



Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

TO COUNCILLOR:

Mrs L M Broadley
Mrs L Eaton
L A Bentley
G A Boulter
J W Boyce
F S Broadley
D M Carter
Miss M V Chamberlain
M H Charlesworth

B Dave
L Darr (Mayor)
R F Eaton (Deputy Mayor)
D A Gamble
Mrs S Z Haq
J Kaufman
Mrs H E Loydall
K J Loydall
R E R Morris

Mrs S B Morris
R H Thakor
G S Atwal
T Barr
A R Bond
K Chalk
B Fahey
T Khong

Dear Sir/Madam,

I hereby summon you to attend a meeting of the **COUNCIL** to be held in the Council Offices, Station Road, Wigston on **TUESDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2015** at **7.00 pm** for the transaction of the business set out in the Agenda below.

Yours faithfully

Council Offices
Wigston
24 August 2015

Chief Executive

AGENDA

Page No's

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. To read, confirm and sign the Minutes of the following Council Meeting
 - a) Council - 16 June 2015 1 - 7
4. Motions on Notice
5. Motion to Confer the Title of Honorary Alderman 8
6. Mayor's Announcements
7. Petitions, Deputations and Questions
8. Leader's Statement
9. To Receive the Minutes for information of the meetings of the following

Committees, Forums, Working Groups and Outside Bodies:

a) Minutes of the Community Safety Partnership held on Tuesday, 26 May 2015	9 - 12
b) Minutes of the Development Control Committee held on Thursday, 28 May 2015	13 - 20
c) Minutes of the Place Shaping Working Group held on Thursday, 11 June 2015	21 - 24
d) Minutes of the Extraordinary Development Control Committee held on Tuesday, 16 June 2015	25 - 30
e) Minutes of the Wigston Residents Forum held on Wednesday, 24 June 2015	31 - 36
f) Minutes of the Development Control Committee held on Thursday, 25 June 2015	37 - 48
g) Minutes of the Greening of the Borough Working Group held on Tuesday, 30 June 2015	49 - 54
h) Minutes of the Development Control Sub Committee held on Monday, 6 July 2015	55 - 58
i) Minutes of the Service Delivery Committee held on Tuesday, 7 July 2015	59 - 75
j) Minutes of the Oadby Residents Forum held on Wednesday, 8 July 2015	76 - 80
k) Minutes of the South Wigston Residents Forum held on Tuesday, 9 July 2015	81 - 84
l) Minutes of the Policy, Finance and Development Committee held on Thursday, 21 July 2015	85 - 97
m) Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on Wednesday, 22 July 2015	98 - 100
n) Minutes of the Constitutional Working Group held on Tuesday, 4 August 2015	101 - 102

10. Exclusion of Press and Public

The Press and Public are likely to be excluded from the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (Exempt Information) during consideration of the item below on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in the respective paragraph of Part 2 Of Schedule 12A of the Act and the public interest in maintaining the exempt items outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

- a) Staffing

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL Offices, Station Road,
Wigston ON TUESDAY, 16 June 2015**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor M Latif Darr - Mayor
Councillor Robert F Eaton - Deputy Mayor

Councillors: G S Atwal, T Barr, L A Bentley, A R Bond, G A Boulter, J W Boyce,
D M Carter, K Chalk, Miss M V Chamberlain, M H Charlesworth, B Dave,
Mrs L Eaton, B Fahey, D A Gamble, Mrs S Z Haq, J Kaufman, T Khong,
Mrs H E Loydall, K J Loydall, Mrs S B Morris, R E R Morris and R H Thakor

Officers in attendance: **Error! No document variable supplied.**

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Resp
11.	<u>THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER TO RECEIVE THE MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR, AND MEMBERS REMAINED STANDING WHILE THE MEETING WAS LED IN PRAYER BY THE MAYOR'S NOMINATED CHAPLIN.</u>	
12.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> An apology for absence was received from Councillors F Broadley and Mrs L Broadley.	
13.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> None.	
14.	<u>TO READ, CONFIRM AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS:</u> RESOLVED: That the minutes of the following meetings be taken as read, confirmed and signed:	
14 (A)	<u>COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2015</u> a) Council held on Tuesday 21 April 2015; and	
14 (B)	<u>AGM - TUESDAY, 19 MAY 2015</u> b) Annual General Meeting held on 19 May 2015.	
15.	<u>ACTION LIST</u>	

	<p>A Member stated that an e-mail received in his capacity as a County Councillor had been sent by a Mr Quinsee in respect of the matter regarding Bell Street advising that no site visit was to go ahead. The Member emphasised the need to consult on this as wide as possible.</p> <p>A Member further stated that Mr Quinsee had been in further correspondence with her to advise that a consultation would first be undertaken with local businesses and business-owners and, whilst those first results were being returned, a second consultation was to be undertaken with local residents and shoppers during the proposed temporary period.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Action List be noted.</p>	
<p>16.</p>	<p><u>MOTIONS ON NOTICE</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>17.</p>	<p><u>MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>18.</p>	<p><u>PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS</u></p> <p>The Leader of the Council reported that a question had been received in relation to his statement on 25 May 2015 in the Leicester Mercury and agenda item 16a. He stated his willingness to respond to the said question however, due to the complex nature and difficult circumstances, would offer such a response in the latter part of the meeting when the private session commences. . He formally acknowledged receipt of the question and stated that he would write to the addresser and respond to Members later in the meeting.</p>	
<p>19.</p>	<p><u>LEADER'S STATEMENT</u></p> <p>The Leader of the Council explained the ordinary context of the Leader's Statement insofar as welcoming new Members and addressing non-agenda items. He stated that the issue in the current meeting's Statement was the move to a strategic authority.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council informed Members that both Mr Hall and himself shall be attending a meeting with other Leicestershire district council leaders on 18 June 2015 to ascertain any commonality of purposes in view of a strategic move. He made reference to the Greater Manchester Authority as such an example with greater devolved powers. He cited The Rt. Hon George Osborne, First Secretary of State and Chancellor of the Exchequer, in defining the prerequisites to a strategic authority, namely: the existence of a local government organisation; and a directly-elected major.</p> <p>In addressing whether the County and City Council(s) can work in partnership on strategic matters, the Leader of the Council cited local planning as a notable example and the complexity and difficulty arising at a micro-scale. He stated that matters of housing,</p>	

	<p>transportation and education were currently being discussed. The outcome was said to be unknown to the Leader of the Council. He summarised the move as a simple equation insofar as if the resources required to be pooled by the Borough was greater than the resources accrued, then the move would not be beneficial and <i>vice versa</i>.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council stated that the question was one which would be addressed in the terms of the greater good as opposed to a simple numerical equation and involving protection factors. He acknowledged that the discussions were to be long and complex, yet the outcome would guarantee the existence of the Borough in the years to come. He noted that the current climate indicated a move towards shared services for reasons of greater resilience.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council said he was willing to report back any development to Members at the next meeting of the Council.</p>	
<p>20.</p>	<p><u>COUNCIL COMMITMENTS 2015 -2019</u></p> <p>Mr Hall presented to Members the contents of the report for agenda item 10 (pages 9 - 22), outlining a draft of the Council's Commitments for the period 2015-2019 with a recommendation to approve the overall scheme whilst acknowledging an opportunity for Members to consider and amend the detail in future committee meetings.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council moved for the Commitments to be approved. He stated that it would have been ideal if a Corporate Plan was presented alongside the Commitments but explained that the reasons for not being able to do so would be addressed in the latter part of the meeting.</p> <p>He further cited the Council Commitments from page 10 of the agenda item, with particular reference to the offering of choice and the principle contained therein, referring to an earlier occasion as an example whereby resident's were given a choice as to whether to introduce wheeled refuse-containers; and the savings made through redesigned services, referring to the upcoming relocation of Customer Services to a more convenient location for residents at Bell Street. In respect of the latter, it was noted that service redesign equated to greater service-efficiency of existing services as opposed to a reduction in services provided. The Leader of the Council described the Commitments as tangible principles capable of being delivered as opposed to a vague concept.</p> <p>A Member seconded the motion and praised the Council's sound financial management in previous years, noting that the appropriate financial planning was in place in advance to deliver the aforementioned Commitments albeit subject to later detailing.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be approved by unanimous agreement.</p>	
<p>21.</p>	<p><u>ICT DELEGATED SERVICE</u></p> <p>Mr Hall presented to Members the contents of the report for agenda</p>	

	<p>item 11 (pages 23 - 25) with a recommendation for Members to: confirm their continued commitment to the ICT Shared Service Partnership; the Council's pro-active role in respect of a proposed joint procurement exercise to deliver further advancement and savings ahead of the contract ending in 2016; and acknowledge the Award Bid for ICT and e-Customer Services. He noted the marked improvement in ICT provisions since this Council's accession to the partnership due its greater resilience and pooled expertise, with the service being delegated to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and the subsequent joining of Melton Borough and Blaby District Councils. Harborough District Council is considering joining.</p> <p>A Member moved for the said commitments to be given, stating that Members would continue to raise the bar in respect of this matter.</p> <p>A Member questioned whether the recommendation given at 2.1 of the report would pre-determine the Council's commitment to the new outsources contract in 2016 in addition to the continued membership of the partnership. The Member requested further clarification as to the recommendations capacity to enter in a contractual arrangement and whether there was opportunity for the Council to withdraw.</p> <p>A Member stated that the Council was a member of a partnership which has a contract with a third-party IT supplier. The said recommendation invited Members to approve the Council's continued membership to that partnership and not to the contract.</p> <p>Mr Hall advised Members that it was an open-ended partnership arrangement for which a recommitment was being sought. He noted that although there was opportunity for the Council to withdraw from the partnership, the alternative option(s) to not continue to be a member would not be as beneficial. He stated that there was no contractual obligation, but a commitment to undergo a procurement process with other council partners commencing April 2016.</p> <p>A Member seconded the proposal for the said commitments to be given, stating that it was necessary to engage in the procurement process with the other council partners. The Member noted that if there was any later dissatisfaction, the Council could withdraw.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether there were sufficient levels of ICT staffing onsite given the difficulties the Member had experienced in requesting assistance regarding the set-up of new ICT equipment.</p> <p>A Member advised that the ICT support contract currently in place was a telephony and remote-access service with a number of members of ICT staff present on-site. It was requested that any outstanding difficulties be relayed to the Member for progressing.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be approved and said commitments be given by unanimous agreement.</p>	
22.	<p><u>CHANGE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>	

The Mayor submitted that agenda item 13 be considered before Members ahead of agenda item 12 citing logistical reasons in respect of the latter.

The Chief Executive confirmed the same and presented the contents of agenda item 13 (pages 29 - 30), citing Members' preference to constitute a new, single Change Management Committee for the purposes set forth at 3.2.1 of the report with the recommendation that Members consider and adopt the generality of the terms of reference of the new committee. He stated that the report might well be the subject of Members' discussions in the following agenda items and that neither Mrs A Court nor he would be party to those later discussions.

A Member moved the recommendation, citing the recent significant changes in staffing as an important reason for the new Committee to scrutinise the changes, workings, advantages and disadvantages of the Council.

Members were prompted to refer to the terms of references which continued overleaf on the agenda.

A Member sought clarification in respect of: (at page 30), the origin and meaning of the 'CR6 Regulatory Governance' cited under 'Risk'; and, at 3.2.of the report, why the terms of reference did not contain any provision to the empanelment of the two requisite Designated Independent Persons (DIP's) as cited at 3 of the report for agenda item 12 at pages 26 - 28.

The Leader of the Council advised that Mr Hall could not comment on the agenda item for which he was required to vacate the Council Chamber. He stated that the report had been examined by external legal professionals and invited the support of all Members so to ensure the proper and prompt work of the Committee. He noted there were relevant questions that required addressed and that there would be opportunity for the terms of reference to be considered and amended at a later stage.

The Member opined that the involvement of external legal professionals was unexpected. The Member again questioned why no provision was made at 2 of the report in the terms of reference in respect of the empanelment of DIP's. The Member sought further clarification as to whether the ordinary rules pertaining to the changing of committee membership and substitutions would apply in the absence of any provision(s) contained in the terms of reference.

The Leader of the Council reiterated the need for the terms of reference to be approved in order for the Committee to operate and the plentiful opportunity for amendment. He noted that such approval would not preclude the need for a significant addition of work to be undertaken. He stated that he was willing to address the Member's point in the latter part of the meeting.

In response to the question the Leader said that if the Member wished to change the Committee's membership, then the Member could do so. The Member stated that he understood the advice of the Leader of the Council to be a commitment on the same.

	<p>A Member sought clarification as to whether the point in question was the changing of the Committee’s membership or the provision of substitutions, adding that due to the technical nature of the Committee that substitutions would not be a working idea.</p> <p>A Member reaffirmed the foregoing statements of the Leader of the Council on the matter and seconded the recommendation.</p> <p>In response to the Leader of the Council’s earlier reference to the relocation of Customer Services to Bell Street, a Member commended the service and the many years of loyalty provided by those members of the customer services staff who would not be continuing in their positions for the Council in the upcoming weeks.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be approved by unanimous agreement.</p>	
<p>23.</p>	<p><u>THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (STANDING ORDERS) (ENGLAND)(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2015</u></p> <p>The Mayor submitted that agenda item 12 now be returned to and considered before Members.</p> <p>The Statutory Officers present, to which the agenda item and report referred respectively, vacated the Council Chamber.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council proceeded to present to Members the contents of report for agenda item 12 (pages 26 - 28), adding it was a government report the Council was obliged to accept. He noted the Local Government Association did not consider the report to make much sense and that there was no option open to Members.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns regarding the completeness of the report and the hurried Parliamentary process in respect of the legislation, in the hope that Parliament would rights the wrongs. The Member further stated that the report raised questions as to a conflict of interest(s) between Committee membership and the Full Council.</p> <p>The agenda item was moved and seconded for approval.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be approved by unanimous agreement.</p>	
<p>24.</p>	<p><u>COMMON SEAL</u></p> <p>RESOLVED: That the common seal of the Council be affixed to all contracts, orders, deeds and other documents arising out of the minutes and reports referred to in the foregoing items.</p>	
<p>25.</p>	<p><u>REPORTS OF MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE COUNCIL TO SERVE ON OUTSIDE BODIES</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p>26.</p>	<p><u>EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</u></p>	

	<p>The Press, Public and remaining Officers present were excluded at 19:48 from the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Section 100 (A)(4) of the local Government Act 1972 (Exempt Information) during consideration of agenda item 16a on the grounds that it involved the disclosure of exempt information, as defined in the respective paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exempt items outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>26 (A)</p>	<p><u>STAFFING</u> Members had a discussion <i>in camera</i> regarding staffing.</p>	
----------------------	--	--

The meeting closed at 7.50 pm

Agenda Item 5

Notice on Motion

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

I wish to put a formal Motion to the full meeting of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council on Tuesday 1st September 2015

I propose that in recognition of his unstinting dedication, hard work and commitment that ex Councillor Peter Swift has demonstrated on behalf of the borough and its residents that he is made an Honorary Alderman in accordance with the protocols set out.

Signed

Councillor John Boyce
16th August 2015

**OADBY & WIGSTON COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP
MEETING HELD AT
COUNCIL OFFICES
WIGSTON
26th May 2015**

Councillor Kevin Loydall (KL)	Chair
Marc Simon (MS)	Leics Police
James Fox (JF)	LCC Community Safety
Chris Woodward (CW)	Leics Police
David Lingard (DL)	OWBC
Claire Weddle (CIW)	WALL

Apologies:

Anita Pathak-Mould (APM)	OWBC
Insp Steve Bunn (SB)	Leics Police
Jay Patel (JP)	OWBC (Minutes)

Item	Person Responsible
<p>1. Chair Introduced Welcome all into the first CSP meeting of 2015-2016.</p> <p>2. Performance Overview 31.03.15-Marc Simons/Chris Woodward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Summary shows a decrease in total crime compared to last year. • Concerns with regards to Theft of motor vehicle, mainly mopeds, ongoing operation in neighbouring areas and we have in our borough. • Domestic Burglary • Theft from motor vehicles is down due to work carried out by volunteers • ASB has also been reduced. • Commercial burglaries mainly builders vans and tools Hinckley & Blaby are have also seen an increase in this area. • Metal theft is also consistency. • Reports highlight the trends of peaks and trough which enable to locate hotspot • Sticker on Vans to be provided by CW to OWBC. <p>3. Leicestershire Safer Communities Agreement-DL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This agreement sets out the county-level community safety priorities across Leicestershire 	<p>CW</p>

<p>and outlines how agencies and partnerships will work together and share resources to deliver these and other Safer Communities common priorities through the Leicestershire Safer Communities Strategy Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSP plan will need altered taking into consideration the agreement • The agreement is drawn from the local area and identifies what needs to be addressed locally or at county level. • Making Communities Neighbourhood Safer has already been amended by MS which will be sent out all parts for approval. <p>4. Formation of Community Delivery Group and Mediation – DL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSP plan has been agreed hence a delivery group to drive this plan is required. • All partners agreed to meet in June. • Reminder to be sent out to all partners due to low representation. • CSP membership needs to reviewed • SB has sourced a quote from a mediation company called UK medication to deal with neighbour issues & dispute between parties. Company would provide mediation training in conjunction with the City to include four members each from OWBC, Police & volunteers, two day course £168 per delegate, total of £2690 and if CSP budget can be used. Other neighbouring district can be looked into combining in the training to spread the cost. • All partners agreed it was a good plan and for MS/SB to go ahead and procure. <p>5. Events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supersonic, Summer Sizzler and South Wigston community event are schedule to take place between Jul-Sep 2015. If a format has been set up it is easy to replicate it. Format to include domestic, abuse, preventive themes. Further discussion to take place by CSP delivery group <p>6. Budget/Funding Update-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridging contract due to expire at the end of Nov 2015. Fifth of CSP budget is spent on bridging contract. • There is a possibility that OWBC might lose one third of the post if this funding is not made available. • Domestic abuse <p>7. JAG Review Update-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JAG is progressing well 	<p>MS</p> <p>DL</p> <p>SB/MS</p>
--	---

- 9 cases of various complexities are dealt at the moment on JAG which is being managed and is getting changing.
- Input from various agencies is very helpful. And to re-invigorate partner to attend is also being looked at.
- Police have Information sharing Group with Kennedy house where officer work closely with liaison with official at Kennedy house which is working smoothly.

8. Domestic Abuse Report – WALL

- Clw distributed a report.
- 36 adults and 49 children within these families
- Client supported over the year were females
- One of the target set of the equality Impact assessment was to reach the ethnic minority in OWBC was successfully.
- Majority of the referrals are self referrals.
- Majority of the cases were of complex needs such as mental health, drug use.
- Bridging contract has been extended which supports any age groups.

9. **Leicestershire Fire & Rescue- Sanjay Bulsara-** no update due to absence of representative.

10. Leicestershire County Council updates – James Fox –

- Leicestershire County are looking at developing Leicester, Leicestershire Rutland action plan & risk abuse will be feeding in by the local action plan.
- Two domestic homicides in the county not from OWBC area.

11. Any other business.-

- DL updated that CROW money has finally been recovered and is in CSP account after a lot of work about £19,000.00 has been . The question was where is this amount should be used. Consultation with retailers who might have an input to as to how this amount should be utilised. DL to contact retailers in OWBC. MS to contact with City Watch and update DL.
- MS updated that part of the action plan hate crime commissioned some work within the organisation was beneficial

DL/MS

Next CSP Meeting – 24th Aug 2015

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL OFFICES, STATION ROAD, WIGSTON ON THURSDAY, 28 MAY 2015

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair: Councillor L A Bentley
 Vice Chair: Councillor Mrs L M Broadley

Councillors: B A Boulter; F S Broadley; Mrs L M Broadley; D M Carter; R F Eaton; B Fahey; D A Gamble; Mrs H E Loydall; R E R Morris; T Barr; B Dave; T K Khong; G S Atwal

Officers in Attendance: Ms E Bailey, Ms A Court, C Forrett, S Dukes, A Thorpe Miss G Ghuman

Others in Attendance: Mr. Hicks, Ms. Grants

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Resp
1.	<p><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></p> <p>Apologies received from Councillors Mrs S Z Haq and J Kaufman.</p>	
2.	<p><u>DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
3.	<p><u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u></p> <p>Councillor H E Loydall declared that Members for Wigston wards had an interest in Bell Street only insofar as the applicant is well known to all in Wigston and the obtaining Residents' Forum.</p>	
4.	<p><u>PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
5.	<p><u>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</u></p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous Committee meeting held on Thursday 2 April 2015 be taken as read, confirmed and signed.</p>	
6.	<p><u>TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO/0307 - LAND AT THE REAR</u></p>	

	<p><u>OF PROPERTIES 11-37 MARSTOWN AVENUE, WIGSTON</u></p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to agenda item 6 (pages 5-7).</p> <p>The Chair moved that the item be deferred to the next Committee meeting in June 2015 as the two ward councillors that were due to speak on behalf of the residents could not attend the meeting.</p> <p>A Member wanted confirmation that no action would be taken on that site during that time.</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the order is deferred until June 2015.</p>	
7.	<p><u>REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONTROL MANAGER</u></p> <p>1. 15/00037/FUL – 34 Bell Street Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 1AD</p> <p>The Planning Officer summarised the contents of the report in agenda item 7 (pages 9-17) in respect of Bell Street.</p> <p>A Member raised a concern as to the potential of restricted access and the impact upon effective refuse collection.</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager advised Members that the collection of refuse would not present any extraordinary issue and that it would be taken to the curb-side or edge of driveway – whichever was the norm. It was reported that there would be an internal element of suitable refuse storage in the building. The Member moved that the collection of refuse should be completed at the curb-side and a note be issued to the applicant to that effect.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether the Council was in receipt of the amendments. The Planning Officer stated that no amendments had been received and that the applicant had been informed that the approval would be subject to the amendments made. The Planning Control Manager reaffirmed that that the application was for approval, subject to the required amendments and the reported conditions, so they do not get the permission if no revised plans are submitted.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether the shop retained at the front of the building was protected. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission would need to be sought in relation to this aspect.</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the application is permitted subject to the Officer's report.</p> <p>There was one abstention from Cllr Boulter.</p> <p>2. 1500098/VAC – Wigston Swimming Pool, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DP and</p>	

**15/00139/FUL Guthlaxton College, Station Road,
Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DS**

Mr. Hicks submitted that a cut and fill exercise has been implemented since the original application to fulfil the sustainable development principle. He acknowledged the report as to the 935mm increase in building height from the original proposal and noted the original demolished building was 1845mm higher with the inclusion of a flue.

