

AGENDA



For a meeting of the
COUNCIL
to be held on
THURSDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2014
at
2.00 PM
in the
COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM. NG31 6PZ
Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

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

For those Councillors who wish to attend, prayers will be held in the Council Chamber at 1:55pm before the commencement of the meeting. Please be seated by 1:50pm.

1. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

The public open forum will commence at **2.00 p.m.** and the following formal business of the Council will commence at **2.30 p.m.** or whenever the public open forum ends, if earlier.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

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

4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 JULY 2014

(Enclosure)

5. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)

(Enclosure)

6. ST PETERS HILL DEVELOPMENT - BUDGET ALLOCATION & PROJECT UPDATE

Report number PD021 by the Portfolio Holders for Grow the Economy – Economic Development and Strategic Resources – Well Run Council

(Enclosure)

7. CAPITAL INVESTMENT - PARK AIR SYSTEMS

Report number PD022 of the Portfolio Holders for Grow the Economy – Economic Development and Strategic Resources – Well Run Council.

(Enclosure)

8. PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2014/15 FOR PROVISION OF LED LIGHTING IN COMMUNAL AREAS

Report number RIM0340 by the Portfolio Holder for Good Housing.

(Enclosure)

9. UPDATES FROM CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Report of the Chairman of the Constitution Committee.

(To follow)

The deadline for notices of motion for the Council meeting on Thursday, 6 November 2014 is 2pm on Friday, 24 October 2014.

MINUTES

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 10 JULY 2014

2.00 PM



PRESENT

Councillor Reginald Howard Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams
Councillor Mark Ashberry
Councillor Ray Auger
Councillor Jean Bevan
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing
Councillor Pam Bosworth
Councillor Robert Broughton
Councillor Terl Bryant
Councillor Paul Carpenter
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright
Councillor George Chivers
Councillor Michael Cook
Councillor Kelham Cooke
Councillor Paul Cosham
Councillor Nick Craft
Councillor Alan Davidson
Councillor Phil Dilks
Councillor Breda Griffin
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Vic Kerr
Councillor Michael King
Councillor Dr Peter Moseley
Councillor David Nalson
Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal

Councillor John Nicholson
Councillor Alan Parkin
Councillor Helen Powell
Councillor Nick Robins
Councillor Bob Sampson
Councillor Bob Sandall
Councillor Susan Sandall
Councillor Trevor Scott
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Rob Shorrock
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith
Councillor Jacky Smith
Councillor John Smith
Councillor Judy Stevens
Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Adam Stokes
Councillor Mrs Brenda Sumner
Councillor Mrs Jean Taylor
Councillor Mike Taylor
Councillor Frank Turner
Councillor Bruce Wells
Councillor Martin Wilkins
Councillor Rosemary H Woolley
Councillor Raymond Wooten

OFFICERS

Chief Executive (Beverly Agass)
Strategic Director – Community and
Environment Focus (Tracey Blackwell)
Strategic Director – Corporate Focus
(Daren Turner)
Strategic Director – Development and
Growth (Steve Ingram)

OFFICERS

Head of Legal and Democratic Services
(Lucy Youles)
Head of Community Assets (Paul
Stokes)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)
Gravity Fields Festival Director
(Rosemary Richards)

Your council working for you

15. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

The Chairman began the meeting by welcoming the Council's new Strategic Director for Development and Growth.

Question 1

The questions submitted by Mrs Patrick were addressed to the Leader of the Council however the Chairman directed them to the Portfolio Holder for Good Housing; the questions related to this Portfolio and the Good Housing Portfolio Holder was considered to be in the position to provide the most full response. Mrs Patrick expressed her dissatisfaction that her question was redirected (requesting it be recorded) however she ultimately put it to the Good Housing Portfolio Holder.

To: Councillor Terl Bryant
Portfolio Holder: Good Housing

Why have you got ridden of a gold star service and abandoned the people?

From: Mrs M. Patrick, Stamford

Response (transcript):

Thank you, Mrs Patrick, to give you a full answer. I assume you are referring to the supporting people role. This is not a question of SKDC deciding to get rid of a gold star service; this change has resulted from the decision by Lincolnshire County Council to fundamentally change their approach to the way it commissions support for older people – moving away from the well-established housing-related support model.

SKDC has been providing the former service referred to you Mrs Patrick always acting as a contractor to Lincolnshire County Council. The service specification issued by Lincolnshire County Council last year required a single contract to lead the delivery of the Wellbeing service across five districts in the county involving a wide range of support services to be provided to people aged 18 upwards tenure blind. On this basis we were unable to bid on the contract.

