



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

*Tuesday, 15th July, 2014 at 4.30 p.m.
at the Council Offices, Farnborough*

Councillor P.J. Moyle (Leader)
Councillor K.H. Muschamp (Deputy Leader and Business, Safety and
Regulation Portfolio)

Councillor Sue Carter (Leisure and Youth Portfolio)
Councillor R.L.G. Dibbs (Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio)
Councillor R.J. Hughes (Health and Housing Portfolio)
Councillor A. Jackman (Concessions and Community Support Portfolio)
Councillor P.G. Taylor (Corporate Services Portfolio)

The Cabinet considered the following matters at the above-mentioned meeting. All executive decisions of the Cabinet shall become effective, subject to the call-in procedure, from **1st August, 2014**.

11. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th June, 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

12. **BLUE BADGE PARKING – REVIEW –**
(Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Head of Community's Report No. COMM1413, which set out the recommendations of the Environment Policy and Review Panel in respect of Blue Badge parking. The Report also proposed that the 65 Plus parking concession should be retained.

The Report set out the background to the review of the Blue Badge parking scheme and the work also carried out as part of the systems thinking review of the Parking Service. The original work of the Environment Panel

task and finish group on parking had been supplemented more recently by further consultation work with car parks customers on what mattered to them about parking. The key concerns expressed were the availability of spaces, good value, wider bays and convenience. As a result, the parking scheme was re-designed to ensure that any customer, whether able-bodied or disabled, residents or visitors could access facilities at any time and comply with the Council's conditions for parking, with Blue Badge holders receiving any additional time benefits provided by the Council. The changes removed the need for permits and smartcards to be issued and for additional special tariffs to be installed within machines. The scheme also applied to the 'pay by phone' trial. The re-design involved all Blue Badge holders having to pay for parking and then receiving an additional 100% parking time

At its meeting on 2nd July, 2014 the Environment Policy and Review Panel had reviewed the trial of the Blue Badge parking scheme, including consideration of the following options for its future implementation in order to recommend to the Cabinet the best way forward:

- **Option 1** – To revert back to free parking for Blue Badge holders
- **Option 2** – To continue with the current trial scheme but with changes including the issue of permits, Civil Enforcement Officers to allow an additional 100% of time to the time displayed by the Blue Badge holder
- **Option 3** – To charge all Blue Badge holders for using Council car parks, but to apply double the time to the purchased ticket.

The Environment Panel had considered the previous work undertaken on the review and trial period and the work of the Parking Service systems thinking review team, which included feedback from both Blue Badge and non-Blue Badge holders using the Council's car parks. The Panel had concluded to recommend to the Cabinet that all Blue Badge holders using Council car parks should be charged and that an additional 100% additional time should be provided to the parking ticket purchased when displayed with a Blue Badge (Option 3). It was considered that this scheme would be more equitable in that all those who could afford to run a car were requested to pay. The 100% added time recognised that those with mobility issues could take longer to carry out their activity. It was also considered a more simple process for the customer as all that had to be done was to purchase a ticket and display it with a Blue Badge. In addition to recommending the approval of Option 3, the Panel also recommended a range of additional improvements, including:

- Signage in car parks should be made clearer
- Improved promotion of the new scheme
- More regular monitoring of Blue Badge bays should be carried out to further reduce abuse
- As many additional Blue Badge parking bays should be provided by the Council as was practical and that this should be kept under review
- Ensure easy accessibility of ticket machines
- The introduction of a Pay by Phone facility as soon as possible to provide customers with payment options.

The Environment Policy and Review Panel had also given consideration to the 65 Plus concession, linked to the concessionary fare scheme which was now operated by Hampshire County Council. It was recommended that this scheme should be retained to encourage visits to the town centres and should be better promoted to residents. It was noted that approximately 500 people took up the concession each year of a smartcard with a value of £30 for a purchase price of £25.

