general perception of a “caravan site” is one of holiday lets or more often when in fixed locations, a site occupied by transient residents or ethnic groups such as the Gypsy community. The latter often attract negative reactions and perceptions of a lifestyle associated with these communities.

This would be a gross misrepresentation of the Appleby Magna site, which should be more accurately described as static mobile home site, protected by the Mobile Homes Act 2013. More importantly, for the purposes of this Committee, is to understand the residents of the site form are a long-standing close-knit community many of whom happily resided on the site in excess of thirty years.

Following a fire to one mobile home in 2011, an FRA was undertaken which identified that action would need to be taken to make the site conform to the regulations. Since that time 9 years ago, the residents have experienced continued ambiguity and indecision about the Councils plans for the site. At the time of the fire two plots were vacant.

In 2014 the residents received a letter advising them the council were restricting their rights to sell or assign their homes and the licence to occupy the plots to another purchaser. This proposal was legally incorrect and caused considerable distress and anxiety to the all residents of the homes, but most acutely to the elderly residents of the site. Included in this letter was the offer to take up a council tenancy as an alternative to remaining on the site.

Despite the council retracting its restrictions on residents’ rights, there have been long delays in progressing any proposals for the site. This uncertainty impacted on residents, and by the time of the first public meeting, not held until 2017, following several formal complaints only 10 residents remained. It was at this meeting the council first proposed alternative options for the site. All the residents at the meeting stated their intention to remain on the site and wanted the council to commit to improving the site and bringing it up to standard.

Protracted discussions and meetings about the site have continued over the last 9 years with no certainty over its future.

During this time, the site has deteriorated considerably; repairs have been poor or non-existent, contractors engaged have left the site in unacceptable and unsafe conditions, and the maintenance of the site and amenities have been neglected, including the main showering and toilet block, which has remained unrepaired since damaged in 2018.

It is rather disingenuous to suggest therefore that a large cohort of the residents have voluntarily relinquished their home. It was inevitable in these circumstances, that many elderly residents in their 70's exhausted by the continuing uncertainty and seeing their environment deteriorate have succumbed to the stress and the uncertainty of the future of their homes. They felt they had little option but to take the offer of alternative accommodation made to them by the council.

Whilst home loss offers were made, this is not universally the case. Notwithstanding the clear issue that residents homes and the plot value has deteriorated as a result of site neglect, and the uncertainty over its future; home loss represents a questionable approach to compensating the value of a home that could have been sold publicly or purchased by the council at an agreed valuation rate.

Further deterioration of the site followed when the decision to not re-let the vacant plots was taken. Inevitably this would further impact on the viability of the site. There is no council record of this decision being taken as part of a formal decision-making process. 1.3 of the report states that management of a caravan site is not the councils core business, however this is a residential mobile homes site, owned and managed by the Council, and housing, of all tenures is the core business of the council. Reletting of some of the plots could have achieved further affordable housing on the site if this had been the strategic aim of the council and mitigated the nominal £5k loss to the general fund per annum. This could still be an option open to the council.

**Consideration for the committee not explicit within the report are the following factors:**

- The residents have statutory rights that must be upheld in any decision the council makes.
- They hold a "Protected Site" agreement in accordance with the Mobile Homes (Selling & Gifting) (England) regulations 2013.
- Without an occupier's consent, the occupier can only be required to move to another pitch on successful application to the appropriate judicial body *and if and only if* -
- The appropriate judicial body is satisfied the other pitch is broadly comparable to the occupier's original pitch and that it is reasonable for the mobile home to be stationed there.
- Payment for moving and re siting of the mobile home is the responsibility of the site owner (the Council)

**Residents Views:**

Despite this long and difficult history over the site, the residents recognise the need for their site to be improved, they want to become proud owners again of their homes.

The remaining residents are a strong community who have positively engaged with the council officers in order to agree progress; they have engaged in drafting plans

for the proposal, suggesting edits and offered compromise, of note is Option D was an alternative proposed by the residents that would facilitate the council being able to develop the existing site.

Residents strongly support Option E in the report, the outcome they have sought for 9 years. They have a vision for its future. If they can remain, they have stated not only will some commit to invest in the renewal and repair of their existing homes, but they will be able to maintain the increased plot sizes, working with the Council and bringing the site back up to acceptable standards.

