

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

6 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 6.30 PM

PRESENT: MR RG ALLEN - MAYOR
MR LJP O'SHEA – DEPUTY MAYOR

Mr PS Bessant, Mr DC Bill MBE, Mr CW Boothby, Mr SL Bray,
Mrs R Camamile, Mr MB Cartwright, Mrs MA Cook, Mr DS Cope,
Mrs GAW Cope, Mr WJ Crooks, Mr MA Hall, Mrs L Hodgkins,
Mr E Hollick, Mrs J Kirby, Mr C Ladkin, Mr MR Lay, Mr KWP Lynch,
Mr K Morrell, Mr M Nickerson, Mrs J Richards, Mr RB Roberts,
Mr SL Rooney, Mrs H Smith, Mrs MJ Surtees, Mr BE Sutton,
Miss DM Taylor, Mr P Wallace, Mr R Ward, Mr HG Williams,
Ms BM Witherford and Ms AV Wright

Officers in attendance: Steve Atkinson, Ilyas Bham, Bill Cullen, Malcolm Evans, Edwina Grant, Julie Kenny, Rebecca Owen, Rob Parkinson and Ashley Wilson

144 PRAYER

Prayer was offered by Pastor Garry Kelly.

145 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Nichols.

146 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Councillor Richards drew attention to minute 87 of the previous meeting and requested that the second paragraph be amended to read "Councillor Richards wished her concern regarding the infrastructure resulting from increased housing development in Barwell and Earl Shilton to be recorded". It was moved by Councillor Surtees, seconded by Councillor Hall and

RESOLVED – the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2016 be approved subject to the abovementioned amendment and signed by the Mayor.

147 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wallace declared a personal interest in agenda item 24 (car parking in Hinckley town centre) as the owner of a business on Castle Street.

Councillors Bill, Bray, Cartwright, Mrs Cope, Mr Cope, Crooks, Hodgkins, Hollick, Lynch, Taylor and Witherford declared personal interests in agenda item 13 (disposal of land, Clifton Way) as the applicant was known to them. As such they stated they would take no part in discussion on the item or voting thereon.

148 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor referred to the successful Snapdragon event, a recent sponsored walk with the Sea Cadets, forthcoming abseil down St Mary's Church spire and a charity soul night at Café Español to raise funds for Hinckley Museum. The Mayor also referred to a letter received from Buckingham Palace to thank the Mayor and citizens of Hinckley and Bosworth for their good wishes on the event of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth's 90th

Birthday. The Mayor also pointed out, out of courtesy, that agenda item 24 would be taken in private session, so that members of the public attending for that item were aware as soon as possible.

149 PETITION: "SAVE HINCKLEY COTTAGE HOSPITAL"

A member of the public presented a petition in relation to Hinckley Hospital. Whilst acknowledging that the action requested by the petition was not within the remit of the authority, members were pleased that the petition had been brought to Council due to the strength of public feeling. Councillor Wright, seconded by Councillor Hall, proposed that the petition be forwarded by the Chief Executive to the West Leicestershire CCG with a copy to the NHS Asset Management Team, as the relevant bodies, with the following representation from the Council:

“Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council acknowledges and supports residents’ wishes for retention and indeed expansion of health services within the borough and more specifically within the Hinckley area. This is a growing borough and we don’t just need services for now but we need to know that our health services are fit and able to cope with the influx of new residents that will come to our borough over the next 10 plus years.

The Council acknowledges and supports the residents view that ideally the Mount Road Cottage Hospital building should be made fit for purpose and be able to offer us all modern, convenient, state of the art and nationally accredited health care services that will take the borough into the future so it will not just be able to treat us, but treat our children and our children’s children.

In acknowledging and supporting the residents’ desire however, the Council acknowledges its understanding, as indicated by the West Leicestershire CCG, that renovation and reconfiguration of the Cottage Hospital building may well not be cost effective; that it may cost millions and that the stretched public NHS purse may be spent more cost effectively by transferring and possibly enhancing those services currently housed within the Cottage Hospital building into a reconfigured Health Centre behind the Cottage Hospital and into the Sunnyside Hospital on Ashby Road which is currently under-utilised.

The Council accepts that the Cottage Hospital building in its present condition is unable to facilitate cancer screening and it cannot get national accreditation for endoscopy as most facilities have now days; further, its layout simply is not conducive to modern medicine and infection prevention.

