



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to attend a MEETING of BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL to be held in the Council Chamber at Parkside Suite - Parkside at 6.00 p.m. on Wednesday 26th April 2017, when the business referred to below will be brought under consideration:-

The formal business will be preceded by a prayer.

1. **To receive apologies for absence**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

3. **To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 28th February 2017 (Pages 1 - 24)**

4. **To receive any announcements from the Chairman and/or Head of Paid Service**

5. **To receive any announcements from the Leader**

6. **To receive comments, questions or petitions from members of the public**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allowed for members of the public to make a comment, ask questions or present petitions. Each member of the public has up to 3 minutes to do this. A councillor may also present a petition on behalf of a member of the public.

7. **Recommendations from the Cabinet** (Pages 25 - 26)

The recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on **28th February 2017** were considered at Council on that date.

To consider the recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on **1st March 2017**

- Council Response to Local Transport Plan No 4 Consultation
- Council Response to Solihull Local Plan Review
- Council Response to Worcestershire County Council Minerals Plan

There were no recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on **22nd March 2017**.

To consider the recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on **5th April 2017**

- ICT Infrastructure Proposals (the background Appendix to the Cabinet report is confidential)
- Shared Services Business Case for Customer Access and Financial Support (the background papers to this item are confidential)

(The background papers to the recommendations are contained at the back of the Council Agenda)

8. **To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28th February 2017, 1st March 2017, 22nd March 2017 and 5th April 2017**
(Pages 27 - 44)

9. **To receive and consider a report from the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Cultural Services, Environmental Services and Regulatory Services**
(Pages 45 - 62)

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item; no longer than 10 minutes for presentation of the report and then up to 3 minutes for each question to be put and answered.

10. **Appointments to Outside Bodies**

To appoint representatives to the following bodies:

Body	Current/former representative	Notes
County Council Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Councillor Cooper	The representative must be a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
Worcestershire County Council Corporate Parenting Board	Councillor May (substitute Councillor Witherspoon from Redditch Borough Council)	To represent the three North Worcestershire Councils
West Mercia Police and Crime Panel	Councillor Smith	Must be a member of the controlling group

11. **Questions on Notice (to be circulated at the Meeting)**

A period of up to 15 minutes is allocated for the asking and answering of questions. This may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman with the agreement of the majority of those present.

To deal with any questions on notice from Members of the Council, in the order in which they have been received.

12. **Motions on Notice (To follow if any)**

A period of up to one hour is allocated to consider the motions on notice. This may only be extended with the agreement of the Council.

Background Information on the recommendation from the Cabinet on Council Response to the Local Transport Plan No 4_(Pages 63 - 72)

Background Information on the recommendation from the Cabinet on the Councils Response to the Solihull Local Plan Review_(Pages 73 - 84)

Background Information on the recommendation from the Cabinet on the Council Response to Worcestershire County Council Minerals Plan_(Pages 85 - 92)

Background Information on the recommendation from the Cabinet on the ICT Infrastructure (Non Confidential Report)_(Pages 93 - 108)

13. **To consider, and if considered appropriate, to pass the following resolution to exclude the public from the meeting during the consideration of item(s) of business containing exempt information:-**

"RESOLVED: that under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act, as amended, the relevant paragraph of that part, in each case, being as set out below, and that it is in the public interest to do so:-

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>	
14	3	"
15	3	"

14. **Background Information on the recommendation from the Cabinet on ICT Infrastructure Report (Confidential Appendix) (Pages 109 - 110)**
15. **Background Information to the recommendation from the Cabinet on Shared Services Business Case for Customer Access and Financial Support Services (Confidential Report and Appendices) (Pages 111 - 174)**

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

28TH FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), M. Glass (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. J. Baxter, M. T. Buxton, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, R. L. Dent, C.A. Hotham, R. E. Jenkins, L. C. R. Mallett, K.J. May, C. M. McDonald, S. R. Peters, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, C. B. Taylor, P.L. Thomas, M. Thompson, M. J. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

89\16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. J. Bloore, B. T. Cooper, R. J. Laight, P. M. McDonald, S. P. Shannon, L. J. Turner and S. A. Webb.

Apologies for late arrival were received from Councillors M. Glass and R. D. Smith (however in the event Councillor Smith was absent from the meeting).

Members offered congratulations and best wishes to Councillor C. J. Bloore on his recent marriage.

90\16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest at this stage.

91\16 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 25th January 2017 were submitted.

Councillor C. M. McDonald referred to minute 87/16 relating to her question on Planning Enforcement matters and stated she had not received any detailed written information from the Portfolio Holder. Councillor C. B. Taylor apologised and undertook to provide this to Councillor McDonald.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 25th January 2017 be approved.

92\16 **TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN**

The Chairman reminded Members that her Civic Dinner in aid of Sunfield was to be held shortly and that tickets were available from Sharon Chaplin.

93\16 **TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

The Leader offered congratulations to Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club on their recent outstanding success in reaching the semi finals of the FA Vase.

The Leader also reminded Council that this was the final Council meeting which Mrs S. Sellers and Mrs S. Jones would be attending at Bromsgrove. On behalf of Members the Leader thanked them for their work on behalf of the Authority and wished them well for the future.

94\16 **COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OR PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

There were no public comments, questions or petitions on this occasion.

95\16 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET**

Business Waste Recycling Service

As it was likely that discussion of this item would require the exclusion of the public from the meeting, the Chairman deferred the item to the end of the agenda.

The Council Plan 2017-2020

The recommendation from the Cabinet in relation to the Council Plan 2017- 2020 was proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Denaro referred to the “refreshed” Council Plan and to the amendments which had been made following the discussion at a previous Council meeting. The Council’s key priorities and strategic purposes were set out on page 6 of the Plan and it was emphasised that the overarching aim was to ensure a sustainable Council. The Plan itself was now a more concise and understandable document.

During the debate some Members expressed the view that the Council Plan contained insufficient detail to enable Portfolio Holders and officers

to be held to account in the future. In addition reference to prudence and efficiency in respect of the Council's finances was challenged.

Other Members however recognised that the revised plan was an improved document from the original version and requested that it now be used going forward by Portfolio Holders to drive improvement through their individual Action Plans.

The Leader confirmed that the Plan would be reviewed on a regular basis and that he would be working with Portfolio Holders and officers in order to deliver the actions arising from the Plan.

RESOLVED that Council Plan 2017- 2020 attached at Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

Planning Development Services Business Case

The recommendation from the Cabinet in relation to the Planning Development Services Business Case was proposed by Councillor C. B. Taylor and seconded by Councillor G. N. Denaro.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Taylor reminded Members of the previous discussions at Council and referred to the additional information previously requested and which was contained in Appendix 2 to the report. Councillor Taylor reported that the number of posts at risk of redundancy had reduced from two to one as one of the officers involved had now secured alternative employment.

Councillor Taylor acknowledged the concerns of some Members regarding the location of staff and confirmed that a strong staff presence would be retained in Bromsgrove. Planning Surgeries were effective and were well attended. It was important to move forward with the proposals in order to remove uncertainty and to progress.

During the debate some Members continued to express concern regarding the majority of planning staff being located in Redditch and the perceived impact on services to Bromsgrove residents. In addition it was hoped that the costs split between the Authorities would be reviewed regularly.

Councillor Taylor responded that formal shared service arrangements would enable a more robust and resilient Planning Development Management Service to continue to offer an improved service to residents. It was important now to progress with the shared service and to end uncertainty for staff.

RESOLVED that the Business Case for the Planning Development Management Shared Service be approved.

Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2020/21

The recommendations from the Cabinet in relation to the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2020/21 were proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

In proposing the recommendations Councillor Denaro referred to the Efficiency Statement which had been previously agreed by this Council and accepted by the Secretary of State and which now had to be implemented. The Medium Term Financial Plan would save £1.916million and would ensure that frontline services were protected.

Councillor Denaro acknowledged that whilst a good start had been made there was still much to do in order to achieve this and highlighted a number of issues including the following:

- the need to drive down costs without impacting on frontline services;
- there was a reduction in the New Homes Bonus funding however Communities would still be able to bid for funding for projects;
- the need for the Authority to become more commercially minded;
- the possibility of establishing an Energy Company together with other Authorities;
- that objections had been lodged in respect of the proposed negative Revenue Support Grant payment from 2019/20;
- the proposed changes to Business Rates
- no cuts were proposed to services;
- Council Tax was proposed to rise by £5 per annum per Band D equivalent;
- the Council's assets would be reviewed to ensure they were being used to support Strategic Purposes;
- savings of 5% from departmental expenditure were projected;
- It was proposed to transfer £259k to balances for 2017/18 achieved from projected income and from savings;

Councillor Denaro stressed that officers would be working to achieve savings and to improve income generation. In addition, as previously mentioned, in 2017/18 there would be a review of management posts across the Council. Councillor Denaro thanked officers and the members of the Finance Working Group for their assistance in the budget process.

Councillor L. C. R. Mallett responded and referred to the reduced levels of balances now held by the Council. This, together with reductions in funding received from Central Government meant that there was no alternative but to seek savings in the budget for future years.

Councillor Mallett expressed the view that a review of the management structure was urgent, with a view to reducing costs in line with a reduction in the Council's budget. He also suggested that there was

limited relevant experience within the Council to deliver successful commercial projects.

Councillor S. J. Baxter acknowledged that the budget process had been more satisfactory this year and that the Finance Working Group had worked well. In view of the lack of detail however, it was difficult to understand how the level of savings projected was to be achieved. On the basis that Portfolio Holders would be closely monitoring savings and would be held to account by the Finance Working Group she would be supporting the budget.

During the debate Members acknowledged the challenges in the funding position nationally and noted that the level of savings to be achieved was a difficult task.

Councillor Denaro responded to the debate and recognised the difficulties highlighted by Members in achieving savings required. In relation to the forthcoming management restructure it was noted that since 2011 the Senior Management Team had reduced by three posts. The principal objectives were to ensure a sustainable Council and to maintain services for residents.

As required under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 a named vote was taken on the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2020/21.

For the recommendations: Councillors C. Allen-Jones, S. J. Baxter, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, R. L. Dent, M. Glass, C. A. Hotham, H. J. Jones, K. J. May, S. R. Peters, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, C. B. Taylor, P. L. Thomas, M. J. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker (17)

Against the recommendations: Councillors M. T. Buxton, R. E. Jenkins, L. C. R. Mallett, C. M. McDonald and M. Thompson (5)

RESOLVED:

(a) that the following return/release from balances be approved:

2017/18 - £259k (return)
2018/19 - £37k (release)
2019/20 - £467k (release)
2020/21 - £494k (release)

(b) that the additional income/efficiencies as attached at Appendix 2 be approved:

2017/18 - £1.113m
2018/19 - £626k
2019/20 - £177k

- (c) that with the exception of the bids in relation to Hagley Scout Hut and Hagley Community Centre the Capital Programme bids as attached at Appendix 3 be approved:
- 2017/18 - £145k
2018/19 - £46k
2019/20 - £1.108m
- (d) that the increase of Council Tax by £5 per Band D equivalent for 2017/18 be approved.
- (e) that the budget savings and pressures for 2018/19 – 2020/21 be subject to change due to the potential impact of changes to service delivery and the localisation of Business Rates together with any changes to the New Homes Bonus.
- (f) that consideration of the Capital Programme bids in respect of Hagley Scout Hut and Hagley Community Centre be deferred to enable further consideration of the Business Cases for the proposals. In addition officers include additional information to the report to Council on 28th February 2017 to explain the position in respect of the deferral.

ICT Infrastructure Report

As it was likely that discussion on this item would involve the exclusion of the public from the meeting, the Chairman deferred the item to the end of the agenda.

Pay Policy Statement 2017/18

The recommendation from the Cabinet in relation to the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18 was proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Denaro reminded Members that this was a statutory document which the Council was required to produce each year under the Localism Act.

It was noted that in making the recommendation Cabinet had also requested that the previous accepted format of the Statement be amended so that the report referred solely to the costs to this Council.

During the debate some Members were concerned regarding the transparency of the split of salary costs between Bromsgrove DC and Redditch BC and whether this reflected the time spent on work relating to each Authority. In particular Members referred to work relating to Combined Authorities and to the Redditch Housing Department which was part of the Redditch workload which was not reflected in Bromsgrove.

Councillor Denaro referred to the Memorandum of Understanding which was part of the Shared Services agreement and which involved a 50/50 share of costs of the senior management team . Some Members felt that there was insufficient evidence to indicate that this was still the case.

As an amendment it was proposed by Councillor L. C. R. Mallett and seconded by Councillor M. Thompson that consideration of the Pay Policy be deferred to enable the proportion of time spent by senior officers in relation to each Authority to be evidenced.

On being put to the vote the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Councillor Denaro undertook to ensure that the proportionality of salaries was considered as a separate issue on a cross part basis but stated that this was not the purpose of the Pay Policy under consideration.

On a requisition under Council Procedure Rule 18.3, the following details of the voting on the recommendation to approve the Pay Policy were recorded:

For the recommendation: Councillors C. Allen-Jones, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, R. L. Dent, M. Glass, H. J. Jones, K. J. May, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, C. B. Taylor, P. L. Thomas, M. J. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker (13)

Against the recommendation: Councillors S. J. Baxter, M. T. Buxton, S. R. Colella, C. A. Hotham, R. E. Jenkins, L. C. R. Mallett, C. M. McDonald, S. R. Peters and M. Thompson (9)

RESOLVED that the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18 as contained in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2017/18 – 2019/20

The recommendations from the Cabinet on the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2017/18 – 2019/20 were proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

It was reported that there had been an error in the Treasury Management Strategy considered by the Cabinet but that the correct version was now before members within the Council Agenda.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Strategy and Prudential Indicators shown at Appendix 1 be approved;
- (b) that the Authorised Limit for borrowing be approved at £15million, should borrowing be required;

- (c) that the maximum level of investment to be held within each organisation (i.e. bank or building society) be as detailed at £2.5million, subject to market conditions; and
- (d) that the updated Treasury Management Policy shown at Appendix 2 be approved.

Council Tax Resolutions 2017/18

The recommendation from the Cabinet in relation to the Council Tax Resolutions for 2017/18 were proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

As required under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 a named vote was taken on the Council Tax Resolutions 2017/18.

For the recommendations: Councillors C. Allen-Jones, S. J. Baxter, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, R. L. Dent, M. Glass, C. A. Hotham, R. E. Jenkins, H. J. Jones, K. J. May, S. R. Peters, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, C. B. Taylor, P. L. Thomas, M. J. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker (18)

Abstentions: Councillors M. T. Buxton, L. C. R. Mallett, C. M. McDonald and M. Thompson (4)

RESOLVED that the Council Tax Resolutions as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

96\16

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON 1ST FEBRUARY 2017

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1st February 2017 were received for information.

Councillor M. Thompson referred to Minute 83/16 relating to Allocation of Homelessness Funding. In relation to St Basil's Councillor Thompson queried how those people over the age of 25 and those under the age of 25 who were not in employment would be supported.

Councillor C. B. Taylor undertook to provide information on this matter outside the meeting.

97\16

REPORT FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, REGULATORY SERVICES AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

In the absence of the Portfolio Holder Councillor R. D. Smith, Councillor P.J. Whittaker was prepared to present the report. It was felt that it was important however for Members to have the opportunity to question the

Portfolio Holder on the contents of the report. Therefore consideration of this item was postponed until the next meeting of the Council when two Portfolio Holder reports would be received.

Some Members expressed disappointment that the Report was again being deferred.

98\16

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Question submitted by Councillor M. Thompson

“The move to Parkside promised to generate income for the Council because it could be hired out for private functions. How much more money has it made through this income stream in the last 12 months compared to the old Council House?”

Councillor P. J. Whittaker responded with the following figures:

Burcot Lane (Spadesbourne Suite and Committee Room)

- 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2015 income was £25,177.58;
- 1st April 2015 to 5th December 2016 income was £17,517.20

Parkside Hall

- 5th December 2015 to 31st March 2016 income was £4,620.21;
- 1st April 2016 to February 2017 income was £11,928.33 (including period during which the Hall was unavailable due to heating works);
- Full 12 months projected income is £14,313.99

Councillor Whittaker further commented that due to the temporary heating problems the venue had not yet been fully promoted but this would be addressed from now on. In addition whilst the facilities at Burcot Lane had been “stand alone” and therefore available at all times this was not the case at Parkside where accommodation was also required for Council use.

Question from Councillor S. R. Colella

“I am sure that the Leader will be aware of recent headlines in the Bromsgrove Standard highlighting the levels of crime being experienced across the District with little or no action being seen by the Police and Crime Commissioner to address this perceived chronic rise in crime.

As reported on 21st February 2017; “Black Audi A6 stolen in Hagley car key burglary”, “Burglars ransack Bromsgrove property and steal cash”, “Police investigating spate of car crime across Bromsgrove District over the last week”.

Will the Leader therefore call on the Police and Crime Commissioner to present a report to this Council detailing the actions that are being taken to address this worrying position?"

Councillor G. N. Denaro responded that the Police and Crime Commissioner was aware of the recent incidents and there had been discussion at the recent West Mercia Police and Crime Panel where instances of vehicle crime and burglary in North Worcestershire had been highlighted. In addition the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership had been involved and were also receiving data on incidents. The Police and Crime Commissioner had increased funding across the County and was holding the Chief Constable to account to give due priority to these issues.

Question submitted by Councillor C. A. Hotham

"Barnt Green has been and is still suffering serious traffic disruption.

The village has seen over 12 months of disruption due to the closure of both Hewell Lane and Linthurst Newtown railway bridges and more recently further disruption with the 3 month closure of Bittell Road and Fiery Hill Road.

As Councillors will appreciate this has had a catastrophic impact on trade within the village with some shops having to lay off staff and owners reducing their own pay by up to two thirds.

Without positive action it is highly likely that much of this footfall will be lost forever and as a result Barnt Green traders have been working with the Council's excellent centres manager to try to address this problem and it has been decided that an intense marketing campaign of Barnt Green and all it has to offer would help to reverse the situation once the road closures have finished.

I am conscious that the centres manager has conflicting priorities and a limited budget for such matters but can I ask that the Portfolio Holder works with the centres manager to identify all available support that can be offered to the traders generally and specifically with their marketing campaign?"