Not only is Option E the most financially viable for the Council it is morally the correct one. These are your residents, they are part of the local community, have spent most of their lives in Appleby Magna and wish to remain on the existing site; it is their home.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix D**

EXTRACT OF MINUTES of a meeting of the COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the Virtual meeting on WEDNESDAY, 6 MAY 2020

Present: Councillor D Harrison (Chairman)

Councillors K Merrie MBE, C C Benfield, A J Bridgen, T Eynon, J Geary, B Harrison-Rushton, G Houlst, M B Wyatt and J Clarke (Substitute for Councillor D E J Tebbutt)

Portfolio Holders: Councillors R D Bayliss and R Blunt

Officers: Mr J Arnold, Mr T Delaney, Mr C Lambert, Mrs M Long, Mr D Moxon and Mr B Walford

### **32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tebbutt and he was substituted by Councillor Clarke.

### **33. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

A non-pecuniary interest was declared in relation to Item 5 - Appleby Magna Caravan Site by Councillor J Clarke in view of his links to the Boy Scout Movement and in Item 6 – Future High Streets Fund by both Councillor D Harrison in his role as County Councillor and C Benfield in his role as vice chair for the campaign to open the Ivanhoe line. These Members remained in the meeting for the debate and vote on these items.

A pecuniary interest was declared by Councillor M Wyatt in relation to Item 8 – Future High Streets Fund for reasons of him having a local business in the Town Centre. He left the meeting for this item and the vote thereon.

### **34. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2020.

It was moved, seconded and by affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2020 be approved as a correct record.

### **35. PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

Two members of the public, Celia and Ken Hopkins had requested to speak on agenda item 6 in relation to Appleby Magna Caravan Site. It was noted that their written statement had been circulated to all Members ahead of the meeting.

The Chair welcomed them both to the meeting and invited them to address the Committee and ask their questions.

For clarity and completeness, the statement is set out in full below:-.

“The residents would like to thank the Committee Members and Officers for the opportunity to submit a statement regarding the report for recommendations of redevelopment / modernisation of the caravan site at Appleby Magna.

The general perception of a “caravan site” is one of holiday lets or more often when in fixed locations, a site occupied by transient residents or ethnic groups such as the Gypsy community. The latter often attract negative reactions and perceptions of a lifestyle associated with these communities.

This would be a gross misrepresentation of the Appleby Magna site, which should be more accurately described as static mobile home site, protected by the Mobile Homes Act 2013. More importantly, for the purposes of this Committee, is to understand the residents of the site form are a long-standing close-knit community many of whom happily resided on the site in excess of thirty years.

Following a fire to one mobile home in 2011, an FRA was undertaken which identified that action would need to be taken to make the site conform to the regulations. Since that time 9 years ago, the residents have experienced continued ambiguity and indecision about the Councils plans for the site. At the time of the fire, two plots were vacant.

In 2014, the residents received a letter advising them the council were restricting their rights to sell or assign their homes and the licence to occupy the plots to another purchaser. This proposal was legally incorrect and caused considerable distress and anxiety to the all residents of the homes, but most acutely to the elderly residents of the site. Included in this letter was the offer to take up a council tenancy as an alternative to remaining on the site.

Despite the council retracting its restrictions on residents’ rights, there have been long delays in progressing any proposals for the site. This uncertainty impacted on residents, and by the time of the first public meeting, not held until 2017, following several formal complaints only 10 residents remained. It was at this meeting the council first proposed alternative options for the site. All the residents at the meeting stated their intention to remain on the site and wanted the council to commit to improving the site and bringing it up to standard.

Protracted discussions and meetings about the site have continued over the last 9 years with no certainty over its future.

During this time, the site has deteriorated considerably; repairs have been poor or non-existent, contractors engaged have left the site in unacceptable and unsafe conditions, and the maintenance of the site and amenities have been neglected, including the main showering and toilet block, which has remained unrepaired since damaged in 2018.

It is rather disingenuous to suggest therefore that a large cohort of the residents have voluntarily relinquished their home. It was inevitable in these circumstances, that many elderly residents in their 70’s exhausted by the continuing uncertainty and seeing their environment deteriorate have succumbed to the stress and the uncertainty of the future of their homes. They felt they had little option but to take the offer of alternative accommodation made to them by the council.

