



**Lewes District Council**

## **Cabinet**

**Minutes** of a Meeting of the **Cabinet** held in the **Ditchling Room, Southover House, Southover Road, Lewes** on **Monday, 4 July 2016** at 2.30pm

### **Present:**

Councillor A Smith (Chair)

Councillors P Franklin, B Giles, T Jones, R Maskell, E Merry and T Nicholson

### **In Attendance:**

Councillor P Gardiner (Chair of the Scrutiny Committee)

Councillor S Osborne (Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group)

Ms D Twitchen (Tenants' Representative)

### **Apology received:**

Councillor M Chartier (Chair of the Audit and Standards Committee)

## **Minutes**

### **3 Minutes**

The Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 25 May 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **4 Variation in the Order of the Agenda**

In light of the level of interest in Agenda Item No 9.6 (entitled "Asset Management: Land at Friars Walk, Lewes; Units 19-21 Cradle Hill, Seaford; Land at Denton Island, Newhaven; Landport Youth Centre, Lewes") from those members of the public who attended the meeting, it was

**Action**

Resolved:

- 4.1** That Agenda Item No 9.6 (entitled “Asset Management: Land at Friars Walk, Lewes; Units 19-21 Cradle Hill, Seaford; Land at Denton Island, Newhaven; Landport Youth Centre, Lewes”) be taken immediately following Agenda Item No 8 (entitled “Reporting Back on Meetings of Outside Bodies”).

Reason for the Decision:

To take account of the level of interest in Agenda Item No 9.6 from those members of the public who attended the meeting.

**5 Public Question Time**

Written questions had been submitted to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Giles, by Dee O’Connell, on the following subjects, copies of which were circulated to Councillors at the meeting and made available to the public attending the meeting (a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book). Oral replies to the questions were given at the meeting by Councillor Giles.

QuestionerQuestion Concerning

Dee O’Connell

In the event that the Old Turkish Baths building, Friars Walk, Lewes, was to be leased, details relating to the time frame and associated advertising arrangements in respect thereof; and, in the event that the building was to be sold, details of the associated advertising arrangements in respect thereof (as referred to in Report No 100/16 on the Agenda for this meeting of the Cabinet).

**6 Reporting Back on Meetings of Outside Bodies**

Councillor Nicholson reported that, earlier in the day, he had attended a meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel at which the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner had presented her report. She had indicated that, since the result of the recent European Union Referendum had been published, there appeared to have been an increase in reports of hate crime nationally but not in Sussex, an issue in respect of which her Police and Crime Plan addressed.

In Sussex there had been an overall reduction of crime of 32% since 2005.

Sussex had been recognised by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary as one of only five that had achieved a rating of “good” or “outstanding” across all

core Police Effectiveness Efficiency and Legitimacy inspection areas.

12 Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) had today been assigned to the Council's geographical area who would be multi-skilled in order to tackle a range of problems. However, Members of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel had reservations about the change to PCSO provision.

Resolved:

- 6.1** That the oral report by Councillor Nicholson relating to a meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel that he had attended as the Council's representative, be received and noted.

**7 Asset Management: Land at Friars Walk, Lewes; Units 19-21 Cradle Hill, Seaford; Land at Denton Island, Newhaven; Landport Youth Centre, Lewes**

The Cabinet considered Report No 100/16 which sought approval of some asset management opportunities that were intended to increase revenue generated, or produce a capital receipt for the Council.

The land at Friar's Walk, Lewes, comprised the Turkish Baths which was a single-storey building that had been constructed in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as a purpose-built Turkish Baths but in respect of which no parts of the original baths remained following its closure as a Turkish Baths in 1882. The building was not listed and was not registered as an Asset of Community Value.

The building had previously housed the Council's print unit but the service had transferred to Eastbourne in June 2015. It had also contained a room that had been set aside for use by Unison, however such facility has been re-provided at Southover House, Lewes. Consequently, the building was currently empty and, in line with the Property Strategy that had been adopted by the Council in May 2012, was surplus to the requirements of the service.

The Report suggested that there were broadly three options for the Council to consider in respect of the building namely; refurbishment; let the building in its current form; and sale of the freehold, further details of which were set out therein.

A plan of the land at Friar's Walk, Lewes, was set out at Appendix A to the Report.