Throughout the transition of the end of LCC's contract with SKDC and the commencement of the new service with LILP, SKDC has sought to assist the handover, for example, with practical support such as carrying out assessments on behalf of LILP, assisting with joint meetings, ensuring that all tenants understood the implications of the changes and, where required, making direct referrals to adult social care for tenants who were not in a position to help themselves. In addition South Kesteven continued the operation of a 24/7 response service until 20 June to enable the County Council's new provider to complete the required assessments for their new service offer.

We are very, very keen to understand the full implications of the roll out of the Wellbeing Service and have repeatedly asked LCC to provide regular and

updated information on the types of support being provided and the number of residents in the district who are receiving their support services.

Mrs Patrick did not ask a supplementary question but made the following statement:

Thank you Mr Bryant. The welfare service is not doing what SKDC did, that's why I always call it the gold star service, but I have a contract here with SKDC and if I may be allowed Mr Chairman to read the paragraph, I think you'll understand. This was done in 8th January 1999: "your property has been de-designated from the warden unit to one that receives lifeline service telephone however I am pleased to be able to inform you due to your circumstances and previous indication that you would like to retain the warden service, it was been agree that you will continue to receive the Warden service throughout your tenancy." Well I haven't given my tenancy up and there's four of us in Stamford of the same calibre. There's one for your Mrs Neal so that you can see what I've put.

Some of the things that Councillor Bryant is quite correct about SKDC but this wellbeing service is not serving the people. Rapid response does not come out if you fall on the floor.

I wanted Councillor Bryant to assure me that he will continue with Lincolnshire County Council because LCC are not consulting this council and they are not doing their duty as they said. SKDC did a good duty and I was pleased to have but I have not got anything. I had to beg for my assessment. They are not doing assessments now for your people here, they're going over to the new ones. They're lying to you through their teeth ... I've got my assessment here and it's not been done correctly. I'm not criticising SKDC on that point, that's LCC but they're lying through their teeth to you and I want you to know and I'm speaking the truth I've got the evidence here. So what do you want to do? Because we, the people, are suffering; we're suffering terribly.

Question 2

To: Councillor Terl Bryant
Portfolio Holder: Good Housing

Why have you adopted a complete lack of communication to tenants and taxpayers? Even to meeting at the eleventh hour with LCC.

From: Mrs M. Patrick, Stamford

Response (transcript):

Thank you Mrs Patrick. I hope I can answer this question as fully as I did the last question. The responsibility for communicating these fundamental changes to former recipients of the County Council's housing related support service was clearly the responsibility of Lincolnshire County Council who actually held a small number of open invitation meetings during August 2013.

As soon as we were able to during 2013 we: one, wrote to every SKDC sheltered housing tenant explaining the contract was coming to an end and why, we then held face to face meetings at each scheme across the district during August 2013 – these were well attended - by 325 people in actual fact and we provided a handout explaining how the service would change. That handout went to everybody who wanted it.

Once we were informed about who the contract had been awarded to we wrote to all affected tenants to explain the changes and requested their approval for data transfer where required, we established a dedicated team of staff to handle telephone queries. We helped in every way possible people to understand the changes. We attended meetings with tenants when invited. We liaised regularly with county council and LILP to obtain feedback on the transitional work and to offer our assistance and issuing regular newsletters to tenants of sheltered schemes; and we have revised our housing management service and created a team of dedicated Sheltered Housing Officers who visit each scheme on a weekly basis to help tenants with their queries and make access to the services as easy as possible. We've requested regular and up-to-date information from the LCC to understand what level of support is being provided to residents in SKDC via their wellbeing service

We will continue to provide a housing service that is tailored to meet the varying needs of tenants occupying South Kesteven District Council's sheltered housing across the district and encouraging the county council to develop appropriate support arrangements for all people who need them. I hope that answers your question, Mrs Patrick.

Supplementary question (transcript):

Downstairs it says "we are looking after our elderly tenants in their autumn years to make them happier and safer people." What are you doing for me because at the moment I'm receiving nothing and there's many, many people in Stamford and around are not receiving anything. So what are you going to do Councillor Bryant to help me in the situation that I'm in because I've got no support whatsoever.

Response (transcript):

Thank you very much indeed Mrs Patrick. Unfortunately I can't quite answer the question in-depth but if you look at this, this is the wellbeing contract that says what the county council will be providing. They are the people responsible for providing you with the care and support that you need. We are providing the landlord function within the council houses. I hope that goes to address your question, if not, if you would come back to me afterwards I will try and address it.

Question 3

To: Councillor Paul Carpenter
Portfolio Holder: Communication and Corporate Governance

Since the advent of electronic voting in this chamber it has become almost impossible for South Kesteven residents to see how their Ward Councillors vote on particular issues even if, like me, you make the 60-mile round trip from the Deepings to a full council meeting. The push-button voting effectively means Councillors vote by secret ballot on every question unless a recorded vote is specifically requested. Of course in the old days we used to be able to see if people put their hands up and we could tell that way but now we can't tell.

In the interests of transparency and open democracy would you not agree that every vote, in Full Council and committees, should be recorded and the votes of each Councillor made accessible via a hyperlink from the minutes published on the Council website?

From: Mr A. Baxter, Deeping St. James

Response (transcript):

Thank you for your question, Mr Baxter. The way we vote is actually set out in our Constitution on page 134 and we must abide by that. There is as you quite rightly say the opportunity for a recorded vote and this does get used reasonably often especially on matters of great public interest and where there has been maybe a heated debate and that can be called on by any single member of this council and then confirmed by a show of ten hands or more. A list of each member's vote on those occasions is shown in the minutes of course and the public can see those any time.

A lot of council business does tend to be on internal matters and sometimes I'm sure the public would not be too interested in who voted where or what on and I would imagine most members of the public would be more interested in the actual issue that was being voted on and the result of that vote more than who voted where.

The electronic system is tested regularly so we know it's accurate. It is a way that most people vote in very similar organisations, in fact many public authorities throughout the country. And I would suggest, as I said before, the outcome of the decision is of interest to the public more than the way it's voted upon.

The information going on the website as you made mention to, that would incur, I think, an unnecessary cost in officer time that would probably only be of the interest of a very few people in the district. Thank you.

Supplementary question (transcript):

Continuing in the theme of democracy and holding the council to account, I

notice that at one of the recent Constitution meetings, because although you're bound by the Constitution, it is you that made the Constitution and it's up to you to change the Constitution if you so wish. I notice at one of your recent Constitution meetings which lasted almost 40 minutes, an issue was raised about Councillors asking questions. Now, I understand from talking to district councillors that these full council meetings are largely ceremonial occasions but isn't it ridiculous and farcical that I can come here, Mrs Patrick can come here, at relatively short notice and ask almost any question we like and expect to receive an answer on the day when my democratically elected representatives are denied the opportunity under, I think, chapter 12 of your Constitution, Councillors are denied the opportunity to have an open question and answer discussion at full council.

Isn't it time elected councillors were allowed to ask and answer questions at council meetings?

Response (transcript):

Mr Chairman, if I may, the supplementary question should relate to my answer to the first question. That was a totally separate subject.

As the supplementary question did not relate to the question asked or the response given to that question, the Chairman proceeded to the next item of business.

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss Channell, Morgan, Rowlands, Russell, Thompson and Wood.

17. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interests were disclosed.

18. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 APRIL 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2014 were proposed, seconded and agreed as a correct record.

19. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)

The Council noted the Chairman's engagements.

One Councillor reported attending the recent annual general meeting for the local scouts, where he was asked to pass on their thanks for the Council's support.

20. GRAVITY FIELDS 2014

The Head of Community Assets introduced a presentation on the Gravity Fields

Festival 2014. He explained that the 2014 festival aimed to further build community engagement and national and local interest. Reference was made to the festival steering group, which comprised members of the local community and the support received to date from approximately 80 staff members who had volunteered to be festival stewards.

The presentation, which was given by the Festival Director summarised the arts, science and educational aspects of the festival programme and included a number of brief video clips. Reference was also made to funding that had been awarded directly for the festival and where the festival had formed part of the funding bid for visiting acts, providing better value for money for the authority. Funding had also been awarded from science-based institutions in support of the science platforms.

Members were informed that marketing for the festival was already underway including regional distribution of flyers and active marketing to schools and colleges. Tickets for events were on sale with full programme and booking information available on the Gravity Fields website.

Specific reference was made to the year-and-a-half long project: 'Lincolnshire's Age of Scientific Discovery', which would culminate with a display in Grantham museum. Work was also being done with local communities on a project: 'In Newton's Footsteps' which was an organised walk taking in the villages to the south of Grantham and included talks from a range of artists and historians at different stages.

The 2014 Festival would also incorporate a number of fringe elements including food-related events and a late night music strand. An element of the festival funding provided for a specific programme of work with special schools in the district.

Aspects of the project would be delivered in a range of venues including local schools, Belton House, Woolsthorpe Manor, Harlaxton Manor and Stamford Arts Centre.

Councillors were given the opportunity to ask questions. In response to a question about the growth experienced after Gravity Fields 2012, the Festival Director highlighted the cultural growth and the increases in audience size and the distances travelled to visit the arts centres. Reference was also made to the positive coverage of the area and how events like the festival were attractive to businesses considering a move to the district as it showed vibrant, sustainable communities. As part of Gravity Fields 2014 further work was being undertaken on the economic impacts through close working with local retailers and hotel groups.

Members were assured that advertising would be wide-reaching across the towns and villages in the district. It was also hoped the festival would benefit from coverage within parish magazines and distribution through schools.