Whilst home loss offers were made, this is not universally the case. Notwithstanding the clear issue that residents homes and the plot value has deteriorated as a result of site neglect, and the uncertainty over its future; home loss represents a questionable approach to compensating the value of a home that could have been sold publicly or purchased by the council at an agreed valuation rate.



Further deterioration of the site followed when the decision to not re-let the vacant plots was taken. Inevitably, this would further impact on the viability of the site. There is no council record of this decision being taken as part of a formal decision-making process. 1.3 of the report states that management of a caravan site is not the council's core business, however this is a residential mobile homes site, owned and managed by the Council, and housing, of all tenures is the core business of the council. Re-letting of some of the plots could have achieved further affordable housing on the site if this had been the strategic aim of the council and mitigated the nominal £5k loss to the general fund per annum. This could still be an option open to the council.

Consideration for the committee not explicit within the report are the following factors:

- The residents have statutory rights that must be upheld in any decision the council makes.
- They hold a "Protected Site" agreement in accordance with the Mobile Homes (Selling & Gifting) (England) regulations 2013.
- Without an occupier's consent, the occupier can only be required to move to another pitch on successful application to the appropriate judicial body and if and only if –
  - The appropriate judicial body is satisfied the other pitch is broadly comparable to the occupier's original pitch and that it is reasonable for the mobile home to be stationed there.
  - Payment for moving and re siting of the mobile home is the responsibility of the site owner (the Council)

Residents Views:

Despite this long and difficult history over the site, the residents recognise the need for their site to be improved; they want to become proud owners again of their homes.

The remaining residents are a strong community who have positively engaged with the council officers in order to agree progress; they have engaged in drafting plans for the proposal, suggesting edits and offered compromise, of note is Option D.

Residents strongly support Option E in the report, the outcome they have sought for 9 years. They have a vision for its future. If they can remain, they have stated not only will some commit to invest in the renewal and repair of their existing homes, but they will be able to maintain the increased plot sizes, working with the Council and bringing the site back up to acceptable standards.

Not only is Option E the most financially viable for the Council it is morally the correct one. These are your residents, they are part of the local community, have spent most of their lives in Appleby Magna and wish to remain on the existing site; it is their home". Was an alternative proposed by the residents that would facilitate the council being able to develop the existing site".

Mr and Mrs Hopkins asked the following questions:-

1. Please explain the apparent contradiction between Option A in the table stating "the most economically advantageous option" compared to sec 6.6 "None of the options has a positive net impact on the councils overall financial position.
2. Option D in the table states this would be the most expensive, however the reasons for this are unclear – can this be explained?

3. Can officers give assurances that there is nothing contained within the confidential appendix that actively contradicts the recommendation in the public report for Option E?

The Chairman thanked Mr and Mrs Hopkins for their statement and questions and invited Chris Lambert, Head of Housing to respond.

Mr Lambert too thanked Mr and Mrs Hopkins and the residents who he said had helped to shape the considerations by officers and the subsequent recommendations.

His responses to the questions are set out below:

1. Option A provided a combination of the highest number of properties for development with the lowest works cost due to the lower amount of groundworks required, leading to the comment that it was the most economically advantageous. We use Net Present Values (NPV) to assess the impact of proposals on the Councils overall financial position. All of the options produced a significant negative NPV assessment score, hence the comment regarding no positive net impact on the Councils overall financial position.
2. Option D included provision towards the relocation of the Scouts facility, which resulted in the costs being higher than the other three options where this was not necessary.
3. I can confirm there is nothing contradictory in the appendix.

Mr Lambert went on to state that he was not proud of this site and it was hoped that the recommendations within the report would help to fix the situation. Collectively we now had a way forward if the Scrutiny Committee was minded to support it.

## **36. APPLEBY MAGNA CARAVAN SITE**

Mr Lambert, Head of Housing presented the report to the Committee. He took Members through the report in detail and emphasised the challenges, all of which were set out in the report.

The Chairman thanked Mr Lambert for his comprehensive report and took questions and comments from Members by inviting each one in turn to speak.