The Cabinet assessed the financial implications of implementing the schemes as set out in the Report. It was noted that, as car park income was currently susceptible to downward pressures from economic conditions and due to the low take up of smartcards (which activated the disabled tariff), it was not possible to identify an increase in income that might be attributable to Blue Badge charging. Based on the income generated from Blue Badge holders using smartcards, it was estimated that the income for either of the payment options would generate around £35,000 per year.

The continuation of the 65 Plus concession was currently subsidised by the Council at a cost of around £10,000 per year. There was no guarantee that, if the scheme was withdrawn, that the Council would receive additional income as customers may choose to park elsewhere, which could even result in the current income being reduced by up to £10,000.

The cost of improving and revising the signage, promotion of the new scheme and additional improvements would be met from within existing budgets.

During discussion, Members expressed their support for the Panel's recommendations. It was also suggested that in the light of the recent decision regarding the lease of the Asda car park, that the Council should seek a dialogue with Asda to explain the Council's position on Blue Badge parking and to ensure that Asda supplied sufficient parking spaces for Blue Badge holders and that the practice of monitoring parking to ensure that the parking scheme was not being abused.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) all Blue Badge holders using Council car parks be charged from October, 2014 with 100% additional time being added to any ticket displayed alongside a Blue Badge;
- (ii) the additional improvements recommended by the Environment Policy and Review Panel and set out in the Head of Community's Report No. COMM1413 be approved and actioned; and
- (iii) approval be given to the continuation of the 65 Plus concession and that this scheme be better promoted.

13. **MEMBER DEVELOPMENT –**
(Corporate Services)

The Cabinet considered the Head of Democratic Services' Report No. DEM1407, which proposed the establishment of a Member Development Group to have responsibility for leading the work to identify councillors' future leadership roles, skills and organisational support requirements and for the planning, implementation and evaluation of learning and development activities.

The Cabinet was advised that elected Member development was a key element of the Council's governance framework and one of the principles of the Council's Code of Corporate Governance. It also helped to support the Council's strategic priorities, particularly around delivering community leadership.

The Report set out the current framework in respect of Member training. The Council had achieved Charter Standard for Member Development in 2008 and had been re-assessed and awarded Charter standard again in 2013. The Charter Assessment team had given the Council some feedback on areas the Council could consider and take forward. This included reviewing the Member Training Working Group in order to raise the profile of the Group and to reposition the Group to provide a more visible and strategic lead within the organisation and with more direct input from the Cabinet. Other areas which had been suggested for focus had included the further exploration of opportunities for joint development activities with other local authorities and partner organisations and sharing of knowledge from councillors attending network and external events.

The Council was currently carrying out work in parallel with the 8 Point Plan to ensure that the Council was sustainable in the future. Some elements of the Council's organisational development work had a clear link to issues that related to Members and the provision of support to Members in their various councillor roles. It was suggested that these issues could be incorporated into the business of the proposed Member Development Group.

It was noted that the new Member Development Group would replace the previous Member Training Working Group and would have strategic responsibility for leading on Member development and would be appointed by the Cabinet. The proposed terms of reference were set out in the Report together with key areas of work for the following eighteen months, including consideration of councillors' community leadership roles and how this could be supported and to update, deliver and monitor the implementation of a revised Member Development Action Plan. It was proposed that the Group would report annually to the Cabinet and to the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel for feedback and to assist evaluation. Membership of the Group would comprise four Conservative Group Members, two Labour and one UKIP Member, to include the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and representatives of the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel (normally to include the Chairman). In addition, it would be important for the Group to

draw on the experience and views of a wide group of Members. It was therefore proposed that other interested Members could be invited to participate at certain meetings where it was planned to gather feedback and evidence on topics, such as local leadership.

The Cabinet supported the proposals for the appointment of a new Member Development Group.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the terms of reference be approved for a new Cabinet working group with responsibility for providing strategic leadership of Member development and related organisational development matters;
- (ii) approval be given for the core membership of the Group to be on the basis of four Conservative Group Members, two Labour Group Members and one UKIP Member, to include two Cabinet Members, one of whom will be the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and representatives from the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel; and
- (iii) the Head of Democratic Services be authorised to confirm the membership of the Group in consultation with the Group Leaders.

