

## **EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL CABINET MINUTES**

**Committee:** Cabinet **Date:** 9 October 2006

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping **Time:** 7.00 - 8.20 pm

**Members Present:** Mrs D Collins (Chairman), C Whitbread (Vice-Chairman), A Green, Mrs A Grigg, J Knapman, S Metcalfe, Mrs M Sartin, D Stallan and Ms S Stavrou

**Other**

**Councillors:** Councillors Mrs A Cooper, P Gode, P McMillan, R Morgan, Mrs C Pond, Mrs J H Whitehouse and M Woollard

**Apologies:** None.

**Officers Present:** P Haywood (Joint Chief Executive), J Gilbert (Head of Environmental Services), R Palmer (Head of Finance), I Willett (Head of Research and Democratic Services), P Pledger (Assistant Head of Housing Services (Property and Resources)), T Carne (Public Relations and Marketing Officer), G J Woodhall (Democratic Services Officer), M Jenkins (Democratic Services Assistant), S G Hill (Senior Democratic Services Officer) and Z Folley (Democratic Services Assistant)

### **61. MINUTES**

The Leader of the Council requested that the confirmation of the minutes of the last meeting be deferred until the next meeting in order to allow members a further opportunity to consider them.

**RESOLVED:**

That confirmation of the minutes of the last meeting of the Cabinet held on 4 September 2006 be deferred until the next meeting.

### **62. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other urgent business for the Cabinet to consider.

### **63. REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

There were no oral reports from Portfolio Holders received by the Cabinet.

### **64. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported that there would be a presentation for members regarding the reorganisation of Whipps Cross Hospital on 9 November 2006, and that the special meeting of the Constitutional Affairs Scrutiny Panel, which would only consider the reorganisation of the Area Planning Sub-Committees, had been rescheduled for 6 November 2006.

**65. TENDER ACCEPTANCE - PVCU WINDOWS AND DOOR REPLACEMENT CONTRACT**

The Housing Portfolio Holder presented a report regarding the tendering exercise for the PVCu Windows and Door Replacement Contract for 2006-07. Six tenders had been received in total, which were opened by the Portfolio Holder on 6 September 2006. The lowest tender received was from Anglian Windows Limited in the sum of £117,970.42, which compared favourably to the £180,000 allocated within the Capital Programme for 2006-07.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That, being the lowest tender received, Anglian Windows Limited be awarded the PVCu Windows and Door Replacement Contract for 2006-07 in the sum of £117,970.42.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The PVCu Windows and Door Replacement Programme was essential for the Council to be able to meet the Decent Homes Standard. Replacement doors and windows also helped to improve the energy efficiency of the Council's stock, which was measured as a best value performance indicator. The tender from Anglian Windows Limited was the lowest received and within the Capital Programme allocation.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

Not to undertake the works, however this would result in higher maintenance costs and the Council failing to meet the Decent Homes Standards.

**66. REPROGRAPHICS SECTION - PURCHASE OF REPLACEMENT PLATEMAKER**

The Finance, Performance Management and Corporate Support Services Portfolio Holder presented a report concerning the purchase of a replacement platemaker for the Reprographics Section. The Portfolio Holder stated that the current Platemaker was eight years old, obsolete and spare parts were no longer available from the manufacturer. In addition, the maintenance contract was due to expire in November 2006 and the Council had been advised that the contract would not be renewed. The existing platemaker was also not fully compatible with the latest versions of Windows and Desktop Publishing software packages. Several manufacturers had been researched and it had been proposed to invest in a relatively new product that utilised a chemical free process and used more durable equipment for the plates thereby saving approximately £1,000 per annum in operating costs. The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that only a growth bid was being requested at the current time.

**RESOLVED:**

- That, in order to purchase a replacement platemaker for use within the Reprographics Section, a capital growth bid be made in the sum of £35,000 for 2007/08.

**Reasons for Decision:**

A new platemaker was required in order to enable the Reprographics Section to continue to comply with the Council's printing requirements. The proposed equipment

would have environmental benefits due to it using a chemical free process, and would also produce a small saving on operational costs.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To do nothing whilst the current equipment remained operational, but this would put the Council at risk of an urgent supplementary estimate if it broke down and spare parts could not be sourced.

**67. CIVIC OFFICES - PLANNED PREVENTATIVE ROLLING MAINTENANCE & IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME**

The Finance, Performance Management and Corporate Support Services Portfolio Holder presented a report on the Planned Preventative Rolling Maintenance and Improvements Programme for the Civic Offices. The Cabinet were reminded that the detection of asbestos in the Condor Building had caused the suspension of a number of items within the Programme, which were only just now being implemented. Consequently, there had been a £13,000 carry forward over the five-year programme. Within the list of planned works for the period, the reinforcement of the sound system for the Council Chamber was again highlighted as it had deteriorated further. The Council had been advised that spare parts were no longer available for the current system and any further fault would render the system non-repairable.

The Cabinet agreed that the Council needed a maintenance programme for the Civic Offices, but the financial constraints currently being experienced necessitated that all items should be reviewed and only the essential items proceeded with. The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that only growth bids had been requested at the current time, thus there would be further opportunity to review the full list of items within the maintenance programme.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That progress on year three (2006/07) of the rolling programme of works for the on-going maintenance of the Civic Offices be noted;
- (2) That the revised anticipated expenditure profile for the next four years (2007/08 to 2010/11) be noted;
- (3) That capital growth bids in the total sum of £143,000 for the years 2007/08 to 2010/11 be made as follows:
  - (a) 2007/08 - £56,000;
  - (b) 2008/09 - £54,500;
  - (c) 2009/10 - £24,000; and
  - (d) 2010/11 - £8,000;
- (4) That a revenue DDF growth bid in the sum of £22,500 for 2007/08 be made; and
- (5) That, due to the delay in works, a revenue DDF carry forward in the sum of £13,000 from the previously approved programme be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

A proactive approach to facilities management for the Civic Offices would ensure that the building and its infrastructure would be maintained to an appropriate level, with an attendant reduction in the risk of critical systems failing.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To do nothing, which would lead to the deterioration of the building fabric and systems, and consequently was not considered a viable option.

To defer action until systems or equipment fail, which would cause varying degrees of disruption depending upon the system involved and lead to requests for supplementary finance.

**68. MEMBER REMUNERATION SCHEME - 2007/08**

The Finance, Performance Management and Corporate Support Services Portfolio Holder presented a report about the Member Remuneration Scheme for 2007/08. The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that the Council had an approved remuneration scheme for members, which consisted of three elements:

- A Basic Allowance currently paid at 90% of the full permitted amount to all members (£2,835 per annum per member);
- A Special Responsibility Allowance currently paid at 50% of the full permitted amount to Cabinet members, Committee Chairmen, and Group Leaders; and
- Travelling and Subsistence paid in respect of approved duties.

The Independent Remuneration Panel, in respect of the scheme for the 2007/08 municipal year, had presented twelve different options to the Cabinet for their consideration.

The Cabinet felt that there should be no change to the current remuneration scheme, as there was still ambiguity over the future cost of the waste management contract. The Leader of the Council thanked the Independent Remuneration Panel for their efforts and recommendations.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Member Remuneration Scheme for 2007/08 be unchanged at:

- (a) Basic Allowance implementation of 90% (£2,835 per member per annum); and
- (b) Special Responsibility Allowance implementation of 50%.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Cabinet did not wish to increase Member Allowances at this time, due to the continuing uncertainty over the future cost of the waste management contract.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The following options were considered and rejected:

- Basic Allowance of 90%, Special Responsibility Allowance of 60%;
- Basic Allowance of 90%, Special Responsibility allowance of 70%;
- Basic Allowance of 90%, Special Responsibility allowance of 80%;
- Basic Allowance of 90%, Special Responsibility allowance of 90%;
- Basic Allowance of 90%, Special Responsibility allowance of 100%;

- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 50%;
- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 60%;
- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 70%;
- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 80%;
- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 90%; and
- Basic Allowance of 100%, Special Responsibility allowance of 100%.

#### **69. ELECTIONS - MAY 2006 AND 2007 AND ELECTORAL REGISTRATION**

The Leader of the Council presented a report concerning the May 2006 and May 2007 Elections, and Electoral Registration. The Cabinet were informed that budget provision for elections in 2006/07 had been £59,000, but that the actual net cost of the May 2006 election had been £71,000. The Returning Officer had analysed the overspend and offered the following explanation. Firstly, after the abandonment of the electoral pilot, which had included electronic counting, the number of count assistants required had been increased from 12 to 92, which had also increased the Council's costs by approximately £4,500. The Department of Constitutional Affairs had determined that this cost would have to be borne locally. Secondly, in May 2006 one-third of the District Council seats were up for election along with a Town Council by-election, which was an extra cost. Combined elections and electoral pilots had shrouded the need to increase the budget by more than inflation as the costs of the elections had been shared with the Government. Thus, it was considered necessary to independently estimate the elections budget annually rather than simply increase the existing budget by inflation, in order to avoid future budget fluctuations. It was also felt that an additional £2,500 should be set aside for any unforeseen by-elections that may arise during the remainder of the current municipal year. The gross expenditure for the elections due in May 2007 had been estimated at £95,000.

In respect of electoral registration, the Leader of the Council stated that £11,000 had been included in the budget for 2006/07 to cover the requirements of the Electoral Services Act, which had now become law. However, a further £6,000 was now considered necessary in order to cover the cost of increased postage and canvassing, which had been required as a result of the new Act, as well as a decline in income from the sale of registers.

The Returning Officer reported that, following the publication of the agenda, the Department of Constitutional Affairs had subsequently agreed to refund £9,500 to the Council in respect of the abortive electoral pilot. The additional costs for electoral registration had predominantly arisen from the addition of a mandatory 'nationality' box on the 'A'-form, which when left blank had necessitated the return of forms to respondents. The Returning Officer added that the request for a £2,500 contingency for a possible District by election could be deferred until such time as the money was needed, but that the additional £6,000 requested for electoral registration costs was urgently required. The Cabinet agreed to defer the contingency of £2,500 for District Council by election, but felt that the request for an additional £6,000 in respect of electoral registration costs should be noted and reviewed when the total cost for the current municipal year was known.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the reasons for the budget overspend for elections in May 2006 be noted;
- (2) That action to budget for elections on a different basis be agreed, and a revenue CSB supplementary estimate in the sum of £12,000 for 2006/07 be recommended to the Council for approval;

(3) That, in order to act as a contingency in respect of any District Council by-election which may be necessary in 2006/07, a revenue CSB growth bid in the sum of £2,500 for 2007/08 be made;

(4) That in respect of the estimated cost of elections in 2007/08 and as a result of a worst case re-assessment of likely electoral costs following the overspending in May 2006, a further revenue CSB growth bid in the sum of £26,000 for 2007/08 be made; and

(5) That, in respect of the increased costs for preparation of the electoral register, a request for a revenue CSB supplementary estimate in the sum of £6,000 for 2006/07 be noted and reviewed when the total cost is known.

**Reasons for Decision:**

It was considered necessary to implement a new basis for the budgeting for elections in order to avoid the budget fluctuations that had occurred in recent years. It was intended to annually review the elections budget in order to negate the effects of inflation. The additional costs incurred for electoral registration would be reviewed when the total cost for the current municipal year was known.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

None; the current budget provision, even with an inflationary increase, had not proved to be a reliable guide to actual spending.

**70. LEADER'S PORTFOLIO - RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAND AND DEVELOPMENT TRANSACTIONS**

The Leader of the Council presented a report regarding responsibility for Land and Development Transactions in respect of the Leader's Portfolio. The Leader of the Council reminded the Cabinet that the portfolios had been reviewed at the Council meeting held on 29 June 2006 (minute 29(b)(i) refers). The Leader's Portfolio had included responsibility for "major property and development proposals affecting the Council's Property Portfolio (where necessary in consultation with the Housing Portfolio Holder) but excluding ongoing estate management." In a recent case it had become unclear as to whether a particular site in the District should fall within the Leader's Portfolio as a "major" transaction or should be dealt with by the Housing Portfolio.

The Leader of the Council added that this definition excluded all Housing Revenue Account projects that did not involve property transactions, but there was a new requirement for the Leader of the Council to be consulted by Portfolio Holders about any other property transaction that fell below the £1 million valuation threshold. In addition, any proposals that did not involve property transactions but might still have significant financial implications for the Council were also subject to the same requirements as property transactions. As these changes involved amending the Constitution, they would have to be ratified by the Council.

**RESOLVED:**

(1) That, the responsibilities contained within the Leader's Portfolio concerning "major property/development proposals affecting the Council's property portfolio (where necessary in consultation with the Housing Portfolio Holder) but excluding ongoing estate management" be clarified so as to

define "major property/development proposals" as those of a value of £1 million or more (excluding any contract relating to HRA schemes of whatever amount) which does not involve the purchase or disposal of land be approved by Council.

(2) That, in respect of proposals valued below the limit of £1 million which affect the Council's property portfolio, the definition be extended to require the relevant Portfolio Holder to consult with the Leader of the Council as to whether the Leader wishes to be involved or take responsibility for dealing with the matter be approved by Council.

(3) That, in respect of development or similar proposals which do not affect the Council's property portfolio directly but may have significant financial implications for the Council, the same definitions set out in resolutions (1) and (2) above apply, be approved for Council.

(4) That, these changes to Portfolio Definitions be recommended to the Council for approval and be included in the Council's Constitution.

#### **Reasons for Decision:**

There had been uncertainty recently as to the direct responsibilities of the Leader of the Council with regards to Land and Development Transactions. This decision would ensure clarification for the Leader of the Council and other Portfolio Holders.

#### **Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

There was no alternative to the proper definition of the Leader's responsibilities. There was another criterion for defining major proposals for development, namely property area, but this was not thought to be as effective.

### **71. BOBINGWORTH TIP REMEDIATION PROJECT**

The Environmental Protection Portfolio Holder presented a report concerning the remediation project at Bobbingworth Tip. The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that it had authorised the remediation scheme to proceed at its meeting in April 2006, with an envisaged start date of 1 June 2006. However, the start of the project had been delayed due to the need to complete a Section 278 Agreement with the Highways Authority (Essex County Council). The cost of repairs had been estimated at £200,000 and following negotiations, the Council was requested to pay a maximum of £65,000 towards the cost of any repairs. This was now felt to be acceptable, as it would avoid any further delay in the implementation of the project with a resultant increase in costs.

The Portfolio Holder stated that the delay had impacted upon the cost of the project. The original, agreed target price had anticipated the project to have begun by August 2006 at the latest, however, as the infrastructure and heavy engineering works had been rescheduled for the spring and summer of 2007, it was expected that the cost of the project would rise. A sum of £225,560 had been allocated for the project's contingency of which only £32,278 remained available. Based upon the industry standard of 10% contingency, it was recommended that the project have a contingency of £115,000. With an estimated underspend of £32,728 for the project, it had been recommended that an additional sum of £82,000 be made available from the general capital contingency fund to enable the scheme to proceed. It was also important to control the future use of the site following the completion of the

remediation project, and it was proposed that by laws be made to enable these controls to be enforced.

The Portfolio Holder reported that Ongar Town Council had expressed grave concern regarding the proposed traffic management scheme, especially in relation to safety issues in Moreton Road, but the Highways Authority (Essex County Council) would not consider alternative routes. The Portfolio Holder also expressed concerns over safety issues in Moreton Road, and would endeavour to minimise any risks to residents. The Portfolio Holder furthermore explained that the public meeting had been held to inform residents of the final arrangements for the project. The Cabinet were reminded that the £65,000 agreed for the Section 278 Agreement with the Highways Authority would not be required until the project had been completed.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the present status of the Bobbingworth Tip project, and the need to commence work urgently, be noted;
- (2) That the completion of the Section 278 agreement with Essex County Council be authorised;
- (3) That such an agreement could incur a future maximum financial cost to the Council in the sum of £65,000 be noted;
- (4) That, if required, such a sum be charged to the Council's General Capital Contingency budget within the Capital Programme;
- (5) That, in order to allow for cost escalation due to the delay in implementing the scheme, £82,000 of the General Capital Contingency budget be allocated to the project contingency budget; and
- (6) That byelaws be made to control the use of the site following remediation.

**Reasons for Decision:**

If the Section 278 agreement was signed in the near future then works to the site entrances could be carried out over the winter, with the drainage and infrastructure works completed next year. As well as providing an open space for the use of local residents and visitors, the scheme would deal with the pollution from the site to the adjoining watercourse and neighbouring private land. The additional contingency would bring the project into line with industry standards for a scheme of this nature, enable the timely implementation of the project and minimise further financial risk to the Council due to any delay in requesting supplementary financial approvals. The imposition of by laws would enable the use of the site to be controlled when the project was completed.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To approve no additional contingency beyond the £32,728 currently budgeted. However, this could lead to delays in the project if any additional funds were required.

To abandon the scheme, but the Council would be liable to legal action by the Environment Agency in respect of the pollution, and/or Thames Water in respect of exceeding discharge limits to their sewerage works.



To not control the use of the site after the project's completion, which would not protect facilities such as the reed beds.

## 72. CAPITAL STRATEGY 2006 - 2011

The Finance, Performance Management and Corporate Support Services Portfolio Holder presented a report regarding the capital strategy for the period 2006-2011. The Portfolio Holder reported that annual updates of the capital strategy enabled the Council to make sound strategic decisions and formed an important part of the Council's performance management and financial planning frameworks. The strategy had been updated, following the approval of the capital programme by the Cabinet at its last meeting on 4 September 2006. Since then, the estimated final cost of phase two of the Loughton High Road Town Centre Enhancement Scheme had risen to £1,640,000, which represented an increase of £225,000. Additional capital estimates in the sum of £35,000 for a replacement platemaker and £143,000 for maintenance works to the Civic Offices in 2007/08 had also been included, but the Cabinet agreed that these two items should be removed due to the continuing uncertainty over the potential cost of the waste management contract.

The future budgetary provision for the Town Centre Enhancement Project in Loughton High Road was considered. A further two phases had been planned in order to complete the project, but no provision had been made in the capital programme for phases III and IV. It was felt that this item should be reviewed when additional capital funding had been identified, particularly from the disposal of landholdings. It was also brought to the Cabinet's attention that a number of trees had been removed during phase II of the project, and it was agreed that the Design Guide for phases III and IV should be reviewed in order to ensure there were no further loss of trees from the area. The Customer Services Transformation Programme was also considered but this was deferred until further capital funding had become available.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted the Council's Key Capital Priorities as originally approved in November 2005, which the Cabinet were content to reaffirm. In April 2006, the Cabinet had agreed to increase the contributions for the provision of affordable housing within the District by a further £500,000 to be funded by savings elsewhere within the Capital Programme. However, the requisite savings had not been identified within the Capital Programme and the Cabinet agreed that this item should be excluded from the strategy.

### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the draft Capital Strategy 2006-2011 be agreed, subject to the following amendments:
  - (a) That the additional provision in the sum of £35,000 for 2007/08 for a replacement platemaker for the Reprographics section be removed;
  - (b) That the additional provision in the sum of £143,000 for 2007/08 to 2010/11 for works to be carried out at the Civic Offices be removed;
  - (c) That in respect of the Loughton High Road Town Centre Enhancement Scheme:
    - (i) the future funding of phases III and IV be reviewed when additional capital funding is identified, particularly from the disposal of landholdings; and

- (ii) the Design Guide be reviewed in order to ensure no further loss of trees from the area; and
- (d) That the Customer Services Transformation Programme be deferred until further capital funding is available;
- (2) That the ranking of the Council's Key Capital Priorities be confirmed;
- (3) That, although originally approved by the Cabinet in April 2006, the exclusion of the additional £500,000 contribution to Affordable Housing be confirmed; and
- (4) That the draft Capital Strategy 2006-2011 be recommended to the Council for approval.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The draft strategy was based upon the Council's current approved capital programme and had taken account of the latest guidance on capital accounting arrangements for local government.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To amend the capital strategy as presented and recommend a revised strategy to the Council for approval.

**73. BROADWAY TOWN CENTRE ENHANCEMENT SCHEME - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio Holder presented a report regarding traffic regulation orders for the Broadway Town Centre Enhancement Scheme. The Portfolio Holder stated that the approved Design Guide for The Broadway Town Centre Enhancement Scheme included the following proposals for parking and traffic management:

- The Broadway to be one-way along its length in a north easterly direction;
- Vere Road to be one-way along its length in a north easterly direction;
- Burton Road to be one-way along its length in a south westerly direction;
- On-street pay and display echelon parking in the Broadway;
- Off-street pay and display parking in the Burton Road car park;
- Off-street permit parking in the smaller Burton Road and Vere Road car parks; and
- The Service Road adjacent to Burton Road car park to be for business parking and loading only.

The parking associated with the London Underground station was not free, and this had had an adverse effect on the parking available, and subsequently the trading, in The Broadway. The parking proposals would operate between 9.30am and 5.30pm, Monday to Saturday inclusive, as this would enable residents to park their cars during the unrestricted periods overnight and on Sundays. Consideration was also being given to Free Saturday Car Parking within the District, and the proposed Burton Road combined car park could be included within these proposals.

The Portfolio Holder added that the parking tariffs would be similar to those in operation in other parts of the District. However it was accepted that these proposals would result in significant changes for local residents and traders, who currently enjoyed free parking. Thus, it was proposed that the first business permit for each trading unit would be offered at a reduced price of £104 per annum in order to

support trading in the area. In addition, it was proposed to limit the maximum number of permits per resident to three. As the Housing Revenue Account owned The Broadway and associated car parks, it would not be possible to credit the General Fund with any income generated by the proposals. It would be prohibitively expensive and time-consuming to transfer the land to the General Fund, thus it had been proposed to implement a management arrangement whereby the General Fund would manage the car parks on behalf of the Housing Revenue Account and receive an appropriate recompense for doing so. The associated traffic regulation orders for the scheme would need to be prepared and submitted.

The Head of Environmental Services advised the Cabinet that there had already been consultation with Essex County Council as the Highways Authority in respect of the traffic regulation orders. However, there would still have to be a formal legal notice period to allow all parties in The Broadway to comment upon the proposals. It was expected that the proposals would result in some displacement of cars from The Broadway to adjoining local streets, but current resources prevented an immediate parking review of the vicinity, however it was agreed that this would be reviewed in due course.

**RESOLVED:**

(1) That the following traffic management arrangements for the Broadway Town Centre Enhancement be agreed, and the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders be prepared for submission:

(a) The Broadway becoming one-way along its length in a north easterly direction;

(b) Vere Road becoming one-way along its length in a north easterly direction; and

(c) Burton Road becoming one-way along its length in a south westerly direction;

(2) That the following parking management regime for The Broadway Town Centre Enhancement be agreed and the associated Traffic Regulation Orders be prepared for submission:

(a) On-street pay-and-display echelon parking in The Broadway be restricted to two hours with no return within three hours between the hours of 9.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive;

(b) Off-street pay-and-display parking in the Burton Road car park be designated a combined (short and long-stay) car park between the hours of 9.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive;

(c) Off-street permit parking in the smaller Burton Road and Vere Road car parks be restricted to resident (and visitors) and business users only, between the hours of 9.30am and 5.30pm; and

(d) The Service Road adjacent to the Burton Road car park be for business permit users only, plus loading and unloading, between the hours of 9.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Saturday inclusive;

(3) That the following tariff structure for the on and off-street parking regimes be agreed:

- (a) Residents and visitor parking permits and business permits be the same as in operation throughout the whole District, with the exception of a reduced price of £104 per annum for the first business permit;
- (b) the maximum number of permits per resident be limited to three; and
- (c) the associated Traffic Regulation Orders be prepared for submission;
- (4) That the management of The Broadway car parking arrangements by Environmental Services on behalf of Housing Services (the Housing Revenue Account) be agreed and a further report on the associated financial arrangements be submitted; and
- (5) That the displacement of parked cars from The Broadway to local roads in the vicinity be reviewed in due course.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The proposals for parking controls were based upon regimes and tariffs in place in other town centres within the District and were designed to be effective. The situation regarding the Housing Revenue Account at The Broadway was unique and the management of the parking schemes by Environmental Services, on behalf of Housing Services, was preferred to the appropriation of the land by the General Fund from the Housing Revenue Account. It was accepted that there could be a knock-on effect of the proposals on residential streets in the vicinity of The Broadway.

**Other Options Considered And Rejected:**

As The Broadway had benefited from free parking for a considerable period of time, it was considered likely that any new scheme that introduced an element of charging could be of concern to local residents and businesses. No specific alternatives were considered as the scheme and tariffs reflected these in operation elsewhere in the District.

To appropriate the land from the Housing Revenue Account to the General Fund, in order to facilitate the management of the parking scheme, however this would involve a lengthy, complex and expensive process.

**74. CHANGE OF DESIGNATION - DARBY DRIVE CAR PARK, WALTHAM ABBEY**

The Civil Engineering and Maintenance Portfolio Holder presented a report about changing the designation of the Darby Drive Car Park in Waltham Abbey. The Cabinet were informed that since a Tesco supermarket opened in Waltham Abbey, with free car parking, the use of the Darby Drive short-stay car park had declined to approximately 25% of its capacity. It was felt that if the designation of the Darby Drive car park was changed from short-stay to combined long/short-stay then it would ease the pressure on Cornmill car park, provide long-stay parking to the east of Waltham Abbey directly behind the shops and businesses, and might attract users of the Tesco and Lee Valley Park car parks back to the centre of Waltham Abbey.

The Portfolio Holder reported that the Waltham Abbey Town Centre Partnership had been consulted and were in favour of the proposed change. It was also felt that the change in designation might also reduce on-street parking in the area. The Head of Environmental Services advised the Cabinet that Essex County Council would be urged to proceed with the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders as soon as possible.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the designation of Darby Drive car park at Waltham Abbey be changed from short-stay to combined long/short-stay; and
- (2) That the Traffic Regulation Order be amended accordingly.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The change should provide a better balance of parking in Waltham Abbey and provide long-stay parking for the use of employers and employees at the cheaper long stay or season rates. It might also encourage some long stay users, currently occupying the privately owned free car parks associated with Tesco and the Lee Valley Park, to park in the Town Centre due to its greater convenience.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To retain the current tariff structure, but use of the car park would continue to fall well below capacity with consequent financial effects to the Council and the economy of the Town Centre.

**75. RODING YOUTH CENTRE - 50 LOUGHTON WAY, BUCKHURST HILL**

The Finance, Performance Management and Corporate Support Services Portfolio Holder presented a report to the Cabinet concerning Buckhurst Hill Parish Council's application to purchase Roding Youth Centre. The Cabinet were informed that Essex County Council had been attempting to conclude the sale of the Roding Youth Centre to Buckhurst Hill Parish Council. An ultimatum had been issued to the Parish Council to complete the purchase otherwise the property would be offered for sale at auction on 31 October 2006. The Youth Centre had been offered to the District Council in the event that the sale to Buckhurst Hill Parish Council did not proceed at an indicative price of £300,000. Heads of Service had been made aware of the availability of these premises, but no operational requirements had been identified for the premises and it had been proposed that the Council should support Buckhurst Hill Parish Council's application to purchase the premises.

The Cabinet were informed that Buckhurst Hill Parish Council had signed the contract and had put a deposit down, but were awaiting a response from Roding Rifle and Pistol Club, who occupied the rifle range in the Centre. The Club's occupancy was currently undocumented, but it had been understood that the rifle club were willing to enter into a 15 year lease prior to the sale on previously agreed terms.

**RESOLVED:**

That Essex County Council Property Services be advised:

- (1) That the purchase by Buckhurst Hill Parish Council of Roding Youth Centre be supported by the Council.
- (2) That the District Council had no operational requirement for Roding Youth Centre and declined the opportunity to purchase in the event that Buckhurst Hill Parish Council did not proceed to complete the transaction.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The Council had no operational requirement for the premises and therefore declined the opportunity to purchase. As a consequence, the Council supported the application by Buckhurst Hill Parish Council to purchase the premises.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To register an interest in purchasing the premises, but no operational requirements for the premises had been identified.

**76. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

**RESOLVED:**

That the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on the grounds that they would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972:

<u>Agenda Item No</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Exempt Information Paragraph Number</u>
19	Waste Management Contract – Financial Position and Procurement	3

**77. WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT - FINANCIAL POSITION & PROCUREMENT**

The Customer Services, Media, Communications and ICT Portfolio Holder presented a report concerning the financial position and procurement options available in respect of the waste management contract. Following the award of the waste management contract to South Herts Waste Management Limited in 2002, the company went into administration in April 2006 and the contract was novated to Cory Environmental Limited in May 2006. There was an underspend of £136,000 on DDF items in 2005/06 relating to the service provided by South Herts Waste Management Limited, and it had already been agreed to carry this funding forward to 2006/07. As these monies were no longer required for their original purpose, it was proposed to vire and add them to the £300,000 previously agreed for the procurement process in respect of a new contract. In addition, it had been estimated that the Trade Waste service would produce a surplus of £25,000, which could also be allocated to the procurement budget.

The Portfolio Holder stated that membership of the Essex Procurement Hub would reduce the cost of the procurement process as the Council would have access to expert legal and financial advice. The initial commitment to join the Hub would be for three years, with a subscription of £36,000 in the first year. It was expected that membership of the Hub would break even and then be self-financing after three years. The Cabinet were reassured that even if it was decided to bring the waste management service in-house, then the Hub could still assist with fleet procurement and service provision. Thus, it was proposed that membership of the Hub should be sought.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the financial position regarding the Waste Management Contract and the use of supplementary estimates previously approved be noted;

- (2) That the unspent DDF monies carried forward to 2006/07, plus any surplus on the Trade Waste account, is vired and added to the £300,000 previously approved by the Council on 24 April 2006 in order to support the change in service provider be recommended to the Council for approval;
- (3) That membership of the Essex Procurement Hub be agreed;
- (4) That part of the additional funding agreed in resolution (2) be used to fund the subscription payments for the Essex Procurement Hub; and
- (5) That, in order to enable the Council to join the Essex Procurement Hub, the relevant Contract Standing Orders be set aside.

**Reasons For Decision:**

The costs of terminating the contract with South Herts Waste Management and procuring a new contract had exceeded the allocated funding. The virement of DDF and Trade Waste surplus monies to increase the funding available would better facilitate the process of procuring a new contract than repeated requests for supplementary finance. The Essex Procurement Hub would provide the necessary expert support required for the procurement process, very economically, and would also be able to assist with other ongoing procurement issues.

**Other Options Considered And Rejected:**

To present frequent requests for supplementary finance throughout the procurement process, however this would simply delay the process.

To appoint external expert legal and consultancy resources to assist with the procurement process, however this would cost considerably more than membership of the Essex Procurement Hub.

**CHAIRMAN**