Councillor K. J. May confirmed that she was working to identify all possible options for support which could be made available in the area. In particular it may be possible for Business Rates payers to apply to the Valuation Office for their Business Rates to be amended if the Highway works represented a material change in circumstances affecting the valuation of the premises.

99\16

MOTIONS ON NOTICE

There were no Motions on Notice on this occasion.

100\16

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

RESOLVED

That under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the items of business the subject of the following minutes on the grounds that they involve the disclosure of "Exempt Information" as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, the relevant part being as set out below and that it is in the public interest to do so.

<u>Minute No</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
101 /16	3
102/16	3

101\16

BUSINESS WASTE RECYCLING SERVICE

The recommendation from the Cabinet in relation to the Business Waste Recycling Service was proposed by Councillor P. J. Whittaker and seconded by Councillor G. N. Denaro.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Whittaker referred to the amended Business Plan document which had been circulated. This did not significantly change the original Business Case but corrected some typographical errors and clarified a number of points. Councillor Whittaker drew attention to paragraph 6.8 on page 15 of the document where the second sentence should read "as laid out in 6.6, a new vehicle is anticipated during 2017-18 at a cost of circa £180,000 and the depreciation of this will be £25,000 per annum over a seven year period". He also referred to page 16 of the replacement document where 2 figures had been transposed in the first and second columns of the direct costs line.

Councillor Whittaker highlighted the opportunities available to provide the new Business Waste Recycling Service which would combine well with other elements of the services currently provided. Introducing the service would be beneficial to the Authority and would provide another option to potential customers. Members broadly welcomed the proposal as a good opportunity. It was recognised that the format for future Business Cases would benefit from being reviewed.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that a phase 1 Business Waste Recycling Service be introduced in 2017/18;
- (b) that the service be extended and rolled out to all customers from 2018/19;
- (c) that the fees and charges as set out in appendix 2 to the report be approved and adopted; and
- (d) that delegated authority be given to the Head of Environmental Services to have discretion to vary the charges for the Business

Agenda Item 3

Council
28th February 2017

Waste Recycling Collection Service when agreeing terms with customers within a variance of plus or minus 25 %.

102\16

ICT INFRASTRUCTURE

(Councillors P. L. Thomas and M. J. A. Webb each declared an Other Disclosable Interest in this item and withdrew from the Meeting).

The recommendation from the Cabinet was proposed by Councillor G. N. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. J. May.

During the debate some Members expressed disappointment at the level of interest in providing the service and felt that further detailed information was required in respect of the service to be provided. In addition it may be appropriate to seek further tenders.

Arising from the debate it was generally agreed that the report be deferred to enable further consideration.

RESOLVED that consideration of the ICT Infrastructure proposals be deferred.

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.

Chairman

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL Council Tax Setting 2017/18

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FINANCE & RESOURCES

1.0 PURPOSE

To seek approval of the appropriate formal resolutions to determine the levels of Council Tax for Bromsgrove District Council for 2017/18. The levels of tax take account of the requirements of Bromsgrove District Council, Worcestershire County Council, the Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, Hereford and Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority and the various Parish Councils.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Localism Act 2011 made significant changes to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and requires the billing authority to calculate a Council Tax requirement for the year, not its budget requirement as previously.

3.0 PRECEPTS AND LEVIES

Details have been received from the various precepting bodies to enable the Council to set the Council Tax for 2017/18. The amounts of the precepts are set out below:

	£
Worcestershire County Council	41,656,608.00
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	6,836,480.41
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority	2,867,585.35
Bromsgrove District Council	7,580,550.10
Parish precepts	850,637.88
Total	59,791,861.74

The Parish Council Precepts for 2017/18 are detailed in the attached **Schedule 3**.

4.0 INFORMATION

Based on the recommendation from Cabinet, it is now necessary to formally set Council Tax levels throughout the area for the spending requirements of Bromsgrove District Council, Worcestershire County Council, the Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia, Hereford and Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority and the various Parish Councils. If the Council approves the recommendations set out below the average band D Council Tax in 2017/18 will be £1,658.27, made up as follows:

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL Council Tax Setting 2017/18

Authority	2016/17	2017/18	Increase
	£	£	%
Bromsgrove District Council	205.24	210.24	2.44
Worcestershire County Council	1,122.31	1,155.31	2.94
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	189.60	189.60	0.00
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue	78.00	79.53	1.96
Parish Councils (Average)	22.73	23.59	3.79
Total Council Tax	1,617.88	1,658.27	2.50

The % increases all relate to the change from current year levels.

The necessary formal resolutions are set out below.

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. That it be noted at its meeting on 11th January 2017 the Cabinet calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 36,056.65 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Act 1992, as amended (the “Act”)]; and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates the amounts as shown in Column 4 of the attached **Schedule 1**.

2. Calculate the Council Tax requirement for the Council’s own purposes for 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is **£7,580,550.10**.

3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) £47,988,849 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act (taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils) *(i.e. Gross expenditure)*
 - (b) £39,557,662 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act. *(i.e. Gross income)*
 - (c) £8,431,188 being the amount by which the aggregate of 3 (a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3 (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act, as its

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL Council Tax Setting 2017/18

Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).

- (d) £233.83 being the amount at 3 (c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
- (e) £850,638 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act (as per the attached **Schedule 3**).
- (f) £210.24 being the amount at 3 (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3 (e) above by Item T (1 (a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
- (g) The amounts shown in Column 3 of **Schedule 1**. These are the basic amounts of the council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of the Council's area shown in Column 1 of the schedule respectively to which special items relate, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act. (District and Parish combined at Band D).
- (h) The amounts shown in Column 5 of **Schedule 1** being the amount given by multiplying the amounts at 4(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL Council Tax Setting 2017/18

4. It be noted that for the year 2017/18 Worcestershire County Council, Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwelling in the Council's area as indicated below:

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Worcestershire County Council	770.21	898.57	1,026.94	1,155.31	1,412.05	1,668.78	1,925.52	2,310.62
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	126.40	147.47	168.54	189.60	231.74	273.87	316.01	379.20
Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Authority	53.02	61.86	70.69	79.53	97.20	114.88	132.55	159.06

5. Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4(h) and 5 above, that Bromsgrove District Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 hereby sets the amounts shown in **Schedule 2** as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.
6. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments under Section 90(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund by ten equal instalments between April 2017 to March 2018 as detailed below:

	Precept £	Surplus on Collection Fund £	Total to pay £
Worcestershire County Council	41,656,608.00	434,834.00	42,091,442.00
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	6,836,480.41	73,056.65	6,909,537.06
Hereford & Worcester Fire	2,867,585.35	30,220.00	2,897,805.35

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL Council Tax Setting 2017/18

7. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make transfers under Section 97 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 from the Collection Fund to the General Fund the sum of £ 8,519,187.98 being the Council's own demand on the Collection Fund (£7,580,550.10), Parish Precepts (£850,637.88) and the distribution of the Surplus on the Collection Fund (£88,000).
8. That the Executive Director Finance & Resources be authorised to make payments from the General Fund to the Parish Councils the sums listed on **Schedule 3** by two equal instalments on 1 April 2017 and 1 October 2017 in respect of the precept levied on the Council.
9. That the above resolutions 3 to 5 be signed by the Chief Executive for use in legal proceedings in the Magistrates Court for the recovery of unpaid Council Taxes.
10. Notices of the making of the said Council Taxes signed by the Chief Executive are given by advertisement in the local press under Section 38(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL TAX
INCLUDING PARISH PRECEPTS 2017/18**

SCHEDULE 1

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5 – by valuation band							
				Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Part of the Council's Area	Parish Band D £	Basic Amount of Council Tax Band D (District + Parish) £	Taxbase	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Alvechurch	47.85	258.09	2,304.12	172.06	200.74	229.41	258.09	315.44	372.79	430.15	516.18
Barnt Green	62.58	272.82	998.54	181.88	212.19	242.51	272.82	333.45	394.08	454.70	545.64
Belbroughton	54.17	264.41	1,199.97	176.27	205.65	235.03	264.41	323.17	381.92	440.67	528.82
Bentley Paucefoot	28.54	238.78	186.28	159.19	185.72	212.25	238.78	291.84	344.90	397.96	477.56
Beoley	24.45	234.69	454.00	156.46	182.54	208.61	234.69	286.84	339.00	391.15	469.38
Bournheath	49.08	259.32	217.59	172.88	201.70	230.51	259.32	316.95	374.58	432.21	518.64
Catshill & Marlbrook	18.11	228.35	2,338.14	152.23	177.61	202.98	228.35	279.10	329.84	380.58	456.70
Clent	87.24	297.48	538.77	198.32	231.37	264.42	297.48	363.58	429.69	495.79	594.96
Cofton Hackett	33.08	243.32	978.54	162.22	189.25	216.29	243.32	297.40	351.47	405.54	486.64
Dodford with Grafton	28.89	239.13	397.35	159.42	185.99	212.56	239.13	292.27	345.40	398.54	478.26
Finstall	25.82	236.06	304.94	157.38	183.61	209.84	236.06	288.52	340.98	393.44	472.12
Frankley	38.31	248.55	50.98	165.70	193.31	220.93	248.55	303.78	359.01	414.24	497.10
Hagley	53.60	263.84	2,901.30	175.89	205.21	234.52	263.84	322.47	381.10	439.73	527.68
Hunnington	40.60	250.84	234.01	167.22	195.10	222.97	250.84	306.58	362.32	418.06	501.68
Lickey & Blackwell	21.03	231.27	2,091.98	154.18	179.88	205.58	231.27	282.67	334.06	385.45	462.54
Romsley	75.53	285.77	656.86	190.51	222.26	254.01	285.77	349.27	412.77	476.28	571.54
Stoke	31.23	241.47	1,700.00	160.98	187.81	214.64	241.47	295.13	348.80	402.46	482.94
Tutnall & Cobley	20.05	230.29	363.16	153.52	179.11	204.70	230.29	281.46	332.64	383.81	460.58
Wythall	26.50	236.74	4,671.28	157.83	184.13	210.44	236.74	289.35	341.96	394.57	473.48
Urban	N/A	N/A	13,468.84	140.16	163.52	186.88	210.24	256.96	303.68	350.40	420.48
Taxbase Total			36,056.65								

Agenda Item 3

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL TAX SCHEDULE FOR THE BROMSGROVE DISTRICT AREA INCLUDING
BROMSGROVE D C, WORCESTERSHIRE C C, POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR WEST
MERCIA, HEREFORD & WORCESTER FIRE & RESCUE AUTHORITY, PARISH PRECEPTS**

SCHEDULE 2

	Taxbase	Precept £	Council Tax per Valuation Band							
			Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
Worcestershire County Council	36,056.65	41,656,608	770.21	898.57	1,026.94	1,155.31	1,412.05	1,668.78	1,925.52	2,310.62
Police & Crime Commissioner for West Mercia	36,056.65	6,836,480.41	126.40	147.47	168.54	189.60	231.74	273.87	316.01	379.20
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Authority	36,056.65	2,867,585.35	53.02	61.86	70.69	79.53	97.20	114.88	132.55	159.06
Bromsgrove District Council	36,056.65	7,266,393	140.16	163.52	186.88	210.24	256.96	303.68	350.40	420.48
Total Unparished			1,089.79	1,271.42	1,453.05	1,634.68	1,997.95	2,361.21	2,724.47	3,269.36
		Precept £	Total Bill Band A £ (6/9)	Total Bill Band B £ (7/9)	Total Bill Band C £ (8/9)	Total Bill Band D £ (9/9)	Total Bill Band E £ (11/9)	Total Bill Band F £ (13/9)	Total Bill Band G £ (15/9)	Total Bill Band H £ (18/9)
Parish										
Alvechurch	2,304.12	110,249	1,121.69	1,308.64	1,495.58	1,682.53	2,056.43	2,430.32	2,804.23	3,365.06
Barnt Green	998.54	62,490	1,131.51	1,320.09	1,508.68	1,697.26	2,074.44	2,451.61	2,828.78	3,394.52
Belbroughton	1,199.97	65,000	1,125.90	1,313.55	1,501.20	1,688.85	2,064.16	2,439.45	2,814.75	3,377.70
Bentley Paucefoot	186.28	5,316	1,108.82	1,293.62	1,478.42	1,663.22	2,032.83	2,402.43	2,772.04	3,326.44
Beoley	454.00	11,100	1,106.09	1,290.44	1,474.78	1,659.13	2,027.83	2,396.53	2,765.23	3,318.26
Bournheath	217.59	10,680	1,122.51	1,309.60	1,496.68	1,683.76	2,057.94	2,432.11	2,806.29	3,367.52
Catshill & Marlbrook	2,338.14	42,346	1,101.86	1,285.51	1,469.15	1,652.79	2,020.09	2,387.37	2,754.66	3,305.58
Clent	538.77	47,000	1,147.95	1,339.27	1,530.59	1,721.92	2,104.57	2,487.22	2,869.87	3,443.84
Cofton Hackett	978.54	32,374	1,111.85	1,297.15	1,482.46	1,667.76	2,038.39	2,409.00	2,779.62	3,335.52
Dodford with Grafton	397.35	11,478	1,109.05	1,293.89	1,478.73	1,663.57	2,033.26	2,402.93	2,772.62	3,327.14
Finstall	304.94	7,875	1,107.01	1,291.51	1,476.01	1,660.50	2,029.51	2,398.51	2,767.52	3,321.00
Frankley	50.98	1,953	1,115.33	1,301.21	1,487.10	1,672.99	2,044.77	2,416.54	2,788.32	3,345.98
Hagley	2,901.30	155,500	1,125.52	1,313.11	1,500.69	1,688.28	2,063.46	2,438.63	2,813.81	3,376.56
Hunnington	234.01	9,500	1,116.85	1,303.00	1,489.14	1,675.28	2,047.57	2,419.85	2,792.14	3,350.56
Lickey & Blackwell	2,091.98	44,000	1,103.81	1,287.78	1,471.75	1,655.71	2,023.66	2,391.59	2,759.53	3,311.42
Romsley	656.86	49,610	1,140.14	1,330.16	1,520.18	1,710.21	2,090.26	2,470.30	2,850.36	3,420.42
Stoke	1,700.00	53,097	1,110.61	1,295.71	1,480.81	1,665.91	2,036.12	2,406.33	2,776.54	3,331.82
Tutnall & Cobley	363.16	7,280	1,103.15	1,287.01	1,470.87	1,654.73	2,022.45	2,390.17	2,757.89	3,309.46
Wythall	4,671.28	123,790	1,107.46	1,292.03	1,476.61	1,661.18	2,030.34	2,399.49	2,768.65	3,322.36
Urban	13,468.84		1,089.79	1,271.42	1,453.05	1,634.68	1,997.95	2,361.21	2,724.47	3,269.36
Total	36,056.65	850,638								

This page is intentionally left blank

Parish Precepts 2017/18

SCHEDULE 3

	2016/17 Precept	2016/17 Taxbase	2016/17 Levy per Band D Equivalent	2017/18 Precept	Percentage Change in Precept Amount	2017/18 Taxbase	2017/18 Levy per Band D Equivalent
	£			£	%		£
Alvechurch	109,157	2,256.97	48.36	110,249	1.00	2,304.12	47.85
Barnt Green	57,650	921.29	62.58	62,490	8.40	998.54	62.58
Belbroughton	60,000	1,194.87	50.21	65,000	8.33	1,199.97	54.17
Bentley Pauncefoot	5,318	184.23	28.87	5,316	-0.04	186.28	28.54
Beoley	11,100	447.95	24.78	11,100	0.00	454.00	24.45
Bournheath	10,680	218.60	48.86	10,680	0.00	217.59	49.08
Catshill & Marlbrook	37,513	2,314.39	16.21	42,346	12.88	2,338.14	18.11
Clent	45,000	685.13	65.68	47,000	4.44	538.77	87.24
Cofton Hackett	31,740	938.27	33.83	32,374	2.00	978.54	33.08
Dodford with Grafton	11,253	392.05	28.70	11,478	2.00	397.35	28.89
Finstall	8,169	292.30	27.95	7,875	-3.60	304.94	25.82
Frankley	1,896	49.79	38.08	1,953	3.00	50.98	38.31
Hagley	140,000	2,639.28	53.04	155,500	11.07	2,901.30	53.60
Hunnington	10,000	230.83	43.32	9,500	-5.00	234.01	40.60
Lickey & Blackwell	44,000	2,084.14	21.11	44,000	0.00	2,091.98	21.03
Romsley	48,495	655.22	74.01	49,610	2.30	656.86	75.53
Stoke	53,097	1,683.87	31.53	53,097	0.00	1,700.00	31.23
Tutnall & Cobley	7,280	362.79	20.07	7,280	0.00	363.16	20.05
Wythall	112,329	4,584.77	24.50	123,790	10.20	4,671.28	26.50
Total	804,677	22,136.74		850,638	5.71	22,587.81	

Agenda Item 3

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

1ST MARCH 2017

1. COUNCIL RESPONSE TO LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN NO 4 CONSULTATION

The Cabinet has considered a report on the proposed response of the Council to the Worcestershire County Council Local Transport Plan No 4 (LTP4).

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments was given as 17th March 2017, this was not a formal timescale. It would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

It is RECOMMENDED

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted; and
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to LTP4 (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the formal consultation response.

2. COUNCIL RESPONSE TO SOLIHULL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

The Cabinet has considered a report on the proposed response to Solihull MBC on the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review Consultation.

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments had been 17th February 2017 and therefore the response had been submitted, this was not a formal timescale. It would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

It is RECOMMENDED

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted; and
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved as the formal consultation response.

3. COUNCIL RESPONSE TO WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MINERALS PLAN

The Cabinet has considered a report on the proposed response of the Council to the Worcestershire County Council's Minerals Local Plan.

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments had been 8th March 2017, this was not a formal timescale. It would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

It is RECOMMENDED

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted; and
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to the Mineral Local Plan (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the consultation response.

5TH APRIL 2017

1. ICT INFRASTRUCTURE RESOURCE PROPOSALS

The Cabinet has considered a report on the outcome of a further procurement exercise in respect of the ICT infrastructure resource.

It is RECOMMENDED that authority be delegated to the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development to proceed with the procurement of a contract with the preferred supplier set out in Appendix 1 option 2 to deliver the ICT infrastructure functions.