**14. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2013/14 –
(Corporate Services)**

The Cabinet considered the Head of Financial Services' Report No. FIN1409, which proposed the approval of the Council's Annual Governance Statement for the year 2013/14, which had been considered and approved by the Standards and Audit Committee and also that the Statement should be signed by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive.

The Cabinet was advised that the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 required local authorities to: conduct at least annually a review of the effectiveness of its system of internal control; prepare an Annual Governance Statement; and, publish the Annual Governance Statement with the Statement of Accounts.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy had produced a guidance and proforma statement, which had been used to develop the Council's Annual Governance Statement. The Council's Code of Governance had been updated and approved by the Licensing and General Purposes Committee on 12th June and the Council on 10th July. The Statement was required to include notification of any significant internal control issues and an action plan to address them. The Cabinet was advised that no significant issues had been identified. A number of actions had been identified

the previous year and had been reviewed. Further actions for the current year had also been identified and would be addressed during the year.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the Annual Governance Statement, as set out in the Head of Financial Services' Report No. FIN1409 be approved for adoption and publication alongside the Council's Statement of Accounts.

15. PREPARATION OF A COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE –
(Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1426 which provided an update on current issues which had arisen from revised regulations and legal advice in relation to the preparation of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule for the Borough. As a result of the revised regulations and legal advice, the Cabinet's agreement was sought to postpone the preparation and introduction of a charging schedule until there was more clarity about its long term future.

The Report advised Members that the CIL had been introduced in 2010 and was a discretionary charge that could be levied on new development to help pay for infrastructure needed to support the impact of development in an area. The charge was to be introduced by local authorities through the preparation and adoption of a CIL charging schedule. Once in place, CIL was a mandatory, non-negotiable payment and had to be charged on a basis of £ per square metre on the net increase in floorspace. This meant a discount could be made for recently occupied converted or replacement floorspace. Any new build was only liable to pay if it had at least 100 square metres gross internal floor space or involved the creation of one or more dwellings. CIL receipts could be pooled and used towards the provision and maintenance of infrastructure.

The Cabinet had first agreed to the preparation of a CIL charge in December, 2011 through the agreement of the Local Development Scheme (Local Plan work programme), which included the preparation of a CIL charging schedule. The timetable for this had been amended several times to take account of numerous changes to the legislation. It was noted that the introduction of the CIL had always been of some concern to the Council and the Report set out the main reasons for these concerns.

The Report advised that, whilst the introduction of a CIL was discretionary, the CIL Regulations introduced changes to the way in which Section 106 planning obligations could be used for the funding of infrastructure. The impact of the Regulations was that, from April 2015, the Council could not pool more than five Section 106 planning obligations towards a specific infrastructure project or type. The base date for calculating whether five obligations had been entered into was April, 2010. If a CIL were in place, Section 106 would remain but would be for site specific infrastructure, the delivery of affordable housing and for Strategic Access Management and

Monitoring contributions which did not compromise infrastructure. If the Council did not have in place a CIL charging structure by April, 2015, one of the risks to the Council was that there might be less opportunity for using Section 106 planning obligations to fund infrastructure in the future.

The Report summarised recent changes in CIL Regulations, legal advice regarding the funding of SANGs and implications for the Council in introducing a CIL charge in respect of funding SPA mitigation, income, resources and other proposed changes to CIL.

The Cabinet assessed the potential risks for the Council in respect of the introduction of a CIL charging schedule. The main risk in delaying the introduction until after April 2015 was considered to be the ability to continue to seek infrastructure funding through Section 106 planning obligations, particularly for those schemes where more than five obligations had already been entered into. If an infrastructure contribution could not be sought to mitigate the impact of a specific development because more than five obligations had already been entered into, then there was a risk as to whether that development could be granted planning permission. Other risks were that the introduction of any new SANGs might comprise the provision of infrastructure rather than the maintenance of infrastructure and might therefore be caught by the pooling restrictions. In the longer term, there might be some risk to the delivery of infrastructure at the Aldershot Urban Extension if more than five 'full' applications were submitted rather than implementing the approved schemes through reserved matters applications. This risk was considered to be relatively low at present.

