

EXECUTIVE

Minutes of a meeting of the Executive of the Bolsover District Council held in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne, on Monday 27th February 2017 at 1000 hours.

PRESENT:-

Members:- Councillors T. Connerton, M.J. Dooley, S.W. Fritchley, B.R. Murray-Carr, K. Reid and J. Ritchie (from during Minute No. 0712).

Officers:- D. Swaine (Chief Executive Officer), B. Mason (Executive Director – Operations), D. Clarke (Assistant Director Finance, Revenues and Benefits), A. Wylie (Deputy Monitoring Officer), K. Apps (Joint Housing Strategy and Growth Manager), K. Drury (Information Engagement & Performance Manager) and A. Bluff (Governance Officer).

Also in attendance at the meeting were Councillors S. Peake, H.J. Gilmour and C. Millington (Scrutiny Officer) and in the public gallery was Councillor T. Munro.

Councillor A.M. Syrett in the Chair

0708. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

0709. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were no urgent items of business.

0710. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

0711. MINUTES – 30TH JANUARY 2017

Moved by Councillor K. Reid and seconded by Councillor B.R. Murray-Carr
RESOLVED that the Minutes of an Executive meeting held on 30th January 2017 be approved as a correct record.

0712. ITEMS RECOMMENDED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

HEALTHY, SAFE, CLEAN AND GREEN COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REVIEW; WHERE DOES PUBLIC HEALTH FIT WITHIN PLANNING POLICY

EXECUTIVE

Executive considered a report of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee which provided information on the findings of a Scrutiny review in relation to where public health fitted in with Planning policy.

The Scrutiny Committee commenced the review in June 2016, following concerns over the demands on local services brought by new development, and that the current Section 106 policy was not working to address public health issues.

Scrutiny Members had sought to understand the various demands and requests on Section 106 contributions and a number of documents, verbal evidence and presentations were considered throughout the review with twelve stakeholders engaged.

The two main concerns arising from the review reflected the comments and concerns raised by stakeholders around consultation on major applications and also on the number of hot food takeaways in areas with high levels of obesity. It was hoped that if accepted, the recommendations in the report would result in positive outcomes for the District's communities.

Members welcomed the report and noted that it had looked in depth, as well as raising awareness, of the issues of Section 106.

The Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing noted that there had been many recent occasions where a Section 106 may have been applicable but outside agencies had not responded, specifically in relation to Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and local practitioners (GP's). The Strategic Health Group had tried to broaden the remit of the CCGs but Planners also had issues with some major developers who felt that anything under £30k was not worth consideration and provided no response. It was hoped that the CCGs would encourage GPs to get more involved with regard to Section 106s.

The Chief Executive Officer noted that the review was a timely report. He advised the meeting that the Government's white paper noted that they would examine the options for reforming the system for delivery of developer contributions to ensure direct benefit for communities. The Government would be carrying out an independent review of community and infrastructure levy and section 106 obligations and make an announcement in the autumn budget statement. With regard to dialogue with the NHS, the Chief Executive Officer felt that further work needed to be carried out and stronger relationships built, especially directly with GPs.

Commenting further, the Chief Executive Officer noted that wider design considerations needed to be linked to Planning, for example, health and community safety when considering development after strategic sites had been agreed; clear guidance on how the Authority wanted to shape development such as the issue of too many takeaways, which then linked to the health agenda.

Members thanked the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee for an informative report which had raised further discussion.

Moved by Councillor A.M. Syrett and seconded by Councillor M.J. Dooley

RESOLVED that 1) the recommendations as set out in the report of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee be noted and,

EXECUTIVE

2) a response to Scrutiny Committee regarding the recommendations be provided within 6 weeks.

(Executive)

REASON FOR DECISION: The recommendations arising from the review reflected the comments and concerns raised by stakeholders and it was hoped that these recommendations would result in positive outcomes for the Council's Communities.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

Councillors S. Peake, H.J. Gilmour and the Scrutiny Officer left the meeting.

0713. POLICY AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK ITEMS

VULNERABLE ADULTS RISK MANAGEMENT (VARM) POLICY

Executive considered a report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, which sought approval of a Joint Vulnerable Adult Risk Management (VARM) Policy and guidance to implement the existing Derbyshire wide VARM policy framework.

In January 2014, Bolsover District Council, North East Derbyshire District Council and Rykneld Homes adopted the wider Derbyshire Safeguarding Adults Board's, Vulnerable Adult Risk Management policy, which provided a framework for professionals to facilitate effective multi-agency working with vulnerable adults who were deemed to have mental capacity and who were at risk of serious harm or death. Both BDC and NEDDC's Housing and Economic Development Strategies highlighted the commitment to help vulnerable people and it had been acknowledged that an internal VARM policy was required to ensure risks to vulnerable adults were minimised.

The draft Joint VARM policy had been developed in conjunction with the Joint Executive Director – Transformation, (the Safeguarding Lead officer) and was in line with the existing Derbyshire wide policy framework, which would be amended accordingly if it should change.

Each organisation had also identified VARM champions who would be the relevant point of contact, including Derbyshire Fire and Rescue, Derbyshire Constabulary, Environmental Health Officers, Housing, Probation, Alcohol and Drug Services.

For BDC the Champions were;

- The Housing Needs Manager
- The Housing Enforcement Manager

VARM cases would continue to be monitored internally using the existing format through PEFORM via the Housing Strategy Team on a quarterly basis and reported to Executive periodically.

Members welcomed the report and agreed that the Policy should be implemented at Bolsover District Council.

EXECUTIVE

Moved by Councillor A.M. Syrett and seconded by Councillor J. Ritchie

RESOLVED that the joint Vulnerable Adults Risk Management (VARM) Policy be agreed and implemented at Bolsover District Council.

(Housing Strategy and Growth Manager)

REASON FOR DECISION: To approve the VARM Policy.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

0714. NON KEY DECISIONS

(A) NORTH DERBYSHIRE HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY 2016-2020

Executive considered a report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, which sought approval of the North Derbyshire Homelessness Strategy 2016 - 2020.

In 2012, the Government introduced a Gold Standard Challenge with a focus on homeless prevention. To assist in achieving this standard and also due to the Council's current strategy having expired, officers had developed a North Derbyshire Homelessness Strategy in partnership with NEDDC and Chesterfield Borough Council.

Following consultation with stakeholders, a number of priorities had been identified, which provided clear focus and direction to enable the Council to prevent homelessness as effectively and efficiently as possible in partnership with neighbouring authorities as well as other partner agencies such as advice and support providers.

Having an up to date Homelessness Strategy that was fit for purpose would put the Council in a strong position when applying for the Gold Standard for Housing Options services; it was also a legal requirement for the Council to have a Homelessness Strategy.

Members welcomed the report.

In response to a Member's query regarding any financial impact on the Authority for an increased strategy on homelessness, the Chief Executive Officer suggested that a further report be presented to Executive within six months, setting out the impact of the policy on the District particularly the corporate performance indicator C06 for the prevention of homelessness and also details of the costs of the preventative work and the financial benefits arising from reduced expenditure for the wider public sector, and details of the Council's procedures for dealing with evictions in order to ensure these were not contributing negatively to homelessness and were securing the best economic and social value.

Moved by Councillor J. Ritchie and seconded by Councillor B.R. Murray-Carr

RESOLVED that 1) the North Derbyshire Homelessness Strategy 2016 - 2020 be approved.

Moved by Councillor A.M. Syrett and seconded by Councillor B.R. Murray-Carr

RESOLVED that 2) a further report be presented to Executive in six months setting out:

EXECUTIVE

(i) the impact of the policy on the District particularly the corporate performance indicator C06 for the prevention of homelessness,

(ii) details of the costs of the preventative work and the financial benefits arising from reduced expenditure for the wider public sector and,

(iii) details of the Council's procedures for dealing with evictions in order to ensure these are not contributing negatively to homelessness and are securing the best economic and social value.

