

# MEETING OF THE COMMUNITIES POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

THURSDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2009  
2.30 PM



---

## PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Christine Brough (Subs)  
Councillor Elizabeth Channell  
Councillor Peter Martin-Mayhew  
Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman)

Councillor Peter Stephens  
Councillor Jeff Thompson (Vice-  
Chairman)  
Councillor Raymond Wootten

## OFFICERS

Corporate Head, Sustainable  
Communities (TT)  
Corporate Head, Resources and  
Organisational Development (PS)  
Service Manager, Assets and Facilities  
(LB)  
Service Manager, Environmental  
Protection (MB)  
Service Manager, Planning Policy (KS)  
Committee Support Officer (JG)

## OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Frances Cartwright (Portfolio  
Holder for Economic Development)

---

## 24. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman welcomed the public to the meeting. He acknowledged that some people were here to speak on item 7 – Stamford Recreation Ground – and suggested that their comments be postponed until discussion on that item. The group agreed.

A member of the public, Mr Butcher, was then invited to make his comments. Mr Butcher reminded members that at the last meeting, the group had discussed the retendering of the Supporting People contract. It was felt that the delay in issuing the specification was due to the high quality of the present services and concerns raised regarding any potential cut to the requirement for a 24 hour service.



*"Listening Learning Delivering"*

**South Kesteven District Council**

STAMFORD • GRANTHAM • BOURNE • THE DEEPINGS

Mr Butcher suggested that in the event that the 24 hours service was reduced, that a pilot scheme be run at Edmunds Close in Stamford. A lady in Stamford had offered to volunteer her time to be a 'first responder'. Proper ambulance first aid training had already been arranged for the lady concerned, and a 'back-up' person had also volunteered for when the lady was on holiday. The idea was that residents or the care centre could call the lady with any problems on Edmunds Close, and she would perform an on the spot assessment of the problem and report back immediately to the care centre. The care centre could then choose to refer the problem to the warden if necessary, or any other relevant person.

The Corporate Head of Sustainable Communities, Teena Twelves, advised that a 'key holder' was common in authorities where there was no 24 hour support. A 'key holder' could be a friend or family, and gave support at their own risk and understanding. She advised that if the lady in question was fully aware of the situation and was willing to take on the responsibility in a voluntary capacity, then she could not see a problem with the scheme.

Mrs Mary Patrick endorsed the comments made by Mr Butcher. She reiterated that the residents were still very keen for a 24 hour service to be maintained, stressing that the Council's service was currently the "gold standard".

Mr Barrie Cox, Chair of the Supported Housing Forum, reiterated that the current service that residents received was excellent, and that none of the residents wanted to lose it. Mr Terl Bryant also made representations in support of the scheme.

Members were impressed with the scheme and the hard work which had already gone on.

***Recommendation:-***

- 1. That the scheme described by Mr Butcher be supported.***
- 2. That congratulations be passed on to Mr Butcher and Mrs Patrick for their hard work and dedication to residents of Stamford.***

**25. MEMBERSHIP**

Councillor Brough was welcomed to the meeting as a substitute for Councillor Bisnauthsing.

**26. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor John Smith in his capacity as Portfolio Holder for Healthy Environment.

**27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Brough declared a personal interest in item 7 – Stamford Recreation Ground, due to her being the Mayor of Stamford Town Council.

**28. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 16TH JULY 2009**

The action notes from the meeting held on the 16<sup>th</sup> July 2009 were noted.

**29. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

Members noted that they had still not received an update on their recommendation made in November 2007 that members of Street Scene staff be provided immediately with O S maps, to be upgraded to an electronic version in the near future. They also expressed concern that there seemed to be no progress on Dog Control Orders. The Committee Support Officer advised that she would look into both of these issues before the next meeting.