(The Appendix to the report in respect of this recommendation is Exempt and is included on “pink” paper at the back of the Council agenda. If Members wish to refer/comment in detail on the Appendix it will be necessary to consider the Exclusion of the Public from the meeting)

2. CUSTOMER ACCESS AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT SERVICES - SERVICE REVIEW

The Cabinet has considered a report on a full service review of the Customer Access and Financial Support Service.

The report and Business Case were recommended for approval by the Shared Services Board on 9th March 2017

It is RECOMMENDED that the proposals within the Customer Access and Financial Support Services - Service Review Business Case be implemented.

(The report and appendices in respect of this recommendation are Exempt and are included on “pink” paper at the back of the Council agenda. If Members wish to refer/comment in detail on the documents it will be necessary to consider the Exclusion of the Public from the meeting)

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

28TH FEBRUARY 2017 AT 4.30 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
C. B. Taylor and P. J. Whittaker

Observers: Councillors S. R. Colella, C. A. Hotham and H.J. Jones

Officers: Mr K. Dicks, Ms J. Pickering, Mrs C. Felton and Ms R. Cole

88/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor R. D. Smith.

89/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

90/16 **PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2017/18**

Members considered the report on the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18.

Members were reminded that the Localism Act required each Local Authority to approve a Pay Policy Statement each year for adoption by 31st March. All financial implications had been included in the budget setting process.

The Localism Act was prescriptive in setting out the following policies which must be included:

- (a) the remuneration of its Chief Officers;
- (b) the remuneration of its lowest paid employees; and
- (c) the relationship between
 - (i) the remuneration of its Chief Officers and
 - (ii) the remuneration of its employees who are not Chief Officers

It was noted that as set out in paragraph 13 of the Pay Policy Statement, the costs of senior management posts were split between Bromsgrove District Council and Redditch Borough Council (and in the case of Head of WRS split between 6 Councils).

Whilst this was illustrated in the table in paragraph 13, with the figure in the final column being the cost to other Councils as in previous years, it was requested that in future for clarity this be shown as the cost to Bromsgrove District Council. Officers undertook to make this alteration for future years.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources also drew Members' attention to the pay ratios set out in paragraph 26 of the report.

Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED that the Pay Policy Statement as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

91/16

TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2017/18 TO 2018/19

The Cabinet considered a report on the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2017/18 to 2018/19.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources reminded Members that the report related to a statutory document which was required to be approved by Council by 31st March. The report related to the way in which Council investments are managed, including banking, money market and capital market transactions, together with how the risks are effectively controlled.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources confirmed that with interest rates at around 0.25% work was on going to look at different options for investment which still had a low risk profile. Investments were reviewed regularly in order to gain the best return and there was access to external advice on this.

Whilst the Council was currently debt free, the MTFP estimated that there would be a borrowing requirement over the next three financial years this was shown in table 1 in section 2.1 of the Strategy.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources also drew attention to the Prudential Indicators including the authorised borrowing limit of £15million.

Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) that the Strategy and Prudential Indicators shown at Appendix 1 be approved;
- (b) that the Authorised Limit for Borrowing be approved at £15million, should borrowing be required;

Agenda Item 8

Cabinet
28th February 2017

- (c) that the maximum level of investment to be held within each organisation (i.e. Bank or Building Society) be as detailed at £2.5million, subject to market conditions; and
- (d) that the updated Treasury Management Policy shown at Appendix 2 be approved.

92/16

COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTIONS 2017/18

The Cabinet considered the Council Tax Resolutions for 2017/18.

It was

RECOMMENDED that the Council Tax Resolutions for 2017/18 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

The meeting closed at 5.00 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

1ST MARCH 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
C. B. Taylor and P. J. Whittaker

Officers: Ms J. Pickering, Mr M. Dunphy, Mrs S. Sellers and Ms R. Cole

93/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

The Leader announced that Councillor R. D. Smith had resigned from the Cabinet.

94/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion.

95/16 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1st February 2017 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1st February 2017 be approved as a correct record.

96/16 **COUNCIL RESPONSE TO LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN NO 4 CONSULTATION**

The Cabinet considered a report on the proposed response of the Council to the Worcestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan No 4 (LTP4). It was noted that the consultation closed formally on 17th March 2017.

Members discussed the report and the proposed response. During the discussion a number of points were highlighted:

- the consultation process itself was felt to have been unsatisfactory as it appeared that there was a lack of public

awareness of LTP4 and therefore response levels would be likely to reflect this;

- there was concern regarding the pre-consultation exercise which had taken place between County officers and District Councillors and officers as part of the development of the LTP4. The initial session had been reasonably well attended but had not been particularly successful. Members had lost some confidence in the process and felt that their concerns were not being properly addressed;
- the North East Strategic Transport Schemes (NEST) did not appear to be sufficiently supported by detailed evidence and little heed had been taken of particular areas of the District, such as Hagley. In respect of other areas, such as Rubery, schemes seemed to be ill thought out;
- Bromsgrove Station Car Park was a cause for concern as the level of parking fees were resulting in cars being parked in surrounding roads;
- Members felt that whilst the Bromsgrove District Plan had only recently been formally approved, WCC had been aware for many years of the locations for growth in the District and little account had been taken of these in the LTP4 proposals;
- Overall, Members agreed that the main issue with the LTP4 was the lack of long term vision and strategy. There was concern that there was insufficient “joined up” thinking and that the Plan would not address the needs of Bromsgrove District. There was no evidence based investment strategy to provide for the infrastructure needs over the next 20-30 years.

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments was given as 17th March 2017, this was not a formal timescale. It would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted; and
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to LTP4 (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the formal consultation response.

97/16

COUNCIL RESPONSE TO SOLIHULL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

The Cabinet considered the report on the proposed response to Solihull MBC on the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation.

Members noted the reasons for the early review of the SLP, in particular the need to meet some of the Birmingham housing needs shortfall elsewhere within the Housing Market Area or other nearby areas such as Solihull.

This Council's response focussed on two aspects: consideration of the housing and employment development targets and site selection in terms of potential impacts on the Bromsgrove District

The need for robust evidence regarding the 2000 dwellings contribution towards the unmet needs arising in the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area within the SLP was recognised. There would be a need for this evidence to be provided in an open and transparent manner as this would be intensively scrutinised.

In relation to the site selection it was noted that three sites were proposed for allocation which were in relatively close proximity to Bromsgrove.

- Land west of Dickens Heath - 700 dwellings;
- Christmas Tree Farm, South of Shirley – 600 dwellings; and
- Dog Kennel Lane, East of Dickens Heath – 850 dwellings

There was concern regarding the likelihood of coalescence of settlements and how this complied with Green Belt Policy. In addition there was a lack of evidence regarding the impact of the three allocations on the infrastructure of Bromsgrove in terms of the transport network, education, GP surgeries etc.

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments had been 17th February 2017 and therefore the response had been submitted, this was not a formal timescale and it would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved as the formal consultation response.

98/16

**COUNCIL RESPONSE TO WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
MINERALS PLAN**

The Cabinet considered a report on the proposed response of the Council to the Worcestershire County Council's Minerals Local Plan. It was noted that the consultation closed formally on 8th March 2017.

Members discussed the report and the proposed response. Members noted that there were three "strategic corridors" proposed within

Bromsgrove District. These did not take account of the built environment but had been determined by the use of geological data and Landscape Character Types.

It was also noted that the Minerals Local Plan did not at present contain information on how the County Council will work with this Council when assessing proposed development sites within Mineral Resource Consulting Areas.

There was concern that the proposals could “blight” some areas for future development and this needed to be resolved before the Plan could be supported.

It was confirmed that whilst the closing date for comments was given as 8th March 2017, this was not a formal timescale. It would be possible for further comments or amendments to be made to the response if this was resolved by Council.

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) that subject to the proviso in the preamble above, the draft officer response to the Mineral Local Plan (as attached at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the consultation response.

99/16

FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT 2016/17 QUARTER 3

The Cabinet considered the report on the Council’s financial position for Revenue and Capital for the period April – December 2016 (Quarter 3 – 2016/17).

The details contained in the report were noted. The potential changes to Planning Fees and possible Business Rates rebates were discussed.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources reported that it was intended to report the information in a revised way for the following financial year which was to report by exception. This would provide Members with the information in a more useful way and assist in focussing on areas which merited greater discussion.

RESOLVED that the current financial position on Revenue and Capital as detailed in the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 6.45 p.m.

Chairman

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

22ND MARCH 2017 AT 1.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
B. T. Cooper, M. A. Sherrey, C. B. Taylor and P. J. Whittaker

Observers: Councillors R. L. Dent and H. J. Jones

Officers: Ms J. Pickering, Mrs S. Sellers and Ms R. Cole

100/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

101/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

102/16 **APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION ON REGISTER OF ASSETS OF
COMMUNITY VALUE - CATSHILL SOCIAL CLUB**

Cabinet considered a report in respect of an application to list Catshill Working Men's Club, Meadow Road, Catshill as an Asset of Community Value.

Officers outlined the application received from CAMRA in respect of the premises. Attention was drawn to the information contained within the application form. Councillor H. J. Jones also spoke briefly on the application.

Members considered the application on its merits and were mindful that the test of whether a building was of community value was contained in Section 88(1) of the Localism Act 2011 and was set out in appendix 3.9 of the report.

Following discussion Members felt that on the information before them contained in section B4 of the application form, the application did satisfy the test and it was

RESOLVED that the application for listing of Catshill Working Men's Club, Meadow Road, Catshill, Bromsgrove as an Asset of Community Value be supported.

Agenda Item 8

Cabinet
22nd March 2017

The meeting closed at 1.25 p.m.

Chairman

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

5TH APRIL 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
B. T. Cooper, M. A. Sherrey, C. B. Taylor and P. J. Whittaker

Observers: Councillor S. A. Webb

Officers: Mr K. Dicks, Ms J. Pickering, Mrs C. Felton, Ms D. Poole, Ms
A. Singleton, Mr M. Hanwell, Mr D. Piper, Mr D. Allen, Mrs S. Sellers
and Ms R. Cole

103/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence on this occasion.

104/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

105/16 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28th February 2017,
1st March 2017 and 22nd March 2017 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28th
February 2017, 1st March 2017 and 22nd March 2017 each be approved
as correct records respectively.

106/16 **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 13th February 2017

The minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on
13th February 2017 were submitted.

Reference was made to the recommendations contained within minute
94/16 relating to the work of the Finance and Budget Working Group.
Cabinet were in agreement with the recommendations subject to the
amendment to the wording of recommendation (3) to read:

- (3) Heads of Service be asked to look at all areas where generate
income and produce a cost recovery statement for further
consideration.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that subject to the above amendment, the recommendations within minute 94/16 of the Overview and Scrutiny Board be approved;
and
(b) that the remainder of the minutes be noted.

Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 27th March 2017

The recommendation contained within minute 109/16 of the Overview and Scrutiny Board relating to the Cabinet Work programme was considered.

It was felt that the recommendation was in accordance with the way the Cabinet sought to operate and therefore it was

RESOLVED that Cabinet Members work with Senior Officers and Heads of Service to ensure that items are placed on the Cabinet Work Programme in a timely manner so that the Overview and Scrutiny Board has the opportunity to identify items for pre-scrutiny.

107/16

WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES BOARD

The minutes of the meeting of the Worcestershire Regulatory Services Board held on 16th February 2017 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Worcestershire Regulatory Service Board held on 16th February 2017 be noted.

108/16

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

RESOLVED that the appointment of Councillor M. A. Sherrey to the following outside bodies (which are Cabinet appointments) be endorsed:

- Worcestershire Health and Wellbeing Board (replacing Councillor K. J. May);
- Worcestershire Health Improvement Group (a Sub Group of the Health and Wellbeing Board)

109/16

REVIEW OF ECONOMIC PRIORITIES AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF TRAVEL

The Leader welcomed to the meeting Robert Spittle and Jonathan Till, Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively of the Bromsgrove Economic Development Theme Group, which was part of the Bromsgrove Partnership Board.

Cabinet considered a report on a set of revised economic priorities for the District. These were supported by an analysis of the various economic challenges faced by and opportunities available to the District.

Members referred to some of the current challenges. In particular reference was made to:

- Low wage levels for those who live and work in Bromsgrove – 6th lowest in the West Midlands region;
- An imbalanced Housing Market and rising affordability issues – the property to annual income ratio in Bromsgrove being 10.8:1 when generally a ratio of 4:1 is considered to be affordable;
- The demographics of the District which showed Bromsgrove has the 10th lowest proportion of residents in the working age group and that numbers in the 30-39 age group were falling (probably due to the cost of housing)

Members' attention was drawn to the 9 strategic priorities for economic growth set out in section 3.22 of the report:

- Driving economic growth
- Improving Connectivity
- Supporting Businesses to start and grow
- Re-balancing the local housing market
- Developing key sectors
- Driving up and retaining skills locally
- Improving the Centres
- Partnership working
- Leading by example

A range of “early actions” to drive forward delivery of these priorities were contained in Appendix 3 to the report.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development stressed that in order to take these priorities forward, the co-operation and support of colleagues within the Cabinet and other Members would be crucial as the priorities cut across many areas of the Council's activities and services.

Mr Spittle expressed the support of the Economic Development Theme Group for the proposals which the Group had helped to shape. It was also suggested that it would be beneficial to look to create a wider Task Force to encourage all Stakeholders to work together.

Cabinet recognised that in order to maximise the success of the Economic Development of the District, the co-operation and support of a wide range of stakeholders would be required and therefore the establishment of a Task Force to facilitate this was supported in principle.

Members welcomed the report and the revision of the economic strategic priorities whilst acknowledging there were a number of challenges which would impact upon their implementation.

Issues which were raised during the discussion included:

- potential sources of funding for some of the priorities;
- the role of the West Midlands Combined Authority;
- the role of the Local Enterprise Partnerships;
- highways issues which needed to be addressed;
- parking issues which were being considered;
- Broad Band issues

It was recognised that Bromsgrove District had a good base from which to build and achieve greater economic growth to benefit residents and the District as a whole.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the economic narrative set out in Appendix 2 to the report and the challenges and opportunities faced by the District set out in section 3.14 of the report be noted and endorsed;
- (b) that the 9 strategic priorities for economic growth set out in section 3.22 of the report be approved; and
- (c) that the Early Action Programme set out in Appendix 3 to the report be approved.

110/16

BEOLEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Cabinet considered a report on the Conservation Area Appraisal and proposed Management Plan for Beoley Conservation Area.

It was noted that following the previous decision to approve the draft Conservation Area Appraisal, public consultation had taken place with local residents and other interested parties. There had been broad support for the Conservation Area Appraisal, Management Plan and minor boundary changes. Comments were included in Appendix 2 to the report.

Cabinet thanked officers for the detailed work undertaken in respect of this proposal. It was noted that the purpose of the Appraisal and Management Plan was to allow development to take within the Conservation Area in a way which would protect and enhance its character and appearance.

Following discussion it was

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Beoley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan be approved and its contents endorsed as a material consideration for planning purposes; and
- (b) that the designation of the areas to be added to the Beoley Conservation Area as outlined in the report be approved.

111/16

REVIEW OF NEW HOMES BONUS COMMUNITY GRANTS SCHEME

Cabinet considered a report on the proposed revision of the New Homes Bonus Community Grants Scheme for 2017/18. The review had been agreed by the New Homes Bonus Community Grants Panel and had been undertaken by Members of the Panel supported by officers.

It was reported that the revised scheme if approved would revert largely to the scheme originally implemented in 2015/16. This would mean that the allocation of funds would be based on where there was evidence of the impact of housing growth.

The application forms and documentation had been reviewed to reflect this and to take account of a number of issues which had been raised previously. As a consequence the application process would be more robust and would require more involvement from Ward Councillors.

The Leader thanked Councillors K. J. May and S. J. Baxter and the officers for their work on this issue.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the revised New Homes Bonus Community Grants Scheme as attached at Appendix 1 to the report be approved;
- (b) that the use of 25% of the additional New Homes Bonus Grant received in 2016/17 to calculate the amount of £144k to be allocated to the scheme be approved;
- (c) that an additional amount of £27,157 be added to the total allocation in respect of funds carried forward from the previous year's scheme; and
- (d) that a deduction of £2k be made from the Scheme to cover the cost of administering the Scheme.

112/16

WORCESTERSHIRE STRATEGIC HOUSING PARTNERSHIP PLAN

Cabinet considered a report in relation to the proposed Worcestershire Housing Partnership Plan and Memorandum of Understanding.

It was noted that the Worcestershire Strategic Housing Partnership was made up of a range of strategic partners including Adult Services and Health, Children's Services, the Department of Work and Pensions, Homes and Communities Agency and Local Authority Strategic Housing Officers from across Worcestershire.

It was reported that the Plan had been developed in order to reflect the major changes around Health and Housing legislation since the Worcestershire Housing Strategy was published in 2011. The new Housing Partnership Plan sought to capture the legislation in one place and to identify the challenges faced as a result of the changes. It also intended to enable action planning across agencies to respond at a local level to pressures on housing.

It was noted that the Plan was an overarching document setting the strategic direction for housing in Worcestershire and recognised the need for partners to work together to make the most effective use of existing resources to maximise the wellbeing of residents. The Local Memorandum of Understanding sets out how the Partnership will work together to address the housing need and achieve wider benefits to partner organisations.

Members recognised that there would still be a number of challenges to deliver the actions within the Plan but action plans would be developed to assist with this.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Worcestershire Housing Partnership Plan be approved; and
- (b) that the Worcestershire Memorandum of Understanding be approved.

113/16

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

That under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the items of business the subject of the following minute on the grounds that they involve the disclosure of "Exempt Information" as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, the relevant part being as set out below and that it is in the public interest to do so.

<u>Minute No</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
114 /16	3
115/16	3

114/16

ICT INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSALS

Cabinet considered a report on a further procurement exercise in respect of ICT Infrastructure resource. It was noted that the full details of the tender specification document had been included within the report. It was also noted that a further procurement exercise had been undertaken as the previous quotation had expired and that only one tender had been received.

Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED that authority be delegated to the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development to proceed with the procurement of a contract to deliver the ICT infrastructure functions with the preferred supplier as set out in Appendix 1 option 2.

115/16

SHARED SERVICES BUSINESS CASE FOR CUSTOMER ACCESS AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT SERVICES

The Head of Customer Access and Financial Support gave a brief presentation on the Business Case for the Service Review of the Customer Access and Financial Support Service.

