



AGENDA

For a meeting of the
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL
to be held on
TUESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2006
at
2.00 PM
in
COMMITTEE ROOM 1, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM
Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive



PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING



Panel Members:	Councillor Dorrien Dexter, Councillor Kenneth Joynson, Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown, Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman), Councillor Stanley Pease, Councillor Mrs Judy Smith, Councillor Ian Stokes, Councillor Mike Williams (Vice-Chairman) and Councillor Mrs Azar Woods
Scrutiny Officer:	Paul Morrison 01476 406512 p.Morrison@southkesteven.gov.uk
Scrutiny Support Officer:	Jo Toomey 01476 406152 j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk

Members of the Panel are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.

1. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

To receive comments or views from members of the public at the Panel's discretion.

2. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel to be notified of any substitute members.

3. APOLOGIES

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare interests in matters for consideration at the meeting.

5. ACTION NOTES

The notes of the meeting held on 20th June 2006 and 25th October 2006 are attached for information. (Enclosure)

6. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE

7. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

8. GRANTHAM CANAL BASIN UPDATE

Update report on Grantham Canal basin – for noting. (Enclosure)

9. PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AUDIT

Following a recommendation from the Resources Development and Scrutiny Panel, the DSP will decide how to address an “audit” of public conveniences across the District, particularly in larger villages. (Enclosure)

10. RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME

The DSP will respond to the request of the Grantham Local Forum to set up a working group to look into residents' parking.

11. SERVICE PLANS: GATEWAY REVIEW 2

The Panel will undertake the second gateway review of the following service plans:

- Development and Building Control
- Planning Policy
- Economic Development and Town Centre Management

Background papers have been circulated to DSP members only.

12. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

Stamford car parking working group – 9th August 2006 (Enclosure)

13. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

(Enclosure)

14. WORK PROGRAMME

(Enclosure)

15. FINANCIAL UPDATE

16. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Representatives on outside bodies to give update reports.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASONS OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES DECIDES IS URGENT.

WORKING STYLE OF SCRUTINY

The Role Of Scrutiny

- To provide a “critical friend” challenge to the Executive as well as external authorities and agencies
- To reflect the voice and concerns of the public and its communities
- Scrutiny Members should take the lead and own the Scrutiny Process on behalf of the public
- Scrutiny should make an impact on the delivery of public services

Remember...

- Scrutiny should be member led
- Any conclusions must be backed up by evidence
- Meetings should adopt an inquisitorial rather than adversarial style of traditional local government committees



MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 20 JUNE 2006 2.30 PM

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Dorrien Dexter
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Ken Joynson

Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith
Councillor Mike Williams (Vice-Chairman)

OFFICERS

Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Support Officer
Head of Planning Policy and Economic
Regeneration
Economic Development Team Leader
Environmental Health Practitioner

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Graham Wheat
Councillor Mrs Mary Wheat

1. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel were notified that Councillor Exton would substitute for Councillor Pease for this meeting only.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Joynson declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 as a former trustee of the owner of the Northfields site in Market Deeping. Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in agenda item 10 in respect of his membership of the Licensing and Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committees.

3. ACTION NOTES

Noted.

4. NORTHFIELDS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARKET DEEPING

Following a Cabinet decision on 12th June 2006 regarding the Northfields Industrial Estate, Market Deeping, the DSP received a presentation on the project from the Economic Development Team Leader. Points raised in the presentation included:

- The project was necessary to address a lack of available employment land in South Kesteven and stifled inward investment and expansion of existing businesses;
- Land for business development has not come forward because of the

premium value of housing land. This has meant that developers would rather use land for housing rather than business purposes because there would be no return;