He submitted that the buff-brick was an original design preference and conception since procurement in 2013 and noted that the old demolished building was of a similar buff-brick colour. Mr. Hicks submitted there was a good relationship with the Technical Manager at Guxlaxton College who has been supportive of the amendments.

The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 7 (pages 18-25 and 44-48, respectively) and the agenda update (page 1) which was circulated at the meeting. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.

The Planning Control Manager stated that the height of the building would be approximately 93cm higher than previously agreed due to the cumulative effects of the cut and fill exercise. The size of the building is also reduced by 100 square metres. Both aspects would not have a significant impact on the character of the area. The pool remains the same size to make more efficient use of the building's internal layout. The amendment from brickwork to a grey colour metal cladding would not be too visible. The end and front elevations were of the same design principle with a window arrangement alteration to the end. A question was raised to the off-site impact of two trees located on-site and whether these should be removed. He noted the tree survey submitted was not clear in respect of this. He advised that the two trees were not subject to a TPO and not worthy of retention. He advised Members to defer the application if it was their intention to retain the two trees. He advised the recommendation be for approval.

The Member expressed particular concern as to the number of amendments being made at this stage in one application. It was also stated that planning permission and the conditions set thereto had already been given consideration and permitted. Questions were raised as to the reduction in the size of the building, the removal of the two trees and why consideration was not initially given to the latter. The Member expressed disapproval in respect of the metal cladding due to its departure from the building's original brick structure.

The Planning Control Manager opined that the amendments made inclusive of materials, less floor place and the cut and fill exercise were cost-related savings.

The Member stated that when originally considering this application the company chosen was the preferred developer and that costs were determined in the early stages. It was also stated the agreed

plan was chosen for residents and that the plan should remain.

The Chair enquired as to whether the original planning permission would be cancelled if the application before Members was refused. The Planning Control Manager advised that the current build on-site did not comply with the original planning permission given and is not authorised. The original planning permission would continue to stand. It was advised that if it was the Members' intention to refuse the application, enforcement action would need to be considered and that if Members had any concerns, deferment would be advisable.

The Member expressed discontent with the application. Information was requested as to who from the Authority agreed and permitted the cut and fill exercise. A request for an independent expert report into the use of cladding vis-a-vis brickwork was made.

The Member stated that the two trees in question were insignificant. It was asserted that an Arboriculturist's opinion would not contribute to a decision for retention and that the committee could not justify the same.

The Member requested clarification as to the substitution of the brickwork for metal and, or, timber cladding. The Member supported deferment. The Planning Control Manager stated that no detailed specification has been received on timber cladding. He advised that the concerns raised were in respect of the brown-colouring of the brickwork.

The Chair stated that Members required further information. It was requested that enquires be made in respect of the original planning permission.

The agenda item was moved and seconded for deferment.

RESOLVED That: the application is deferred.

All Members in favour of deferment save for one abstention.

**3. 15/00117/FUL – 203 Wigston Road, Oadby,
Leicestershire, LE2 5JF**

The Planning Control and Enforcement Officer summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 7 (pages 26-32) in respect of Wigston Road. The proposal was reported to include the erection of a two and a half storey rear extension with an increase in roof height and a second floor balcony to the rear. It was reported that there was no breach of the 45 degree code of practice or impact on the neighbours' amenity space. The Planning Officer confirmed that a letter of representation received stated that the neighbour has no objections or further comments.

A Member raised a concern in respect of the proposed balcony. It was advised that the amended plans in the latest revision implemented a change to the roof's structure. This was to incorporate mono-pitch gables to both sides and provide full height

screening so to avoid any adverse impact.

The agenda item was moved and seconded by Members for recommendation and the Officer commended for the revision to safeguard the neighbours' interests and rights of enjoyment.

A Member identified the need to consider the proposal's potential effect/s upon wildlife and the prospect of bats roosting in the roofspace. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that the recommendation as to a bat survey was a routine response given by Leicestershire County Council and that a dialogue was open with their Ecology Team in terms of how to manage any discoveries. Members were informed that undertaking a survey in every instance prior to any detection would be overly-burdensome and, therefore, excessive to householders. Members were advised that if it was their intention to follow the recommendation to survey, deferment would be sensible.

The Member agreed that it would be unreasonable to undertake a bat survey in the circumstances.

The agenda item was moved and seconded for approval.

RESOLVED That: the application is permitted.

4. 15/00126/FUL – 4A Selbury Drive, Oadby, Leicestershire, LE2 5NG

Members considered the agenda update that was circulated at the meeting.

The applicant's agent Ms. Grants informed Members that the applicant operated a Martial Arts Clubs on Mandervell Road in shared premises alongside a gymnasium which has since changed ownership. The applicant was seeking new and improved premises for the club. The agent stated that there was no heavy-goods vehicle access to the intended premises rendering it unsuitable for employment purposes. The agent explained that the new premises had been on the market for over one-year with few other interested parties. She opined that the premise is flexible for non-employment uses and so she complies with our policy. The Martial Arts Club was seeking approval with any change in the use of the premises for a temporary period to be reverted by to the Committee for consideration and she asked for the officers proposal to be overturned.

The Planning Control and Enforcement Officer summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 7. This alongside the agenda update should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.

The application was cited as a change of use of 4A Selbury Drive from B class use to D2 class use for martial arts premises with B1 use on the first floor. The main issues identified by the Planning Officer were the change of use and associated highway implications. It was stated that the site subsists as employment land on Oadby

Industrial Estate and its use governed by the Supplementary Employment Policy 3 of the Borough Council's Employment Sites Supplementary Planning Document. The Planning Officer referred Members to the criteria detailed in the report regarding non-B class uses and advised Members that the proposed change would not meet the set criteria which are outlined in the report.

There is no mention of actively looking for sites which is a requirement and further information submitted was a basic search and listed why those premises were not suitable. He stated that with regards to the comment made about the B Class use not being viable, the property has been marketed for sale and no reference that it has not been marketed for rent. The Planning Officer made reference in the report to the potential of limited vehicle parking spaces shared with the adjacent property. It was noted that 146 letters of support were received from members of the Martial Arts Club and that some named signatories had since come forward alleging they were not aware of being named as supporters and making representations. The Planning Officer advised Members that the proposal did not comply with the policy and given the industrial nature of the area that the recommendation to Members was for refusal.

A Member supported temporary approval for a period of two years pending further information for permanent permission to be granted and that if this was not granted it would leave the decision open to appeal as it would be inconsistent with what has been previously granted to other units within the same area.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that any decision taken with conditions could have an appeal lodged. It was stated that previous applications for non-B class change in use/s for temporary permission have submitted sufficient evidence to warrant those decisions. It was advised that the evidence and reasons provided in the current application was materially different and a recommendation had been made on the facts.

A Member enquired as to the current occupancy of the Oadby Industrial Estate. The Planning Control Manager advised that any answer would be contingent on the condition of the units available and the industrial uses of those units. The Member stated that the temporary permission previously granted to the applicant on Mandervell Road had proven successful. A positive track-record promoting health and fitness through the granting of temporary permission in similar circumstances was cited.

The Chair noted that Safeguarding issues are for the applicant to take into consideration as opposed to the Committee.

The Planning Control Manager highlighted the importance of balancing the need to adhere to policy and retaining capacity for employment land on the estate and the benefits accrued by the proposal. It was reiterated that upon the evidence submitted there was insufficient justification for non-B class usage.

A Member asked whether temporary permission may be granted and it was confirmed that this option was available. The Member moved

	<p>that temporary permission be granted for 2 years.</p> <p>A Member stated that levels of employment on the estate had increased and that lack of vehicle parking space would not present an issue as the building adjacent to the premises was vacant.</p> <p>A Member stated that the matter of temporary permission was not before Members, however was advised by the Planning Control Manager that temporary permission may be granted subject to a condition stating the same.</p> <p>A Member stated that it was commendable to see a developer reference the entire area and that Officers were correct in their approach to attach significance to policy adherence. Notwithstanding this, the Member agreed that the matter was one in which common sense ought to prevail and supported the granting of temporary permission. It was stated that the item would return to the Committee for its consideration should there be any change of circumstances in the future.</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the application is permitted subject to insertion of a condition stating that the permission granted is temporary and for a period of two years.</p>	
8.	<p><u>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON BROWNFIELD SITES WITHIN THE BOROUGH OF OADBY AND WIGSTON</u></p> <p>The Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager (PPR) summarised the contents of the Local Development Order (LDO) in agenda item 8 (pages 50-45) and the agenda update (pages 5-7) which was circulated at the meeting. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The LDO was put before Members in respect of preparing an order for Housing Development on Brownfield Land in the Borough. He outlined the background and objective to the LDO. He also said that the Queen's speech had included the preparation of a new Housing Bill. One of the main elements of the Bill will relate to housing supply and is to introduce a statutory register for brownfield land, to help achieve the target of getting LDOs in place on 90% of suitable brownfield sites by 2020. He advised Members that the LDO had no further financial implications for the Council, and noted that due to the fact that the LDO removes the need for a planning application, no such application will be received. He stated that this will help with the 5 Year supply of housing the Council has committed to.</p> <p>A Member requested that the advantages and disadvantages be outlined for adopting the LDO to confirm and allay the Member's suspicions.</p> <p>The PPR Manager referred the Member to the advantages set forth in the report. He summarised that the LDO would encourage development to progress on the named sites in the Borough and provide a measure of certainty for potential developers. With regards to disadvantages he stated there would be loss of fees but confirmed</p>	

that the grant would compensate for some of those losses.

The Member questioned the extent of the advantage enjoyed by the Council in encouraging developers to come forward and the degree of control the Council would exercise in its capacity as a local authority in the execution of the LDO.

The PPR Manager advised Members that the Council would exercise the necessary controls insofar as the Council itself prepares the application as opposed to the developer. He stated that the preparation of the LDO would involve public consultation.

The Director of Services stated it was important to note that this was going out to consultation and during the consultation process a better understanding of the same can be obtained. Sustainable development is key and this is a proposal with regards to the same. The decision made will not be irreversible.

A Member expressed a concern regarding the manner in which the LDO had been brought before Members for their consideration and proposed that the matter be deferred until Members had received the appropriate training. The Member requested that the results obtained in the consultation phase be relayed back to Members in due course.

The PPR Manager informed Members that he was restricted in terms of providing any further information as the LDO was still in its infancy, stating that training would be of limited benefit and would delay the preparation and public consultation process.

A Member sought clarification as to the implications of the LDO in terms of who would determine planning permission. The PPR Manager advised that the LDO itself would provide the means to obtaining planning permission for which the Council will set-forth and prepare.

The Member moved for deferment and requested that Members be informed and, or, included in the upcoming consultation process. The PPR Manager stated that the inclusion of a training session for Members was a possibility.

The Member restated the need for further information to be provided and that a meeting be convened at a later date when Members were better informed.

The agenda item was moved and seconded for approval.

RESOLVED That: That the recommendation to proceed with the Local Development Order is permitted.

All Members were in favour save for one abstention from Councillor Boulter.

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm

Place Shaping Working Group Minutes Oadby and Wigston Borough Council Thursday 11 June 2015

Councillors Present:

Councillor Boyce (Chair)
Councillor Bentley
Councillor Carter
Councillor J Kaufman
Councillor S Morris
Councillor Thakor (substitute for Councillor Dave)

Officers Present:

Adrian Thorpe (Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager)
Jamie Carr (Planning Policy Officer)
Judith Sturley (Senior Economic Regeneration Officer)
Mark Hryniw (Town Centre Manager)

1. Apologies:

Councillor Darr
Councillor Barr
Councillor Boulter
Councillor Dave

2. Minutes and matters arising

- 2.1 There have been no further meetings regarding the Duty to Cooperate, therefore no updates.
- 2.2 Adrian Thorpe has sent out an email with an update regarding the Network Rail Consultation.
- 2.3 Councillor Boyce asked if the Council had gained ownership of Oadby Grange Country Park. Adrian Thorpe was going to check with the Council's Legal department and email Councillor Boyce with an update.
- 2.4 Councillor Kaufman asked whether the Oadby Grange Country Park matter would need to go back to Committee as it had been a long time. Councillor Boyce said that it would be best to see what the position is first before considering whether it needs to go back to Members.

3. Town Centre Managers Update

- 3.1 Mark Hryniw outlined the current void rates within the three town centres and suggested that all three of the town centres had seen a drop in the number of void units since the last count and that all three centres compared favourably to the National average.

- 3.2 Councillor Kaufman asked what was happening with the Oadby Library public house site in Oadby. Mark Hryniw said that the site was being advertised for sale and that it was in the Council's Investor Prospectus. Progress is being sought regarding bringing the site forward as a development opportunity.
- 3.3 Councillor Kaufman and Councillor Thakor asked whether or not the current hand car wash on the Oadby Library public house site was licenced. This was going to be checked by officers.
- 3.4 Mark Hryniw updated on the digital display screens and said that the advertisement policy was due to go to Committee in July for Member approval. Although there was initial teething problems with the digital display screen software, this seems to have been rectified.
- 3.5 Councillor Thakor suggested that Wigston Police wanted to advertise their beat personnel on the signs. Adrian Thorpe said that he had spoken to Wigston police and that they were to produce an advertisement.
- 3.6 Mark Hryniw highlighted key upcoming event dates for the three town centres (as Town Centre Managers Report 11 June 2015).
- 3.7 Councillor Kaufman asked why the festive lights within Oadby had been left on throughout January. Mark Hryniw explained that Oadby Traders had asked for the lights to be left on. Councillor Boyce asked if all of the proposed dates for switch-on/off could be advertised on the digital display screens.
- 3.8 Mark Hryniw updated regarding Christmas/festive lights for 2015. Councillor S Morris suggested that there was a faulty lamp post that kept blowing the lights in South Wigston last Christmas. Mark Hryniw said that the County Council electricians had been out to check and said that there was no fault with the lamp post, however he was going to get them checked again for a second opinion.
- 3.9 Councillor Boyce asked whether the County Council's roll out of LED lamps would have an effect on the Christmas lights. Mark Hryniw suggested that it would not as it was to do with the bulbs rather than the whole post.
- 3.10 Councillor S Morris asked if the road closure orders had been completed. Mark Hryniw said that all the orders had been signed and sealed.

4. Economic Regeneration Strategy Review

- 4.1 Judith Sturley explained that a review of the Economic Development Strategy was underway, as the previous strategy was for the time period 2009 to 2014. Judith Sturley read through the key points of her report and outlined the proposed structure of the Economic Development Strategy Review. Judith Sturley also suggested that once drafted the Economic Development Strategy Review would be taken to Policy, Finance and Development Committee for Member approval.

- 4.2 Judith Sturley said that once approved the Economic Development Strategy would be an important document in applying for future project funding, for example Horsewell Lane, No. 41-43 Canal Street and Blaby Road Park Pavilion.
- 4.3 Councillor Boyce asked what the publication timescales were. Adrian Thorpe suggested that a key objectives report would come back to the next Place Shaping Group, then onto Policy, Finance and Development Committee.
- 4.4 Councillor Boyce asked if the Direction for Growth employment allocation should be part of the Economic Development Strategy Review. It was agreed that it should be.

5. Stoughton Grange Development Brief

- 5.1 Adrian Thorpe explained the reason for the redrafted Stoughton Grange Development brief and said that the consultation had received 8 responses from interested parties.
- 5.2 Adrian Thorpe said that the main response to the consultation had been from the Co-op which suggested that they were currently considering development options on the site and that the brief should be more flexible with regards to the alternative uses of the site. Adrian Thorpe also said that the Co-op had been contacted to arrange a meeting, however nothing had been heard back yet.
- 5.3 Adrian Thorpe suggested that the Development Brief should not be adopted prior to the meeting with the Co-op. He said that the Core Strategy has specific policies relating to Green Wedge areas, therefore not adopting the document at this moment in time would not pose a threat to the misuse of the site.
- 5.4 Councillor Kaufman asked why the EDDR had been protected through the Core Strategy process. He suggested that it was showing up on title searches and could cause issues for land purchases. Adrian Thorpe said that the County Council wanted to retain the designation therefore it had to be protected.
- 5.5 Councillor Thakor suggested that he had not been consulted with the Development Brief draft document. Adrian Thorpe said that the document had been circulated to all Councillors that were on the consultation database.
- 5.6 Councillor Boyce suggested that it was positive the Co-op is willing to work with the Council on the brief.

6. Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

- 6.1 Adrian Thorpe explained what the Sustainability Appraisal was and that it was required by European directive. In essence, it is a document that appraises potential development sites proposed to come forward through the Local Plan Review process. The scoping report is the first step in the Sustainability Appraisal process.
- 6.2 The Scoping Report has been through two rounds of consultation with the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England, all of which are now happy with the contents of the document.

6.3 The main Sustainability Appraisal report will be produced alongside the Local Plan Review and will be consulted upon at the same time as the Local Plan Review also.

7. Residential and Employment Land Availability Reports

7.1 Jamie Carr highlighted the key points of each document and their importance to the planning and decision making process.

7.2 Jamie Carr explained that the Council had provided in excess of the annual housing requirement of 90 for the period of April 2014 to March 2015 and that the forecast was for this (in excess provision) to continue in the forthcoming years. This is due to relatively high numbers of appropriate housing development sites currently.

7.3 Jamie Carr also explained that it was imperative that the Council kept identifying an up to date supply of deliverable development sites to ensure that unsustainable development could not come forward.

8. Leicester and Leicestershire Regeneration Funding Opportunities

8.1 Judith Sturley outlined the potential funding opportunities available to the authority, for example EU Structural Fund 2014 – 2020, Local Growth Fund 2015 – 2012 and City Deal 2014.

8.2 Councillor Boyce asked if there was a chance that the Council would be able to secure funding. Judith Sturley said that there may be the opportunity to bid for funding for construction jobs. She also mentioned that PERA were putting together a bid for funding for non city location enterprise centres and that this bid could be beneficial for the Borough, ie South Wigston Enterprise Centre.

8.3 Councillor Kaufman asked if there was funding opportunities relating to apprenticeships and degree level and above, as he was aware that the number of people out of work at 24 years of age and older was relatively high. Judith Sturley said that there was probably not funding for this, however it would be worth speaking to employers about apprenticeships etc.

9. Any Other Business

9.1 None.

10. Date of Next Meeting

10.1 The next Place Shaping Work Group is proposed for Thursday 17th September, 2015, 18:30, Committee Room, Council Offices, Wigston.

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON TUESDAY 16 JUNE 2015, COMMENCING AT 6.00 P.M.

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u></p> <p>Chairman – L Bentley Vice Chairman – D Gamble</p> <p>Councillors: G S Atwal; G A Boulter; B Dave; R Eaton; J Kaufman; T K Khong; Mrs H E Loydall; R E R Morris; Mrs S B Morris</p> <p>Officers in attendance: Ms A Court, C Forrett, Miss G Ghuman</p> <p>Others in attendance: Mr Dan Hicks</p>

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
9.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>The Chair stated that the meeting was not called by him, but by the Monitoring Officer who confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>Apologies receive from Councillors Mrs L Broadley, F Broadley, E Barr and Mrs S Haq.</p>	
10.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS</p> <p>It was declared that Councillor Mrs S Morris was substituting for Councillor Mrs S Haq.</p> <p>D Gamble proposed by Mrs H Loydall, and seconded by Mrs S Morris, to substitute as Vice Chairman for the duration of this meeting alone in the absence of Mrs L Broadley.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>1. Councillor D Gamble substitutes as Vice Chairman for this duration of this meeting.</p>	
11.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>Councillor G Boulter declared he was an Associate Governor of Guxlaxton College.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs S Morris declared she was a Director of the Multi-Academy Trust incorporating Guxlaxton College. The Member stated that she was not involved in the applications' consultation process and confirmed she was attending with an open mind.</p> <p>The Monitoring Officer advised that Councillor Mrs S Morris may</p>	

	remain at the meeting.	
12.	<p>REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONTROL MANAGER</p> <p>1. WIGSTON SWIMMING POOL - APPLICATION 15/00098/VAC 2. GUXLAXTON COLLEGE – APPLICATION 15/00139/FUL</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 4 (pages 2 - 17) and the agenda update (page 1) which was circulated at the meeting. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>Mr Hicks acknowledged the issues raised at the last meeting in terms of the changes submitted since the tender. He summarised that the issues were identified as: to make the most efficient use of space; improvement(s) to design in respect of the inclusion of a sauna facility; to keep within budgetary constraints subsequent to an increase in material costs in the preceding 18 months; and the technical design in respect of the underground results which were not carried out until the results of the survey were known.</p> <p>Mr Hicks submitted that the cut and fill exercise was necessary to raise ground levels. He acknowledged there was a 935mm increase in the building height from the original application; notwithstanding this, he noted the original building demolished was 1845mm higher. Mr Hicks stated that the trees located on-site would be re-located and, or, replaced where necessary and that the trees affected were either of a poor positioning or quality. It was stated there was a good relationship with the Technical Manager at Guxlaxton College who has been supportive of the amendments.</p> <p>Mr Hicks submitted that the buff-brick was the preferred design conception for which obtaining colour palettes were developed and noted that the old demolished building was of a similar buff-brick colour. It was stated that the roofing materials would weather over-time, dulling in its appearance, and that there would be little visual impact due to restricted sight. It was confirmed that the top-front and side-elevations has not changed in terms of the proposed metal-cladding.</p> <p>Mr Hicks cited that investigations into the acoustics impact proved more than satisfactory and the data sheets had highlighted a normal passage of sound, and that a direct comparison of cladding <i>vis-a-vis</i> brickwork was not possible due to qualitative differences in measurements. He further advised that any potential acoustic concerns were to be addressed by soft-landscaping and that any noise generated would be comparatively insignificant to that ordinarily generated by the traffic on the surrounding highways and the neighbouring railway line. It was reported that past-use of the said panelling materials presented no acoustic issues.</p> <p>Mr Hicks stated that the site entrance would be made good with grass-seed laid. An upgrade to the tarmac would be implemented to ensure complaint heavy-goods vehicle access, to which professional</p>	

teams had applied their technical expertise and experience.

