Steve Atkinson MA(Oxon) MBA FloD FRSA Chief Executive



Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council A Borough to be proud of

SCRUTINY COMMISSION - 9 MAY 2013

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

7. PARISH & COMMUNITY INITIATIVE FUND (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Public Space Manager.

9. REFLECTION OF BARWELL SUE APPLICATION PROCESS

Report of the Barwell & Earl Shilton Scrutiny Group outlining the process followed prior to consideration of the Barwell SUE planning application and lessons learned.

The following late representation has been received from a member of the Scrutiny Group:

Having read the draft report to scrutiny prepared by the chair of the working group, I would like to make the following additional comments.

1). Highways

Throughout the meetings of the group, the highways modelling results from both the developers model and LCC's model toom a frustratingly long time to be produced. Further the results put before the group were presented with little or no supporting information for the group to view to attempt to gauge validity of the results provided and the highway works required to accomodate the additional traffic volumes generated by the SUE developments.

It is fair to say that the information before the group at the date of writing makes little or no mention of highway modifications in and around Earl Shilton, whilst the plans to further restrict traffic flows in the centre of Barwell seems contradictory to the aim of drawing the additional residents of the SUE into the centre of barwell to promote the village centre and its sustainability.

The highway program presented by LCC very late in the day of the Barwell application at first appraisal appear little more than superficial tinkering with a handfull of junctions in the vicinity.

At this point I have strong concerns regarding the highways program proposed and the impact on the road system in and around Earl Shilton and Barwell, I would like to see a great deal more investigation and analysis carried out on this area before either development progresses further.

2). Severn Trent.

As the Chair has indicated in his report, this has also been an uphill battle to establish the predicted effects and proposed measures to deal with the additional demands placed upon the systems by the additional developments.

At this time the group has received very little in the way of any volume data to indicate the impact of the developments upon the water and sewerage systems.

In essence the main points that the group has received from Severn Trent is that a new pipeline is to be installed between Barwell and Hinckley to direct sewerage away from the Earl Shilton works and an indication that the Earl Shilton plant will remain operational - probably.

Again I have strong concerns regarding the robustness of the plans in place to deal with the additional demands placed upon the water and sewerage systems by the SUE's and at the very least wouldlike to see some form of supporting data from Severn Trent to demonstrate what they believe the impact to be and to allow group members to attempt to assess if the proposed measures are adequate or need to be revisited.

3). I have queried the need for the number of additional dwellings in and around Barwell and Earl Shilton - if there is such a demand for housing it seems strange that there are high numbers of properties remaining unsold or unlet for prolonged periods and property sale and rental prices are gradually falling.

Already there a number of permitted developments where the builders are building to order.

It is my understanding that the council is in a position to challenge the housing numbers allocated to it - If correct do we have an indication as to what the revised numbers would be and what steps could and have been taken to reduce the numbers?

As a group I firmly believe that we still have a great deal of ground to cover.

Richard Allen Member for Earl Shilton

11. MATTERS FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC MAY BE EXCLUDED

To consider the passing of a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the public from the undermentioned item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 10 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Act.

12. HINCKLEY CLUB FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - UPDATE (To Follow)

This report has been removed from the agenda and will instead go to the Finance, Audit & Performance Committee on 3 June.

APPENDIX 1 – PCIF allocation of grants 2013/14

Parish	Project	Applicant	Project cost		Maximum eligible grant	Score	Recommended grant	Conditions to be applied / comments
Bagworth and Thornton	Thornton Church Handrail installation	St Peter's Church, Thornton	£2,791	£500	£1,396	68.0	£500	
Barlestone	Meeting point community Space	Elohim Church	£30,315	£10,000	£10,000	67.0		Panel recommend funding £3910. Two schemes were received in Barlestone and criteria of grant fund is a maximum oif £10000 per Parish (the funding of the other scheme recommended at £6090), this group has also received a lot of funding in recent years.
Barlestone	Exercise for All	Barlestone Parish Council	£16,160	£10,000	£8,080	80.5		Recommended grant funding amount based on 50% of lowest received quote of £12180.
Barwell	Low Maintenance Landscaping at George Ward Centre	George Ward Centre	£9,124	£1,224	£4,562	53.5	£1,224	
Barwell	Pathway improvements at kirkby Rd	Barwell Parish Council	£7,395	£3,697	£3,697	65.5		Panel reccomends a maximum of £1036 be offered. This is based on previous grants for the same project being allocated over the last two years totalling £8964 and the total grant funding per project being £10,000.
Burbage	New Tarmac Footpath Hinckley Road Recreation Ground	Burbage Parish Council	£18,500	£9,250	£9,250	84.5	£9,250	
Cadeby	Development Plan for repair works at All Saints Church	Cadeby Parish Council	£21,952	£5,942	£10,000	55.5		Grant applied for to help fund a project development plan to enable phase 2 works to carry out large scale repairs to the church. Part funding has also been secured from English Heritage grant. Funding of a new community notice board, also included in the application. Final offer reflects part funding development plan works and 50% funding of notice board.
Desford	Resiting of Tennis Court Gate	Desford Lawn Tennis Club	£900	£540	£450	55.0		Resiting of gate to improve access for all users. Only 1 quote received. Offered £450 or 50% of further quote whichever is the least.
Desford	Painting of Mural on Community Building Garden Wall	Desford Free Church	£600	£300	£300	43.0	£300	

Parish	Project	Applicant	Project cost		Maximum eligible grant	Score	Recommended grant	Conditions to be applied / comments
Desford	Sport in Desford access improvements (car parking)	Sport in Desford	£15,001	£5,000	£7,500	65.5	£5,000	
Desford	Scout Group Camping Equipment	Desford Scout Group	£7,800	£3,820	£3,900	50.5	£3,820	
Earl Shilton	Mill Lane Cemetery Pergola, Benches and Planters	Earl Shilton Town Council	£3,350	£1,669	£1,675	54.5	£1,669.00	
Groby	Scout Hut Improvements	Groby 73rd Scouts	£10,749	£5,375	£5,375	68.5	£5,000	Panel recommends a grant of £5000. Further project in Groby requesting further £5000, and maximum grant per Parish is £10000 as per criteria of grant fund. Second Quote still required final offer based on £5000 or 50% of second quote whichever is the least.
Groby	The Garden of Remembrance	Groby Parish Council	£14,250	£5,000	£7,125	69.0	£5,000	
Market Bosworth	Parish Hall Annex Development	Market Bosworth Hall Management Committee	£238,000	£10,000	£10,000	84.0	£7,000	Panel recommends a Grant of £7,000. Unable to fund the full £10,000 requested in application due to grant criteria of a maximum of £10,000 per Parish and decision to fund futher Market Bosworth Project.Allocation of £7000 reflects the higher score and larger project cost of this project.
Market Bosworth	MBSSC Football and Cricket pitch drainage Works.	Market Bosworth Sports and Social Club	£29,476	£6,181	£10,000	60.0	£3,000	Panel recommends a grant of £3,000. Unable to fund the full £6181 requested due to grant criteria of a maximum of £10,000 per Parish and decision to fund other Market Bosworth Project. Allocation of £3000 reflects the lower score received and comparative lower total project cost of this scheme.
Market Bosworth	Gravel Path upgrade at Park Street Memorial Gardens	Market Bosworth Parish Council	£2,429	£1,214	£1,214	58.0	£0	Recommended for rejection. 3 Applications for Market Bosworth were received requesting a total of £17,395. The criteria for the grant specify an allocation of a maximum of £10,000 per Parish and the panel felt the two other applications offered better overall community benefit and scored more highly than this project.
Markfield	New Skate Park Project	Markfield Parish Council	£55,657	£10,000	£10,000	80.0	£10,000	Excellent overall scheme
Nailstone	Replacement of Leaded windows	Nailstone Parochial Church Council	£1,260	£630	£630	50.5	£630	

Parish	Project	Applicant		Amount applied for	Maximum eligible grant	Score	Recommended grant	Conditions to be applied / comments
Newbold Verdon		Newbold Verdon Parish Council	£1,663	£830	£831	55.5	£830	Grant based on second highest quote, but offering best value for money.
Peckleton	hard surface for basket ball	Peckleton Parish Council	£4,987	£2,993	£2,493	63.5	£2,493	Recommended Grant 50% of total cost, as per grant criteria.
Ratby	Entrance Improvements at Ferndale Community Park	Ratby Parish Council	£3,487	£3,000	£1,743	61.5	£1,743	Recommended grant funding based on lowest received quote.
Stanton under Bardon	Replacement of Carpet in Main Hall	Without Walls Christian Fellowship	£2,550	£1,275	£1,275	68.5	£1,275	
Stoke Golding	Outdoor Gym and Fitness Trail	Stoke Golding Parish Council	£9,990	£10,000	£4,995	90.5	£4,995	Offered based on 50% of lowest received quote (£9990).
Twycross	New Kitchen at Twycross Village Hall	Twycross Village Hall	£5,800	£2,900	£2,900	61.5	£2,900	
Twycross	Norton Juxta Village Hall insulation	Norton Juxta Twycross Village Hall Institute	£1,000	£500	£500	56.0	£500	Application based on estimated costs, 2x quotes required before final offered made. Offer will be £500 or 50% of lowest quote whichever is the least.
Total			£515,186	£111,840	£119,891		£84,382	

#REF!

Page 3

Page 4

This page is intentionally left blank