



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY 20TH JANUARY 2021
AT 6.00 P.M.

MICROSOFT TEAMS - VIRTUAL

MEMBERS: Councillors R. J. Laight (Chairman), A. J. B. Beaumont (Vice-Chairman), S. J. Baxter, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English, M. Glass, S. G. Hession, C.A. Hotham, S. A. Robinson, R. J. Hunter, R. E. Jenkins, H. J. Jones, A. D. Kent, J. E. King, A. D. Kriss, L. C. R. Mallett, K.J. May, M. Middleton, P. M. McDonald, H. D. N. Rone-Clarke, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas, M. Thompson, J. Till, K. J. Van Der Plank, S. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

AGENDA

WELCOME

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 2nd December 2020 (Pages 1 - 16)

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. Urgent Decisions (Pages 17 - 18)
8. Constitution Review Report (Pages 19 - 22)
9. Political Balance Report (Pages 23 - 28)
10. Recommendations from the Cabinet

To consider the recommendations from the meeting(s) of the Cabinet held on 13th January 2021 (to follow).

11. Background Information on the recommendations from the Cabinet
 - (i) Worcestershire Regulatory Services - Recommendations Budget 2021/22 (Pages 29 - 48)

12. To note the minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 13th January 2020 (to follow)

13. Questions on Notice (Pages 49 - 50)

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

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.

14. Motions on Notice (Pages 51 - 56)

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.

15. Burcot Lane Report (Pages 57 - 60)

16. 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 item(s) of business on the grounds that it/they involve(s) 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>
17	3
18	3

17. Burcot Lane Confidential Appendix (Pages 61 - 62)
18. Confidential Minutes (Pages 63 - 64)

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

12th January 2021

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact
Jess Bayley

Parkside, Market Street, Bromsgrove, B61 8DA
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Extn.3268)
e.mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

GUIDANCE ON VIRTUAL MEETINGS

Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic Bromsgrove District Council will be holding this meeting in accordance with the relevant legislative arrangements for remote meetings of a local authority. For more information please refer to the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police Crime Panels meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

Please note that this is a public meeting conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams conferencing between invited participants and live streamed for general access via the Council's YouTube channel.

You are able to access the livestream of the meeting from the Committee Pages of the website, alongside the agenda for the meeting.

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers please do not hesitate to contact the officer named above.

Notes:

As referred to above, the virtual Microsoft Teams meeting will be streamed live and accessible to view. Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when Council might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded and for any such items the live stream will be suspended and that part of the meeting will not be recorded.



INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

Access to Information

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

- You can attend all Council, Cabinet and Committee/Board meetings, except for any part of the meeting when the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- You can inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- You can inspect minutes of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards for up to six years following a meeting.
- You can have access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to six years from the date of the meeting. These are listed at the end of each report.
- An electronic register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc. is available on our website.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public will be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards.
- You have access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned, as detailed in the Council’s Constitution, Scheme of Delegation.

You can access the following documents:

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- The Council’s Constitution

at www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

2ND DECEMBER 2020, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors R. J. Laight (Chairman, until Minute Item No. 44/20), A. J. B. Beaumont (Vice-Chairman), S. J. Baxter (until Minute Item No. 44/20), S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English, M. Glass, S. G. Hession (until Minute Item No. 45/20), C.A. Hotham, S. A. Hughes, R. J. Hunter, R. E. Jenkins (until Minute Item No. 45/20), H. J. Jones, A. D. Kent, J. E. King, A. D. Kriss, L. C. R. Mallett, K.J. May, M. Middleton, P. M. McDonald, H. D. N. Rone-Clarke, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas, M. Thompson, J. Till, K. J. Van Der Plank, S. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

35\20 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

36\20 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

37\20 **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 21ST OCTOBER 2020**

Members considered the minutes of the meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 21st October 2020.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 21st October be approved as a true and correct record.

38\20 **TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND/OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE**

The Chairman advised Council that he had no announcements to make on this occasion.

The Head of Paid Service also confirmed that he had no announcements to make at the meeting.

39\20 **TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

The Leader noted that it had been a difficult year due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Bromsgrove District had been placed in Tier Two following the second national lockdown and she encouraged everyone to follow

Agenda Item 3

Council
2nd December 2020

the guidelines. The Leader welcomed the news that the Covid-19 vaccine produced by Pfizer and BioNTech had been approved for use by the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) that day.

During consideration of this item, the political party group leaders joined the Leader of the Council in thanking Council staff, elected Members and key workers for their hard work during the Covid-19 pandemic. Reference was also made to the temperature that the Pfizer BioNTech vaccine needed for storage purposes and questions were raised about how the vaccine would be transported safely to vulnerable residents who might struggle to attend the vaccination centre at the Artrix. Officers undertook to obtain further information on this subject for Members' consideration.

Clarification was requested about the action that could be taken to enable Districts in Tiers 2 and 3 to be placed in Tier 1 in the future. The Leader explained that she attended meetings of the Worcestershire Local Engagement Board where the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic locally was discussed. There would be the potential to lobby for Worcestershire to be placed in Tier 1. However, risk factors and local Covid-19 case numbers would be taken into account when decisions were taken about the tier in which the county should be placed moving forward.

40\20

TO RECEIVE COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OR PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no comments, questions or petitions from members of the public on this occasion.

41\20

URGENT DECISIONS

Members noted a number of urgent decisions that had been taken since the previous meeting of Council in respect of the following matters:

- Section 106 funding for 76, Sherwood Road
- Covid Impact - Subsidy to the Leisure Service Provider SLM (Everyone Active)
- Worcestershire Business Rates Pool 2021/22
- Green Homes Local Authority Delivery Grant Funding
- Licensing (Miscellaneous) Sub-Committees A and B

It was noted that a significant number of urgent decisions had been taken in 2020. Many of these urgent decisions had been made due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Members welcomed the urgent decision in respect of the Green homes grant funding and requested further information on this subject for the consideration of local residents. Questions were also raised regarding the ways in which the availability of the grant funding had been

communicated to eligible householders. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the lead officer for the Green Homes grant funding would be asked to share this information with Members.

However, concerns were raised about the frequency with which urgent decisions were being taken and the potential impact on the transparency of the decision-making process. In particular, reference was made to the urgent decision in respect of the Worcestershire Business Rates Pool 2021/22, where a decision had been recorded as taking place on 22nd October 2020, the day after a full Council meeting. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that this decision would be checked. Members were advised that the Council aimed to minimise the number of urgent decisions that were taken and all of these decisions were published on the Council's website to ensure transparency.

Reference was also made to the potential for urgent decisions to be considered through the Council's Overview and Scrutiny process. It was noted that the urgent decisions were signed off by the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board and questions were raised about the extent to which these decisions could be subject to scrutiny. The Overview and Scrutiny Chairman responded by suggesting that if Members felt he was not fulfilling his role then this could be considered at a future Board meeting. Councillor L. Mallett requested that this part of the debate be recorded in the minutes. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Board had the authority to determine the position of the Overview and Scrutiny Chairman.

During consideration of this item reference was also made to the length of time involved in considering and making an urgent decision, including the amount of notice provided to Members consulted over urgent decisions. It was also noted that group leaders had opportunities to meet outside formal Committee meetings when a range of issues could be discussed. The Monitoring Officer suggested that this matter could be addressed by the Leader outside the meeting.

42\20

AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Members were advised that Councillor J. Till was standing down from the Licensing Committee and would be replaced by Councillor A. Kriss. Councillor Till was thanked for her work serving as a member of the Committee.

During consideration of this item Members questioned why an appointment to the Licensing Committee had been reported to Council. The Monitoring Officer explained that group leaders were responsible for determining their group's appointments. However, Committee appointments were always retrospectively reported to Council, both at the Annual Council meeting and during the year as they occurred.

43\20

APPOINTMENT OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

Members were advised that there was a requirement under the Local Government Act 1972 for the Council to have a Section 151 Officer. During a recent meeting of the Appointments Committee, Mr J. Howse had been nominated to the position of Section 151 Officer and Director of Resources. Subject to Council agreement, Mr Howse would be commencing employment with the authority in 2021.

RESOLVED that Mr James Howse be appointed as the officer responsible for the administration of the Council's finances under s151 of the Local Government Act 1972.

44\20

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET (TO FOLLOW)

Worcestershire Regulatory Services Board Budget Recommendations 2020/21

Councillor A. Kent, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services, presented the recommendations arising from a meeting of the Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) Board held on 1st October 2020.

The recommendations addressed the need for partner organisations to increase budget contributions in order to cover increased pension costs. The increase in pension costs had arisen following the outcomes of a national court case in relation to age related contributions. A refund had been requested to be paid to Wyre Forest District Council, which was withdrawing from the pest control service provided by WRS. The revised budget contribution from Bromsgrove District Council to WRS in 2020/21 would be £468,000, or 14.59 per cent of the WRS budget.

