



# Council

Mon 14 Oct  
2013  
7.00 pm

Council Chamber  
Town Hall  
Redditch

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

*making  
a  
difference*

[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

# Access to Information - Your Rights

---

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.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, all items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- (Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council's Website:  
[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

---

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact  
Ivor Westmore  
Democratic Services**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH  
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Extn. 3269) Fax: (01527) 65216  
e.mail: [ivor.westmore@bromgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:ivor.westmore@bromgroveandredditch.gov.uk)**

# Welcome to today's meeting.

## Guidance for the Public

---

### **Agenda Papers**

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

### **Chair**

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

### **Running Order**

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

**Refreshments** : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

### **Decisions**

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

### **Members of the Public**

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

### **Special Arrangements**

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

### **Further Information**

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

### **Fire/ Emergency instructions**

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

**Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.**

**Do Not use lifts.**

**Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.**

The emergency **Assembly Area** is on **Walter Stranz Square**.





# Council

14<sup>th</sup> October 2013

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

## Agenda

### Membership:

Cllrs:	Wanda King (Mayor)	Carole Gandy
	Pat Witherspoon (Deputy Mayor)	Adam Griffin
	Joe Baker	Bill Hartnett
	Roger Bennett	Pattie Hill
	Rebecca Blake	Roger Hill
	Michael Braley	Gay Hopkins
	Andrew Brazier	Alan Mason
	Juliet Brunner	Phil Mould
	David Bush	Brenda Quinney
	Michael Chalk	Mark Shurmer
	Simon Chalk	Yvonne Smith
	Greg Chance	Luke Stephens
	Brandon Clayton	Debbie Taylor
	John Fisher	Derek Taylor
	Andrew Fry	

<b>1. Welcome</b>	The Mayor will open the meeting and welcome all present.
<b>2. Apologies</b>	To receive any apologies for absence on behalf of Council members.
<b>3. Declarations of Interest</b>	To invite Councillors to declare any interests they may have in items on the agenda.
<b>4. Minutes</b> (Pages 1 - 12) Chief Executive	To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2013. <b>(Minutes attached)</b>
<b>5. Announcements</b>	To consider Announcements under Procedure Rule 10: a) Mayor's Announcements b) Leader's Announcements c) Chief Executive's Announcements.  (Oral report)

<p><b>6. Questions on Notice</b> (Pages 13 - 16) Chief Executive</p>	<p>To consider the following Questions for the Leader, which have been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 9.2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <u>“Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 – Proposal for Houses off Far Moor Lane”</u>  Councillor Adam Griffin</li><li>2. <u>“Council-owned Housing Land”</u>  Councillor Michael Chalk</li><li>3. <u>“Local Plan No.4 – Statement of Community Involvement”</u>  Mr Robert McColl</li><li>4. <u>“Proposal for Houses off Far Moor Lane”</u>  Mr Robert McColl</li></ol> <p>(Questions attached)</p>
<p><b>7. Motions on Notice</b> Chief Executive</p>	<p>No Motions have been submitted under Procedure Rule 11.</p>
<p><b>8. Executive Committee</b> (Pages 17 - 32) Chief Executive</p>	<p>To receive the minutes and consider the recommendations and/or referrals from the following meetings of the Executive Committee:</p> <p>17<sup>th</sup> September 2013</p> <p>Matters requiring the Council’s consideration include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Options for 54 South Street; and</li><li>• Finance Monitoring Report 2013/14.</li></ul> <p>(Reports and decisions attached.)</p> <p><b>(Minutes circulated in Minute Book 4 – 2013/14)</b></p>

<p><b>9. Regulatory Committees</b> Chief Executive</p>	<p>To formally receive the minutes of the following meetings of the Council's Regulatory Committees:</p> <p>Planning Committee - 28<sup>th</sup> August 2013 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013</p>
<p><b>10. Urgent Business - Record of Decisions</b> Chief Executive</p>	<p>To note any decisions taken in accordance with the Council's Urgency Procedure Rules (Part 6, Paragraph 5 and/or Part 7, Paragraph 15 of the Constitution), as specified.</p> <p>(None to date).</p>
<p><b>11. Urgent Business - general (if any)</b></p>	<p>To consider any additional items exceptionally agreed by the Mayor as Urgent Business in accordance with the powers vested in her by virtue of Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.</p> <p>(This power should be exercised only in cases where there are genuinely special circumstances which require consideration of an item which has not previously been published on the Order of Business for the meeting.)</p>
<p><b>12. Exclusion of the Public</b></p>	<p>Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, to consider excluding the public from the meeting in relation to any items of business on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged it may be necessary to move the following resolution:</p> <p><b>“that, under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs (to be specified) of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.”</b></p> <p><b>[Subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>• Para 1 – <u>any individual</u>;</b></li><li><b>• Para 2 – <u>the identity of any individual</u>;</b></li></ul>

- 
- **Para 3 – financial or business affairs;**
  - **Para 4 – labour relations matters;**
  - **Para 5 – legal professional privilege;**
  - **Para 6 – a notice, order or direction;**
  - **Para 7 – the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;**

**may need to be considered as ‘exempt’.]**

---

(Note: Anyone requiring copies of any previously circulated reports, or supplementary papers, should please contact Committee Services Officers in advance of the meeting.)