Councillor Benfield asked about the housing needs of the local residents and whether any consideration had been given to modular housing. Mr Lambert referred to paragraph 4.2 of the report which explained that housing needs in the village were not excessive due to the level of recent historic development, and that the council was looking for ways to introduce modular housing into our new build programme in the future. Councillor Bridgen asked if the scouts were happy with option D as well as option E to which he was advised that the scouts wanted certainty so by accepting option E, it would provide them with security and an option for an improved facility to be developed. Councillor Clarke asked if there was a risk that the existing five tenants would decrease in number further and thus any re-modelling would be undertaken with no residents on site. Mr Lambert advised that the tenancies could not be terminated by the council, and that the residents could sell the sites on which their caravan sits by assignment. He reassured the Committee that all those in situ were intent on remaining for the foreseeable future. Councillor Geary reported his dismay at his view of the site during a recent visit. He likened it to a refugee camp and argued that the Council should never have allowed it to get into such a state. Mr Lambert advised that he could not argue with this view and repeated that he was not proud of this site but that we were now moving forwards to do something about it.

Other Members echoed the comments made and the support of Option E as set out in the report. They felt it was a well argued report and hoped that the residents would be pleased to see the Committee's support of their preferred option.

The Chairman invited Councillor Bayliss as the Portfolio Holder to speak. Councillor Bayliss reiterated some of the points raised by Mr Lambert and thanked the Committee for its valued input, the findings and conclusions of which would be reported to Cabinet on 26 May.

The Chairman advised that, as the recommendation was simply asking the Committee to note and comment on the report ahead of its submission to Cabinet, which included a recommendation that Option E be supported. He advised that he would take it by affirmation of the meeting that Members were happy to do this unless anyone objected. He asked if there were any objections. There were none.

The recommendation as set out on page 9 of the report was moved, seconded and by affirmation of the meeting it was

**RESOLVED THAT:**

The report be duly noted and Option E be supported. The comments made at this meeting will be reported to cabinet ahead of its meeting on 26 May where a decision would be made.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>MARLBOROUGH SQUARE FUNDING</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Richard Blunt Leader of the Council	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#"><u>Building Confidence in Coalville</u></a> – Cabinet Paper 13 June 2017	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
	<a href="#"><u>Marlborough Square Refurbishment</u></a> - Cabinet Paper 16 January 2018  <b>Marlborough Square Refreshment Costs – Cabinet Paper 15 January 2019 (Confidential)</b>	<b>Key Decision:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Sufficient funding to meet the estimated cost of the project will be provided by reallocating an existing reserve to the project and by accepting the LLEP grant.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	Legal advice was sought in the preparation of the report.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	There are none.	
	<b>Signed off by the Deputy Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	<b>This report seeks authority to accept a grant of £360,000 from the Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership for public realm work at Marlborough Square and to reallocate an earmarked reserve to the project.</b>	
<b>Reason for Decision</b>	Approval is required to reallocate an earmarked reserve and to accept the grant of £360,000 as there is a requirement to enter into a contract with the Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT:</b> <b>I) AUTHORITY BE GIVEN TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE TO ENTER INTO THE GRANT AGREEMENT TO RECIEVE £360,000 FROM THE LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP FOR PUBLIC REALM WORK AT MARLBOROUGH SQUARE</b> <b>II) PROGRESS ON THE REDESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT IS NOTED.</b> <b>III) THE EARMARKED RESERVE FOR THE ACQUISITION AND REDEVLOPMENT OF PROPERTY IN COALVILLE IS RETAINED IN FULL AS SET OUT IN THE REPORT FOR THE MARLBOROUGH SQUARE PROJECT</b>	

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Marlborough Square project forms part of a wider scheme of public realm works proposed across Coalville to improve the appearance of the town and encourage inward investment. Other related projects include works to the Belvoir Centre recently proposed by the owners, Gylo, and the programme of projects that will form the Council's bid to the Future High Streets Fund.
- 1.2 The project has previously been reported to Cabinet on 13 June 2017, 16 January 2018 and 15 January 2019. These Cabinet reports are included in the background papers to this report. This report sets out progress made since January 2019 and seeks approval to accept a grant of £360,000 which has been offered by the Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership (LLEP) from the business rates pooled funds. This funding has resulted from a bid submitted by the Business Focus team into competitive process and will make a significant contribution to the project's costs.