Mr Hicks confirmed that all other conditions had been met.

The Chair made reference to the availability of the proposed materials, alongside visual representations, for inspection by Members during the Planning Control Manager's report.

The Planning Control Manager stated that the agenda item was deferred from the previous meeting for want of further information. It was confirmed that the acoustic concerns had been addressed by Mr Hicks and that, although he was not in receipt of any information on the same, to his knowledge there was no reason to dispute the details reported. The key issues before Members were summarised as minor material amendments to all four elevations, namely in respect of: the side-elevation facing the railway line, the use of metal-cladding in lieu of brickwork; the side-elevation facing Guxlaxton College, of the same above in entire metal-cladding (as per the samples) with an insignificant change to window fenestration levels; the front-elevation facing Station Road, of the same brickwork and timber-cladding with a grey-in-colour rendering finish (as per the samples) with the colour to be agreed.

He advised that the differences in building height were acceptable and within the parameters of planning merits.

It was reported that there was a firm view of a red-brick character area and that the development ought to reflect this and so to accentuate design features, as included in the recommendation. The heavy-goods vehicle materials were approved as suitable for access purposes, addressing its initially problematic light-weight construction. The car parking space were given as a block-paved system, comprising of plastic and loose gravel with a recommendation of a grass-turfed substitute exterior to provide a sustainable drainage solution. A drainage scheme had been submitted and a consultation was to be held.

In respect of the second off-site application, the Planning Control Manager re-affirmed that the trees affected would be replaced and, or, replanted as necessary as an expectation to complete off-site works and noted previous references made by Members about the trees' poor quality, positioning and angle.

The Chair reiterated that the agenda item before Members was a minor amendment to materials within the acceptable remit of planning terms and not a planning issue *per se*.

A Member enquired as to whether the metal-cladding was of a special finish to prevent vandalism. The Planning Control Manager advised that it was a standard metal-cladding product similarly used on retail parks.

A Member questioned the lack of availability of common red-brick versus buff-brick.

A Member stated that a number of concerns had been allayed having inspected the illustrations for a second-time. It was reiterated that the trees affected were not significant and ought to be removed due to their 45 degree angling and welcomed the advantages of a replanting scheme to better provide for tree positioning and longevity.

The Member opined that the buff-brick exterior presented as a better-blend in relation to remainder of the building although had no objection to the recommendation. The Member requested more information regarding the effectiveness of the acoustic barrier provided by the metal-cladding and whether the use of such a material would be equally suitable for a swimming pool and the noises generated therein.

The Planning Control Manager stated that he was not in receipt of any further information, in addition to that presented by Mr Hicks, in terms of the acoustics investigations. He noted that from anecdotal-experience, no such aforesaid difference was evident. The Monitoring Officer confirmed the contents of the investigative report, citing it acoustically met the sought-after recommendations in terms of sound transfer and that a direct comparison could not be made. It was noted that brickwork or metal-cladding were equal in sufficiency.

A Member sought reassurance that any financial burden arising from any necessary remedial action to counter potential acoustic implications in the future would not be borne by the Council whilst acknowledging the appropriate remit of the same request. The Monitoring Officer advised that any such financial burden would be inherited by the contractor.

A Member enquired as to whether there was suitable boundary treatment through the planting of trees to visibly obscure the metal-cladding facade from the view of Guxlaxton College. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that no such treatment alongside the site boundary was permissible with reference to the site plan. The Member expressed that an agreement ought to be negotiated with the neighbouring college and a note be served on the applicant.

The Member raised a concern as to the availability of the information to Members contained in the acoustic report. Reassurances were sought from the contractor in respect to if the materials proposed for use were suitable for a residential-area and notably the need for appropriate insulation to mitigate any potential drumming-effects emanating from the metal roof.

The Chair enquired as to whether a condition was suitable to address the aforementioned matter.

The Planning Control Manager advised that a condition may be imposed stating that any noise originating from the building should not exceed the site boundary. It was further advised that a pre-

coloured, power-coated matt finish to materials proposed for use should be considered to remain in-keeping with the residential area and that the oxidising effects in respect of the roof will minimise long-term visual impact.

The Member stated that the brick colour was a subjective subject-matter and would prompt greater contention if the proportion of brickwork grossly exceeded that of windowed exterior. As this was not the case, the Member did not express a preference as to the colour of the brickwork yet acknowledged that it was an immediate red-brick area. A concern was raised with the Chair as to the colour of the mortar to be used in terms of its appropriate shading.

The Chair instructed Officers to make further enquires be made into the colour of the mortar. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if they considered the colour of the mortar to be an important issue, then a condition may be imposed accordingly as a planning issue.

A Member enquired as to whether any special finish could be applied to the metal-cladding to pro-actively pre-empt any attempt at vandalism (i.e. graffiti) or whether this potential issue could be re-actively managed by on-site means of security and CCTV. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that any surface was susceptible to vandalism and that the concern was more appropriately addressed as a management issue, whilst acknowledging the advantage of taking a pro-active approach.

A Member enquired as to whether the metal roof would present any fire hazards due to light being reflected. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if a power-coated matt finish was to be used, it would not be predisposed to any such risk in terms light reflection nor adverse visual impact.

The Chair recommended that the issues pertaining to the colour of the mortar and roofing materials to be used should be delegated to Officers to determine a suitable solution.

A Member enquired as to the conditions attached to the choice of finishing colours. The Planning Control Manager advised Members that if there was a preference as to colour, that Members can be further advised on the same.

The agenda items were respectively moved and seconded for approval in respect of the minor amendments to materials proposed for use, subject to conditions that: the proper assurances be given in terms of satisfactory acoustic levels at the site boundary; a note be served on the applicant to liaise with Guxlaxton College regarding any potential boundary treatment; and the colour of the mortar, roofing materials and exact finish to be used be delegated to the Officers to determine a suitable solution.

RESOLVED THAT:

	<p>The application in respect of Wigston Swimming Pool (Application 15/00098/VAC) be permitted subject to conditions.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The application in respect of Guxlaxton College (Application 15/00139/FUL) be permitted subject to conditions by ten votes in favour and one abstention from Councillor Mrs S Morris.</p>	
<p>13.</p>	<p>TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO/0307 – LAND AT THE REAR OF PROPERTIES 11-37 MARSTOWN AVENUE, WIGSTON</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The agenda item be deferred until the ordinary meeting of the Committee in June 2015 by unanimous agreement.</p>	

The Meeting Closed at 6.50pm

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WIGSTON RESIDENTS` FORUM HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES,
STATION ROAD, WIGSTON ON TUESDAY 24 JUNE 2015, COMMENCING AT 7:30 P.M.**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor G Boulter – Chair

Councillors: H. Loydall, K Loydall, , L.A Bentley and R. Eaton

Residents In Attendance M A Drage, S Dacey, P Tebbutt, D Tebbutt, P Bates, M J Bates, R Carter, M K Wertwyla, C Huscroft, M A Sturgeon, D Needles, R Needles, P Lapworth, A Schofield, G Schofield, D Walton

Others in Attendance: V Quintyne (OWBC).D Cliffe(Conservation Volunteers), PCSO 6118 Sarah Parnaby , PCSO 6572 Jayne Pearson Police Community Support Officers ,T. Bentley (First Responders), R.Moughton (First Responders),P Cousins (Wigston Civic Society,

Apologies:

Residents: Richard Blackburn ,Linda Blackburn, Sue Lobb, John Lobb, Carolyn Holmes Brocks Hill Country Park and Centre Manager, PC Damien Hyatt, L Pires (WigstonTraders) , L Blackburn, G. Blackburn , Cllr:M.Charlesworth.

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Responsible												
26	<p><u>1.Local Police Issues</u></p> <p>As the regular Police representative PC3177Damian Hyatt is on paternity leave PCSO 6118 Sarah Parnaby and PCSO 6572 Jayne Pearson Police Community Support Officers provided the Police Update to residents. Crime figures were reported as follows:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%; text-align: left;">Previous 3 Months</td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: right;">Last 3 Months</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attempted burglary in dwellings: 7</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burglaries: 7.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Theft from Vehicles. 9</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robberies: 1</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoplifting: 37 with17 detected</td> <td style="text-align: right;">.10</td> </tr> </table>	Previous 3 Months	Last 3 Months	Attempted burglary in dwellings: 7	5	Burglaries: 7.	5	Theft from Vehicles. 9	3	Robberies: 1	1	Shoplifting: 37 with17 detected	.10	
Previous 3 Months	Last 3 Months													
Attempted burglary in dwellings: 7	5													
Burglaries: 7.	5													
Theft from Vehicles. 9	3													
Robberies: 1	1													
Shoplifting: 37 with17 detected	.10													

	<p>Bilking..... 1</p> <p>The Police is focussed on further engagement with partner agencies and working on various crime and antisocial behaviour interventions in the Borough. Saturday and Friday nights are seeing antisocial behaviour reduced to zero level.</p> <p>Residents were informed of Police intervention work on: littering and graffiti, work with the Impact Team to provide training for Macdonald’s staff and football sessions between the Police and young people which is to become a regular once a week-night event.</p> <p>ELS Cafe is open on Friday nights supporting positive activities for young people.</p> <p>Boulter Crescent community flat is working with residents to build Police rapport with communities and provides a cooked meal on Friday lunchtime.</p> <p>As part of developing its community links Police attend more community events, for example coffee mornings. They also attended the Summer Solstice event hosted by Leicestershire Pagans at Brocks Hill Country Park and made a visit to the Hindu Temple in Knighton.</p> <p>A basketball session is held every Friday evening at Guthlaxton College. 20 plus children attend but the space is proving too small for the demand. National sports scouts use such sessions to look for the next “Michael Jordan” an internationally renowned basketball player.</p> <p>For the future, an Allotment Day at Aylestone Lane and Granville Gardens is planned. This will be an opportunity to security mark tools and provide free security devices and crime prevention information. There is a single point of Neighbourhood Watch in the Borough. Anyone interested in setting up a scheme is invited to contact the Police Community Support Officers.</p> <p>In concluding the update the Police stressed residents are encouraged to contact the Police on telephone number 101 to report offending behaviour and criminal activity. The Chair thanked the Police Support Officers for the update.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>27</p>	<p><u>2 Local Government Boundary Commission Review for England</u></p> <p>The Community Engagement Officer explained that the County Council had approached the English Boundary Commission to look at recommending a new pattern of wards across the County so no Councillor would be providing support to on average no more than nine thousand electoral voters. The Boundary Commission was seeking feedback and comment from electoral voters on whether they agreed with recommendations to change Oadby and Wigston electoral ward divisions. This is in order to: provide what it termed “electoral equality”, reflecting the interests and identities of communities and promote effective and convenient local government. It was outlined that the proposed recommendations to address County Councillor representation of electoral voter numbers, at County Council level required residents` feedback and comments. Feedback and comments were being requested from all three Resident Forums to inform the proposed Boundary Commission Recommendations. Residents were also informed they could make their own submission on the Boundary Commission Recommendations, on line using the following web site link.</p> <p>http://www.leics.gov.uk/oadbyandwigston_electoral_review_proposals.pdf</p> <p>Residents were also informed their comments would be gathered together and used to provide a Borough wide response to the Boundary Commission Recommendations. The deadline for submission of comments to the Boundary Commission is 21st July 2015.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Community Engagement Officer would circulate a copy of the Oadby and Wigston Council submission based on the recommendations made by the Resident Forum attendees to all.</p>	<p>Veronika Quintyne</p>
------------------	--	---------------------------------

28	<p><u>Friends of Brocks Hill – The Natural Discoveries Conservation Volunteer Development Proposal (Presentation)</u></p> <p>Mike Bates on behalf of the Friends of Brock`s Hill Group gave a presentation on a proposal to increase the number of Super Conservation Volunteers across the whole borough over the next two years. The outcome of this being further community engagement, focussing on biodiversity sites across the Borough, up skilling volunteers , establishing ongoing volunteer groups, incorporating health and safety legislation, working towards recruiting a Project Officer for Volunteer development, running training courses and making the Borough a better place to live ,learn and work.</p> <p>The Canal and River Trust Volunteers is engaged in this community development work and Voluntary Action Leicester is willing to set up a “friends” group.</p> <p>It was proposed the Friends of Brocks Hill Conservation Project receive £1,000 to help with volunteer training and developing the Project. This proposal was carried and the Project awarded £1,000.</p>	Veronika Quintyne
29	<p><u>Wigston Traders Update</u></p> <p>An update report is to come to the next meeting.</p>	
30	<p><u>Pride of the Borough Update</u></p> <p>Residents were reminded of the benefit of subscribing to a Pride of the Borough Loyalty Card, which costs £5.00 per year. A card can also be purchased from the Council Reception, at the Council Offices, Station Road, Wigston.</p>	
31	<p><u>Chairman`s Updates including, Capital Projects Update, Requests for spending and Update on the Forum Budget.</u></p> <p>The Chair provided a verbal update on activity and spending flowing from the Resident Forum budget.</p> <p>The Customer Service Centre opens in Bell Street in the Summer. No opening date as yet has been identified. Jacky Griffiths, the Customer Services Manager is to provide a presentation at the Centre in bell Street.</p> <p>The Senior Citizen`s Action Group meets 21 August at 2pm at the Freer Centre.</p> <p>Wigston Post Office closes January 2016. The Council is working to identify a new location in the Centre of Wigston.</p> <p>Consultation with Highways is to take place on what type of bus shelters to</p>	

erect. A bus shelter licence costs £50 plus and indemnity. The placing of a bus stop outside the Firs costs £3,000. A basic cantilever bus shelter is the preferred Borough Council choice. Installation of a shelter costs between £4,000 to £4,500. There is the cost of £4,000 for the Paddock Street site. A resident expressed the view that only one bus an hour uses that stretch of road. The Horsewell Lane bus shelter proposal was agreed. The cost awarded is £3,000.

At a meeting this evening the Policy Committee of the Council is to address the usage of bus shelters. Usage figures are to be brought back to the next Resident Forum meeting.

Paddock Street Bus Shelter is to be replaced this Summer. It will include a perch seat.

Consultation on the placing of Trees in Tubs

Previously there were some trees in tubs which resided on Bell Street. There has been a request over the past five years to have these trees placed in Holmden Avenue, Wigston. A question was raised as to if these trees could be place in Holmden Avenue in the tubs, on the grass verges. There are a total of six trees. It was agreed by residents for this issue to be progressed using a consultation approach.

A resident noted lamp-posts in the lanes require painting. The Chair stated these are to be painted next week.

The quality of the grass cutting was raised as a concern by residents. Comments on this are to be fed back to the County Council. Blaby Council contractors also cuts grass in Oadby and Wigston. The cuts have been reduced from seven cuts to five cuts. A resident observed grass cut using the flail system is ending up in the road. This has led to complaints of weeds growing in the gutters. For an extra £2,000 the Council can access one more cut of the grass. A meeting on the 14th June is to see a Council pre negotiation of spraying.

Road Works

Road working signs are to go up on Station Road, as gas pipes are to be re laid.

	<p>The County Council will be putting business open as usual signs in South Wigston.</p> <p>The block drains are almost all clear. A tag was left in a drain and therefore has to be done the same time as the gas pipe work. Carlton Drive to Willow Park was flooded three weeks ago. Drains on the bend from Perry Close are blocked therefore work is going on over the next fortnight. Single lane traffic lights are to be placed on Station Road.</p> <p>Residents were reminded that should they wish to discuss issues that affect them before the full meeting begins, there is a surgery session with the Police, Councillors and Council Officers between 7.00pm and 7.30pm</p> <p>The date of the next Resident Forum meeting is: Wednesday 16th September 2015 at 7pm.</p>	
--	--	--

The meeting closed at 8.45pm

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD
AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON THURSDAY 25 JUNE 2015
COMMENCING AT 07:00 PM**

IN ATTENDANCE:
 Chair - L A Bentley
 Vice Chair- Mrs L M Broadley
 Councillors: G S Atwal; G A Boulter; D M Carter; B Dave; D A Gamble; J Kaufman; Dr T Khong; Mrs H E Loydall; and R E R Morris
 Officers in attendance: Mrs A Court; C Forrett; Miss G Ghuman; and S Ball
 Others in attendance: Mrs S B Morris and L Wiggins

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
14.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies received from Councillors E Barr, F S Broadley, Mrs S Z Haq and R F Eaton.</p>	
15.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS</p> <p>None.</p>	
16.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>Councillor Mrs H E Loydall declared that application 4/00538/FUL and the references made in the report to the Police, that her son is employed by the Police Constabulary in the Loughborough area.</p>	
17.	<p>PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS</p> <p>None.</p>	
18.	<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28 MAY 2015</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous Committee meeting held on Thursday 28 May 2015 be taken as read, confirmed and signed.</p>	
19.	<p>TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO/0307 - MARSTOWN AVENUE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to Agenda item 6 at pages 10-12. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>Mrs S B Morris spoke on behalf of residents as their request to speak in person had been denied. It was stated that residents had chosen to move to south-side properties on Marstown Avenue due to the rear-view of the land in respect of the trees and wildlife within. The trees</p>	

were reported to provide an effective sound-barrier to the noise generated from the railway line and screening from the properties adjacent. The Forestry Commission was cited in that the removal of trees may cause subsidence from the movement of trains. The high-water table upon which the properties were sited was said to be at risk due to the stability provided by the trees in the clay grounding. The Forestry Commission attended the site to inspect on three occasions and concluded the site was worthy of protection, recommending tree management as opposed to felling. They warned that the removal of trees may affect the railway embankment and the structural integrity of the properties. She claimed that the residents' insurers had advised a claim would be instigated against the Council to remedy any damage caused insofar as not retaining the trees and confirming the TPO, as a recent local precedent dictated. The resident's thanked Members for their consideration. Mrs Morris summarised that the site provided a public amenity to residents either side on both Marstown Avenue and Kirkdale Road and invited Members to confirm the TPO for the reasons aforementioned.

A Member enquired as to why the residents were not permitted to speak in person at the meeting. The Chair advised that such a granting of permission was contrary to the Standing Orders in respect of consideration of TPO's.

A Member sought a point of clarification from the speaker as to the precedent cited in her report. It was confirmed that the precedent referred to was an historic claim against the Council for subsidence in the said area of land.

The Chair advised Members that the issue before them was whether to confirm or otherwise the TPO and not the process or reasons for delays for which the report was put before Members for their due consideration.

The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 6 (pages 10-12). He directed Members attention to a site visit that took place some six weeks ago. The site was described as a now unkempt, former builders' yard. The TPO was originally made during the Christmas period at which time work was being undertaken. He referred Members to the report, citing that representations had been received for and against the confirming of the TPO (at page 11). The Council's arboriculturist had attended the site and had not recommended the making of a TPO due to the tree's poor quality or low public amenity value (at page 12). The oak tree positioned to the east of the site had since been removed due to its adverse structural impact on the courtyard of garages positioned nearby: this tree alone was considered sufficient to warrant a TPO prior to its removal.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that the points raised by the speaker (viz. water-table level, acoustic-barrier and screening) were not before Members' consideration and/or sufficient justification to override the recommendation of the report not to confirm the TPO. He confirmed that the line of sight from the railway bridge to the site was approximately 70-80 metres and obscured by a secondary line of trees

positioned by Network Rail along the embankment, rendering the trees barely visible. The poplar trees that were visible close to the boundary with Network Rail had been pollarded and the recommendation was to re-pollard if further works were to be undertaken. The area of land in question was reported to provide little public amenity value to justify the continued protection of the trees thereon.

A Member agreed that the trees onsite required an extensive amount of work. He raised a concern regarding the transpiring of work required to a felling of a total of 12 trees on the site as of the 29 December 2014 resulting in the provisional making of the TPO. The felling has been carried out by means of services rendered by a tree surgeon (applied loosely) employed by the land's proprietor to undertake work. It was stated that the Planning Control and Enforcement Officer attended the site on behalf of the Council on four occasions since the initial making of the Order in response to reports of chainsaws being taken to the land. The Forestry Commission was cited to have issued a 'no felling' direction, in place until September 2015, during which time the oak tree was nevertheless felled. The Member made reference to an unverified case imminently before the courts taken by the Forestry Commission against a land owner in similar circumstances. For the aforesaid reasons, the Member opined that there was an imminent danger and therefore a ground for the TPO to be confirmed.

The Member further stated that Natural Britain had attended the site and confirmed the presence of bats and slow-worms, the later being protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as a 'priority species'. The removal of trees was therefore reported to potentially stifle the biodiversity of the land and engager wildlife. In respect of public amenity value, it was stated that the site was visible irrespective of distance and cited a notable decision of other authority which, in confirming a TPO, found public amenity value in the case of a single resident's line of sight from a rear-garden area. It was further opined that the sound-barrier provided by the trees in question did harbour some of the noise generated and that its utility in this regard was yet to be proved by the Planning Control Manager. He noted that if the TPO was confirmed, the likelihood of the proprietor of the land appealing to the High Court was minimal due to the financial implications accrued to him. The Member submitted there was sufficient justification to confirm the TPO for the aforementioned reasons and moved the proposal for the same.