During consideration of this item, it was noted that there appeared to have been a challenging debate at the WRS Board meeting when the budget position for 2020/21 had been discussed. Members noted that Councillors A. Kent and H. Jones served on the WRS Board on behalf of Bromsgrove District Council. It was also noted that there would be further recommendations about the WRS budget coming forward in future months for Members' consideration.

Members commented that WRS had been working very hard during the Covid-19 pandemic, which had created a number of challenges for the service. Officers in the team were praised for their hard work at this difficult time.

RESOLVED that partner authorities approve the following for 2020/21:

- 1.1 the additional partner liabilities for 2020/21 in relation to increase in WRS pension forward funding rate and recommend the increase to individual partner councils:-

Bromsgrove District Council	£11k
-----------------------------	------

Agenda Item 3

Council
2nd December 2020

- 1.2 the additional partner liabilities for 2020/21 in relation to the additional increase in pay award of 0.75% from the original estimated 2% and recommend the increase to individual partner councils:-

Bromsgrove District Council	£3k
-----------------------------	-----

- 1.3 the refund to Wyre Forest in relation to the change of Pest Control Services and recommend the refund to individual partner councils:-

Wyre Forest District Council	£7k
------------------------------	-----

- 1.5 the revised budget for 2020/21 and partner percentage allocations for 2020/21 onwards, due to the change in pest control service at Wyre Forest:-

	£'000	Revised %
Bromsgrove District Council	468	14.59

Domestic Abuse Policy

Councillor S. Webb, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Health and Wellbeing, presented the Domestic Abuse Policy for Members' consideration. Members were advised that the policy set out the Council's approach to responding to cases of domestic abuse and supporting victims, which included participation in multi-agency partnership work to tackle domestic abuse. The Domestic Abuse Act would introduce a legal duty, from April 2021 onwards, for Councils to house victims of domestic abuse and their children. The legislation also introduced a statutory definition of domestic abuse, which acknowledged that this could be physical, emotional and / or coercive.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the draft Domestic Abuse Policy be adopted; and
- (2) the Head of Housing and Community Services be given delegated authority to update and amend the policy in line with any new legislation and guidance, as and when required.

(During consideration of this item an issue was raised about the Chairman's location whilst participating in the meeting and questions were raised about the suitability of this location. Reference was made to the Covid-19 rules, in respect of areas such as Bromsgrove District that had been placed under Tier Two restrictions. An adjournment subsequently took place from 18.54 to 19.22. At the end of this adjournment the Monitoring Officer advised that the matter of the

location of the Chairman at the start of the meeting would be investigated further. Members were advised that there were some exemptions which applied to individuals participating in business meetings from the same location and this would be explored further.

The Chairman left the meeting during the adjournment and did not return. The Vice Chairman chaired the remainder of the meeting from 19.22 until the end of the meeting.)

Financial Monitoring Report Quarter 2 2020/21

Councillor G. Denaro, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling Services, presented the Financial Monitoring Report for quarter 2 of the 2020/21 financial year and in so doing highlighted a typographical error in the report. Members were advised that this did not change the total figures that had been recorded.

Council was informed that quarter 2 in the financial year was the first point at which the full impact of the Covid-19 pandemic could start to be identified in the budget. The Council had received funding from the Government to help cover the financial costs arising from the pandemic and this had been provided in four tranches. In total, £865,000 of this funding remained to be spent and Members could determine how this should be used.

There was projected to be a variance in the budget by the end of the financial year. To address this, the Leader, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling Services were due to meet with senior Officers over the following weeks to discuss expenditure.

For the strategic purpose 'communities which are safe, well-maintained and green' there was projected to be a variance in the budget of £165,000. In part, this had occurred because Bereavement Services had not secured the income that had been anticipated at the start of the year. There had also been overspends on the trees and waste management services and a business case was in the process of being developed for the latter service.

There had been some savings achieved in Enabling Services. In particular, savings had been secured from vacant posts in Customer, Democratic and IT services. There had been an underspend in respect of the strategic purpose 'living independent, active and healthy lives' primarily because it had not been possible to hold events during the Covid-19 pandemic. However, the strategic purpose 'run and grow a successful business' was overspent by £779,000 and it was unlikely these costs would be covered by the remaining Covid-19 grant funding.

Expenditure in the Capital Programme was not as advanced as had been anticipated. Therefore, reprofiling work would be required. However, some activity had commenced with regard to the Burcot Lane

site and it was likely that this would result in expenditure early in the new year.

RESOLVED that the reprofiling of the Burcot Lane project in the capital programme 2020/21 due to officers completing a review of the Capital budget for 2020/21 – 2023/24 as detailed in appendix 3 be approved.

Capital Strategy 2020/21 Incorporating the Treasury Management Strategy

Councillor G. Denaro, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling Services, presented the Capital Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy for 2020/21. Council was informed that these strategies would usually be considered earlier in the municipal year but had been postponed due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Council was informed that in respect of short-term investments, the authority had previously worked with the Bank of England but this resulted in a low rate of return. Officers had worked hard to encourage Money Markets, which provided a greater rate of return, to consider working with the Council on short-term investments.

The Investment Strategy had been altered. In previous years the Council had only permitted investments to be made where there would be a good rate of return. The strategy had now been updated to enable the authority to make purchases that might break even or could result in a loss, in cases where the investment would benefit the local community.

During consideration of this item Members questioned whether the Capital Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy had been considered at the latest meeting of the Finance and Budget Working Group. Further information was requested about the use of capital receipts as well as the structure costs of the ERP system, or new finance system, and service delivery for this system. The Head of Financial and Customer Services explained that the capital receipts were used to help cover costs that would usually be covered using revenue budgets. In relation to the ERP system, some of the costs related to staff redundancies.

RESOLVED that

- (1) the Capital Strategy as an appropriate overarching strategy for the Council be approved;
- (2) the Treasury Management Strategy for 2020/21 and the associated MRP policy be approved;
- (3) the policy for Flexible use of Capital Receipts be approved; and
- (4) the Investment Strategy be approved.

Fees and Charges 2021/22

Councillor G. Denaro, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling Services, presented the proposed fees and charges for the 2021/22 financial year. In presenting the report, Councillor Denaro thanked both the Finance and Budget Working Group and Officers working in the finance department for their hard work in reviewing the figures. In some cases, fees had been set in order to achieve full cost recovery. In other cases, fees had not been increased due to concerns about the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the customers in receipt of those services. An additional fee had been proposed for the Birdbox.

RESOLVED that

- a) all fees and charges included in appendix 1 to the report be approved;
- b) an additional charge for the electric supply at the Birdbox be approved and
- c) all fees and charges included in appendix 1 are charged commencing 1st February 2021.

Bromsgrove District Council Car Parks – Capital Works Programme

Councillor K. May, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, the Town Centre and Strategic Partnerships, presented the Bromsgrove District Council Car Parks – Capital Works Programme report for Members' consideration. Members were advised that there were no risks to any of the car parks in the district arising from the proposals detailed in the report. There would be a full maintenance schedule and a fully costed business case had been prepared.

Some Members welcomed the report and the proposed investment in the town's car parks. It was suggested that this was an exciting time to invest in car parks and would help the local economy, following the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Unfortunately, during the pandemic, nationally there had been reports of businesses struggling financially, particularly in the retail sector. Action needed to be taken to make Bromsgrove a desirable place to visit and the proposals in respect of car parking would contribute to this. In addition, questions were raised about the extent to which Bromsgrove District council could afford to pay for the repairs and maintenance costs required to refurbish this car park.

However, some Members raised concerns about the potential for a third party to manage one of the Council's car parks in Bromsgrove town centre. In particular, concerns were raised that the Council might potentially lose income if a third party managed the car park on the Council's behalf. Concerns were also raised about the extent to which the Council could ensure that the charges for the car park levied by a third party would be equitable.

Agenda Item 3

Council
2nd December 2020

Members noted that further information in respect of the offer from a third party to manage one of the Council's car parks, which related to the first recommendation in the report, had been provided on pink papers and would need to be discussed in exempt session. In this context, Members agreed to determine recommendations 2 – 7 during consideration of this item and to determine the first recommendation in the report at the end of the meeting.

RESOLVED that

- (1) delegated powers be given to the Head of Environmental and Housing Property Services, Head of Finance and Customer Services and the Portfolio Holder, to explore, negotiate and agree the final lease details with the third party, be approved;
- (2) a decrease in the 2020/2021 Capital Programme of £34.5k to provide a total budget of £85.5k for replacement of parking machines be approved;
- (3) an increase of £432.0k, £307.0k or £267.0k in 2021/2022 to be funded from borrowing or balances following consideration as part of the medium term financial plan review be approved;
- (4) an increase of £136.0k to the 2022/2023 Capital Programme to be funded from borrowing or balances following consideration as part of the medium term financial plan review be approved;
- (5) an increase of £116.0k to the 2023/2024 Capital Programme to be funded from borrowing or balances following consideration as part of the medium term financial plan review be approved; and
- (6) an increase of £441.0k or £121.0k in 2024/2025 to be funded from borrowing or balances following consideration as part of the medium term financial plan review.

(During consideration of this item there was a brief adjournment, from 20.02 to 20.11).