The presentation included the following:

- a reminder of the strategic and operational purposes for the service;
- the work undertaken within the service over a three year period to understand how best to meet the purposes and to ensure the roles and capacity needed were understood;
- working with partners such as Connecting Families and BDHT;
- the aims of the proposal and proposed structure;
- key work areas i.e. welfare support, revenues, customer support, quality and improvement and systems development but working as one Team;
- financial savings;
- the impact on staff;
- the reasons for not pursuing alternative operating models

The Head of Customer Access and Financial Support referred to the report and to the Business Case which contained part of the significant amount of the evidence which had been obtained through the transformation process including trial working, gathering of customer demand etc.

Members raised a number of queries to which officers responded. It was also requested that for clarity a Glossary of Terms be included as an Appendix to the report.

It was acknowledged that there would need to be further changes within the service in future due to changing circumstances both nationally and locally.

Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED that the proposals within the Customer Access and Financial Support Services – Service Review Business Case be approved.

116/16

MRS S SELLERS

The Leader referred to this being the last Cabinet meeting to be attended by the Council's Principal Solicitor Mrs Sarah Sellers. The Leader thanked Mrs Sellers for her work on behalf of the Authority and wished her well for the future.

Agenda Item 8

Cabinet
5th April 2017

The meeting closed at 7.25 p.m.

Chairman

Bromsgrove District Council

Report of the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Worcestershire Regulatory Services

Aligned to Help me to Keep my Place Safe and Looking Good

I am pleased to present my report to councillors for the areas covered by my portfolio. In so doing I would like to look back over recent events and forward to emerging issues affecting our council and our residents.

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:

BEREAVEMENT SERVICES

BROMSGROVE NORTH CEMETERY, BARLEY MOW LANE, CATSHILL

Following a period of works which commenced on the 4th July 2016, the construction of the necessary infrastructure including the main access road, footpaths, fencing, surface water drainage with off-site infiltration soak away system and ancillary works is nearing completion. We will shortly be moving into the process of researching and consulting on the options that we will provide on the new site.

Consultation with regards to different memorial and burial options have started and various companies are now submitting quotations.

WASTE COLLECTIONS

- Filming of new recycling awareness sketches took place in November 16 and videos were circulated throughout December on social media and have been added to the council's You Tube profile and to be used elsewhere;
- Recycling leaflets are currently being delivered to all houses in the District using pictorial messages to aid understanding in what materials can be recycled.
- New recycling awareness tags were launched in March 17 to assist in the education of residents regarding contamination.
- In Cab units are now fitted to all RCV's working on both domestic and recycling collections. This is currently being trialled to assess coverage areas and should be live from late November to early December 16. These units allow the crews to report issues such as bins going in the backs of trucks, or bins not out, in real time and they also allow us to see where the vehicles are on their rounds.
- Trade waste is now making a small surplus as officers continue to promote the service;

- Officers have managed to retrieve around 20 customers who had previously left the Trade Waste Service, resulting in an increase in revenue and extra positive publicity;
- Trade Waste leaflets are continuing to be used in the business rates details for 17/18 financial year;
- The Business waste recycling service commenced April 1 17;
- Officers are currently exploring options to work with neighbouring authorities.

Garden Waste:

- Garden waste fees increased to £42.00 from February 17.

Sweepers:

- Route optimisation software has been recently purchased (September 16) and is currently being worked on and reviewed by officers.

BDC PLACE TEAMS

Place working is now finishing its second year and has evolved with some successes, and exposed some areas where further evolution is needed to strike the right balance across the District.

The 2016/17 financial year was a successful year in the main, with good standards maintained across the majority of the district with the exception of a few known trouble spots that have additional challenges to maintain such as high speed rural roads that require traffic management to work safely, and areas where demand is simply at a high level requiring a disproportionate level of resources.

We have been working to identify where works should be carried out by partner organisations that have historically been carried out by BDC, and this has freed up resources for better use on our genuine responsibilities, and we will continue to refine this and work closer with our partners at WCC, BDHT & Parishes. Some of these may lead to additional income in the longer term, although this will likely be low level given the financial pressures our partners are also facing at the moment.

Particular highlights in 2016/17 were:

- An increasing number of Bulky Waste collections, which generate additional income for the council, with over 1600 collections carried out since April.

Agenda Item 9

- Over 12,600 jobs carried out across the district ranging from litter picking and fly tip removals, through to hedge cutting and litter bin emptying.

Fly tipping was a significant impact on the district during 2016/17, with 1,829 fly tips collected during the financial year at an estimated cost to BDC of £87,000 in staff and vehicle costs. These have ranged from small single items through to significant lorry loads requiring our HIAB to remove using large skips and the hydraulic grab.

Our relationship with BDHT has continued to develop, and we are now carrying out a wide range of paid clearance jobs on their behalf whilst working to reduce the impact of fly tipping on their bin stores. Working closely with our refuse team, we have now agreed a more streamlined approach with BDHT to address the problems at the remaining trouble spots where residents are fly tipping and causing other problems, so that issues can be escalated and resolved rather than creating additional work and cost for both BDHT and BDC.

We are still working closely with WCC and have completed projects on the Bromsgrove Highway, A38, and the Oakalls estate to share resources and increase the standard of maintenance in line with our strategic purpose, but with minimal cost impact on either BDC or WCC. This has been highly successful to date and we are to repeat the full maintenance on the Bromsgrove Highway in 2017/18 at WCC's expense, with the first of these planned for early May.

Priorities for the year ahead are:

- To further improve the grass cutting service across the district
- Remove the chewing gum from Bromsgrove High Street and increase awareness of this issue alongside routine work to keep the surface up to a high standard.
- Increase the efficiency of our bulky waste collection service to continue providing a high value service, and free resources for our other services across the district.
- Work to identify opportunities to work with our existing partners to raise additional income through services across the district where we have the resources and skills to provide support.

BDC ENFORCEMENT HIGHLIGHTS

- April 2016 - £300 FPN paid for breach of 'Duty of Care' for disposal of waste after local resident identified fly tipping. Covered in local press.
- April 2016 – Joint stop and search project took place with the police in the Wythall area to tackle illegal transporting of waste and fly tipping. No breaches found.

Agenda Item 9

- A successful prosecution for fly tipping (Jan 2017) through the use of surveillance cameras at a known fly tipping hotspot, and evidence gathered on a number of other small commercial fly tippers (man & van) that are being followed up for this and other locations across the district.
- Joint working with Co-ordinators to gather evidence on fly tips and issue warning letters where prosecution not appropriate.
- Routine patrols in Bromsgrove Town Centre to address issues arising from local businesses and work with them to resolve them:
 - Fast food outlets in Bromsgrove now starting to carry out additional litter picking as part of their closing routine after being spoken to by our enforcement officer. Still working well 12 months on.
 - Pubs have been spoken to about smoking related litter and are continuing to support us on this in Bromsgrove Town Centre.
 - New Market organisers working with us to address market waste being disposed of in our litter bins. Issue reduced, but now involving the Town Centre Manager in this process to address few remaining issues.
- Closer working with Parish Councils regarding littering, fly tipping and dog fouling – letter dropped warning letters regarding known issues on several roads across Bromsgrove. A project is starting from Easter 2017 to address littering in Hagley through increased education and enforcement activity, which will then be reviewed and applied as a template for other areas in the district where needed as well.
- 254 Abandoned Vehicles investigated and dealt with since 1st April 2016.
- On-going partnership with Enforcement teams from Wychavon, Wyre Forest and Worcester City to share best practice in tackling environmental crime.

NORTH WORCESTERSHIRE WATER MANAGEMENT

Major Schemes achieved or ongoing:

1. Hagley - Infrastructure Scheme working with STW Ltd, Environment Agency and Highways to reduce flood risk in Hagley through improving the capacity of watercourses, and improving conveyance through the highway drainage network and STW surface water sewers.
2. Callow Brook - Completed the flood storage pools in November 2015 and we have since undertaken earth moving to reduce ground levels following concerns of residents. Planting has now been completed, and the scheme has been shown to work well during storm events.
3. Bournheath – Flood risk modelling undertaken to identify the risks from all sources of flooding. Design work for a scheme to reduce flood risk to around 20 properties in the village, properties and highways is underway. Working in partnership with STW Ltd and WCC Highways to also reduce foul sewer flooding. Funding of £99k has been requested from the Environment Agency.
4. Bromsgrove Town Surface Water Management Plan Group - Membership includes NWWM, EA, BDC Environmental Services, Highways, STW Ltd and Highways England. The group focuses on 9 locations, and flood risk has already been reduced at a number of locations around the town. The EA are undertaking flood risk modelling at present – following this will be investigations into whether a major flood defence scheme is warranted and feasible.
5. A38 Charford - Work to investigate opportunities for funding and works with STW, Highways, Economic Development, EA. Early stages at present of understanding infrastructure and complexity of issues. A focus group has been formed and some initial safety works are programmed.

Flood investigations and minor schemes:

1. Wast Hills Lane – drainage infrastructure cleansing and improvement works.
2. Dagnell End Road - drainage infrastructure cleansing and improvement works.
3. Lea End Lane - drainage infrastructure cleansing and improvement works.
4. Bentley Pauncefoot and Stoke Prior – drainage infrastructure improvements with the Parish Lengthsman.
5. Sidemoor School – culvert removal and improved flow conveyance.
6. Houndsfield Lane - site clearance of fly-tipping to reinstate flow in the watercourse, working with Rooftop Housing and BDC Environmental Services.
7. Truemans Heath Lane - Cross Boundary working with Solihull on Highway flooding issues.
8. A448 – Working with Highways on improved drainage and reducing runoff onto the highway.

Agenda Item 9

9. Blackwell Road – ditch and footpath improvement works in conjunction with WCC rights of way and Parish Council.
10. Bromsgrove Market Hall – Involvement through the planning process to have the Spadesbourne Brook naturalised through the site; work is now complete.

General and ongoing activities:

1. A Flooding Hotspot guide has been produced to aid the PLACE teams working in lead up to and response to flood events. Including a health and safety review for each hotspot location.
2. Recording assets (e.g. culverts, trash screens etc) onto a countywide web mapping system.
3. Revising the sandbag policy along with Emergency planners.
4. Working with Emergency Planners to replace the Multi Agency Flood Plan with a Flooding Response Framework document.
5. Part of 'Love Your River Bromsgrove' working group helping to improve water quality and wildlife.
6. Responding to Government consultations, for instance relating to planning policy changes.
7. In November 2016 flooding was reported at 18 locations, but no internal flooding was reported and flood alleviation schemes were successfully put to the test.
8. No Notices have been served during the last financial year – we have managed to resolve all cases amicably with land owners.

Planning work:

1. We have commented on over 150 planning applications.
2. 24 of these planning applications have been “major” (including Perryfields, Whitford Road, Foxlydiate and the Birmingham Resilience Pipeline) – each requiring in-depth involvement and more technical advice.

Consenting work:

1. 27 consent applications received for works in ordinary watercourses – each application comes with a £50 fee.

WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES

Environmental Health

The service now boasts several Primary Authority agreements whereby a business enters into a contractual agreement with us on a full cost-recovery basis to receive assured advice. One of these is a major food warehouse in Stoke Prior. Further, several Bromsgrove businesses have signed up to the Healthy Eating award (which again is a paid for business support process) and work continues with the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to develop a scheme aimed at helping small producers and manufacturers to access new markets.

The number of service requests in respect of food safety and hygiene for the third quarter of 2016/17 showed a spike, exceeding the peak of 2014/15 and significantly above the number received last year. This, together with the continuation of relatively high levels of nuisance work into October and November and the high number of complex legal cases under investigation (including two food premises closures in Worcestershire) meant that the number of food interventions were down on the same quarter last year. In order to address this we prioritised inspection work in the final quarter of the year and have also brought in some capacity in the form of agency staff. This is affordable due to our on-going income generation activity and will not require additional funding. The ability to respond to this situation demonstrates how flexible the income generation strategy has been in enabling WRS to quickly meet changing demands.

235 food hygiene interventions were carried out in Bromsgrove District 2016/17. Compliance in Bromsgrove remains high at 97.4% with only 12 premises currently rated level 2 or below in the Food Standards Agency's Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (which rates business from levels 0-5). These businesses which are deemed not to be "broadly compliant" are subject to further intervention to ensure that hygiene requirements are met.

Environmental Health complaints, enquiries and notifications recorded by WRS are set to exceed previous years. The service has conducted an extensive investigation relating to an alleged odour nuisance arising from animal by-product operations in the District and Environmental Health Practitioners have continued to work with Network Rail and their contractors to minimise noise impacts of on-going track upgrade and electrification works through Bromsgrove.

Air Quality

The Bromsgrove Air Quality Status Report has been completed and uploaded on the WRS website together with the Air Quality Action Plan Update which is the document that details action taken to resolve air quality by all over the last 12 months. Ahead of the LTP4's publication, WRS were liaising with the County Council's Project Manager for the A38 Corridor improvements to ensure that improving the air quality

situation around Redditch Road and Lickey End are priorities and incorporated in the proposals. Since publication of the consultation document WRS have provided comments on sections where air quality is a factor of consideration.

Permitted Processes

The Pollution Control regulations are there to protect human health by ensuring emissions to air, land and water are controlled. Certain industrial processes such as car resprayers and flexible packaging printers use large volumes of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) which would be emitted to atmosphere if not controlled. There are other industrial processes that are regulated also, which means firms have to apply for a permit. In granting the permit WRS work with the business so that they know what they need to do to comply by using our wealth of experience of dealing with similar companies. Our aim is to support the businesses in navigating the red tape and protecting health and in Bromsgrove we believe most are compliant.

There are those companies that seek a competitive advantage by not controlling their emissions and operating without a permit. WRS undertook a campaign across the County in 2016 to identify anyone who is operating illegally. You can check the WRS website for a list of all businesses that operate with the appropriate permit: <http://www.worcsregservices.gov.uk/media/1928600/May-2016-Public-Register-word-format.pdf> . If you suspect that a business is operating without a permit, please do not hesitate to call or check with our Permitting team on 01905 822799. A review of the findings of the campaign in early 2017 suggest compliance with the permitting regime is good.

Licensing

Licensing Officers continue to monitor and respond to changes in national guidance and licensing legislation; the bi-annual data exchange for the National Fraud Initiative for taxi drivers, personal licence holders and street traders has been successfully completed across the county.

The Immigration Act 2016, parts of which came into force for taxi licensing from 1st December 2016 means that Licensing Authorities now have to check that new and renewal applicants have the right to live and work in the United Kingdom prior to the issuing of a licence; licensing authorities have to issue shorter licences if an applicant has limited leave to remain in the United Kingdom but can work while they are here so that the licence expires when the applicant's right to work expires.

Licensing has also completed this year's data exchange/match with each districts finance teams to aid reconciliation processes for those licences that each district invoices for – Premises licences/ Gambling Premises and Small Lotteries.

Licensing Officers are also participating in the "Safer Bromsgrove Licensed Sector Tasking Group" which is looking at issues in the Night Time Economy in and around the High Street/ Worcester Road Bromsgrove; and discussions are taking place with

Agenda Item 9

regards to whether or not things can be improved with joint working and the multi agency approach.

Licensing Officers have presented new policies to the Licensing Committee in the areas of “Scrap Metal Licensing” and on the introduction of a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Penalty Points Scheme for taxi operators, vehicle owners and drivers – this draft policy is currently at the consultation stage.

LEISURE & CULTURAL SERVICES:

PARKS & OPEN SPACES

The team continue to manage the play and open space portfolio using the electronic PSS live database to maintain standards and target resources directly to need and priorities based manage risk.

During the 2016/17 the team has completed the following 106 funded schemes:

- ASDA Recreation Ground refurbishment of the play area
- Refurbishment of footpaths within the Oakalls development
- Installation of new security measures in Aston Fields Recreation Ground
- Final completion of Barnsley Hall Changing rooms and lease agreement to Santiago Colts FC
- Woodrush High School Sports provision
- Artrix football pitch refurbishment and enhancement

The team are now working towards the following projects for 2017:

- Wythall Park – Officers worked with the Wythall Park Association Trustees, the Local Cricket Club and with National Governing Body for Cricket (ECB) in an attempt to provide facility improvements for the on-site Cricket Club. After protracted negotiation with all parties the works proved beyond the financial viability of the scheme. Due to the claw-back period of the funding stream, the original proposal was adopted to create additional linked/circular footpaths in Wythall Park to provide all year round accessibility for active recreation/jogging/cycling/walking. Included as part of the scheme will be areas of outdoor fixed gym equipment which will enable teen/adults to participate in exercise free of charge. The new provision and access improvements will benefit all residents of the locality.
- Hagley Outdoor fitness – we will be working with the Parish Council to support their delivery of outdoor fitness at Hagley Recreation Ground.
- Alvechurch Teenage Risk play/skate – we will be working with the Parish Council to support their consultation and delivery of play for teens within their park at Wiggin Memorial Ground.
- Woodrush Rugby Club and Beaudessert POS – in line with the 106 funding from the Bleakhouse Farm development improvements will be made at Woodrush Rugby Club – and Beaudessert Nature Reserve.
- Sanders Park DDA Play Provision – The team have been working with contractors and local special needs schools to deliver a scheme that will fit and blend into the existing play provision in Sanders park. This new DDA equipment will provide additional inclusive play that has been supported by students at Chadsgrove.

- Sanders Park Fitness – 106 Funding will be used to provide a first phase of fitness equipment within the park to encourage more outdoor activity that is proving increasingly popular within many of our local parks.

Sanders Park

Removal of the Concrete Channel - Heads of Terms has been drafted between the Council and Severn Trent for the large scale works to remove sections of the concrete channel in Sanders Park. A site meeting of all partners is being scheduled after Easter to ensure the communication of this large scale project is provided throughout the summer season in readiness for commencement in September 2017.

Catering Contract - James Stokes has carried out some modifications to the building and surrounding café area which has included new block paving to improve the outdoor seating area as well as replacing the canopy. Work continues with the repainting of the building/facia and the installation of new 'sail shades' to ensure high impact and shading during the summer months.

Parks Transformation Team – the parks intervention group is now nearing completion and a report will be presented to the Shared Service Board for consideration. The proposal will ensure the team objectives meet the needs and demands of the public

Planning Negotiations – the team continue to work with the planning and legal departments in the District on pre and live applications to achieve the highest quality of POS, Sport and Play provision throughout the District.