A Member stated that the site was an important wildlife corridor, one of only a few in the Borough leading-off the railway embankment, and a forging area and habitat for known bats and slow-worms. He stated that if the TPO were to be confirmed, it would not prevent the necessary work to be undertaken in the future (subject to an application) and would preserve the sound-barrier provided. However, to not confirm the TPO would be the incorrect decision, adding that a number of trees onsite were particularly attractive specimens and different to those found elsewhere in the Borough. The Member approached the question on the balance of probability insofar as the likelihood of the proprietor felling the remaining trees onsite if the TPO were not to be confirmed, citing past experience as an indicator of near certainty of the same. The

fact that the trees in question could be seen from 11 south-side properties on Marstown Avenue should be given sufficient weight in favour of the argument to confirm the TPO. The secondary line of trees alongside the railway embankment were said to be subject to the discretion of Network Rail who, in the Winter past, had removed similar trees from the site at the old station on Station Road. He summarised the reasons aforementioned and stated that on the balance of probability, it would be wise to confirm the TPO and to invite the applicant back to undertake the necessary work. The Member seconded the proposal for the TPO to be confirmed.

The Chair stated that he appreciated the views of Members and so to provide greater balance, noted that the site was mostly scrubland littered with waste (e.g. bricks, pallets etc.) which required clearing due to a risk of contamination impacting on the biodiversity. He stated that if the applicant did exercise his right to appeal, a cost implication would too be borne by the Council and so warned Members on the prudent-use of public funds in such matters.

A Member sought clarification as to the definition of a tree and the numbers of trees seeking preservation in the context of an Order made covering all trees located in the area defined on the plan provided (at page 10). He stated that much of the biodiversity onsite may be supported by scrub and other forms of non-tree vegetation present.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that a detailed survey of the site had not been undertaken so the exact number of trees under the Order was not known. He stated that, according to the regulations, the definition of a tree and the size of the area covered by an Order was determined by a prescribed height and girth of the tree(s) for the purposes of a TPO.

The Member sought comment from the Officers in respect of the Council's possible legal responsibility in view of both opposing parties' contentions that a liability to the Council may potentially arise either way (i.e. clay-soil issues due water retraction, unmanageable damp areas due to light blockage, and potential hazards to the railway at page 11), described as a "no win" situation.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that no liability would arise against the Council. The proprietor of the land would assume responsibility in the event of any subsistence and/or ground-shrinkage should the TPO not be confirmed and trees subsequently removed. An issue of liability in respect of the felled oak tree was now said to be non-existent insofar as, in preventing the proprietor from felling the tree, the Council would have been liable for its adverse structural impact on the courtyard of garages positioned nearby (as confirmed by a Court Order). This is what formed part of the representations received from concerned residents on Marstown Avenue.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed the Planning Control Manager's advice.

Councillor G S Atwal vacated the Council Chamber at 07:32 PM.

A Member sought a more definitive statement from the Officers as to the exact extent of the Council's legal responsibility insofar as if the TPO was to be confirmed, whether the Council would be liable or not if a tree subsequently fell and injured an individual and/or caused an obstruction on the railway line.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that the point entertained two aspects: (i) the making of the Order; and (ii) the dealing with applications to undertake work to a TPO tree. In respect of the former, it was advised that ordinarily the Council was not exposed to such a risk, save for if a TPO was confirmed in the knowledge that the trees were structurally poor or weak. In respect of the latter, it was advised that the reverse was true and the applicant could seek costs from the Council. It was stated that this contingency was not the case nor before Members for their consideration.

A Member stated he agreed with the representation made by the Council's volunteer Tree Warden in that confirming the TPO would be consistent with the 'Greening the Borough' policy (at page 12) in aspiring to promote the healthy development of trees *vis-a-vis* the retention of all trees. It was said that by not confirming the TPO do Members seek to prevent the proprietor from maintaining the trees in question to ensure their long-term health. The Member reiterated the notion of a decision based on the balance of probabilities and stated his inclination in favour of confirming the TPO.

A Member re-echoed the Council's arboriculturist comments regarding the tree's poor quality and the removal of dead wood (at page 12), the Council was said to be at risk if it were to confirm the TPO. The Member stated that had the oak tree remained, she would have had no hesitation in supporting the confirmation of the TPO. She directed Members to focus on what trees remained, describing the remainder as insignificant in terms of their ill-health and limited lifespan.

The Chair advised that no such opportunity could be afforded as the confirmation or otherwise of the TPO was a matter that required a final determination at this meeting.

In responding to Members' earlier questions. The Planning Control Manager reported that on the occasions where the Planning and Enforcement Officer had attended the site, the works being undertaken at the time were the cutting of lodges/branches already felled and the felling of the oak tree itself. In respect of the Forestry Commission, the legislation in question was not over-riding but a separate issue which ought not to feature in Members' considerations. In respect of protected species, the confirmation of the Order or otherwise would not engender any rights or implications under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981. He directed Members' to consider the quality of the public amenity value provided by the trees as a determining factor, with reference made to the arboriculturist's and Members' earlier comments as to the poor quality of particular trees cited. The trees were said to have some noise-deadening properties however, due to the numerous breaks in the tree line, this was neither absolute nor material to the decision-

	<p>making process. According to planning guidance, it was not recommended that a TPO be confirmed as a means to manage any work undertaken acknowledged by all as necessary.</p> <p>The Chair moved for the recommendation for TPO not to be confirmed, stating that to otherwise confirm in this instance was not the correct decision so to ensure the expediency of tree management onsite and to afford the landowner the opportunity to honour the assurances given to the same.</p> <p>A Member seconded the proposal for the recommendation to be approved.</p> <p>DEFEATED THAT:</p> <p>The amendment to the recommendation that the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made on the 30 December 2014 be confirmed by four votes in favour, and six votes against.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The recommendation that the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made on the 30 December 2014 is not confirmed by six votes in favour, and three votes against.</p>	
19.	<p>TREE PRESERVATION ORDER TPO/0308 - 3 GLEBE CLOSE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to Agenda item 7 at pages 13-14. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 7 (pages 13-14). He reported that two s. 211 Tree Notifications were received for the felling of multiple trees onsite to which the arboriculturist's advice was sought. A provisional Tree Protection Order (TPO) was made for reasons of public amenity value. The arboriculturist was not able to gain entry to the site since to complete a more detailed inspection of the trees. The recommendation was to confirm the TPO as provisionally made given the timescales involved. There had been no change in circumstances.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to why access to the site in question was not possible and/or granted.</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager advised Members that dealings had been ongoing with the proprietor's agent and that, despite several attempts to request access to the site, no permission was forthcoming.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <p>The recommendation that the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) made on the 28 January 2015 be confirmed.</p>	
20.	<p>REPORT OF THE PLANNING CONTROL MANAGER</p>	

The Committee gave consideration to Agenda item 6 at pages 15-32. These should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.

1. 14/00538/FUL - Wigston House, 183 Kirkdale Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 4SU

The applicant's agent, Mr L Wiggins, spoke on behalf of Wesley House Partnership. He spoke of the applicant's delight in the application securing recommendation for approval, stating the proposal sought to provide a well-designed housing scheme that was both attractive and in-keeping with the conservation area. It proposed redevelopment on a brownfield site for housing in a predominately residential area recognised, in principle, to fulfil the regeneration master plan for the area in accordance with policy three of the adopted core-strategy. It was acknowledged that the proposal if brought-forward formed a significant part of the Council's wider regeneration scheme objective which the applicant fully supported. The proposal was said to not preclude the development of the bus depot nor the land off Bennett Way, with provisional access to the latter being facilitated. The noise generated by the depot was noted as an issue for adjoining plots and that concerns regarding the appearance of a high-acoustic fence should be allayed due to it being out-of-sight from the road and the potential for the fence's height to be reduced once the noise-source was removed. The scheme was said to adopt the design-principle of providing strong frontages on the back-edge of the footpath, with staggered groups of dwellings further into the site away from the traditional terraced street-pattern. All of the dwellings were said to be provided with two, off-street vehicle-parking spaces, with the exception of the smaller apartments with a 125% division to cater for residents and businesses. All houses are to include private rear gardens of an appropriate size, with the occupiers of the apartments sharing a communal garden area.

He noted the concerns raised during the determination of the application and stated that they had now been resolved as confirmed in the report. The four dwellings proposed on plots 10 to 13 to the north of Kirkdale Avenue was said to have a minimal impact to the level of light enjoyed by those occupiers. The closest dwellings to the east were to be positioned to the gable-end of the rear-elevation/s to ensure no over-looking and the minimum amount of disturbance from noise and lighting. It was reported that there would be no discernible impact from the noise generated from passing traffic once onsite. The amount of traffic and its impact on the highway network had been assessed by the applicant's partner and praised by the Highways Authority with no objections raised. The applicant was said to be aware of the presence of Japanese knotweed on the western-side of the site and gave assurances that the necessary steps would be taken to eradicate it. It was reported that the applicant had a proven track-record in delivering affordable housing locally and that it was their desire for the 56 proposed dwellings to accommodate local families in housing need as soon as practicably possible. It was anticipated that work would commence onsite immediately once the pre-commencement conditions

were discharged and the applicant was keen to avoid any delays due to the limited window of opportunity in terms of the scheme's funding.

The Planning Control Manager summarised the contents of the report for agenda item 8 (pages 16 - 32). The proposal was a scheme of 56 dwellings incorporating a number of design features from the conservation area to remain in-keeping with the same. A number of visual elevations were presented to Members to demonstrate the design's consistency with Kirkdale Road. It was said that a number of amendments had been made in consultation with Conservation Officers, most notably in respect of the dwellings' canopies. The amended siting of properties on a hip to the rear of Kirkdale Road was a helpful amendment in terms of planning to alleviate the impact on visual neighbouring residential properties. The design did not reflect the parking arrangements of a traditional housing estate resulting in a number of parking-court areas, designed and sited to prevent overlooking. It was noted that a balance was recognised between the need for adequate parking in modern-day terrace properties and retaining the area's character. In respect of the acoustic-fencing, the proposal was to install the fence along the identified boundary to ensure the acoustic levels were acceptable to prospective residents' living standards: although noted as not an ideal solution, the fencing would not be seen in the public domain. The concept was said to evolve in terms of later planning and noise mitigation.

The Planning Control Manager informally updated Members as to the comments received back from consultations since the drafting of the report. County Highways was said to have reiterated the overall theme of the conditions outlined. A s 106 agreement contribution was also to be sought in respect of the real-time provision of travel/tracking-information in relation to bus-stops which were forming part of the negotiations to ensure compliance with the civil regulations. It was noted that discussions had not been forthcoming with the Police regarding the report's reference to their respective contribution. Members were invited to delegate to Officers the authority to progress and negotiate the above under the appropriate delegated powers. The Police were reported to have objected to the application as it did not provide for their required mitigation on policing impacts to which the Planning Control Manager did not agree for reasons outlined in the report. The figures in the report regarding the CCTV have been deemed unsuitable by the Police for reasons of insufficient funding. However, according to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, it was noted that the developer should not contribute more than was necessary in planning terms: the Police's suggestion was said to go above and beyond the need arising from the development and a recommendation was put to Members to agree to the original contribution in the report.

The Chair advised Members to consider the matters before them, to the exclusion of an earlier reference made to prospective access to Bennett Way.

A Member stated that it was unacceptable for Highways to submit a late letter and expected future compliance within the prescribed

timescales. He approved of the application, describing it as well-designed and affordable housing scheme on a brownfield site and commended the applicant's considerable efforts to remain in-keeping with the conservation area. The Member moved the proposal in favour of the recommendation.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that there had been an ongoing dialogue with Highways and a number of responses had been received over a period of time during negotiations before a formal reply.

A Member was in favour of regenerating a brownfield site. He enquired as to whether the applicant experienced any difficulty in sourcing a suitable green as the trees onsite appeared more mature than those intended to be planted. He requested a landscaping plan be implemented involving Members and Tree Wardens. It was asked as to whether some sound-deadening provision could be additionally installed to protect prospective residents from noise generated from the Leicester-to-Birmingham railway line. The use of a suitable brick colour was also raised so to be in-keeping with the street-scene on Kirkdale Road. He enquired as to whether Leicestershire County Council would be taking ownership of the highways within the dwelling-complex.

The Chair confirmed that it was acceptable for Members to be involved in such a landscaping plan given their appropriate training. It was noted that the noise emanating from the railway line would have been minimised had the decision of central government gone ahead to electrify the trains/lines.

The Planning Control Manager made reference to the architect's plans, citing the three green circles as indicative of the landscaping scheme forming part of the recommendation. The railway line had been acknowledged in the report as a noise-source of concern and a package of window-glazing was to be installed to ensure acceptable living standards for prospective residents. The railway line was noted to be the Southern freight-line with only a few trains passing during the day-time only. He advised Members that the development required red-brick materials in terms of maintain a consistency with the character of Kirkdale Road, controlled by planning conditions. The main access highways were to be of an adoptable standard and adopted as such, with the exclusion of three identified roads best maintained through site management.

A Member agreed with the landscape planning. He enquired as to whether the adopted highways would have street-lighting and if the dwellings' design incorporated slate/slate-like roofing and chimneys to complement the surrounding street-scene. He opined that the proposal was of a poor and monotonous design, noting that every street in the area had its own design peculiarity. A major concern was raised regarding access arrangements from Kirkdale Road and Station Street, stating that rear-access from Bennett Way was more commonsensical: he expressed his unwillingness to endorse any development sited on the proposed juncture. It was said that the area ought to be developed

but in sympatric way and therefore, for the reasons also aforementioned, the Member felt unable to support the application.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that in respect of chimneys, the proposal was a modern development in a conservation area that is predominately unseen. He stated that he could not disagree in principle with the Member's suggestion and was willing to negotiate with the applicant to explore the possibility of the front block of dwellings incorporating chimneys: there would be some reluctance to go beyond that as the statutory test had been met in terms of the area's character *vis-a-vis* improvement proposed.

The Chair stated that access via Bennett Way was not before Members.

The Planning Control Manager advised that there had been some historical discussions concerning traffic-flow and access. He confirmed that Kirkdale Road and Station Street was an existing highway access-point and a non-discretionary view of the same had been taken by Highways. It was advised that there was no theoretical difference in the traffic-flow at either access point and presented the same highway benefit. It was re-iterated that Bennett Way did not form part of the application which must be considered on its sole merits: however, it was added to reassure Members that access via Bennett Way was predominantly under the control of the Council and discussions had been held with the developers to explore this subject-matter.

The Chair stated the proposal would be consistent with the Member's earlier that every street in the area had its own design peculiarity insofar as the proposed development itself was of also of a comparatively distinct design. The Member disagreed with this statement for the reasons aforementioned.

The Member raised a concern as to the adequacy of vehicle-parking spaces provided for prospective apartment residents (i.e. 1.25 spaces per apartment) and sought clarification as how any overflow would be accommodated.

The Chair enquired as to whether this was a town-centre development.

The Planning Control Manager advised that, in terms of parking availability, the development was not considered to be a town-centre site but was in walking distance of the same so was a material consideration. The apartments were noted to be smaller than the one-bedroom units and, as such, of a commensurate vehicle-parking generation. The availability of parking spaces was considered appropriate given the site's location and access to nearby amenities and transport links.

The Member stated there was insufficient parking availability Kirkdale Road and Station Street which would worsen due to the intended highway access.

The Planning Control Manager advised Members that the Highway Agency had recommended that the highways in the site were to be

subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (i.e. double yellow lines) to ensure fluid access, adding it would have neither a positive nor negative effect of existing residential properties. It was said that the choice of roofing-materials formed part of the conditions and, whilst noting the Member's suggestion above, that an eclectic mix of materials had been used on existing terraced properties. Slate/slate-like roofing was considered to unnecessary. The choice of roofing-materials was said to be crucial, with the possible use of mock clay tiles suggested.

The Member suggested that brick-detailing be introduced to enhance the exterior appearance of the dwellings, with no cost incurred to the applicant.

The Planning Control Manger stated that discussions could be held with the applicant but did not consider this a proper ground to withhold permission, adding that brick-detailing was not a consistent feature in the street-scene.

A Member stated the proposed application had the potential to be a good development contingent on the quality of the workmanship, referencing the intended stone cills around the windows and the separation of brickwork on the first floor levels. A concern was raised as to unlit areas on the ends of the unadopted roads and the potential risks and vulnerabilities presented to members of the public. An analogy to the development at Two Steeples Square was cited where residents were said to be concerned about accessing the rear of their properties in unlit areas. It was also enquired as to who would be responsible for maintenance to the lighting on the unadopted roads.

The Planning Control Manager understood the concern raised and advised that a simple scheme of low-level lighting in the unlit areas could be approached through a condition. The unadopted areas would be maintained through a maintenance management company, inclusive of any lighting.

A Member said that the initial concerns the Member had in respect of the consultation process and overall design had been addressed, citing a final paragraph from the report (at page 21) insofar as the applicant had given due consideration to conversation. The Member enquired as to whether the recommendations of the Bat Survey had been brought to the applicant's attention in accordance with the report (at page 17).

The Planning Control Manager confirmed that the recommendations had been brought to the applicant's attention who had consulted on it. It was reiterated that there was a low potential for bat roosts and the applicant was aware of that response if terms of their protected species status.

The Chair seconded the proposal in favour of the recommendation and summarised the intended condition in respect of: landscaping; negotiations in terms of s 106 agreements, contributions, highways and chimneys; delegations to Officers; and lighting for unadopted roads/areas.

RESOLVED THAT:

Planning permission be granted subject to the aforementioned conditions, with ten votes in favour and one abstention from Councillor G A Boulter.

The Meeting Closed at 08:29 PM

**MINUTES OF THE GREENING OF THE BOROUGH WORKING GROUP
HELD 30 JUNE 2015**

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u></p> <p>Members</p> <p>D M Carter (Chair) A Bond S Morris B Boulter</p> <p>Officers: Anne Court – Director of Services (AC) Carolyn Holmes- Country Parks & Environment Manager (CH) Brian Kew - Operations Manager (BK)</p>

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Resp
31	<u>APOLOGIES</u> Councillors R Thakar; J W Boyce	
32.	<p><u>MINUTES</u></p> <p>S Morris was omitted from the Apologies to the meeting and the addition to these was noted Minutes of Previous Meeting on 17 February 2015 were agreed and signed as an accurate record of that meeting.</p>	
33	<p><u>MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</u></p> <p>Update on roadside grass verges provided by AC with minutes of previous meeting.</p> <p>Issue of trees at Brocks Hill (BH) from the town centres funded by Wigston residents raised by Cllr Boulter. To be followed up as needed. BK advised some containers at the Depot and trees at BH</p> <p>Income paper for 2014-15 to be tabled as part of the finance plan for autumn SDC. This will be completed with the Head of Finance.</p> <p>Regarding clean and green data and emails to customer service it was requested Customer Service Centre are advised on details needed from such alerts from residents to permit a prompt and efficient response.</p> <p>Issue of dog bins on A6 reported to BK by Cllr Bond. To</p>	<p>BK/CH</p> <p>CH</p> <p>BK</p> <p>AC/MS</p>

	<p>be followed up by Margaret Smith (MS). It was requested dog fouling issue papers are tabled to Service Delivery Committee (SDC). It was noted that at last meeting a request had been passed to Corporate Enforcement for a paper to Policy Finance and Development (PFD) and CH confirmed this had been passed on.</p> <p>Members requested operation plan for Gateways for the SDC meeting. This should include details of signs and plantings. This should link to the phased refurbishment.</p>	AC/MS
34.	<p>GREENING OF THE BOROUGH MAJOR PROJECTS REPORT – AGENDA ITEM 4</p> <p>Social media: S Morris congratulated BH on the Facebook page and engagement. CH advised it is clearly generating bookings for events; reaching new audiences and allowing targeted marketing.</p> <p>Crow Mill: A report on progress on the picnic shelter refurbishment was requested for the next meeting.</p> <p>South Wigston Strategic Support and residents projects: Clarification was sought about links with the VAL capacity building project and TCV project (health and communities) that had presented to the Engagement Forum. CH advised she is steering the groups to work together and connect to existing networks.</p> <p>Cllr Morris has contact with the resident regarding the wildlife area in South Wigston as a meeting has not been forthcoming despite a network of projects offering support. This is being led by Dave Cliffe from VAL through his project. CH to advise VAL</p> <p>Clifton Bridge: Work has started on the capital project and support from LCC has been offered and should be claimed within 6 weeks. This should be £2,500 (awaiting formal offer letter).</p> <p>Fludes Lane: Positive meeting with Trent River Trust, LCC flood team; Clean and Green, Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water regarding the litter trap and also wider site of the Washbrook (including the flood basin at Oadby Grange). Consultant to be brought in to look at latter and storm event capacity of flood basin. Progress is being made on resolving issues.</p> <p>Brocks Hill Updates: Some issue with rainwater harvesting but this will be fixed for school holidays. CH reported school bookings have continued to rise and by the end of the summer term bookings will be over £5,000 (an income target of £3,900 had been set for this year, which was a growth of 15% on 2014/15), so CH advised this is very positive.</p> <p>Room hire is down 26% like on like period. This is due to changes in LCC and NHS bookings and some feedback</p>	<p>AC/MS</p> <p>CH</p>