45\20

TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON 25TH NOVEMBER 2020 (TO FOLLOW)

Members commented that reference had been made in the minutes to the Finance and Budget Working Group's debate about the fees and charges and that questions had been raised during this debate about fees for planning enforcement. Councillor C. Hotham clarified that the group had, in fact, been discussing fees for pre-application advice.

Reference was also made to the Bromsgrove Economic Recovery Framework, which had been discussed during the Cabinet meeting. Councillor S. Douglas asked for Members to be consulted at the 'imagine stage' of the town centres regeneration process.

The minutes from the Cabinet meeting held on 25th November 2020 were noted.

46\20

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Question Submitted by Councillor J King

“The leader assured this council recently that all Bromsgrove District Council workers are paid at least the real living wage currently £9.30per hour). Could she now assure this council that this includes those who are sub-contracted to work on behalf of Bromsgrove District Council delivering public services? Could she also confirm that it is a condition of any tender process for council services that sub-contractors must pay their staff the real living wage and if this is not current practice , could steps be taken to put this condition in place?”

The Leader responded by explaining that this issue had previously been discussed at a meeting of Council and had also been referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board for a full investigation to be carried out. A motion had been put forward on this matter on 21st November 2012 and the Board received an initial report on 22nd April 2013 and a further report on 15th July 2013. The second report was the most relevant to the question that had been asked, as it highlighted the issues which could have an impact on the implementation and monitoring of the living wage. This was acknowledged by the Board when Members determined that no further action should be taken. The Leader offered to share copies of the minutes of the relevant meetings and reports that had previously been considered on this subject and advised that the position had not changed since then.

Question Submitted by Councillor R. Hunter

“Given that the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee has recently exposed the selection criteria for the £3.6bn Towns Fund for being ‘vague and based on sweeping assumptions’ to the extent that it is a ‘risk to the civil service’s reputation for impartiality’ will the Leader write to the Secretary of State to ask that any future funds of this type are distributed using a fairer and more transparent process?”

The Leader advised that the matter of fairness and transparency had been addressed in the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee’s Report published on 11th November 2020, following the inquiry ‘Selecting Towns for the Towns Fund’. The Council supported the report’s conclusions and recommendations, including the recommendation that *“to avoid accusations that government is selecting towns for political reasons, the Department [i.e. Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government] should be upfront and transparent about how it reaches funding decisions as the Towns Fund progresses, particularly the planned competitive round. The principle of openness and transparency should extend across the whole of government when it*

is selecting some local areas, but not others, to benefit from taxpayers' money". In this context, the Leader advised that it would not be appropriate at this stage to write a letter to the Secretary of State in respect of this matter.

Question Submitted by Councillor C. Hotham

"In the six months to August 2020 Wychavon District Council collected 957 tonnes of road sweeping, in the same period Bromsgrove District Council collected only 43 tonnes. Is the Portfolio Holder concerned that this failure could lead to localised flooding as road gullies become even more blocked with debris?"

Councillor M. Sherrey, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, provided an answer to the question in her capacity as the relevant lead Portfolio Holder.

Members were informed that unfortunately, there had been a number of mechanical issues with the Council's large sweepers during the year that had significantly disrupted operations up until September 2020. This was in addition to the Coronavirus issues, which resulted in the sweeper drivers providing support to the waste collection service due to staff shielding and isolating.

The Council had taken steps to replace, as well as repair, this equipment in order to restore the full service, and by December 2020 the sweepers were operating at normal levels again, with a new sweeper on order and expected before Christmas. The Council had been targeting resources to ensure that all known flooding hotspots had been managed as a priority since September 2020.

Staff had been monitoring the state of the district whilst sweepers had been off the road, to ensure that the Council was targeting resources efficiently. The team hoped to bring standards back to normal levels by the new year, with leaf fall being the greatest challenge at this time of year.

Members were asked to note that in the same period last year the Council swept 466 tons of material with sweepers. It was difficult to compare the amounts collected in districts due to the number and type of roads in each district. The Council normally operated 1.5 large sweepers across Bromsgrove, and 1 mid-size sweeper. Under the shared service with Redditch, the Council operated a total of 3 large sweepers and Redditch had been equally affected. The Place Teams also used mini sweepers which could manage small amounts on pavements but could not cover the work of the large sweepers. Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, staffing had been a challenge across all services due to isolation requirements and shielding. The Council had prioritised waste collection services to ensure continuity for residents.

Question Submitted by Councillor P. McDonald

“Would the Leader write to Chancellor Rishi Sunak not to leave low-paid workers struggling on less than the minimum wage by increasing its 80 per cent contribution to workers’ wages to 100 per cent, so that those on minimum wage get their full pay if their bosses do not top up their wages, after he extended the furlough scheme to March next year.”

The Leader replied by explaining that whilst the Council acknowledged the impact a reduced salary had for workers on less than the minimum wage, when balanced with the national financial position and the funds the Government had already provided to support workers during the pandemic, it was felt that the current support contribution of 80% to workers was appropriate at this time.

Question Submitted by Councillor J. Till

“Following the recent coverage about cycling & walking in Bromsgrove. Could the Leader confirm the Council’s commitment to active travel?”

Councillor A. Kent, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services, responded to this question in his capacity as the relevant lead Portfolio Holder.

Members were advised that, along with colleagues at Worcestershire County Council, Bromsgrove District Council was committed to promoting and enhancing active travel as an alternative to cars. In recent years, the Council had worked with Worcestershire County Council on the national productivity and investment fund (NPIF) scheme. This fund would provide over £3 million to support 9 new or improved active travel routes across the district and these schemes were in the process of being implemented.

The A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme (BREP) was in the process of working up the details of innovative green walking and cycling corridors to compliment the physical work being done in and around the carriageway of the A38. The section between Charford Road and the Oakalls would provide over a kilometre of new or improved walking and cycling routes of which approximately 50% would be a high-quality segregated section, 20% on new shared surfaces, and the remaining 30% on quiet and safe streets. In addition, as part of the Active Travel Fund, Bromsgrove District Council was supporting Worcestershire County Council on the provision of an active travel route between Bromsgrove and Redditch. As part of the work to be undertaken on the Local Plan, active travel would feature in the transport assessment work, ensuring that going forward the reliance on private car use could be addressed.

The planning applications for both Whitford Road and Perryfields provided new walking and cycling infrastructure both within and off site, including a new link through Sanders Park. In the case of Perryfields,

the proposal contained a new mobility hub, which in due course might offer e-bike rental schemes, enhanced bus availability and provision and other mobility measures to help reduce the reliance on private car use.

During consideration of the response to this question concerns were raised by Councillor R. Hunter about the reference to the Active Travel Fund. In addition, Councillor L. Mallett noted that Worcestershire had performed poorly on servicing active travel. Furthermore, he noted that of the two planning applications that had been referenced in the answer, one had been refused and one was a live planning application. The Monitoring Officer suggested that these concerns should be discussed further outside the meeting.

Reference was made by Councillor S. Robinson to the need for the public to have a right of reply where accusations were raised pertaining to the public and she expressed concerns that this had not been possible in relation to the question and answer about cycling and walking in Bromsgrove. Councillor A. Kent advised that no accusations had been made in relation to the public and he requested that this exchange be recorded in the minutes.

47\20

MOTIONS ON NOTICE

The Vice Chairman explained that in respect of Councillor R. Hunter's motion it has been agreed by the Leader and accepted by Councillor Hunter, that this matter would be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board for consideration.

The Vice Chairman also advised that, in respect of Councillor McDonald's motion, following discussions, it had also been agreed that the subject of the Motion would be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board for consideration.

IHRA Definition of Antisemitism

Members considered the following Motion on Notice, submitted by Councillor M. Thompson:

"This Council, in solidarity agrees to unequivocally adopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism."

The Motion was proposed by Councillor M. Thompson and seconded by Councillor A. Kriss.

In proposing the Motion, Councillor Thompson explained that whilst there had been suggestions that the Motion might be unconstitutional and amendments had been suggested, it was important to tackle prejudice. Reference was made to the findings in the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) report 'Investigation into Antisemitism in the Labour Party', which was published in October 2020, the lessons that were being learned from this and the action that had

Agenda Item 3

Council
2nd December 2020

been taken since. Councillor Thompson highlighted his own political past and advised that he was opposed to all forms of racism, including antisemitism, and expressed concerns that racist and antisemitic comments had been made by national political figures from a number of political parties over the years.

In seconding the Motion Councillor Kriss explained that the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) had been established to tackle prejudice, undertake research and to raise awareness of antisemitism and the Holocaust. The IHRA had worked on the Holocaust Memorial Day commemorations, which had been introduced following concerns that reports of antisemitism were on the rise globally. Increasingly, people were expressing antisemitic comments and opinions in their criticisms of Israel and unfortunately some people believed in conspiracy theories about Jewish people. The IHRA definition of antisemitism had been adopted by the Government and Councillor Kriss urged Bromsgrove District Council to do the same.