The Council owned the freehold of the Cradle Hill Industrial Estate, Seaford, for which the units were all let out on long leases, but most were geared on a ground rent only basis.

The lease in respect of units 19-21 had become available after the tenant had got into financial difficulty. The current rent to the Council amounted to £11,620 per annum (pa) but there were two outstanding rent reviews for which, after review, the rent was anticipated to rise to £17,000 pa.

The units comprised a total area of 11,506 square feet (sq ft). With some

modernisation to remove the asbestos cladding and install warm-air heating, the units could be let for around £33,000 pa which, if implemented, would treble the current rental income.

Officers had conducted a valuation of the lease and concluded that it was worth in the region of £120,000 to buy-in. The Report therefore recommended that Cabinet approves the purchase of the lease for £120,000 and sets aside capital investment of up to £100,000 including fees to modernise.

A plan of 19-21 Cradle Hill, Seaford, was set out at Appendix B to the Report.

Denton Island Bowls Club leased land from the Council at Denton Island, Newhaven. The Club currently paid a rent of £23,000, which was abated to £18,000, but a recent rent review had suggested that the rental figure should be closer to £25,000. The Club had stated that any higher rent would be unaffordable for it.

Officers had discussed the matter with the Club and had proposed that it surrendered around 15,000 sq ft of unused land to the side of the building, in return for which the rent would remain at £23,000 until June 2023.

If implemented, the surrendered land would be capable of supporting a commercial development of around 5,000-6,000 sq ft. It was not suitable for housing as it was an ex-landfill site that was surrounded by commercial enterprises. The Report suggested that the area could be used by Lewes Skatehouse in order to relocate from its site at North Street, Lewes.

The Report therefore recommended that Cabinet approve the surrender of the current lease to Denton Island Bowls Club, together with granting a new lease for a smaller area on the existing terms. It further recommended that up to £530,000 be set aside to develop the surrendered land for a new facility for Lewes Skatehouse on Denton Island, subject to agreement of commercial terms.

A plan of the land at Denton Island, Newhaven, was set out at Appendix C to the Report.

The Landport Youth Centre building (LYCb) was located on the Landport Estate, Lewes. It had previously been let to Ambition, formerly Lewes Boys Club, and was currently let on a Tenancy at Will to a charity called Landport Youth Centre (LYC).

Such Tenancy was a month by month rolling agreement that allowed LYC to access and operate from the building at a peppercorn rent. It could be broken at any time by either party giving one month's notice. A Tenancy at Will should not be used in place of a lease and was very much an interim measure. Paragraph 3.22 of the Report set out details of the composition of the building which would be difficult to convert to residential and for which there were few other alternative uses.

LYC had maintained the building at their cost over a number of years but were not in a position to pay a market rent to the Council for which the last rent review in 2013 had suggested that the rent should be in the region of £18,000 pa. LYC delivered a much-needed service from the building and officers had

explored a number of ways of enabling LYC to remain there.

Officers had been contacted by an organisation called Pippa's Group which was currently located in a portacabin at Pells School. The Group had been looking for permanent premises for some time and ideally would like to purchase a property at Landport. The Group offered support to pre-school children who might have difficulty adapting to school. Additionally, they conducted parenting classes and had good links with the Dance Studio, which also needed to relocate from its current location. Officers had undertaken a meeting between representatives of LYC, Pippa's Group and the Dance Studio to establish whether it would be possible for all three services to operate from LYCb which had been positive.

Pippa's Group was interested in purchasing the building which they would let in part to LYC and the Dance Studio. The purchase depended upon whether it would be possible to reconfigure the building by adding another floor, and the level of the associated costs.

LYCb was a Housing Revenue Account property in respect of which any disposal would require the Secretary of State's permission. However, sale of the property would result in a capital receipt for the Council of around £190,000 but, more importantly, would enable the co-location of three services with a strong emphasis on children and youth provision.

The Report therefore recommended that Cabinet approve the sale in principle of LYCb to Pippa's Group, subject to reaching mutually agreeable terms for a sale price of around £190,000.

A plan of Landport Youth Centre was set out at Appendix D to the Report.