- The project would achieve aims and aspirations of the South Kesteven Economic Development Strategy, the Lincolnshire Economic Development Strategy and the EMDA Regional Economic Development Strategy;
- The project developed on a partnership basis between Lincolnshire County Council and SKDC, with input from EMDA;
- The design was developed with one 6-acre site and three 1-acre sites, which could equate to 300 new jobs, 3 new businesses, 400 jobs safeguarded, 1 business expanded and 1 research and design unit created;
- Bids were submitted to the Welland SSP and EMDA as economic development project funders. Lincolnshire County Council provided £2.6 million as lead partner and on-the ground project manager. A gap was identified in the overall project cost of £3.2 million. SKDC were asked to contribute to this. On 12th June 2006, the Cabinet agreed to make a one-off contribution of £160,000 for the project;
- The concept was to service the land, then allow the market to bring it forward;
- Lincolnshire County Council would retain any return from the project as the only equity partner. This would mean that they would also select to whom the land would be sold. There were concerns that in reserving their rights as the only equity partner, the distribution of the units would be done on a return-only basis;
- Issues that needed to be addressed as part of the project included water pipe adoption, highway adoption and a potential ransom strip. With regard to water pipe adoption and supply, there was the potential need to include a new water pump to ensure business needs were met. Problems with highways adoption had arisen because the road was marginally too narrow for Lincolnshire County Council to adopt. A bid for funding to address these issues had been made. There was also the possibility that SKDC held a ransom strip of land. The Cabinet agreed that if any strip was held, it should be considered a one-off contribution to the project in kind;
- 64 businesses had applied to Lincolnshire County Council for use of the site;
- Completion of serviced land was expected in November 2006, with new units due for completion circa the summer of 2007;
- SKDC, Lincolnshire County Council and the Welland SSP would meet in July 2006 to discuss the possibility of managed office or innovation centre units adjoining the new development to the east for 2008/09.

Panel members discussed the presentations. They felt that the redevelopment of the site could provide employment opportunity for people who would otherwise travel to Peterborough. The land would offer employment opportunities for residents of the new housing developments in Bourne, where there may not otherwise be sufficient employment opportunity to meet demand.

The Panel hoped that the future usage of the site would be based around more skilled workers. A key issue of the Deepings Business Club has been the idea of managed office space.

There were concerns about the effects of potentially increased traffic in the area. The site would be accessible directly from the A16, so it was hoped that this would have only a minimal impact to the town centres in the Deepings.

It was suggested that the Economic Development Team Leader should give the presentation on the site to Market Deeping Town Council and Deeping St. James Parish Council so that they would be fully aware of plans. The Economic Development Team Leader agreed that this would be a good idea and he would liaise with the Deepings Town Centre Manager to discuss this possibility.

5. GRANTHAM CANAL BASIN UPDATE

The Economic Development Team Leader advised the Panel that the tender to conduct a feasibility study on the Grantham Canal Basin project had recently been commissioned. This had been awarded to EKOS and partners, who had divided the project into three stages: a baseline study, a plaster plan and a draft supplementary planning document. The first stage was underway and would provide an initial baseline and an economic case for change. SKDC, Lincolnshire Enterprise, Lincolnshire County Council and the Grantham Canal Partnership had made financial input to the project.

A copy of the initial baseline study was presented to the governance committee on Monday 19th June 2006. A finalised copy would be available in 2-3 weeks, which could be circulated to Panel members for their information. British Waterways had been impressed by the political will for the success of the project.

The Canal Basin project would include opening the canal at the site of the original basin at old Wharf Road. The feasibility would assess whether this would be possible and include an assessment of problems presented by the A1.

The DSP were informed of an approximate timescale, subject to the feasibility of the project: the full feasibility study should be complete by January 2007, any necessary purchases relevant to the success of the project should be complete by 2009, development on site should occur in 2009/10 and completion would be due in 2014/15.

6. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE

A response to the Small Business Units Working Group from the Economic Development Portfolio Holder was attached for information.

7. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The Panel noted the indicators circulated with the agenda. Updated performance indicators were circulated at the meeting. The indicators for planning services had fallen below target. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Regeneration explained that while the department had yet to meet the targets set by the Council, national targets had been achieved. National

targets were given priority because successful achievement would determine whether the Council would be awarded a Planning Delivery Grant. He also advised the Panel that the percentage of large applications dealt with within 13 weeks was susceptible to change because of the small number of large planning applications received.

No figures were available for indicators relating to economic development; these figures would be reported on a quarterly or annual basis. The Panel were interested in the indicator for VAT registered businesses. They requested clarification as to whether the target was the number of new VAT registered businesses or the total number of VAT registered businesses. They felt that it would be useful to have information on the total number of VAT registered businesses and the number of new VAT registered businesses. As not all businesses were large enough to be VAT registered, the Panel also suggested that it would be helpful to have information on the total number of businesses within the District. Councillor Joynson said that he would be prepared to advise on the collation of this data.