In view of the complexity of the CIL, the resources required to establish a charge and to implement it and the likelihood of no financial advantage towards the funding of infrastructure in the Borough, it was proposed that until greater certainty was known regarding the future of CIL, the introduction of a CIL charging schedule should be delayed. It was recommended that this decision should be reviewed later in 2015 once there was further clarity on the future of CIL and experience had been gained of working within a more limited Section 106 process.

The Cabinet was in agreement with the advice given by the Head of Planning Services.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy be postponed until further clarity on its future was known in 2015.

16. **FARNBOROUGH LAWN TENNIS CLUB –**
(Leisure and Youth/Corporate Services)

The Cabinet considered the Head of Community's Report No. COMM1414, which sought approval for the Solicitor to the Council to vary the lease with Farnborough Lawn Tennis Club to enable the Club to secure

£50,000 funding from Sport England towards the extension of the Club's pavilion.

It was noted that it was standard practice for external funders to require a minimum period of security of tenure when offering funding to clubs. Whilst the Club's lease was of sufficient length, Sport England had also requested the suspension for seven years of the Club's right to terminate the lease early. This would provide Sport England with an assurance of the Club's intention to deliver its proposed activities during this time.

The Cabinet was advised that the extension to the pavilion would cost approximately £110,000 and the Club had been awarded £50,000 from Sport England. The Club would contribute £20,000 from its own funds and the Council had set aside £40,000 of Section 106 funding in the Council's 2014/15 Capital Programme.

The Cabinet was further advised that the Club currently received 100% rent relief and was also exempt under the Government's small business rates relief scheme. It was noted that, with the extension and if the small business rates relief scheme were to be withdrawn, the Club's rates would increase to £2,500. If the small business rates relief scheme continued and the Council provided 100% relief, this would cost the Council £500 per annum. It was proposed to continue to offer 100% rent and rate relief to the Club given the contribution made by the Club to improving the quality of people's lives in an area with pockets of multiple deprivation particularly linked to poor health.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to vary the Club's lease as outlined in the Head of Community's Report No. COMM14114.

17. NATIONAL NON-DOMESTIC RATES – REOCCUPATION RELIEF POLICY –
(Concessions and Community Support)

The Cabinet considered the Director of Resources' Report No. DOR1405 which sought approval to adopt a local policy to enable the Council to award reoccupation relief from business rates with effect from 1st April, 2015 to local ratepayers, as had been announced in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's 2013 Autumn Statement.

The Government had announced that it would provide a 50% business rates discount for eighteen months for businesses moving into previously empty retail premises between 1st April, 2014 and 31st March, 2016 up to State Aid De Minimis limits. The Government had provided guidance about the operation and delivery of the relief and would fully reimburse local authorities for all relief awarded by way of a direct grant. The guidance also set out a broad framework of the types of property the policy was intended to help. For the purposes of this discount, comparable retail premises would be considered as in the adopted Retail Relief Policy which had been agreed by the Cabinet on 18th March, 2014.

Under the scheme, the relief available for each property was 50% of the business rates liability after any mandatory or other discretionary reliefs (other than Retail Relief) had been applied up to State Aid De Minimis limits. To administer State Aid De Minimis limits it was necessary for the local authority to establish that the award of aid would not result in the undertaking having received more than 200,000 Euros. This applied to the aggregate of all aid received throughout the country.

The Report advised that approximately 85 properties that had been empty for more than twelve months could meet the criteria for the receipt of relief. The full financial effect of any relief awarded would be reimbursed via grant payments to the Council.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) local Reoccupation Relief Policy be established for reducing business rates liabilities, as set out in the Director of Resources' Report No. DOR1405; and
- (ii) responsibility to resolve disputes about eligibility for relief or amounts awarded be delegated to the Director of Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Concessions and Community Support.