(Housing Strategy and Growth Manager)

REASON FOR DECISION: It is a legal requirement for the Council to have a Homelessness Strategy.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

(B) SHEFFIELD CITY REGION SOCIAL AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMPACT

Executive considered a report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing which sought approval for the Council to be a signatory of the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Social and Affordable Housing Compact.

In January 2016, the SCR Housing Forum met to discuss the key issues of meeting the challenge to deliver housing growth, Right to Buy extension to housing associations and a collective framework for allocations. It was agreed that a working group be established to develop a common set of principles that all major landlords across the SCR could sign up to.

The working group was launched in March 2016 and identified roles and responsibilities to ensure appropriate linkages to the SCR Housing Executive Board and Housing Directors Group. The working group had developed the Social and Affordable Housing Compact between April and August 2016 and the official launch date was in early December 2016.

The eight objectives of the SCR Social and Affordable Housing Compact were detailed in the report.

The SCR Social and Affordable Housing Compact would be signed by 8 Council's, 4 ALMOs and up to 29 Housing Associations; if the Council signed up to the Compact, BDC would be included in developing and shaping the SCR Compact as it evolved over time.

Members noted that the Authority was a non constituent member of the SCR.

The Chief Executive Officer advised the meeting that if the Council signed up to the Compact, it would be highlighted that this was to a statement of principles as a non constituent member.

Moved by Councillor J.R Ritchie and seconded by Councillor S. Fritchley

EXECUTIVE

RESOLVED that the Authority signs up to the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Social and Affordable Social Housing Compact Statement of Principles as a non constituent member.

(Housing Strategy and Growth Manager)

REASON FOR DECISION: Bolsover District Council would be included in developing and shaping the SCR Compact as it evolved over time.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: Not to sign the SCR Social and Affordable Housing Compact – rejected as this would result in Bolsover DC being excluded from future developments in the SCR Social and Affordable Housing Compact.

The Housing Strategy and Growth Manager left the meeting.

(C) CORPORATE PLAN TARGETS PERFORMANCE UPDATE – OCTOBER 2016 TO DECEMBER 2016 (QUARTER 3 – 2016/17)

Executive considered a report of the Assistant Director – Customer Service and Improvement which provided breakdown details of quarter 3 (October to December 2016) performance outturn for the Corporate Plan 2015 -2019 targets.

Out of the 60 targets 47 (78.3%) were on track, 9 (15%) had been achieved (3 this quarter and 6 previously), 2 (3.3%) had been flagged as an 'alert', i.e. they may not achieve their annual target, 1 (1.7%) was overdue and 1 (1.7%) had been withdrawn (previously). Full details of progress were given in the report.

In relation to target G11: 'Through a programme of targeted refurbishment bring 15 empty private sector properties back into use per annum'. No properties brought back into use to date during 2016/17, it was noted that a new Empty Properties Officer was now in post and supporting this area of work

Members thanked the Information, Engagement & Performance Manager for the update.

Moved by Councillor J. Ritchie and seconded by Councillor M.J. Dooley

RESOLVED that progress against the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 targets be noted.

REASON FOR DECISION: To keep Members informed of progress against the Corporate Plan Targets noting achievements and any areas of concern.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: Not applicable, as providing an overview of performance against agreed targets.

The Information, Engagement & Performance Manager left the meeting.

EXECUTIVE

(D) INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

Executive considered a report of the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services which provided information on changes to the Investors in People (IiP) Standard and also sought approval to withdraw from the IiP process.

The Council had committed to achieving the Investors in People standard for a number of years through corporate objectives and work plans with a three yearly external assessment process. In July 2015, Bolsover District Council was assessed against the Investors in People Standard and accredited with the Silver level of the Extended Framework.

In September 2015, Investors in people launched a new Standard - the Sixth Generation of the Investors in People Standard.

The new framework was structured around nine indicators, which were organised under three headings; Leading, Supporting and Improving and also introduced a four stage performance model; (developed, established, advanced, high performing), which underpinned the nine indicators of the IiP framework.