During consideration of this item, Councillor S. Douglas suggested that clarification should be provided about the focus of the Motion and she therefore proposed that the IHRA's definition of antisemitism should be referenced in the Motion as follows: "*Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed to Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.*" In discussing this proposal from Councillor Douglas, Members questioned whether this was an amendment. Instead, it was suggested that this provided clarification about the focus of the Motion, as originally worded.

Members subsequently discussed the Motion in further detail. In discussing the Motion, Councillor M. Middleton highlighted the need for the Council to demonstrate that it took a firm stance against antisemitism and that this form of prejudice had no place in society. Members were asked to recall the genocide that had taken place during the Holocaust in World War Two and the many millions of people from the Jewish community, as well as other communities, who had been murdered during this time as an example of the impact that antisemitism could have if it went unchallenged. Personal stories were shared about family and friends who had died in the Holocaust and a plea was made for this to never happen again. Councillor H. Rone-Clarke commented that there was a need to deal with cases of antisemitism in a dynamic manner. He noted that in his political activism he was opposed to all forms of prejudice, including antisemitism. In addition, Councillor P. McDonald highlighted that the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups had already adopted the IHRA's definition of antisemitism at the national level. Members concluded by noting that the Overview and Scrutiny Board had launched an Equalities Task Group during the municipal year and it was important to demonstrate the Council's commitment to equalities.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried.

Planning Enforcement

Councillor C. Hotham advised that he had contacted the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services about the subject of Planning Enforcement prior to the meeting and had agreed to attend a meeting with the Portfolio Holder and Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to discuss the matter further. In this context, Councillor Hotham withdrew his Motion on Planning Enforcement.

Parking Enforcement Around Schools

Councillor H. Rone-Clarke commented that, in light of information that he had received from the Leader that an Officer had been employed to undertake parking enforcement work around schools, he would be withdrawing the Motion.

48\20

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 item of business on the grounds that it involves 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>Minute Item No.</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>	
49/20	3	

49\20

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT CAR PARKS - CAPITAL PROGRAMME CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX

Members discussed the information that had been provided on pink papers in advance of the meeting about the Recreation Road South Car Park in exempt session.

It was noted that the Council was being offered extra funding by a third party to manage the car park at a time when the Council's parking revenue had declined. Members commented that the car park was not due to be refurbished for another 5 years and therefore a contract with a third party for 2 to 3 years would not impact on the condition of the car park. Concerns were raised that the Council would lose revenue if this deal was agreed. In addition, it was suggested that the car park was the jewel in the crown of Bromsgrove car parks and should therefore continue to be managed by the Council.

Agenda Item 3

Council
2nd December 2020

The Leader advised that moving forward, there were costs in respect of new car park infrastructure for the Recreation Road South Car Park. Parking Enforcement Officers would be diverted from the car park to working around schools, which would potentially have a beneficial impact on the safety of local school pupils. The Leader concluded by explaining that there would be no risk to the Council arising from the agreement with the third party.

During consideration of this item Members questioned whether there had been a breach in terms of the discussion of exempt information during the public session at the meeting, in particular through the naming of the third party organisation. The Monitoring Officer explained that she would investigate whether there had been a breach, though she noted that there were potential exemptions in respect of the commercial aspects of the agreement.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 18.3 a recorded vote was taken and the voting was as follows:

For the Recommendation: Councillors S. Colella, R. Deeming, G. Denaro, S. Douglas, A. English, M. Glass, C. Hotham, R. Hunter, H. Jones, A. Kent, J. King, A. Kriss, K. May, M. Middleton, S. Robinson, M. Thompson, P. Thomas, J. Till, M. Sherrey, C. Spencer, K. Van Der Plank, S. Webb and P. Whittaker. (23)

Against the Recommendation: Councillors L. Mallett, P. McDonald and H. Rone-Clarke. (3)

Abstentions: (0)

On being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.

RESOLVED that the preliminary offer made by a third party, to take over the running and maintenance of the Recreation Road South Car Park be accepted.

(During the consideration of this item, Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore agreed to move to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that information would be revealed relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting closed at 9.53 p.m.

Chairman

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

RECORD OF DECISION TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

Subject: LOCAL RESTRICTION SUPPORT GRANT AND ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS GRANTS

Brief Statement of Subject Matter:

The government announced new schemes of support for businesses impacted by the coronavirus restrictions in November 2020.

The announcement introduced five schemes of support which are applicable as local authorities move between tiers of local restrictions or in cases where national restrictions are imposed. There is detail in the attached reports about these schemes and how they work.

The recommendations are that:

1. the guidance for awards of Local Restriction Support Grant (Open) and Additional Restrictions Grant detailed in appendix A are adopted.
2. The Head of Financial and Customer Services is authorised to finalise the guidance and to make other decisions including amendments to the guidelines in relation to the payment of grants, in consultation with the portfolio holder for finance and enabling.
3. The determination and payment of grants, in line with the guidelines, is delegated to Revenue Services Officers.

Decision: To adopt the proposed schemes as per the attached reports.

Date: 4th December 2020

RESOLVED:

Grounds for Urgency:

Due to the scheduling of the next Council meeting an urgent decision is required in order for the scheme to be implemented as soon as possible, in line with Government requirements and to ensure support to businesses is not delayed.

DECISION APPROVED BY:

.....
Chief Executive

.....
Dated

.....
Section 151 Officer

.....
Dated

Agenda Item 7

.....
Monitoring Officer

.....
Dated

.....
Leader

.....
Dated

.....
Chairman, Overview & Scrutiny Board

.....
Dated

.....
Chairman

.....
Dated

Changes to the Council's Constitution

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr G Denaro
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Claire Felton – Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services
Ward(s) Affected	All
Ward Councillor(s) Consulted	N/A
Key Decision / Non-Key Decision	Non-key

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 This report details the background to a recommendation that was made at a recent meeting of the Constitution Review Working Group in respect of delegations to Officers for Section 106 funds.
- 1.2 The report requests that authority be delegated to the S151 officer so that they can spend and allocate S106 monies in accordance with the originally agreed S106 agreement without returning to Council once the monies have been received. Councillors will be able to monitor this spend on the quarterly finance reports.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Council is asked to RESOLVE that:

authority to spend S106 monies up to a value of £50k be delegated to the S151 Officer to spend in line with the S106 agreement which caused the receipt of the S106 monies.

3. KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 Following on from discussions held at a recent meeting of the Constitution Review Working Group between the Group Leaders, the Head of Finance and Customer Service requested that authority be delegated to the S151 Officer in respect of any spend and allocated S106 monies be made in accordance with the originally agreed S106 agreement without returning to council once the monies have been received. Councillors will be able to monitor this spend on the quarterly Finance reports
- 3.2 S106 monies are received from developers as a contribution towards the increased pressure on the local area and to mitigate this. The Agreement specifies at the point of signing the area and what the monies can be spent on. At present permission is sought from council to spend these monies once they are received. Going forwards the proposal is that it is reported in arrears on the quarterly

COUNCIL

20th January 2021

financial monitoring reports to members and that officers have delegated authority to spend the monies in line with the agreement up to a value of £50k.

- 3.3 Currently the S106 monies are monitored by several officers. There is a lot of S106 agreements to monitor and can be quite a timely process. The current process when officers wish to utilise the monies is that they must request approval through the normal democratic process. This due to the time of meetings can act as a barrier to spend such monies and a delay in getting contracts in place and in time for certain projects. The developer also has a clawback date if the monies have not been spent and therefore being able to have delegated authority will enable us to act quickly and not have to return the money back to developers.

Financial Implications

- 3.4 There are no direct financial implications arising directly from this report.

Legal Implications

- 3.5 The Council is required by law to maintain a constitution which sets out how the Council makes decisions.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.6 Managers meet with finance officers on a monthly basis to consider the current financial position and to ensure actions are in place to mitigate any variations to the budget.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.7 There are no specific customer or equalities implications arising from this report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are failure to comply with legislative and governance requirements which may expose the Council to the risk of challenge by way of judicial review or appeal which may result in awards of damages and costs against the Council and loss of reputation.

5. APPENDICES

None

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

COUNCIL

20th January 2021

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Amanda Scarce – Senior Democratic Services Officer

email: a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel.: 01527 881443

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

20th January 2021

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES 2020-21 - REVISED

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr G Denaro
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Claire Felton, Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 Members are asked to approve the appointment and composition of the Council's Boards and Committees for the remainder of the 2020-21 Municipal Year. The need for this to be revised is following a recent change to the political proportionality.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That for the ensuing Municipal Year, the Committees set out in the table in Appendix 1 of the report be appointed and that the representation of the different political groups on the Council on those Committees be as set out in that table until the next Annual Meeting of the Council, or until the next review of political representation under Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, whichever is the earlier; and**
- 2.2 **That Members be appointed to the Committees and as substitute members in accordance with nominations to be made by Group Leaders and the details will be appended to the minutes of the Council meeting.**

Financial Implications

- 3.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 Sections 15 -17 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 place a duty on Councils to allocate the seats on certain committees in proportion to the size of the political groups on the Council.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 The Council is required by law and/or its own Constitution to appoint various Boards and Committees, agree their terms of reference and to agree the allocation of seats which are subject to the rules of political proportionality. It must review the political balance on an annual basis or when any changes to the political proportionality occur.
- 3.4 The rules of political proportionality mean that the political balance of the Council needs to be reflected in the political composition of individual Boards and Committees. In addition, the total number of seats allocated to each group must reflect the political balance of the Council.
- 3.5 The proposed allocation of seats on each Board/Committee is done on a strict mathematical basis.
- 3.6 When the Council reviewed the constitution in June 2015, it agreed the principle of substitute members on the Planning and Licensing Committees undertaking the same training as the full members of the Committees. In order that such training can be run effectively by including all Councillors for whom it is most relevant, Group Leaders are asked to identify who will act as substitute members for the Licensing and Planning Committees for the remainder of this municipal year.
- 3.7 For all other committees substitutes will be notified to the Democratic Services Officers, as required on the instruction of the Group concerned.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.9 No implications have been identified.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 There are no significant risks associated with this item.

5. APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Revised Committees and Allocation of Committee Places 2019-20

COUNCIL

20th January 2021

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Jess Bayley – Senior Democratic Services Officer

E Mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel: (01527) 64252 Ext: 3268

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

POLITICAL BALANCE CALCULATION 2020/21 wef January 2021

The figures in *italics* are the mathematical calculations.

Committee	Cons 17 <i>54.84% of total</i>	Lab 3 <i>9.68% of total</i>	Lib Dems Dem 3 <i>9.68% of total</i>	B'grove Ind East 4 <i>12.90% of total</i>	B'grove Ind West & Central 4 <i>12.90% of total</i>	Total
Overview and Scrutiny Board	6 <i>6.03</i>	1 <i>1.06</i>	1 <i>1.06</i>	1 <i>1.42</i>	2 <i>1.42</i>	11 11 members on Board <i>11</i>
Licensing Committee	6 <i>6.03</i>	1 <i>1.06</i>	2 <i>1.06</i>	1 <i>1.42</i>	1 <i>1.42</i>	11 11 members on Cttee <i>11</i>
Planning Committee	6 <i>6.03</i>	2 <i>1.06</i>	1 <i>1.06</i>	1 <i>1.42</i>	1 <i>1.42</i>	11 11 members on Cttee <i>11</i>
Audit, Stds & Gov'ce Committee	5 <i>4.94</i>	1 <i>0.87</i>	1 <i>0.87</i>	1 <i>1.16</i>	1 <i>1.16</i>	9 9 members on Cttee <i>9</i>
Electoral Matters Cttee	4 <i>3.84</i>	1 <i>0.68</i>	1 <i>0.68</i>	1 <i>0.90</i>	0 <i>0.90</i>	7 7 members on Cttee <i>7</i>
Appeals	3 <i>2.74</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	5 5 members on Cttee <i>5</i>
Appointments	3 <i>2.74</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	5 5 members on Cttee <i>5</i>
Statutory Officers	3 <i>2.74</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	0 <i>0.48</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	1 <i>0.65</i>	5 5 members on Cttee <i>5</i>
TOTAL	36	6	6	8	8	64
<i>Exact Mathematical Entitlement</i>	<i>35.10</i>	<i>6.20</i>	<i>6.20</i>	<i>8.26</i>	<i>8.26</i>	<i>64</i>

This page is intentionally left blank

WORCESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCILS

VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES BOARD

THURSDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER 2020, AT 4.30 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. Dyke (Chairman), J. Squires (Vice-Chairman), A. D. Kent, H. J. Jones, J. Raine, N. Nazir, E. Stokes (during minute no's 20/20 to 26/20), D. Morris and P. Dyke

Officers: Mr. S. Wilkes, Ms. C. Flanagan, Mr C. Forrester, Ms K. Goldey, Ms. K. Lahel, Mr. M. Cox, Mr. D. Mellors, Mrs. P. Ross and J Gresham

Partner Officers: Mr. L. Griffiths, Worcester City Council, Mr. P. Merrick, Malvern Hills District Council and Wychavon District Council and Mr. M. Parker, Wyre Forest District Council

20/20 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T. Wells, Malvern Hills District Council and Councillor M. Johnson, Worcester City Council.

21/20 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

22/20 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Worcestershire Regulatory Services Board held on 1st October 2020, were submitted.

RESOLVED that minutes of the Worcestershire Regulatory Services Board meeting held on 1st October 2020, be approved as a correct record.

23/20 **INFORMATION REPORT - THE INCREASE IN CHARGES BY WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Members received an information report on the increase in charges by Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC).

The Head of Regulatory Services reminded Members that at the Board meeting held on 1st October 2020, during the presentation of the Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) Budgets 2020/2021; Members had raised some concern with regard to the additional partner liabilities for 2020/2021 in respect of a £13k increase in accommodation

charges and ICT hosting of WRS from Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC).

As requested by Members, the information report before Members provided some background information and the process that was followed leading to this increase.

In 2014/15, before the service moved to Wyre Forest House, a search for accommodation across the local government family in the county was undertaken, as Worcester City Council had decided to sell its accommodation that WRS occupied.

WRS was offered space in Redditch Library, Wyre Forest House and the old Police Station in Pershore. A review concluded that the Wyre Forest offer was the most cost effective and, with office space that was ready to move into without any additional work, it was the easiest to adopt. WRS moved into Wyre Forest House in March 2015.

At the end of January 2020, as Head of Service, he was approached by the WFDC IT Manager and their Director of Finance as the original agreement for accommodation and IT support was coming to an end. The initial conversation covered only IT provision but, in the first week of February, it was confirmed that a similar uplift would be requested for the accommodation. The increases were based on the compounded impact of the rate of inflation over that period. The table below demonstrates how colleagues at WFDC arrived at their final figures:

Year	RPI Annual %
2019	2.6
2018	2.7
2017	4.1
2016	2.5
2015	1.2

Applying these figures on an annual basis looking backwards led to a compound figure of £50,000 per annum for IT provision (up from £44,000,) and £61,000 per annum for accommodation (up from £54,000.) These figures were rounded, so the overall increase to the nearest £1,000 was £13,000.

As Head of Service, he did express his concerns that coming at this point in the year made it difficult to incorporate these increases into the WRS budget as it had been set for the year already. WFDC officers apologised for this issue but as the Head of Service he had had to agree. This was not the first time that the need for the partnership to set a budget in November had caused an issue for one or other partner authorities in their own budget setting process.

The service provided by WFDC IT team was very good and, as part of the annual staff survey, staff still commented on how changing ICT host

had improved their experience of work based IT solutions. The office accommodation at Wyre Forest House was also of an excellent standard, better than many other public buildings in the County.

As Head of Service, he further consulted with the officer members of the Board. Whilst they expressed their disappointment that WFDC had asked for an increase, they did not object outright and had reluctantly accepted that an inflation only increase was difficult to resist.

The potential availability of other suitable accommodation within the local government family, was carried out, however, it was clear that nothing suitable was available at that time with sufficient quantity of space and desk numbers, even before a consideration of cost was made. Only the old Police Station in Pershore remained available and that needed some work to bring it up to standard in order to be suitable. Worcestershire County Council were also approached regarding space at County Hall, but at this time, there was not sufficient available.

Members should also be aware that, officers had to consider the impact on disruptions to the service and the workforce; plus a re-location would also entail officers becoming entitled to a disbursement payment equivalent to the mileage cost of any additional home to work travel for a period of one year after the move. This was a not un-substantial amount the last time the service had had to move from Worcester City Council.

On balance, it was felt that the sensible solution was to pay the uplift and continue with the current arrangements. The increase in spend was within his remit for decision making.

In terms of the service's accommodation, the accommodation and the service received from WFDC ICT was excellent. The partnership was now on a rolling contract that would be reviewed annually.

One of the results of Covid-19 was the increasing ubiquitous nature of working from home and this should give Councils the opportunity to re-consider staff working practices and accommodation needs. This could lead to partner authorities having further capacity available that may be suitable for WRS.

However, with the current pandemic and the way in which resources were stretched, it would not be practical to consider this for 2021/22. From February 2021, the Management Team would certainly explore options for the following year and review the number of desks currently available / in use and realistically look to reduce those numbers.

The Head of Regulatory Services further commented that originally officer members of the Board had indicated that their preferred option was to simply include this increase in the income targets for the year. Given the current situation however, he had felt that it was worth asking Board Members to consider whether they would make an uplift to the budget to cover this.

If the Board did not wish to agree to uplift the budget by this amount, the option of reverting to fund this with income remained.

Councillor A. D. Kent, Bromsgrove District Council, took the opportunity to thank the Head of Regulatory Services for his detailed report. However, he was still disappointed that the democratic process had failed and that he had had to make a decision. The Head of Regulatory Services had been put in a difficult position having to make such a decision so late in the day, and he fully understood the position that the Head of Regulatory Services had been put in.

In response to Councillor Kent, the Head of Finance and Customer Services commented that partner authorities based their budgets differently. Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) and Redditch Borough Council (RBC) did not use RPI Annual percentage, they tended to set their budgets using CPI and the actual costs of delivering a service.

