



AGENDA

For a meeting of the
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL
to be held on
TUESDAY, 30 JANUARY 2007
at
2.30 PM
in
COMMITTEE ROOM 1, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM
Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive

Panel Members:	Councillor Dorrien Dexter, Councillor Ken 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 21st November 2006 are attached for information.
(Enclosure)

6. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE

7. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

8. DECRIMINALISATION OF PARKING

The Service Manager, Assets and Facilities will attend the meeting to talk about the decriminalisation of parking.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT

The Panel will scrutinise the equalities impact assessment for Economic Development and Town Centre Management.
(Enclosure)

10. MARKETS - CHARGING STRUCTURE

The Service Manager, Economic Development and Town Centre Management will discuss amended charges for markets within the district.
(Enclosure)

11. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

12. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

(Enclosure)

13. WORK PROGRAMME

(Enclosure)

14. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Representatives on outside bodies to give update reports.

15. FINANCIAL UPDATE

16. 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, 21 NOVEMBER 2006 2.00 PM

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Mrs Joyce Gaffigan
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Margery Radley
Councillor Mike Williams (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Azar Woods

OFFICERS

Corporate Head, Finance and Resources
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Support Officer
Service Manager, Economic Development
and Town Centre Management
Business Manager, Development and
Building Control
Service Manager, Planning Policy

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Gerald Taylor

20. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel were notified that Councillor Exton would be substituting for Councillor Mrs. Smith, Councillor Mrs. Gaffigan would be substituting for Councillor Joynson and Councillor Mrs. Radley would be substituting for Councillor Stokes for this meeting only.

21. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Pease.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

23. ACTION NOTES

Noted.

24. GRANTHAM CANAL BASIN UPDATE

An update report on the Grantham canal basin project was circulated with the agenda and noted.

25. RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME

The Grantham Local Forum requested that the DSP set up a working group to look into a residents' parking scheme. The Chairman advised the committee that a scheme would only be possible if Lincolnshire County Council decriminalised parking. This could only be done after consultation and with consent from all district councils. Decriminalisation was not expected for a minimum of two years. Members felt that this was a long time and suggested that a representative from the County Council should be invited to the next meeting on 30th January 2007 to discuss the issue, the Panel would then decide on any further action. They agreed that a response should be sent back to the Grantham Local Forum explaining what they intended to do.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. A representative from the County Council should be invited to attend the DSP meeting on 30th January 2007 to discuss the decriminalisation of parking.***
- 2. A response should be sent to the Grantham Local Forum explaining that following a visit by a representative from the County Council the DSP will decide what action to take.***

26. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

The report from the Stamford Car Parking Working Group was noted. The DSP considered the working group's recommendations. Panel members agreed that the group should be disbanded until the findings of other working groups had been published. The Chairman thanked members of the working group.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. The Stamford Car Parking Working Group should be disbanded until reports of other working groups examining car parking in Stamford are completed;***
- 2. To request an update from the Economic Development Portfolio Holder on the status of other working groups looking at car parking in Stamford;***
- 3. When reports are available from other working groups, the Stamford Car Parking Working Group should be reconvened to scrutinise any recommendations that have been made.***

To recommend to Cabinet that:

- 1. Subject to a favourable report from the County Council, consideration should be given to making appropriate budgetary provision in advance of the expected decriminalisation of parking by the County Council;***
- 2. Subject to a favourable report from the County Council on the decriminalisation of on-street parking, the District Council should undertake consultation and feasibility work on a district-wide residents' parking scheme.***

27. PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AUDIT

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Gerald Taylor to the meeting. The Resources

DSP recommended that a “public convenience audit” should be carried out in villages across the District and Councillor Taylor was present to represent that view. The Council had satisfied its toilet provision policy for towns and members of the Resources DSP felt that it would be appropriate to address toilet provision in villages. The operation of a scheme in conjunction with Parish Councils was suggested. Queries were made about access to external funding sources.

Members of the DSP supported the idea of rural toilet provision. Discussion ensued on how this could be achieved. Suggestions included: joint working with Parish Councils; use of facilities within village halls and investment from private business. A list of local service centres or sustainable villages was circulated with the agenda. Further to those listed, Members requested that the Witham Valley villages, Castle Bytham and South Witham be added.

Members also considered whether the District Council should subsidise toilet provision or whether they should pay for one element of it, such as planning costs.

The Scrutiny Officer reminded Members that the District Council was hosting a Parish Council Conference on 7th December 2006. One of the items for consideration was the provision of shared services. Members asked the Scrutiny Officer to prepare a paper for circulation at the meeting to find out the level of interest and commitment from Parish Councils’

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. To request the Scrutiny Officer prepare a paper on public conveniences in rural areas for circulation at the Parish Council Conference on 7th December 2006.**
- 2. Investigations should be made to identify any external funding sources for the provision of public conveniences in rural areas.**

28. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Noted.