The introduction of the new IiP Standard would involve a significant amount of work for the Council in terms of understanding the requirements of the new Standard; service areas producing, implementing and evidencing the requirements; Human Resources and Organisational Development in supporting service areas with the work and collating evidence, as well as time to develop a close working relationship with a new assessor.

If the Council continued with IiP, the budget allocation would need to be increased to meet the cost of assessment against the new standard, whereas not continuing with IiP would make a saving of £5,500 which had been allocated in the 2018/19 budget.

BDC's current accreditation would continue until the end of the three year period which was toward the end of 2018.

Members agreed that given the increased costs, resource commitment required and the general trend within the region and beyond, the Authority should discontinue with IiP assessment/accreditation.

Moved by Councillor M.J. Dooley and seconded by Councillor K. Reid

RESOLVED that 1) the changes to the Investors in People Sixth Generation Standard be noted,

2) given the increased costs, resource commitment required and the general trend within the region and beyond, the Authority discontinues with IiP assessment/accreditation.

(Assistant Director - HR & Payroll)

REASON FOR DECISION: Due to the significant changes to the IiP Standard requiring resource commitment and an increase in cost to the Authority.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

EXECUTIVE

(E) HIGH SPEED 2 PHASE 2b; CREWE TO MANCHESTER, WEST MIDLANDS TO LEEDS

Executive considered a report of the Chief Executive Officer which provided details of the Government's High Speed 2 Phase 2b route refinement consultation and also the property consultation. The report also set out proposals for a response to the consultation. A summary of residents' letters received by the Council which raised their concerns was attached as an appendix to the report.

In November 2016, the Government published its preferred route for Phase 2b of HS2. Whilst the proposed route refinement varied the previous route of HS2 through the District, with seven substantial changes, there remained a significant impact on property, businesses and local communities, including the potential loss of income to the Authority in business rates and council tax and impact on the visual amenity.

Of the seven route refinements outlined, the one most relevant to the Council's area was the Derbyshire to West Yorkshire (M18/Eastern Route).

Additionally, the consultation document set out how the proposed route could serve Sheffield City Centre and Chesterfield with a spur line. This would link into the existing rail network south of Chesterfield by joining the existing line near Clay Cross. It was proposed that this spur line would cross the M1 from east to west just after Junction 28 of the M1 and would then travel through Blackwell and Newton meeting the existing line near Stonebroom where it would then travel on into Chesterfield. A copy of the map setting out the spur route and the main route and the proposals for the line to the Staveley Depot could be viewed via a link provided in the report for Members' information.

Since the announcement of the proposed changes, ongoing dialogue had taken place with HS2, with the Leader of the Council writing directly to Sir David Higgins to express concern about the impact on the District.

In addition to this, the Chief Executive Officer and the Leader had met with the HS2 Consultation Team and Sir David Higgins, to talk through the impact and how best the Council could influence Government's proposals and what opportunities were available to mitigate the significant impact on communities and businesses.

The Chief Executive Officer noted that there were many factors to be considered and in consultation with the Leader of the Council, he would be responding to the consultation on behalf of the Authority. Any Member comments to add to the consultation should be referred to the Chief Executive Officer to assist with the response and the finalisation of the response with the Leader.

The deadline regarding the route refinement consultation and the property consultation was 9th March 2016.

A lengthy discussion took place.

Moved by Councillor A.M. Syrett and seconded by Councillor M.J. Dooley

RESOLVED that 1) the Chief Executive Officer, in consultation with the Leader, finalises the Council's response to the HS2 consultation in order that it be submitted by 9th March 2017,

EXECUTIVE

2) any Member comments to add to the consultation be referred to the Chief Executive Officer to assist with the response and the finalisation of the response with the Leader,

(Chief Executive Officer)

REASON FOR DECISION: To enable the Council to respond to the HS2 consultation by the deadline of 9th March 2017.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED: For the District Council not to respond to the consultation was rejected as this would limit its ability to influence the proposals and ensure that Government were aware of the impact and opportunities HS2 presented for the Council's local communities and businesses.

The meeting concluded at 1115 hours.