ARTS DEVELOPMENT BROMSGROVE – NEW ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS

In partnership with the Council's Arts Development Team, Friends of St John's, Artrix and North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration an exciting Christmas Offer was delivered.

- The successful 2nd Christmas 4 day Market in conjunction with the switch on event on Saturday 19th November, the production of the Better Bromsgrove Christmas publication, the 'illuminate' Christmas lantern parade from the town centre to St John's church on Saturday 26th November and performances in the town on the 3rd, 10th and 17th December by Blackwell Concert Band and The Fidgets.
- Members of the new Children and Young People's Providers Group, formed in September, attended the bonfire and firework event and held a successful consultation event with young people to gather their views regarding the town

centre and what activities they engage in and would like. In addition to this, we developed the offer from the group to attend the St Georges Day event planned for April 2017 to have a marquee to promote the different agencies services around children and young people.

- Bromsgrove Arts and Culture Consortium met with Arts Council England (ACE) to discuss bidding for funding. The meeting with ACE indicating that a Grants for the Arts application would be their recommended route to take. The consortium also built new relationships with other stakeholders locally of relevance to their work in preparedness for their external funding bid.
- The Team supported Artrix attended Overview and Scrutiny to present their first annual report as a part of their current 3 year funding agreement, councillors found the presentation engaging, informative and positive.
- Throughout April to June the Arts Development Service worked with Sports Development to deliver the Spirit of Bromsgrove Awards at Artrix. The awards celebrated individual and organisations involved in the arts, community and sports, the event was very successful with many compliments from those who attended.
- As a part of the Teams work to support the Bromsgrove high street offer, in May, the Team successfully organised for the first Italian Market in Bromsgrove town centre. The market was very well received by the public and it's planned to bring it back later this year or early next year.
- In October, as part of the town centre new events calendar, the Team hosted the White Hart Morris, Chester Morris and Cardiff Morris Men in the events space.
- The Team worked in partnership with Bromsgrove Festival to successful deliver the Day of Dance event on the high street and the Summer Jam, for teenagers, in Sanders Park and worked in partnership with the "Court Leet" to successfully deliver their historic market alongside the normal market.

BROMSGROVE EVENTS TEAM PROGRAMME

Queen's 90th Birthday Event - This event took place on the High street and included Blackwell Concert band and the birthday choir. The Queens beacon was lit by Mrs Britten Long Deputy Lord Lieutenant at 7.30pm in conjunction with other events throughout England St Georges Day.

St Georges Day - The event included working with Vintage Class 1940's and 50's performers, the YMCA running an activity and craft stall and working with the Friends of St John's to make crowns and costumes for a procession from the High street

event to St John's church to celebrate the Queens 90th birthday. The event also included circus skills, Bromsgrove Women's institute and Artrix Show Stars choirs and the Nancy Butterfly Morris Dancers.

Street Theatre - Six Street theatre events were delivered across the district, with two professional street theatre acts at each event. There were various activities including circus skills, craft and drumming, for the children, together with community involvement at each event.

Bandstand Events Sanders Park - A bandstand programme of nineteen events were enjoyed May – September. Various bands played each week, including Worcester Youth Jazz Orchestra, Malvern Hills District band and Celebration Reed and Brass band, with a number of key events provided by the events team working in partnership with the community. These included Austins in the park, Summer fun in the park and Choirs in the park.

Bonfire Event - The good weather helped swell the attendance numbers to approximately 8000. This year the event included a fire walk in aid of sight concern. Entertainment was provided by Tommy Wilson's Funfair and performances from local performer Jasmine Rawlings who performed with the nationally acclaimed band UFQ.

Christmas - The Events team organised Christmas light switch on events in Bromsgrove High Street and Rubery. The entertainment was provided by Local singers Hourglass, Joe James, Skye Hadley, Issi Young and Scott Cartwright, together with the Rock choir, and school choirs Chadsgrove, St James's and Holywell. The lights in Bromsgrove were switched on with the help of Lauren Rowles Paralympic rowing champion at the Rio 2016 Games and Bromsgrove District Council Chairman Helen Jones.

The event in then High street was complimented by the Christmas market.

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Health Intervention

Bromsgrove shows a middle-high level of excess weight which is 0.8% higher than the national average; however levels of activity across the district are middle-high. The Active People's Survey shows an increase in people exercising 3 x or more per week but a decrease in lower level activity such as 1 x week. Bromsgrove are retaining active people but not engaging as many inactive people as previous years.

Sports Development works to improve the health of the Bromsgrove Community through physical activity and mental health and wellbeing:

Activity Referral: A referral scheme where medical professionals (GP's, physios, nurse advisors etc) can refer suitable people into a 6 week activity scheme. This is currently run out of the Dolphin Centre (town centre) and Rush Active (Wythall). Participants who have completed the programme have experienced reduced blood pressure, improved mental health, better weight management as well as improving strength, mobility and the ability to carry out everyday tasks. The scheme has been reviewed and the participant now receives an optional 30 minute contact per week with the course leader – this helps with motivation, sustainability and confidence. 57 people were referred into the course during 16/17 at the Dolphin Centre and Rush Active. There has been a co-ordinated leaflet drop which went out with the Wythall Directory in March 2017 so there should be a marked increase in referrals at Rush Active in the near future.

PSI (Postural Stability Intervention): This is a national scheme which helps people who may be at risk of falling. People can self-refer into this scheme or be referred through a medical professional. This scheme is run in partnership with Public Health and the County Sports Partnership. The intervention helps to improve strength and mobility as well as improving confidence as many of the participant's lives alone so are socially isolated. Currently being run at 5 locations across Bromsgrove: Crabtree Cross, Gilbert Court, Amphlett Hall, St Chad's, Methodist Centre and the Stroke Centre. Funding has been granted for Year 3 (2017/18) and there are 3 pilots across Worcestershire that are focussing on 25 hours of instruction plus 25 hours of home exercise. The home exercise will be monitored by the instructor and signed off every week. This is to reduce number of sessions where transport is required and give the participant more ownership and confidence to exercise in their own home.

Mental Health and Wellbeing: Mental Health and wellbeing has become a high priority for Bromsgrove for all age groups. The significance of this has been highlighted in the Worcestershire Health and Wellbeing Strategy as it is one of the top 3 priorities. We are working with New Brook, Prince of Wales Community Hospital (a mental health unit) to identify activity opportunities appropriate for their patients, breaking down barriers such as social isolation, motivation, confidence and illness.

Couch 2 5k: This scheme has been hugely successful in getting inactive residents engaged in physical activity. The programme encourages people to walk/run their way up to 5km over a 9 week period. It is all inclusive and the age range is vast. 33% of those taking part are inactive i.e. they do not meet the recommended weekly activity level of 1 x 30 minutes. Targeting this population will see the greatest health benefits in terms of reduction in NHS admissions/appointments, increased mental health and wellbeing and improved community cohesion. The courses are run 3 times a year and have an average attendance of 35 people. There are more sessions run over the Spring/Summer months due to the lighter nights, whereas only 1 session was run during the Winter months.

50+ classes: Aimed at people over the age of 50, but welcomes all ages. These sessions are targeted to improve levels of physical activity in the older age group as well as provide social opportunities to improve mental health and wellbeing. Activities provided include yoga, pilates, tai chi, aerobics. Access to facilities and transport is important and can be a barrier to exercise.

Inactive communities: Inactivity is more prevalent in the following community groups – disabled, ethnic minorities, women, low socio-economic groups. Targeted activities are offered through partnerships with schools (Chadsgrove and Rigby), community groups (YMCA) and charities (Age UK, Alzheimer’s Society). Street Cricket and Handball have been highlighted as popular sports for ethnic minority groups. Sessions continue to be sustainable and are run weekly for children and young people in partnership with a local deliverer (Jon Newton Development School). This promotes interaction and acts as a diversionary activity to reduce anti social behaviour and improve community cohesion.

Children and Young People: BDC provides Primary Sports Project sessions as a coaching service delivered to the schools as part of their provision for curriculum and after school club physical education. As part of this we partner with the All Active Academy, delivering the Change for Life clubs, which target the inactive children in each school. Sports Development also sit on the Children and Young People Group to offer experience, knowledge and avenues for children and young people to become active. Work with the local Young Carers Association is continuing into 17/18 to provide alternative activity for those in carer roles.

Club and Coach Development: Club Forum (held quarterly) is run through Sports Development and invites local clubs to attend workshops and forums to discuss subjects such as funding, volunteering, managing clubs and club development. This is a useful resource and has been accessed by 14 clubs throughout 16/17. Support and guidance priorities for 2017/18 will be Woodrush Rugby Club ground improvement, Bromsgrove Cricket Club netting pitch development, Bromsgrove Tennis Club new practice wall/court development, Kings Norton Rugby Club changing room development to allow for concurrent male and female participation and Bromsgrove Indoor Bowls rink extension.

Disability Provision: Over the last year, more disability provision has been run across Bromsgrove schools and this is something we hope to build on into 17/18. Coaches and instructors are receiving training from Chadsgrove School to help with disability instruction. Disability sessions include Sailing, Junior Athletics, Multisports and Boccia, as well as receiving more funding to run a climbing programme in October 2017.

Challenges

- **Facility availability:** Cost to hire facilities can vary and may not always be cost effective to the participant.
- **Transport:** Lack of transport links – Burt’s buses are the only community provider for older people to access and it can be restricted to location and time/day
- **Location:** Bromsgrove is a rural district with many outlying areas. Finding suitable instructors/coaches to deliver sessions to these areas can be challenging. Upskilling community members to deliver within their own area can be helpful however is reliant on finding a motivated/enthusiastic person.

- **GP Referrals:** Activity Referral is reliant on medical professionals referring participants into the scheme. A continuing issue is the low number of GP's who proactively refer onto the scheme. This is down to a number of issues: lack of time, information, poor practice communication (practice managers/GP's)
- **Distribution of information:** Due to Bromsgrove being a rural location and older demographic, newspaper advertising, noticeboards and word of mouth are the best forms of marketing. This is dependant on community groups/organisations displaying information to their users, and not all organisations do this consistently.
- **Available Funding:** Accessing funding can be difficult with services being redesigned and priorities shifting.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Facilities

The BDC Facility Management team are now exercising more control over the Parkside building with it now being over 12 months into operation. We continue to negotiate with the original contractors in completing a list of snagging and defects which are slowly being actioned. This is presented challenges in getting simple repairs completed being hamstrung by the snagging process. Contracts have been taken out to ensure the building is compliant and servicing schedules are in place which have been procured to ensure best value.

A recent consultation exercise with all partners using the building identified the biggest concern as the inconsistency of the heating. As a result we have persisted with the heating control engineers and a solution has been sought that keeps the building at adequate temperature throughout the day. Works have been undertaken in the Parkside hall to install additional heating to ensure there is sufficient heat going into that room. The installation has been successful and has subtly been integrated into the existing building fabric.

Partners have been happy with the service the facilities team have been providing, which has exceeded their expectations in many cases. The challenge we now face is to introduce a service review that will make efficiencies and also increase the quality of service that is provided.

Toilet Cleansing Operations

The toilet cleansing operatives have continued to provide the cleaning function to the public toilets in the town centre, Sanders Park, Rubery High Street and Alvechurch 7

days a week in addition to cleaning changing rooms across the district. Through a series of commercialism workshops we are looking on how we can reduce costs in providing the service and increase income, exploring opportunities to grow the business.

Sponsorship

We continue to achieve sponsorship for the 4 main roundabout sites along the A38 as well as the Fairfield roundabout, however it has been difficult to continuously sell the 4 sites located near Alvechurch. We will now look at promoting these for shorter terms or at discounted rates in order to achieve income and give opportunities to smaller businesses.

Christmas Lights – Bromsgrove and Rubery

The new 3 year contract started in December 2016 and a new look/scheme was implemented. Another successful year and great compliments received with the switch on event giving both Bromsgrove and Rubery a lift throughout the festive period. A few additional lighting columns along the Stratford road has been included to give a greater impact when entering the town.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Response of BDC to consultation on Local Transport
Plan No 4 (LTP4)**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	Yes
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council, as the Local Transport Authority, is required to produce, deliver and maintain a Local Transport Plan. The authority is now formally consulting on the contents of the LTP4. The consultation closes on 17th March 2017.
- 1.2 Five documents are being consulted on including:
1. The main LTP4 document
 2. Habitats Regulation Assessment
 3. Network Management Plan
 4. Policies Document
 5. Strategic Environmental Assessment

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members note the contents of the report.
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the draft officer response to LTP4 (as attached at Appendix 1) be approved by Council and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the formal consultation response.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 As funding will be limited over the plan period the plan seeks to focus on ensuring that best use is being made of existing transport infrastructure, by focusing on maintenance and enhancement schemes where a robust business case and funding can be identified. The County Council states it also intends to bid for funding with partner organisations. The Council is urging WCC to develop a more robust infrastructure funding strategy to ensure the appropriate level of investment is secured for transport infrastructure across the District.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 Worcestershire County Council, as the Local Transport Authority, is legally required to produce, deliver and maintain a Local Transport Plan under the Transport Act (2000) and the Local Transport Act (2008).

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 Members will recall a pre consultation exercise was undertaken by WCC in July 2016 and this was followed up by a presentation on the consultation to Members on 12 January 2017.
- 3.4 The WCC have divided the County up into three geographical areas including:
1. South Worcestershire
 2. Wyre Forest
 3. North East Worcestershire
- 3.5 Transport packages within the North East Worcestershire delivery strategy are grouped into either:
1. North East strategic transport schemes (NEST)
 2. Redditch package (R)
 3. Bromsgrove package (BR)
- 3.6 There are eight 'NEST'- strategic projects which relate to Bromsgrove and six specific Bromsgrove (BR) schemes.

1. North East Strategic Transport (NEST) 1-Lickey End (M42 Junction 1). Major Junction Enhancement Scheme and Lickey End AQMA Remediation
Lickey End (M42, Junction 1) is widely recognised as operating in excess of built capacity and so is now heavily congested at peak times. The junction is the focus for an Air Quality Management Area and offers a challenging environment for non-motorised users. This major scheme would look at strategic options to tackle this issue, which could include redesign or junction relocation and will be delivered in partnership with Highways England.

2. NEST 2- Bromsgrove A38 Strategic Corridor (Lydiate Ash to 'Hanley' Turn) (Should read 'Hanbury')
The A38 Bromsgrove Corridor Major Scheme is currently being developed by Worcestershire County Council (WCC). An Outline Business Case was submitted to the Local Transport Body (LTB) in March 2016 for Programme Entry Approval. Conditional Approval is planned to be obtained in April 2017. The scheme will support the sustainable growth of Bromsgrove by enhancing the A38 Bromsgrove

Eastern Bypass. The scheme includes a series of junction enhancements where delay and congestion is currently experienced, and where conditions are predicted to deteriorate further without intervention. These works will be critical in helping to support the objectives of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP), the Redditch Local Plan, Worcestershire's LTP 4 and both the Worcestershire and Greater Birmingham and Solihull Strategic Economic Plans (SEP) prepared by the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP).

3. NEST 4- North East Worcestershire Transport Telematics Investment Package

This would include Variable Message Signs, Real Time Information Systems, Signalling Improvements and Traffic Counters.

4. NEST 5- Old Birmingham Road/ Linehouse Lane/Braces Lane Junction (Marlbrook)

A complete review of the junction's capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

5. NEST 6- Hagley Junctions

A complete review of a number of junctions in a given area to assess capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

6. NEST 7- Wythall Rail Station Enhancement Scheme,

7. NEST 8- Hagley Rail Station Enhancement,

8. NEST 9- Alvechurch Rail Station Enhancement Scheme

Station enhancements could include:

Improvements to passenger information and station facilities for passengers;

Facilities that will cater for current and future demand growth;

Improvements to walking /cycling routes to the station;

Improvements to access arrangements for cyclists and provide additional new cycle storage facilities;

Set-down and pick-up facilities for taxi users and operators;

Improve facilities for passengers with disabilities or who experience difficulty using the railway station facilities;

Improvement to car parking;

Working with Train Operating Companies to improve services

9. BR1- Bromsgrove Transport Strategy

This proposed scheme would involve a package of Public Realm Enhancements in Bromsgrove Town Centre and would be integrated with other schemes in the area. The scheme would also involve a comprehensive multimodal review of network efficiency and infrastructure. This study would identify where to focus investment to improve the operation of the local transport network. This would also include a review of Bromsgrove's highway network to explore options to improve and disperse traffic flow to increase efficiency and AQMA remediation at Worcester Road.

10. BR2-Bromsgrove - Strategic Active Travel Network Investment Programme (Including Catshill, Marlbrook and Lickey End)

Active Travel Investment Programme is a systemic investment in walking and cycling links across the Bromsgrove area to create a comprehensive, integrated off-road network linking residential areas with key trip attractors, including schools, rail stations, town centres and employment locations. This will include surfacing, signage, lighting and public realm improvements to create an attractive and coherent network.

11. BR3 -Broad Street/Stourbridge Road Junction, BR4 -Parkfield - Strand / Market Street / Stourbridge Road / Birmingham Road Junction, BR5- Bromsgrove - St John Street / Hanover Street / Kidderminster Road Junction

A complete review of the junction's capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

12. BR6-Bromsgrove - Worcester Road/Rock Hill Key Corridor of Improvement (including Worcester Road AQMA Remediation)

A systemic investment in a key corridor to improve transport infrastructure to enable it to support increased economic activity (through quicker journey times and reduced congestion). This could include new technology (signals/signing) surfacing, lighting, enhanced walking/cycling infrastructure.

13. BR7-Bromsgrove Station - Car Park Extension Scheme

Potential to increase car park capacity if demand grows to a point where a suitable business case can be identified to support investment.

14. RB1 -Rubery Public Realm Scheme

A systemic investment in a town centre or area's transport infrastructure to enable it to support increased economic activity and diversification. This could include a redesign of space, new surfacing, lighting, drainage and functional changes to support enhanced

accessibility by walking, cycling, passenger transport or motorised vehicle. This would need to be funded by development growth, recognising that the main shopping area would need to be enhanced to support increased demand.