The Head of Regulatory Services further commented that BDC, as the host authority for WRS had not increased their charges since the inception of WRS in 2010. The costs had originally included ICT costs, which had over time been reduced when WRS moved into their current accommodation in 2015/2016. Staffing numbers across WRS had reduced by half. Members stated that the costs of BDC hosting the shared service was something that needed to be discussed with all partner authorities and Board Members.

Members were in agreement and expressed their disappointment that very little notice of a 12% increase had been given to WRS. Members also commented that officers needed to assess the costs of disrupting the service against moving to other premises in the future. However, Members also agreed that a review of the office accommodation needs of WRS was definitely needed going forward.

The Chairman took the opportunity to inform the Board that, she had fed back the comments and concerns raised at the last meeting of the Board to her respective authority.

The Head of Regulatory Services further informed the Board that the current contract with Wyre Forest District Council was due to expire on 23rd March 2021; therefore, there had not been sufficient time to look at alternative accommodation; and realistically officers were dealing with the current pandemic. However, between now and February 2021 officers would look at the number of desks required; and that going forward his management team would conduct a rigorous review of the requirements of the service with a potential reduction for 2022/2023. The service had tried to keep as much of the hosting costs, as possible, within the local government family.

RECOMMENDED that the additional partner liabilities for 2020/2021 in relation to the increase in accommodation charges and ICT hosting from Wyre Forest District Council, be approved as follows:-

Bromsgrove District Council	£2k
Malvern Hills District Council	£2k
Redditch Borough Council	£2k
Worcester City Council	£2k
Wychavon District Council	£3k
Wyre Forest District Council	£2k
Total	£13k

24/20

INFORMATION REPORT - COVID ACTIVITY COSTINGS

Members were provided with an information report on Covid Activity costings, as requested by Board Members at the last meeting of the Board on 1st October 2020. During that meeting Board Members had thanked officers for all of the hard work they were doing on Covid related activities and had suggested that they would like to see additional funding being made available to support the service.

The Head of Regulatory Services explained that the WRS Management Team were giving active consideration to bidding to the Chief Executives for additional resources but that a paper would be bought forward to outline current spending levels on Covid related activity.

When the first lockdown commenced at the end of March 2020, it quickly became clear that local authorities were going to incur significant additional costs for work related to controlling the pandemic. The Secretary of State had made an announcement declaring that both Environmental Health Officers and Trading Standards Officers would be responsible for enforcement of the business closure and control provisions that required some businesses to close, others to operate by delivery only and moved many hospitality businesses towards takeaway only activities.

Bromsgrove District Council, the host authority had immediately asked all of its services to record all Covid related activity so that estimates of cost could be given to central government, in order that support payments might match the actual costs. WRS officers were already required to record the time taken on the majority of their activities, so it was a relatively simple exercise to add some additional coding into their

time recording system and to ask officers to use these to record how much time was spent on Covid related activities.

Because we have our fee earner model for charging out WRS officers for commercial activities it was a very straight forward exercise to convert the figures to a monetary amount that reflected the full cost of the officer undertaking the activities.

The Head of Regulatory Services drew Members' attention to the table at Appendix A to the report, which contained the monthly totals, starting in April 2020 for the cost of undertaking Covid related activities on behalf of the six councils and the cost of the team embedded in the Local Outbreak Response Team.

Given the nature of the pandemic, WRS had not sought to allocate these costs geographically to individual partners. This would go against the "One Worcestershire" approach that all seven councils in the County had taken towards tackling the pandemic.

Members will note that these amounts are not insubstantial. The service had been fortunate that the Food Standards Agency had opted to put a moratorium on routine food hygiene inspections at the beginning of the pandemic. This allowed for the vast majority of staff resource that would otherwise have been dedicated to food related work to be put into the pandemic response.

As the economy re-opened, with the service being in essence an economic regulator, the pressures on the service and its staff had grown. Balancing business as usual activity had become more difficult and additional agency staffing resource had been brought in to support the efforts. This would be funded by the monies due from Worcestershire County Council to cover the cost WRS officers who formed part of the Local Outbreak Response Team. These pressures will only grow as numbers of cases rise and it was almost certain that more capacity would be required for the service to both deliver pandemic controls and respond to what we all referred to as "business as usual" activities.

The Head of Regulatory Services highlighted that the Community Environmental Health team had been re-organised to deliver both Covid controls and an embedded unit within the Local Outbreak Response team, as detailed in the table on page 22 of the main agenda report.

Originally 3 members of the Technical Services team were moved into Community Environmental Health to help deal with capacity issues. They had now moved back into Technical Services to deliver income generation activities.

Work in the Local Outbreak Response team was being funded by monies from Worcestershire County Council (WCC) that central government had already provided for the disease response. This

covered the cost of the additional capacity brought in to deal with business as usual activities.

WCC was currently awaiting confirmation from central government on further funding bids to provide additional capacity for backwards contact tracing within the Local Outbreak Response Team, for delivery by WRS; and for dealing with referrals from the national contact tracing system to deal with those people who had a positive test but had not responded to calls from the national system. This was known as “lost to follow up.” WRS would pick up this work along with district colleagues to deliver this service aspect, including door knocking where local telephone calls did not lead to a response.

As Members will be aware, WRS had been entrusted with delivering the project referred to nationally as Covid marshals and locally as Covid Advisors. The district councils had pooled this funding for WRS to deliver this advisory work, but the funding was also earmarked for additional enforcement work. A proportion of the funding could be used to cover the cost of things like out-of-hours enforcement, so we avoided being short of capacity during the week and additional capacity generally. Work had commenced on recruiting this team and the first deployments took place over the weekend of 7th/ 8th November 2020.

This report should serve as a reminder to partners that, although many areas of local government are striving to move into Recovery phase, WRS remained an embedded part of the Response phase and would be for the medium term.

WRS would do its best to contribute to the Recovery phase as it did during last year’s winter flooding events.

Members thanked the Head of Regulatory Services for a really useful report and stated that WRS were really central to the response to the Covid pandemic.

In response to Members’ questions, the Head of Regulatory Services drew Members’ attention to the table of expenditure as detailed on page 23 of the main agenda report.

There were 6/7 FTE (full time equivalent) officers working on Covid compliance and 3/4 on outbreak response. So approximately 1/3rd of that amount £70k would be covered by the monies received from WCC, who had agreed to £162k of funding up to the end March 2021. £120k costs of Covid enforcement had been undertaken by the district councils.

In response to Members, the Technical Services Manager explained that Covid advisors were ‘paired up’ and spread out, with particular attention paid to any areas with high rates of infection that have been flagged up. Enforcement action could be taken if deemed necessary. Officers were responding where there were identified areas of concern and in areas with rising numbers. Marshalls were deployed to areas with the highest

number of reported cases. Covid Marshalls had been received well by businesses, shoppers and customers, who had welcomed the provision of face masks when they had forgotten theirs.

Members took the opportunity to thank officers and to recognise the good work that WRS officers were doing in order to help deal with the current pandemic.

The Environmental Health & Trading Standards Manager further commented that officers took the approach 'engage, educate and encourage', enforcement was a last resort.

RESOLVED that the Information Report on Covid Activity Costings, be noted.

25/20

WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES - REVENUE MONITORING APRIL - SEPT 2020

Members were asked to consider the Worcestershire Regulatory Services Revenue Monitoring for April to September 2020.

The Head of Finance & Customer Services, Bromsgrove District Council, introduced the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the Recommendations as detailed on pages 25 and 26 of the main agenda report.

Members were asked to note that the revised budget 2020/2021 was based on the recommended budget funding as stated in agenda item number 4, with regards to the increase in ICT and Rent at Wyre Forest House.

Members were further informed that the report showed a projected outturn 2020/2021 of £17k deficit. This was an estimation to the year-end based on the following assumptions:-

- There were two vacant posts within the service, we have assumed no recruitment to the Business & Relationship Manager for the current year to assist in reducing the projected outturn deficit. This will need to be reviewed at the end of quarter 3. The other vacant post was a Regulatory Apprentice which we hoped to recruit to in the near future.
- If April to Sept spend on pest control continued on the same trend for the rest of year, there would be an overspend on this service of £16k. WRS officers would continue to monitor and analyse this spend and advise of final recharges for 2020/21 as soon as possible. The projected outturn figure to be funded by partners was:-

Redditch Borough Council	£9k
Wychavon District Council	£7k

Members' attention was drawn to the figures detailed in Appendix 1 to the report:

- Savings due to employees working on Local Outbreak Response Team.
- Essential calibration on noise monitoring.
- Reduction in dogs straying and the dog warden had been taken in house.
- Bereavement / Works in Default to be charged to relevant partners.

The Head of Regulatory Services further explained that with regard to the local Covid outbreak team, WRS had started with an estimate of £162k, for the year. The figures quoted in the table were up to the end of October, so there were four more months to go. Staff involved in local outbreak contact tracing work and look to follow up work would have to be included. Therefore, this could go above £181k, back filling of a certain amount of normal WRS business activities would also have to be factored in.