## 2.0 PROJECT PROGRESS AND UPDATE

- 2.1 Following work by Leicestershire County Council (LCC) the Council took on the role of leading the delivery of the scheme the internal project management was strengthened in 2019 with work including a detailed risk register, weekly meetings and monthly monitoring reports to highlight any changes to the design, cost or programme. The LCC proposals were reviewed in early 2019. On the basis of consultation with local businesses and other stakeholders, consultants HBS revised proposals and then developed detailed proposals to satisfy the requirements of the project brief and the day to day operational needs in summer 2019 to resolve the significant issues which had been identified. Following feedback, the proposals were further refined and submitted to LCC for initial highway authority approval at the end of 2019. At that point the anticipated start date for the work was May 2020 however this has not been possible, as outlined in sections 2.5 to 2.7.
- 2.2 The fundamental principle used in developing the design are ensuring that the highest quality scheme is delivered in order to make a difference to the town. This includes the choice of appropriate trees, natural materials and lighting and it has required significantly more design input to realise this and resolve all the practical issues. In addition, the space is very tight so that it has been challenging to deliver these objectives and also maintain the functioning of the highway network in this part of the town centre. This was the key reason for the Council taking responsibility for delivery. Given all of this, obtaining approval from the highway authority (s278) is complex and this has affected the programme but the attached plan (Appendix 1) shows how trees, market stalls, natural materials in the most important central space can be delivered.
- 2.3 The second reason for the Council taking on responsibility for delivery was the need for a fixed tender price in order to ensure certainty on quality and cost. The design seeks to focus the budget on the placemaking and maximising the quality possible. The appointed team from HBS include civil engineers, quantity surveyors and other consultants as necessary and the scheme has been refined to allow natural and high quality materials in the central area. HBS have been fully costing the design as it develops so that works remain within the previously approved parameters. The quantity surveyor has considered various options for delivery and is recommending the approach as set out within the programme.
- 2.4 The redesign process has been extensive due to the complexity of balancing the requirements of different users and the revised proposals will create a high quality area of public space (one of the town's four squares) with:
  - Outdoor seating areas – with revised specification to ensure an appropriate level of comfort.
  - New tree planting – with changed choice of species to reflect the limited space available, root barriers to prevent damage to paving and tree grilles which co-ordinate with the overall palette of materials.

- A more pedestrian friendly environment with priority afforded to pedestrians and with vehicles encouraged to drive through the square at lower speeds through changes in carriageway level and surfacing.
- Improved bus passenger waiting areas with a significantly improved public realm and with the highest quality paving in the key central area designed to have varied colour with warm hues.
- New taxi rank - with an improved layout to eliminate space used as roadway unnecessarily.
- New Christmas tree pit.
- New short stay parking spaces - the existing free parking has been relocated equally to Jackson and Margaret Street car parks.
- Maximised space for events that can take place without closing the square to vehicles and which can also be used for an outdoor market.
- Underground power cabling for the market stalls.
- Public art in a focal position in the square.

2.5 Approval by LCC to carry out the work on the highway (Section 278 approval) was initially requested in 2019 with the aim of commencing the work in May 2020 however a considerable amount of additional information was requested such that this process has taken significantly longer than originally allocated in the programme resulting in a delay of approximately 6 months. Following approval, which is expected imminently, an application for planning permission will be submitted and a fixed tender price will be sought for the work. The final design proposal will be submitted to Cabinet for approval at the same time as the tendered price.

2.6 Previous public consultation showed that there is support for the scheme from the majority of businesses and the public. Liaison with buses companies and taxis is continuing to maximise functionality whilst retaining the quality aspects of the scheme. Further consultation will be carried out prior to applying for planning permission for a change of use to public realm and the public art.

2.7 The proposed programme, shown in Appendix 2, includes starting work on 1.12.20 and completing on 31.5.21. However the current Corvid 19 pandemic has already caused delays and further delays are anticipated. A reasonable worst case programme is provided in Appendix 3 and indicates a start on site in 15.2.21 and completion on 28.8.21. This programme takes into account the risks and mitigation proposals identified in the risk assessment.

2.8 The programme aligns with the Future High Streets Fund (FHSF) programme and the funding for the scheme will be identified in the FHSF bid which will enable the amount sought in the bid to be increased which, if successful, can then fund further public realm work in Coalville.

### 3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Changes to the project as outlined above have resulted in the requirement to make alterations to the funding in combination with the successful application for LLEP funding. Since the Council has taken over control of the project there has been on-going monitoring to ensure that the estimated cost does not exceed £2 million as previously reported.