CONCLUSION:

1. ***That performance indicators for economic development should include the total number of VAT registered businesses and the number of new VAT registered businesses.***
2. ***That information on the total number of businesses within the District should be included.***

8. GAMBLING ACT, 2005

A copy of the Draft Statement of Principles for the Gambling Act 2005 was circulated to all Panel members for information. An Environmental Health Practitioner briefly introduced topic to members. The Gambling Act 2005 followed the same structure as the Licensing Act 2003. It had already been decided that any applications made under this Act would fall within the remit of the Alcohol and Entertainment Licensing Committee. On 2nd June 2006, the Licensing Committee approved the Draft Statement of Principles for consultation. The main focus of the Gambling Act 2005 was the licensing of premises. The following points were discussed:

- ***Economic Development:*** The new Gambling Act could impact on economic development because the gambling industry involves large amounts of money. It could also mean an increase in visitors from outside the District.
- ***Sunday Trading:*** Under previous legislation, gambling had been restricted by Sunday Trading restrictions. Restrictions would lose effect under the 2005 Act.
- ***Family Entertainment Centres:*** This is the sort of gambling facility that would be most likely within South Kesteven. It would cover areas that included several gaming machines.
- ***Income Generation:*** Licensing of premises for gambling should be cost neutral. Information on the scale of charges had not been received.
- ***Casino Policy:*** The Government had limited the number of licences for

full casinos. There would be the possibility that more licences would become available in future years.

- *Gambling Establishments:* The Act covered bingo halls, which would mean that the District could see an increased number of these. There would be more scope for these to be situated in areas that might not have been considered by magistrates.
- *Small lotteries:* These would also fall under the remit of the 2005 Act but it was anticipated that changes to the way these were run would be minimal.

9. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

Stamford Car Parks Working Group

The group had met for a scoping meeting on 31st May 2006. The purpose of the group was identified and the information that would be needed was established. The group had received most of the information required including information on decriminalisation of parking, the number of spaces available at car parks within Stamford and there area. The group were waiting for financial figures specific to each car park. It was hoped that the group would meet again within two to three weeks.

Markets Working Group

The group had had two meetings; the notes for both were circulated at the meeting. At the first meeting, the group had addressed the points that were recommended following the original markets report of 2004. The District Council's Amenities Manager attended the second meeting of the group to answer any questions. The working group stated that they hoped to visit each of the markets within the District.

At the second meeting of the working group, the formal market testing of market staffing was discussed. The group considered the information that had been made available to them, including the South Kesteven District Council Markets Regulations and Codes of Practice, the programme of specialist markets for 2006, the National Retail and Market Survey and stall occupancy of markets within the District and considered that contracting the staffing of markets to the private sector would be of no benefit. They felt that valuable local information would be lost, the balance of the market could be compromised and traders identified through a database might not meet the needs of people within the District. The DSP supported the recommendation of the working group.

The Market Supervisor was praised for his hard work and enthusiasm; the Panel agreed that he was largely responsible for the successful running of the markets.

The panel discussed charity stalls and wondered whether more could be done to encourage charities to use the market more. One stall a week was set aside for charity use in Grantham and Stamford.

Following Councillor Selby's replacement on the Panel by Councillor Mrs. Dexter, it was suggested that she might join the working group. It was also suggested that Councillor Exton should be appointed to the group because of his past experience. The DSP agreed with these suggestions.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. To recommend to the Cabinet that staffing for markets should be retained in-house;***
- 2. That Councillor Mrs. Dexter and Councillor Exton should be appointed as additional members of the Markets Working Group.***

10. WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Officer advised panel members of amendments to the DSP work programme following the publication of the Forward Plan for July to October. The decision date for future parking provision for Stamford was changed to not before July 2006. New items had also been added: the Corporate Plan, which would be due for decision not before September 2006, the Local Development Framework (submission of draft version including core strategy and economic and housing DPD) and affordable housing, decisions for both of which would be made not before October 2006.

The Resources DSP had referred the issue of the provision of toilet facilities to the Economic DSP. The remit of this would be clarified at the next meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group on July 24th 2006.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. That the Local Development Framework (submission of draft version including economic and housing DPD) and the Corporate Plan should be included as agenda items for the next meeting of the DSP on 19th September 2006.***
- 2. That the remit of the item referred to the DSP on the provision of toilet facilities within the District should be clarified at the next meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group.***

11. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 16:18.



MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2006 2.30
PM

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Dorrien Dexter
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman)
Councillor Stan Pease

Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Mike Williams (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Azar Woods

OFFICERS

Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Support Officer
Service Manager, Finance and Risk Management (notes 12-16)
Service Manager, Economic Regeneration and Town Centre Management (notes 12-15)
Service Manager, Planning Policy (notes 12-16)
Business Manager, Development and Building Control

12. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel were notified that Councillor Exton would be substituting for Councillor Mrs. Smith for this meeting only.

13. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joynson and Mrs. Kaberry-Brown.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

The Scrutiny Officer explained that the first gateway review was for monitoring service performance against the relevant service plan for 2006/07 and identifying remedial action. During the second gateway review the Panel would look at the service plan in conjunction with projected budgets. Financial services would inspect the service plan, which should reflect comments and recommendations made by the DSP during the second review. The DSP would then conduct the third gateway review.

The Service Manager, Finance and Risk Management said that the Panel needed to be satisfied that they had carried out robust scrutiny of service plans so that service managers

had a clear mandate.

15. GATEWAY 1: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT

The Service Manager, Economic Development and Town Centre Management gave a presentation on the areas of the 2006/07 Planning Policy and Economic Regeneration Service Plan that were relevant to the new service area. The service was relevant to two of the District Council's corporate priorities: town centre regeneration (Category A) and business development (Category B).

Operational delivery was aided through strategic documents produced for the council and independent groups. SKDC first measured the performance of the economic development team in 2005/06; this was used to set the baseline for 2006/07 indicators, which included: the total number of business enquiries, inward investment enquiries, the number of jobs created, adults in employment gaining new skills, businesses assisted with projects and business support, the number of business start-ups that were supported and the leverage of external funding per pound invested by SKDC.

A Town Centre Manager had been appointed to all towns to work with the Town Centre Management Partnerships (TCMP). Each partnership was at a different stage: Stamford was the most mature, the Deepings was still gathering consensus and support. TCMPs were identified as the best vehicle for delivering partnership initiatives and utilising local support, whilst accessing national resources.

The management restructure amalgamated street markets and fairs and events with Economic Development and Town Centre Management. As the structure was new, service resources had yet to be considered.

The service was responsible for policy formation and policy alignment; partnership working and direct intervention. The team was involved in a wide range of town centre projects and initiatives and economic and community development projects and initiatives across the district.

Challenges for the service during 2006/07 included ensuring consistent service for markets and fairs, delivery of the Stamford Gateway project, the evaluation of the Northfields project, provision of support for TCMPs, gaining consensus and agreement of the Grantham Masterplan and the compilation of a project team and plan of attack; bid writing to economic development agencies for key projects and monitoring, reporting and project managing schemes.

The service handled a diverse range of budgets. A significant spend between December 2006 and February 2007 was expected for town centre projects. The need to readjust budget codes to reflect the restructure had been identified.

Panel members discussed the presentation and asked. Points included:

- The structure and composition of the market team remained the same following the transition from the former Leisure and Cultural Services.
- Events held in the town centres were funded by a number of different sources; some were funded by the District Council, others were funded by private companies who received District Council support and publicity;
- The priority given to the development of housing impacted on the number of business start-up workshops that could be provided.
- The leverage of external funding per pound was dependent on projects

undertaken by the District Council. Large projects would source greater funding from external agencies increasing the leverage.

- If the District Council controlled Community Interest Companies (CICs) they would be less eligible to receive external funding.
- To achieve Gershon savings, Economic Development Officers had been trained internally. This meant that the Council could take advantage of the skills they had developed. This was useful because there was no specific training in Economic Development was available post-16 and meant that non-qualified staff could be used instead of qualified staff.
- A key issue for the Council was staff retention. Other service managers present this; the private sector was viewed as more attractive. Panel members suggested that staff retention would be aided if salaries were at the same level as neighbouring authorities.
- If a market existed, the Team would consider entering contracts undertaking Economic Development work on behalf of other councils.
- Gershon savings would be reviewed in terms of staff productivity: the rate at which market stalls were erected in Stamford was greater than Grantham.

Issues to note for Gateway 2:

- **Increase in salary for officers to aid retention**

16. GATEWAY 1: PLANNING POLICY

A presentation on the Planning Policy service plan was given by the manager. The service was responsible for the production of the Local Development Framework (LDF), the provision of advice for development control officers, responding to consultation documents, data collection and upholding the conservation policy. The planning policy team was fully staffed.