The steering group for the festival was formed from early conversations and

interest with the college, churches, Grantham Journal, National Trust and business groups and comprised eight to ten members. This steering group consulted on a regular basis with eighty to one-hundred other interested parties and organisations.

The Chairman thanked the Head of Community Assets and the Festival Director on behalf of the Council.

21. REPORT ON URGENT DECISIONS

The Leader's report (number CAB018) informing Councillors of a decision taken under urgency provisions, was noted.

22. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2013/14

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee presented the Committee's annual report for 2013/14 as appended to report number LDS129, which the Council noted.

A question was raised in relation to the Scrutiny Committee's role holding the Executive to account and why no work in this area had been undertaken in 2013/14. The Council was reminded that the Scrutiny Committee, which was politically balanced, had a wide-ranging remit including looking at areas where they would like additional information, looking beyond the Council and considering issues and events that affect local communities. Members were also advised that any Councillor could request a topic for consideration by the Committee.

23. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Decision:

- 1. That the Appeals Panel on page 82, item 2 of the Constitution is removed from the Constitution**
- 2. That the Notice of Questions at 11.3(i) at page 127 of the Constitution be amended to include the wording underlined below and that 72 hours be changed to 3 working days:**

11.3(i) They have given at least 3 working days notice before the day of the meeting in writing of the question including the wording of the question to be asked to the Chief Executive
- 3. That the Constitution be amended at page 46 to replace the Policy Co-ordinating Group with the Cabinet and Policy Development Liaison Group as set out in Appendix 1 of report LDS128.**
- 4. That the Council adopt the revised Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules as set out in Appendix 2 of report LDS128**

5. That the Officer Scheme of Delegation be amended to include the following under the Operations Director (formerly Head of Environmental Services) delegation:

To serve and authorise officers and contractors appointed to exercise the function relating to the control of stray dogs where appropriate to serve notices under Section 149 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (seizure of stray dogs)

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee presented report number LDS128 which detailed recommendations made by the Committee at its meeting on 9 June 2014. He proposed the recommendations as written in the report with a small adjustment to recommendation 1.2, so that, if approved, the change would read:

11.3(i) They have given at least 3 working days notice before the day of the meeting in writing of the question including the wording of the question to be asked to the Chief Executive

This was seconded.

An amendment was proposed to recommendation two:

That the Constitution is amended to allow questions to members of the Executive to be submitted by members of the council in writing at least three working days prior to any full council meeting.

Submitted questions to be answered by the appropriate Executive member or the Leader of the Council in a written statement to be circulated to all members and the question and answer to be included in the minutes of the meeting.

Councillors speaking in favour of the amendment highlighted the disparity between the rights of members of the public and councillors. Several Councillors also made reference to the format for questions at Lincolnshire County Council, where a question could be submitted on the day of a council meeting and an answer provided within two hours. They also felt it was anomalous that a question asked of a Portfolio Holder was given to a policy development group to answer. There was some criticism that responses to questions were not published in the Council minutes. Some members also referred to difficulties attending meetings of which they were members because mileage was not payable and they would have to take time off from work.

The suggestion was made that it might be appropriate to refer the proposed amendment to the Constitution Committee for full consideration if the amendment was not successful.

A number of Cabinet members, in speaking against the amendment stated that they were prepared to answer Councillors' questions at any time via telephone, e-mail or in person. They also added that responses to questions were

recorded in PDG action notes and that the relevant Portfolio Holder would attend the meeting to which a question was referred and join in debate. Other members who spoke against the amended suggested it would have been more appropriate for it to be debated at Constitution Committee rather than presented straight to full Council.

Following a comment made by one Councillor, officers clarified that questions submitted electronically were considered as having been submitted “in writing”.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.4, a recorded vote was requested on the amendment and received the support of more than ten Members.

Councillors Bevan, Chivers, Adam Stokes and Ian Stokes had left the meeting before the recorded vote was taken.

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Ashberry	Councillor Adams	
Councillor Bisnauthsing	Councillor Auger	
Councillor Broughton	Councillor Mrs Bosworth	
Councillor Davidson	Councillor Bryant	
Councillor Dilks	Councillor Carpenter	
Councillor Howard	Councillor Mrs Cartwright	
Councillor V Kerr	Councillor Cook	
Councillor Dr Moseley	Councillor Cooke	
Councillor Powell	Councillor Cosham	
Councillor Sampson	Councillor Craft	
Councillor B Sandall	Councillor Griffin	
Councillor S Sandall	Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown	
Councillor Selby	Councillor King	
Councillor Shorrock	Councillor Nalson	
Councillor Stevens	Councillor Mrs Neal	
Councillor Wells	Councillor Nicholson	
	Councillor Parkin	
	Councillor Robins	
	Councillor Scott	
	Councillor Jacky Smith	
	Councillor John Smith	
	Councillor Mrs Judy Smith	
	Councillor Mrs Sumner	
	Councillor Mrs Taylor	
	Councillor Taylor	
	Councillor Turner	
	Councillor Wilkins	
	Councillor Woolley	
	Councillor Wootten	
16	29	0