The Council advocates the development and provision of additional local health services such as a further emergency care offering, accommodation for health-related voluntary bodies and (if renovation/reconfiguration of the Cottage hospital building is not economically viable) significant investment into the Health Centre and Sunnyside Hospital buildings as well as health services generally in the borough, including needed renovation, reconfiguration and expansion of some of those buildings.

Again, if Mount Road Cottage Hospital is simply not economically viable, the Council would strongly advocate building an extension to the Sunnyside Hospital site to allow for possible housing of some of the transferred services from the Cottage Hospital, to allow provision and room for additional/enhanced services and to provide capacity for the significant growth our area will undergo over the next 10 years. *(this was previously planned back in the 2008 Community Health Services Consultation)*

The Sunnyside site does provide vast scope for expansion of building with ample parking. Transportation to and from the Sunnyside site should be carefully considered as well as pedestrian safety at the Sunnyside site.”

During discussion on the above proposal, reference was made to:

- The financial pressures facing the NHS
- The informative presentation received by the Scrutiny Commission in relation to the current healthcare consultation
- The importance of not putting at risk future investment in local health services by protecting a building that may not be fit for purpose.

Councillor Witherford requested that a comment be added to the representation that, should the CCG decide to keep the current Mount Road building, the space would be best used to reconfigure areas such as consultation and waiting rooms to support current GP services. Councillor Wright agreed to include this in the representation.

It was unanimously

RESOLVED – the petition be sent on to the West Leicestershire CCG and the NHS Asset Management Team with the following representation from the Council:

“Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council acknowledges and supports residents’ wishes for retention and indeed expansion of health services within the borough and more specifically within the Hinckley area. This is a growing borough and we don’t just need services for now but we need to know that our health services are fit and able to cope with the influx of new residents that will come to our borough over the next 10 plus years.

The Council acknowledges and supports the residents view that ideally the Mount Road Cottage Hospital building should be made fit for purpose and be able to offer us all modern, convenient, state of the art and nationally accredited health care services that will take the borough into the future so it will not just be able to treat us, but treat our children and our children’s children.

In acknowledging and supporting the residents’ desire however, the Council acknowledges its understanding, as indicated by the West Leicestershire CCG, that renovation and reconfiguration of the Cottage Hospital building may well not be cost effective; that it may cost millions and that the stretched public NHS purse may be spent more cost effectively by transferring and possibly enhancing those services currently housed within the Cottage Hospital building into a reconfigured Health Centre behind the Cottage Hospital and into the Sunnyside Hospital on Ashby Road which is currently under-utilised.

The Council accepts that the Cottage Hospital building in its present condition is unable to facilitate cancer screening and it cannot get national accreditation for endoscopy as most facilities have now days; further, its layout simply is not conducive to modern medicine and infection prevention.

The Council advocates the development and provision of additional local health services such as a further emergency care offering, accommodation for health-related voluntary bodies and (if renovation/reconfiguration of the Cottage hospital building is not economically viable) significant investment into the Health Centre and Sunnyside Hospital buildings as well as health services generally in the

borough, including needed renovation, reconfiguration and expansion of some of those buildings.

Again, if Mount Road Cottage Hospital is simply not economically viable, the Council would strongly advocate building an extension to the Sunnyside Hospital site to allow for possible housing of some of the transferred services from the Cottage Hospital, to allow provision and room for additional/enhanced services and to provide capacity for the significant growth our area will undergo over the next 10 years. *(this was previously planned back in the 2008 Community Health Services Consultation)*

The Sunnyside site does provide vast scope for expansion of building with ample parking. Transportation to and from the Sunnyside site should be carefully considered as well as pedestrian safety at the Sunnyside site.”

150 QUESTIONS

The following questions were received and responses provided:

- (a) Question from Councillor Cartwright to the Leader (Executive member for Finance)

“With an increasing number of High Street banks offering cashback on direct debit payments to customers who pay their utility bills such as gas, electric and council tax by direct debit, would the Executive member for Finance please answer the following questions:

- (i) Taking, for example, my property in Groby, a band D property, as a reference – what is the actual cost in financial terms, with and without officer time, to collect my council tax by the various methods available to me, broken down in a clear financial statement?
- (ii) What is the cost in collecting each of the ten direct debits and the total cost of collecting the yearly payments?
- (iii) Does the council pay a commission to those banks that do not offer this incentive to their customers or pay a reduced amount compared to the banks that do not offer this incentive?”

Response from Councillor Hall

“Thank you for your question, Cllr Cartwright. With regard to parts (i) and (ii), we do not hold the information to calculate this cost. However our average cost of collection per property is £9.10. From this, direct salary costs are £6.70.