The primary aim of the Planning Policy service was to meet statutory requirements to prepare a Local Development Framework. In April 2006, the Statement of Community Involvement was the first document to be adopted. Consultation on the Core Strategy and Site Allocations was undertaken during the summer of 2006. Background studies to form a robust evidence base for the documents were almost complete. Two conservation area appraisals had been delivered.

Achievements of the service in 2006 included: the submission of all national and regional monitoring returns; improvements to I.T. software and its infrastructure; increased delivery of affordable housing in partnership with other services and a successful Growth Point bid for Grantham.

The budget for 2006/07 was significantly higher than the total actual spend for 2005/06. The actual spend recorded to the end of September appeared under budget. This was attributed to anomalies in the employee budget; it was not clear from which budgets funding for some staff had been drawn. There was a need to clarify on what areas the Planning Delivery Grant had been spent.

The service was moved from Category B to Category M, however, it played a key role in delivering two Category A outcomes: affordable housing and town centre regeneration. A large number of service obligations were laid down in the Local Development Scheme – a three year project plan for the production of the LDF, which made it simpler to plan expenditure.

A reduction in employee costs beyond 2006/07 was anticipated because of the loss of half a service manager, planning officer and reduced hours for a senior planning officer. There would be a reduction in budget for consultants' fees because the majority of budgets would have been delivered by the end of 2006/07. There was the need to increase the budget for hearings and inspectors' fees.

Gershon savings had been achieved through significant reduction in employee costs; the purchase of IT software which increased efficiency; the partial recoup of consultants' fees through the charging structure for reports and background studies and disinvestment in historic building grants.

The SWOT analysis identified service strengths as: a good knowledge base in a settled team with opportunities presented by the LDF. That the LDF system was new was identified as a weakness. Other weaknesses included the ability to recruit qualified staff and a lack of resources for heritage and urban design. Opportunities would be provided through partnership working and the ability to set realistic targets through the Local Development Scheme. Threats identified were the management of the impact of restructure, the flexible nature of the planning delivery grant and further changes to the national planning system.

Additional resources could be required following the monitoring of effects from the restructure. To improve the service's BVPI performance on conservation area appraisals, further resources could be required. Additional finance would have to be available for LDF examinations and inspectors' fees.

Following the presentation, members of the panel discussed the issues raised:

- Where possible, studies were done in conjunction with other local authority areas, however, most required area specific information.
- Without funding in place for appeals and inspectors' fees, the Council would be unable to get the LDF signed-off.
- Reduction in the level of funding for conservation projects caused concern.
- The robust evidence necessary for the compilation and sign-off of the LDF would consist of empirical evidence based on statistics, social and economic data and anecdotal evidence.
- The service had undertaken a cautious approach to the production of LDF documents, since the first two authorities to undergo inspection were deemed unsound.

Issues to note for Gateway 2:

- **Whether additional resources would be necessary to improve the number of conservation area appraisals undertaken in a year.**

CONCLUSION:

That the Service Manager, Planning Policy should look into anomalies between the budgeted spend for employees and the actual spend for employees for 2006/07.

17. GATEWAY 1: DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL

The Building Control Service Plan had been considered by the Community DSP. The Panel agreed that they should continue to scrutinise the service.

The Business Manager for Development and Building Control spoke briefly to the Development Control Service Plan. Development Control was an underperforming service. The attainment of standards was necessary for securing planning delivery grant funding. Overall, the service was approximately 7-8% below targets for dealing with applications in the statutory period. The loss of key staff, primarily to the private sector, had made a large impact.

Some service problems were caused by the Development Control Manager having a caseload in addition to their management responsibilities.

A peer review of the service was conducted in April 2006, however the lack of dedicated management had meant that recommendations had not been implemented. The Business Manager stated that implementing the recommendations was a priority.

Work was being done with an accountant to identify projects where planning delivery grant money was allocated and whether the projects were completed on budget, under budget or over budget.

Key staff posts were held by external consultants. Internal staffing would strengthen the service. Staff recruited to the section would need to be of a high calibre. One danger was that staffing could become bottom heavy. There was a risk that there could be too many unskilled officers compared to professionals.