The Environmental Health and Trading Standards Manager clarified that officers were not seeing a significant increase or trend in bereavement costs due to the current pandemic.

With regard to Pest Control, the Technical Services Manager stated that there were 3 partner authorities that currently provided a subsidised pest control service.

RESOLVED that

- a) the final financial position for the period April to September 2020, be noted;
- b) partner authorities be informed of their liabilities for 2020/2021 in relation to Bereavements as follows:-

Council	Apr–Sept Actual Bereavements £000	20 for
Redditch Borough Council	5	
Malvern Hills District Council	2	
Worcester City Council	7	
Bromsgrove District Council	5	
Total	19	

- c) partner authorities are informed of their liabilities for 2020/2021 in relation to Pest Control as follows:-

Council	Estimated Projected Outturn Recharge in Relation to Pest Control 2020/21 £000
Redditch Borough Council	9
Wychavon District Council	7
Total	16

- d) partner authorities are informed of their liabilities for 2020/2021 in relation to three additional Technical Officers as follows:-

Council	Estimated Projected Outturn 2020/21 Tech Officer Income Generation £000	Estimated Projected Outturn 2020/21 Tech Officer Animal Activity £000	Estimated Projected Outturn 2020/21 Gull Control £000
Redditch Borough Council	3	2	
Malvern Hills District Council	2	9	
Worcester City Council	2	2	35
Bromsgrove District Council	2	6	
Wychavon District Council	3	9	
Wyre Forest District Council	2	5	
Total	14	34	35

26/20

WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES BUDGET 2021/22 - 2023/24

The Head of Finance & Customer Services, Bromsgrove District Council, introduced the report and in doing so highlighted that the recommendations were caveated as starting point assuming that the base budget figure for 2020/2021 had been updated to include all of the increases mentioned at the Worcestershire Regulatory Services Board meeting in October 2020, including the additional funding for Wyre Forest District Council for accommodation and ICT costs.

The Head of Finance & Customer Services further drew Members' attention to the Recommendations as detailed on pages 33 and 34 of the main agenda report.

Members were further informed that the following assumptions had been made in relation to the projections:

- 2% pay award across all staff for 2021/22 – 20223/24. This will be subject to the National Pay Negotiations that are ongoing and therefore the final position will reflect any formally agreed increases, the budget also includes any employee entitled to an incremental increase.
- No inflationary increases in supplies and services, premises or transport.
- Pension back-funding will be paid by all partners.

The unavoidable salary pressures were not able to be met currently by WRS making additional income, in the main due to the pressures created by the pandemic and the response to it. The normal sources of income (local authorities,) were not currently focused on the areas of work that WRS delivered for income generation purposes and WRS officers were at the heart of the response locally. Therefore, an increase to partner funding would be required, as detailed on page 35 of the main agenda report.

Clearly, should the situation with the pandemic improve in the second half of 2021/2022, WRS Officers would be looking to move forward with the programme of income generation and the benefits of this may be seen in an underspend that could be returned to partners at year end. Hence, an upfront investment this year would give certainty to the service and the partners in terms of cost, with the potential for a return on investment if the pandemic situation eased.

In addition to the base budget there were three additional technical officers working on income generation, animal activity and gull control. Officers were unable to include these officers into the base budget as the income generation officer was a temporary agreement agreed by partner councils and the animal activity and gull control officer recharge percentage basis was different to the agreed partner recharge allocations.

RECOMMENDED that partner authorities approve the following for 2020/2021:

1.1 the 2021/22 gross expenditure budget of £3,739k as shown in Appendix 1.

1.2 the 2021/22 income budget of £529k as shown in Appendix 1.

1.3 the revenue budget and partner percentage allocations for 2021/2022 onwards:

Council	£'000	Revised %
Bromsgrove District Council	468	14.59
Malvern Hills District Council	412	12.82
Redditch Borough Council	564	17.57
Worcester City Council	532	16.58
Wychavon District	748	23.29
Wyre Forest District Council	486	15.15
Total	3,210	

1.4 the additional partner liabilities for 2021/2022 in relation to unavoidable salary pressure.

Bromsgrove District Council	£9k
Malvern Hills District Council	£8k
Redditch Borough Council	£10k
Worcester City Council	£10k
Wychavon District Council	£14k
Wyre Forest District Council	£9k
Total	£60k

1.5 the additional partner liabilities for 2021/2022 in relation to three Technical Officers.

Council	Tech Officer Income Generation £000	Tech Officer Animal Activity £000	Tech Officer Gull Control £000
Bromsgrove District Council	5	6	
Malvern Hills District Council	4	10	
Redditch Borough Council	6	2	
Worcester City Council	5	4	30
Wychavon District Council	7	9	
Wyre Forest District Council	5	5	
Total	32	36	30

27/20

ACTIVITY & PERFORMANCE DATA - QUARTERS 1 AND 2

The Environmental Health and Trading Standards Manager, WRS, presented the Activity and Performance Data for Quarters 1 and 2, 2020/2021; and in doing so highlighted that the first half of the year had seen extraordinary circumstances with officers helping to control the pandemic.

Members' attention was drawn to the following:-

Activity Data

The Food Standards Agency suspended the Food Hygiene inspection programme at the beginning of lockdown in March and this continued throughout the second quarter. This explained the low number of inspections, reflecting that the service was engaging mainly with new entrants to the sector or those wanting re-rating. Clearly any allegations of serious misconduct were also followed up and food service requests did show an increase through the quarter.

Numbers of licensing complaints and enquires began to grow during quarter 2, in line with the re-opening of licensed premises and the growth in wider licensed activities. Applications also began to rise to the kind of levels one might expect.

Planning application numbers rose during quarter 2, going back towards their normal trajectory as the economy re-opened. Environmental Information Requests, often associated with the planning and development process were also returning to

more normal levels during this period.

As we always see during the summer months, nuisance/ pollution complaints showed their characteristic peak. Noise complaint numbers exceeded the number for the same period in the previous two years, this time by a significant proportion, 12% or more above the previous two year's equivalent periods.

Performance

Quarter 2 saw a broader report of performance measures than the starting quarter. The year continued reasonably well from a customer satisfaction perspective with the non-business customer measure at 74.4% and business customers at 97.7%. Given the pressures on the service during the first six months of the year, this was seen as good. At the same point last year, customer satisfaction was at 73.8% and business satisfaction at 98.3%. People who felt better equipped to deal with issues was at 72.3% compared with 63% this time last year.

Processing of taxi driver license renewals remained good with a county-wide average of 97.4% done within 5 working days.

Compliments outnumber complaints by 3:1 (24:78) and staff sickness was looking reasonably good at 0.95 days per FTE. This was better than the previous year's figure at Q1 (2.91 days per FTE.)

Income as a proportion of budget was at 4.37%. This was as expected down on previous years due to the pandemic and our usual customer based of local authorities not requiring our services at the same level. At the same point last year, just over £160,000 had come in compared with just over £130,000 this year. maintain comparability, we have not included income for measures to combat the pandemic in the calculation.

The Chairman took the opportunity to thank officers for a comprehensive report.

RESOLVED that the Activity and Performance Data Quarters 1 and 2, 2020/2021, be noted and that Members use the contents of the report in their own reporting back to their respective partner authority.

28/20

INFORMATION REPORT - IT UPDATE

The Technical Services Manager, WRS, presented the Board with an Information Report that provided an update on IT, following a request from the Board at the meeting held in October 2020.

The Technical Services Manager referred Members to the Gantt chart as detailed at Appendix 1 to the report.

The first phase of replacement laptops had been completed. Officers continued to work on improving the look of the WRS website on Umbraco 8. Discussions were taking place with the host authority,

Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) on whether WRS would be able to take payments on behalf of the other partner authorities.

Councillor A. D. Kent, BDC, thanked officers for the brilliant update and Gantt chart, as this detailed what had been delivered. Councillor Kent also took the opportunity to thank the Head of Regulatory Services for taking the time to have further discussions with him, regards the concerns he had raised at the last meeting of the Board.

RESOLVED that the Information Report – IT Update, be noted.

29/20

THE NEW STATUTORY STANDARDS FOR TAXIS AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES

The Acting Licensing and support Services Manager, WRS, provided the Board with a report that detailed the new statutory standards for Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles.

Members were informed that in July 2020, following a number of high profile enquiries into criminal offences involving taxi drivers, the Secretary of State for Transport had issued the long awaited, new 'Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards' to licensing authorities aimed at safeguarding children and vulnerable adults.

The standards set out a range of measures to protect passengers and the Department for Transport would require an update from each licensing authority by January 2021.

The recommendations in the Standards were detailed on page 84 of the main agenda report.

WRS officers believed that, in light of the recommendations set out in the Standards, that all of the district councils' current hackney carriage and private hire licensing policies would need to be reviewed carefully with a view to implementing the changes. This review would ultimately lead to the drafting of a new cohesive policy document that brought together each district council's procedures on taxi and private hire vehicle licensing. This would include, but not be limited to, policies on convictions, a "fit and proper" person test, licence conditions and vehicle standards.