3.2 A budget of £1.82 million is available for the project provided that the LLEP funding is accepted. In July 2018, Cabinet agreed to retain £486k from a reserve established to acquire and redevelop assets reserve only on the basis that the LLEP funding bid was unsuccessful. Assuming the bid was successful, the value of the LLEP funding would be returned to this original reserve however the Council currently does not have any other plans for this reserve.

3.3 This funding for the project is therefore made up from a number of sources and net of expenditure incurred on the project in 2018/19 as follows:

£1,100,605.49	Approved by Cabinet in January 2018
-£346,269.07	Expenditure incurred in 2018/19
£517,000	Funding agreed from participation in the Leicestershire Business Rates Pilot (Cabinet June 2019)
£360,000	LLEP funding, subject to approval
£60,000	Contribution from Local Business Fund reserve
£486,000	Contribution from Acquiring and Developing Assets reserve
-£360,000	Return of part contribution from Acquiring and Developing assets reserve on basis of successful LLEP bid, as agreed by Cabinet previously in July 2018
<b>£1,817,336.42</b>	<b>Total Project Funding</b>

3.4 However current cost estimates indicate that this will not be sufficient to enhance the quality and functionality of the square to the required level, with the estimated scheme cost likely to be in the region of £2m. It is therefore proposed to both accept the LLEP grant offer and also retain the full contribution from the acquiring and developing assets reserve in full for the Marlborough Square project until a final figure can be reported to Cabinet for approval. This would mean the project will have funding in place of £2.17m. Not all of this funding is expected to be needed however it is common for construction costs to be inaccurate by 5 – 10% and, especially in view of the current unusual circumstances, it is considered prudent to make an appropriate budget allowance.

3.5 The grant offer of £360,000 by the LLEP is subject to terms and conditions and authority is requested for the Strategic Director of Place to enter into a contract for the funding.

3.6 The maintenance arrangements will be captured in a maintenance agreement that sets out the division of maintenance responsibilities between LCC and the District Council and the uplift in costs arising from the high-quality, non-standard items that form part of the design. Cabinet's approval for any additional costs will be sought alongside seeking approval for the tender for the work.

3.7 Planning for the events programme at Marlborough Square has commenced and will be brought forward for approval once a completion date for the work has been confirmed.

3.8 In the short term, it may be necessary for the council to use existing budgets pay for additional enforcement to ensure that the new parking arrangements within the square operate effectively.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Officers have worked closely with the Leader, Ward Members, local businesses and stakeholders to identify a concept proposal that meets collective aspirations for the square. Public consultation has shown strong overall support for the proposal and further consultation will be carried out with regard to the final proposals. The programme has been delayed due to the need for design revisions to achieve the high level of quality and functionality required from limited space, the additional information required as part of the LCC approval process and COVID V19, as outlined above, however the process will result in cost certainty and the opportunity taken to provide quality public realm that lasts decades.

4.2 Cabinet are requested to approve the recommendations made to reallocate the earmarked reserve and delegate authority to accept the LLEP grant offer which make a significant contribution to the project budget and enable the project to progress further.



<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting Coalville to be a more vibrant, family-friendly town</li> <li>- Support for businesses and helping people into local jobs</li> <li>- Developing a clean and green district</li> <li>- Our communities are safe, healthy and connected</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	The scheme aligns with the existing policies for public space in Coalville.
Safeguarding:	Not applicable
Equalities/Diversity:	The proposals meet current guidance for people with disabilities and include raised paving at bus stops to make buses more accessible and tactile paving at road crossings to assist people with sight impairment.
Customer Impact:	The scheme will create a greatly improved public space in the centre of Coalville which will benefit all users.
Economic and Social Impact:	The project seeks to create an attractive and functional space for markets and events. In conjunction with the Newmarket, this will create a destination so that additional people will be attracted to Marlborough Square and the increased footfall will benefit the nearby shops and the town centre generally.
Environment and Climate Change:	The project proposals include a larger number of trees, an improved space for pedestrians and cycle facilities. Sustainable materials will be used wherever possible.
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Community consultation has been carried out with regard to the project proposals and is detailed in the report and further consultation is proposed.
Risks:	A full risk assessment has been carried out and the risks are being mitigated. Any remaining risks will be reported when Cabinet approval is sought to accept the tender for the works.
Officer Contact	Mark Fiander Head of Economic Regeneration <a href="mailto:mark.fiander@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">mark.fiander@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]





Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Likely to contain exempt information under paragraph(s) 3 of  
Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank