

# Public Document Pack

## HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

23 SEPTEMBER 2014 AT 6.30 PM

PRESENT: MR JG BANNISTER - MAYOR  
MR K NICHOLS – DEPUTY MAYOR

Mr RG Allen, Mr DC Bill MBE, Mr CW Boothby, Mr SL Bray,  
Mrs R Camamile, Mr MB Cartwright, Mrs T Chastney, Mr DS Cope,  
Mr WJ Crooks, Mr DM Gould, Mr PAS Hall, Mrs WA Hall,  
Mrs L Hodgkins, Mr MS Hulbert, Mr DW Inman, Mr C Ladkin,  
Mr MR Lay, Mr KWP Lynch, Mr R Mayne, Mr JS Moore, Mr K Morrell,  
Mr MT Mullaney, Mr LJP O'Shea, Mrs J Richards, Mrs H Smith,  
Mrs S Sprason, Mr BE Sutton and Miss DM Taylor

Officers in attendance: Steve Atkinson, Bill Cullen, Malcolm Evans, Emma Horton, Julie Kenny, Sanjiv Kohli, Karen Mason, Rebecca Owen, Sally Smith and Sharon Stacey

### 170 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Batty, Bessant and Ward.

### 171 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was moved by Councillor Bray, seconded by Councillor Moore and

RESOLVED – the minutes of the meetings held on 1 July and 2 September 2013 be approved and signed by the Mayor.

### 172 ADDITIONAL URGENT BUSINESS BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

The Mayor agreed to take three items of urgent business: changes to membership of committees, a petition from Councillor Morrell and a petition from Councillor Crooks. It was agreed that these would be taken immediately.

### 173 MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED –

- (i) Councillor Mayne be replaced by Councillor Hodgkins on the Finance, Audit & Performance Committee;
- (ii) Councillor Hodgkins be replaced by Councillor Mayne on the Scrutiny Commission.

### 174 HOUSING POLICY PETITION

Councillor Morrell was permitted to submit a petition with 358 signatures with the following title:

*"We the Parishioners of Sheepy feel betrayed by current Government Housing Policies.*

- *The Parishioners & Parish Council recognised and agreed the need for more housing.*

- *The Parish Council worked with Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to produce an agreed core strategy yet the Government is imposing housing numbers on Local Councils which far exceed the numbers laid down in the core strategy.*
- *The Localism Act was supposed to empower the local community yet local wishes and opinions are being ignored contrary to the Localism policy.*
- *The National Planning Policy Framework was supposed to protect the countryside from inappropriate development yet present Government policy is giving housing developers carte blanche to develop on valuable quality agricultural land.*
- *A rising population not only needs to be housed but needs to be fed and according to new research, Britain is running out of land for food and faces a potential shortfall of two million hectares by 2030.*

*We the Parishioners of Sheepy Magna and Sheepy Parva insist that the Government reconsiders this policy immediately and uses its leadership and influence over HBBC to remove the intent of using prime agricultural land for an unwanted expansion of the village which will, over time, completely destroy its character and which is very much against voters' wishes!"*

It was agreed that Councillor Morrell would raise the issue further under the Statement of Community Involvement.

#### 175 PETITION AGAINST PLANNING APPLICATION 14/00435/OUT

Councillor Crooks presented a petition with 434 signatures with the following title:

*"We the undersigned wish to object to the proposed plan to build 450 houses known as 'Thrussel Meadows' in Barlestone & Osbaston on the grounds of increased traffic, overdevelopment of the site and lack of facilities & amenities to support this type & size of major development."*

The petition was accepted and it was agreed that it would be passed to the Planning team.

#### 176 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared at this stage.

#### 177 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor briefly reported that he had attended many enjoyable events recently.

#### 178 QUESTIONS

The attached questions were asked in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.1 and answers provided. Supplementary questions were asked as follows:

- (b) Councillor Moore asked if there had been an annual increase in car parking charges under the previous Conservative administration. In response it was stated that there had been annual increases as per the response circulated.
- (c) Councillor Moore queried the position of the Council nationally with regard to Council Tax. In response it was reported that the authority was the ninth lowest.
- (d) Councillor Camamile asked why other authorities could collect carrier bags whilst HBBC's contractor could not. The Executive member explained that, whilst the contract had never included collection of carrier bags, they had taken them

anyway due to the high value of other recyclable materials in the bins. Due to the lower value of recyclable materials now, the contractor was not willing to take them under the current contract. It was explained that other authorities would be paying more for their contract and as such, carrier bags could be taken.

179 LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITION STATEMENT

The Leader started his speech by sending his best wishes to Councillor Ward who had damaged his knee.

During his position statement, the Leader referred to progress on the Leisure Centre contract, work on the Bus Station site, difficult budget decisions needed for the future, the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan consultation and forthcoming Executive consideration of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Mallory Park noise control.

180 MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission introduced the minutes of recent meetings.

181 SOCIAL SERVICES ADAPTATIONS

Members received a report which outlined increasing pressure on the Social Services Adaptations budget and requested a virement to address this. Members asked questions regarding the waiting list for adaptations, the average costs and the reasons for removing adaptations when a property is vacated. In response to these and other comments, the following points were made:

- The assessment process undertaken by Social Services was very lengthy as they were under-resourced
- The average cost of an adaptation was £862
- There was currently no waiting list for HBBC to carry out the work once a referral, specification and necessary permissions were received
- Whilst properties were advertised as having adaptations in place, it was important to ensure adaptations met the needs of the individual, and as such there were often no residents on the housing waiting list requiring that particular adaptation.

It was moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Bray and

RESOLVED – the virement of £100,000 from the Major Voids capital budget to the Social Services Adaptations capital budget be approved in accordance with financial procedure rules.

182 ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR LEGISLATION

Council was informed of the new Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) powers, the Community Trigger and Endeavour. During discussion reference was made to the lack of resources within the Police, the increased perception of anti social behaviour and the excellent work of Endeavour. It was moved by Councillor Bill, seconded by Councillor Witherford and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The provisions of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 be noted and powers be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (Community Direction) and authorised officers to take action under Part 4 of that Act;

- (ii) The ASB policy be approved;
- (iii) The Community Trigger detailed in the report be noted;
- (iv) The work of the Endeavour team in tackling a wide range of Community Protection issues and improving public confidence be noted and commended.

183 ACTIVE HINCKLEY

Members were informed of a new externally funded cycling and walking scheme called 'Active Hinckley'. During discussion, Members referred to walking and cycling initiatives set up by other local employers, including the bus station developer. It was moved by Councillor Cope, seconded by Councillor Bray and

RESOLVED –

- (i) the securing of external funding be welcomed;
- (ii) the creation of income and expenditure budgets of £45,000 for 2014/15 and £65,000 for 2015/16, to be funded from the external grant via the Department of Transport's Local Sustainable Transport Fund and issued by Leicestershire County Council, be approved.

184 STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

The Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement for 2013/14 was presented to members. The Chairman of the Finance, Audit & Performance Committee reported that the Auditors were happy with the documents and she thanked the Finance team for their hard work. It was moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Bray and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The Statement of Accounts for the year 2013/14 be approved;
- (ii) The expected 'unqualified' audit opinion be noted.

185 BUDGET STRATEGY 2015/16

The Budget Strategy 2015/16 was presented to Council in conjunction with the Statement of Accounts and the New Homes Bonus reports also on the agenda for this meeting. It was moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Bray and by majority

RESOLVED – the Budget Strategy 2015/16 be approved.

186 NEW HOMES BONUS

Members received a report which provided information on the levels of funding to parish councils by the Borough Council. Attention was drawn to the supplementary agenda which contained a recommendation from the Finance, Audit & Performance Committee that the New Homes Bonus allocation to parish councils be withdrawn with effect from 2015/16.

Several Councillors expressed concern regarding the removal of funding to already struggling parishes. It was highlighted that the forwarding of New Homes Bonus monies to parishes was discretionary and that HBBC was the only authority in Leicestershire who did this and it had been made clear from the outset that it was never intended to be relied upon by parishes.

The provision of Council Tax Support to parishes was discussed, and it was agreed that there was currently no intention to remove this, and it would only be removed as a last resort.

It was moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Bray and by majority

RESOLVED –

- (i) The significant level of discretionary support provided to parish councils and the Special Expenses Area to date be noted;
- (ii) In light of the requirement contained in the Medium Term Financial Strategy to consider removal of the New Homes Bonus in order to ensure minimum general fund balance levels from 2015/16 onwards, the ending of all payments of New Homes Bonus to parish councils and the special expenses area from 2015/16 be approved;
- (iii) The ongoing provision of Council Tax Support funding to parish councils be approved.

187 MIDDLEFIELD LANE SITE DISPOSAL

A report seeking to dispose of the Middlefield Lane site was presented to Council. A member asked whether it would be a good idea to market the site with outline planning permission as had been done previously with another site. In response it was felt that there would be not benefit to doing so, but if no suitable tenders were received this would be reconsidered. Concern was also expressed that the site had been considered for council housing, but it was felt to be too large and too expensive. It was moved by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Bill and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The use of a formal tender process for marketing and disposal at a figure of not less than £2.2m be approved;
- (ii) Authority to accept a tender and dispose of the land at a value not less than £2.2m be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Direction).

188 EARL SHILTON & BARWELL AREA ACTION PLAN

Council gave consideration to the Earl Shilton & Barwell Area Action Plan. It was reported that the Inspector had recommended modifications which had been incorporated. During discussion, the following points were raised:

- The need to avoid over-provision of affordable flats in Earl Shilton
- the importance of bringing the employment land into use early in the Barwell SUE development
- concern regarding Mill Lane in Earl Shilton becoming a 'rat run' and the need to avoid heavy lorries using that road

- the position regarding town centre regeneration for Earl Shilton
- the viability claim from developers of Barwell SUE regarding the affordable housing provision.

In response to comments made, the Leader explained that planning permission for Barwell SUE had not been issued, as he was not yet satisfied that the commitments would be delivered and permission would not be issued until an agreement that was the best possible for the area had been reached.

It was moved by Councillor Bray, seconded by Councillor Bill and

RESOLVED –

- (i) the conclusions and recommendations of the Planning Inspector of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan be noted;
- (ii) the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan be adopted.

Councillor Lay left the meeting at 8.45pm.

189 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Members received a report on the findings of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Consultation Statement and resulting modifications. At this point, Councillor Morrell spoke on his petition (minute 174 refers) which called for the Government to reconsider its intention to expand the villages of Sheepy Magna and Sheepy Parva, using agricultural land.

It was moved by Councillor Bray, seconded by Councillor Bill and by majority

RESOLVED –

- (i) The findings of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Consultation Statement and resulting modifications to the final SCI be approved;
- (ii) The publication of the SCI to inform plan-making and decision-taking be approved.

190 MOTIONS RECEIVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES 13.1 AND 13.2

Councillor Gould, seconded by Councillor Hulbert, proposed the following motion:

The council notes:

- It has been estimated that the UK Treasury loses as much as £12 billion to tax dodging by multinational companies every year. Developing countries lose three times more to tax dodging than they receive in aid each year – enough to give a basic education to the 57 million children currently missing out.
- The UK has a particular responsibility to end tax dodging, as it is responsible for 1 in 5 of the world's tax havens in the British Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.
- The use of tax havens by UK companies is rife, with 98 of the FTSE 100 companies routinely using tax havens.
- Large multinational companies pay as little as 5% in corporate taxes globally, while smaller businesses pay up to 30%.

This council believes:

- As a local authority we have a duty to provide the best possible public services.
- Our ability to provide quality local services would be significantly enhanced by the increased revenues from the government tackling tax dodging.
- All who benefit from public spending should contribute their fair share.
- The UK must take a lead role in creating a fairer tax system and combatting tax dodging.

This council resolves:

- To support the campaign for tax justice, supporting the motion:

*“While many ordinary people face falling household income and rising costs of living, some multinational companies are avoiding billions of pounds of tax from a tax system that fails to make them pay their fair share. Local governments in developing countries and the UK alike would benefit from a fairer tax system where multinational companies pay their fair share, enabling authorities around the world to provide quality public services. The UK government must listen to the strength of public feeling and act to end the injustice of tax dodging by large multinational companies, in developing countries and the UK.”*

Following discussion, it was unanimously

RESOLVED – the above motion be sent to HM Treasury.

(The Meeting closed at 8.55 pm)

---

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL – 23 SEPTEMBER 2014**

**QUESTIONS**

(a) From Councillor Moore to the Executive Member for Finance

Can the Executive Member for Finance tell me how much the annual increases and average rise in council tax of the last Conservative Council (2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 budgets) compared to the average rise of the Lib Dem administration from the 2008 budget onwards?

Response from Councillor Lynch:

Thank you Cllr Moore for your question. A summary of the average Band D Council Tax levels for the Borough Council together with the average percentage rise are set out below. Please note that the Borough rate for the years 2004/05, 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08 was set by the Conservative Administration. During these 4 years the average Band D Council Tax increased by 19%. In contrast, in the last 7 years i.e. 2008/09 to 2014/15, this Administration has reduced the amount of increase of Council Tax each year with a complete freeze over the last 4 years of this Administration.

**Average Band D Increases**

<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>
72.90	77.35	79.82	86.71	90.67	93.78	96.02	95.96	95.96	95.96	95.96
	6.10%	3.19%	8.63%	4.57%	3.43%	2.39%	-0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

(b) From Councillor Moore to the Executive Member for Finance

Can the Leader of the Council provide me with figures in relation to short stay parking charges for the two administrations (Periods 2004 through 2013)?

Response from Councillor Lynch:

Thank you Cllr Moore for your question. The short stay car parking charges from 2004/05 to 2014/15 are set out below.

Please note that the charges from 2004/05 to 2007/08 were set by the Conservative Administration.

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b><u>Short Stay</u></b>												
Up to 1 hour	0.40	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.50	0.50
Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	0.80	0.90	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.00	1.00

(c) From Councillor Moore to the Executive Member for Finance

Can the Executive Member for Finance provide me with details of how Hinckley and Bosworth's Band D council tax level compares with other Leicestershire and neighbouring districts?

Response from Councillor Lynch:

Thank you Cllr Moore for your question. Hinckley and Bosworth's average Band D Council Tax compared to the Leicestershire Districts and immediately neighbouring authorities of North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth is set out below. It is noteworthy that this Council's average Band D Council Tax is 10.52% lower than the next lowest authority's rate (Charnwood Borough Council) and 58.40% lower than the highest of the Leicestershire Districts (Melton Borough Council). When compared to our neighbouring authorities across the border, this Council's average Council Tax is 85% lower.

2014/15	Av. Band D CTax		
	District	Special Exp	Total
<b>Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</b>	<b>95.96</b>	<b>16.20</b>	<b>112.16</b>
Harborough District Council - Inc Average Parish Requirement	150.10	17.93	168.03
NWLDC	158.58	0.00	158.58
Oadby & Wigston Inc Average Parish Requirement & Special Expenses	202.60	0.00	202.60
Melton	177.66	0.00	177.66
Charnwood	102.62	21.34	123.96
Nuneaton & Bedworth	207.56	0.00	207.56
North West Warwickshire	207.30	0.00	207.30

(d) From Councillor Camamile to the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services

Bearing in mind this Council has publicly stated its' commitment to achieving the highest possible level of recycling, can the Executive member please explain why residents who have been magnificent in their efforts to recycle are now being told that they must now put a significant amount of materials clearly marked "suitable for recycling" in their black (landfill) bins and can he please confirm the cost to the council tax payer of the Council employing "bin police" who have been reported sneaking up people's driveways to inspect their bins so they can put exclusion stickers on recycling bins.