---





## Council

9<sup>th</sup> September 2013

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Wanda King (Mayor), Councillor Pat Witherspoon (Deputy Mayor) and Councillors Joe Baker, Rebecca Blake, Michael Braley, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Simon Chalk, Greg Chance, Brandon Clayton, John Fisher, Andrew Fry, Carole Gandy, Adam Griffin, Bill Hartnett, Pattie Hill, Roger Hill, Gay Hopkins, Alan Mason, Phil Mould, Brenda Quinney, Mark Shurmer, Yvonne Smith, Luke Stephens and Debbie Taylor

### Also Present:

Mrs Veronica Allen, Mrs Tanweer Dean, Mr Malcolm Glainger and Mr David Rose

### Officers:

E Baker, R Bamford, J Carradine, D Etheridge, C Felton, C Flanagan and S Hanley, S Jones, D Parker-Jones, J Pickering, J Staniland

### Committee Services Officer:

I Westmore

#### 40. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Roger Bennett and Derek Taylor.

#### 41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 42. MINUTES

##### RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2013 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

.....  
Chair

**43. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) Mayor

The Mayor's communications and announcements were as follows:

i) Mayoral Functions

The Mayor advised that since the last meeting of the Council she and the Deputy Mayor had attended a number of engagements, including an inaugural banquet at Worcester Guildhall, a graduation event at Redditch Library, the Scarecrow Weekend at Forge Mill Museum, the send-off for the Borough's Special Olympians, the Palace Theatre Centenary celebrations, the Mayor of Pershore's charity event and a local Alzheimer's Society event.

ii) Forthcoming events

The Mayor advised that forthcoming events included an event hosted by the Kerala Society, a meeting of the Worcestershire Ambassadors and, finally her own Civic Service on 22<sup>nd</sup> September.

The Mayor thanked her Deputy for standing in for her on those occasions when she was unable to attend an event.

(b) Leader

The Leader's announcements were as follows:

i) Mrs Veronica Allen

The Leader introduced former community leader and community worker, Mrs Veronica Allen, who was visiting Redditch from her home in Jamaica. Mrs Allen presented a gift to the Mayor from the Jamaican Tourist Board to celebrate 50 years of Jamaican independence and expressed her hope that the twinning links between Redditch and St Elizabeth in Jamaica might prosper.

ii) Mrs Tanweer Dean

The Leader led the Council in recognising the outstanding contribution to the community made by Mrs Tanweer Dean through her excellent and dedicated service at the Sandycroft Centre and Mrs Dean was presented with a certificate by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Leader.

iii) Mercian Regiment

Following the question at the previous meeting of the Council in respect of the Mercian Regiment, the Leader advised that he had subsequently been in contact with the Adjutant of the 37<sup>th</sup> Signal Regiment, based at Kohima House, Redditch, and extended an invitation to all Members to attend and observe a military training event in mid-October.

iv) Palace Theatre

The Leader advised that he, along with a number of other members of the Council, had attended the celebrations of the centenary of the Palace Theatre the previous weekend and reported that he had subsequently thanked and congratulated the staff at the Palace for their work and dedication.

v) Local Enterprise Partnership

The Leader reported that a meeting had taken place the previous week at which the Leaders of the three north Worcestershire authorities had met with Mr Andy Street from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership.

vi) Good Funeral Awards

The Leader led the Council in congratulating two employees of the Council, Amanda Ryan and Martin McEvilly, who had reached the finals of the Good Funeral Awards and had been awarded second place in the category of Crematorium Attendants of the Year.

vii) Special Olympics

The Leader reported on the tremendous success of Redditch athletes at the recent Special Olympics at Bath. The Council was advised that the successful athletes would be invited to attend the following meeting of the Council in order that they might be congratulated in person.

viii) Alexandra Hospital

The Leader advised that, given the lack of response to a previous letter from the MP and Leaders of Redditch Borough, Bromsgrove District and Stratford upon Avon District Councils, a follow up letter had been forwarded to the Secretary of State seeking a reply.

ix) Bandstand Festival

The Leader reflected on a successful summer of musical events at the Bandstand on Church Green and advised that the final show would be taking place that coming weekend.

x) MacMillan Coffee Morning

The Leader advised the Council that the MacMillan Cancer Support World's Biggest Coffee Morning event would be taking place at the Town Hall on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

**44. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

The Leader responded to two questions submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 9.2 from Mr David Rose and Mr Malcolm Glainger. Both questions related to the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4.