**30. STAMFORD RECREATION GROUND CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE OPTIONS FOR COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP**

Liz Banner, the Service Manager for Assets and Facilities, was listed as the lead officer for this item. However, Paul Stokes, Corporate Head of Resources and Organisational Development, was also present at the meeting, and as he had been involved with the project as the previous Service Manager, he provided the group with a verbal update on the Stamford recreation ground:-

- The recreation ground was originally held by the Borough Council which was merged into South Kesteven District Council in 1974, under the Local Government Act 1972.
- The recreation grounds were currently maintained by SKDC with various other groups / charities involved.
- Stamford Town Council had expressed an interest in taking on the running of the recreation ground, and had approached SKDC to ask if they would pass it over.
- SKDC was aware of several other ideas, from various other sources, for the recreation ground.
- There were various matters to consider, including a grounds maintenance contract that SKDC had for the recreation ground and the cost to local people if the ground became a special expense on the council tax.
- Stamford Town Council was considering the final piece of documentation from SKDC before making a decision to proceed or not.
- There was a covenant on the grounds that they should be maintained for recreational facilities only. The land also came under a covenant on the Burghley estate, which was more difficult to remove.
- The current toilets were meant to be closed to public, as they were in poor condition and there was no statutory need for them to be open. Friends of Stamford Recreation Ground were looking to raise money to improve these facilities.

Mr Peter Hayes, a member of Friends of Stamford Recreation Ground (FOSR), informed the group that FOSR had raised over £135,000 towards renovating the recreation ground. FOSR currently received invaluable support from SKDC

Assets and Facilities department. FOSR had concerns that Stamford Town Council would not have the same resources available if it took over management of the grounds, i.e. skills, officers, time, money etc, and that FOSR's plans for future projects might be jeopardised.

Mr Hayes advised the group that FOSR had written to Stamford Town Council in February asking for reassurance that they would still receive support if the recreation ground did change ownership. To date no response had been received. Councillor Brough, as Mayor to Stamford Town Council, apologised to Mr Hayes and said that she would look into this and ensure that a response was provided shortly.

Mrs Patrick expressed concern that the Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce wished to acquire a car park below the recreation ground although she thought this was unsuitable due to the limestone and natural springs.

Mr Bryant wished to express his respect for the Friends of Stamford Recreation ground for their 'quiet, unassuming hard work'. He asked why there had not been a public consultation on the proposed change in ownership. Mr Stokes explained that at the moment, Stamford Town Council (STC) had not agreed that they wanted to go ahead with the change in ownership. If STC expressed an interest in going ahead, then SKDC had a duty to advertise and consult on the proposal at that point.

Members discussed the item and expressed their congratulations to Mr Hayes and the Friends of Stamford Recreation Ground for their hard work. The Chairman asked if this issue would return to the group before going to Cabinet. Mr Stokes said that it looked doubtful that the report would go to Cabinet in November, so therefore there was chance for it to come back before the Communities PDG beforehand. Mr Stokes also advised that Resources PDG might want to hear the report. The Chairman suggested that this come back to the next meeting, and that members of the Resources PDG be invited along.

***Recommendations:-***

- 1. To congratulate the Friends of Stamford Recreation Ground on their hard work and achievements.***
- 2. That a further update be provided at the next meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> November, which members of the Resources PDG will be invited to.***

**31. UPDATE TO CARBON MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Mike Brown, the Service Manager for Environmental Protection gave a brief summary of report ENV 451 in place of Michael Rickard and Tracey Blackwell who had both sent their apologies.

The report is an update to the report (ENV 415) presented and approved by Cabinet on 6th October 2008. The report explained the reasons why the Carbon Management Plan (CMP) had been updated together with the specific

details of the changes made.

- An initial baseline was developed last year using the framework set out by the Carbon Trust. At that point in time a 2005/6 baseline was used as it was thought that the national carbon reduction indicators would be based on that timeframe.
- However, the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) had used data from 2008/09 to calculate the national carbon reduction indicators.
- Following publication of the indicator definitions for NI 185 (% reduction of carbon emissions from local authority operations) and 186 (community carbon emissions) the baseline level of emissions had been revised using the national framework. As a result of this change the CMP had been updated, although it remained in a similar format.
- The report outlined actions taken so far to reduce carbon emissions, and a list of actions planned for the future.

Councillor Thompson acknowledged the planned actions for the future. He asked why pool covers were being acquired for Grantham and the Deepings, but not the other swimming pools. Mr Brown advised that the council were looking to reduce emissions at all the pools. They would invest in pool covers at Grantham and the Deepings and then look to invest in other pools after that. He advised members that the plan was a 'living document' and would be constantly updated.