18. MERGER OF NORTH HAMPSHIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS – (Business, Safety and Regulation)

The Cabinet considered the Chief Executive's Report No. CEX1401, which proposed the merger of the three district based Community Safety Partnerships for North Hampshire (Basingstoke and Deane, Hart and Rushmoor) into one strategic partnership to be serviced by the officer team of Safer North Hampshire.

The Report advised that, in 2012, the three authorities in Safer North Hampshire had considered a report on the outcomes of a review of the Community Safety Partnerships and the teams that support them. The Report recommended a shared community safety service which would result in more efficient and effective working arrangements, an improved service delivered to residents across the area and would forge closer working relationships between the Community Safety Partnerships. This shared service came into effect on 1st November, 2012, known as Safer North Hampshire. A recent review had shown that the shared service arrangements for the officer team were working well and had delivered a number of improvements, particularly with regard to processes and partnerships without significantly diminishing the scope of the strategic services offered. Given that the shared service was now embedded, it was considered desirable to progress the formal merger of the three community safety partnerships.

The Cabinet was advised that, over the previous year, work had been undertaken to move towards the merger of the three Community Safety

Partnerships. Under the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, as amended in 2012, the Police and Crime Commissioner could only merge community safety partnerships together where such a move would be in the interests of one or more of the following criteria: reduce crime and disorder; reduce reoffending; and, combatting the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances. It was felt that the merger proposal would be in the interest of all three criteria. It would bring a strategic approach to addressing the issues that had already been identified as common across the three areas and bring consistency of message and response from all agencies in the Partnership. It was noted that partnership resources would be maintained across the Safer North Hampshire area and could be enhanced to address specific priorities in local neighbourhoods through the targeted deployment of resources or campaign information. Local authorities' interests with regard to financial contributions to the officer team of Safer North Hampshire would continue to be safeguarded through a Deed of Delegation.

The Cabinet was advised that a merger of Community Safety Partnerships legally has to have certain characteristics:

- Unanimous buy-in from all responsible authorities
- Clear evidence of benefits arising from the merger
- Clear commitment to focus on Police and Crime Commissioner priorities
- One overview and scrutiny body across the three districts
- Unanimous agreement of all responsible authorities if the agreement is to be dissolved

Mr. Simon Hayes, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire had indicated that he was supportive of a merger in principle, subject to evidence that the arrangements fulfilled the criteria set out in the legislation. A Combination Agreement setting out the legal framework for the operation of a merged Community Safety Partnership would need to be signed by the relevant parties and approved by the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Community Safety Partnership would also have Terms of Reference setting out its governance structures and procedures for its strategic activity across the three districts. Each council would be represented through its relevant portfolio holder and by the Safer North Hampshire Community Safety Manager as the lead officer for each authority. A representative of each of the statutory partners would also be a member of the Community Safety Partnership.

The Report also advised Members regarding how the Community Safety Partnership would relate to community safety forums retained at a local level and with the operational groups working on specific issues. It also showed that council priorities would be fed into the work of the Community Safety Partnership via the Safer North Hampshire officer team and that the Community Safety Partnership would be accountable to a joint overview and scrutiny committee, which was a requirement of the Combination Agreement. The governance framework for the joint committee was being developed to ensure proportionate political representation and operating protocols. The

draft terms of reference for the joint committee were attached to the Report. As part of the arrangements, consideration of other crime and disorder and community safety matters would remain with the individual authorities. In Rushmoor's case, this meant that the Borough Services Policy and Review Panel would continue to carry out its on-going monitoring of community safety issues within Rushmoor. Operational multi-agency meetings addressing priorities at a local level would still continue.

The Cabinet was advised that each of the authorities had discussed the proposed merger at its overview and scrutiny committee. Whilst some issues of details had been raised, there had been general support for the merger. The Cabinets at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Hart District Council had already considered the proposed merger and were recommending their full Councils to give approval. It was noted that there were no adverse financial implications arising from the merger of the three Community Safety Partnerships.