	<p>about catering costs - but mainly reduced budgets. CH reported LCC have agreed catering costs in advance with contractors for their cafes to attract mutual business. CH proposes a similar marketing push to that done for schools around room hire.</p> <p>Visitor numbers monitored through the digital people counters at BH have been 53,307 from April 1st to 30th June (counters read at closing prior to meeting), with the tally since installation on January 2nd of 73,709. This shows BH has been under-reporting as the highest visitor tally reported to members was 48,000.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Climate Change Strategic Support: Greenhouse Gas Reporting: Report to go to Service Delivery Committee once completed.</p> <p>Clean and Green data: This in future is to go to SDC as a paper.</p> <p>It was also suggested the Clean and Green/EDOS report to the working group be tabled as a separate paper/agenda item in future. This will benefit staff when collating additional papers for SDC.</p>	<p>CH</p> <p>BK</p>
<p>35</p>	<p><u>VOLUNTEERING UPDATE - AGENDA ITEM 5</u></p> <p>The Volunteering Policy and Procedure is still with HR and will be passed to a future PFD, following their work to align this document to the work experience policy and procedure.</p>	<p>AC/CH</p>
<p>36</p>	<p><u>GtB ADDITIONAL ITEMS REQUESTED AGENDA ITEM 6</u></p> <p>a) Oadby Grange: Discussion around issues of the flood basin, site works needed and progress to date.</p> <p>Clean and Green revised costings needed. This will mean once legal transfer is completed a full assessment of works costs (e.g. car park, trees and gate) and revenue costs can be made. Other than quotes for the work no further work needed at present.</p> <p>CH to liaise with Crystal Andrade over risk of drowning in flood basin and to see if fence can be installed by landowners. CH also to clarify over right of access</p> <p>CH advised Community Payback interested in working on site but would need additional staff support and this would need to come from commuted sum. This would improve path access around the site.</p> <p>b) Salary breakdown for GtB delivery: Accepted with recommendation the new code be established. AC to take this to SMT to clarify if the figure of £77,689 is below the delegated threshold or if a</p>	<p>BK</p> <p>CH</p> <p>AC</p>

	<p>paper needs to go to committee.</p> <p>c) External Funding: noted. CH reiterated the support from LCC this year for Clifton Bridge which will reduce the amount used from within the capital bid.</p> <p>d) Volunteering hours and financial value. It was acknowledged this can not be reported in accounts but agreed the hourly rate of SCP12 be accepted of £10.50. This is a valuable contribution and members commented the work of the volunteers is essential to maintaining sites.</p> <p>CH advised the Assistant Ranger has reported a like on like increase of 47% in volunteering hours. A prediction for the year was asked for. CH advised this is not possible. Many volunteers have voiced concerns about sustaining support if the post is not in place. The ranger would struggle to deliver the service levels being achieved now.</p> <p>e) Volunteer Development Project and Vehicle: CH gave an up to date summary as the Friends have been successful at securing funding from the Wigston Forum (£1000). A bid for £43,900 has been submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund which will be considered at their August panel. CH explained the public health money is really for BH activities, but since the programme offers some targeted activities for vulnerable conservation volunteers it could link in if needed. An update was given on the Edith Murphy Foundation who visited BH for the Garden Party and were impressed with progress made. They will make a decision July. The Friends are also approaching the South Wigston and Oadby Forums for support and will have decisions by 9th July. They are also approaching the Florence Turner Trust for a small grant.</p> <p>An extensive discussion followed around the issues of timing of notice needed for the Assistant Ranger as a new post has had to be created to be eligible for external funding support. It was agreed clarification would be obtained from HR.</p> <p>It was requested that confirmation be made that the GtB reserve can fund a revenue project.</p> <p>Members suggested that CH consider the Paul Getty Foundation, Rowntree Trust and Frys as possible funding sources</p> <p>CH had met with British Gas regarding an electric vehicle, but awaiting further contact. Members</p>	<p>CH</p> <p>CH</p>
--	--	---------------------

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE (ENFORCEMENT) HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON MONDAY 06 JULY 2015 COMMENCING AT 05:30 PM

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u> Chair - L A Bentley</p> <p>Councillors: Mrs L M Broadley, D M Carter, R E R Morris</p> <p>Officers in attendance: S Robshaw, Miss G Ghuman, S Ball</p>

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs L M Broadley stated that the agenda incorrectly named Councillor F S Broadley as a Sub-Committee member in lieu. The Member requested that this error be noted and rectified on subsequent agendas.</p>	
2.	<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 09 MARCH 2015</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous Sub-Committee meeting held on Monday 09 March 2015 be taken as read, confirmed and signed.</p>	
3.	<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>Councillor R E R Morris declared an interest in respect of agenda item 6, 1 Butt Close, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 1NS (No. 14/00158/UNAWKS) insofar as the respondent is his next-door neighbour.</p>	
4.	<p>FORMAL NOTICES SERVED</p> <p>The Sub-Committee gave consideration to formal notices requiring authorisation for service where a breach of planning control had not yet been resolved. These notices are set out in the report (at pages 4 - 5) and should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Corporate Enforcement Officer reported that no notices had been issued since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee. He noted that a number of notices were overdue due to recent,</p>	

	<p>unprecedented shortages in staffing.</p> <p>He further gave verbal updates on those notices served and responded to enquiries regarding cases raised by Members in respect of: 2 Clifford Street, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 4SH (No. 13/00043/UNAWKS); and 7 Barton Close, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2JR (No. 14/00051/UNAUTU).</p> <p>The progress of several ongoing appeal cases was also discussed.</p>	
5.	<p>FORMAL NOTICES TO BE SERVED</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the business to be transacted involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended), and the public interest in maintaining the exempt items outweighs the public interest in disclosing the same information.</p> <p>The Sub-Committee gave consideration to formal notices to be served where a breach of planning control had not yet been resolved.</p> <p>The Corporate Enforcement Officer gave an update on those formal notices which were expected to be served and responded to enquiries regarding cases raised by Members in respect of: 33 Cartwright Drive, Oadby, Leicestershire, LE2 5HN (No. 13/00073/215); The Salvation Army, Ladysmith Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 4UZ (No. 13/00007/UNAWKS); and 113 Saffron Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 4UQ (No. 13/00033/UNAWKS).</p> <p>A discussion with Members as to management of Japanese knotweed was also had with Members in regards to <i>inter alia</i> its proper classification, the involvement of the Environment Agency and best practice in issuing Section 215 notices pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be noted.</p>	
6.	<p>ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION</p> <p>The Sub-Committee gave consideration to a number of cases which had been live for 90-days or more. The Sub-Committee were given verbal updates on these cases and Members determined whether they could be closed as no further action was required, or whether unresolved matters warranted them being kept open beyond the 90-day period.</p>	

Members agreed to close several enforcement cases which had now been resolved or which did not warrant further enforcement action.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the following cases be closed.

- 13/00026/UNAUTU
- 13/00111/UNAUTU
- 14/00115/COND
- 15/00001/UNAWKS
- 13/00122/UNAUTU
- 15/00005/CONENF
- 15/00021/UNAWKS
- 12/00069/215
- 13/00102/215
- 14/00034/UNAWKS
- 14/00152/UNAWKS
- 14/00183/UNAWKS
- 14/00175/UNAWKS
- 14/00185/UNAWKS
- 15/0025/UNAWKS
- 12/00095/COND
- 13/00055/UNAWKS
- 13/00185/UNAWKS
- 13/0013/UNAUTU
- 13/00142/COND
- 13/00166/UNAWKS
- 14/00091/UNAWKS
- 15/00011/CONENF
- 15/00029/UNAWKS
- 13/00003/UNAUTU
- 13/00119/UNAWKS
- 14/00181/UNAUTU
- 13/00100/UNAWKS
- 14/00086/UNAWKS
- 12/00100/UNAWKS
- 12/00111/UNAWKS
- 13/00106/UNAWKS
- 13/00140/UNAWKS
- 13/00161/215
- 14/00028/215

7.

LOW PRIORITY CASES

The Sub-Committee noted the low priority cases where a breach

	<p>of planning control had not yet been resolved.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the following cases be closed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15/00046/UNAWKS • 15/00051/COND • 15/00065/UNAWKS • 15/00059/UNAWKS • 15/00055/UNAWKS • 15/00035/UNAUTU • 15/00044/UNAUTU • 15/00054/UNAWKS • 15/00042/215 • 15/00039/UNAWKS • 15/00061/ UNAWKS 	
8.	<p>CLOSED CASES</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the report be noted.</p>	

The Meeting Closed at 06:53 PM

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON TUESDAY 07 JULY 2015 COMMENCING AT 7:00 PM

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u> Chair - G A Boulter Vice Chair - Mrs S Z Haq</p> <p>Councillors: G S Atwal; L A Bentley; Ms A R Bond; J W Boyce; F S Broadley; Mrs L M Broadley; D M Carter; Ms K Chalk; K J Loydall; and R H Thakor.</p> <p>Officers in attendance: Mrs A Court; C Raymakers; Ms A Pathak-Mould; Miss G Ghuman; and S Ball</p>

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>An apology for absence was received from Councillors Miss M V Chamberlain and Dr T Khong.</p>	
2.	<p>APPOINTMENTS OF SUBSTITUTES</p> <p>None.</p>	
3.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>None.</p>	
4.	<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2015</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether a verbal update was to be given at this meeting in respect of Bennett Way (Min Ref. 62). The Chair confirmed this was to be included in the Community Update by the Head of Community.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous Committee meeting held on Tuesday 10 March 2015 be taken as read, confirmed and signed.</p>	
5.	<p>PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS</p> <p>None.</p>	
6.	<p>COMMUNITY UPDATE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 6 - 12) which should be read together with these minutes as a</p>	

composite document.

Rent Arrears

The Head of Community reported that rent arrears were comparatively higher at the end of this March and measures were to be implemented to examine services to enable collections and support tenants experiencing difficulties in paying. She advised Members that the issue of arrears did not involve significant numbers of bedroom tax cases but rather implicated the “working poor”. Members were advised that the Community Team are liaising with other service-areas in order to maximise the incomes of those affected and to facilitate tenant re/payment plans. The service was noted to be worked by temporary officers with an aim to seek permanence staffing levels to ensure greater stability. The work was considered to be a priority for the Community Safety Manager who continues to monitor the situation on an ongoing, weekly-basis.

A Member enquired as to the exact quarterly percentage for rent arrears with reference to the 3% target (at page 9). The Head of Community advised that the percentage for rent arrears currently calculated at above 3.5%.

A Member was of the opinion that the issue of rent arrears was likely to worsen given the government’s budget to render the working poor marginally poorer and *vice versa*. There was uncertainty as to ongoing housing benefit entitlement, suggesting the need to devise an action plan (to include the resources to service the same) relating to the collection of rents. A more realistic budget provision and collection target was also sought in this respect (at page 7).

The Head of Community commented that the comparative analysis work undertaken district-by-district concluded that the Borough had the highest proportion of “working poor” suggesting more residents were in lower-paid employment. It was cited that the Chartered Institute of Housing advised a 98% rate of collections for those top-performing organisations, from which a recommendation was being sought to incorporate into the HRA business plan.

Gas Safety

The Head of Community gave an update on gas safety performance as requested by Members that this is a Standing Item.

A Member sought clarification as to the Council’s assurance regarding gas contractors’ compliance, gas safety certification and that all fitters are qualified.

The Head of Community reassured Members that gas safety certification was a prerequisite to contract procurement, adding that contractors were auditing on a monthly basis and that a 100% rate of compliance was recorded until the end of July.

Update on Capital Programme 2014/15 and Decent Homes

The Head of Community directed Members' attention to Appendix 1 of the report (pages 11-12), adding that the volume of work has been achieved within the Capital Programme across several areas. Work at Boulter Crescent was reported to be at a halfway point and other projects such as subsidence works are completed.

A Member noted the achievements made and commended the Officers on their hard work.

Boulter Crescent Community House

The Head of Community stated that an opportunity was to be explored to further improve the community facilities following the House's recent refurbishment as part of the Capital Programme. She advised that the scheme was taking longer than anticipated due to consultations with the community/residents. She noted the Officer's work at Elizabeth Court and invited Members to attend upcoming Community Housing events for additional information.

A Member congratulated the work at the House insofar as the objectives set by the Community Partnership in terms of reducing anti-social behaviour.

Aids and Adaptations in Council Properties

The Head of Community outlined the aids and adaptations made to Council-owned properties (at page 8) from Occupational Health referrals, forming part of a waiting list held by Landlord Services. No backlog was reported save for those significant adaptations requiring the necessary planning permission.

Supporting Leicestershire Families (SLF) and Early Help

The Head of Community reported that these areas were at their greatest change at County-level in respect of mid-term financial strategies to consolidate services. She advised Members that discussions had been held in terms of services not being duplicated within the Borough, and the targeting of those services to end-users, with lesser rhetoric on the cutting of services to find savings. She said the Council would continue to work in partnership with Leicestershire County Council during this transitional phase in the hope that a more definite structure will follow. The feedback received was positive and she stated it may warrant the possibility of a closer, working partnership with Officers in this Council as opposed to being relocated elsewhere. It was said that a report was to be brought forward to this Committee detailing the support received by families in this Borough once that information was made available by Supporting Leicestershire Families.

A Member stated that it would not come as a surprise if Early Help was due another spending cut stemming from the government's budget implications. He stated that although the logic was sound in the long-term to provide a saving, that saving would not accrue back to this Council. It was hypothesised that if the service was to be presented in a

stand-alone report, it would struggle to win approval given the inability to clearly identify its advantages or disadvantages. It was said this was not necessarily a critical reflection of its workers.

It was suggested that a review of the service take place at the next meeting of this Committee and at the meeting of the Steering Group on 29 September 2015, with a view to ascertain:

- (i) what financial contribution is currently being made by this Council;
- (ii) the estimated financial contribution to be made by the Council in the future;
- (iii) to cross-reference those contributions *vis-à-vis* the tangible output in the Borough; and
- (iv) to devise a plan to mainstream some elements of the existing service into this Council's own. It was said that a significant amount of work was necessarily required.

The Head of Community confirmed that the Council's contribution over a three year-period amounted to £23,000 per annum, furnishing three workers and a team leader based at the Council Offices who would work in partnership with other service-areas. She advised that to employ a single Housing Officer at the £23,000 would not achieve the same work requirements as the above. The cost benefit analysis was said to be outstanding from Leicestershire County Council which, once made available, would enable an evaluation for better service-delivery.

The Member asserted that the said cost benefit analysis has been on-promise for the last two years, suggesting that initial reports seen presented a cost benefit yet failed to identify the beneficiary. He stated that although the current arrangements yielded a greater return to the Council from its investment, this return was not guaranteed therefore prompting a need to put the appropriate budgetary provisions in place to provide a contingency.

A Member stated that significant funding had been provided by the government to facilitate this project, raising unanswered questions as the prudent use of such funds and the need for a further subsidy provided by this Council and. He added that a presentation delivered at Leicestershire County Council had purported to use the cost benefit analysis to forecast an overspend on a district-level, thus suggesting no overall cost benefit. The Member also enquired as to which agency the benefit would/saving accrue in view of a deficit. If not to the Council. A meaningful analysis of input *versus* output was therefore required.

Housing Related Support for Older People Update

The Head of Community reported that progress for housing-related support was contingent on the receipt of staff consultations, having had the funding confirmed for the end of September. A structure was to be put in place to provide tenancy support across the Borough, incorporating homelessness and complications arising from the private-sector, however noted there was a marginal delay in its implementation given the recent turnover of new staff.

Dog Fouling

The Head of Community stated that in response to a negative press release regarding dog fouling within the Borough, a joint-initiative between Corporate Enforcement, Environmental Health and Community Housing had been launched. The high visibility patrols were said to be positively received by residents of the Borough and would continue to operate along-side the "Keep Britain Tidy" campaign.

The Chair stated that the protocol for the removal of graffiti from private property was still outstanding. The Head of Community confirmed that such a protocol had been the subject of discussion as the latest Corporate Enforcement Team Meeting and would be noted on the Action List.

The Chair commended the Officers in respect of the dog fouling initiative.

A Member further congratulated the dog fouling initiative, yet emphasised the need for continuity and consistency to guarantee its ongoing effectiveness. He added that should a prosecution arise, it ought to be publicised to strengthen the initiative's deterrent effect within the Borough. The Member enquired as to several omissions made in the report in respect of where and when these patrols were to be deployed in order to ascertain the initiative's impact.

The Head of Community confirmed that a comprehensive analysis had been conducted into fouling "hotspots" citing an example of a park in Oadby (whereby a patrol had attend between the hours of 7-9 am) and activity reported outside school-areas. Further discussions at the latest Corporate Enforcement Team Meeting also proposed the training of members of the "Clean and Green" Team in addition to Officers on-the-ground. The first patrols were noted in the first instance to be an educative exercise, with any prospective prosecution serving as validation behind the issuing of fixed penalty notices.

A Member presented a dog fouling bin-bag scheme currently implemented by Falkirk District Council, citing a 50% reduction in dog fouling in that district area. She recommended that this Council emulate a similar scheme, whereby bags would be readily distributed to the public a various Council outlets. It was opined that such a scheme could be a potential cost-effective solution. The Head of Community requested that a bag sample be provided for inspection.

A Member raised a concern regarding the deteriorating condition of dog foul bins across the Borough. She suggested that foul should not be disposed of in the ordinary bins. Urban foxes were also said to be problem insofar as they would strew the contents of refuse bins whilst foraging.

A Member supported the initiative and enforcement action and suggested a rota be implemented to systematically patrol the parks in the Borough, citing numerous fouling incidents he had witnessed dog-

walking in Knighton Park. He further raised a concern in respect of the inaction taken to remove graffiti from private property within the Oadby Uplands Ward, rendering the affected areas less attractive and emphasising the anti-social nature of such activity.

The Chair referred to several failing agreements entered into with companies to remove graffiti from privately-owned junction and post boxes, impressing the need for the aforementioned protocol to be made available imminently to address the matter. He confirmed that the FPN for dog fouling was now £100.

A Member stated dog fouling was not limited to parks and school-areas, but implicated neighbouring streets prompting residents to affix “No Fouling” signage to their front-gates, thus requesting patrols to be widely deployed.

The Chair invited Members to direct any information of areas likely to be affected by dog fouling to the Head of Community.

A Member enquired as to whether a grant was available in order to facilitate the bin-bag scheme earlier referred to by another Member. The Head of Community confirmed that revenue streams existed in the Community Safety budget under the remit of dog fouling being tantamount to anti-social behaviour. She reiterated that the issue was a community-wide problem requiring partnership action and pooled resources in order to overcome.

A Member suggested that the issue be brought before, and the scheme potential sourced from, the three Residents’ Forums in the Borough.

A Member stated that if a cost effective bin-bag solution was to be implemented, that the necessary budgetary provisions be put in place.

Community Payback Scheme

The Head of Community reported that the Community Payback Scheme had recently provided for the painting of approximately 30 lamp posts, whereby materials had been supplied by the Council and the labour by payback offenders. The Scheme been had extended into other service-area (e.g. Support Leicestershire Families) with further areas to be explored.

The Chair suggested that works to bus shelters be added to the Scheme.

Heat or Eat

The Head of Community reported that “Heat or Eat” was a Local Welfare Fund which has had success in the Borough in identifying individuals and families requiring heating vouchers and/or food parcels, with a regrettable increase in the latter. The service was described overall as a good and responsive one.

RESOLVED THAT:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report be noted by Members. 2. The targets set for rent arrears be agreed. 	
7.	<p>CHOICE BASED LETTING SYSTEM</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 13 - 14) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She stated that the report was for information only in terms of the district-wide sub-group's progress in securing an IT-based choice-based letting system without a formal recommendation as a decision had yet to be made.</p> <p>The Vice-Chair described the scheme as notable example of a good-working partnership and enquired as to whether it had impacted on re-housing lists and waiting times. The Head of Community advised that, although such a question was a difficult one, the scheme has provided for better transparency to dispel erroneous perceptions surrounding waiting-time: the provision of more affordable housing was said to be the solution to reduce waiting times.</p> <p>A Member stated that a recommendation was effectively made out at para. 4 of the report (at page 13) for the negotiation of a further 12 month contract extension, and proposed a substantive recommendation for the same.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether a provision was in place to enable tenants to substitute and/or exchange properties. The Head of Community advised that such a mechanism was extensively developed last year operating as a separate scheme, with signings to various websites (including a nation-wide platform) and information disseminated to tenants. The Member suggested that periodic updates be circulated to tenants about this mechanism so to accommodate any changes to tenants' requirements and circumstances.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The report be noted by Members. 2. A further 12 month contract extension be negotiated. 	
8.	<p>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY - RIGHT TO MOVE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 15 - 17) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She said the report sought the approval from Members to revise the Housing Allocations Policy as a statutory requirement to reflect the legislative changes as outlined in Appendix 1 (at page 17), adding that the "Right to Move" was another government-originating initiative akin</p>	

to that of the "Right to Buy" initiative.

The Chair advised Members that the report had to be noted, accordingly.

A Member sought clarification as to the following information:

- (i) if 1% of the total lettings and not lettings stock was to be made available under the initiative;
- (ii) if the initiative solely applied to social tenants moving from one district to another, as opposed to from the private-rented sector, and the Housing Associations' involvement; and
- (iii) if those exercising the right automatically displaced existing, resident-Borough applicants on the housing waiting list.

The Head of Community confirmed the above, adding that applicants would be routinely added to the register and their housing needs assessed in accordance with the standard adopted criteria: there would be no extraordinary priority/treatment with the same right being afforded to residents of this Borough to move locality. She stated that an allocation of *up to* 1% of the lettings was to be made available, subject to applicant demand.

The Member raised a concern as to the number of prospective applications given the desirable suburban character of the Borough, questioning whether the Council was obliged to accept all applicants or up to the 1% threshold.

The Head of Community advised the threshold was capped at 1% and that the research suggested the number of applications would be fewer than expected due to the need for applicants to secure/demonstrate long-term employment in Borough, which is accepted to be less competitive in terms of job-creation.

The Chair requested that, in view of the amendment made by Leicester City Council to their Allocation Policy prescribing a minimum two-year residency condition, this Borough's minimum six-month residency condition be reviewed at the next meeting of this Committee with a view to amend the Policy in accordance with that of Leicester City Council.

A Member opined that the initiative was another measure imposed by central government, dictating what can and cannot be done in the Borough: it was said that if the Council enjoyed more autonomy, the likelihood of success would be more favourable. The Member raised a hypothetical concern as to the position an applicant would find himself in should he subsequently become unemployed after securing tenancy. He welcomed the policy review so to eliminate any unfair advantages gained or disadvantages suffered as a result.

A Member raised a question as to the reputational damage to be potentially suffered to the Borough and thus agreed with the foregoing discussions.

A Member denounced the initiative as particularly poor example of

	<p>politics insofar as it did not reflect the reality that individuals seldom move, in effect giving consideration to an irrelevancy which nevertheless must be approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The Housing Allocations Policy be revised to reflect the statutory changes as outlined in Appendix 1.</p>	
9.	<p>HOMELESS DISCHARGE OF DUTY TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at page 18) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She noted that the policy was adopted last year by Members and was pleased to report the same had not been needed to be used to date.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The report be noted by Members.</p>	
10.	<p>HOMELESSNESS TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION FOR FAMILIES</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 19 - 20) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She informed Members of the current arrangements for temporary accommodation following the closure of Graytone House Hostel last December. A report was previously put before Members outlining the previous difficulties in sourcing a short-term lease for an appropriate property in the Borough in view of the market. The Council has continued to look at the proposal with a view to source a long-term lease. Discussions have been had with a registered partner of Council-owner property in the hope that they are agreeable to returning the lease to provide the required temporary accommodation. It was noted that there was some uncertainty as to how long this process would continue but reassured Members that interim provisions were in place.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to what limitations, if any, prohibited residents of Kennedy House claiming homelessness following its imminent closure given residents' purported right to housing having been resident in the Borough for a period of six months. It was also asked what contingency plans were in place should the registered partner not agree to go ahead so to avoid potentially placing residents in already scarcely available Council-house properties.</p> <p>The Head of Community advised that the closure of Kennedy House was to be given separate consideration in an independent report at a later point in the meeting (agenda item 12). She confirmed that the proviso (as amended 18 months ago to address the same Members' concern) for six-month residency in the Borough applied to "stable" residency only, so excluded housing entitlement to hostel-type residents for want of "permanent" residency.</p>	

	RESOLVED THAT: The report be noted by Members.	
11.	<p>DISABLED FACILITY GRANTS (DFG'S)</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 21 - 25) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She stated that the report detailed the commitments for the last three financial up to, and including, this financial year. It was noted that although the Council was in receipt of a grant from Leicestershire County Council to discharge its statutory duty, this grant was successively insufficient each year thus requiring top-up funding to ensure minimal backlogs and maximum service-delivery. A top-up of £78,068 for this financial year (down on previous years) was sought in order to deliver the programme for 2015/16, returning to 2012/13 funding levels with reference to Table 1 (at page 21). Further information was provided to Members on 2016/17 at Appendix 1 (at pages 24-27), subject to the budget integration in terms of various health and social care services.</p> <p>Other areas of work referred to include the Light Bulb Project, an integrated housing-care initiative which shall determine whether DFG's are to be determined by Leicestershire County Council or this Council in the future with further information awaiting. It was confirmed that the Council continue to have a good ongoing working relationship with its local Occupation Health provider.</p> <p>The Chair raised a concern regarding the discrepancy between this Council being legally responsible for discharging its statutory duty in respect of DFG's whilst Leicestershire County Council being in account of the essential budget.</p> <p>A Member stated that if the Light Bulb Project was to become the delivery mechanism for DFG's, an invoice may be raised against this Council for the additional funding. The Member said that the Project would require the appropriate governance and financial controls and needed to be relayed back to Leicestershire County Council in time for budgetary preparations commencing in September. He said the Project lacked clarity thus rendering the matter of budgeting more difficult.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: Members recommend to the Policy, Finance and Development Committee that the additional capital funding of £78,068 be made available.</p>	
12.	<p>CLOSURE OF KENNEDY HOUSE HOSTEL</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 28 - 29) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She reported that most residents from Kennedy House originate from</p>	

	<p>outside of the Borough as it was a pan-district used facility and also accommodated a number of homelessness cases due to a historical policy flaw. Pro-active steps were said to have been taken to mitigate any risk of short-notice housing relief, with Officers having collated a preliminary register of eight cases under the jurisdiction of the Borough who have begun to assess these individuals' support needs. She advised that three cases have been identified as belonging to Blaby District Council who have been advised of the same. She cited a Supreme Court ruling insofar this Council's responsibility to initially house affected residents which may potential entertain a financial implication, however confirmed that reserve funding was available to meet any temporary accommodation costs.</p> <p>The Chair informed Members that Kennedy House had served notice to its residents on 07 July, although this was yet to be confirmed by the House.</p> <p>A Member added that although Kennedy House had informed the neighbouring Day Centre that notice had been served, they did not confirm if they shall be vacating the premises entirely, raising questions as to what the House's prospective purpose/intentions were. He requested that Officers make enquires when next in contact with the House to ascertain any future Council involvement, stating that its closure may not be an overall negative.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The report be noted by Members.</p>	
13.	<p>FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE PLAN</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Head of Community as set out in the report (at pages 30 - 52) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>She noted that the report required approval annually to comply with the Council's statutory duty. The plan had been prepared by the Environmental Health Team Leader, who has since left the Authority. The Head of Community confirmed that Finance had since verified the figures contained in the report as correct.</p> <p>A Member requested that in the future a draft of the Service Plan be brought to this Committee in sufficient time for Member's to have an input.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Food Safety Delivery Plan for 2015/16 be noted and approved by Members. 2. The substitution of new roles of officers within the detailed plan as and when appropriate resources are recruited to the Environmental Health Team be authorised. 	
14.	<p>LEISURE CONTRACT PERFORMANCE MONITORING</p>	

	<p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Director of Services as set out in the report (at page 53) which, together with Appendix 1 circulated at the meeting as it was omitted from the report, should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The report was said to provide an overview of performance for the first contract year, with 426,000 attendances recorded marking a significant increase from previous years. It was reported that gym and group-class memberships had increased by 77% and 66% respectively, totalling 3, 086 new members. The health and safety incident record was noted to be below the leisure industry's average. The Building Programme in respect of Parklands Leisure Centre and Wigston Swimming Pool were confirmed as on target for November 2015.</p> <p>A Member requested that a system of checks be implemented for accurate recording for profit-sharing purposes.</p> <p>A Member stated that profit-sharing in place on certain activities may or may not have been paid due an inadequate profits audit. He enquired as to whether recourse to a process could be made to audit the accounts to ascertain accurate profit records so to request the appropriate amount due.</p> <p>The Director of Services confirmed that there had been close-monitoring of the contract and suitable audits undertaken.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The report be noted by Members.</p>	
15.	<p>BROCKS HILL AND OPERATIONS UPDATE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Director of Services as set out in the report (at pages 56 - 62) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>Brocks Hill</p> <p>The first part of the report was said to provide an update on the activity at Brocks Hill Country Park and Centre as was reflected at the Greening of the Borough Working Group (at pages 56-57).</p> <p>A Member enquired as to the progress made from the interim arrangements for SLM and café delivery to cater events. The Director of Services stated that the procurement was due to begin imminently.</p> <p>Operations</p> <p>The issue concerning bus shelters were raised before Members in considering alternative provisions and shelter designs for the future. She reported that research had been undertaken in respect of a proposal for an advertising company to install and maintain bus shelters in the Borough at minimal or no cost to the Council, in return for advertising rights granted to the company on the shelters installed</p>	

(subject to content approval). Further enquires made confirmed that a Council contribution to the capital cost of the shelter would return a negotiable proportion of the advertising revenues generated and multiple shelter designs were available for Members to consider.

Three options were outlined, namely:

- (i) to continue with the current, bespoke corporate design;
- (ii) to continue with the refurbishment of existing shelters, installing new-design shelters on an *ad-hoc* basis endorsed by Leicestershire County Council; or
- (iii) a combination of the above two options. It was noted that more information was needed before a final decision could be made, particularly in respect of revenue-sharing if Members wish to pursue the advertising company's option.

The Chair stated that although the advertising company had given some indication of sites that may be suitable with further information to be obtained from the company on further sites across the Borough. It was suggested that the standard Borough design be used on such sites due to its proven vandal-proof properties with ongoing maintenance work to be assigned to offenders under the Community Payback Scheme.

A Member agreed that more information was needed regarding *inter alia* longevity, resilience and repairs/maintenance before a final decision was made. He agreed with the Chair's recommendation for the interim period.

A Member also agreed although queried the vandal-proof qualities of any alternative design given the amount of glass incorporated: the report did not specify if the advertising company would meet any of the replacement costs.

A Member stated that adequate seating provision must be provided for in any new design to accommodate the needs of those who were unable to stand for long periods of time (i.e. the elderly). It was also said that any new bus shelters ought to be correctly installed (i.e. inwardly facing the road).

The Chair stated that all new bus shelters were now provided with seating-perches with existing shelters were being retrofitted with seats resourced via the Residents' Forums and confirmed that existing shelters were outwardly installed to prevent commuters from being "splashed" by passing traffic.

The Chair requested that a report be brought to the next meeting of this Committee detailing further information regarding the areas upon which the advertising company's wished to operate, the revenue-sharing options and repairs/maintenance, defining who would bear the cost implications thereof.

The Director of Services reported that requests for wheeled bins for garden waste were continuing to be received. The new vehicles were

said to be easing the method of refuse collection and had been positively received in conjunction with the opting-in scheme. Notwithstanding this, it was noted that there were several outstanding issues surrounding dual-collections of bins and bags for garden waste predominately in relation to Health and Safety. The recycling participation rate for across the Borough was cited at 70% with 50% of materials collected being of a recyclable quality. It was reported that the closure of the pre-dominant paper mill had impacted on the paper-recycling industry. It was said that the Council has since contracted with a new provider still giving a favourable rate.

The Director of Services stated that the report outlined the cycles undertaken in terms of street cleansing and grounds maintenance in the Borough.

A Member enquired as to what arrangements were in place for the cutting of grass verges and weed-control in gutters in the Borough having received complaints from residents.

The Chair advised that it was this Council's decision not to return grass verge maintenance back in-house subsequent to out-sourcing the contract to Leicestershire County Council. It was confirmed that Blaby District Council currently maintains grass verges on the Council's behalf. It was reported that the weed-spraying contract commenced late this year and spraying was now completed in Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston. Two spraying sessions were said to take place a year.

A Member stated that members of the public could no longer access the canal around the Ervins Lock footbridge, impacting on the amenity of leisure facilities, and enquired as to the progress made on the building of the bridge.

The Director of Services stated that a meeting request with the Canal and Rivers Trust made subsequent to the closure was yet to be agreed to by the Trust to discuss particulars and secure approval. The Regeneration Team and Facilities Manager were working in partnership to progress this matter.

The Member raised a concern in respect of the outstanding health and safety issues around the continued bag opt-in and enquired as to what course of action the Council was pursuing to eliminate the same and if extra resources were to be invested to expedite the dual-collection system. Further clarification as to the recycling participation rates/figures was also sought.

The Director of Services advised that the health and safety issues would continue as long as the opt-in remained (as confirmed by the Health and Safety Officer) with no mitigation possible other than to continue to promote the advantages/availability of wheeled bins for garden waste. The recycling participation rate was clarified as the percentage of residents in the Borough who engaged with the scheme. The recycling rate was clarified as the percentage of all materials collected being of a recyclable quality. It was noted that the Council remained the third top-performing authority in the country in terms of

	<p>weight per resident deposited in landfill.</p> <p>A Member requested that further evidence be provided to support the health and safety concerns. He stated that a proper conclusion could not be made unless the evidence first suggested that the appropriate training was implemented and that best-practice was being monitored during collections.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether the services provided by Blaby District Council extended to the Oadby area and requested that litter-picking be continued along the A6 central reservation, with a suggestion of litter patrols. The Chair confirmed that the services did extend to Oadby, however a separate arrangement existed in respect of the A6 as an arterial route. It was advised that any concerns regarding litter should be reported to Operations and The Depot.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether wheeled bins were to be provided for general waste. The Chair confirmed this was not the Council's intention.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The report be noted by Members.</p>	
<p>16.</p>	<p>PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT - 2014/15</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Principal Accountant as set out in the report (at pages 63 – 72 but excluding page 68 having been included in error) which should to be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>He advised that an under-spend in the general fund was reported in Committee expenditure owing to accounting regulations in terms of how revenue grants appropriated to the reserves for service-specific purposes are to be publish in the final accounts so to provide a more comparative analysis. The grants were said to be appropriated as they were due to be spent next year.</p> <p>A number of medium-sized under-spends across the budget were all identified (at page 66), most notably in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Community Development due to salary compression and the movement of the senior systems budget to another area; (ii) Brooks Hill due to a significant increase in income of 27% since 2014/15 with parts of the expenditure transferred to the Capital Programme so to discharge some s. 106 monies; (iii) Day Centres due to the non-payment of a group's management fee at Bassett Street; (iv) Transport of approximately £20,000 due to fewer vehicle repairs, re-shaping of purchases and lower fuel costs in the last 12 months; and (v) Refuse and Recycling. <p>A fall of approximately £100,000 in recycling disposal income was reported as a result of adverse market forces and the economy. The take-up of green wheeled bins for garden waste has seen a reduction of</p>	

	<p>£28,000 in spending on bags in addition to new income streams of £8,000 through the purchase of extra bins, with the savings materialising earlier than expected and/or budgeted for.</p> <p>A Member enquired as what the variance of £7,000 under the Grand Union Canal Footbridge Scheme related to (at page 71) and sought assurances that the £48,000 under the same scheme (at page 74) still remained in the budget and was not subject to time-limits. The Principal Accountant advised that it was agreed at a meeting of the Policy, Finance and Development Committee in February 2015 that some of Capital Programme Budget was to be carried over into 2015/16, inclusive of the £48,000. The variance was a result of intended initial works on the scheme which did not take place and the £7,000 was to be carried forward into next year (subject to approval). The availability of s. 106 funds was said to be monitored to ensure they were spent in time.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether the £67,000 apportioned to reserves would be returned. The Principal Accountant confirmed this would be the case, with some attributable to the under-spend on Sports Services Commissioning.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to reduction in the fees of the bowling clubs. The Principal Accountant confirmed that the income budget had been reduced by approximately £1,000 so that teams were able to play without paying a fee. He stated that the variance was too insignificant for it to be featured in the report.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether any of the allocated funds under the Play Area Refurbishment Scheme were to be invested in Ellis Park in Oadby. The Principal Accountant advised that definite answer would be sought from colleagues and the relayed to the Member in due course.</p> <p>A Member stated that the effective under-spend of one million pounds on the Housing Revenue Account ought to be categorised as a capital, as opposed to a revenue, spend. The Principal Accountant advised that this was due to the rescheduling of capital works across the years which, since the introduction of the new finance regime for Housing, had allowed for a substantial revenue contribution to the Capital Programme to be budgeted. He noted that the contribution increased the general housing revenue account reserve, however it was intended that this would be spent at the appropriate time nonetheless.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reported outturn be noted by Members. 2. The requested revenue and capital carry forwards as set out in Appendix 5 be noted by Members. 	
17.	<p>COMMITTEE BUDGET REVIEW - APRIL TO MAY 2015</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report and appendices delivered by the Principal Accountant as set out in the report (at pages 73 – 74) which should to be read together with these minutes as a</p>	

<p>composite document.</p> <p>He stated that discussions with Officers were due to be held to seriously consider expenditure over the next 12 months, budgets for the following year and identify any issues in capacity going forward given the overspends across numerous cost centres. It was also noted that income at Brooks Hill had fallen in the same quarter of last year due to a loss of a community-group booking.</p> <p>A Member enquired as to whether it was possible to secure funding for festive lights via the Residents' Forums as opposed to extending a revenue. The Principal Accountant stated that a request for this had been received from the Residents' Forums and more requests were to be expected. Alternative funding provisions were currently being investigated in respect of the matter.</p> <p>A Member stated that the core-funding for festive lights was contained in the main budget, with additional lights having been purchased by the Residents' Forums. He further questioned the consistency of this report to the preceding one in terms of an under-spend which ought to be reflect in next year's budget. The Principal Accountant advised that it was too early in the year to forecast expenditure levels. He noted that there had been under-spends which were budgeted for so reductions were not immediately forthcoming.</p> <p>RESOLVED THAT: The current positions be noted by Members.</p>	
--	--

The Meeting Closed at 9:13 PM

Agenda Item 9j

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OADBY RESIDENTS FORUM HELD AT BAPTIST CHURCH HALL, LEICESTER ROAD, OADBY ON WEDNESDAY 8 JULY 2015, COMMENCING AT 6.30 PM.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor D Carter–Chair

Councillors: S.Haq, J Kaufman, B.Dave, A Bond, B Fahey,

Residents in attendance: P Bliss, S Dickinson, T Fahey, L Kaufman, A Yilmuz, M Whearuty, K Rimi, G Harris, A Harris, J Bryan, G Orwin, M Orwin, M J Bates, P Sale, D Wheeler, L Harrison, H Smith, R G Wright, S Bolton, K Hambleton, K Turner, R Turner, G S Williams, T Chowdhury

Others in Attendance: PC M Fenwick, PC S.Henderson, V Quintyne (OWBC), S Gutteridge (Oadby Traders), G Lamb (Pride of the Borough)

Apologies:

J Pelmore, Councillor D Gamble, Councillor L Darr (Mayor), Councillor G.Atwal, Councillor R Thakor, Councillor T Khong, J Vickerstaff ,H Vickerstaff, C Bott

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Responsible																		
23.	<p><u>LOCAL POLICE ISSUES</u></p> <p>Prior to the Police providing a verbal update crime report the Chair reminded residents that, the Resident Forums were established to give residents a voice to air borough issues which matter to them. The Forum meeting hosts an open surgery period from 6pm to 6.30pm for residents to raise individual concerns one to one with Councillors, the Police and other officers.</p> <p>PC M Fenwick provided an update on crime figures for the period since the Forum last met. This is summarised below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="268 1406 1117 1608"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Current</th> <th>Previous</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Burglary Dwelling</td> <td>22</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BOTD</td> <td>03</td> <td>03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td> <td>16</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robbery</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criminal Damage</td> <td>13</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Burglaries are down by 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Criminal damage figures were reduced. 2. Thefts from motor vehicles have increased, particularly from BMWs, Mercedes, and tool thefts from vans. 3. There were 25 incidents of burglaries. This is a priority area for the Police. 4. Operations are in place to combat criminal damage. 5. There were 54 incidents of anti-social behaviour emanating from the centre of Oadby. <p>A system called Columbus is being used to map crime data in the locality. Columbus helps the Police to plan strategies and solutions.</p>		Current	Previous	Burglary Dwelling	22	26	BOTD	03	03	Theft from Motor Vehicle	16	15	Robbery	0	0	Criminal Damage	13	15	
	Current	Previous																		
Burglary Dwelling	22	26																		
BOTD	03	03																		
Theft from Motor Vehicle	16	15																		
Robbery	0	0																		
Criminal Damage	13	15																		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of police volunteers for the Community Speed Watch schemes is ongoing. • There are still issues around parking and speeding around schools. for example Launde Primary School and Manor High School. <p>There is concern about the increased use of nitrous oxide (laughing gas) in the borough. Use causes hallucinations, disorientation, fainting and risk of death. The Police are aware of gas canisters on the industrial estate.</p> <p>Residents were requested to inform the Police if they come across wrappers left around which indicate the use of “legal highs”.</p> <p>Reporting can be done by residents accessing the Police website, clicking the bottom banner icon to access the Beat Team. Contact can also be made via Twitter and Facebook. Residents can also join in discussion via a monthly Police chat room session. There is also access to a police newsletter and a form for residents to provide information about illegal activity happening in their area. Ring 101 to report an incident to the Oadby Beat Team. The Police are also hosting surgeries in the borough Information posters are to be placed on the Borough Council noticeboard.</p> <p>A resident reported accidents around the Manor Road Extension and Copse Close areas.</p> <p>As a priority signage is being created to address residential car parking on the Grange estate.</p> <p>Action is being taken on irresponsible parking on pavements.</p> <p>In concluding the presentation the Chair thanked the Police for the update.</p>	
24	<p><u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW FOR ENGLAND</u></p> <p>The Community Engagement Officer explained that the County Council had approached the Boundary Commission to look at recommending a new pattern of wards across the County so each Councillor would be providing support to an average of 9,984 electoral voters.</p> <p>The Boundary Commission was seeking feedback and comment from electoral registered voters on whether they agreed with recommendations to change Oadby and Wigston electoral ward divisions. This is in order to: provide what it termed “electoral equality”, reflecting the interests and identities of communities and promote effective and convenient local government.</p> <p>It was outlined that the proposed recommendations to address County Councillor representation of electoral voter numbers at County Council level required residents` feedback and comments. Feedback and comments were being requested from all three Resident Forums to inform the proposed Boundary Commission recommendations. Residents were also informed they could make their own submission on the Boundary Commission recommendations, on line using the following web site link.</p>	