Mr Rose asked the following question:

Why are Redditch Borough Council still advocating building between 600 and 3,400 houses in Webheath, when Redditch Borough Council Planning Committee on 22nd May, 2013 voted against Taylor Wimpey building 200 new houses, (which surely means that Redditch Borough Council have decided not to build in Webheath), because of poor highway infrastructure, over subscribed local schools, poor unsustainable infrastructures (including foul sewage) etc.?

The Leader replied as follows:

Paragraph 3.16 in the Report answers this question and explains why an early planning application from a developer, on part of a proposed site, is different to the consideration of sites for inclusion through the Plan making process.

3.16 "...With regards to Policy 48 Webheath, Officers are aware that the Council refused planning permission on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2013 for a proposal on part this Strategic Site set out in the Draft Local Plan No.4. The refusal was based upon the proposal's additional traffic generation on the local road network coupled with the lack of suitable infrastructure to support the development and the lack of contribution towards the wider highway network infrastructure; however this does not alter the fact that the proposal site and the remainder of the Webheath Strategic Site is capable of sustainable delivery in the short to medium term, subject to necessary infrastructure being delivered. This Strategic Site should therefore continue to feature in the Proposed Submission version of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4."

More details will follow later this year on the viability of the site to be able to deliver the necessary infrastructure. This will confirm whether there are showstoppers to the Local Plan's proposed allocated sites being delivered sustainably. The necessary works for the Foxlydiate site will be tested through detailed highway modelling. The costs of wider highway infrastructure and other sustainable transport costs will need to be aggregated to the Webheath site and to the cross boundary site at Foxlydiate in order to test the viability accurately. The cost of implementing necessary sewerage treatment for the two sites is borne by both the developer (for the on-site drainage, connection, pumping station and pressurised sewer) and Severn Trent Water and therefore has little impact on the ability of the site to be delivered, in any case the cost of upgrade works to serve these sites would not be vastly different to the alternative site options.

Mr Rose subsequently asked the following supplementary question of the Leader:

Mr Rose stated that he did not agree with the answer provided by the Leader and briefly recounted the reasons given for refusal of an application to build 200 dwellings at Webheath by the Planning Committee in May of this year, the decision of which body had concluded by declaring that the proposed development was not sustainable. Mr Rose suggested that central Government had given the green light for building on any land provided it was sustainable and enquired whether this would mean that the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 would be declared unsound when it came before the Planning Inspector in due course.

Officers provided an answer to this supplementary question on behalf of the Leader, as follows:

The purpose of the Inspection was to establish whether the decision made by the Council on the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 was sustainable and the Council would have to await the conclusion of the Inspector's deliberations.

Mr Glainger asked the following question:

If central government do not require Bromsgrove District Council to release green belt land for Redditch housing growth, where would RBC propose to build the extra 3400 houses within their own boundaries?

The Leader replied as follows:

It is unlikely that Central Government would make such a judgement about not requiring development for Redditch in Bromsgrove District. At the examination of Redditch's and

Bromsgrove Plans, the Planning Inspectorate will test the soundness of the plans. If there is no such requirement incumbent on Bromsgrove, then the examinations can explore this matter and the Inspector will ultimately take this view and advise the Councils.

There are no locations within Redditch Borough for this amount of housing development to go. If there was any prospect of any other pieces of land within Redditch being developable, the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Panel of Inspectors in their Report of September 2009 would not have suggested that Redditch's requirements would need to be met cross boundary, if they were not satisfied with the evidence. All the recent evidence from Central Government and the Planning Inspectorate points to Councils having to work together under the duty to cooperate.

There are no developers waiting or requesting allocations on larger sites in Redditch green belt. There are no more suitable sites within Redditch's urban area which are able to be allocated for residential development because all potential sites have been counted as a contribution towards offsetting the requirements.

Mr Glainger subsequently asked the following supplementary question of the Leader:

It was declared astonishing that Redditch Borough Council did not have a Plan B or contingency should the present Plan fail to be adopted. Surely if there was no more room to build within the Borough the Council should simply declare that the Borough was full.

Once again, Officers provided an answer to this supplementary question on behalf of the Leader, as follows:

The Council was required to plan for objectively assessed development. Should the Inspector conclude that the land identified in Bromsgrove Borough was not suitable for housing development and there was no land available for additional housing in Redditch the Inspector would report such a finding to the Council accordingly.

**45. MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

No motions had been submitted.

**46. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Members considered the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013.

2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4

At the request of the Mayor, Planning Officers provided a brief summary of the contents of the appendices which made up the Plan and its associated documents.