- Indicator SK51 (the number of businesses assisted/ supported) was red because it was a yearly target and the figure was taken from a half-yearly review.
- Indicator SK33 (number of residents satisfied with the choice of shopping in the district) was red. This was based on people’s perceptions.
- BVPI 106, BVPI 109a, BVPI 109b and BVPI 109c were all red. No report had been received from the Business Manager, Development and Building Control.

CONCLUSION:

The Panel requests that the Business Manager, Development and Building Control provide a report explaining why BVPI 106, BVPI 109a, BVPI 109b and BVPI 109c are below target.

29. WORK PROGRAMME

Noted.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, it was resolved that the public be excluded because of the likelihood in view of the nature of the business to be transacted that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1-4 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended.

30. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT

The Service Manager, Economic Development and Town Centre Management presented his draft service plan for 2007/07. He explained how the service related to corporate priorities and provided information for comparison with neighbouring authorities. The presentation included information on performance indicators and new areas of responsibility for the service.

Panel Members discussed the impact of work absorbed from the former leisure and cultural services and diversity across the district. Areas where savings could be made were considered.

The Panel went through the Gateway 2 Checklist.

No.	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	No.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	Yes.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	<i>In part.</i>
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	Yes.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.

10	Have major deviations been identified to current years budget	Yes.
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	No.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	Yes.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	No.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	No
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	Yes.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	<i>Mostly. Some additional projects needed adding.</i>
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	<i>No – some areas were identified by the Panel.</i>

ACTION POINTS:

- 1. Costings work on equalities should be undertaken.**
- 2. The breakdown of figures in section 6 of the service plan should be completed fully. A copy of the summary across all budget heads should be circulated to members of the Economic DSP.**
- 3. Major procurement proposals should be identified prior to Gateway Review 3.**
- 4. Outstanding capital projects for the next 3-5 years should be identified and project appraisal forms completed.**
- 5. To include areas for potential savings, as identified by the Economic DSP.**

31. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL

The Development and Building Control Service Plan was presented. The service was underperforming and actions for mitigation were identified. The service was statutory and the key driver was service users. The service priority would be implementing recommendations made by the planning peer review.

Budget sheets were available. These needed to be supplied to all DSP members.

Panel Members went through the Gateway 2 Checklist.

No.	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	No.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	Mostly.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	Yes.
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	No.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.
10	Have major deviations been identified to current years budget	Yes.
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	Yes.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	No.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	Yes.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	N/A
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	No.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project	N/A

	appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	No

ACTION POINTS:

1. *To circulate budget sheets for Development and Building Control to all members of the Economic DSP.*
2. *To identify potential Gershon savings.*
3. *To circulate a copy of the proposed structure to all members of the Economic DSP.*
4. *To circulate a copy of the PESTLE analysis to all members of the Economic DSP.*
5. *To complete the financial summary looking particularly at the cost centres for employee growth and supplies and services.*
6. *To identify areas for potential savings.*

32. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: PLANNING POLICY

Members considered the Planning Policy service plan in conjunction with the Gateway Review 2 checklist.

No	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	Yes.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	No.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	Yes.
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	Yes.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.
10	Have major deviations been identified to current years	Yes.

	budget	
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	No.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	No.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	Yes.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	N/A
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	Yes.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	No.
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	Yes.

ACTION POINTS:

1. *To identify any equality costings for the service.*
2. *To complete a PESTLE analysis and circulate to members of the Economic DSP.*

33. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:25.

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section: Economic Development & Town Centre Management Services		Names of those undertaking assessment: Neil Cuttell Mark Harrison Neil Carrington	
Name of Policy to be assessed: Economic & Community Development Strategy 2005-2008	Date of Assessment: 11/12/2006	Is this a new or existing policy?: Existing Policy	
<p>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy: As per page 19 of the Strategy, there are three key priority aims of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Town Centre Regeneration b) Business Development c) Encouraging Communities to become Sustainable 			
<p>2. What are the key performance indicators? As per pages 20-22 of the Strategy there are 14 indicators with measurements and definitions, including business enquiries, Business Start ups supported, Footfall figures and Investments.</p>			
<p>3. Who will be affected by this policy? This policy will affect anyone that works, lives or visits the district. It will affect the work of key partners that South Kesteven partners with as well as other internal sections and departments at South Kesteven District Council. Specifically the policy will work with Town Centre Management Partnerships, Businesses, and Business Clubs and Organizations.</p>			
<p>4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? This policy will affect anyone that works, lives or visits the district. More specifically it works with growing businesses, the deprived according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation, the socially isolated, and the unemployed. However all residents benefit from Town Centre Regeneration.</p>			
<p>5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service? As per page 23 of the Strategy, there are numerous partners who are involved with South Kesteven District Council. The primary ones are Lincolnshire County Council, Welland SSP, Lincolnshire Enterprise and the local Town Centre Management Partnerships.</p>			
<p>6. What outcomes are required from this policy and for whom? The key outcomes of this policy are not very well set out; however the outcomes can be directly attributed to the 'areas for action' targets within pages 25-28 of the Strategy Action Plan. The overall outcomes include; increase in local GVA, reduction in unemployment, an increase in higher knowledge higher skilled employment.</p>			
<p>7. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) International, National and Regional economies could change priorities b) Provision of services / Priority setting within SKDC c) Resource delivery (deficiency / efficiency) 			
<p>8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? Residents, Town Centre Management Partnerships, Visitors, Local Businesses</p>			
<p>9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? South Kesteven District Council implements the policy principally through the Head of Sustainable Communities Department and the Section Managers. However this policy can only</p>			