	<p>http://www.leics.gov.uk/oadbyandwigston_electoral_review_proposals.pdf</p> <p>Residents were informed their comments would be gathered together and used to provide a Borough wide response to the Boundary Commission recommendations. The deadline for submission of comments to the Boundary Commission is 21st July 2015.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Community Engagement Officer would circulate a copy of the Oadby and Wigston Council submission response based on the recommendations made by attendees to all three Resident Forums.</p>	Veronika Quintyne
25	<p><u>FRIENDS OF BROCKS HILL – CONSERVATION VOLUNTEERS PROPOSAL (Presentation)</u></p> <p>Mike Bates on behalf of the Friends of Brock`s Hill Group gave a presentation on a proposal to increase the number of Conservation Volunteers across the whole borough over the next two years. The outcomes would be to increase further community engagement with a focus on biodiversity sites across the Borough, up skill volunteers including health and safety legislation establish ongoing volunteer groups, work towards recruiting a Project Officer for Volunteer development who would help run training courses and make the Borough a better place to live ,learn and work.</p> <p>The Project is focussed on the whole of the Borough.Voluntary Action Leicester is willing to help set up “friends” groups to support the project. The established “friends groups” would make their own applications for funding. There is also a funding box at Brocks Hill to raise funds.</p> <p>A resident questioned whether Grange Country Park now belonged to the Council. The Chair clarified that the Park was not yet officially Council owned. This is being progressed.</p> <p>Residents awarded £2,000 to the Brocks Hill project. This award is to be actioned with Finance once approved by council`s PFD committee.</p>	Veronika Quintyne
26	<p><u>OADBY TRADERS UPDATE</u></p> <p>It was reported that matching benches are being placed in Oadby Parade. On Sunday 16th August the Oadby Parade is to be closed for a classic and sports car show organised by Oadby Town Centre Association.</p> <p>The festive lights switch-on is planned for November 7th 2015.The switch-on is to coincide with Divali. Input is to come from members of the Hindu and Muslim communities, a male voice choir and Billy Bragg`s funfair More details will be brought to the next Resident Forum meeting.</p> <p>The Chair brought to the Forum`s attention a request by a resident about making shops more accessible to people with a disability.</p> <p>The Traders Group noted they are working to address how shops can be made more customer accessible using ramps for people with a disability.</p> <p>The Farmer`s Market has been moved to prevent traffic bottlenecks. A request was made to get feedback from the community about the good and not so good points of the Farmer`s Market in order to improve its use. The Market is held on the fourth Friday of the month.</p>	
27	<p><u>PRIDE OF THE BOROUGH</u></p> <p>The Pride of the Borough is coordinating entry to East Midlands In Bloom. The judges are arriving tomorrow , 9am till 1pm to carry out the judging in Oadby.</p>	

<p>28</p>	<p><u>CHAIRMAN`S UPDATES INCLUDING,CAPITAL PROJECTS UPDATES</u> <u>REQUESTS FOR SPENDING AND UPDATE ON THE FORUM BUDGET</u></p> <p><u>Customer Services transformation</u> Customer Services transformation has concluded The opening times are to be circulated to Resident Forum members. Councillor Gamble is to bring an update on Customer Services Transformation.</p> <p><u>Speed Activated Road Signs</u> An investment has been made in Speed Activated Road Signs in Wigston and South Wigston They are used as a means of reducing speeding. Residents requested information on how effective these are in the reduction of speeding. A Slow-Slow sign on Copse Close links with the mobile sign.</p> <p><u>Cottage Farm site Development</u> Developers appealed and were successful in their application to develop the Cottage Farm site. The Council was unsuccessful in its application for a judicial review relating to the development of the Cottage Farm site. The Council is seeking further legal advice .</p> <p><u>Ellis Park Fountain</u> The Chair clarified the cost of repairing and bringing the Ellis Park fountain back into use, including treatments to prevent listeria formation. The cost of full repair inclusive of enabling water consumption would incur future unsustainable ongoing costs. Following a Resident Forum vote inclusive of one abstention, It was agreed to keep it in a decent aesthetically pleasing state of repair, plus clean and refurbish the notice board next to it to complement the fountain.</p> <p><u>Parklands Leisure Centre</u> Removal of two stones from Sandhurst Street School, weighing some 50 pounds and 50 centimetres square was discussed. It was proposed that these stones be relocated to Ellis Park, depending on future development. It was agreed to bring this back to a future Forum meeting for discussion.</p> <p><u>Burton`s Corner Seats</u> Three seats have been funded. Orders for the seats have been placed by the Council. Brookside Construction is to install the seats complete with plaques. A litter bin is to be added which echoes the style of the seats and placed on the Parade. Paving is to be weeded. The Council Depot was contacted about the spraying of the weed killer. On behalf of the Forum the Chair thanked Peter Bliss from Oadby Civic Society for his work on this development.</p> <p><u>Uplands Road Bin</u> The Forum supported the installation of a bin on Uplands Road. It was noted that if a recycled one could be used then this would save the Council £450.</p> <p><u>Bus Shelter on Howden Road</u> Residents were informed a bus shelter on Howden Road would cost about £3,200. The Services Committee discussed this last night, along with a proposal that some bus shelters on the main traffic routes carry advertisements.</p> <p>A resident queried by what criteria the purchase of a bus shelter was justified For example is this based on how many people would use it or the feelings of residents</p>	<p>Veronika Quintyne Councillor Gamble</p> <p>Veronika Quintyne</p>
-----------	--	---

	<p>in its proposed vicinity, as the bus shelter would be located almost outside of Brocks Hill Primary School. Planning considerations were needed. Upkeep would be absorbed by the Council. Cleaning and painting at a cost of £550 would be incurred, however there was no revenue impact on the Forum. It was agreed that more information for justifying supplying the shelter was needed.</p>	<p>Veronika Quintyne</p>
<p>29</p>	<p><u>ITEMS RAISED BY RESIDENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE FUNDING OF ITEMS</u></p> <p>Councillor Carter is to be notified of any requests for future funding of projects. The grey post boxes which are currently still in place will be removed by March 2016.</p> <p>It was suggested the bin near the park bench outside of ASDA be moved further down the A6 as there is a litter problem there. The ward Councillor is to be requested to look into this.</p> <p>Residents identified that there are bushes overhanging the A6. Councillor Gamble is to liaise with Highways to address them being cut back.</p> <p>The date of the next Resident Forum meeting is: Wednesday September 2nd 2015 at 6.30pm.</p> <p>Residents were reminded that should they wish to discuss issues that affect them before the full meeting begins at 6.30pm, there is a surgery session with the Police, Councillors and Council Officers between 6pm and 6.30pm.</p>	<p>Councillor Bond</p> <p>Councillor Gamble</p>

Meeting closed at 20:00

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SOUTH WIGSTON RESIDENTS FORUM HELD AT BASSETT STREET COMMUNITY HUB, BASSETT STREET, SOUTH WIGSTON ON WEDNESDAY 9 JULY 2015, COMMENCING AT 7.30 P.M.

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u></p> <p>Councillor J Boyce – Chair</p> <p>Councillors G Boulter , R E R Morris</p> <p>Residents in attendance: W Simmons, C Walter, T. Sumpter, P.James, R.Carter, J.Guesford; P.Bates, M. Bates, P.Tebbutt; D.Tebbutt,</p> <p>Others in Attendance: V Quintyne (OWBC).D Cliffe(Voluntary Action Leicester), PC C Sutherley (Police Officer), F Middleton(Family Foodies Project)</p> <p>Apologies: Councillor S Morris , J.Cooke (The Conservation Volunteers); A.Kind</p>

Min Ref	Narrative	Officer Responsible															
20.	<p><u>LOCAL POLICING ISSUES</u></p> <p>Police Officer Sutherley provided an update on crime prevention for the period since the Forum last met. This is summarised below:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">LAST 3 MONTHS</p> <p>PREVIOUS 3 MONTHS</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">BURGLARY DWELLING</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BURGLARY OTHER THAN DWELLING</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ROBBERY</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </table> <p>Beat officers are now deployed to create community links with all residents , shops schools ,families and the public generally to address local crime prevention issues and build sustained community cohesion. This work has seen a visible fall in anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Speeding in the Fairfield area is being addressed. The Police is also addressing setting up a community speed watch scheme in the Borough. Funding is being negotiated for this. Special constables and volunteers would be used on this scheme.</p> <p>Some residents expressed concern that the 101 Police phone line seemed out of operation on Monday and Tuesday last week. The Police agreed to check to ensure it was working correctly and inform Councillor Boyce of this.</p> <p>Residents expressed concern about cyclists going through red lights on the</p>	BURGLARY DWELLING	5	5	BURGLARY OTHER THAN DWELLING	13	18	THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE	2	5	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	5	8	ROBBERY	0	0	PC Sutherley
BURGLARY DWELLING	5	5															
BURGLARY OTHER THAN DWELLING	13	18															
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE	2	5															
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	5	8															
ROBBERY	0	0															

	<p>Blaby Road and Landsdown Grove area between the South Leicestershire College and the lights going towards Tesco Superstore. The Police informed the Forum that stats on accidents around this junction can be obtained from County Council. Councillor Boulter added that he would look at the issue of the stats to see if there was anything of significance. If not significant then this would be left as an item of information.</p> <p>On concluding the Update the Chair thanked the Police</p>	<p>Councillor Boulter</p>
<p>21</p>	<p><u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW FOR ENGLAND</u></p> <p>The Community Engagement Officer explained that the County Council had approached the English Boundary Commission to look at recommending a new pattern of electoral voting wards across the County so no Councillor would be providing support to more than nine thousand electoral voters.</p> <p>The Boundary Commission sought feedback and comment from electorally registered voters on whether they agreed with recommendations to change Oadby and Wigston electoral ward divisions. This is in order to ,provide what it termed “electoral equality”, reflecting the interests and identities of communities and promoting effective and convenient local government. Ultimately no County Councillor would represent on average no more than 9,000 elected voters .This is deemed a more manageable number than say 14,000.</p> <p>Feedback and comments were being requested from all three Resident Forums to inform the proposed Boundary Commission Recommendations.</p> <p>Residents were also informed they could make their own submission on the Boundary Commission Recommendations, on line using the following web site link.</p> <p>http://www.leics.gov.uk/oadbyandwigston_electoral_review_proposals.pdf</p> <p>Residents were also informed their comments would be gathered together and used to provide a Borough wide response to the Boundary Commission Recommendations. The deadline for submission of comments to the Boundary Commission is 21st July 2015.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Community Engagement Officer is to a copy of the Oadby and Wigston Council submission based on the recommendations made by the Resident Forum attendees to all three Resident Forums.</p> <p>On concluding her presentation the Chair thanked the Community Engagement Officer for the presentation.</p>	<p>Veronika Quintyne</p>
<p>22.</p>	<p><u>FRIENDS OF BROCKS HILL-CONSERVATION VOLUNTEERS PROPOSAL(Presentation)</u></p> <p>Mike Bates on behalf of the Friends of Brock`s Hill Group gave a presentation on a proposal to increase the number of Super Conservation Volunteers across the whole borough over the next two years. Copies of this written proposal was circulated at the meeting and was also circulated electronically.</p> <p>The outcome of the proposal would be to increase further community engagement, focus on biodiversity sites across the Borough, up skill volunteers , further establish ongoing volunteer groups, incorporate health</p>	

	<p>and safety legislation, work towards recruiting a Project Officer for Volunteer development, run training courses and make the Borough a better place to live ,learn and work.</p> <p>The Canal and River Trust Volunteers is engaged in this community development work and Voluntary Action Leicester is willing to set up a “friends” group to support the project. The established “friends groups” would make their own applications for funding. There is also a funding box at Brocks Hill to raise funds. The Project is focussed on the whole of the Borough.</p> <p>On concluding the proposal the Chair thanked Mike Bates for the presentation, requested residents to state whether they were in agreement to award the £2,000 of funding requested. One resident voted against the proposal and the others agreed to defer the proposal to the next meeting of the Forum for further debate.</p>	
23	<p><u>COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING PRESENTATION & VOLUNTARY ACTION LEICESTER PARTNERSHIP WORKING.</u></p> <p>Dave Cliffe gave a brief update on the joint work between Voluntary Action Leicester and the Conservation Volunteer Project, led by Jessie Cooke. These two agencies are working together to see how best to use their funds to support voluntary and Community action in the South Wigston area.</p> <p>A support/advisory networking group, South Wigston Community Action Group has been set up. A range of projects including community managed libraries and volunteer led projects have started to run.</p> <p>An asset based community tool is being used to help set up the focus of the projects and measure what difference they will make. People can work informally or through constituted groups.</p> <p>A community newsletter is in the process of development. The community work is seeking to build on what is being developed in South Wigston and act complimentary to this.</p> <p>On concluding his presentation, the Chair thanked Dave Cliffe.</p>	
24	<p><u>SOUTH WIGSTON TRADERS UPDATES</u></p> <p>A question was raised as to why South Wigston Traders seemed not to be signing up to Pride of the Borough Scheme. It was stated that sign up in this economic climate was not yet viewed as viable until Traders could see the benefit of it.</p>	
25	<p><u>PRIDE OF THE BOROUGH</u></p> <p>The Pride of the Borough is going for the gold award again. It was noted that the Blaby Road flagpole has been received and will be going up shortly. The mobile awareness sign has arrived. Three locations have been chosen for its use; lamppost number 29 on Saffron Road, 13 and 14 on Dorset near the football ground</p>	
26	<p><u>CHAIRMAN’S UPDATES INCLUDING CAPITAL PROJECTS UPDATE,REQUESTS FOR SPENDING AND UPDATE ON FORUM BUDGET</u></p> <p>A paper copy of the Resident Forum Budget Update Report was circulated</p>	

	at the meeting and electronically to those who supplied an email address.	
27	<p><u>ITEMS RAISED BY RESIDENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE ITEMS</u></p> <p><u>THE FAMILY FOODIES PROJECT</u></p> <p>The Family Foodies Project put forward a proposal requesting £2000. The proposal is to help promote the new Family Foodies extension project at Parklands School, in South Wigston.</p> <p>The Family Foodies currently cook and provide healthy meals for families on a low income at All Saints Primary School. The funding will help to pay for the launch of publicising the extension of the Project's work with Parklands School and also help buy some initial supplies of food. Teachers are coming on board as volunteers. Family Foodies is a constituted group. It approaches other charitable givers to obtain funding.</p> <p>The Chair suggested Family Foodies connects with the Conservation Volunteer Project and Enviromental Health. Environmental Health is aware of the remit of Family Foodies Project which is health compliant. Following the proposal Family Foodies was awarded £2,000.by the Forum. VQ was requested to forward notification of this award to Finance and send the Family Foodies Project the necessary forms for accessing the award.</p> <p>The date of the next Forum meeting is: September 9th 2015. 7pm till 9pm.</p> <p>Residents were to be reminded that should they wish to discuss issues that affect them before the full meeting begins, there is a confidential one to one surgery session with the Police, Councillors and Council Officers between 7.00pm and 7.30pm.</p>	Veronika Quintyne

Meeting closed at 20:55

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE POLICY, FINANCE & DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON TUESDAY 21 JULY
2015 COMMENCING AT 7:00 PM**

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u></p> <p>Chair - Mrs S B Morris Vice Chair - D A Gamble</p> <p>Councillors: G S Atwal; L A Bentley; G A Boulter; J W Boyce; B Dave; B Fahey; J Kaufman; and K J Loydall</p> <p>Officers in Attendance: Mrs C Court; P Loveday; Ms A Pathak-Mould; A Thorpe; Miss G Ghuman; and S Ball</p>

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence received from Councillors Latif Darr Richard Morris and Ted Barr</p>	
2.	<p>APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTES</p> <p>Councillor Dr Teck Khong was appointed as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Ted Barr.</p>	
3.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>None.</p>	
4.	<p>PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS</p> <p>None.</p>	
5.	<p>ACTION LIST</p> <p>A verbal update was provided by the Director of Services with regards to the adoption of open spaces within the Oadby Woodlands Ward. She advised Members that there was a report that was presented to committee in July 2014 whereby four areas of open spaces had been identified as land which the Council was maintaining but did not own.</p> <p>Members were reminded that the recommendation put forward was that the Council would partake in discussions with land owners, with a view to the council adopting the said land subject to a commuted sum. In March 2015 a report was submitted to Senior Management team for the Policy, Finance and Development Committee (hereinafter PFD) to advise Members that discussions had been taking place with the landowners as to whether they would transfer the land. She explained that whilst they were willing to transfer the land, they were not prepared</p>	

	<p>to pay a commuted sum. Therefore, she advised Members that Senior Management Team felt that it would be best to defer the same; there was conflicting information as to whether the Council had been maintaining the same or not. She stated that the Clean and Green team had categorically stated that they had not been maintaining the trees. Further clarification was sought as different departments were saying different things. The clarification was not sought in time for the March PFD Committee. Notification was received from the developers that as they had not heard from the council they would auction the sites off.</p> <p>She advised that it had recently come to light that one of the sights has a play area and upon speaking with the solicitors acting on behalf of the landowners, it has been agreed that the play area would not be auctioned off but gifted to the Council. She confirmed that all of the remaining open spaces were auctioned on 16 July.</p> <p>A Member thanked the Officers who dealt with this and welcomed the update but considered it unfortunate that this play area reached a stage whereby it would be auctioned. He appreciated the verbal update but said that it should have been a report as stated within the minutes of the previous meeting, and insisted that it should come to the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the report would be presented at a committee meeting but could not guarantee when this will be done.</p> <p>A Member queried whether the fact that the other 3 areas that were wooded and have been sold off contradicts the Council's Greening of the Borough Strategy. He was advised that there are policies in place that protect such open spaces.</p> <p>A Member also stated that the information relating to Building Control was not received by and should be acted upon as soon as possible.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members noted the Action List.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT 2014/15 AND 2015/16</p> <p>The Audit Manager advised that this report summarises the work conducted from 1st April 2015 to early July 2015.</p> <p>He stated that a lot of the work in this period is work that was deferred from previous financial year with the majority having significant assurance with one moderate, whereby assurance has been received that work has been done.</p> <p>He explained Section 4 of the report contained the Recommendation Tracking, informing Members that these were due to be implemented by the end of June. He said that there are a total of 50 recommendations and that between end of March and June 34 had been added. He advised that details are given of outstanding recommendations and that these were not necessarily subject to their audit unless management specifically requested the same.</p> <p>A Member asked whether a Health and Safety Officer had been</p>	

	<p>recruited to which the Director of Services replied that a Health and Safety Officer is in post and has started work with high risk areas, assuring Members that progress is being made.</p> <p>The Member asked whether the relevant individual from Zurich had started (As at page 25), to which the Finance Manager replied that work has started and explained that this work had been delayed by operational issues.</p> <p>The Member further asked whether we had a Communications Officer (as at page 27) and the Director of Services advised Members that the Council was working with a company that does letterbox and Cuttlefish too. She stated that an arrangement will be reviewed in September to see whether a Full Time Communications Officer is needed.</p> <p>A Member raised a query in relation to the Recovery Plan mentioned on page 26. He reiterated the importance that all information that the Council has is protected and asked whether what was in place currently was adequate. The Chair stated this is a live document and that she will obtain a personal guarantee that all is ok.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members note the content of the progress report for 2014/15 and 2015/16</p>	
7.	<p>INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Audit Manager as set out in report pages 32-46, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager explained that this is the Internal audit annual report highlighting key outcomes of internal Audit reports during 2014-2015. He advised that the findings from this form the annual governance statement which is later in the agenda.</p> <p>The Chair advised all new Members that despite the fact it states it is an internal audit report this work has been contracted out to an external company to ensure its transparent.</p> <p>The Audit Manager outlined the purpose of the report and advised that the overall opinion was that significant assurance can be given and that there is a generally sound system of internal control, designed to meet the organisations objectives. However, he stated that there were some significant internal control issues (As at page 40) that may need to be included within the annual governance statement. Notwithstanding this he advised that since the production of this report there have been discussions with Senior Management team who have stated that they will see how the issues can be resolved. He stated that subject to adequate and effective action being taken, these would not need to be published within the annual governance statement.</p> <p>The Chair advised Members that significant assurance is good and despite more assurance being needed on certain areas these should</p>	

	<p>hopefully be resolved in time for the annual governance statement.</p> <p>A Member stated that these were pertinent finance reports and questioned why the reports author (the Council's Section 151 Officer) was not present at the meeting. The Chair advised that the Section 151 Officer as not due in the office today and stated that the Finance Manager was capable of addressing the issues present.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members noted the report.</p>	
8.	<p>PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT 2014/15</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 47-53, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager outlined the report stating that the provisional outturn position for 2014/15 is £1.953m, which represents a £463,000 underspend for the financial year as compared with the revised estimate. He explained that two of the major variances were as follows; in terms of staff costs he stated there was saving of 75k taking into consideration an overspend on hired staff and revised staff costs too at time of budget. The other variances he advised was the overpayment of housing benefits due to better information from the Department of Work and Pensions, as detailed within the reports. He advised the general trend of the variances that have materialised have been even. With regards to the Capital outturn £306,000 he stated represents an underspend of £413,000.</p> <p>A Member expressed concern regarding Appendix 3 and the note concerning the Customer services centre and that it had completed earlier than expected as it does not appear to be completed. The Finance Manager stated that there is a technicality with the scheme being carried over into 2015/16.</p> <p>A Member questioned the revised budget for 2014/15 stating that there was an overspend of £15,000. He was advised that despite that overspend showing in 2014/15 that there would not ultimately be an overspend as the scheme is carried over into 2015/16.</p> <p>The Member raised concern over the hired staff budget contained within the report on page 48. He asked whether the figure of £258,000 includes consultants, if this is not the case then he stated that Members need to be made aware of the separate costs for consultants.</p> <p>The Chair advised that every time a Consultant is employed it has been through Committee. The Director of Services stated there are a variety of reasons for agency staff, partially due to current market trends. She assured Members that it is something HR is working on.</p> <p>The Member stated that elected Members should see separate figures so that it can be monitored. The Chair said she will have discussions with the relevant parties.</p>	

	<p>RESOLVED: That Members note the outturn positions for 2014/15.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>OVERALL PROVISIONAL BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT 2014/15</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 54-63, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager outlined the report stating that it relates to the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).</p> <p>With regards to the General Fund he advised that there is an overall reduction in outturn next expenditure against the revised budgets for 2014/2015 of £203,206. He also noted that income from business rates is better than expected.</p> <p>He explained that the Section 31 grant for small business relief has helped with the NNDR business rates income. With regards to the HRA he advised the outturn position is £827,000 in surplus.</p> <p>A Member questioned the figures with regards to the General Fund (primarily point 2 on page 55) and the Finance Manager advised that salaries were revised and that on top of that there were more savings made. However for completeness and clarity he advised he will send an email to all Members explaining the same.</p> <p>A Member stated that it should be reported to Members when there is both an overspend and an underspend with the reasons why so that there is transparency. He made particular reference to page 60 and the HPDG Reserve budget against the revised estimate and the outturn and asked why there were such big changes. He noted the same issue with Management of Change stating the trend is not good and that Officers must advise as to why such variations exist. He voiced that under spending is just as bad as overspending.</p> <p>The Finance Manager advised there are many reasons and some concern the level of activity within the authority and advised that he will discuss with him after the meeting.</p> <p>The Member also questioned the delays in relation to the Capital programme asking whether there are sufficient resources so as to ensure that it will happen within the next financial year. He asked for the reasoning behind the backlogs and if there are issues present what solutions there are. The Chair advised all Members will get a written response via email.</p> <p>A Member noted that on Page 60, the Grants Reserve illustrated a £10,000 under spend and the Finance Manager advised he would revert back to him via email with a response.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council stated that the budget set, the monitoring or outturn was wrong. He suggested that a branch review of the budget, monitoring and the outturn needs to be conducted as one of the process (budget, monitoring or outturn) is not sufficiently robust. The</p>	

	<p>Chair noted his comments.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members</p> <p>(1) Note the report and overall provisional outturn provisions for both the General Fund (as at Appendix 1 of the report) and the Housing Revenue Account 2014-15 (Appendix 2)</p> <p>(2) Approve the requested revenue and capital carry forwards for both the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (Appendix 3)</p> <p>(3) Approve the transfer of £400,000 from the General fund Reserve to the Budget Equilibrium Reserve as at 31 March 2015.</p> <p>(4) Approve the transfer of £200,000 from the General Fund Reserve to the Management of Change Reserve as at 31 March 2015.</p> <p>Councillor Fahey voted against and Councillors Khong and Atwal abstained from voting.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>COMMITTEE BUDGET REVIEW APRIL TO MAY 2015</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 64-65, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager advised that this review is for the first 2 months of the financial year only. He advised there has been no movement and includes the Capital spend. The Leader of the Council stated variances are unlikely at this stage.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members note the current positions.</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p>DRAFT ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2014/15</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 66-87, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager outlined the report and asked for Members to approve the same and refer to the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive for certification. He noted that the statement currently includes the areas for improvement however reiterated that should these be resolved by September's Council meeting these can be removed from the Annual Governance Statement.</p> <p>A Member noted the 8 bullet points on page 68 and stated there were so many variations, it is difficult to identify in either an individual or collective way. The Finance Manager advised that this is from official guidance so they have been suggested by CIPFA/SOLACE and inserted into the report.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Annual Governance Statement (2014/15) as set out in Appendix 1 of the report be approved and referred to the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive for formal certification.</p>	

<p>12.</p>	<p>RESIDENTS FORUM BUDGET POSITION AND ALLOCATION REQUESTS</p> <p>he Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 88-92, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager outlined the report stating that the appendices set out the positions of the forums at the moment. He advised that the recommendation is for the budgets to be carried forward for completion in 2015/16.</p> <p>A Member stated that the grants to the community response team monies should be paid.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That</p> <p>(1) Members note the position of the Forum’s budget. (2) Members approve that any ongoing forum schemes have their budgets carried forward for completion in 2015/16 (3) Members approve the allocations requested by the forums as set out in the report.</p>	
<p>13.</p>	<p>DEBT RECOVERY POLICY</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 93-117, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager advised the Members that this policy combines all of the recovery policies into one document.</p> <p>The Chair advised Members that they are voting for their own policy as opposed to that of the officers.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members approve the revised corporate Debt Policy as at Appendix 1 of the report.</p>	
<p>14.</p>	<p>UPDATED MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Finance Manager as set out in pages 118-139, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Finance Manager advised that this report is an update to the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) that was approved in March 2015. He advised the report takes into consideration a number of things; firstly the Governments budget on the 8 July and the Councils revised Commitments as approved at Council this year and the Draft 2014/15 outturn position. He advised that there is little change for 2016-17 and 2017-18. He advised the budget that came out on 8 July provided little guidance for local government. It did mention a pay rise of 1% and that the living wage would rise to £9. He reaffirmed that the Council has implemented the living wage (and so the change will have</p>	

	<p>minimal impact on the Council's budget) and that the 1% increase has already been incorporated.</p> <p>A Member asked whether a policy was to be created for Greening the Borough as it is a council priority. The Director of Services advised that the Council has commissioned a tree strategy and that work on the same will commence in August.</p> <p>A Member asked for the reasons why Oadby and Wigston Borough Council had the worst settlement of all districts in the County (as per page 119). The Finance Manager advised that this relates to a basket of grants income referred to Spending Power. He stated that Spending Power includes New Homes Bonus for which this Council gets the second worst contribution in the county, which severely distorts the Council's Spending Power percentage.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council stated that he was unsure of what works need to be done but advised that it is prudent to assume that there will be a cut next year and so a Medium Term Financial Strategy would need to be produced, which reflected two different cut levels</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Committee approves the updated Medium Term Financial Strategy as set out in the report.</p>	
15.	<p>CUSTOMER SERVICE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME UPDATE</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Director of Services as set out in pages 140-146, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Director of Services advised that this report is an update to the transition of Customer services to the centre of Wigston. She stated that the project timetable has moved to mid September for the opening, explaining that this was no reflection on how it has been managed, reassuring Members that it has been managed very well. She advised Members that all new recruits will be fully trained before the centre opens. She informed Members that the lease had been signed and that refurbishment work is being undertaken.</p> <p>Members welcomed the update and a Member asked what the plan is with regards to Council services in Oadby as the surgery hours at Oadby Library have been reduced posing a problem for the residents of Oadby.</p> <p>The Finance Manager advised that going forward there will be a review for Oadby to ensure sufficient representation. With regards to the number of surgery hours at Oadby Library, he advised this was a Leicestershire County Council decision. A Member stated that South Wigston should also be taken into consideration in respect of the above too.</p> <p>The Leader stated that these are positive comments and the outcome is important.</p>	

	RESOLVED: That Members note the report and progress to date.	
16.	<p>ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE BOROUGH</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Head of Community as set out in pages 64-65, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Head of Community outlined the report stating that the report is primarily about advisory services within the borough however the new customer services centre gives more options about how the Council delivers its services on taking up an opportunity to look at a European Funding potential for a bid on what is termed as Me and My Learning. She provided some background information regarding the Council's procurement exercise with the Citizens Advice Bureau and the fact that the contract is due to lapse at the end of July 2015. She advised Members that the Community Engagement Officer has conducted extensive research and has concluded that there are good small advice centres within Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p>She stated that in looking at the mapping out services there is different availability and the opportunity of consolidating advisory services within the borough which is the concept and ethos of Me and My Learning.</p> <p>Members were advised that Melton Borough Council are the lead authority to put forward a bid and are seeking an an initial request from this Council.</p> <p>The Finance Manager stated that it is an 'in principle' bid at the moment and that there is a second stage to the same. He further stated that the implementation of the above could shift the level that the Council's involvement is required and the pace the Council wanted to suit the level of funding received.</p> <p>Members raised concerns over the CAB and its availability/access as they had received complaints from residents and suggested that the contract with CAB should be allowed to lapse. A Member opined that Me and My Learning was similar to Supporting Leicestershire Families (SLF) in that in principle it sounds good however ultimately it is of no benefit to the Council. He suggested the best way forward would be to include this in the SLF agenda and see where that goes.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council supported the suggestion to allow the contract to lapse and suggested a review and a procurement exercise based on independent advice. He reiterated that the advice is independent and not about Council services. He stated he has an email from the Chief Executive of one other district which he read out and says that if one signs up to the initial bid for Me and My Learning it implies a commitment for the second bid and so suggested that the report is remitted to Leicestershire County Council's Supporting Leicestershire Families to consider.</p> <p>The Chair stated that residents cannot be left without a support system and so stressed the urgency for action to be taken.</p>	

	<p>Members reaffirmed that they were not challenging the report and acknowledged the Officers hard work however they had concerns about the advisory services provided and wanted Officers to look at independent services. .</p> <p>RESOLVED: That</p> <p>(1) This report is remitted to Supporting Leicestershire Families and the Contract with the Citizens Advice Bureau be allowed to lapse. Withdraw funding for CAB, and let the contract lapse.</p> <p>Action be taken as a matter of urgency.</p>	
17.	<p>FOOD WASTE COLLECTION</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Director of Services as set out in pages 154-156, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Director of Services advised that this report is an update regarding the current position on waste initiatives that will be subject to further reports.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council asked for this to be limited to no longer than 6 months which was seconded by the Chair.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members approve the recommendations subject to them being no longer than 6 months.</p>	
18.	<p>DIGITAL DISPLAY POLICY</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager as set out in pages 157-171, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager outlined the report, highlighting that the policy contains fees and charges for advertising on the screens. He further advised that these fees and charges would cover the maintenance costs for the same.</p> <p>A Member welcomed this suggestion but questioned how the fees would be calculated, particularly in relation to which business would be considered to be local and which not. The Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager advised that national chains would be considered as businesses outside of the borough where as franchises would be considered as being local businesses.</p> <p>A Member questioned how much this would cost the Council to install, where the monies are coming from and who will maintain the same. It was confirmed by the Finance Manager that the monies for this have come out of the Capital Budget.</p>	

	<p>The Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager confirmed that he would email all Members as to how much the costs would be, however advised that research was conducted before purchasing the screens.</p> <p>The Member asked questioned who will maintain and how much that would cost. The Chair stated that the costs would be recouped from the revenue accumulated through the advertisements.</p> <p>Another Member stated that he welcomed this because local community organisations will be able to obtain free advertisements for their events/causes, hence supporting the Council’s Communication Strategy.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members approve:</p> <p>(1) The Digital Display Screen Advertising</p> <p>(2) The fees and charges scale for advertising on the digital display boards as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report.</p> <p>Councillors Fahey and Khong abstained from the vote.</p>	
<p>19.</p>	<p>FACILITIES ON HORSEWELL LANE PARK</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager as set out in pages 172-178, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>Members considered supplementary papers that were submitted to Members at the Committee.</p> <p>The Planning Policy and Regeneration Manager outlined the report stating that after working with various stakeholders, the report recommends that the plans are agreed. He also stated that the recommendations include that of further works being undertaken as part of the scheme.</p> <p>A Member stated they welcomed the report and stated a lot of work has been done.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That:</p> <p>(1) Members note the progress made on the option analyses undertaken to date and the work with stakeholders on options for redeveloping Horsewell Lane park and approve in principle the proposed basis on which the Council will move the project forward and seek funding</p> <p>(2) The Director of Services commissions further work to establish the cost of the redevelopment proposals so as to inform individual discussions with stakeholders and develop a funding package for the scheme.</p>	

	<p>(3) The Council consider a capital to the scheme in considering the 2016/17 budget.</p> <p>Councillor Atwal abstained from the vote.</p>	
<p>20.</p>	<p>DISABILITY FACILITIES GRANT</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Head of Community as set out in pages 179-183, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Head of Community outlined the report, stating that Members are asked to approve the additional funding of £78,068; details of which are within the report.</p> <p>Members welcomed the report and stated that this has been an ongoing situation whereby monies need to be paid.</p> <p>The Leader of the Council stated that he had no issues with the monies but was concerned about the 'Light Bulb Project' as there is a danger that it will increase costs. For the purposes of clarification he advised a report is needed as soon as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>The Head of Community stated that this project will go live in 2016 and currently is being piloted in Blaby District Council. She added that the Health and Wellbeing Board on 22 September will receive a presentation on the Lightbulb initiative, and invited Members to attend should they want further information.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members approve the additional capital funding of £78,068 to meet the demand which has been recommended from Service Delivery Committee of 7 July 2015.</p>	
<p>21.</p>	<p>LEISURE CONTRACT UPDATE - REPORT TO FOLLOW</p> <p>The Committee gave consideration to the report delivered by the Director of Services, which should be read together with these minutes as a composite document.</p> <p>The Director of Services updated Members on the Leisure Management contract, especially the financial implications. She advised that work is on time for completion in November. With regards to the refurbishment of the gym at Parklands, she advised it is in progress and that in Decemeber 2014 there were additional works that needed to be done and could not have been costed for at the beginning.</p> <p>In Wigston she advised that the soil has a small element of asbestos contamination and in order to dispose of the same safely, it will cost roughly £18,000. She advised that once information is received from the Contract Manager re the blockage she will circulate an email to Members</p> <p>At Parklands there is a drainage issue which could not have been foreseen. The Surveyors have been challenged in this regard however</p>	

	<p>as this could not have been foreseen the Council will have to pay £33,000 for the drainage to be manually dug out. She advised there is headroom within the budget to pay this and will provide a further update at the next committee meeting.</p> <p>A Member sought clarification that this report that the report is to be noted and that Officers are therefore not asking for authorisation for any additional monies to be paid from the budget of £9.6million.</p> <p>The Chair reaffirmed that If extra monies were needed it would come back to committee. The Finance Manager also reaffirmed this saying that despite the £10m allocation approval would still be needed by committee and confirmed that the £9.6 million is the approved contract sum.</p> <p>The Director of Services stated that firstly they will look at what can be done within the existing contract (make savings to fund this) so if this cannot be done she will bring a report to next committee.</p> <p>The Leader stated that effectively it could go £51,000 over £9.6m. If this is needed he suggested that authority be taken in September at full Council or else it may result in falling foul of the deadline.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Members note the report.</p>	
22.	<p>EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>The Press and Public are likely to be excluded from the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Section 100 (A)(4) of the local Government Act 1972 (Exempt Information) during consideration of the item below on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in the respective paragraph of Part 1 Of Schedule 12A of the Act and the public interest in maintaining the exempt items outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.</p>	
22.	<p>STAFF HONORARIUM - FINANCE</p> <p>Members had a discussion <i>in camera</i> about staff honorarium.</p>	
22.	<p>BENEFITS OVERPAYMENT</p> <p>Members had a discussion <i>in camera</i> about benefits overpayment.</p>	
23.	<p>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 24 March 2015, be taken as read, confirmed, and signed.</p>	

The Meeting Closed at 09:05 PM

Agenda Item 9m

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD
AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON ON WEDNESDAY 22 JULY 2015
COMMENCING AT 7:00 PM**

<p><u>IN ATTENDANCE:</u></p> <p>Chair - Mrs H E Loydall Vice Chair - Miss M V Chamberlain</p> <p>Councillors: G S Atwal; G A Boulter; F S Broadley; Mrs L M Broadley; M H Charlesworth; R F Eaton; B Fahey; and J Kaufman</p> <p>Officers in Attendance: S Eyre; J Mortell; Miss S Illston; Miss G Ghuman</p>
--

Min Ref.	Narrative	Officer Resp.
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence received from Councillors K Loydall, Ms K Chalk and R Thakor.</p>	
2.	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 22 January 2015, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.</p>	
3.	<p>INTRODUCTIONS</p> <p>The Chair introduced the new licensing team to the Members stating that the new Licensing Officer is James Mortell, the interim Licensing Team Leader is Stephen Eyre who is from North West Leicestershire District Council and the Legal and Licensing Assistant who is Sophie Illston.</p> <p>Councillor Atwal declared an interest in that he is a Taxi Driver by profession for Leicester City Council however he stated he came to the meeting with an open mind so was allowed to stay at the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>LICENSED VEHICLES INSURANCE CERTIFICATES</p> <p>The Licensing team leader outlined the report advising Members that some taxi drivers take out weekly insurance policies which creates extra data entry work for Officers. He advised that this extra work infringes on enforcement work and the general amongst taxi drivers is to take a 12 month policy but pay it on a monthly basis.</p> <p>He referred Members to Section 12 of the Taxi Licensing Policy which was adopted by the Committee in July 2013, where it is clear that only 12 month insurance certificates should be accepted with the exception</p>	

	<p>of a 6 month when a taxi license is first issued and occasionally a temporary cover note and so asked Members permission to enforce the policy as it stands.</p> <p>The Chair advised that she had asked for this to come to the committee as there have been issues with this previously, it is stated in the policy that the Council will only accept 12 month renewals (bar exceptional circumstances as mentioned above). She advised that Officers at the time reassured her that this was not an issue however it has now come to light that it is. She reiterated section 12 of the policy stating that it is clear that on first application the insurance should be 6 months/temporary followed by a 12 month policy which is then followed by an annual renewal.</p> <p>She recommended that the Council follows the policy and adheres to the 12 month renewal.</p> <p>A Member asked whether there was any benefit to the 7 day certificate to which the response from the Licensing Team Leader was that some drivers may have monetary issues so they opt for weekly insurance renewals despite it being potentially more costly in the long run.</p> <p>The Chair stated that cost should not be priority and that the main concern should focus on the safety of residents.</p> <p>A Member expressed his concern stating that Taxi Drivers are self employed and by enforcing the policy it may discourage new drivers to join the trade which may lead to a shortage of taxi drivers. He asked whether any leniency could be applied and have monthly renewals instead of annual.</p> <p>The Licensing Team Leader stated that he was mindful of the fact that some drivers may have cash flow issues but did not believe it was appropriate to do so as taxi drivers need to be insured all of the time.</p> <p>A Member noted that annual policies can be paid in monthly instalments so cash flow should not be a problem.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Taxi Drivers must ensure their vehicle is insured for 12 months and renewed annually and that the policy should be enforced in this regard.</p> <p>All Members in favour bar 1 against from Cllr G S Atwal.</p>	
5.	<p>CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION (VERBAL UPDATE)</p> <p>The Chair advised that she had requested this to come to committee as she wanted an update as to how Leicestershire County Council are devolving information down to the districts.</p> <p>The Licensing Team Leader advised that this is a sensitive subject matter and that each Council/County has to organise their own way of ensuring the incidents in Rochdale and Rotherham are not repeated. He advised Members of a meeting to be held in August where he will be able to find out more information obtain information concerning a full</p>	

	<p>coherent and coordinated approach will be undertaken not only for taxi drivers but licensed premises on the whole. He advised Members that he will report back to the chair once this meeting had took place.</p> <p>He advised that a forum whereby taxi drivers will be made aware of such matters will take place at Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.</p> <p>The Chair asked for a report to come back to committee so that all are updated as to the most current position of the same.</p> <p>A Member advised that other authorities have introduced free courses for taxi drivers which not only improve the standards of service, but also enhance public safety.. He advised Members that the taxi drivers are obliged to attend such courses.</p> <p>The Chair asked Officers to look into this.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That Officers report back to the October committee meeting with a report on this subject matter.</p>	
6.	<p>GAMBLING ACT 2005 - STATEMENT OF LICENSING PRINCIPLES (VERBAL UPDATE)</p> <p>The Licensing Team Leader advised Members that he will draft a new policy and have it go to consultation for a period of six weeks. He advised that it will need to be adopted at Full Council in December.</p> <p>A Member asked whether there had been many legislative changes to which he was advised that the changes have remained static and the Gambling Commission wanted risk assessments to be carried out on premises and the fact that Oadby has a racecourse needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That a draft statement will go out to consultation over the Summer with a report to be presented at the October committee. The finalised statement will then go to full Council in December to be approved for the next five years.</p>	

The Meeting Closed at 7:36 PM

**MINUTES OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL WORKING GROUP,
HELD AT COUNCIL OFFICES, WIGSTON,
ON 4 AUGUST 2015**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors: Mrs S Morris, B Boulter, Mrs L Broadley, Mrs H Loydall, T Barr,
A Bond

Officers: Mrs A Court- Director of Services and Monitoring Officer

	Narrative	Officer Responsible
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></p> <p>Councillor D Carter</p> <p>1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting on 15 October 2014</p> <p>Agreed. Matters arising- the remuneration panel clarification on outside body payments and the checklist for members on key procedural rules are outstanding</p> <p>2. Standards</p> <p>(i)Hearing Panels Training and Membership – it had previously been agreed that the pool would be all members to sit on Standard investigation panels for which training would be given. AC had brought this back to the group as on reflection it would not be appropriate for effectively full Council to be the pool from which panels are drawn from. Members agreed with this on reflection. It was agreed that whilst all members are to be invited to training, any panel would in the first instance be drawn from members of Policy, Finance and Development committee, who had attended training (as Standards matters are within the Terms of Reference for that committee). In the exceptional circumstances of there being insufficient members of Policy Finance and Development available eg due to</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p>

	<p>conflicting out, to form necessary panels then other members who had received training would be called upon. AC to amend the Terms of Reference for Policy, Finance and Development committee as necessary to include panel hearings</p> <p>4. (ii) Reporting of Standards Matters – with the statutory scheme and prescribed reporting of matters being abolished it was agreed that reporting of all complaints and outcomes would be published through Policy Finance and Development committee as a standing agenda item. Where necessary, reporting would be exempt.</p> <p>5. Openness of Local Bodies Regulations 2014 – webcasting of Council and Committee meetings</p> <p>AC circulated information collated from other local authorities on the feasibility of webcasting meetings. The general consensus from the reports being that it was prohibitive in terms of resource and set up costs. As an alternative and to comply with the Openness agenda, Members agreed that the recording of Council, Policy Finance and Development, Service Delivery and Development Control be implemented with making the audio recording available on the Council’s website</p> <p>6. Speaking at meetings – duration</p> <p>A member of the group had specifically raised an issue on the lengthiness of some members speeches at meeting and queried whether stricter time limits should be imposed by the Chairs. Other members disagree with a strict approach out of concern of stifling debate and felt the current Constitutional rules are sufficient, allowing the Chairs discretion as they see fit for extended speeches. This was with the caveat that a “come back” speaker would only be permitted if introducing something new to the debate.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p>
--	---	---------------------