RESOLVED that the new statutory standards for Taxis and Private Hire vehicles and the guidance as referred to in the report, be noted.

The meeting closed at 6.03 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Account description	Revised Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget
	2020 / 2021	2021 / 2022	2022 / 2023	2023 / 2024
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Employees				
Monthly salaries	2,848	2,935	3,012	3,090
Training for professional qualifications	0	0	0	0
Medical fees (employees')	2	2	2	2
Employers' liability insurance	25	25	25	25
Employees' professional subscriptions	2	2	2	2
Sub-Total - Employees	2,877	2,964	3,041	3,119
Premises				
Rents	58	58	58	58
Room hire	2	2	2	2
Trade Waste	1	1	1	1
Sub-Total - Premises	61	61	61	61
Transport				
Vehicle repairs/maint'ce	3	3	3	3
Diesel fuel	8	8	8	8
Licences	1	1	1	1
Contract hire of vehicles	4	4	4	4
Vehicle insurances	5	5	5	5
Van Lease	9	9	9	9
Fares & Car Parking	5	5	5	5
Car allowances	70	70	70	70
Sub-Total - Transport	105	105	105	105
Supplies & Service				
Equipment - purchase/maintenance/rental	22	22	22	22
Materials	9	9	9	9
Clothing, uniforms & laundry	2	2	2	2
Training fees	23	23	23	23
General insurances	19	19	19	19
Printing and stationery	17	17	17	17
Books and publications	2	2	2	2
Postage/packaging	11	11	11	11
ICT	40	40	40	40
Telephones	21	21	21	21
Taxi Tests	22	22	22	22
CRB Checks (taxi)	26	26	26	26
Support service recharges	100	100	100	100
Support service recharges - ICT	50	50	50	50
Sub-Total - Supplies & Service	363	363	363	363

	Budget 2020 / 2021 £000's	Budget 2021 / 2022 £000's	Budget 2022 / 2023 £000's	Budget 2023 / 2024 £000's
Contractors				
Consultants / Contractors' fees/charges/SLA's	227	229	229	229
Advertising (general)	5	5	5	5
Grants and subscriptions	13	13	13	13
Sub-Total - Contractors	245	247	247	247
Income				
Grants / Primary Authority / Food Training / Contaminated Land / Stray Dogs / Ad Hoc	-370	-372	-372	-372
Funding approved for unavoidable Salary Pressures				
Sub-Total - Income	-370	-372	-372	-372
Income				
Funding from partners for Technical Officers	-70	-97	-100	-104
Sub-Total - Income	-70	-97	-100	-104
Additional Income				
Income to be found due to unavoidable salary pressures		-60	-134	-208
Sub-Total - Income	0	-60	-134	-208
DISTRICT PARTNERSHIP BUDGET	3,210	3,210	3,210	3,210
21-22 Partner Percentages				
Bromsgrove District Council	14.59%			
Malvern Hills District Council	12.82%			
Redditch Borough Council	17.57%			
Worcester City Council	16.58%			
Wychavon District Council	23.29%			
Wyre Forest District Council	15.15%			
Total	100.00%			

	Budget	Contribution Technical Officers	Partner Contribution	Unavoidable Salary Pressures	Total Partner Contribution
	2021 / 2022	2021 / 2022	2021 / 2022	2021 / 2022	2021 / 2022
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Budget 2021 / 22					
Bromsgrove District Council	468	11	479	9	488
Malvern Hills District Council	412	14	426	8	434
Redditch Borough Council	564	8	572	10	582
Worcester City Council	532	39	571	10	581
Wychavon District Council	748	16	764	14	778
Wyre Forest District Council	486	10	496	9	505
Total	3,210	98	3,308	60	3,368

	Budget	Contribution Technical Officers	Partner Contribution	Unavoidable Salary Pressures	Total Partner Contribution
	2022 / 2023	2022 / 2023	2022 / 2023	2022 / 2023	2022 / 2023
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Budget 2022 / 23					
Bromsgrove District Council	468	12	480	20	500
Malvern Hills District Council	412	14	426	18	444
Redditch Borough Council	564	8	572	23	595
Worcester City Council	532	39	571	22	593
Wychavon District Council	748	18	766	31	797
Wyre Forest District Council	486	10	496	20	516
Total	3,210	101	3,311	134	3,445

	Budget	Contribution Technical Officers	Partner Contribution	Unavoidable Salary Pressures	Total Partner Contribution
	2023 / 2024	2023 / 2024	2023 / 2024	2023 / 2024	2023 / 2024
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Budget 2023 / 24					
Bromsgrove District Council	468	12	480	31	511
Malvern Hills District Council	412	15	427	28	455
Redditch Borough Council	564	8	572	36	608
Worcester City Council	532	40	572	34	606
Wychavon District Council	748	18	766	48	814
Wyre Forest District Council	486	10	496	31	527
Total	3,210	103	3,313	208	3,521

Page 47

Agenda Item 11a

This page is intentionally left blank

Bromsgrove District Council – 20th January 2021
Item 13 - Member Questions

1. From Councillor S Robinson
Question for the Leader

Can the portfolio holder inform me what enforcement is being carried out to stop cars parking on double yellow lines?

2. From Councillor K Van der Plank
Question for the Leader

“Many of our local businesses are really struggling especially as a result of this new lockdown. Please could the leader confirm what business grants are still available to businesses in the District impacted by Covid. What is the process for applying for these and the deadline and how is this going to be communicated across the district?”

3. From Councillor R Hunter
Question to The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling

“Please could you update council on what is being done to support those local businesses worst affected by the pandemic. Can you confirm how many Bromsgrove businesses have received the Additional Restrictions Grant since November and how many Bromsgrove pubs have received their Christmas Support Grant?”

4. From Councillor S Baxter
Question to the Leader

“Please can the leader update the Council on progress with the green borehole district heat network proposal to be sited at Bromsgrove School.”

**5. From Councillor S Douglas
Question for the Leader**

Wording in respect of Cllr Douglas' question to follow.

NOTICE OF MOTION

The following Notice of Motion has been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 10 by Councillor H Rone-Clarke.

WORDING TO FOLLOW

This page is intentionally left blank

NOTICE OF MOTION

The following Notice of Motion has been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 10 by Councillor J King:

Motion: Becoming a Living Wage accredited local authority

Council resolves to build on its success in paying the Living Wage to directly employed staff by working with contractors to support them to also pay the Living Wage, and to seek accreditation from the Living Wage Foundation.

This page is intentionally left blank

NOTICE OF MOTION

The following Notice of Motion has been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 10 by Councillor R Hunter:

Motion: Mapping our land assets so we can better support environmental projects

Council resolves to develop for members a map of all the land owned by BDC to help support and promote charitable and community involvement in environmental projects such as tree planting.

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

20TH JANUARY 2021

Burcot Lane Development – Disposal of Affordable Housing

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Shirley Webb
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Sue Hanley Deputy Chief Executive
Wards Affected	All
Ward Councillor Consulted	No
Key Decision	
This report contains exempt information as defined in Paragraph(s) 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 This report follows the Cabinet report of the 6th August and brings forward the disposal of the affordable housing to a Registered Provider being delivered at the at the old Council House, Burcot Lane development.
- 1.2 Following the agreement of Cabinet on the 6 August 2020, Officers have in the first instance explored the disposal of the affordable housing with bdht. The offer made by bdht is provided in Appendix 1 (confidential) which had been determined by officers as acceptable.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council **RESOLVE:-**

- 2.1 That delegated authority is given to the Deputy Chief Executive and the Head of Legal, Equality and Democratic Services to accept the offer from bdht and take all the necessary financial and legal steps to complete the sale.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 Disposal of the affordable housing will generate a capital receipt for the Council.
- 3.2 The offer received from bdht is provided in appendix 1 (confidential).

Legal Implications

- 3.3 The Council as part of its planning permission for the Old Council House site is required to dispose of the affordable housing to a

COUNCIL

20TH JANUARY 2021

Registered Provider. The Council does not have a Housing Revenue Account and so may not itself retain affordable housing stock.

- 3.4 The Council has discretion to dispose of its assets (such as land or buildings) under section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972, provided that it does not do so for a consideration less than the best that can be reasonably obtained.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.5 The Council will have nomination rights to 100% of the initial letting of the affordable housing and 75% thereafter. These are the usual s106 nomination rights.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.6 Increasing the supply of affordable housing in the district will assist households on low incomes by providing them with good quality and secure accommodation options.
- 3.7 Occupiers of the affordable housing will be housed from the Council's housing register.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 The Council is required by the s106 Agreement to dispose of the affordable housing to a registered provider. Other Registered Providers could be approached, but disposal to another provider will not provide the synergies afforded by BDHT's ownership of the adjoining site and may result in a lower capital return to the Council.
- 4.2 Officers have undertaken an evaluation of the offer and are content this offer is appropriate to accept.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – bdht offer (confidential)

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Cabinet report dated 6th August 2020

7. KEY

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Matthew Bough

COUNCIL

20TH JANUARY 2021

matthew.bough@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

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