Costings for the back scanning of documents were awaited. Ongoing scanning for the planning portal was underway, as was web administration. Results of the arboricultural survey were due, which would mean that all Tree Preservation Orders could be plotted on the G.I.S. system and integrated with Land Charges.

Some team development had been done. It was anticipated that future training would be given to senior officers, who would then provide in-house training for junior members of staff.

Members of the panel briefly questioned the Business Manager. They were eager that Members were involved in some training so that they had a good comprehension of incoming legislation. It would also help officers and members work more effectively together. A meeting had been scheduled with the Chairman of the Development Control Committee for this reason.

In the short term the service priority would be achieving targets to help gain Planning Delivery Grant money, in the longer term, the main focus would be the provision of a quality service.

Issues to note for Gateway 2:

- **The Planning Delivery Grant spend should be identified.**
- **Recruitment and retention of staff should be priorities for the service.**

18. GATEWAY 2 & GATEWAY 3

The Panel agreed dates and times for Gateways 2 and 3.

Gateway 2

Tuesday 21st November 2006 at 2:00pm

Gateway 3

Wednesday 13th December 2006 at 2:00pm

19. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:10.

Grantham Canal Basin Report November 1st 2006

Current Situation

The Study is currently still within the first phase (Socio economic baseline) as it was felt important to await the decision on the Growth Point bid. If we had proceeded with a set of options before the outcome of this bid, we could have had a study that was not going to deliver the required needs of a growing sub regional centre over the next twenty years. Now we are aware of the outcome a decision can be made on the options available within the study.

The Growth Point bid was approved in late October 2006, and therefore the Canal Basin Steering Group can meet to instruct the consultants to proceed with the completion of the first phase of the study.

When this has been completed (estimated as late November 2006) the Service Managers for Economic Development & Town Centres, and Planning Policy can proceed with the master planning phase of the study. This will require a separate tendering process, which should be complete before early February 2007. This will allow alignment between the Grantham Masterplan and the Canal Basin Study. The new Corporate Head for Sustainable Communities should have a significant role to play within the Canal Basin Steering Group when appointed. Partners of the Steering Group wish to see some corporate lead from SKDC to ensure ownership and buy-in from the Local Authority.

The Economic Development & Town Centre Services Manager has submitted an expression of interest form, in September 2006 to Lincolnshire Enterprise to request some economic development funding for 2009-2012 for the Canal Basin. The heart of the bid was built around mix use development and the servicing of the site. To date no response has been received on this request.

Actions are as follows: -

The Planning Policy Service Manager will inform EKOS (awarded consultants) the situation regarding the Growth Point bid, and instruct them to complete socio economic baseline.

The Economic Development & Town Centre Services Manager will arrange the meeting of the Steering Group for late November 2006.

In early December 2006 the Economic Development & Town Centre Services Manager will work with two key partners, internal service managers and possibly the new corporate head to draw up a tender specification for the Canal Basin Masterplan phase of the study. This will be submitted to a variety of external consultants with a view to awarding a contract in early February 2007.

In early January 2007 the Economic Development & Town Centre Services Manager will arrange a meeting of the members of the Canal Basin Executive; including the leaders of SKDC and LCC to report on progress and best way forward.

ENDS

BRIEFING NOTE FOR THE ECONOMIC DSP: PUBLIC CONVENIENCES IN SOUTH KESTEVEN

The Council's Policy:

On Monday 12th July 2004, the Cabinet agreed a policy for District Council Provision of public conveniences within South Kesteven. The policy agreed stated that one attended toilet should be provided for each of the towns within the District. Additional provision (or additional opening hours) had to be funded at a local level by the relevant Town/Parish Council. Opening hours for District Council provided facilities were based around core times and aligned with hours of retail operation. To facilitate an evening economy, out-of-hours facilities would be included where possible within the building design.

The Council's Assets:

The Council's Asset Management Plan for 2006-2009 was approved at the Cabinet meeting on Monday 7th August 2006. Appendix 2 of the Asset Management Plan lists the Council's operational assets, including public conveniences. Those listed were Red Lion Square, Stamford; Rainbow Centre, Market Deeping; Bus Station, Grantham and South Road, Bourne. The Bus Station in Grantham was leased by the District Council, the other public convenience sites were District Council owned.