The Cabinet supported the proposals for the merger.

The Cabinet RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL that

- (i) the merger of the three Community Safety Partnerships be endorsed in accordance with the arrangements set out in the Chief Executive's Report No. CEX1401, including the appointment of the Cabinet Member for Business, Safety and Regulation as the Council's representative on the Partnership;
- (ii) approval be given to the appointment of, and governance arrangements for, a joint overview and scrutiny committee with Hart and Rushmoor to comply with the requirements of the Police and Justice Act, 2006;
- (iii) the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Safety and Regulation, to sign the Combination Agreement, creating one Community Safety Partnership for North Hampshire; and
- (iv) the Head of Democratic Services be authorised to appoint representatives (in accordance with the political balance requirements) to the overview and scrutiny committee for 2014/15 following consultation with the Group Leaders.

19. ACTIVATION ALDERSHOT –
(Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Director of Community and Environment's Report No. DCE1407 which sought agreement to various urban realm and highway improvement schemes as part of the 'Activation Aldershot' programme by the Council.

The Cabinet had agreed the establishment of a formal Regeneration Programme for Aldershot in November, 2012 and a bid for funding of £3 million for a series of projects called 'Activation Aldershot' from the Growing Enterprise Fund had been provisionally agreed in September 2012, together with an allocation of £1.5 million from the Council's own capital budget to make a total budget of £4.5 million. The Activation Aldershot projects aimed to integrate the town with the Wellesley development through green transport infrastructure and public realm improvements which would drive housing and town centre growth. It was anticipated that the projects would accelerate the regeneration and revitalisation of Aldershot. As part of the Section 106 agreement relating to the new Wellesley development, Grainger PLC had undertaken to carry out highway infrastructure improvements between the new development and the town which would be forward funded by the Growing Enterprise Fund at a total cost of £1.5 million. This left a total budget of £3 million for the Council's Activation Aldershot projects.

The Report set out details of the key design issues for the town centre: improved linkages; wayfinding; reducing clutter; improved appearance; and, street tree planting. To help address the issues identified, the following projects had been identified:

- Barrack Road/Grosvenor Road – Improvement of pedestrian links from Westgate with the main shopping areas through the creation of a shared space which would be more pedestrian friendly and prove a more attractive environment
- Court Road/High Street/Wellington Street junction and Union Street/Wellington Street junction – This would be an important pedestrian approach into the town centre for people arriving by car and parking in the High Street multi-storey car park.

Concept drawings of the proposed projects were set out in the Report. In addition, a number of maintenance projects were proposed for the pedestrianised area of the town centre to refresh paving, improve street furniture and lighting and introduce new signage. To complement this, it was also proposed to develop a scheme to make shopfront improvement grants available to local retailers to improve the street scene within the town.

It was noted that the overall programme and specific schemes had been the subject of consultation through the Aldershot Place Board, Aldershot Members Task and Finish Group and the Aldershot Retailers Group and had received widespread support. Public consultation on the programme would commence shortly.

The Report set out details of the phased approach to the Activation Aldershot projects and the financial implications of the work, including legal costs relating to the schemes reflecting the needs for Section 106, Section 278 and loan agreements. To undertake the works outlined in the Report would require additional temporary resources in the Capital Projects team, estimated at £50,000 per annum including on-costs.

The Cabinet was advised that the terms of the LEP Growing Enterprise Fund award were complex. Of the £4.5 million capital allocated for regeneration works (£3 million town centre and £1.5 million linkage from Wellesley to be carried out by Grainger direct), £3 million of this would be ultimately met by Grainger, who would repay the Council, who in turn would repay Enterprise M3. Grainger would fund this repayment through income derived from house sales as the Wellesley scheme developed. The total capital cost to the Council would be £1.5 million. Accounting for the funding mechanism was also complex and initially would incur revenue costs to the Council which would be offset by adjustments within revenue contributions to capital, giving a neutral effect overall.