The Leader noted that the Council was at one stage in a very long process which had started some years beforehand and reiterated the requirement upon the Council to produce such a Plan. Given the assessed need for additional dwelling spaces, the Council had approached Bromsgrove District Council under the Duty to Co-operate and the preferred housing development sites had been selected following the assessment of a number of potential sites.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that, without a Plan, there would be a free for all, Central Government could impose a Plan and the Council could be forced to spend a great deal of money defending against developers. It was stated that the Plan was based on robust evidence, sound professional advice from Officers and a thorough and proper consultation process. The meeting was reminded that, should the recommendations be approved by the Council, there would follow a period during which the soundness of the Plan might be challenged and Officers would be on hand to assist people to frame such challenges in a way which would be recognised by the Planning Inspector.

A number of other Members of the Council spoke on the proposals before it, with the main points raised being summarised below.

- Not all of the sites identified within the Local Plan for housing development had previously been brought before Members for consideration, including the two sites alongside the A435 in Matchborough and Winyates;
- The transport infrastructure in areas identified for housing development was not suitable;
- The views of the local community should form a major consideration in the making of such decisions;
- Redditch new town had been developed in a planned way with employment land and housing land built in close proximity, which reduced the need for lengthy commuting to work. The present plans separated housing and employment land and went against this principle;
- The numbers of new dwellings which had been identified as being required for the Borough in the period since the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy were contested as being too high;

- The types and density of the housing which was being proposed under the Local Plan were not considered suitable;
- A number of green spaces and areas of the Green Belt would be lost as a result of the proposals within the Local Plan;
- Areas surrounding those identified for the major areas of housing development would be rendered vulnerable to flooding as a result of this additional development;
- Redditch would be celebrating 50 years of the New Town next year and dire pronouncements had been made at that time about the future of the town which had proved to be unfounded;
- Members were being asked to approve matters which had not been brought before them by Officers and which were to be the subject of forthcoming briefings, in part because matters were seemingly being rushed through;
- The alternative sites for housing development in Bromsgrove District, principally Bordesley, had not been adequately considered by Officers when assessing which sites were most suitable for additional housing development;
- The proposed development would tie the Borough closer to Bromsgrove town along the already over-used A38 whereas the Borough's major employment contacts with Birmingham were left under-developed;
- The existing infrastructure in and around Bordesley was superior to that to be found in the area around Webheath in areas such as public transport provision and proximity to motorway connections;
- The choice of locations for additional housing growth seemed predicated on choices made by Bromsgrove District Council rather than Redditch Borough Council;
- The level of housing development proposed was in excess of that which would be sufficient to meet the natural growth of Redditch and the additional housing would merely serve to provide cheap housing for people from outside of the Borough

Following considerable discussion the matter was put to the vote and it was



**RESOLVED that**

- 1) the Officer responses and actions (Appendix 1) to consultation held on Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 be endorsed;**
- 2) the Officer responses and actions (Appendix 2) to consultation held on Redditch Housing Growth be endorsed;**
- 3) the Proposed Submission Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (Appendix 3) and Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 4) for representations to be made by statutory bodies and members of the public, commencing 30th September 2013 until 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013 be approved;**
- 4) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition to review the representations made following the close of the representations period, and that subject to no significant weaknesses being raised to doubt the soundness of the draft Plan (for tests of soundness see paragraph 3.20 of this report), that the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in December 2013;**
- 5) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition to prepare and submit the necessary documents to support Submission of the Local Plan; and**
- 6) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition, to undertake such further revisions, technical corrections and editorial changes deemed necessary in preparing the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State and to agree subsequent changes where appropriate during the examination.**

(At 8.15pm, following consideration of this item, there was a short adjournment. The meeting reconvened at 8.25pm.)

The remainder of the matters referred to Council by the Executive Committee on 2nd September were then considered by the Council and it was

**RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013 be received and all outstanding recommendations adopted.**

**47. RESTRUCTURE - ENABLING HEADS OF SERVICE**

Following the deferral of determination of this matter at the previous meeting of the Council, Members considered a report concerning a proposed restructure of a number of Heads of Service roles and responsibilities within the Finance and Resources Directorate.

**RESOLVED that**

**the business case for the restructure of the Directorate be approved.**

(Members of the Conservative group on the Council and Councillor Michael Braley wished it to be recorded that they had abstained from voting on this matter)

**48. REGULATORY COMMITTEES**

Members received the minutes of recent meetings of the Audit and Governance, Planning and Standards Committees.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2013 be received and adopted;**
- 2) the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2013 be received and adopted; and**
- 3) the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2013 be received and all outstanding recommendations adopted.**

**49. THE SCRAP METAL DEALERS ACT 2013**

The Council considered a report which set out proposals which would allow the provisions of the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 to be effectively implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013.

Members were generally pleased that the Act had come into force and were interested to establish how it might effectively regulate the business within the Borough. It was noted that the fees had been proposed at a level which would cover the costs incurred by the Council in carrying out the procedures and formalities of administering the statutory regime.

The Council noted that the Act primarily affected the activities of scrap metal dealers and had less impact on the activities of collectors, a discrepancy which was the source of disappointment to some who felt that the collectors were an occasional cause of nuisance. Officers highlighted that the Act was primarily to deal with matters other than noise nuisance, a problem which was the realm of the Environmental Protection Act. However, Officers did suggest that the authority could deem the suitability of licence holders, that licences could be revoked and that factors such as complaints under the Environmental Protection Act might form grounds for such action. Officers undertook to report back to Councillor Brunner on measures proposed to be undertaken the previous year to tackle noise nuisance by Regulatory Services. Officers also undertook to confirm for Councillor Hopkins the situation with regard to the Environmental Protection Act and noise emitted from moving as opposed to stationary vehicles

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) authority be delegated to Licensing Sub-Committees to refuse applications made under paragraph 2 or 3 of Schedule 1 of the Act for the grant or variation of a licence;**
- 2) authority be delegated to Licensing Sub-Committees to revoke or vary a licence under section 4 of the Act;**
- 3) authority be delegated to the Head of Worcestershire Regulatory Services to carry out all other functions and exercise all other powers provided under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013; and**
- 4) the fees to be charged under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 be set as shown in the table at Appendix 3 to the report.**

**50. URGENT BUSINESS - RECORD OF DECISIONS**

There were no Urgent Decisions to note.

**51. URGENT BUSINESS - GENERAL (IF ANY)**

There were no separate items of urgent business to consider at this meeting.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.53 pm

.....  
Chair

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**COUNCIL**14<sup>th</sup> October 2013**QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER**

The following Questions to the Leader have been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 9.2:

1. **“BOROUGH OF REDDITCH LOCAL PLAN NO.4 – PROPOSAL FOR HOUSES OFF FAR MOOR LANE”**

(Councillor Adam Griffin)

Would the Leader of the Council agree with me that openness and transparency in local government is important?

**In this spirit of openness** could he please explain to this Council why residents in my ward of Winyates Green have not been consulted about the proposal to build houses off Far Moor Lane?

Furthermore could he explain why the inclusion of this in LP4 was not discussed at PAP or any in other forum with Councillors?

Would he confirm whether **any** Winyates Councillors were briefed about this proposal? If so when was this briefing and why was I not included when it occurred?

What will he do to ensure residents of Winyates Green are **made** aware of this **major** housing proposal? **More importantly, will he commit to keeping the residents of Winyates Green updated on any such proposals?**

2. **“COUNCIL-OWNED HOUSING LAND”**

(Councillor Michael Chalk)

- a) Will the leader inform this council of every piece of land in the Borough that this council owns and can be used for housing?
- b) Will he detail which is for sale or potential sale?
- c) Will he give assurances to this Council and the residents of this town and outline how he proposes to explore all avenues to sell land rather than give it away for nothing.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

14<sup>th</sup> October 2013

---

- d) How does he propose to ensure that this Council gets best value for the sale of this land?

3. **“LOCAL PLAN NO. 4 - STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT”**

(Mr Robert McColl)

The Council's Statement of Community Involvement sets out a clear statement that Community Involvement is fundamental to the development of The Local Plan.

The draft Local Plan No 4 also states that the plan has been 'influenced by the local community', as well as stakeholders and developers. The statement adds that it aims to help the local community see that the housing growth can re-vitalise the area.

To date, there is little evidence that either of these claims have been robustly pursued. To the contrary, to date the Council have only given one example of direct communication, which was a letter to a Winyates Green resident, mistakenly referenced as a member of a group that was disbanded more than a decade ago.

Similarly, it has not been made clear which part of this strip of loved greenbelt and special wildlife site, or the residential area of the green is in need of re-vitalisation.

Can the residents of Winyates Green be given the opportunity to influence this plan? Can meaningful consultation take place, giving us the time and opportunity to fully understand the proposals and its implications? Can we have an exhibition jointly hosted by the Council and local residents in the Winyates Green Community Centre?

4. **“PROPOSAL FOR HOUSES OFF FAR MOOR LANE”**

(Mr Robert McColl)

In 2001, Stratford on Avon submitted a planning application to build housing along this strip of land. It was refused for many reasons, but I would like to focus on one in particular, it relates to access to the housing estate from Far Moor Lane. It was turned down in 2001.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**14<sup>th</sup> October 2013**

---

[At time of writing, Council planning experienced difficulty locating the documented reasons that road access to the site was refused]

Access to a housing estate from Far Moor Lane now appears to be considered by planning to be acceptable. Can the Council clarify what has changed, and why the original ruling has been overturned?





REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**COUNCIL**

14<sup>th</sup> October 2013

---

**52. OPTIONS FOR 54 SOUTH STREET (PREVIOUS REDI CENTRE)**

**RECOMMENDED that**

- 1) the property be marketed for disposal; and**
- 2) the Head of Finance and Resources agree the final details of any sale, following the receipt of any bids/expressions of interest, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management.**



**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**OPTIONS FOR 54 SOUTH STREET (PREVIOUS REDI CENTRE)**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor John Fisher, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Teresa Kristunas, Head of Finance & Resources
Wards Affected	All

**1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

Members are requested to consider the options for the 54 South Street, the former REDI Centre building.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Executive Committee is asked to **RECOMMEND** that

- 1) the property be marketed for disposal; and
- 2) the Head of Finance & Resources agree the final details of any sale, following the receipt of any bids/expressions of interest, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management.

**3. KEY ISSUES**

3.1. Members at their meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2013 resolved to declare 54 South Street (the previous REDI Centre) surplus and requested officers to prepare a report on a range of options for the building.

**3.2. The Property****Main Building**

- 3.2.1. The property was acquired from Worcestershire County Council in March 2003 for the sum of £108,000. The original two storeys building currently standing was constructed in approximately 1896 as the Silverwood Junior School.
- 3.2.2. The property is of brick and tile construction and is not listed or recorded as being of local historical interest.
- 3.2.3. The property consists of a reception area, offices, meeting rooms, workshop areas, small hall, kitchen and coffee bar.

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE****17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

3.2.4. The Council does not hold a copy of a condition survey or measured survey for the property, however the Valuation Office Agency records for Business Rates purposes, that the net internal area is 393.90sqms or 4,215 sqft.

Car Park

3.2.5. There is a 25 space car pack adjacent to the building accessed via Ipsley Street.

3.2.6. The Black Horse pub has by way of a licence agreement, a right to cross the car park for access to its premises. This licence can be terminated upon four weeks notice.

Potential Uses3.3. Disposal for Development

3.3.1. Advice has been sought from two agents with regards to the potential disposal of the former REDI Centre site. Both indicated that it would likely to be unattractive to developers for commercial or residential conversion. New build residential development was considered to be the most favourable option particularly if the site formed part of a larger site consisting of the County Council's Youth Centre site. The Youth House has been registered as an Asset of Community Value.

3.3.2. It is the opinion of the agents that the inclusion of the REDI Centre site with the Youth Centre as a joint disposal would not significantly increase the attractiveness or value of the County Council's site.

3.3.3. Any potential disposal of the REDI Centre is likely to generate interest from local community groups, who in turn may seek to acquire the property for community benefit now that the decision of the Youth House has been made. The Youth House is to be offered for sale on the open market following a failed bid from community groups to acquire the building.

3.3.4. The former REDI Centre building, 54 South Street, has to date not been registered as an Asset of Community Value. Should a community group successfully register the former REDI Centre building as an Asset of Community Value the Council would be expected to give community groups sufficient time to develop an interest in the building in the form of a business case before deciding if any such offer achieved best value in terms of capital receipt and/or a tangible community benefit. If an acceptable offer was not forthcoming then the Council would then be in a position to offer the property for sale on the open market.

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 20133.4. Disposal for Business Use

3.4.1. Although the Agents suggested a lack of interest for such use, Property Services consider that the property could be refurbished to a lower specification level for use as Doctors Surgery or Veterinary Clinic.

3.5. Retained for Future Use3.5.1. Voluntary Sector:

3.5.2. In addition to being used to deliver Council services the property has historically been utilised by the Voluntary Sector for the provision of community services uses such as a Crèche and café. Since closure interest has been received for an arts centre.

3.5.3. The property lends itself to use by multiple occupiers because of its common reception area and scope for the separation of significant working areas. It may be of significant interest to Community Groups wishing to rent offices or space to undertake activities, as is currently happening at Community House, Easemore Road, under the management of the Redditch Neighbourhood Trust.

3.5.4. Should this option be considered, the property will likely require day to day management or caretaking services to open and secure the property at the beginning and end of the business day. Tenancy arrangements could be dealt with by the Property Services as with all other commercial arrangements.

3.5.5. With respect to total rental income and subject to no rent concessions, a sum of £20,000 to £25,000 pa would not be unrealistic if fully let.

Business Start-Ups:

3.6. Planning consent permitting, consideration could be given to the property being used a base for a small number (potentially 6) of start-up enterprises. The Council currently offers such facilities at Greenlands, The Rubicon and Hemming Road Centres. Typically units could be let on an inclusive rent basis as with the existing Centres and managed by the existing Economic Development Team.