Sustainable villages

If the DSP did want to review toilet provision within the villages, the following were identified as 'local service centres', i.e. sustainable villages, during preparation processes of the Local Development Framework: Ancaster, Barkston and Syston, Barrowby, Baston, Billingborough and Horbling, Caythorpe and Frieston, Colsterworth and Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth, Corby Glen. Great Gonerby, Harlaxton, Langtoft, Long Bennington, Morton & Hanthorpe, Rippingale and Thurlby and Northorpe. Please note that this list is currently under review and could be subject to some amendment.

Report to the Economic DSP

Subject: Stamford Car Parking Working Group

Meeting Date: 9th August 2006 (10:30 to 11:40)

Present: Councillor Exton
Councillor Mrs. Smith

Councillor Smith (Economic Development Portfolio Holder)

Mike Sibthorp (Head of Planning Policy and Economic Regeneration)

Jo Toomey (Scrutiny Support Officer)

On Street Parking Provision

- The County Council had put parking orders out for consultation.
- The working group was interested in proposals for Bath Row, West. Parking on the west side of Bath Row was free all day; the parking orders proposed free parking but suggested that it should be time-limited to two-hour periods between 10am to 3pm Monday to Saturday.
- The working group thought that this was a good idea and would encourage people to use long stay car parks. This would release free short term parking within a reasonable distance from the town centre.

Decriminalisation of Parking

- Any positive impact of decriminalisation would only be realised in the long-term.
- Decriminalisation of parking was dependent upon work being undertaken by the County Council. A consultant's report was being prepared, which it was hoped would be ready by August 2006. Decisions would then need to be made within the County Council, before proposals were submitted to District Councils for consultation.
- A final decision on the decriminalisation of parking was not expected until 2007.
- No budgetary provision had been made for decriminalisation in 2006/07.
- Decriminalisation would mean that the District Council would face set up costs for schemes, including monitoring costs.
- It was felt that in the long term, the decriminalisation of on-street parking would provide a return, which could be used by the District Council on any issues relating to car parking.
- It was thought that provision of on-street parking would lead to a general improvement to traffic in town centres.
- Instead of charging for on-street parking, the working group felt that it would be better to ensure that decriminalisation is properly enforced rather than operating a charging system.

Recommendations to the DSP:

That the DSP recommends to Cabinet that:

1. **Subject to a favourable report from the County Council on the decriminalisation of on-street parking, provision should be made in the**

budget for 2007/08 to cover any costs that might arise from the implementation of on-street parking schemes.

- 2. Subject to a favourable report from the County Council and in conjunction with the decriminalisation of on-street parking, the District Council should undertake consultation and feasibility work on a residents' parking scheme.**

Off Street Parking

- Immediately following the increase in car parking charges and change in pay structure, the number of tickets sold per month decreased.
- The Council's Asset Management plan required maximising income from all car parks.
- A meeting had been held with Stamford Town Council to discuss car-parking issues. At this meeting the need for increased parking provision in the medium term was acknowledged.
- The District Council had begun to engage with the development industry on creative solutions to address car-parking need. It was hoped that solutions would be development-led.
- Few new sites had been identified for use as car parks. The best opportunities for strategic car park development were identified as North Street, Wharf Road and Cattle Market. These three sites were considered to be the best for development, as traffic would be encouraged to stay on the relief road instead of entering Stamford town centre.
- Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce had presented suggestions to the District Council on proposals for the development of North Street car park.
- Park and ride schemes were not deemed feasible, however ideas of shuttling people from peripheral car parks were considered.
- Schemes that would provide more car parking facilities for Stamford included multi-storey car parks, underground car parking and car parks integrated with other developments including housing, light industry, business and retail.

Recommendations

- 1. The Stamford Car Parking Working Group should be disbanded until reports of other working groups examining car parking in Stamford are completed.**
- 2. When reports are available, the Working Group should be reconvened to scrutinise any recommendations that have been made.**

Economic DSP - Performance Monitoring 2005/06

Those indicators with a number in the PI column are from the Government's Best Value Performance Indicators suite used by many Councils. The remaining indicators are local to SKDC and may be relatively simple measures/indicators only. The reader is asked therefore to exercise an element of caution when interpreting any data attached to them.