Response from Councillor Crooks:

New regulations are being introduced to improve the quality of recycling collected and produced. These affect the Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF's), the locations to which recycling loads are transported for sorting, and from January 2015, Councils are required to make a separate collection of waste paper, metal, plastic and glass, unless it is clearly demonstrated that it is not practical to do so. Unfortunately, there is a large amount of materials placed within the blue lidded recycling bin which is either rubbish, types of plastics which cannot be recycled, or material which we do not collect as part of our recycling scheme. In July, 13% of all material in the blue lidded bins was unsuitable. Incorrect recycling costs the Council money and we have therefore put in place information stickers and additional staffing to improve the quality of recycling. By taking this action within existing collection arrangements, we are seeking to maintain the low number of containers, reduce 'contamination' and maintain low costs.

The staff checking bins have been employed as some residents have not responded to our previous communications about not recycling certain types of plastic. We intend that this is a constructive measure, to assist residents who may need further explanation and advice. Most councils will not collect bins if they contain incorrect materials. The cost of the additional staff is £21,000 and this has been met from existing resources.

(e) From Councillor Camamile to the Executive member for Neighbourhood Services

Can the Executive member please advise elected members of the anticipated increase in waste going to landfill as a consequence of this change in policy and can he explain why these changes did not come to Council for full scrutiny before they were put in place.

Response from Councillor Crooks:

There is no change in policy by the Council. We are simply encouraging and reinforcing the good practice from residents over many years and seeking to explain what now needs to be done to meet changes in regulations. There will **not** be an increase in landfill per se, as the offending materials are currently removed by the contractor and sent to landfill. Conversely, these materials also contaminate higher value plastics, which means these also cannot be recycled. In addition, by putting plastic film and bags in the residual waste bin, landfill can be avoided by extracting this via mechanical and/or biological treatment to make Refused Derived Fuel (RDF).

The changes being put in place were in response to decisions made by central government, itself responding to EU regulations. The Council was not changing any policy, nor was it changing its methods of collection; to do so would have incurred additional costs. We constantly seek to keep service costs to a minimum and maintain a method of collection with which our residents are familiar and to which they continue to make an excellent contribution. Because there has been no policy change, there was no requirement for any decision at full Council.

However, I am concerned that future promised withdrawal of recycling credits by the County Council WILL lead to an increase in landfill. A policy supported by Councillor Camamile and her Conservative colleagues.

(f) From Councillor Morrell to the Leader of the Council

Further to a recent article in the Hinckley Times confirming that the developer of the bus station site was actively encouraging interest in the Crescent from established businesses currently located on Castle Street and no doubt offering very attractive inducements for them to move to the Crescent, can the Executive member please advise what proactive policies this administration has in place to fill any key shop units that become vacant and in general what initiatives will this administration be promoting to consolidate and indeed attract new business to Castle Street.

Response from Councillor Bray:

I am pleased to report that Castle Street remains strong in retail performance and occupancy. The current vacancy rate is only 3.48% which comprises just four shop units. This is well below the national rate of 10.1% and East Midlands rate of 11% for town centres.

As you will be aware, the Council is a key partner on the Hinckley Town Centre Partnership and BID. There are a range of initiatives and support available to encourage businesses to start up in Castle Street and the rest of the town centre. These include:

- New business start-up support grants.
- Business advice support from the BID office.
- Website provision for the new business.
- Promotional write up for new businesses in the BID monthly newsletter.
- Access to 5,000 loyalty card members to profile business and offer incentives.
- Planning advice surgeries for incoming and existing business.
- Small business grant relief.
- Hinckley Digital Market Town initiative – making Wi-Fi accessible to all businesses in the town centre.

In addition to this, the very fact that the Council has facilitated a multi-million pound shopping and leisure regeneration scheme at the Crescent will help further in raising the profile of Hinckley as a town to come and shop and spend leisure time in.

Councillor Morrell and his colleagues of course opposed this in this Council Chamber.