Summary of Draft Response

- 3.7 Appendix 1 contains the full response to LTP4, the main issue with the LTP is its lack of long term vision and strategy. It could be said that the document as it stands isn't really a plan or strategy and could be seen as a series of ad hoc schemes which are not clearly joining together to provide a coherent transport strategy for the District.
- 3.8 Policy BR1 - **Bromsgrove Transport Strategy** is the focus for much of the response, at the moment officers feel this policy is too limited in what it's trying to achieve. An early indication has already been given by WCC that the wording of BR1 can be altered to allow for a more overarching and longer term strategy to be produced in relation to Bromsgrove. This overarching strategy, which will consider all modes of transport, is likely to be a key element in shaping how the District develops in the future.
- 3.9 BDC would like this strategy to be seen as an opportunity for transport considerations to more heavily influence the decisions on where all forms of future development should take place. The Strategy should play a positive role in addressing infrastructure deficiencies, simply mitigating the impact of future development is not an option BDC can support.
- 3.10 An evidence based investment strategy needs to be developed which can be used to secure necessary infrastructure funding. This strategy needs to be robust and flexible to ensure it can address the requirements for a range of local and central government funding regimes which will inevitably change over the lifetime of any plan. The strategy needs to be fully integrated with other similar strategies being developed in adjoining areas.
- 3.11 In summary, it is believed that nothing short of a radical programme of investment in the transport infrastructure of the District will be needed to ensure Bromsgrove can cope with the pressures likely to be exerted on it over the next 20-30 years.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.12 Members will recall a pre consultation exercise was undertaken by WCC in July 2016 and this was followed up by a presentation on the consultation to Members on 12 January 2017.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 The risks associated with not responding to this consultation is that BDCs views will not be taken into account by WCC in LTP4 consultation or future Planning, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and future bidding for funding towards essential transport infrastructure.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – BDC response to LTP4

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. The main LTP4 document
2. Habitats Regulation Assessment
3. Network Management Plan
4. Policies Document
5. Strategic Environmental Assessment

7. KEY

WCC- Worcestershire County Council
LTP- Local Transport Plan
BDP- Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030 Adopted January 2017
AQMA- Air Quality management Area
IDP- Infrastructure Delivery Plan

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Mike Dunphy
Strategic Planning Manager

E Mail: m.dunphy@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel:01527 881325

Bromsgrove District Council Response to Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4)

Response

1 Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) welcomes the production of a new Local Transport Plan for the County, although serious reservations remain about the effectiveness of the plan as currently drafted. The consultation document states that LTP4;

'Sets out the priorities for the County. It identifies the approach to managing the increased transport demand that is fully consistent with projected housing development and economic growth.'

2 It is the Council's view that whilst the above statement maybe correct, a key feature particularly in relation to Bromsgrove is not addressed in LTP4. There are future development needs identified but not allocated in the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) which currently do not feature in any context in the LTP4, failure to even acknowledge this issue is a significant omission within LTP4 to the extent that the Council cannot support the plan as it is drafted.

3 It has been widely known for a number of years that the Council will be reviewing the recently adopted BDP, including reviewing the green belt to find additional housing for both local needs and the wider needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market (GBHMA) area, which the district is a part of. This review as a minimum will be looking for land for 2300 houses which is approximately 118 hectares. There will also be a likely need to safeguard land for beyond the plan period of approximately 202 hectares to meet expected future development needs although this is could possibly change as future housing and employment needs are calculated. This figure does not include land for any wider GBHMA development needs, which cannot be met on brownfield and other suitable sites in the main urban areas.

4 The Council acknowledges that LTP4 cannot address these issues directly with scheme proposals until more information is known on the final scale and location of development. BDC considers that as currently drafted policy **BR1- Bromsgrove Transport Strategy** is too limited in its scope to adequately address this future challenge. The current wording does nothing to futureproof and add capacity into the Bromsgrove transport network to avert future congestion problems and consequent adverse impacts on air quality.

5 It is welcomed that at officer level indication has been given that the wording of BR1 can be altered to allow for a more overarching and longer term strategy to be produced in relation to Bromsgrove. This overarching strategy which will consider all modes of transport is likely to be a key element in shaping how the District develops in the future. It is essential that progress on the development of this strategy is reported back at regular intervals, and subjected to wider stakeholder consultation to ensure that it evolves in a manner which addresses the challenges being presented to those who currently, and in the future want to live and work in Bromsgrove District.

Appendix

6 BDC would like this strategy to be seen as an opportunity for transport considerations to more heavily influence the decisions on where all forms of future development should take place. The Strategy should play a positive role in addressing infrastructure deficiencies which currently exist, and which will not be solved without intervention over and above that which can be secured from additional development. Simply mitigating the impact of future development is not an option BDC can support.

7 An evidence based investment strategy needs to be developed which can be used to secure necessary infrastructure funding. This strategy needs to be robust and flexible to ensure it can address the requirements for a range of local and central government funding regimes which will inevitably change over the lifetime of any plan. The strategy needs to be fully integrated with other similar strategies being developed in adjoining areas, particularly to the north in the West Midlands Conurbation to ensure that full advantage is taken of all additional infrastructure investment and possible funding that becomes available.

8 Further to the main strategic issue raised above the council would also comment that there is no discussion of the known problems in Bromsgrove and how the existing problems, let alone as mentioned above a vision for how future predicted ones, can be addressed. The current congestion problems are a key concern for Bromsgrove not only for the resident population but for the businesses that operate in the area who often cite the local transport infrastructure as being one of the major barriers to economic activity. The LTP documents as drafted seem to list a large number of ad hoc schemes within no overall defined strategy or prioritisation. It maybe that there is a strategy to these schemes but no detailed discussion is provided to explain how they interrelate to address the wide ranging concerns many stakeholders have already expressed in the early stages of consultation. In some instances the schemes identified are not explained in sufficient detail or with justification for the need and the prioritisation. One example of this is the priority for looking for more car parking at Bromsgrove station, when the station has only just opened and car park never seems to be at capacity.

9 Whilst the Council is not necessarily objecting, the reason for combining Bromsgrove and Redditch together as 'North East Worcestershire' also seems confused. The areas are very distinct areas, with markedly different socio economic structures, so therefore to say this is done for socio economic reasons and because both Councils relate to Birmingham is confusing. It is our understanding that the transport challenges the authorities face are very different. As the description of the North East Worcestershire Transport Challenges in LTP4 is very generic it is difficult to ascertain from the plan what these challenges really are across North East Worcestershire. Consequently without this understanding it difficult to form a view as to whether grouping Bromsgrove and Redditch together is for the benefit of each authority. Particularly as it is assumed that full strategies as per the one identified for Bromsgrove above will be produced for all areas of the county, including Redditch. As a whole again we assume these local elements will form a coherent transport strategy for the whole of Worcestershire which links complementary strategies in adjoining areas such as the West Midlands conurbation and Warwickshire.

10 In summary it is believed that nothing short of a radical programme of investment in all modes of transport infrastructure across the District will be needed to ensure Bromsgrove can cope

Appendix

with the pressures likely to be exerted on it over the next 20-30 years. The Council want to work closely with WCC to develop a future plan and investment strategy which can sensitively deliver both significant housing and employment growth in the future whilst still retaining the attractiveness and local distinctiveness of the District.

This page is intentionally left blank

Response to Solihull MBC on the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	Yes
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 The current local plan for Solihull, the “Solihull Local Plan” (SLP), was adopted in December 2013 and covers the period 2011 to 2028. Although it is a recently adopted plan, and is up-to-date in many respects, there are three reasons that have triggered the need for an early review of it.
- 1.2 Firstly, the successful legal challenge to the local plan post adoption means that the current Local Plan has no overall housing requirement for the Plan period. This makes it difficult to demonstrate that the Borough has a five-year housing land supply, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.3 Secondly, the examination of the Birmingham Development Plan has made clear that the City Council is unable to meet its own housing need within its boundaries, and that the shortfall will have to be met elsewhere within the Housing Market Area (HMA) (or other nearby areas) such as Solihull. The adopted Solihull Local Plan acknowledges that when work on housing needs identifies a need for further provision in the Borough, a review will be brought forward to address this. Solihull MBC believes that this is the appropriate time for doing this.
- 1.4 Finally, the arrival of HS2 to the Borough, and in particular the Interchange station marks a significant shift from the SLP. The ‘Proposed Local Area Plan for the High Speed 2 Interchange and Adjoining Area’ highlighted the need to review the Green Belt boundary.
- 1.5 Solihull MBC have therefore produced the Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016) and is now consulting on this stage of the Plan’s progression.
- 1.6 The closing date for submission of responses was 17th February 2017 and the attached response has been issued to Solihull MBC as an officer response until formal authorisation by the Council is received.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members note the contents of the report
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation (as attached at Appendix 1) be approved by Council as the formal consultation response.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 None identified.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 The attached response discusses the Duty to Co-operate which is a legal requirement under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 112 (2) of the Localism Act 2011.

Service / Operational Implications

3.3 Summary of Response

The response is structured in two parts; firstly, consideration of the housing and employment development targets and secondly, in relation to site selection in terms of potential impacts on Bromsgrove District.

- 3.4 Housing and employment development targets:
Robust evidence should be available regarding the justification and proportionality of the 2000 dwellings contribution contained within the Plan, towards meeting the unmet housing needs arising in the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA). Bearing in mind Solihull's pivotal economic position within the region, BDC consider that the appropriate level of growth commensurate with this position should be thoroughly evidenced and justified in an open and transparent manner, which will stand up to the scrutiny it will inevitably receive .
- 3.5 Solihull MBC need to remain committed to the recently advertised GBHMA Strategic Growth Study and ensure flexibility is maintained in the Plan to reflect the Study's strategic findings regardless of pre-existing local evidence. BDC consider that this issue strikes at the heart of the ethos of the Duty to Co-operate, that co-operation on this basis should be both meaningful and ongoing.
- 3.6 There appears to be an absence of an objectively assessed need (OAN) figure within the Plan at this stage. A clear calculation or

commentary should be included in the Local Plan as to how the dwellings target has been arrived at, specifically defining the OAN and any other 'policy-on' factors over and above this.

- 3.7 BDC would question the robustness of the decision in the SHMA to uplift the demographic starting point by 10% in response to market signals. This represents a modest uplift in the light of evidence and BDC consider a 20% uplift would be more appropriate.
- 3.8 Based on the evidence provided BDC consider that the growth in jobs in the Borough has been underestimated.
- 3.9 In addition to the modest uplift for market signals and the lack of any uplift for future jobs growth, it is noted that the SHMA does not propose an uplift to the OAN to address affordable housing need. BDC consider that this position should be reviewed.
- 3.10 Site selection:
Three sites appear to be proposed for allocation in the Plan in relatively close proximity to Bromsgrove;
1) Proposed site allocation 4 west of Dickens Heath-700 dwellings
2) Proposed site allocation 13 (Christmas tree farm) south of Shirley - 600 dwellings
3) Proposed site allocation 12- Dog Kennel Lane east of Dickens Heath- 850 dwellings
- 3.11 The first of these, site 4, abuts the County and District boundary, with Majors Green already abutting the boundary to the west. This is obviously contrary to purpose 2 of the function of Green Belts, to prevent the coalescence of settlements (Paragraph 80 NPPF). The other sites are situated to the south of Shirley at a further distance than site 4 but nonetheless could still have an impact on the infrastructure of Bromsgrove.
- 3.12 BDC are concerned that the evidence base being used, in many cases post-dates the Plans production in November 2016, for example, the Sustainability Appraisal (January 2017), Landscape Character Assessment (December 2016), Topic Paper 4- Options for Growth and Site Selection (December 2016). BDC therefore questions how the evidence base has been used to support the site selection process.
- 3.13 Furthermore BDC are also concerned about the lack of evidence regarding the impact of the three allocations, amounting to 2150 dwellings, on the infrastructure of nearby Bromsgrove District, for example, in terms of the impact on the wider transport network, highways and public transport; education; community facilities; GP surgeries and so forth.

4. Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

4.1 None identified.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

5.1 The risks associated with not responding to this consultation is that BDC's concerns will not be taken into account by Solihull MBC in the future progression of the Local Plan which have an impact to a greater or lesser extent on Bromsgrove District.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – BDC response to Solihull MBC

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Solihull Draft Local Plan November 2016

8. KEY

Solihull MBC- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
GBHMA- Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area
NPPF- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
OAN- objectively assessed need (housing)
SHMA- Strategic Housing Market Assessment
HS2- High Speed 2 (rail network)

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Rosemary Williams

r.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

01527-881316



Policy and Spatial Planning
Solihull MBC
Council House
Manor Square
Solihull
B91 3QB

strategicplanning@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

17th February 2017

Dear Sir / Madam

Solihull Draft Local Plan Review

Bromsgrove District Council Consultation Response

1. Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Solihull Draft Local Plan. This response represents an informal view at this stage. Once formal endorsement is received from the Council, we will confirm the wording of the final response via email.
2. BDC have read the Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016) with interest and would like to comment on the parts of the draft plan that are relevant to the district and the wider Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA). The response is in two parts, firstly the consideration of the development targets contained within the plan and secondly in relation to site and selection methodology which impact on the Bromsgrove district.

Contribution to HMA shortfall

3. The Council questions SMBC's inclusion of the statement at para 211 that there is:

"A direction of travel that has received a measure of support is indicating that the Council ought to be testing, through this local plan review, the potential to accommodate a further 2,000 dwellings from the shortfall, in addition to accommodating the Borough's own needs."

Notwithstanding the fact there is a lack of similar wording within Policy P5 which would commit the Council to undertake this testing. It is notable that the possibility of SMBC testing a further 2000 dwellings only received a measure of support and not full support in discussions with other housing market area authorities.

4. The Council has been an active member of the GBHMA working group since its formation and has participated fully in all the activities undertaken by this group. This includes the agreement to participate in the recently advertised Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area Strategic Growth Study. It is essential that the Strategic Growth Study proceeds as per the brief and that all areas of the GBHMA are looked at with the same level of scrutiny. Whilst pre-existing work will play a part in informing this study, this work cannot be used to

Appendix

undermine the strategic nature of what the study aims to achieve, particularly in determining which areas of Green Belt are worthy of consideration for future development needs. The need for a strategic green belt review is also highlighted in the recently published West Midlands Land Commission report which stresses;

The (Green Belt) review should pick up from and, where appropriate, supersede the reviews which a significant number of local authorities have underway, where the Commission has heard from a number of respondents that individual local reviews risk a piecemeal and unsustainable ‘chipping away’ of the Green Belt.

5. Under Challenge B on page 19 of the draft plan , it is stated that:

“To ensure that provision is made for an **appropriate proportion** of the HMA shortfall in new housing land consistent with the achievement of sustainable development and the other objectives of the Plan.” (emphasis added).

It is important to ascertain how any contribution, 2000 or otherwise, has been arrived at and how it has been concluded that this is an ‘appropriate proportion’. In the context of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Authorities as mentioned above , the 2,000 contribution from SMBC has not been agreed. Any contribution towards meeting the shortfall from the HMA needs the full support of the GBHMA authorities and should be based on a robust and thorough apportionment methodology. The strategic growth study is mechanism to achieve this. Regardless of the all above it is also unclear whether this 2,000 dwelling contribution to the shortfall has been included within the 15,029 additional homes that SMBC plan to deliver between 2014-2033. This is discussed further in the OAN section of the response below.

6. It should be noted that the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) Strategic Housing Needs Study (SHNS) - Stage 3 Report (August 2015) states at para 2.45 that:

*“Of these ‘missing dwellings’ **most should be within easy reach of Birmingham and to a lesser extent, Solihull.** This is where the largest imbalances between need and supply are found.”* (emphasis added).

This is a reflection of Table 2.2 of the same report which shows that after Birmingham, Solihull had the biggest mismatch between need and supply for the study period of 2011-2031. Throughout the Draft Local Plan, it is emphasised that Solihull plays an important role in the region and is “*a regional and nationally significant economic hub*” (para 29). The proportion of the HMA housing need shortfall to be accommodated by SMBC should therefore reflect the significant role the Borough plays, and be aligned with its economic development aspirations to make the most of the exciting opportunities planned.

7. Para 211 of the draft Local Plan states that the HMA shortfall arising from the 2015 SHNS produced by PBA is 37,500. In the Birmingham Development Plan (adopted January 2017), the shortfall cited in Policy PG1 for Birmingham alone and to be accommodated elsewhere within the GBHMA is 37,900. This was added to the policy to reflect Main Modification 2 (MM2) and also to the Monitoring Section and Policy TP48 through MM84 arising from the Inspector’s Report. The 37,900 shortfall in the Birmingham Plan is a more robust figure which was endorsed through Examination and enshrined in an adopted Development Plan. It should be referred to until superseded by an updated OAN (and shortfall) for the HMA.

Objectively Assessed Need and the Solihull SHMA (November 2016)

8. There is an absence of an objectively assessed need (OAN) figure within the plan at this stage, and having read Part 1 of the November 2016 Solihull SHMA, it is important that the Council specify which of the two OAN figures stated at para 7.21 of their SHMA report that they are looking to deliver (13,094 or 14,278). Reflecting on the Council's own experiences at the examination of the Bromsgrove District Plan, the Inspector insisted that the Council specify Bromsgrove's OAN, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Defining the OAN is particularly relevant in the context of establishing Solihull's contribution to the wider HMA shortfall.
9. Para 214 states that the target of 14,905 net additional dwellings reflects the full OAN, a contribution to the wider HMA shortfall and an allowance to ensure consistency with the SHNS (Strategic Housing Needs Study) for the period 2011-14. Firstly, it is unclear what the 14,905 figure refers to, given the target in Policy P5 is 15,029 and nor does it tally with the total estimated capacity figure of 15,534 in the Table on page 73. Secondly, a clear calculation or commentary should be included in the Local Plan as to how the dwellings target has been arrived at, specifically defining the OAN and any other 'policy-on' factors over and above this.

Market Signals

10. The decision in the SHMA to uplift the demographic starting point by 10% in response to market signals is an intriguing one. This is in the context of high house prices compared to regional and national averages which is referenced throughout the Draft Local Plan, but specifically at paras: 32, 49 and 63.
11. The conclusion that the market signals only represent the need for a modest uplift of 10% is also questionable based on para 4.57 which says:

"From the three cases discussed above we cannot draw definite conclusions about the correct market signals uplift for Solihull."

and para 4.58:

"In short, the size of any market uplift cannot be simply inferred from earlier examples; it also requires judgement."