Councillor Wootten expressed his shock at the amount of energy used by the leisure centres, and felt there had to be a way of significantly reducing it. It was questioned whether the Grantham Stadium's energy was included with the Meres leisure centre, or if they were dealt with separately. Mr Brown was unsure, and said that he would check this and get back to members on this point.

Mr Bryant, a member of the public, drew attention to the Section 151 Officer's comments on page 5 of the report.

*"It is important any proposals that require a financial contribution in advance are demonstrated in a business case that set out any 'invest to save' elements".*

Mr Bryant asked for confirmation on what the council's position was on investing to save. Teena Twelves, Corporate Head for Sustainable Communities, explained that the 'invest to save' programme meant that officers were required to demonstrate that there was an appropriate payback period for any initial payment for projects.

Members then had a short discussion on what length of time was deemed acceptable 'payback period'. It was felt that longer payback periods should be considered worthwhile, especially if the project significantly reduced carbon

emissions.

The Chairman also commented that alternative energy and energy efficiency should be major considerations for future council projects. The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Councillor Frances Cartwright, reassured members that energy efficiency was part of the specification for the Bourne Core Area development business case, and was part of the specification for the Deepings Incubation centre.

***Recommendation:-***

***That consideration be given for longer term 'payback' periods for projects and actions deemed to reduce carbon emissions.***

**32. EAST MIDLANDS REGIONAL PLAN: PARTIAL REVIEW**

Karen Sinclair, Service Manager for Planning Policy gave a brief overview of report PLA 781.

- The East midland Regional Plan (EMRP) was adopted in March 2009. However, before it was even adopted the Government asked the East Midland Regional Assembly (EMRA) to undertake a further partial review focusing on housing, transport and climate change.
- In June 2009 EMRA began consultation on the partial review with the publication of an Options Consultation document.
- Consultation responses were required to be submitted by 6th October 2009: a report will be taken to Cabinet on the 5th October to formalise the Council's response. Responses will be used to help inform the revision of key policies.
- The primary focus of the Options consultation was on meeting future housing provision but the consultation also covered:
  - Approaches to setting affordable housing targets beyond 2021
  - HMA based transport outcomes and challenges to be met
  - Low carbon and renewable energy generation
  - Apportionment of aggregates extraction by county up to 2021
- An extract from the Options Consultation document covering the Peterborough Partial Housing Market Area (HMA) was attached to the report as Appendix A. The consultation consisted of three options, and Councillors were asked for their opinions.

Members discussed plans for growth in Grantham. It was felt that the current transport infrastructure did not allow for large growth, not helped by the lack of decent public transport in the rural areas.

***Recommendation:-***

***That option 2 be looked at with great consideration and sympathy to residents of a rural area.***

**33. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF STATION APPROACH, GRANTHAM**

Karen Sinclair, the Service Manager for Planning Policy, gave an overview of her report PLA782.

- The north and south of Grantham train station were underused.
- The aim was to try and achieve better links with the town centre and to achieve economic redevelopment in the vicinity of the station to uplift the area.
- Market feasibility testing had shown that there was a market for offices, residential development and a hotel.
- A public consultation would commence in early October.

Members discussed the report and ideas within it. Councillor Thompson expressed concern about a new hotel being built, as other hotels in Grantham had lost custom and closed down. The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development explained that there was a niche in the market for a hotel to hold business lunches and conferences. The hotel would market itself for business customers mainly. Its proximity to the train station and the mainline would help with this.

Councillor Wootten asked if Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) were to be used to make this project happen. The Corporate Head of Sustainable Communities, Teena Twelves, explained that negotiations were in progress with Network Rail and other landowners, and it was hoped that they would come to a mutual agreement. The Council was looking at suitable alternative accommodation for the businesses involved. However, Ms Twelves stressed that this was a key development for Grantham, and CPO powers would be utilized if absolutely necessary. She confirmed that the majority of the Victorian houses along Station Road were already owned by the Council.

Mr Barrie Cox, a member of the public, asked about the bus services in Grantham. Mrs Twelves explained that the new through-town service would collect from various stops around the town every half an hour. This would include the train station, so that people could get shuttled into the town centre.

Mrs Sinclair confirmed that the project had confirmed funding for 2011/12 /13. It could take up to two years to see the build start to take place.

Members thanked Mrs Sinclair for her report and Mrs Twelves and Councillor Cartwright for their input.

**34. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 4.35 pm.