Resolved:

- |            |  |            |
|------------|--|------------|
| <b>7.1</b> | That the Director of Corporate Services be given delegated authority to refurbish the building known as the Turkish Baths, Friars Walk, Lewes, at a cost of up to £220,000 (including fees and planning) and to let the refurbished building at a commercial rent with a change of use to retail or restaurant, as detailed in Report No 100/16; | DCS/<br>CE |
| <b>7.2</b> | That the Director of Corporate Services be given delegated authority to purchase the lease of 19-21 Cradle Hill, Seaford, for £120,000 and set aside capital investment of up to £100,000 including fees to modernise the unit;  | DCS/<br>CE |
| <b>7.3</b> | That the surrender of the current lease to Denton Island Bowls Club, Newhaven, together with granting a new lease for a smaller area on the existing terms, be approved;   | DCS/<br>CE |
| <b>7.4</b> | That it be agreed in principle to set aside up to £530,000 in the capital programme to develop the surrendered land at Denton Island, Newhaven, to provide a new facility for Lewes Skatehouse, subject to agreement of commercial terms and the submission of a robust business plan from Lewes Skatehouse; and                                 | DCS/<br>CE |
| <b>7.5</b> | That the sale of Landport Youth Centre, Lewes, be approved in  | DCS/       |

principle and that the Director of Corporate Services be given delegated authority to negotiate terms.

CE

Reasons for the Decisions:

To increase revenue to the Council by investing in a number of assets to deliver the best yield.

To assist with the relocation of businesses from the North St Quarter, Lewes, freeing up land for development.

## 8 Finance Update – Performance Report 2015/2016

The Cabinet considered Report No 95/16 which provided an update on financial matters that affected the General Fund Revenue Account, the Housing Revenue Account and the approved Capital Programme.

The Council's 2015/2016 Accounts had been closed. The Director of Corporate Services had approved the draft Statement of Accounts on 29 June 2016. The Accounts had been released to the Council's external auditor BDO and were available to the public for inspection.

Paragraph 4.2 of the Report set out details of the General Fund year end position for 2015/2016 which was in line with the forecast made when updating the Medium Term Financial Strategy at the time of preparing the 2016/2017 budget. Table 6, which was set out in paragraph 4.2.10, listed the contributions to and use of each General Fund Reserve in 2015/2016, and the balance held at the end of the year. It also identified the anticipated movement on each Reserve in 2016/2017, which reflected the approved General Fund budget and the capital programme.

Paragraph 4.3 of the Report set out details relating to the Housing Revenue Account in respect of which the outturn for 2015/2016 had produced a net surplus of £88,000 compared with a deficit of £491,000 that had been projected when setting the budget for the year, a net positive variation of £579,000. Table 7 in paragraph 4.3.1 summarised the main variations compared with that projection.

Paragraph 4.4 of the Report set out details relating to the Collection Fund, the balance on which at 31 March 2016 was a surplus of £1.528m, compared with a surplus of £1.090m which had been estimated at the time of setting the Council Tax for 2016/2017. That positive variation, at 0.7% of income, reflected growth in the taxbase, changes in entitlement to discounts and a decrease in the value of Council Tax Reduction Scheme awards compared with the projection. Such variation was well within the acceptable level of tolerance given that the total annual amount of Council Tax due was £60.6m. The earliest that the additional surplus could be distributed was during 2017/2018 and would be between the Council, East Sussex County Council, East Sussex Fire Authority and the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner, based on 2016/2017 Council Tax amounts. Approximately 16% of the surplus would be returned to the Council.

Appendix 1 to the Report set out the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2015/2016. Appendix 2 detailed the Capital Programme for 2015/2016 and Appendix 3 detailed the Capital Programme for 2016/2017.

Resolved:

- |            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| <b>8.1</b> | That the final position on the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and Collection Fund accounts for 2015/2016, as set out in Report No 95/16, be agreed; | DCS |
| <b>8.2</b> | That the allocation of Reserves at 31 March 2016, as shown in Table 6* to the Report, be confirmed;  | DCS |
| <b>8.3</b> | That the Capital Programme outturn for 2015/2016, as shown in Appendix 2 to the Report, be agreed; and   | DCS |
| <b>8.4</b> | That the updated 2016/2017 Capital Programme, as set out in Appendix 3 to the Report, be approved.   | DCS |

It was further

Recommended:

- |            |   |                     |
|------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>8.5</b> | That the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2015/2016, as set out at Appendix 1 to Report No 95/16, be approved. | DCS<br>(to<br>note) |
|------------|---|---------------------|

Reasons for the Decisions:

It is essential to ensure that the Council has a sound financial base so that it can respond effectively to changing demand for statutory and discretionary services, reducing income levels, including Government funding, and inflationary pressures on expenditure. Reports to Cabinet through the year, including quarterly financial performance reports, ensure that the Council's financial health is kept under continual review.