be achieved by working with the identified stakeholders as set out in the Strategy.
<p>10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on different racial groups? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on any racial group</p>
<p>11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on men and women? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on men or women</p>
<p>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on disabled people? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>There is a positive impact through one particular project on page 28; the Welland Disability Inclusion Project, that is being led by the Welland SSP, however no the policy does not differentially impact on any disabled people.</p>
<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of sexual orientation? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on any grounds of sexual orientation</p>
<p>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of age? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on grounds of age</p>
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of religious belief? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on grounds for religious belief</p>
<p>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on any other groups of people eg those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgendered or transsexual people. If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No the policy does not differentially impact on any other groups of people.</p>
<p>17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access?</p> <p>The policy document itself could be made available in other languages, through language line.</p>
<p>18. Where do you think improvements could be made?</p> <p>The policy document could be made available in brail, large print, different languages or spoken word.</p>

19. Are there any unmet needs or requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups. If yes, please give details.
The rural population were identified; however on reviewing many of the projects and initiatives they are not excluded and many projects are of positive impact to the rural areas.
20. Is there a complaints system?
The policy document itself does not have a complaints system; however contact details are given. To date, and through the consultation process no complaints have ever been received.
21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?
No we do not measure these issues with regard to complaints, as there have been none.
22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?
The Strategy was endorsed by Cabinet in early October 2005, and was subject to a 10 week consultation period from May 2005 to July 2005. The performance indicators are taken to Cabinet Briefing, SMT, DSP and team meetings. There is also feedback and reviews given to core partners like Lincolnshire Enterprise, Welland SSP, Town Centre Management Partnerships, and EMDA through project progress sheets.
23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?
Yes consultations were undertaken with key partners, the Local Strategic Partnership, Town Councils, Partners identified within the Strategy.
24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view?
The Strategy was completed after reviewing other neighbouring authorities economic development strategies and KPIs. The KPIs were developed alongside the Chief Economic Development Officers Society KPI framework. The Service Plans for financial years 2005/6 and 2006/7 highlight the cost per head for the service against neighbouring authorities and authorities of similar size, for which SKDC come out in the median range.
25. Could the differential impact identified in 8 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy?
No
26. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy?
No
27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?
Not Applicable
28. Should the policy proceed to a full impact assessment?
No

29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by

Not Applicable

Signed (Lead Officer):

Date: ...11/12/2006.....

Agenda Item 10

	Detail	Effective Date	2006/07 £	2007/08 £	VAT
	MARKETS - GRANTHAM				
1	Standard Stall (3.05m x 1.22m)	01/04/06	20.00	20.50	Exempt
2	Pitch (3.05m x 3.05m)	01/04/06	18.50	19.00	Exempt
3	<u>Vehicles parked for storage</u>				
	Cars and light vans	01/04/06	6.20	6.20	Exempt
	Large vehicles	01/04/06	9.50	9.50	Exempt
	MARKETS - STAMFORD				
4	Standard Stall (3.05m x 1.22m)	01/04/06	21.00	21.50	Exempt
5	Pitch (3.05m x 3.05m)	01/04/06	19.00	19.50	Exempt
6	Craft Fair - Table	01/04/03	21.00	22.00	Exempt
7	Craft Fair - Stall	01/04/06	26.00	27.00	Exempt
8	<u>Vehicles parked for storage</u>				
	Cars and light vans	01/04/06	6.20	6.20	Exempt
	Large vehicles	01/04/06	9.50	9.50	Exempt
	MARKETS - BOURNE				
9	Standard Stall (3.05m x 1.22m)	01/04/06	15.50	16.00	Exempt
10	Pitch (3.05m x 3.05m)	01/04/06	14.50	15.00	Exempt
11	<u>Vehicles parked for storage</u>				
	Cars and light vans	01/04/06	6.20	6.20	Exempt
	Large vehicles	01/04/06	9.50	9.50	Exempt
12	Hire of stall for private function	01/04/06	5.50	7.00	Exempt
13	FOR ALL MARKETS				
	Farmers Markets - supply of stall cover in addition to standard stall charge	01/04/06	1.00	1.00	Exempt

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	Sept	Oct	Nov	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%	56.99%	56.09%	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%	50%	46.67%	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%	60.70%	61.73%	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%	73.03%	74.28%	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.

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

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

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 Currently suspended
Toilet facilities within the District		N/a	Reference from Resources DSP June 2006
Grantham Masterplan	14.07.06	Not before January 2007	Special meeting held on 24.08.06
Local Development Framework – to consider responses to core strategy consultation	16.06.06	Not before March 2007	20.03.07
Service Planning: Gateway Review 3	N/a	Jan/Feb 2007	10.01.07