74% of council tax payers use the direct debit payment option.

Three files per month are sent for council tax. The annual charge for this is £126.

In response to part (iii), no commission is paid to any bank or financial institution.”

- (b) Question from Councillor Witherford to the Executive member for Environmental Health

“The current Environmental Report states that requests for rat treatments are down by 65% since the introduction of the charges set out in the latest budget

statement. This charge was challenged by our group at the time and concerns were shown that the public would resist reporting possible infestations due to this imposition. I cannot believe that there has been a reduction in the rat population in Hinckley and Bosworth to this extent as the redevelopment programme is still ongoing, additional housing estates are coming forward and the consequent disturbance of habitat is evident. It is common knowledge that this area, with its underground streams, brooks and ponds, has always had a large rat population which was adequately controlled by treatments provided free of charge by this Council in the past.

In the interests of the health, safety and wellbeing of all our residents, can the Executive member confirm that the administration will agree to revert to a no-charge situation for reporting evidence of rat infestations?"

Response from Councillor Morrell

"I thank Cllr Witherford for her question. I can confirm that, as predicted, the number of requests for treatments carried out by the council has decreased since April this year following the introduction of a £20 charge. Requests for this service vary considerably from year to year depending on the weather and other factors affecting the sightings of rats. The last two years have seen significant increases in treatments but compared to three years ago the current reduction in treatments is only down by 28%. The majority of treatments occur during the late summer and early autumn so it is probably too early to draw firm observations as to the impact of charging. When the service is free, residents are happy to request a treatment even if only a single transient rat has been seen and often no further "take" of poison occurs. Officers have not observed a significant increase in complaints relating to rats which would be expected if populations had significantly increased. The service continues to work with Severn Trent Water in baiting local sewers on a proactive basis. We will continue to monitor the situation but at the current time we are not minded to reintroduce a free service, something which is very rare for local authorities during these current financial restrictions. £20 is still a highly subsidised cost compared to those charged by private pest control contractors and represents very good value for the comprehensive treatment received."

By way of supplementary question, Councillor Witherford asked whether the Executive member was aware of the three or four recent reports of rat infestations on Trinity Vicarage Road. He agreed to look into it and respond to Cllr Witherford outside of the meeting.

(c) Question from Councillor Hodgkins to the Leader (Executive member for Finance)

"Following the withdrawal of a court case involving one of our tenants recently, when it was determined that the tenant in question should get a full refund of the charges made to her in regard to the so called "bedroom tax", can the Executive member please advise how many other council tenants are in a similar situation. In the interest of consistency, can the Executive member please confirm that they too will receive similar refunds and what will be the total cost to the council for such reimbursements?"

Response from Councillor Hall

"Thank you, Cllr Hodgkins, for your question.

It is very difficult to give a definitive answer in respect of numbers, cost and consistency, because the circumstances will differ in each case. Indeed, the case

you quote had its own complexities and changes in circumstances – hence the delay in being able to give a definitive response.”

151 LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITION STATEMENT

In his position statement, the Leader made reference to the matters for decision on the agenda.

152 MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

The minutes of the Scrutiny Commission were noted.

153 STARTER HOMES BID - DRUID STREET SITE

A report was presented which recommended marketing of land at Druid Street for use for the construction of starter homes. It was moved by Councillor Surtees, seconded by Councillor Rooney and

RESOLVED – the site at Druid Street, Hinckley, be declared surplus and be marketed and disposed for use for the construction of starter homes.

154 LAND DISPOSALS

Members gave consideration to disposal of four sites at Bridge Road, Burbage; Elwell Avenue, Barwell; Langdale Road, Hinckley; and Wykin Road, Hinckley. In relation to Bridge Road, Burbage, it was requested that any development should not add to the current parking problems in that area. It was moved by Councillor Surtees, seconded by Councillor Rooney and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The disposal of land at Bridge Road, Burbage, at a price of not less than £40,000, be approved;
- (ii) The disposal of land at Elwell Avenue, Barwell, at a price of not less than £60,000, be approved;
- (iii) The disposal of land at Langdale Road, Hinckley, at a price of not less than £230,000, be approved;
- (iv) The disposal of land at Wykin Road, Hinckley, at a price of not less than £27,500, be approved.

155 PRESENTATION

At this juncture, the Mayor presented Sue and Jim Houghton, who had just arrived in the meeting, with a gift in recognition of their hard work for the people of the Borough and at Sport in Desford, which had resulted in their both being awarded a British Empire Medal in this year's Queen's Birthday Honours.

156 DISPOSAL OF LAND, CLIFTON WAY

Councillors Bill, Bray, Cartwright, Mrs Cope, Mr Cope, Crooks, Hodgkins, Hollick, Lynch, Taylor and Witherford reminded the meeting that they had declared a personal interest in this item and would take no part in the debate or voting thereon.

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval of the disposal of land in Clifton Way, Hinckley, to facilitate the extension of the Hollycroft Medical Centre. A member suggested that the developer be approached to ask if they could remove the covenant at cost rather than charge the already struggling NHS for doing so. It was moved by Councillor Surtees, seconded by Councillor Rooney and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The site at Clifton Way be designated surplus to requirements and withdrawn from allocation as public open space;
- (ii) Disposal of the site for the extension of Hollycroft Medical Centre upon payment of £75,000 plus legal costs be approved;
- (iii) Payment to Jelson Ltd to release the restrictive covenant to enable use as a medical centre on the best terms that can be negotiated, not exceeding 50% of the sale proceeds be approved, with a request that Jelson Ltd charge this work at cost only.

157 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COMPANY: MIDDLEFIELD LANE

Council received a report which provided an update on the business plan for the company and sought approval for disposal of the site at Middlefield Lane. Some members expressed disappointment that it was recommended not to pursue the site for development of housing by Hinckley & Bosworth Development Ltd. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Surtees and

RESOLVED –

- (i) Hinckley & Bosworth Development Ltd be not pursued for the development of housing on Middlefield Lane;
- (ii) The Middlefield Lane site be disposed of in the open market to ensure the best consideration of the site be obtained;
- (iii) Hinckley & Bosworth Development Limited be retained to explore future opportunities in the housing market and also other potential markets and revenue streams.

158 AUDIT RESULTS REPORT (ISA260) FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2016

Council received the Audit Results Report from the External Auditor. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Surtees and

RESOLVED – the Audit Results Report be received and approved.

159 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT & STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

Members received the financial statements and Annual Governance Statement for 2015/16. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Surtees and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The audited Annual Governance Statement and financial statements for 2015/16 be approved;

- (ii) The draft management letter of representation requested by the external auditors be noted.

160 FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2015/16

Council was informed of the financial outturn position for 2015/16. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Surtees and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The general fund outturn be approved;
- (ii) The transfers to earmarked reserves and balances be approved;
- (iii) The revenue carry forwards of expenditure and income be approved;
- (iv) The draft housing revenue and housing repairs account (HRA) outturn for 2015/16 and transfers to/from balances be approved;
- (v) The draft capital programme outturn for the general fund and housing revenue account be approved;
- (vi) The capital carry forwards be approved;
- (vii) The outturn for the Leicestershire Revenues and Benefits Partnership be approved.

161 EFFICIENCY PLAN

Consideration was given to the Efficiency Plan which would be submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Camamile and

RESOLVED –

- (ii) The Efficiency Plan be approved for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government;
- (ii) Should announcements regarding revisions to the New Homes Bonus scheme be made before the submission deadline of 14 October and/or comments be made by the Peer Challenge Team following their on-site visit later in September, the Leader of the Council, Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer be granted delegated authority to approve appropriate revisions.

162 EXTENDING FUNDING AND RELATED SUPPORT TO PARISHES AND COMMUNITIES

A report was received which proposed revisions to the Parish and Community Initiative Fund (PCIF) and proposed a new Developing Communities Fund. In response to a member's question, it was confirmed that the Developing Communities Fund would be available for all parishes, but not for the unparished town of Hinckley. The initiative relating to support for Neighbourhood Development Plans was welcomed and it was noted that this would support all parishes and communities within the borough.

Some members expressed concern that it would not be available for projects in the Hinckley wards which, they felt, was unfair as Hinckley residents were contributing to it via their payments to the green waste service. In response, it was noted that the majority of income for the green waste service was coming from the rural areas, and members were reminded that the high take up of the service had resulted in a surplus which, was a positive development. A member suggested that the report should reflect that the funding for the Developing Communities Fund did not come solely from the additional income from the garden waste scheme. The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Bray and seconded by Councillor Bill:

“In order to ensure opportunities for all the communities in the borough, and not just for those in rural area, as everyone is facing developments in one form or another, I propose that recommendation 2.1(ii) be amended as follows: delete the words ‘available for parishes and communities on the bases set out in appendix B’ and replace with ‘to be available for all parishes and communities across the borough’”.