12. Therefore it is interesting that this judgement has resulted in the use of a low uplift based on the comparison with the authorities of Eastleigh (10% uplift), Uttlesford (10% uplift) and Canterbury (30% uplift). It is suggested that alternative authorities could have easily been referenced to support a different conclusion and higher percentage uplift. It would have been prudent to use authorities which are more comparable to Solihull in terms of their housing markets and geography.
13. Using the recommendations of the Local Plans Expert Group (March 2016), specifically Appendix 6 which amends the text of the NPPG to provide advice on market signals and how plan makers should respond to them. This states that:
"Based on the data published by DCLG, LPAs should apply an upward adjustment to the demographic starting point in line with the following benchmarks
 - *Where the House Price Ratio is less than 5.3 and Rental Affordability Ratio is less than 25%, no uplift is required;*

Appendix

- Where HPR is at or above 5.3 and less than 7.0, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 25% and less than 30%, a 10% uplift should be applied;
- Where the HPR is at or above 7.0 and less than 8.7, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 30% and less than 35%, a 20% uplift should be applied; and
- Where the HPR is at or above 8.7, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 35%, a 25% uplift should be applied.”

14. Para 183 of the Draft Local Plan states that the house price ratio (lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings) in Solihull in 2015 was 8.45 (which was notably higher than the average for England (7.02)). In line with the LPEG’s methodology, a **20% uplift** may be more appropriate to address the market signals.

Future Jobs

15. It is highly important that future labour supply matches future jobs growth and Experian forecasting has been used at Chapter 5 of the Solihull SHMA to explore this. The forecasting model shows an increase of 15,200 jobs over the plan period from 119,700 to 134,300 (para 5.9). On this basis the SHMA reports that “*the availability of labour will be sufficient to fill those jobs.*” Therefore there is no upward adjustment proposed to the demographic starting point in response to jobs growth. This growth of 15,200 jobs over the plan period appears relatively low and is questionable given the number of major employers in the Borough, coupled with the economic growth aspirations of SMBC. The commentary in the Draft Local Plan itself at paragraph 30 also appears to contradict this very conservative level of jobs growth when it is cited that:

“Over the five years 2010-2015 Solihull had the fastest growing labour market outside of London”

And

“At a broad sector level 2015 saw particularly strong employment growth in manufacturing (+1,300, +12%), transport and communications (+1,100, +14%), as well as across all financial, professional and business services;”

16. Based on the information provided in the Draft Local Plan, if 2,400 jobs were created from just two sectors in one year alone, this is equivalent to 16% of the predicted jobs growth over the entire plan period to 2033. It therefore appears that the Experian model has significantly underestimated the jobs growth for the plan period.
17. The SHMA attempts to quantify the impact of the UK Central proposal by undertaking bespoke modelling (in addition to the Experian forecasting) around this proposal. Para 37 of the Draft Local Plan states that:

“The potential of UK Central, to generate further economic and employment growth for the region as a whole is on a nationally significant scale – over 100,000 jobs and £15bn GDP in the West Midlands by 2040 – jobs and growth that are critical to Solihull, its neighbours and to the rebalancing of the national economy.”

18. Whilst it is accepted that the impact of UK Central will extend beyond SMBC’s boundaries, given the location of the project which is centred around Birmingham airport in the authority’s area, it would be expected that the majority of the jobs growth would be delivered within the Borough. The SHMA uses jobs figures from the UK Central Strategic Outline Case which “*estimates 16,500 gross additional jobs will be delivered in the UKC Hub*

Appendix

between 2026 and 2045” (para 5.20). This figure is then reduced further to 9,286 reflecting purely the net additional jobs for the same period (para 5.21). However it is argued that this new reduced figure related to the whole of the GBSLEP sub-region and are not specific to Solihull. We do not follow this explanation as the SHMA notes at para 5.21 that these jobs would be located in Solihull.

19. Once all of the forecasting and modelling is disentangled, it is recommended at para 5.34 that:

“For the purpose of calculating the OAN, the rebalanced UKC Hub scenario results in an additional 400 people in 2033 over the baseline model. Experian comment that ‘the results are as you would expect, there is a small increase in population, jobs and employment and a fall in excess jobs to zero’.”

20. Common sense would dictate that the major infrastructure and economic growth proposed through the UK Central project should result in a far greater jobs growth and associated increase in labour supply than 400 additional people as cited in the SHMA. If it is surmised that the additional jobs would be filled by workers commuting in to Solihull from the rest of the West Midlands, as suggested at paras 5.27 and 5.36 of the SHMA, this would represent unsustainable commuting, contrary to para 70 of the NPPF and as quoted at para 5.1 of the Solihull SHMA.

21. The SHMA goes on to conclude Chapter 5 at para 5.39 by stating:

“Given we are recommending both a demographic adjustment and a market signals uplift on the 2014-based projections, we do not think that there is any justification for a separate economic uplift to address the UKC Hub, not least because it will only start to come forward at the very end of the period and the uncertainties surrounding long-term economic impact forecasting of this nature.”

22. The application of a demographic adjustment and a market signals uplift are separate factors and do not restrict the Council’s ability to apply an economic uplift where common sense would indicate a further uplift is necessary. The online Planning Practice Guidance does not state that it is an ‘either/or’ approach in terms of applying uplifts in response to market signals, employment trends and affordable need. Additionally, the SHMA appears to be internally inconsistent as the Strategic Outline Case is referenced which indicates that the new jobs are going to be delivered from 2026 which is just over halfway through the plan period, not ‘at the very end’ as referenced in the quote above.

Affordable Housing

23. In addition to the modest uplift for market signals and the lack of any uplift for future jobs growth, it is noted that the SHMA does not propose an uplift to the OAN to address affordable need. This should be reviewed in light of the commentary throughout the Draft Local Plan of a ‘severe lack of affordable housing’ (para 49) and the high ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings (para 183).

Proposed Allocations and site selection methodology

24. This section of the response focusses predominantly on the proposed site allocations and supporting evidence base and relate predominantly to questions 15 and 16. Although the site allocations appear to presented as options they are not truly options since they do not

Appendix

provide comparative levels of growth and all appear to be required to meet the Housing requirement.

25. Three sites appear to be proposed for allocation in relatively close proximity to Bromsgrove;
 - Proposed site allocation 4 west of Dickens Heath-700 dwellings
 - Proposed site allocation 13 (Christmas tree farm) south of Shirley - 600 dwellings
 - Proposed site allocation 12- Dog Kennel Lane east of Dickens Heath- 850 dwellings

Site allocation 4, in particular, abuts the District and County boundary. With Majors Green lying in Bromsgrove District already abutting the boundary to the west, this allocation would result in the coalescence of settlements contrary to purpose 2 of the function of Green Belts as set out in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

26. Turning now to the Green Belt Assessment carried out in July 2016. Site 4 lies part in 'refined parcels' RP70 and 71 which achieve above average scores of 8 and 7 respectively. Whilst it is stated that the assessment is 'policy off' it is apparent certain assumptions are made as relative importance to different areas of the Green Belt such as the several references being made to the 'vital' or 'strategic' " Meriden Gap"

"this Assessment has been carried out using an entirely 'policy off' approach in order to assess the strategic performance of the land designated as Green Belt within the Borough"

27. Further references to this study are then found in Topic Paper 4 which examines 'Options for Growth and Site Selection' December 2016, for example,

Page 76...

Area F - South of Shirley between Tanworth Lane and the Borough Boundary

373. **Accessibility** -This area is generally accessible, with most sites being of medium to high accessibility in the Accessibility Mapping study.

374. **Green Belt** - The eastern part of this area performs moderately in the GBA with scores of 6, with the western part of the area, parcel 70, being moderate to high. Development in some areas could lead to the loss of the gaps between the urban area and Dickens Heath.

375. **Constraints & Opportunities** - This area is largely constraint free, although there is a Local Wildlife Site towards Whitlock's End. The draft LCA identifies the sensitivity of this area to pressure for development close to the urban edge of Solihull and Dickens Heath.

376. **Capacity** - The area presents an opportunity for significant growth.

377. **Deliverability** – The SHELAA indicates generally good marketability/viability for sites assessed in this area.

378. **Conclusion** - The moderate impact on the Green Belt and the medium to high accessibility indicate that this land is suitable for consideration for growth, although any development would need to ensure that meaningful gaps to settlements are retained. Where impact on Green Belt is more than limited, this is balanced by the higher accessibility that the area has.

No further information is provided on how 'meaningful gaps' will be achieved. In para 374, parcel 70 is referred to as being 'moderate to high' but this transfers to 'moderate' impact on the Green Belt in the conclusion.

28. It is also interesting to note that the Landscape Character Assessment carried out again in December 2016, identifies this area LCA 2 'Southern Countryside'. What it concludes (page

22 onwards) is that this area has a very low landscape capacity to accommodate new development with visual sensitivity in the area being high.

29. In terms of infrastructure, updated evidence is found in the evidence document "Solihull Connected Transport Strategy 2016 Delivery Plan 2016-2036." Improvements to infrastructure in the vicinity of all 3 sites appear to be:

- 28. Jct 4 M42 (Blythe Valley) capacity improvement
- 32. A34 Stratford Road high quality multi modal route enhancements including Shirley Centre
- 34. Local Stations multi modal interchange and access improvements

BDC have concerns regarding the trip movements associated with the 3 proposed site allocations potentially amounting to over 2000 dwellings in close proximity to Bromsgrove district and impacts on wider transport network.

30. Also of concern, as voiced in previous responses to the Solihull Plan, is the impact on other components of infrastructure in terms of schools, GP surgeries, for example, in the nearby settlements in Bromsgrove. Although it is noted in the accessibility study carried out again in December 2016, this does not fully cover infrastructure outside the Borough. It is noted that for shops and GP surgeries this extended 800m beyond the Borough boundary but schools are limited to those within the Borough.

Conclusions

31. Bromsgrove District Council has concerns about the Draft Solihull Local Plan review as expressed above. The most significant one being the lack of full or evidence based consideration of the wider housing needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. At the moment the Council is concerned that SMBC may not be able to meet its duty to cooperate as prescribed in the Localism Act. Full engagement in the work of the GBHMA would help to satisfy this requirement.

32. The other concerns relate to the allocation of sites in the vicinity of Bromsgrove District. We believe that the proposed allocation in relation to site 4 does not comply with national green belt policy. We also do not consider that at this stage the evidence base being used to support the 3 allocations, is complete or consistent. This leaves the Council with unanswered questions as to the impact on Bromsgrove District of developing these areas.

Officers from the Council will be more than willing to meet with SMBC representatives to try and ensure that the issues outlined above are addressed in later iterations of the Draft Local Plan review.

Yours faithfully,



Ruth Bamford

Head of Planning and Regeneration
Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils

Third Stage Consultation on Mineral Local Plan Response

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council, as the Minerals Planning Authority is producing a Minerals Local Plan. The Third Stage Consultation on the emerging Minerals Local Plan (MLP) for Worcestershire runs until 8 March 2017. The consultation document includes policies on the location of sites for mineral extraction, requirements for mineral extraction applications, preferred areas and specific sites identified for mineral extraction, strategic corridors where mineral extraction in principle is accepted, and Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and Mineral Resource Consultation Areas (MRSAs) where any non-exempt development will be required to conduct a Mineral Resource Assessment to determine whether development will have an unacceptable impact on the mineral resources in the County.
- 1.2 This report explains the recommendations for a formal response from Bromsgrove District Council on the emerging MLP.
- 1.3 As the Council does not meet until after the closing date for responses, it is proposed that once considered by the Cabinet the draft response is submitted to the County Council pending formal agreement by the Council.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the content of the report be noted;
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the draft Officer response to the Mineral Local Plan for Worcestershire as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed as the Council's formal response.

3. KEY ISSUES**Financial Implications**

- 3.1 No financial implications are envisaged at this stage.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 No legal implications are envisaged at this stage.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 Worcestershire County Council (WCC), as the Minerals Planning Authority is producing a Minerals Local Plan. This is the third stage consultation where WCC have proposed strategic corridors, MSAs and MRCAs as well as development management policies for minerals developments.
- 3.4 There are three strategic corridors proposed within Bromsgrove District. The North East Worcestershire strategic corridor is wholly within Bromsgrove District. Along with the Salwarpe Tributaries Strategic Corridor, these two strategic corridors surround Bromsgrove Town. A small section of the North West Worcestershire strategic corridor is within Bromsgrove District to the west of Hagley.
- 3.5 The strategic corridors have been determined using geological data and Landscape Character Types. The strategic corridors do not take into account constraints or the existing built environment.
- 3.6 Any windfall sites which come forward within the strategic corridors across the County which contribute to the quality, character and distinctiveness of the strategic corridor they are within, will be granted planning permission, provided the applications also adhere to the development management policies. Therefore, although the strategic corridors cover large portions of the County, this will not result in minerals development over the whole of the strategic corridors.
- 3.7 The development management policies include the requirements for mineral workings. These policies include requirements for extraction near to heritage assets; impacts on air quality; transport requirements and restoration; and biodiversity enhancement post extraction.
- 3.8 WCC has identified MSAs which correspond to the key and significant resources within the County. The guidance requires the MSAs to reflect the existing resources. The MRCAs are areas which WCC can identify from the MSAs. WCC has identified these areas by buffering out from the boundaries of the MSAs by 250 meters. Non-mineral developments (which are not exempt) which come forward, must produce a Mineral Resource Assessment and consult with WCC on the proposal.
- 3.9 There are a number of discrepancies with the MSAs and MRCAs boundaries which need further clarification.
- 3.10 The MLP does not include information on how WCC will work with the Borough, District and City Councils when assessing proposed development sites within MRCAs.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

None

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risks envisaged at this stage.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Consultation Response

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Worcestershire County Council Minerals Local Plan Third Stage Consultation

http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/7615/minerals_local_plan_third_stage_consultation

7. KEY

MLP – Minerals Local Plan

MSA – Mineral Safeguarding Area

MRCA - Mineral Resource Consultation Area

WCC – Worcestershire County Council

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Isabel Roberts

E Mail: Isabel.roberts@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel: 01527 881 603

This page is intentionally left blank

Minerals Local Plan 3rd Consultation Response from Bromsgrove District Council

1. Overview

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council (WCC) is the Minerals Planning Authority in Worcestershire and is required to produce an up to date Minerals Local Plan. The emerging Minerals Local Plan (MLP) is at its third stage consultation and will replace the existing county of Hereford and Worcester Minerals Local Plan 1997 (MLP 1997).
- 1.2 Bromsgrove District Council (the Council) welcomes an updated Minerals Local Plan for the county, however, has some concerns with regards to the impact on existing and future development in the District.

2. Strategic Corridors

- 2.1 The Council finds the concept of strategic corridors an interesting and acceptable proposition. The strategic corridors are determined by the location of mineral resources and landscape character types and do not take into account constraints, such as heritage assets or existing built development or allocated sites.
- 2.2 The Council believes further emphasis of minerals development within the Green Belt should be further emphasised to ensure that it is understood that minerals extraction itself is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

3. Development Management policies

- 3.1 The Council welcomes Policy MLP12: Adequate and Diverse Supply of Building Stone which allows for small local quarries to supply stone for the repair and maintenance of historic buildings. It encourages WCC to emphasise the importance of allowing small stone mining operations to open for relatively small amounts of local stone for use on historic buildings in the County.
- 3.2 Policy MLP23: Historic Environment explains that developments must have regard to the historic environment. However, the Council are concerned that the policy wording of part a) uses the phrase 'unacceptable harm'. This wording does not reflect the NPPF and the Council believes it should, as the NPPF wordings are established measures of the impact on heritage assets.

3.3 Policy MLP23 could also provide a distinction between nationally designated heritage assets and locally designated heritage assets as to the level of harm a particular heritage asset or its setting may sustain before being detrimental.

4. Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Resource Consultation Areas

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Minerals Planning Authorities adopt appropriate policies as well as define MSAs and MRCAs. Paragraph 8.4 of the MLP explains the types of development which are exempt from Policies MLP27 and MLP28. The exempt development includes allocated sites in Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans, minor development within the curtilage of existing buildings, demolition of buildings, replacement dwellings Certificates of Lawfulness and Listed Building consent among others.

- define Minerals Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Minerals Consultation Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas;

National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Paragraph 143

4.2 The Council would suggest further exempt development from mineral safeguarding requirements to include rural exception sites and infill development of a small number of new dwellings to ensure these types of development remain viable.

4.3 The Council understands that the extents of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) are determined by the extent of mineral resources. The Mineral Resource Consultation Areas (MRCAs) are proposed to be determined through adding a 250m buffer from the boundary of the MSAs which alone is a crude tool, as it does not take into account other constraints and considerations.

4.4 There are a number of discrepancies which the Council will be happy to discuss with WCC to find a reasonable and mutually acceptable resolution. However, as drafted, the Council does not support the MSAs and MRCAs, especially with regards to some of the building stone MSAs and MRCAs and MRCAs for other types of minerals where they overlap with existing built development.

4.5 The Council would welcome further information as to how proposed future allocations may be located within MRCAs, and the steps and interactions WCC would wish to undertake to ensure that the MRCAs do not blight land for future development.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

5th April 2017

ICT Infrastructure Resource

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr G Denaro
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Deb Poole, Head of Transformation & OD
Wards Affected	N/A
Ward Councillor Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 At full council on 23rd November 2016 members agreed that a procurement exercise to find a potential supplier to undertake the main ICT infrastructure function would be undertaken. It was further agreed that the results of this exercise would be presented to Cabinet.
- 1.2 The results of the procurement exercise were reported to Council on 28th February and it was agreed a further report clarifying the process be presented to Council in April.
- 1.3 Members particularly asked to be provided with the original specification document so as to enable them to properly and effectively assess the results of the tender exercise in line with the Councils overall requirements in this area. Members are advised that the original specification document is at appendix 2 to this report
- 1.4 Members are advised that since the last meeting it has been necessary to undertake a further procurement exercise as the previous quotations had expired and that on this occasion only one tender has been received.
- 1.5 Certain information contained in this report is confidential and for that reason the main body of the report and Appendix 2 will be made public but Appendix 1 which includes exempt information will remain confidential.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet is requested to **RECOMMEND**:

- 2.1 That authority be delegated to the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development to proceed with the procurement of a contract to deliver the ICT infrastructure functions with the preferred supplier as set out in Appendix 1 option 2.