One member expressed the concern about the proposed terms of reference for the Cabinet and PDG liaison group. He suggested that involving the Cabinet

member in the work programming of policy development groups provided the opportunity for Cabinet to influence the outcome of discussions and risked the groups' independence. It was proposed and seconded that the terms of reference should be referred back to the Constitution Committee for further discussion and consideration. On being put to the vote, this was lost.

Separate votes were taken on each of the recommendations, all of which were carried.

24. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Report number LDS130 of the Chief Executive asked Councillors to appoint a representative to the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board to fill a vacancy created by the resignation from the Board of Councillor Mike Taylor. No nominations were received and the position remained vacant.

25. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 16:14.

Agenda Item 5

Chairman's Engagements 11 July 2014 to 11 September 2014

Date	Ref	Organisation and Event	Location	Chauf
12.07.14	RH021	The High Sheriff of Lincolnshire and The Countess of Yarborough – Champagne Tea	Brocklesby Park, Lincolnshire	✓
13.07.14	RH022	The Chairman and Lady of Lincolnshire County Council – Service of Dedication in Lincoln Cathedral with Lincolnshire Youth Symphony Orchestra	Lincoln Cathedral	✓
05.08.14	RH027	Chairman of West Lindsey District Council, afternoon tea to commemorate the centenary of the start of the first world war	Council Chamber, Marshalls Yard, Gainsborough,	✓
07.08.14	RH	WW1 Service – Rev Philip Brent	St. Guthlac's Church Market Deeping	
20.08.14	RH032	The Mayor of Grantham's Fund Raising Coffee Morning	Mayor's Parlour Guildhall, Grantham	
24.08.14	RH024	British Model Flying Association 2014 Annual British National Championships	Royal Air Force Station Barkston Heath	
29.08.14	RH033	The Mayor of Lincoln – Great Mayoral Bake Off and Afternoon Tea	City Hall, Lincoln	✓
31.08.14	RH028	Mayor & Mayoress of Melton Borough Council – Civic Service & Reception	St. Mary's Church, Melton Mowbray	✓
07.09.14	RH036	The Town Mayor and Mayoress of Newark – Annual Battle of Britain Commemorative Service	Meet at Town Hall, Newark	✓
07.09.14	RH029	Chairman of East Lindsey District Council's Civic Service	St. Mary's Church, North Somercotes	✓
10.09.14	RH025	University of Lincoln Graduation Ceremonies – Computer Science and Social and Political Science	Lincoln Cathedral	✓

REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Grow the Economy – Economic Development Portfolio Holder
Strategic Resources – Well Run Council Portfolio Holder

REPORT NO: PD021

DATE: 11 September 2014

TITLE:	St Peters Hill development - budget allocation & project update	
KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:	Budget Provision	
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:	Councillor Frances Cartwright Grow the Economy and Economic Development Councillor Mike Taylor Strategic Resources - Well Run Council	
CONTACT OFFICER:	Neil Cucksey n.cucksey@southkesteven.gov.uk 01476 40 62 24	
INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS: Equality and Diversity	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below	Full impact assessment Required:
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: www.southkesteven.gov.uk	
BACKGROUND PAPERS	PD019- Redevelopment of St Peters Hill, Grantham. Procurement and Budget allocation update.Cabinet, 04 August 2014. http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=13291 HOF267- Determination of Budget 2014/15 and indicative budgets to 2016/17 – General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and associated capital programmes. Council, 03 March 2014. http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=3018&T=10 PD015- Redevelopment of St Peter's Hill Grantham Cabinet, 03 February 2014. http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=12666 http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=12667	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That Council note the progress made on developing the scheme and agree to amend the allocation in the capital programme for this scheme to £4.95m from the £6.1M currently allocated to “Town Centre Projects – St Peters Hill Development” for the period 2014/15 – 2016/17.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 2.1 The report provides an update on the makeup of the components of the proposed scheme, the procurement route being progressed and allocation of capital towards the scheme. Cabinet has supported this project at its meeting on 4 August 2014 and is seeking approval from Council for the investment in line with the revised costings obtained as part of the project development.