Councillor Hall, along with four other councillors, requested that voting on this motion be recorded. The vote was taken as follows:

Councillors Bill, Bray, Cartwright, Mr Cope, Mrs Cope, Crooks, Hodgkins, Hollick, Lynch, Taylor and Witherford voted FOR the amendment (11);

Councillors Bessant, Boothby, Camamile, Cook, Hall, Kirby, Ladkin, Morrell, Nickerson, O’Shea, Richards, Roberts, Rooney, Smith, Surtees, Sutton, Wallace, Ward, Williams and Wright voted AGAINST the amendment (20);

Councillors Allen and Lay abstained from voting.

The motion was declared LOST.

It was moved by Councillor Morrell and seconded by Councillor Ladkin that the recommendation contained within the report be approved. Councillor Hall, along with four other councillors, requested that voting on the motion be recorded. The vote was taken as follows:

Councillors Bessant, Bill, Boothby, Bray, Camamile, Cartwright, Cook, Mr Cope, Mrs Cope, Crooks, Hall, Hodgkins, Hollick, Kirby, Ladkin, Lay, Lynch, Morrell, Nickerson, Richards, Roberts, Rooney, Smith, Surtees, Sutton, Taylor, Wallace, Ward, Williams, Witherford and Wright voted FOR the motion (31);

There were no votes AGAINST the motion (0);

Councillors Allen and O’Shea abstained from voting.

The motion was CARRIED and it was

RESOLVED –

- (i) The revised criteria and arrangements for the Parish & Community Initiative Fund be approved;
- (ii) The details for the additional Developing Communities Fund be approved;
- (iii) Parishes and communities be engaged and encouraged to bring forward Neighbourhood Development Plans and associated

outline applications for Developing Communities Funding by 9 December 2016;

- (iv) The Leader, Executive member for Rural Communities & Tourism, Licensing & Environmental Services, Executive member for Town and Urban Communities and the Chief Executive be granted delegated authority to agree the criteria for evaluating any applications received;
- (v) Projects agreed at that stage receive funding from April 2017;
- (vi) The establishment of a Neighbourhood Planning Support Officer, should the thresholds in paragraph 3.7 of the report be met, be approved.

Councillor Lay left the meeting at this juncture.

163 PROPOSALS FOR REARRANGEMENTS FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE

Consideration was given to a report which proposed changes to the operation of the Planning Committee. Councillor Bray announced that all members of his group who were not members of the Planning Committee would be nominated as substitutes. Councillor Hall named Councillors Boothby, Morrell, Nickerson and himself as substitutes. A member expressed concern that there was already the facility to be 'minded to refuse' an application on deferring it. In response to a member's question, it was clarified that, when a deferred item was brought back to the following meeting, there would be no restriction on members speaking on the application.

On the motion of Councillor Rooney, seconded by Councillor Ward, it was

RESOLVED –

- (i) The necessary amendments to the Constitution be approved, with all members being able to speak when the matter returned to the committee;
- (ii) The arrangements for briefings, site visits and the operation of the committee be approved;
- (iii) The proposal to trial the introduction of video footage as part of the officer presentation be approved;
- (iv) The Nolan Principles be noted;
- (v) The operation and effectiveness of the Planning Committee be reviewed annually.

164 APPOINTMENT TO POORS PLATT CHARITY, BARWELL

It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Boothby and

RESOLVED – Councillor Smith be appointed to Poors Platt charity, Barwell, for a term of four years.

165 CORPORATE STRUCTURE

Bill Cullen, Julie Kenny and Rob Parkinson left the meeting for this item as they were named in, and directly affected by, the report and its recommendations.

Members gave consideration to the proposed new senior management structure. It was moved by Councillor Hall, seconded by Councillor Morrell and

RESOLVED –

- (i) The revised management structure be approved with effect from 1 January 2017;
- (ii) The job descriptions for the new posts be approved;
- (iii) The appointments to the new posts be approved;
- (iv) The associated cost reductions from April 2017 be approved;
- (v) A continuous review of the management structure and associated cost implications be maintained.

166 MATTERS FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC MAY BE EXCLUDED

On the motion of Councillor Hall seconded by Councillor Morrell, it was

RESOLVED – in accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 10 of Part I of Schedule 12A of that Act.

167 CAR PARKING IN HINCKLEY TOWN CENTRE

Members received a report on car parking in Hinckley town centre. It was moved by Councillor Ladkin, seconded by Councillor Hall and

RESOLVED – the recommendation contained in the report be approved.

(The Meeting closed at 9.06 pm)

MAYOR