IND Type = C - Cumulative/% - Percentage/ CA - Cumulative Average/N - Number/A - Average
Reporting = blank - Monthly/Q - Quarterly/Y - Yearly/H - Half yearly (Sept)

PI	SKDC Priority Area and PI Description	Lead Officer	IND Type	Reporting	2005/06 SKDC Outturn	2004/05 Upper Quartile	2006/2007 SKDC Target	April	May	June	July	August	September	Are We Improving Yr on Yr?	2007/2008 SKDC Targets	2008/2009 SKDC Targets
TOWN CENTRE DEVELOPMENT Priority A																
SK30	Score against checklist to make Grantham a performing SRC	Neil Cuttell	%	Q	65%	N/A	67.5%			69%			69%	Y	70%	72.5%
SK31	No. of new retail units in town centres	Neil Cuttell	N	Q	34	N/A	12			3			11	Y	15	20
SK32	No. of vacant retail units as a % on NDR list	Neil Cuttell	%	Q	8%	N/A	9.2%			7.8%			7.8%	Y	9.2%	9.2%
SK33	No. of residents satisfied with choice of shopping within the district	Neil Cuttell	A	Y	55%	N/A	60%						55%	n/a	65%	70%
BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT Priority B																
SK50	No. of VAT registered businesses in district	Neil Cuttell	N	Q	4490	N/A	4500			4490			4490	Y	4510	4520
SK51	Number of Businesses Assisted/Supported (this includes businesses started up)	Neil Cuttell	CA	Y	360	N/A	370						299	n/a	380	390
SK52	Number of Business Enquiries	Neil Cuttell	CA	Q	204	N/A	220			60			193	n/a	250	270
SK53	Net stock of non retails Business premises	Neil Cuttell	CA	Y	1443	N/A	1448						1594	n/a	1455	1475
PLANNING & CONSERVATION Priority Y																
BVPI 106	% of new homes built on previously developed land	Stuart Vickers	CA		52.69%	94.0%	60%	65.79%	51.52%	51.52%	53.23%	50.33%	57.22%	N	65%	65%
BVPI 109a	Planning major applications determined within 13 weeks	Stuart Vickers	CA		69.23%	69.0%	65%	50%	60%	60.00%	54.55%	56.25%	57.89%	N	67%	70%
BVPI 109b	Planning minor applications determined within 8 weeks	Stuart Vickers	CA		77.99%	75.4%	80%	82.14%	70.83%	63.97%	61.33%	61.17%	60.50%	N	80%	80%
BVPI 109c	Planning other applications determined within 8 weeks	Stuart Vickers	CA		86.78%	88.0%	90%	75.42%	75.73%	74.10%	74.22%	73.41%	73.46%	N	90%	90%

DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANELS (DSPs) WORK PROGRAMME 2006/7

INTRODUCTION

This Work Programme is partly derived from the Cabinet's Forward Plan, but also contains items that have been brought forward by the DSPs themselves.

Where the item has appeared on the Forward Plan, the anticipated date of the key decision is listed in the second column. The third column shows the last available date that the full DSP can consider this item before the key decision is due to be taken (unless a special meeting is called). This does NOT necessarily mean that the item will appear on the DSP agenda, this will only happen if this is requested by the Chairman or members of the DSP. There will also be instances where there is no DSP meeting before a decision is due to be taken; in these cases the next meeting date after the decision date is shown.

As Cabinet meets monthly and the DSPs meet bi-monthly it is not possible within the current timetable of meetings for the DSPs to consider every single Cabinet or Cabinet Member decision. Scrutiny members are therefore encouraged to read this Work Programme and bring forward items for consideration where they think that an item should be considered by the DSP.

**DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANELS (DSPs)
WORK PROGRAMME 2006/7**

ECONOMIC DSP			
<u>ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION</u>	<u>Date item appeared on Forward Plan</u>	<u>DATE OF KEY DECISION (IF APPROPRIATE)</u>	<u>DSP MEETING</u>
Grantham Canal Basin		N/a	Working Group appointed – meetings suspended for the time being
Grantham Rail Link		N/a	Working Group appointed – meetings suspended for the time being
Markets		N/a	Working Group reconvened 18.04.06
Future Parking Provision for Stamford		Not before July 2006	Working Group appointed
Toilet facilities within the District		N/a	Reference from Resources DSP June 2006
Grantham Masterplan	14.07.06	Not before November 2006	Special meeting held on 24.08.06
Local Development Framework – submission of draft version	16.06.06	Not before November 2006	21.11.06
Service Planning: Gateway Reviews		Jan/Feb 2007	Review 1 held 25.10.06