CABINET

5th April 2017

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 The current cost to Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) for providing the service is £34,093 per year. This includes the salary and on-costs for the two posts effected.
- 3.2 Details of the second procurement exercise and the associated costs are outlined in Appendix 1
- 3.3 Whilst we included in the specification that Bromsgrove District Council would charge £225 per month, per person, to any supplier delivering the outsource contract and wishing to retain members of staff on our premises to cover the costs of providing office space, desks, electricity, phones etc., this is not required and therefore does not need to be considered in the financial implications.

Legal Implications

- 3.4 Subject to Member approval to proceed, the next stage would be to enter into a legal contract with the preferred the supplier to deliver the ICT Infrastructure functions based on an initial 12 month contract with the option to extend for a further 12 months.
- 3.5 Key to ensuring the Authority could not be left with a contract it finds does not deliver to the standards required; the procurement advert stated we will require the ability to terminate the contract with 90 days' notice (following the initial 90 days of the contract commencement date) for any reason.
- 3.6 As previously reported, if the outsourcing to an external provider proceeds this will constitute a relevant transfer for the purposes of the TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings, Protection of Employment) Regulations. The rules provide that where in house services are transferred to external providers existing members of staff TUPE across to the new contractor. This will affect one member of staff. Any issues in this regard will be managed as part of the process in accordance with usual HR procedures.
- 3.7 The information set out in the main body of this report and in Appendix 2 is non-exempt and is available publically. The information set out in Appendix 1 includes details that are commercially sensitive. Accordingly the information is exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

CABINET

5th April 2017

- 3.8 Section 4.2.3 of the constitution states 'If only one quotation is received you must to seek some more quotations or obtain an exemption from the Rules in accordance with section 9 (Form of Waiver)'. Whilst a previous procurement exercise for this service had returned two quotations, on this occasion only 1 was received and therefore a Form of Waiver will need to be signed.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.9 This proposal presents a solution to correct a particular ongoing issue in the service due to the problem of recruiting staff with the types of skills required within the ICT Infrastructure service. The overall organisational approach remains that of sharing internal resource where ever possible.
- 3.10 The ICT Infrastructure Officer and ICT Infrastructure & Network Officer posts play a key role in maintaining day to day delivery of the ICT service to the Authority. Their main function is to ensure that the servers and storage which enable the business applications to work, are operating successfully. This includes the servers for Emails, Finance, Payroll, Revs & Bens, Elections etc.
- 3.11 In addition the team have been involved in several 'power off' situations at both Parkside and Redditch Town Hall and are key to closing down services correctly and returning them to a working state. Further power off situations may occur at both sites and currently only 1 person is available with the correct skillset to cover this task.
- 3.12 Senior managers are aware that the current lack of resource is having a detrimental effect on the remaining personnel and that this issue needs to be resolved as soon as possible to maintain staff morale and avoid absence.
- 3.13 As mentioned above, resource is currently being purchased on an ad-hoc basis whilst we try to maintain a service with only 1 of the 2 posts filled. The resource comes from several different companies and trying to maintain continuity of service is becoming increasingly difficult.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.14 There are no customer / equalities and diversity implications.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 There is a risk that the external provider will not deliver the service to the level provided by the current internal team. This risk will be

CABINET

5th April 2017

addressed by ensuring, as far as possible, that there are appropriate contractual obligations imposed on the external provider.

- 4.2 The impact of outsourcing could inadvertently increase pressure in the short term, on existing members of ICT whilst the new service is procured and then implemented. The result of increased pressure could lead to additional sick leave but this has been mitigated by securing additional temporary resource from external companies.
- 4.3 To be balanced against the risks outlined above, is the risk that if no action to pursue outsourcing is taken then the Council is likely to continue to encounter recruitment problems which over a period of time may undermine the ability for the service to be provided.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Not included: Exempt item

Appendix 2 – Advertised Specification

1. Introduction

2. Bromsgrove District Council (The Authority) would like to invite suppliers to bid to supply a Technical ICT Infrastructure service equivalent to two full-time experienced technical employees. The service provided will need to at least equal the current in-house provision equivalent to the two posts (74hrs per week in total). In addition, out of hours work will be required on an occasional basis to ensure that the Council services are available during the core hours of Monday to Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm. The opportunity contained within this advert is to supply the service resource only, no hardware or software is included as these assets will remain within the ownership of the Authority and also Redditch Borough Council with whom Bromsgrove District Council provide a shared service agreement to deliver the whole ICT service. For clarification, this bid opportunity does not include any other part of the ICT service – only the ICT Infrastructure roles detailed in the following information.

3. Suppliers are requested to respond to all points from 1 to 97 in their bid response by writing below each corresponding section, with one of the following :-

U= Understand. The point is just for information and there is no additional information provided that needs to be scored by the Authority.

NC=None Compliant. The specification has requested something that cannot be delivered by the supplier. Further details can be provided if necessary.

CABINET

5th April 2017

PC= Partially Compliant. The specification has requested something that can be delivered in part by the supplier. Further details must be provided as to what can and cannot be delivered.

FC= Fully Compliant. The specification has requested something that can be delivered completely by the supplier. Further details should be provided where possible, in how this will be delivered.

4. Background Information.

5. Bromsgrove District Council is the host authority for the ICT Service delivered to both Bromsgrove District Council and Redditch Borough Council. The shared service agreement has been running successfully for a number of years and is currently delivered by 28 posts covering many different aspects of ICT including Application Development, GIS, Web Development & Support, ICT Helpdesk, Network Support, Project Delivery, Business Application Support, Information Management and ICT Infrastructure Support. Whilst retention of staff and recruitment into any available posts are generally at normal levels, it has proven more difficult over the past few years to maintain the ICT Infrastructure resource level at the two posts contained within the ICT staff structure. Currently one of these posts is vacant and one which is filled by a member of in-house staff that would form part of a TUPE agreement should this exercise prove to be a cost efficient way and stable way to deliver the ICT Infrastructure service.

6. Current Infrastructure

7. There are two main sites where the equipment covered by this contract will reside (please see Appendix A for addresses). The first is at Bromsgrove and is known as 'Parkside', and the other larger site, is at Redditch Town Hall. Both sites provide the disaster recovery site for the other, using VEEAM. There is a 1Gb Wide Area Network link connecting the two sites which is excluded from this contract.
8. 16 Physical Servers excluding ESX Hosts
9. Number of virtual servers
 - Bromsgrove (Parkside)
 - 5 ESX Hosts
 - 52 Virtual Machines
 - Redditch (Town Hall)
 - 7 ESX Hosts
 - 139 Virtual Machines
10. VMware version numbers
 - VMware Vcenter Server 5.5.0, 1891313

Host Info:

CABINET

5th April 2017

Bromsgrove (Parkside)

- Production_G5
 - a. ○ PKESX03 ESXI 5.1.0, 3872664
 - b. ○ PKESX04 ESXI 5.1.0, 1483097
 - c. ○ PKESX05 ESXI 5.1.0, 3872664
- Production_G9
 - a. ○ PKESX01 ESXI 5.5.0, 2403361
 - b. ○ PKESX02 ESXI 5.5.0, 2403361

Redditch (Town Hall)

- Production_EVC
 - a. ○ RBCESX01 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
 - b. ○ RBCESX02 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
 - c. ○ RBCESX05 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
 - d. ○ RBCESX06 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
 - e. ○ RBCESX3 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
 - f. ○ RBCESX4 ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055
- DMZ
 - a. ○ RBCESX-DMZ ESXI 5.5.0, 2718055

11. Please note – A project is currently scheduled to upgrade VMWare on all servers to version 6.0 and this will be complete during the time of the advert.

12. Storage Area Network and software versions

- VNX5200 Unified
 - File Version 8.1
 - Block Version 05.33
 - 169TB Usable Storage
- VNX5300 Unified
 - File Version 7.1
 - Block Version 05.32
 - 155TB Usable Storage

13. Veeam versions

- Server SVVEEAMMGMT VEEAM Backup and Replication 9.0.0.902
- Server SVVEEAMONE Veeam One 9.0.0.2062

14. Full details of Microsoft Exchange environment

- Exchange 2010 SP3, all virtual machines
 - 2 Sites (Bromsgrove Parkside and Redditch Town Hall), each site has
 - 2 Mailbox servers
 - 2 Hub transport & Client Access servers

CABINET

5th April 2017

- Mailbox servers replicate data using DAG functionality

15. The LAN, WAN and Wireless networks are not included within this bid opportunity as they are provided by a separate part of the ICT Team.

16. General Service Requirements

17. The requirements of the service are to maintain and support the Infrastructure as described above and in the detail below. As part of your bid response, please detail how you will deliver the service and include all costs for doing so. Costs must be a total for delivering the service and include any overtime, 3rd party costs, expenses, travel etc.

18. If your delivery mechanism requires staff to be located onsite on a day to day basis, then a set fee of £225 per person per month will be charged by the authority to the winning bid supplier, to cover facilities such as office space, a desk, power and provision of a telephone with any call costs being added as they become known. Suppliers will need to agree that any staff located on site can only be used to deliver this service only to the Authority.

19. Term of contract

20. The Authority is seeking to award the contract for an initial period of 12 months with a provision to extend for a further 12 months. Should the service be required beyond that point, it is envisaged an EU tender may be required (subject to Brexit) due to the overall value of the contract.

21. The Authority will require the ability to terminate the contract with 90 days' notice (following the initial 90 days of the contract commencement date) for any reason. Any request for termination will be provided in writing (via email). The supplier will have the ability to terminate the contract with the same 90 day notice period following the initial 90 days of the contract.

22. Please note – the Authority may choose not to enter into an agreement with any potential supplier for this opportunity.

23. The Authority require the ability to terminate the contract on 90 days' notice (following the initial 90 days of the contract commencement date) without discussion or disclosure of reason. Any request for termination will be provided in writing (via email).

24. The Authority respects the right of the supplier to have the ability to terminate the contract on 180 days' notice (following the initial 90 days of the contract commencement date) without discussion or disclosure of reason. Any request for termination will be provided in writing (via email).

CABINET

5th April 2017

25. Marking Criteria

26. Responses to this advert will be marked on the following basis :-

- 40% price
- 60% quality

27. Detailed Requirements

28. It is a requirement of the contract to have named individuals who will deliver the services of this contract at a technical level. Accepting that these may change, due to normal levels of staff employment rotation, please list the relevant qualifications of the technical staff who will be involved for directly delivering this contract.

29. Suppliers must have experienced engineers in the following technologies,

30. EMC
31. Veeam
32. Linux
33. HP-UX
34. VMWare
35. Microsoft

36. It would be desirable for the technical team responsible for servicing this contract to have specific accreditations that cover

- Project Management - Prince2 Practitioner
- EMC – Implementation engineer and technical architect
- VMWare – Data Centre Certified Professional

37. It would be desirable for all supporting, technical (direct or indirect) staff to have been cleared to Baseline Personal Security Standard (BPSS) standard and provide supporting evidence.

38. It would be desirable for the supplier to have achieved Cyber Essentials and provide supporting evidence

39. The supplier should confirm that they will be utilising fully employed in-house resources to service this contract (as opposed to a third party for an element).

40. Service Definitions

- Severity 1 – Critical System unavailable to multiple users causing impact to authority functions during normal working hours
- Severity 2 – Critical System performance or reliability impacting user experience for multiple users
- Severity 3 – Non-Critical System unavailable to multiple users causing impact to authority functions during normal working hours
- Severity 4 – Non-Critical System performance or reliability impacting user experience for multiple users
- Severity 5 - Project Work or low priority requests

CABINET

5th April 2017

41. SLAs

- Severity 1 – aim to restore service within 90 minutes
- Severity 2 - aim to restore service within 180 minutes
- Severity 3 - aim to restore service within 1 normal working day
- Severity 4 - aim to restore service within 2 normal working days
- Severity 5 - aim to complete requested tasks within timescale agreed with Authority

42. The supplier must have the ability to provide onsite resource within 1 hour for severity 1 and 2 incidents, Monday to Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm.

43. The supplier must have the ability to provide onsite resource within 2 hours for severity 3 and 4 incidents, Monday to Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm.

44. The supplier must have the ability to provide onsite resource within 1 hour for severity 1 incidents that occasionally occur outside normal office hours (Mon – Fri 8:30am-5:00pm). Whilst it is difficult to quantify ‘occasional’ – for the purposes of this contract please cost 1 day per month to allow for any work of this nature.

45. The supplier must have the ability to provide onsite resource for occasional planned out of office hours (Mon–Fri 8:30am-5:00pm) work. This is classes as Severity 5 in the table above and would cover work items planned in advance to cover items such as server room power downs and restarts, software upgrades, hardware upgrades and configuration changes that would impact normal service delivery. Whilst it is difficult to quantify ‘occasional’ – for the purposes of this contract please cost 1 day per month to allow for any work of this nature although it may not be used for several months and then planned work lasting two to three days could be required.

46. Scope of the Service to be provided

47. The ICT Infrastructure service requires the following :-

48. Management of Active Directory & Groups Policies

- Monitoring using existing toolsets
- Fault Identification & Remediation
- Minor & Major Upgrades
- 2nd & 3rd Line Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure

49. Management of Windows Server Estate

- Monitoring using existing toolsets
- Fault Identification & Remediation
- Minor & Major Upgrades
- Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
- Currently 25% of the estate is patched on a weekly basis on a 4 week rotating schedule.

CABINET

5th April 2017

50. Management of Client Estate
 - Ensure all physical PC's and laptops are patched on a weekly basis with the latest vendor provided patches using tools provided by the Authority. This will include Microsoft Patches, Virus Definition Updates and other security patches.
51. Management of Virtual Server Environment based on VMware Hypervisor
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
52. Management of Email Infrastructure
 - Exchange Server Infrastructure located at BDC & RBC Sites
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
53. Management of Network Email Filtering Devices
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Liaise with 3rd Parties to enable Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
54. Management of Storage Area Networks
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
55. Management of EMC & HP Storage Arrays
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
56. Management of Server Room Environment
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
57. Management of DMZ Infrastructure
 - Includes server software, server hardware and storage specifically relating to the provision of services in the DMZ Infrastructure
 - Monitoring using existing toolsets
 - Fault Identification & Remediation
 - Minor & Major Upgrades
 - Adds, Moves & Changes as required via standard change control procedure
58. SQL Database Support, Maintenance & Report Writing
59. 3rd Party Call Management & Handling – for any items that require your company to discuss support with another company we have a contract with.
60. RBC & BDC Server Room Daily Checks

CABINET

5th April 2017

- The Supplier will perform remote daily checks of specified systems according to the authorities requirements
61. Included in the 12 month contract, at no extra costs to the authority, up to 2 extraordinary incidents to cover specific planned out of hours works such as:
- Temporary SLA uplifts for business critical operations e.g. elections
62. Project Management of IT Work Packages.
- Work with members of the BDC RBC team to deliver projects using recognised project management methodologies to agreed standards.
63. Liaising with internal front line resource
64. Service Review Meetings
- To be performed fortnightly on-site at the authority and will last 1 hour
65. Working within existing change control procedures
66. Comply with authority Internal processes and standards
67. Where appropriate, appraise and determine the impact of new or proposed legislation and guidelines
68. Work with the authorities ICT Helpdesk Desk to revise and update internal process documentation
69. Assist in the diagnosis and resolution of problems relating to the ICT Infrastructure
70. Ensure releases, upgrades, fixes & patches available from software suppliers are installed in line with agreed implementation plans
71. Ensure that documentation relating to corporate systems and software is kept current and available for use by other authority members
72. Work with all parties, internal and external, to ensure effective communication
73. The service cover is 8:30am to 17:00 Monday to Friday. Provision of out of hours support will be provided as requested within this document.
74. On site resource as required (no permanent on-site presence required, ad-hoc as necessary but must be within 1 hour travelling time for Severity 1 fault resolution.)
75. The scope definition is intended to specify the roles and responsibilities relevant to the current infrastructure. This service contract must encompass the current infrastructure and include additions and changes to services and applications and their supported infrastructure made through normal organic growth at no extra cost, but exclude additions that arise from growth through further partnership agreements that may form with other local Authorities.

CABINET

5th April 2017

76. Out of Scope

- 77. Server Backup Environment Management
- 78. Networking
 - Provision, monitoring, configuration and management of
 - LAN
 - WAN
 - Wireless
- 79. Business Application Support. For applications not specifically defined as in-scope for this contract, any application installation, monitoring, configuration and management is out of scope.
- 80. Provision and Management of
 - Tablets
 - Laptops
 - Mobiles Phones
 - Web Services
 - Web Site Management
 - Web Content
- 81. Provision of service desk function to provide 1st line support to the authorities customer base
- 82. Information Management
- 83. IP Telephony Support
- 84. VDI Environment Support
- 85. Active Directory - User Add/Moves/Changes
- 86. Client builds
- 87. CCTV Management
- 88. The supplier shall not be responsible for providing any hardware, software or licenses. These are to be provided by the authority. This is a service only contract.
- 89. Disaster Recovery Testing

90. Appendix A

91. Site Addresses

Bromsgrove District Council

Bromsgrove District Council
Parkside
Market Street
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

CABINET

5th April 2017

Redditch Borough Council

Redditch Borough Council
Town Hall
Walter Stranz Square
Redditch
Worcestershire
B98 8AH

92. Appendix B

93. Costing Profile

94. Please note that due to the decision process for permission to proceed, a report detailing these costs will be presented to Councillors during April 2017. Costs should therefore be fixed until the end of April 2017 to enable that process to be completed.

95. The Authority will require the ability to terminate the contract with 90 days' notice (following the initial 90 days of the contract commencement date) for any reason. Any request for termination will be provided in writing (via email). The supplier will have the ability to terminate the contract with the same 90 day notice period following the initial 90 days of the contract.

96. Year 1 and 2 Total Costs

Year 1 – Please enter below the total cost for delivering the service as per your response to this advert	Year 2 – Please enter below the total cost for delivering the service as per your response to this advert	Please enter below any comments required regarding the costs.
£	£	

97. The council requires invoices to be requested for payment quarterly – please state if this is acceptable and in addition, if an alternative payment profile could offer a reduction in cost, then please detail this.

CABINET

5th April 2017

6. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**
None

AUTHORS OF REPORT

Name: Deb Poole
E Mail: d.poole@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 881256

Name: Mark Hanwell
E Mail: m.hanwell@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 881248

CABINET

5th April 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank