

# EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL CABINET MINUTES

**Committee:** Cabinet

**Date:** 7 June 2010

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

**Time:** 7.40 - 10.20 pm

**Members Present:** Mrs D Collins (Chairman), C Whitbread (Vice-Chairman), R Bassett, B Rolfe, Mrs M Sartin, Mrs P Smith, D Stellan, Ms S Stavrou and Mrs L Wagland

**Other**

**Councillors:** K Angold-Stephens, Mrs P Brooks, P Gode, D Jacobs, J Knapman, S Murray, Mrs J H Whitehouse, J M Whitehouse, Mrs E Webster, W Breare-Hall, Mrs S Jones, Mrs R Brookes, L Leonard, Ms J Hart and B Judd

**Apologies:** -

**Officers Present:** P Haywood (Chief Executive), I Willett (Assistant to the Chief Executive), A Hall (Director of Housing), C O'Boyle (Director of Corporate Support Services), R Palmer (Director of Finance and ICT), J Chandler (Assistant Director (Community Services and Customer Relations)), K Durrani (Assistant Director Technical (Environment and Street Scene)), P Maddock (Assistant Director (Accountancy)), M Tipping (Assistant Director (Facilities Management & Emergency Planning)), T Carne (Public Relations and Marketing Officer), S Devine (Environmental Health Officer), S G Hill (Senior Democratic Services Officer), I White (Forward Planning Manager) and G J Woodhall (Democratic Services Officer)

## 1. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman made a short address to remind all present that the meeting would be broadcast on the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor J M Whitehouse declared a personal interest in agenda item 8c, Parking Review Funding Allocation, by virtue of being a resident of Epping. The Councillor had determined that his interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue.

(b) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor Mrs P Brooks declared a personal interest in agenda item 11, Adoption of Standard Caravan Site Licence Conditions for Permanent Residential Sites, by virtue of being a resident of a park. The Councillor had determined that her interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue to represent the residents of her ward.

(c) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor Mrs E Webster declared a personal interest in agenda item 11, Adoption of Standard Caravan Site Licence Conditions for Permanent Residential Sites, by virtue of her Sister being a park owner. The Councillor had determined that her interest was not

prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue to represent the residents of her ward.

(d) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor P Gode declared a personal interest in agenda item 14, Community Governance Review – Ongar Town Council & the Greensted Ward, by virtue of being an Ongar Town Councillor. The Councillor had determined that his interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue.

(e) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor B Judd declared a personal interest in agenda item 14, Community Governance Review – Ongar Town Council & the Greensted Ward, by virtue of being an Ongar Town Councillor. The Councillor had determined that his interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue.

(f) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Officer Conduct, I Willett declared a personal interest in agenda item 8c, Parking Review Funding Allocation, by virtue of being a resident of Epping, but determined that his interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue.

### **3. MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 April 2010 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **4. REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

#### **(a) Leader**

The Leader reported upon recent correspondence with the new Government Minister for Communities & Local Government. Decisions upon housing supply, including provision for Gypsies & Travellers, would reside with local authorities in future rather than on a regional basis; the Council had responded by requesting that the Gypsy & Traveller Direction be removed. It had also been announced that Councils would be required to publish all items of expenditure in excess of £500 on their website.

### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There had been no questions received from members of the public for the Cabinet to consider.

### **6. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee presented a report of its meeting held on 1 June 2010, when the Committee:

(i) received a presentation from London Underground regarding their plans for the stations within the District, including the opening times of ticket offices, and the planning being undertaken for the forthcoming Olympic Games;

(ii) revised the Terms of Reference for the Safer Cleaner Greener Scrutiny Panel;

- (iii) authorised the Constitution & Member Services Scrutiny Panel to report directly to the Council on the amended petitioning scheme to include the new provisions for the e-petition scheme;
- (iv) agreed the response to a Defra consultation on landfill from the Safer Cleaner Greener Scrutiny Panel;
- (v) considered the Scrutiny Work Programme and added three new items regarding the procedures for appointments to various committees and bodies, the procedure for the appointment of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and the possible appointment of Assistant Portfolio Holders; and
- (vi) appointed Members, Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen to all the Scrutiny Panels for the year.

## 7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

In accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs (6) and (24) of the Council Procedure Rules, the Leader of the Council had permitted the following items of urgent business to be considered following the publication of the agenda:

- (i) Local Land Charges – Access to Environmental Information;
- (ii) Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee – 27 May 2010;
- (iii) North Weald Airfield & Asset Management Cabinet Committee – 17 May 2010; and
- (iv) Parking Review Funding Allocation.

## 8. FINANCE & PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 18 MAY 2010

The Portfolio Holder for Finance & Economic Development presented the minutes from the meeting of the Finance & Performance Management Cabinet Committee held on 18 May 2010. Recommendations had been made regarding the replacement of the Housing Revenue Account Subsidy System.

The Director of Finance & ICT added that the placing of the non-housing assets within the Housing Revenue Account had been an historical accident and Officers were currently investigating the process required to transfer these assets to the General Fund. The Housing Revenue Account would be compensated for the loss of these assets but initial forecasts indicated that the Housing Revenue Account would still be viable and that the proposed transfer would not impact upon rents.

### **Decision:**

#### Replacement of Housing Revenue Account Subsidy System

- (1) That the report provided by ConsultCIH on the implications of the proposed reforms of the Housing Revenue Account Subsidy System upon the Council be noted;
- (2) That the views of the Council's Tenants & Leaseholders Federation on the Government's proposed reforms be noted;

(3) That the proposed offer from the Department of Communities & Local Government on the reform of the Housing Subsidy System be rejected;

(4) That the Council's draft response to the Government consultation (attached at Appendix 2 of the Cabinet Committee's report) be approved; and

(5) That the submission of a further report to a future meeting of the Cabinet on the possible transfer of non-housing assets currently held within the Housing Revenue Account to the General Fund be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all the relevant issues in relation to the recommendations and that these should be endorsed.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had considered all the relevant options in formulating their recommendations. The Cabinet did not consider that there were any further options.

**9. LOCAL LAND CHARGES - ACCESS TO ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION**

The Portfolio Holder for Legal & Estates presented a report on access to environmental information for Local Land Charges.

The Portfolio Holder stated that the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) had published guidance whereupon, in its opinion, the majority of the information provided by local authorities in response to property search enquiries was likely to be environmental information and charges should only be levied in accordance with the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). Legal advice had been sought by the Local Government Association (LGA) as to the correctness of this opinion as this would have an impact upon the fees Councils could charge. The risk to this Council was that a possible £113,000 of received income would have to be refunded for searches already undertaken.

**Decision:**

That the Information Commissioner's guidance on charging for access to environmental information be noted and updates be requested upon the receipt of further legal advice regarding the potential impact of the Environmental Information Regulations.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The advice of the LGA would impact upon the income of the Council.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

There are no other options for consideration.

**10. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET COMMITTEE - 27 MAY 2010**

The Leader of the Council presented the minutes from the meeting of the Local

Development Framework Cabinet Committee held on 27 May 2010. The issues considered by the Cabinet Committee had included: the Landscape Character Assessment; and the draft Methodology for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

**Decision:**

That the minutes of the Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee held on 27 May 2010 be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all the relevant issues in relation to the recommendations and that these should be endorsed.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had considered all the relevant options in formulating their recommendations. The Cabinet did not consider that there were any further options.

**11. NORTH WEALD AIRFIELD & ASSET MANAGEMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 17 MAY 2010**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance & Economic Development presented the minutes from the meeting of the North Weald Airfield Strategy & Asset Management Cabinet Committee held on 17 May 2010. Recommendations had been made regarding the: use of land Adjacent to Merlin Way, North Weald for a Waste Depot or Transfer Station; use of part of the Airfield as a 'Park & Ride' facility for the Olympic White Water Centre; and an update on the Aviation Intensification Study. Other issues considered by the Cabinet Committee included: the Northern Showground on the Airfield; and the notes of the Asset Management Group from the meeting held on 20 April 2010.

With respect to using part of the Airfield as a 'Park & Ride' facility for the Olympic White Water Centre, the Housing Portfolio Holder felt that the Cabinet Committee had also agreed in principle for North Weald Bassett Parish Council to benefit from a share of any potential income to the Council. The Cabinet concurred and this was added to the recommendation.

**Decision:**

Use of Land Adjacent to Merlin Way, North Weald for Waste Depot/Transfer Station

(1) That the relocation of the Council's waste contractor's depot on a temporary basis be supported until the end of their contract period onto the land identified and Officers be instructed to undertake any additional work necessary to facilitate the move; and

(2) That the continued interest of Essex County Council in securing a stake in the land adjoining North Weald Airfield at Merlin Way, North Weald for a waste transfer station be noted, but whilst undertaking the Aviation Intensification Study the Council could not provide a written commitment on land availability by 31 August 2010;

Use of Part of Airfield as 'Park & Ride' for Olympic White Water Centre

- (3) That the Caravan Club's withdrawal of its proposal to use part of the North Weald Airfield as a camping site for the duration of the 2012 Olympics be noted; and
- (4) That, in principle, the Olympic Development Agency's request for the use of the North Weald Airfield as a park-and-ride facility for the white water centre be considered, subject to:
- (a) terms and conditions;
- (b) a negotiated income share for the Council in the event that the Local Organising Committee for the Olympic Games charged spectators for parking; and
- (c) an agreement in principle for North Weald Bassett Parish Council to benefit from a share of any potential income to the Council; and

Aviation Intensification Study Update

- (5) That the level of interest in the undertaking of the Aviation Intensification Study for North Weald Airfield be noted;
- (6) That the results of the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire be noted, with eight bidders proceeding to the Invitation to Tender stage;
- (7) That, following consideration of the assessment scoring for the Experience and Method Statement, the five highest scoring applicants be invited for interviews;
- (8) That a Thursday be the preferred day for interviews; and
- (9) That the Members of the North Weald Airfield & Asset Management Cabinet Committee be included on the interview panel, and if the North Weald Bassett Ward Member of the Committee was unable to attend the interviews then the remaining North Weald Bassett Ward Member be co-opted onto the interview panel with voting rights.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all the relevant issues in relation to the recommendations and that these should be endorsed.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had considered all the relevant options in formulating their recommendations. The Cabinet did not consider that there were any further options.

**12. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - ONGAR TOWN COUNCIL/ GREENSTED WARD**

The Leader of the Council requested the Returning Officer to present reports upon the proposed Community Governance Reviews involving Moreton, Bobbingworth and The Lavers Parish Council, the Greensted Ward of Ongar Town Council and Stanford Rivers Parish Council.

The Returning Officer stated that a request had been received from Moreton, Bobbingworth and The Lavers (MBL) Parish Council for a review of its parish electoral wards, via a Community Governance Review conducted under Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Parish Council was seeking to combine three parish electoral wards (High Laver, Little Laver and Magdalen Laver) to form a new single parish ward, on the grounds of reducing election costs and maintaining community identity. The new ward would be known as "The Lavers". The Cabinet was reminded that it had previously queried the number of Parish Councillors proposed and had requested a contribution to the costs of performing the Review, particularly the consultation. The Cabinet was requested to consider how the review should be conducted at Member level and whether the boundary issue between the Greensted ward and MBL Parish Council should be included in the review.

The Parish Clerk from MBL Parish Council stated that the Parish Council covered a large area, even if the population density was relatively low. Merging the wards as proposed would save on election costs for the Parish Council. It was added that no MBL Parish Councillor had ever claimed any expenses, so reducing the number of Parish Councillors as part of the review would not produce any cost savings. The costs of the consultation could be reduced substantially; the local Church-based magazine could be used at no extra cost, and the Parish Councillors would deliver the consultation forms individually to residents. In relation to the review of the boundary between the Parish Council and the Greensted ward, the Parish Clerk felt that the residents involved should decide and that no objection would be raised by the Parish Council.

The Returning Officer stated that the usual statutory requirement to publish a public notice in a local newspaper might not have been stipulated in the regulations, and therefore the consultation could proceed as indicated by the Parish Clerk. There were only five households affected by the potential boundary change and no resident in that area had ever requested a review. The Cabinet decided to recommend to the Council that a Community Governance Review should be undertaken over the proposed amalgamation of the three parish wards, with the existing representation being retained, but that the boundary issue involving Greensted ward should not be included, with a new committee set up to progress the Review.

The Returning Officer then reported upon a request that had been received for a Community Governance Review for the Parish Ward of Greensted in Ongar Town Parish from local residents for the boundary between Ongar Town and Stanford Rivers Parish Council to be amended so that the Parish Ward was transferred to Stanford Rivers. The Cabinet was reminded that if the transfer went ahead then it would also necessitate a change in the District ward boundary, which would have to be referred to the Boundary Committee for England and would be an expensive process.

The Cabinet received representations from the residents and Ongar Town Council. The residents' representative stated that the review involved more than 60 households, of which a number were in favour of the review, and who felt that Stanford Rivers Parish Council was more closely connected in character to the ward than Ongar Town Council. The representative from Ongar Town Council stated that no concerns had been raised by residents within the affected ward with either the Town Council or Councillors. It was felt that the request was motivated by the perceived disquiet of one resident, as well as the refusal to impose weight restrictions and speed limits in the area by the County Council, following advice from the Police; the Town Council was still campaigning on behalf of the ward for these measures to be implemented. The Town Council had experience of representing other rural

wards, and it was felt that the proposed review would be costly with little or no benefit to residents at the end of it.

Two District Ward members for Ongar who were both on the Town Council spoke out against the Review, whilst a third felt that the review should at least proceed to the consultation stage. The Cabinet felt that the Review should not proceed and resolved to recommend to the Council accordingly.

**Decision:**

Moreton, Bobbingworth and The Lavers Parish Council

(1) That, with the appropriate public notice of the opening of the review and initial consultation period, the undertaking of a Community Governance Review of Moreton, Bobbingworth and The Lavers Parish Council be recommended to the Council for approval over the proposed amalgamation of the following three parish wards:

- (a) High Laver;
- (b) Little Laver; and
- (c) Magdalen Laver;

(2) That the Parish Council representation on the proposed amalgamated ward remain the same as the total of the three individual wards, be recommended to the Council for approval;

(3) That the exclusion of the boundary issue between Greensted ward and Moreton, Bobbingworth & The Lavers Parish Council from the proposed Community Governance Review be recommended to the Council for approval; and

(4) That progress of the proposed review by means of a new Committee, with membership and terms of reference to be presented by the Returning Officer, be recommended to the Council for approval; and

Ongar Town Council and Greensted Ward

(5) That the rejection of a proposal to conduct a Community Governance Review in respect of the transfer of the Greensted ward from Ongar Town Council to Stanford Rivers Parish Council be recommended to the Council for approval.

**Reasons for Decision:**

To respond to the requests for Community Governance Reviews as directed by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

Following receipt of a request for a Community Governance Review, there was no other option but to respond.

**13. PARKING REVIEW FUNDING ALLOCATION**

The Portfolio Holder for Operational Planning & Transport presented a report upon the funding allocation for the three Parking Reviews currently scheduled.

The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that the Council had implemented a number of Parking Reviews when it had previously held an agency agreement with Essex County Council (ECC), as the Highways Authority. However, when the agency agreement ended in 2006, the powers to undertake such work reverted back to the County Council. The Council was currently committed to undertaking Parking Reviews in Epping, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton Broadway to address parking difficulties. The Reviews were currently at various stages with Epping being the most advanced, followed by Buckhurst Hill and then Loughton.

The Portfolio Holder added that a key issue was the large cost of undertaking these Reviews as the existing budget allocation was not enough to complete all three schemes, based upon the figures provided by the County Council. The current budget allocation for all three Reviews was £672,000, which represented a shortfall of £128,000 when other costs and a further delay of six weeks - due to one notice being placed in the wrong local newspaper by County Council Officers - were taken into account.

The Portfolio Holder voiced her concerns over the projected costs of the Reviews and the time being taken to complete them, before outlining a number of options for the Cabinet to consider:

- (i) abandon all three scheduled schemes and re-allocate the funding to explore opportunities for providing more car parking facilities in the three towns including the possible use of future Section 106 monies; however, this would require £215,000 being charged to the District Development Fund (DDF) to cover the costs incurred to date;
- (ii) implement the Epping and Buckhurst Hill schemes at an estimated cost of £456,000 and examine other alternatives for the Loughton Broadway scheme; or
- (iii) to seek supplementary finance in the sum of £128,000 to enable the completion of all three schemes.

There was much discontent expressed about the approach of the County Council to the Reviews, in particular that no detailed and updated schedule of costs had been provided by the County Council or that there was any willingness for the Highways Authority to share the costs. It was felt that abandonment of the schemes was not a viable option. Parking was a major issue which affected the quality of life for many residents in Epping, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton Broadway, especially those living in the vicinity of a London Underground station. It was also felt that the schemes for Epping and Buckhurst Hill had probably progressed too far to be abandoned at this stage anyway. Comment was also passed about the cost of placing public notices in local newspapers, and whether there were any alternative methods available for advertising statutory notices, which would be more cost-effective for the Council. Some Members were also unhappy that the report had been tabled at the meeting and not published with the agenda, as this issue could have attracted substantial public interest.

The Cabinet felt that the County Council Portfolio Holder for Highways & Transportation should be invited to a Cabinet meeting to answer questions about the approach taken by Highways Officers over the three Parking Reviews currently scheduled. The Portfolio Holder for Performance Management reminded the meeting that an invitation had been made to the County Portfolio Holder to attend the next scheduled meeting of the Local Highways Panel on 22 June 2010, along with a senior Highways Officer. The Cabinet agreed to defer further consideration of this issue until after that meeting when Members would have an opportunity to seek

answers from the Portfolio Holder. In the meantime, it was also agreed that no further work should be undertaken on the Reviews until further notice to prevent the Council incurring further costs.

**Decision:**

(1) That consideration of the funding allocation for the Parking Reviews currently being undertaken within the District be deferred until after the next scheduled meeting of the Local Highways Panel whereupon questions be asked of the Essex County Council Portfolio Holder for Highways & Transportation and Senior Highways Officers regarding their cost to date;

(2) That, in respect of the Parking Reviews, Highways Officers be informed no further analysis of the consultation responses received to date be undertaken until further notice to avoid the further incurrence of unnecessary costs for the Council.

**Reasons for Decision:**

There was insufficient budget provision to complete all three ongoing Parking Reviews based upon the figures provided by the County Council. It was felt that further work on the Parking Reviews should be suspended until Members had been given an opportunity to question the relevant County Council Portfolio Holder at the next scheduled meeting of the Local Highways Panel.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To abandon all three Parking Reviews.

To seek further supplementary finance to complete all three Reviews.

To only complete two of the three scheduled schemes using the available funding.

**14. ADOPTION OF STANDARD CARAVAN SITE LICENCE CONDITIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENTIAL SITES**

The Housing Portfolio Holder presented a report about the adoption of revised Standard Caravan Site Licence conditions for permanent residential sites.

The Portfolio Holder reported that it was a statutory requirement for local authorities to issue licences on all their mobile homes sites and to decide what conditions to attach. In 2008, the Government had produced new standards for permanent residential mobile homes sites, providing a framework upon which Councils could base the conditions they attached when re-licensing sites. The Council's current standard site licence conditions had not been revised for many years and it was now considered appropriate to set new conditions for the permanent, residential sites that were in line with these national 'model' standards, but also include minor variations to take account of local circumstances and historic agreements.

The Portfolio Holder added that following a consultation exercise, new Standard Caravan Site Licence conditions for residential sites within the District had been drafted and these were attached as an Appendix to the report. It was also announced that a petition had been received from the residents of Abridge Park regarding the proposed new conditions. The Cabinet was requested to agree these conditions so that they could be issued to all site owners of existing residential mobile home sites in the District.

Concern was expressed about the proposed new conditions, particularly in relation to fences, hedges and sheds. Some of the Parks within the District were 30 years old and many of the homes now had gardens with fences, hedges, trees and sheds. The residents felt very strongly that to reduce the height of fences and hedges to one metre, and to remove any sheds constructed of a combustible material was a very draconian measure.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his sympathy for the affected residents, and stated that all cases involving fences, hedges and sheds would be dealt with sympathetically, however the Council had received clear and unequivocal advice from Fire Officers that fences and hedges greater than one metre in height presented a far greater fire risk. It simply was not possible to allow existing fences and hedges to remain at a maximum height of two metres. The Portfolio Holder declared some extra conditions for enforcing the new regulations. All residents of residential caravan sites would be individually written to regarding the new licence conditions, and would be given a period of three years to reduce the height of their fences and six months to reduce the height of their hedges and trees, as well as removing any combustible sheds within the separation area. Members were reminded that financial assistance was available for residents to comply with the new conditions through the Council's Handyperson Scheme.

It was queried as to whether the consultation letters reached all the intended consultees, as only five responses had been received by the Council. The Director of Housing stated that a third party organisation had conducted the consultation on behalf of the Council, and had provided assurances that letters had been sent to all the individual sites and Residents Associations. The Portfolio Holder added that the new agreements would be between the Council and the site owners, and that the Council would be vigilant in ensuring that site owners complied with the new regulations. It was also the intention of Officers to extend the new licence conditions to both Gypsy & Traveller sites and Holiday Caravan sites in due course.

**Decision:**

(1) That, as attached at Appendix 2 of the report, the revised 'Standard Caravan Site Licence Conditions for Permanent Residential Sites in Epping Forest District Council' be adopted, subject to the following amendments:

(a) the deadline for removing combustible sheds and reducing the height of hedges/trees to no more than one metre within separation spaces be set at six months; and

(b) the deadline for reducing the height of fences to no more than one metre within separation spaces be set at three years;

(2) That all residents of permanent residential sites within the District be informed of the new conditions by letter;

(3) That financial assistance in the form of the Council's Handyperson Service and the Small Loans Scheme be made available to residents that qualify, to assist them in complying with conditions related to the removal or replacement of sheds, fences and hedges;

(4) That, following a second consultation exercise, site licence conditions based on these standard site licence conditions be also applied to Gypsy & Traveller sites which had planning permission as permanent residential caravan sites; and

(5) That, in due course, the intention to similarly licence holiday caravan sites in accordance with the relevant model standards be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The existing site licence conditions for caravan sites in Epping Forest District had not been reviewed for many years. New proposed standard caravan site licence conditions for permanent residential sites had been drafted to ensure conditions were relevant, consistent and would adequately protect the health and safety of people residing at, or visiting, sites within the District.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not set new licence conditions and allowing the remaining ones to remain in place, however the existing conditions were outdated and such an approach would compromise the health and safety of those living on or visiting mobile home sites.

To only impose the new conditions when a site was licensed with a new owner, however this would result in improvements only being made when sites changed ownership and would also lead to inconsistent standards across the District.

**15. INDIVIDUAL GRANTS SCHEME**

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Wellbeing presented a report on the cessation of the Individual Grants Scheme, and allocating a portion of its funding to enhance the Annual Bursary Award Scheme for Young People. As this report was considered after 10.00pm, it was voted upon without debate in accordance with the revised procedures for the operation of Cabinet meetings agreed by the Council.

**Decision:**

(1) That the cessation of the Individual Grant Scheme be approved and £6,000 of the budget for this scheme be re-allocated to extend and enhance the annual Bursary Award Scheme for Young People aged 13 – 25; and

(2) That, as a consequence of this arrangement, the achievement of a £4,000 revenue saving per annum be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The current maximum level of individual grant awarded per individual was not sufficient to make a real difference to the applicant, in terms of their potential development, and all applicants were required to equally match fund any grant awarded, which was a barrier to many individuals and families.

The proposed new Bursary Award Scheme would enable the Council to increase its publicity, particularly through increasing opportunities for award winners to be ambassadors and positive role models for young people at local events.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To continue with the current policy and procedures for Individual Grants.

To withdraw the funding available to local residents through Individual Grant Aid and Leisure Bursaries. However, in view of London 2012 Olympics and its associated

Cultural programme, this decision could prevent the development of an Olympian/ Paralympian, or outstanding artist from within the District.

**16. CONTRACT FOR NEW WINDOWS & IN-FILL CLADDING PANELS - CONDOR BUILDING, CIVIC OFFICES**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance Management presented a report concerning the contract for new windows and infill cladding panels in the Condor Building at the Civic Offices. As this report was considered after 10.00pm, it was voted upon without debate in accordance with the revised procedures for the operation of Cabinet meetings agreed by the Council.

**Decision:**

(1) That a contract be awarded to Hazelmere Commercial Windows in the sum of £201,422.60 for the replacement of windows and infill cladding panels in the Conder building at the Civic Offices;

(2) That a virement in the sum of £40,000 in the Capital Budget for Planned and Preventative Maintenance for 2010/11 be approved to provide the additional budget required for this project; and

(3) That the Chairman of Council be requested to waive the normal call in arrangements in view of the time critical nature of this project to enable an order to be placed as soon as possible and the project completed before the winter period.

**Reasons for Decision:**

To ensure that the project was adequately funded and completed during the current financial year before the onset of the winter period.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

Retender this project. However as there were only two companies included within the Essex Procurement Hub Framework agreement and they had both been involved with the current tender, any fresh tendering exercise would have to be outside the arrangements for the Procurement Hub. It would also effectively mean delaying the project until 2011/12.

**17. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET COMMITTEE - 12 APRIL 2010**

The Leader of the Council presented the minutes from the meeting of the Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee held on 12 April 2010. Recommendations had been made regarding the consultation arrangements for the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The methodology for the consideration of Core Strategies for the Evidence Base had also been examined by the Cabinet Committee. As this report was considered after 10.00pm, it was voted upon without debate in accordance with the revised procedures for the operation of Cabinet meetings agreed by the Council.

**Decision:**

**Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report – Consultation Arrangements**

(1) That the draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report be published for a five-week period of public consultation between 17 May and 18 June 2010;

- (2) That an Executive Summary of the Scoping Report be produced and published on the Council's website;
- (3) That a set of Guidance Questions to assist with the completion of the consultation by stakeholders and the public be produced and published; and
- (4) That the contents of the Executive Summary and Guidance Questions be confirmed informally by Members of the Cabinet Committee prior to publication.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all the relevant issues in relation to the recommendations and that these should be endorsed.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The Cabinet were satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had considered all the relevant options in formulating their recommendations. The Cabinet did not consider that there were any further options.

**CHAIRMAN**