- (g) From Councillor Morrell to the Executive member for Culture & Leisure

At the recent Council meeting held on 2nd September when it was unanimously agreed by the Council to improve the specification of the swimming pool in the new leisure centre, concerns were raised not only about servicing the cost of any additional borrowing but also additional running costs for the improved swimming pool. Therefore, can the Executive member please confirm that the Council working with input from Hinckley Swimming Club will exhaustively investigate any potential additional leisure centre revenue that will be generated from these improvements and from the increase in useable floor area for leisure activity above the new leisure centre's original foot print.

Response from Councillor Cope:

I can confirm that PFP will work closely with Hinckley Swimming Club, the ASA and Council Officers to seek additional revenue streams resulting from the installation of the moveable floor in the main pool.

- (h) From Councillor Richards to the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services

Since the introduction of civil parking enforcement officers and in the context of the very restricted times allocated for parking enforcement outside of Hinckley, parking restrictions on double yellow lines are regularly flouted and often completely ignored out of office hours. As this is a worsening problem how does the administration propose to address this blatant disregard of parking restrictions that were obviously implemented for good reason in the first place.

Response from Councillor Crooks:

On street parking and the enforcement of double yellow lines is the responsibility of Leicestershire County Council, not Hinckley and Bosworth. I'm surprised that Cllr Richards, having been a County Councillor for the past 5 years, wasn't aware of this fact?

Given the concerns you raise are outside of Hinckley I'd suggest you ask the relevant LCC members to raise this with LCC on your behalf.

- (i) From Councillor Ladkin to the Executive Member for Culture & Leisure

My colleague Cllr. Richards put a question to a recent Scrutiny meeting in respect of concerns voiced by a number of members that there may not be adequate parking provision for the new leisure centre. The response was that there would be more than adequate parking, this claim was based on a traffic impact assessment projecting a 30%

increase in usage. Therefore, can the Executive member please explain how this tallies with the 400% increase in usage on which the operator's business case is based.

Response from Councillor Cope:

Your reference to a 400% increase in usage figures is wildly incorrect. The Council report dated 2 September, Appendix F (question 3), details Officers response to the question which has already been posed.

- PFP's tender submission calculated the usage of the facility will rise from the current 650,000 visits per annum, to 880,000 in year 3 maturity (35% increase).
- The new pool will increase the participation in swimming by 40% (from 268,000 visits to 373,000 visits).
- The facility will be served directly by Mount Road car park – 106 spaces.
- Argents Mead location will have approximately 264 spaces available from conveniently located car parks. In addition, the bus station car park will have over 500 spaces.
- There will be an overall net increase in the number of car parking spaces in the town centre of around 19% following the opening of the Crescent.
- Busy periods for Leisure Centre are 5pm – 9pm when the town centre businesses are predominantly closed.

(j) From Councillor Ladkin to the Leader of the Council

In the Leisure Centre report to Council on 2nd September, 2.10 on page 1 it refers to *"an income budget of £20,000 for 2015/2016 should be approved to reflect one off income received from PFPLM for car parking provision"*. Could the Executive member please elaborate on this and confirm whether or not the developer will be using all or any part of Mount Road car park during the construction phase of the new leisure centre, either for reserved contractor parking, material/plant storage or general accommodation.

Response from Councillor Bray:

Currently, all SLM employees receive a car parking pass for which the contractor pays. This will change when the new facility opens. Just ten dedicated employees of PFP will receive a pass. For example, the Engineer and Duty Managers, who open and close the facility, will have a pass, allowing them to park close to the facility on Mount Road car park. This arrangement will continue during the length of the contract. As you rightly note, the Council has negotiated an income of £20,000 as a one-off payment to fund this arrangement.

The site compound, which will include material/plant storage on general accommodation, will be located on Argents Mead, utilising the former short stay car park. It is the Council's intention to keep Mount Road car park operational to members of the public during the construction phase. It is likely that sub-contractors may need to utilise the car park. At this stage, it is envisaged that they will have to purchase car parking tickets.

This page is intentionally left blank