The Council's Treasury Management function deals with very large value transactions on a daily basis. It is essential that the Council is satisfied that appropriate controls are in place and in accordance with the Code of Practice on Treasury Management in the Public Services prepared by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and adopted by the Council.

*\*(NB Subsequent to the meeting it was established that the figure of "(2,639)", as set out in line 8 of Table 6 of the Report, should have read "(2,157)".*

**9 Portfolio Progress and Performance Report 2015/16 and Quarter 4 (January to March 2016)**

The Cabinet considered Report No 96/16 which, in Appendix 1 thereto, set out details relating to the Council's progress and performance in respect of key projects and targets for the fourth and final quarter of the year namely, January to March 2016, and also for the full 2015/16 year. It indicated where performance and projects were 'on track/on target' and where there were

areas of under-performance/concern. Where performance or projects had not achieved target, an explanation was provided, together with a summary of the management action that had been taken in respect thereof. The Appendix was structured around the Cabinet portfolios.

Appendix 2 to the Report detailed the projects and performance areas that were to be reported to the Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet for quarterly monitoring during 2016/17.

The Report had been considered by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 1 July 2016 and paragraphs 49 and 50 thereof outlined details of the Scrutiny work programme 2015/16.

It was important that the Council monitored and assessed its performance on a regular basis in order to ensure that it continued to deliver excellent services to its communities in line with planned targets. It was also vital to monitor progress with key strategic projects in order to ensure that the Council was delivering what it had committed to or had set out to achieve.

The Scrutiny Committee maintained oversight of the Council's performance and could challenge areas of under-performance. Report No 96/16 set out the Council's performance against its targets and projects for the fourth quarter of 2015/16 namely, from 1 January to 31 March 2016, and also its position at year end, against the targets set for the full year 2015/16.

The Council had an annual cycle for the preparation, delivery and monitoring of its corporate and service plans which enabled it to regularly review its work, and the targets it sets for performance, so as to ensure that they continued to reflect customer needs and Council aspirations.

Occasionally it was necessary and appropriate for projects to be discontinued due to a change in circumstances, professional advice or to consider other opportunities to maximise the benefits. During 2015/16, only 2 projects had been cancelled/discontinued, further details of which were set out in paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Report.

The Cabinet was advised that a Report would be prepared for consideration at a future meeting which monitored high level performance of the Joint Transformation Programme.

The Scrutiny Committee had considered the Report at its meeting held on 1 July 2016 at which it had been noted that, with regard to the Council's performance for the year as at the end of the 4th quarter:

85% of the Council's key projects were either completed or on track;

79% of the Council's performance targets were either met, exceeded or within a 5% variance during the year as a whole; and

Only five indicators had not met the planned targets for the year.

The Committee had wished to thank the officers who had helped to make improvements to the Council's performance over the last year, particularly with



regard to recycling. The Committee had appreciated their efforts but acknowledged that such performance was difficult to improve.

The Committee had raised concerns regarding the use of bed and breakfast accommodation but had recognised that there were many external factors that would influence the Council's use of temporary accommodation. There had been a rise in the use of emergency accommodation however, it was hoped that the scrutiny review of housing supply and demand, that was highlighted in the Annual Scrutiny Programme for 2016/17, would address such issues where possible. The Interim Director of Service Delivery had advised that the Council would be considering 'good practice' at other authorities as part of a review. It was reported to the Cabinet that the Council was working to increase the availability of temporary accommodation by way of private sector leasing in respect of which proposals and resources were being prepared.

The Committee had noted that the Equal Pay Audit had been postponed in light of Joint Transformation Programme activities but would be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. The Strategic Performance Manager had indicated that every area within that Programme would be equality assessed in the intervening period.

Resolved:

- 9.1 That progress and performance for Quarter 4, as set out in Appendix 1 to Report No 96/16, and the year as a whole, be noted;
- 9.2 That the projects and performance areas as shown in Appendix 2 to the Report, be agreed for future reporting; DBSD
- 9.3 That the programme of work undertaken by the Scrutiny Committee be noted; and
- 9.4 That the Scrutiny Committee be thanked for its comments and support in respect of the Report. DBSD

Reasons for the Decisions:

To enable Cabinet to consider specific aspects of the Council's progress and performance and any recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Committee.

## 10 Adoption 'Making' of the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan

The Cabinet considered Report No 97/16 which related to the adoption 'making' of the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan.

The Localism Act 2011 had introduced a right for communities to draw up neighbourhood plans. Hamsey Parish Council, with support and advice from the Council, had produced a neighbourhood plan which had subsequently undergone a successful examination and referendum. A detailed legislative framework for undertaking neighbourhood planning was set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (general) Regulations 2012. Report No 97/16

considered whether the Plan should be adopted by the Council as part of the statutory development plan.

Neighbourhood plans, once adopted, formed part of the statutory development plan and sat alongside the Local Plan that was prepared by the Local Planning Authority. Part of Hamsey parish was within the South Downs National Park in respect of which the South Downs National Park Authority was preparing a Local Plan that covered the entire National Park. Once adopted, that local plan would replace the Lewes District Joint Core Strategy: Local Plan Part 1 in the areas within the National Park. Should planning permission be sought in areas covered by an adopted neighbourhood plan, the application must be determined in accordance with both the neighbourhood plan and the Local Plan.

There were some legally prescribed stages that needed to be undertaken in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan and it needed to be subject to examination by an independent examiner. Subject to a positive outcome from such an examination, the plan then proceeded to a referendum. In instances when a neighbourhood plan was subject to a successful referendum, and the local planning authority was satisfied that European Union and human rights obligations had been met, it was a legal requirement to bring the plan into force as soon as reasonably practicable.

Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.12 of the Report set out details relating to progress of the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan in respect of which a referendum had been held in Hamsey Parish on Thursday, 2 June 2016, that had posed the following question to eligible voters:

“Do you want Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Hamsey Parish to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?”

28% of registered electors recorded votes, 120 votes of which were cast in favour of ‘yes’ compared with 13 in favour of ‘No’. It was declared that more than half of those voting had voted in favour of the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan.

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, following the outcome of the referendum it was for the Council to ‘make’ the neighbourhood plan so that it formally became part of the development plan for Lewes District. The South Downs National Park Authority would also formally adopt the plan.

Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) sets out the requirement for a local planning authority when it came to adopting (ie ‘making’) a neighbourhood plan, further details of which were set out in paragraph 3.12 of the Report.

Recommended:

- 10.1** That the Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan, as detailed in Report No 97/16, be formally adopted as part of the statutory development plan for the district.

DBSD  
(to  
note)

Reasons for the Decision:

The Hamsey Neighbourhood Plan has undergone a successful examination and received a majority vote in favour at a referendum.

To comply with the Localism Act which requires local planning authorities to 'make' a neighbourhood development plan as soon as reasonably practicable following a successful referendum.

**11 Community Infrastructure Levy Instalments Policy Revision**

The Cabinet considered Report No 98/16 which related to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Instalments Policy for the Lewes District Council Charging Area.

Implementation of CIL in the Lewes District planning authority area had been in place since 1 December 2015 and the first few CIL planning cases were being processed. At the time that the Report was prepared, no cases had been significant enough to trigger the Council's CIL Instalments Policy which had been approved by the Council as part of the CIL adoption process on 9 November 2015. As that Policy was approved by the Council, any amendments thereto needed to also be approved by Council, unless delegated authority had subsequently been provided.

The instalments policy was written whilst the Charging Schedule was being prepared and prior to the purchase of software to implement CIL. The instalments policy allowed for the CIL amounts generated on larger residential developments to be paid in three separate instalments as the development progressed.

Since CIL implementation had commenced, the Council had found that the instalments policy did not particularly lend itself to the software that the Council had purchased in order to ensure the legally compliant processing of CIL cases. Additionally, it had been discovered that such a policy would require a significant level of development monitoring by the Council which would not be an efficient use of officer's time. The Report therefore proposed that the policy be amended in a way that was compatible with the Council's software and allowed for the collection of payments to be undertaken in a more time efficient manner, further details of which were set out in the Report.

Recommended:

**11.1** That the revised Community Infrastructure Levy Instalments Policy, as set out at Appendix 1 to Report No 98/16, be adopted, published and implemented, in accordance with regulation 69B of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended); and

DBSD  
(to  
note)

**11.2** That the Director of Business Strategy and Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, be authorised to make any further amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy implementation policies where the intention is to respond to

DBSD  
(to  
note)

regulatory or practical requirements.

Reasons for the Decisions:

To enable the Council to monitor and ensure the collection of due Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments in a more efficient and robust manner, which is compatible with the recently acquired CIL monitoring software.

To enable the Council to make future amendments to implementation policies, which respond to regulatory or practical requirements in a more expedient and efficient manner.

## **12 Risk Management – Annual Report to Cabinet**

The Cabinet considered Report No 99/16 that related to risk management which was about using common sense to take effective action to prevent or limit the impact of risks in order to help the Council meet its priorities and deliver services effectively.

In September 2003 the Cabinet had adopted a Risk Management Strategy that sets out the responsibilities for risk management at the Council, and which was supported by a framework of procedures and guidance for the assessment of risks and the development of mitigating controls. The Strategy included provision for an annual review by the Corporate Management Team (CMT). The Strategy had been reviewed in May 2016 and had been updated with minor changes including the Audit and Standards Committee being able to comment on the report in advance of Cabinet.

In order to support the Strategy the Council had a standard approach for assessing risk which was applied to service planning, the management of major projects and decision making. The methodology reflected the need to manage the different aspects of the uncertainty that was inevitable when making changes in how the Council worked and taking new approaches to regeneration and investment. The methodology now recognised both the uncertainty that could have an adverse impact leading to loss, harm or damage and the uncertainty that could have a positive effect leading to benefits or rewards.

A copy of the Council's Strategy was set out at Appendix 1 to the Report.

Information which related to strategic risks was set out in the Report. Such risks were those that were likely to have a significant impact across the Council in that, if they occurred, they were likely to prevent it from achieving its strategic objectives.

The compilation of a Strategic Risk Register provided evidence of a risk aware and risk managed organisation. Generally, the register reflected the risks that would be common to comparable local authorities in the current period of change and financial challenge for Local Government.

Appendix 2 to the Report showed the Strategic Risk Register that had been

compiled by the CMT for the year 2016/17.

Heads of service and some senior managers had received detailed risk management training in the autumn 2015. Training was planned for the CMT in the summer 2016 in order to develop a joint approach to risk management with Eastbourne Borough Council.

Resolved:

- 12.1** That the annual report on risk management, as detailed in Report No 99/16, be received and endorsed, and that the Council's Risk Management Strategy, as set out at Appendix 1 thereto, be noted; and
- 12.2** That the strategic risks identified by the Corporate Management Team and the associated mitigating controls, as set out in Appendix 2 to the Report, be noted.

DCS

Reasons for the Decisions:

The Council is committed to the proper management of risk. Report No 99/16 forms part of the annual reporting cycle on risk as set out in the Risk Management Strategy. The Report has been received by the Audit and Standards Committee at its June 2016 meeting and is now presented to be endorsed by Cabinet. The Report is also one of the key elements in the Council's submissions to the external auditor, BDO, and will provide data for the Annual Governance Statement.

**13 Asset Maintenance: Car Parks, and 16 West Street, Lewes**

The Cabinet considered Report No 101/16 which related to asset maintenance of car parks and 16 West Street, Lewes.

The Council operated and maintained a total of 57 car parks across the district in respect of which charges applied in 21 of them with the remainder being free at the point of use.

In 2013, the Council had commissioned an independent Car Park Safety Inspections Report of the majority of car parks. The report set out actions that would improve safety for users. Officers had worked within the current budget constraints to undertake priority repairs and had also undertaken a series of condition surveys. Additionally, the car parks were inspected on a regular basis and serious defects were identified and managed appropriately. However, based upon the estimated costs of the issues identified, the existing annual budget in the sum of £12,000 was insufficient to address the volume and value of the issues identified. Approximately 218 actions had been identified across a number of features which had been prioritised and estimated as detailed in paragraph 1.7 of Report No 101/16.

The Report recommended that the Council undertake the high priority works namely P1 and P2 surface car parks and P1 Multi-Storey, as soon as possible at a cost of up to £67,500 plus £20,000 contingency to be funded from the

Asset Maintenance Reserve.

The remaining works would be considered in line with the wider capital programme and, in respect of the multi-storey car park in Newhaven, within the context of the Enterprise Zone and any associated future plan.

The Council owned a retail unit at 16 West Street, Lewes, which was leased as a hairdresser's shop until April 2015 when the lease had expired. New tenants were lined up and were ready to move in.

The roof of the unit needed extensive repairs and possibly a full replacement for which initial estimates indicated that capital expenditure of £10,000 plus fees was required. Officers had negotiated a rent of £10,400 per annum for the property over a period of 10 years which would give a payback on the works by year 3.

A new £1 coin would come into circulation in 2017 in respect of which all of the Council's 26 pay and display parking machines needed to be updated to accommodate the new coin. The majority of the machines were at the end of their useful life and spares were difficult to locate as the model owned by both the Council and East Sussex County Council was obsolete.

Each new machine would cost between £2,700 and £3,700 depending on whether the Council wished to also opt for payment by debit/credit card at the machines. The current machines did not allow for that but the cashless parking scheme that was operated by RingGo currently generated 7% of parking revenue since its introduction in 2014. Therefore the capital cost of replacing the machines would be between £70,200 and £96,200.

East Sussex County Council was considering a phased approach to replacing its stock of machines over a period of 3 years. The Council could also follow that approach but would still need to spend in the region of £8,000 to replace all of its coin validators which, if implemented, could be funded from the Asset Maintenance Reserve.

Paragraphs 1.19 to 1.28 of the Report set out details relating to proposals for parking improvements in Newhaven in respect of which the Report recommended that the Council approves spend in the sum of £17,000, to be met from the existing service budget, to engage a specialist consultancy firm to identify feasible options; develop concepts to be agreed with key stakeholders, officers and councillors (including Newhaven Town Council); and create a detailed package of interventions for implementation.

Resolved:

- 13.1** That the expenditure on all Council car parks be approved to address the priority 1 & 2 issues as summarised in Appendix A to Report No 101/16 and the priority 1 issues shown at Appendix B thereto, to be funded from the Asset Maintenance Reserve, to also include a contingency allowance of up to £20,000;
- 13.2** That all priority 3 & 4 issues detailed at Appendix A, and priority 2, 3, and 4 works outlined at Appendix B, be deferred for a further 18 months to enable Cabinet to consider the works in the context of the

CE/  
DCS

CE/  
DCS

wider capital programme;

**13.3** That the replacement of the Council's parking machine coin validators be approved at a cost of £8,000 to be funded from the Asset Maintenance Reserve, and that the officers be authorised to investigate the potential costs of replacing all of the Council's 26 parking machines on a joint procurement basis with East Sussex County Council, bringing a Report to Cabinet once the costs and best approach to phasing the replacement is determined;

CE/  
DCS

**13.4** That capital expenditure of £10,000 plus fees be approved to repair the roof at 16, West Street, Lewes; and

CE/  
DCS

**13.5** That specialist traffic management consultants be engaged to conduct a feasibility study of parking improvements in Newhaven Town Centre, the cost of the study being funded from the existing service budget.

CE/  
DCS

#### Reasons for the Decisions:

The estimated repair costs for high priority works within the car parks is £67,500. Due to the nature of some of the works, it is recommended that a further £20,000 contingency is allowed.

Maintaining the car parks is key to encouraging use of the car parks and reducing risk of accident claims to the Council. The car parking policy and strategy should remain responsive to local needs, taking into account the drivers for social and economic change.

The parking meters are coming to the end of their useful life and it is difficult to get parts for them. Additionally, a new £1 coin will be introduced in 2017 and the Council has the option of changing the coin validators only, or replacing the machines and increasing the number of ways motorists can pay for parking.

## **14 Ward Issues Raised by Councillors at Council**

The Cabinet considered Report No 102/16 which set out responses to Ward issues that had been raised by councillors at the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 11 May 2016.

#### Resolved:

**14.1** That the Officer action in respect of Ward issues that had been raised by Councillors at the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 11 May 2016, as detailed in Report No 102/16, be noted and agreed.

Interim  
DSD/  
DBSD

#### Reason for the Decision:

To ensure that appropriate follow up action is taken in respect of Ward issues that were raised by councillors at Meetings of the Council.

The meeting ended at 3.45pm.

A Smith  
Chair