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 3.1 The General Fund capital programme is focussed on the delivery of priority projects particularly in relation to Grow the Economy – economic regeneration.
- 3.2 This ambitious proposal involves the redevelopment of land and premises at St Catherine’s Road which will create a 6 screen multiplex cinema with adjacent restaurants thereby bringing significant improvements to the leisure and cultural offer in the vicinity. This level of investment in the town centre will provide an economic boost to the local economy and ensure the Council continues its track record of delivering its priorities.
- 3.3 In order to compliment the enhanced Cinema offer and existing Guildhall Arts Centre a soft marketing exercise has been carried out to ascertain the likely level of interest from A3 (Restaurant) operators in locating new offers to Grantham in the space adjacent to the cinema.
- 3.4 The level of confirmed interest in the scheme has been strong. Taking only those operators that confirmed definite interest in having space in the scheme, there is currently more demand than available space on the ground floor. We have therefore looked to include approximately 4000 sq ft of A3 space on the first floor.
- 3.5 Typically first floor space for A3 use is less attractive to operators; however the concept of a food court with multi cuisine and live cooking areas sits well with a quality fast food offer for those seeking a quicker dining experience before or after a film. A reconfiguration of the space at first floor level will suit this use. Placing the entrance immediately adjacent to the Cinema entrance ensures footfall passes the entrance to the first floor A3 outlet.
- 3.6 The balance of the first floor, approx 5800 sq ft net, is allocated to office use. The space could be let as one unit or split into smaller units to meet some of the demand recently identified, but without any business support or services.

4. Procurement route

- 4.1 The procurement route being progressed for the construction of the new Community Hall, Cinema, A3 units and public realm is via the East Midlands Property Alliance (EMPA) framework.
- 4.2 This framework has been used recently by the Council to deliver new housing and is an expedient and efficient way of procuring the works whilst having transparency and certainty of the cost model and programme early in the project.
- 4.3 The EMPA Framework also ensures a target spend through the local supply chain and typically 50% of site labour lives within 20 miles of the site and 80% within 40 miles.
- 4.4 The contractor has provided feasibility information in support of the project.
- 4.5 Following completion of the Feasibility Stage, the Council may, at its sole discretion, issue a Project Order to the Contractor to proceed to the Pre-Construction Stage. This will obviously be dependent upon the cost model and programme meeting expectations of financial viability and deliverability when fully tested.

5. Budget Allocation.

- 5.1 The cost plan from the EMPA framework contractor has indicated an overall project cost for the elements to be provided by the Council of circa £4,740,331. At this point the overall cost needs to be caveated in respect of the elements of fit out to be undertaken by the cinema operator. Whilst the framework contractor has met with the cinema operator there is still some work to do on the interface between the Cinema shell and fit out works.
- 5.2 In addition the following cost elements have been identified and included in the overall project cost.
 - Preliminaries
 - Professional Fees
 - Design and construction contingency & risk @ 6%
 - Overheads and profit
 - Materials and labour inflation costs @ 8%. This reflects the current trend in the market

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 At this point the overall viability of the scheme is enhanced by the increased income potential for A3 space on the first floor. There is some further opportunity to improve the overall financial return on the scheme. The levels of rent potential occupiers have identified they are prepared to pay for the A3 space is higher than previously modelled.
- 6.2 The recommendations are set out to support the amendments made to the scheme and progress on to the feasibility phase of the procurement route.

7. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

7.1 The other options considered for procurement are:

- Design and build with contractors design via OJEU compliant procurement process.
- Traditional design package commissioned by SKDC and bill of quantities for contractors to competitively price via OJEU compliant procurement process.

7.2 The above options would add between 3 to 6 months to the overall timeline before construction commenced on site and have therefore been discounted at this stage.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 External project management support has been appointed to move the project forward in line with the overall project programme.

9. RISK AND MITIGATION

9.1 Risk has been considered as part of this report and any specific high risks are included in the table below:

Category Risk	Action / Controls
A risk register has been developed as part of the project governance	
The framework contractor has provided a construction phase risk register.	

10. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS

10.1 None applicable

11. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

11.1 An initial response has been received from the Police Crime Prevention section which is generally favourable to the scheme and suggests some improvements to be considered as part of the design iteration.

12. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES

12.1 The General Fund capital programme includes an allocation for 'Town Centre Projects – St Peters Hill Development' for £6.1M for the period 2014/15 – 2016/17. This report proposes a reduction to this allocation which will result in a corresponding reduction in the financing arrangements underpinning the original allocation.

13. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- 13.1 The delivery of the proposed building works can be achieved through a framework agreement in accordance with the Council's Contract and Procurement Procedure Rules.
- 13.2 The recommendation to Council is required because the decision proposed is not wholly in accordance with the budget approved at full Council on the 3rd March 2014.

14. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICES

- 14.1 None Applicable

15. APPENDICES:

- 15.1 None Applicable

REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Grow the Economy - Economic Development Portfolio Holder
Strategic Resources – Well Run Council Potfolio Holder

REPORT NO: PD022

DATE: 11 September 2014

TITLE:	Extension Proposal – Park Air Systems, Market Deeping	
KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:	Budget Framework Proposal.	
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:	Councillor Frances Cartwright Grow the Economy and Economic Development Councillor Mike Taylor Strategic Resources - Well Run Council	
CONTACT OFFICER:	Neil Cucksey n.cucksey@southkesteven.gov.uk 01476 40 62 24	
INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS: Equality and Diversity	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below N/A	Full impact assessment Required:
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: www.southkesteven.gov.uk	
BACKGROUND PAPERS	Cabinet report PD020- 04 August 2014. http://moderngov.southkesteven.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=13306	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That Council amends the General Fund Capital Programme for 2014/15 & 2015/16 to include up to £495,000 over the two financial years to be invested in the extension to Premises at Northfields Industrial Estate, Market Deeping (the Premises).

2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 2.1 These Premises are owned by the Council and leased to Park Air Systems (PAS).
- 2.2 PAS approached the Council to procure a “turn key” extension to the existing Premises to be used as a training facility. This report sets out the capital requirements for the scheme. Cabinet considered this proposal on 4 August 2014 and is seeking approval from Council for inclusion in the capital programme in order to deliver the project.

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 3.1 Background
- 3.2 The Council is owner of the Premises comprising 6133m² gross internal area (“GIA”) at Northfields Industrial Estate, Market Deeping let to PAS. The property comprises high quality production facility and associated offices.
- 3.3 PAS has requested that the Council procures additional space by way of an extension to the existing premises for the provision of ‘a training facility’. It is expected that the GIA of the extension will be approximately 300m². This will support their business in offering bespoke training on their systems to their international customers. PAS currently employs circa 160 staff at Market Deeping and operates as a communications specialist in the international aviation and aeronautical industry and is part of Northrop Grumman - a major international company.
- 3.4 The extension will be located close to the front of the existing site and will be highly visible close to the prestigious main entrance to the Premises. It will be used by a range of clients from the worldwide customer base, and is intended to be a class leading training facility and to complement the existing building.
- 3.5 The site currently forms part of the car park in relation to the existing factory and is within the demised area let to PAS so there are no costs of land acquisition.

4. PLANNING

- 4.1 The Land upon which the extension will be constructed lies fully within the existing demised area and is zoned for light industrial use.
- 4.2 An application for planning permission for the proposed development has been submitted.

5. ECONOMIC BENEFIT

- 5.1 The development secures further investment in the local economy and retains PAS as a tenant ensuring the business remains as a key contributor to the local economy. It increases the rent roll of the Council’s Investment portfolio and provides a good return on investment.

6. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Whilst this is becoming a very large factory within a rural area, PAS has been located in Market Deeping since 1966 and the Council developed this unit for it in 2001 following a move from another unit in the town. It would seem likely that the business will remain in the town for the foreseeable future.
- 6.2 Apart from the Mitie Scotgate premises (c900m²) this is the sole remaining SKDC owned asset on this estate. It is the largest asset in the Council's Investment Portfolio and the further investment into this property does not directly, at this point, create new jobs. However it secures existing jobs and allows PAS to seek further opportunities to grow the business internationally.
- 6.3 The extension whilst designed to PAS's requirement is not so bespoke as to be unsuitable for use by any future tenant.
- 6.4 PAS has indicated that it does not invest directly in property assets and will not fund the physical extension to the property as a tenant improvement. If the Council doesn't invest the proposal will not proceed. This could have ramifications in relation to Landlord/ Tenant relationships and would not accord with the Council's priority to "Grow the economy".

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 This proposal represents a success story within the local area and the advent of the proposed extension will yield a good positive story to enhance the Council's reputation. The proposal accords with the Council's priority to Grow the economy, more specifically to:
- Support & facilitate the growth of business.
 - Easy to do business with- look to say yes.
 - Skills- create high value employment.
 - Attract as a destination for investment.
- 7.2 PAS offers a very good covenant and its rent payment history is excellent. The additional rent on the proposed extension enhances the value of the Council's investment and adds to the investment portfolio revenue stream.

8.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 8.1 A similar amount of money could be invested in the development for example of small starter units elsewhere. But clearly there would be a need for a site acquisition and the investment would not be as secure due to the variable nature of the tenant base. Management costs would be higher and erode income as well.
- 8.2 The site is already used for industry and is demised to PAS on an existing lease so there is no alternative scope for development at this time.

9. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The project will be managed from within existing resources. Some professional support in cost management will be required should the project be approved to the delivery phase.

10. RISK AND MITIGATION

- 10.1 Risk has been considered as part of this report and any specific high risks are included in the table below:

Category Risk	Action / Controls
If SKDC decides not to invest there could be reputational damage and the tenant may decide to place future investment at other locations within or outside the UK. The tenant may not extend its current lease if the extension does not proceed.	Continued positive dialogue with the Tenant until a decision is formally made.
A risk register will be developed as part of the project governance	Project governance
The framework contractor will provided a construction phase risk register.	EMPA Framework agreement.

11. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS

- 11.1 None arising from this report

12. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 None arising from this report

13. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES

- 13.1 The investment in this proposal can be met from either capital reserves or utilising the Council's New Homes Bonus Reserve which is established to fund priority led projects of this type. The Return on Investment offers an financially attractive rate when compared with the average current investment rate of 0.90% providing the Council with additional returns for further future investment. There will be a marginal increase in the rating assessment of the facility which will generate a modest increase in localised business rate income. The increase in the future revenue stream following the introduction of the new rental arrangements will be a positive contribution towards the Council's medium term financial planning.

14. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- 14.1 The development proposal will require the grant of a new lease to the current tenant on new terms. An agreement for lease during the development is

proposed which will require the new lease to be completed when the development is finished.

- 14.2 The implications of state aid have been considered and will not be applicable in circumstances where the Council's intention is to increase rent payments to recover its costs.

15. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICES

- 15.1 None received.

REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Cllr Terl Bryant – Portfolio Holder Good Housing

REPORT NO: RIM. 0340

DATE: 1st September 2014

TITLE:	Proposed Change to the HRA Capital Programme 2014/15 for Provision of LED Lighting in Communal Areas	
KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:	Budget Framework Proposal	
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:	Cllr Terl Bryant Portfolio Holder Good Housing	
CONTACT OFFICER:	Liz Banner – l.banner@southkesteven.gov.uk	
INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS: Equality and Diversity	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below	Full impact assessment Required:
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: www.southkesteven.gov.uk	
BACKGROUND PAPERS	Equality Impact Assessment	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 To recommend that the Capital Programme for the Housing Revenue Account be amended to include an allocation of £775K for 2014/15.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 2.1 Through the formulation of the HRA Business Plan, the potential to install LED lighting to the communal areas of sheltered housing schemes was considered.
- 2.2 This report provides the detail on the use of LED lighting in these areas through a lighting re-wiring programme to the communal areas of 31 Sheltered Housing schemes. LED lighting will both provide a longer life for the lighting and reduce energy usage.

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 3.1 The invention and development of high-power white light LED led to its use as illumination and is now fast replacing incandescent and fluorescent lighting.

- 3.2 The Energy Saving Trust recognised the potential of LED lighting for communal areas of social housing. They commissioned a trial to included areas such as stairwells, corridors and common rooms.

- 3.3 The trial measured the performance, energy saving potential and maintenance of light levels over multiple sites. The key findings of the trial included:

- Lighting levels increased in both phases of the field trial
- The new LED lighting generated ongoing energy savings
- The LED lights both increased the 'colour temperature', giving a brighter, whiter light, closer to that of daylight and also enhanced the ambience in most of the sites
- Lighting levels when measured after approximately six months of use, maintained an average performance of 93.6%
- A return of investment at approximately 2 years.

- 3.4 The benefits of installing LED lighting are:

- LED is long lasting and it will continue glowing for up to 25 times longer than a standard bulb
- An LED system typically uses 70% less energy than standard methods
- LED bulbs are shock resistant and contain no harmful chemicals such as mercury
- LED bulbs are 100% recyclable
- LED bulbs do not flicker

- 3.5 The programme is to install LED lighting to the communal areas of all 31 Sheltered Housing Schemes.
- 3.6 The installation of the LED lighting involves minimal physical works, which is the changing of the light fitting; therefore, there will be limited disruption to the tenants.

4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The other option considered is to continue to use the current lighting system, but this would not generate any of the savings for both running costs and CO2 emissions.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The approximate cost of this work is £775,000 and the estimated payback period is 2.12 years.

6. RISK AND MITIGATION

Risk has been considered as part of this report and any specific high risks are included in the table below:

Category Risk	Action / Controls
Delays during build due to extraneous circumstances	Continual monitoring of contractor and utilisation of liquidated damages if necessary.
Lack of resource from contractors to deliver the project.	Current contract provisions / project plan provided by contractors

7. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS

- 7.1 A Stage 1 analysis will be carried out and any adverse impact will be addressed.

8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Implications are taken into account of essential works in maintenance of stock.

9. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES

- 9.1 The Housing Revenue Account capital programme was approved by Council on 3 March 2014. The proposed amendment, if approved will be incorporated into the original programme and will be funded from the Major Repairs Reserve should no external funding support be forthcoming.

10. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- 10.1 The budget and policy framework procedure rules require decisions which are not wholly within the budget approved by Council to be considered and made by full Council.