Potential for alternative use.

3.7. During the period that 54 South Street has been vacant a number of organisations and businesses have approached the Council with a view to leasing the property but it has remained vacant. It is unlikely that this situation will change in the near future and there will be an ongoing cost

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013

to the Council all the time the property remains empty. Officers would therefore recommend that the property is marketed for disposal.

**3.8. Marketing Appraisal of the former REDI Centre, 54 South Street.****Existing Use Value**

3.8.1. The following valuations have been based upon the Valuation Office Agency's rateable value figures for rent of £25,000 for the property and assume that the property is fully let.

3.8.2. It has been assumed that of the 25 space car park serving the property 16 spaces would be allocated to tenants as part of the tenancy terms. The remaining 9 spaces would be separately let to tenants if required.

**Disposal Value**

3.8.3. The property does not lend itself easily to conversion to residential units due to its physical characteristics and shape, therefore to maximise the use of the existing building, part demolition and/or new build may be necessary.

3.8.4. New build costs are approximately 15% lower than rehabilitation/conversion costs, it is therefore anticipated that any prospective developer would consider conversion a less attractive option and unless planning requirements dictated retention of the existing building preclude any offers for such.

3.8.5. It is estimated that the disposal of the building would generate a capital receipt in the region of £200k.

**Financial Implications**

3.9 Disposal of the building would general a capital receipt that could be used to support the Council's Capital Programme. Retention of the building for alternative use may involve the Council in incurring expenditure on the building in addition to the interim cost of maintaining the security of the void premises.

**Legal Implications**

3.10 There are no legal implications.

**Service / Operational Implications**

3.11 No direct implications. The property has not been used as a Community Centre for a number of years. Community groups are, however, able to

## **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**

apply to register the building as an Asset of Community Value and thereby, if successful, bid to acquire the property.

### **Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

3.12. No direct implications.

#### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

There are no risks identified.

#### **5. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Files held by Property Services.

### **AUTHORS OF REPORT**

Name: Teresa Kristunas, Head of Finance & Resources  
E Mail: [t.kristunas@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:t.kristunas@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 64252 ext 3295





REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**COUNCIL**

14<sup>th</sup> October 2013

---

53. **FINANCE MONITORING REPORT 2013/14 - APRIL - JUNE  
(QUARTER 1)**

**RECOMMENDED that**

**£48K of currently available S106 funds be included in the 2013/4 capital programme to fund the improvements to the play area at Glover Street.**



**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**FINANCE MONITORING REPORT 2013/14 - APRIL – JUNE (QUARTER 1)**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor John Fisher, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management.
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Teresa Kristunas, Head of Finance and Resources
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	N/A
Non Key Decision	

**1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

This report details the Council's financial position for the period April to June 2013 (Quarter 1 – 2013/14).

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Executive Committee is asked RESOLVE that**

- 1) **the current financial position on Revenue be noted, as detailed in the report; and**

**RECOMMEND to Council that**

- 2) **£48k of currently available S106 funds be included in the 2013/14 capital programme to fund the improvements to the play area at Glover Street.**

**3. KEY ISSUES**

- 3.1 This report provides details of the financial information across the Council. The aim is to ensure Officers and Members can make informed and considered judgement of the overall position of the Council.

**Financial Implications**

- 3.2 The Council set a balanced budget in February 2013 for the financial year 2013/14. Within the budget were included savings of £550K which were not fully identified. These included savings relating to Shared Services, Transformation, and general vacancies with the Council. The table at 3.5 shows that £107K of these savings has been identified in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of the financial year.

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**Revenue Budget summary Quarter 1 (April – June) 2013/14 –  
Overall Council**

3.3 The current financial position for services delivered within the Borough is detailed in the table below.

3.4 Internal recharges have not been included in these figures to allow comparison for each service area.

3.5

<b>Service Head</b>	<b>Budget 2013/14 £'000 (a)</b>	<b>Budget April - June £'000 (b)</b>	<b>Actual Spend April – June £'000 (c)</b>	<b>Variance to date April - June £'000 (c-b=d)</b>	<b>Reference to financial comments</b>
<b>Environmental Services</b> Inc: Waste, Landscape & Bereavement services	3,312	1,097	1,076	-21	3.14
<b>Community Services</b> Inc: Strategic Housing, CCTV/ Lifeline & Community safety	1,640	371	371	0	-
<b>Regulatory Services</b>	568	139	137	-2	-
<b>Leisure &amp; Cultural Services</b>	2,786	698	689	-9	3.8
<b>Planning &amp; Regeneration</b>	1,753	344	352	8	3.9
<b>Customer Services</b>	537	134	122	-12	3.11
<b>Finance &amp; Resources</b> Inc: HR, & Revenues and Benefits	4,969	1,207	1,166	-41	3.12

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013

<b>Legal, Equalities &amp; Democratic Services</b>	848	211	186	-25	3.13
<b>Business Transformation</b> Inc: IT Services	940	356	350	-6	3.10
<b>Head of Housing Services (GF)</b>	883	223	216	-7	3.7
<b>Corporate Services</b> Inc: CMT & Communications	1,342	336	344	8	-
<b>SERVICE TOTAL</b>	<b>19,578</b>	<b>5,116</b>	<b>5,009</b>	<b>-107</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>Savings to be found</b>	<b>-550</b>	<b>-138</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>3.15</b>
<b>Total for Quarter</b>	<b>19,028</b>	<b>4,978</b>	<b>5,009</b>	<b>31</b>	

**Financial Commentary**

- 3.6 Savings of £107K have been found during the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter towards the unidentified savings of £550K.
- 3.7 The Housing (general fund) savings are due to savings with the dispersed units.
- 3.8 The savings within Leisure & Cultural Services are mostly due to vacancies within the Business Development Team in the first quarter of the year. The requirement to fill these vacancies is linked to the ongoing transformation process within the Service.
- 3.9 The share of the Building Control partnership income is not going to be paid as it is going to be reinvested into the Service.
- 3.10 The savings within Business Transformation are in relation to vacancies within the department.
- 3.11 The under spend within the Customer Services department is due to a number of new vacancies that exist.

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013

---

- 3.12 The variances with Finance & Resources are as follows:

Human Resources – The under spend to date is due to the Corporate Training budget is to be allocated to services in due course. HR is currently visiting DMT's to determine their needs. This will be reviewed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter

Benefits – The underspend to date within the Benefits service is due to several staff on maternity leave and a vacant post, this will be reviewed for the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter.

Revenues – Variance to date is due to a member of staff on long term sickness.

Asset & Property Management – The overspend for the quarter is made up of a shortfall of income on Investment Properties due to vacant units, which then impacts on increased NNDR costs.

- 3.13 The variances within Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services are predominantly due to vacant posts in all three areas, however a service review has taken place and the new structure came in to effect from 01/07/13. Budgets will be revised and reflected in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter report. There are also small savings to date within the Members services from the Members training and expenses budgets.
- 3.14 An underspend of £21k within Environmental Services is due to vacant posts within Cleansing and Bereavement Services, and reduced working hours for a store-person.
- 3.15 A number of savings were identified at the budget setting process by Heads of Service; these have not affected the service delivered, Heads of Service have been able to apply these savings using a Transformation Methodology. The progress of these savings is being monitored by Finance and the Heads of Service, the total is £755K across the whole authority and are included in the table at 3.15. There is an additional risk that if these savings are not achieved then this will increase the amount of unidentified savings.

**Treasury Management**

- 3.16 The Council's Treasury Management Strategy has been developed in accordance with the Prudential Code for Capital Finance prudential indicators and is used to manage risks arising from financial instruments. Additionally treasury management practices are followed on a day to day basis.

**EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE**17<sup>th</sup> September 2013**Credit Risk**

3.17 Credit risk arises from deposits with banks and financial institutions, as well as credit exposures to the Council's customers. Credit risk is minimised by use of a specified list of investment counterparty criteria and by limiting the amount invested with each institution. The Council receives credit rating details from its Treasury Management Advisers on a daily basis and any counterparty falling below the criteria is removed from the list.

3.18 At 30th June 2013, short-term investments comprise:

	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2013 £000
Deposits with Banks/Building Societies	6,000

**Income from investments**

3.19 An investment income target of £25k has been set for 2013/14 using a projected rate of return of 0.75% - 1.50%. During the past financial year, bank base rates have remained at 0.50% and current indications are projecting minimal upward movement for the short-term.

3.20 In the 3 months to 30 June, the Council earned income from investments of £6k. The Council is on track to achieve the budget on investments for 2013.

**General Fund Balances**

3.21 The General Fund Balance as at the 31st March 2013 is £1m; a balanced budget was set in February 2013, should the unidentified savings not be achieved during the year or any unexpected expenditure occur this would be funded from Balances.

**Legal Implications**

3.22 No Legal implications have been identified.

**Service/Operational Implications**

3.23 Sound performance management and data quality are keys to achieving improved scores in the use of resources judgement. This performance report supports that aim.

# **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

17<sup>th</sup> September 2013

---

## **Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

3.24 Performance Improvement is a Council objective.

### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

Risk considerations are covered within the report.

### **5. APPENDICES**

None

### **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.

## **AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Sam Morgan

E Mail: [sam.morgan@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:sam.morgan@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

Tel: (01527) 64252 ext 3790