During discussion, the Cabinet expressed its support for the proposals and felt that the proposals were a significant step forward for the regeneration of Aldershot.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to enter into agreements with Enterprise M3 and Grainger in relation to the Growing Enterprise Fund and into agreements pursuant to Section 278 of the Highways Act, 1980 with the County Council;
- (ii) approval be given to the further development of, and consultation on, the major schemes for Barrack Road and Court Road;
- (iii) approval be given for the creation of a one year temporary post within the Council's Capital Projects Team to deliver the works; and
- (iv) approval be given to the commencement of the shopfront, street lighting and street furniture schemes.

20. BEAUMONT PARK WALL – EMERGENCY WORKS TO BOUNDARY WALL WITH FARNBOROUGH ROAD, VARIATION TO CAPITAL PROGRAMME – (Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Director of Community and Environment's Report No. DCE1406 which sought approval to a variation of the Capital Programme to allow urgent works to be carried out to the boundary wall at Beaumont Park facing onto Farnborough Road, Aldershot.

The Cabinet was advised that the section of wall requiring urgent repair had been constructed between 1854-9 and had Grade II Listing. The wall formed the rear boundary of four houses, formerly First Wessex properties, six houses and roadway owned by First Wessex and open areas under the Council's ownership. Consultations with the Council's Conservation Officer and specialist architectural consultants and engineers showed that the

rebuilding of the leaning sections of the wall was required in order to preserve the wall and to avoid a collapse into properties and the Farnborough Road. A means of rectification had been received from consultants together with budget costs. It was noted that some sections of the walling that were not leaning and walling with cast iron railings above facing Alexandra Road required repair and repointing, but this work was not considered urgent and would be subject of a separate bid for capital funds to be carried out in the 2015/16 financial year. It had been agreed with First Wessex that the Council would be the lead agency to enter into the necessary contractual arrangements for the work.

The Cabinet considered the financial implications of the urgent works required. It was noted that the estimated cost for these works was £73,000. There was also a separate additional cost for employing consultants at £23,000 to survey, prepare a specification, appoint contractors and manage the construction contract. The property owners, including First Wessex, would be expected to reimburse the Council for their share of the costs. This had been agreed in principle with First Wessex. Reimbursement would be based on percentage of wall in different ownership. It was estimated that the Council's final cost would be £96,000 x 20m/131m=£14,614.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) approval be given to a variation to the 2014/15 Capital Programme of £96,000 to fund the reconstruction and repairs to the boundary wall; and
- (ii) the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to recover the costs from First Wessex and others as appropriate on such terms as may be agreed.

21. CONTRACTS MEMBER WORKING GROUP –
(Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Director of Community and Environment's Report No. DCE1408 which proposed a Contracts Working Group to guide the evaluation of future options to deliver frontline services post 2017. The services affected would be waste collection, recycling, street cleansing, grounds maintenance and toilet cleaning.

It was proposed that a Contracts Working Group be established with the key roles to: examine the service delivery options available and recommend which to take forward to implementation; and, monitor and provide input into the development and mobilisation of the chosen service delivery option. It was proposed that, for 2014/15, the Group would comprise six Members on the basis of four Conservatives, two minority group Members. The membership should include:

- the Cabinet Member for Environment and Service Delivery
- one additional Cabinet Member
- the Chairman of the Environment Policy and Review Panel

- one Conservative Group Member
- two minority group Members

It would also be important for the Group to draw on experience of other elected Members. It was therefore proposed that the Group should invite participation from other Members as required.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) a Member Working Group be established to steer the options evaluation process with regard to the future delivery of the services highlighted in the Director of Community and Environment's Report No. DCE1408;
- (ii) the core membership of the Group be agreed, as outlined in the Report; and
- (iii) the Head of Democratic Services be authorised to confirm the membership of the Group in consultation with the Group Leaders.

22. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC –

RESOLVED: That, taking into account the public interest test, the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the under mentioned items to avoid the disclosure of exempt information within the paragraphs of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 indicated against the items:

Minute Nos.	Schedule 12A Para. Nos.	Categories
13	1	Information relating to an individual
14 and 15	3	Information relating to financial or business affairs

**THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE CONSIDERED
IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC**

23. CONTRACT REVIEW (REFUSE, RECYCLING, CLEANSING, GROUNDS MAINTENANCE AND TOILET CLEANING) – RESOURCING –
(Environment and Service Delivery)

The Cabinet considered the Head of Community's Exempt Report No. COMM1412, which sought approval of staff changes and a supplementary estimate of £27,000 in 2014/15 and £25,000 from 2015/16 to be met from the Service Improvement Fund. The supplementary estimate was required in order to release time for the Contracts Manager to carry out the contract review of refuse, recycling, cleansing and grounds maintenance in liaison with

the Head of Community, Head of Finance and the Solicitor to the Council. The proposal was to upgrade one of the Technical Managers to assist with the Contract Manager's current role and then to backfill the Technical Manager's post on a temporary basis. To backfill this post, it was proposed that one of the existing Technical Officer post holders should be given the opportunity to take on the work released by the Contracts Manager. It was further proposed that a part-time, temporary Technical Officer should be appointed to cover the work vacated by the upgrade of a Technical Officer.

It was noted that the project would run until April 2017 and it was proposed to trial the new arrangements for one year, with any extension subject to ongoing review. Due to the complex nature of the options appraisal for the contract review, it was also proposed that external consultancy support should be obtained towards the end of 2014 to validate the findings.

The Report set out the financial implications of the proposals. It was proposed that funding for these temporary changes and the external consultancy support to validate the findings should be drawn from the Service Improvement Fund.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that approval be given to the staff changes and supplementary estimate of £27,000 in 2014/15 and £25,000 from 2015/16 to be met from the Service Improvement Fund, as set out in the Head of Community's Exempt Report No. COMM1412.

24. **THE SOURCE YOUNG PEOPLE'S CHARITY – CONSENT AS MORTGAGEE TO GRANT EASEMENT FOR ACCESS OVER NO. 237 HIGH STREET, ALDERSHOT –**
(Corporate Services)

The Cabinet considered the Solicitor to the Council's Exempt Report No. LEG1412 which sought authority for the Solicitor to the Council to grant consent on behalf of the Council as mortgagee to The Source Young People's Charity to grant an easement for access over its property at No. 237 High Street, Aldershot, for the benefit of a neighbouring property.

The Report advised that the Council's security would not be prejudiced by the grant of the proposed easement and the consideration for the grant would provide much needed funding for the Source.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that, upon payment of the Council's reasonable legal and valuation costs (if the consideration paid to the Source allows it), the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to grant the consent sought by the Source, subject to the grant of the proposed easement being made in compliance with the requirements of the Charities Act, 2011, as set out in the Solicitor to the Council's Exempt Report No. LEG1412.

25. **LAND AT AYLING HILL, ALDERSHOT – CONSENT AS COVENANTEETO GRANT OF LEASE FOR GAS GOVERNOR –**
(Corporate Services)

The Cabinet considered the Solicitor to the Council's Exempt Report No. LEG1411, which sought authority for the Solicitor to the Council to grant consent to First Wessex to grant a lease of approximately 80 square metres of amenity land to Southern Gas Networks PLC for a gas governor, access and pipe easement. It was proposed that the Council should grant consent as covenantee to the grant of the proposed lease.

The Report explained that this land had been transferred to First Wessex's predecessor as part of the Large Scale Voluntary Transfer of the Council's housing stock in 1995. In the transfer, the land was designated amenity land and, as such, had been transferred subject to covenant that it should not be disposed of or developed without the prior consent in writing of the Council. First Wessex, as owners and managers of the land, were satisfied that the need for the new gas governor had been established and that the impact on the amenity value of the land was minimal.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that, upon payment of the Council's reasonable legal and valuation costs, the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to grant the consent sought by First Wessex as requested and on such other terms as the Solicitor to the Council shall advise.

The Meeting closed at 5.35 p.m.

CR. P.J. MOYLE
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL