



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DECISIONS NOTICE

The following decisions were taken in the week ending 4 August 2006 and, if not called in by Councillors, will come into operation on Monday 14 August 2006. A decision may be called in, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure contained within Part 4 of the Constitution, by Councillors submitting a request in writing to Democratic Services (e-mail: democratic.services@stedsb.gov.uk) by 5 p.m. on Friday 11 August 2006.

A. DECISIONS TAKEN BY CABINET ON 2 AUGUST 2006

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
5	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 26 July 2006	X129	(a) Shopmobility and Tourist Information Services Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee continue to be involved in discussions on the future long-term siting of the Shopmobility and Tourist Information Services, as appropriate.	There are no direct financial implications for Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee continuing to be involved in the future long-term siting of the Shopmobility and Tourist Information Services.	Having been involved in the review of the shopmobility and Tourist Information Services it was felt that Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should continue to be involved in discussions on the future long-term siting of these services.	Not involving the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was not considered an option.	Nigel Aitkens (01284-735258) Adriana Stapleton (01284-757613)
			(b) Suffolk Joint Local Area Agreement Scrutiny Panel The Head of Legal and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Group	There are no direct financial implications for a Member of the Council being nominated to the	An approach had been made by the County Council for a nomination to the Joint Local Area Agreement Scrutiny Panel as the Panel would include	Not nominating a Member of the Borough Council to the Scrutiny Panel was not considered an option.	John Griffiths (01284-757136) Adriana Stapleton (01284-757613)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>Leader of the Conservative Group, be authorised to make a nomination to the Suffolk Joint Local Area Agreement Scrutiny Panel, and that the Chief Executive be authorised to agree that nomination under the urgency powers.</p> <p>(c) Scrutiny Budget 2007/2008 The ring fenced funding for the Committees next staff survey be carried forward in the Scrutiny Budget to 2007/2008.</p> <p>(d) Review of the Call-in Procedure (1) all Members be surveyed as to their views on a review of the call-in procedure; (2) the Chairman of the Democratic Renewal Panel be authorised to nominate a member of the Cabinet and one other non-Cabinet member (preferably a member of the Democratic Renewal Panel) to meet informally with the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Scrutiny Manager and a representative</p>	<p>Suffolk Joint Local Area Agreement Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>There are no direct financial implications for undertaking the next survey in 2007/2008 as the funding for this has been earmarked.</p> <p>The review of the Council's Call-in Procedures would be undertaken within existing resources.</p>	<p>representatives from all district Councils within Suffolk.</p> <p>The main reasons for deferring the staff survey were that there had been several staff surveys on various topics recently and that deferring it would also allow the survey to be combined with any further consultation required for the Public Service Village project.</p> <p>Although the use of the Council's Call-in Procedure had been used on a few occasions it was considered appropriate to review the procedure against the processes used by other Council's to ensure St Edmundsbury is benefiting from the latest good practice.</p>	<p>Not deferring the staff survey was not considered an option.</p> <p>Not to review the Call-in Procedures was not considered an option.</p>	<p>Jeff Stevens (01440-762511)</p> <p>Adriana Stapleton (01284-757613)</p> <p>Jeff Stevens (01440-762511)</p> <p>Adriana Stapleton (01284-757613)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to carry out the review; and (3) these three Members report back to the Democratic Renewal Panel with recommendations for any amendments to the current call-in procedure during 2006/2007.				
6	Report of the Policy Development Committee: Serving Face-to-Face Customer Demand at the Public Service Village and Potential Partnership with Customer Services Direct Ltd (Aug06/07 & Aug06/12)	X130	<p>(a) Serving Face-to-Face Customer Demand at the Public Service Village (1) Option 1 of Report X43 be implemented, namely that a reception be built at the Public Service Village (PSV) to service all customer demand, with facilities in Bury St Edmunds town centre to pass customers on to the PSV by telephone or by appointment.</p> <p>(b) Potential Partnership with Customer Services Direct Ltd (1) Neither a full business case for, nor procurement of, a solution involving Customer Services Direct (CSD) Ltd, based on CSD's current operating model be conducted</p>	<p>The option of having a reception at the Public Service Village to service all customer face-to-face demand in Bury St Edmund was considered to be around £550,000 cheaper than the alternative of having a face-to-face reception in Bury St Edmunds Town Centre.</p> <p>Customer Services Direct Ltd considered that significant savings could be made by partnership working but it was considered that these savings were</p>	<p>From an analysis of the statistics undertaken as to the most appropriate location for a face-to-face service delivery point within Bury St Edmunds it was considered to be more efficient and cost effective for this reception to be in the new Public Service Village to be located on the Western Way site in Bury St Edmunds.</p> <p>It was considered that the level of service provided and the amount of financial savings would not improve on the Borough Council's services that had already been subject to Vanguard Examination.</p>	<p>Two main options were considered:- (1) a purpose built reception at the Public Service Village to service all customer demand with facilities in Bury St Edmunds Town Centre to pass customers onto the PSV by telephone or by appointment; or (2) to provide face-to-face service delivery only in the town centre, and the PSV reception to be used solely for the receipt of parcels and greeting visitors attending meetings.</p> <p>Two options were considered, namely, to either work in partnership with Customer Services Direct Ltd or not.</p>	<p>Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580)</p> <p>Carlton Brand (01284-757200)</p> <p>Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580)</p> <p>Carlton Brand (01284-757200)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>at this time, but as the CSD model of operation evolves, then this position should be re-evaluated as part of the Public Service Village (PSV) project;</p> <p>(2) St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Suffolk County Council customer access and Information Communication Technology requirements be identified and defined within a PSV project workstream to ensure the optimum common work processes, architecture and software applications for both internal and external customers. This will need to encompass system purpose and demand data from various channels, including face-to-face, telephone, and the internet; and</p> <p>(3) A fully integrated customer access model like the Stowmarket contact centre be not pursued, although there will be a need for a single reception at the PSV providing joint County Council and Borough Council customer services. These services will require some integration between the services of the partner councils in the PSV where this integration would produce improved services and</p>	<p>not as significant as those being identified as apart of the Borough Council's Vanguard Examination and through the Council's Dynamic Review – Innovation, Value and Enterprise (DR-IVE) process.</p>			

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			reduced costs. It is envisaged at this stage, however, that this will not mean transferring services or staff to CSD as a separate company.				
7	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Review of the Parish Revenue Grant System (Aug06/16)	X131	(1) subject to consultation with the parishes, from 2007/2008 the maximum total revenue grant any individual parish can receive be set at 10% of the total revenue support grant budget; and (2) any issues of concern arising from the consultation be brought back to the Cabinet through the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to feed into the final decision.	The decisions have implications for individual Parish Councils but do not have immediate implications for the Borough Council's budget in respect of Annual Revenue Support for Parish Councils.	The current scheme for allocating Annual Revenue Support Grant to Parish Councils was in its second year of operation and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee did not feel it was appropriate to carry out a major review of the system. However, an anomaly with the current scheme had been identified in that, of the 72 Parishes which received support, two of these had received 31% of the total grant budget.	Various options were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580) Graham Moore (01284-757252)
8	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Corporate Code of Governance and Statement on Internal Control (Aug06/09)	X132	(1) the Code of Corporate Governance and its associated Position Statement and Action Plan as detailed in Report X127 be approved and published; (2) the Statement on Internal Control (SIC) as detailed in Report X127 be approved and issued with the Council's published accounts, and that the Internal Control Assessment and Action Plan, as detailed in Report X127 be approved; and (3) the process used to	Updating the Code of Corporate Governance and Statement on Internal Control does not have a direct financial implication.	Reviewing the Code of Corporate Governance and Statement on Internal Control is undertaken annually and in accordance with good practice.	Options were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580) Chris Barber (01284-757241)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			compile the SIC and review of internal controls as detailed in Report X127 be endorsed for application in future years.				
9	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Council Improvement Plan - Data Quality	X133	That the 2006/2007 Council Improvement Plan be updated as detailed in Report X133.	There are no direct financial implications in updating the Council Improvement Plan.	The Audit Commission will be publishing a new Value for Money (VFM) conclusion in September 2006 as part of the annual audit programme. To avoid duplication, the 12 criteria of the VFM conclusion will draw heavily upon the Council's Use of Resources Assessment. However, there is a new criteria relating to data quality, and to the way in which the Council addresses this important issue corporately. Therefore, it was felt appropriate that specific actions should be added to the Council's Improvement Plan to record the fact that the Council is addressing this issue.	Options were considered in detail by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Jeff Stevens (01440-762511) Alex Wilson (01284-757002)
12	Public Service Village: Preferred Site (Aug06/18)	X136	That site A as detailed in Report X136 be approved as the site location for the proposed new offices at the Western Way site, Bury St Edmunds.	The detailed financial implications of the Public Service Village are still to be determined.	The reasons for decision are as detailed in Report X136.	Following consideration of the issues by the Public Service Village Programme Board. Two options (options A and C) were considered by the Cabinet.	Nigel Aitkens (01284-735258) Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580) Ivan Sams (01284-757304)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
13	Joint Staff Consultative Panel/Central Safety Panel: Proposed Amalgamation	agenda item 13	That the Joint Staff Consultative and Central Safety Panels be not amalgamated.	There are no financial implications arising from the continuation of the current practice of holding separate meetings of these two Panels.	After extensive consultation with Members of both Panels it was considered that these Panels had distinctly separate functions and priorities and neither Panel was in favour of the proposed amalgamation.	To amalgamate both Panels.	Jeff Stevens (01440-762511) Louise Hammond (01284-757008)
15	Joint Staff Consultative Panel (Aug06/14)	X138	The revised Sickness Absence and Ill Health Policy and Procedure as detailed in Paper X139 be approved.	The no are direct financial implications in revising this policy and procedure.	Guidelines for managing sickness absence were agreed in January 1997. It had been clear through casework that those guidelines were no longer comprehensive, in particular in dealing with long term sickness and persistent ongoing short term absences. Further legal obligations on the Council, such as the Disability Discrimination Act, Employment Act 2002, (Dispute Resolution) Regulations 2004 and the publication of the Health and Safety Executive Stress Standards had also evolved since January 1997, therefore this policy and procedure had been redrafted and subjected to extensive consultation.	Options concerning the compilation of the new policy and procedure were considered in detail by the Joint Staff Consultative Panel.	Jeff Stevens (01440-762511) Louise Hammond (01284-757008)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
16	Report of the Policy Development Committee: Housing Health and Safety Rating System Enforcement Policy (Aug06/10)	X140	(1) The Enforcement Policy for Part 1 of the Housing Act 2004, as set out in Appendix 1 to Report X107, be adopted; (2) All enforcement actions set out in Section 5 to the draft Policy be chargeable, except in the case of owner-occupiers in receipt of means tested benefits; and (3) The Corporate Director for Community be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, to set the charges for the enforcement actions in (2) above, based on the hourly rates for the work involved.	The Act allows local authorities to make reasonable charges to recover expenses arising from enforcement administration and action and, therefore, the majority of the Council's costs will be recovered.	The housing fitness enforcement powers of the Housing Act 1985 have been replaced by a new framework. The new framework is structured around an evidence based risk assessment process, the Housing Health and Safety Rating System, on which the local authority will base its enforcement decision. The Act also allows local authorities to make reasonable charges to recover expenses arising from enforcement administration and action.	There is no option but to introduce a new framework in respect of housing fitness enforcement powers but options were considered in respect of the levying of charges to offset the costs of the enforcement administration and action.	Jeremy Farthing (01440-820763) Richard Whitehead (01284-757037)
17	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Deprivation Review Action Plan (Aug06/17)	X141	That the Action Plan developed following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Review of Deprivation attached to Report X141 be approved.	There are no direct financial implications in compiling the Deprivation Review Action Plan.	On 25 May 2006 the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held a special meeting to examine the provision made to tackle deprivation in the Borough. The displays, presentations and discussions held lead to a number of suggestions being made which had been brought together into the Action Plan.	Detailed options were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee both at the special meeting held on 25 May 2006 and again on 27 July 2006.	Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580) Mike Dawson (01284-757060)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
18	Licensing and Regulatory Committee: Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles (Aug06/06)	X142	That consultation on the draft Gambling Act: Statement of Principles, as contained within Paper X142 commence in accordance with the timetable detailed in Section 8.3 of Report X97.	The cost of consulting on the proposed Statement of Principles will be contained within existing budgets.	The Gambling Act 2005 will come into force on 1 September 2006. The Act requires the Council to adopt a Statement of Principles following a consultation procedure.	The Council has a duty to produce and consult on a Statement of Principles and this was considered by the Licensing and Regulatory Committee on 10 July 2006.	Paul Farmer (01284-768777) Hilary Workman (01284-757113)
19	Acacia Avenue, Bury St Edmunds: Housing Scheme	agenda item 19	(1) the Contract for the sale of the site at Acacia Avenue, Bury St Edmunds to Havebury Housing Partnership be approved; and (2) provision be made for a grant of £100,000 from this receipt to Havebury Housing Partnership in order to development eight to ten homes on the site as soon as possible.	There are no additional financial implications arising from these decisions as these replace the previously approved Registered Social Landlord with another.	The Cabinet previously approved the sale of land at Acacia Avenue, Bury St Edmunds to Jephson Housing Association to develop the site for affordable housing and in addition made a grant of £100,000 from the Council's Affordable Housing Capital Programme allocation to assist in the development of the affordable homes. Negotiations for the contract of sale have been ongoing but regrettably Jephson Housing Association is now unable to proceed with the purchase of the land.	Officers have considered the most appropriate Registered Social Landlord to develop the site.	Jeremy Farthing (01440-820763) Carole Herries (01284-757603)
20	Leisure Development and Olympic 2012 Panel	X143	(a) Name of Panel That the Panel be re-titled Leisure Development and Olympic and Paralympic 2012 Panel; and (b) 2012 Olympics and the proposed review of sports development	There are no financial implications in re-titling the name of the Panel. The review of Sports Development will	The change in title reflects more accurately the Olympic Games movement. To fully realise the opportunities arising from the Olympic Games, the	No other option was considered. It was considered essential that a review be undertaken into the sports	Terry Clements (01284-827161) Neil Anthony (01284-757064) Terry Clements (01284-827161)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>(1) the update regarding the Olympic Games in 2012 be noted;</p> <p>(2) the scope of the Sports Development Review, as detailed in Section 3 of Report X114 be approved;</p> <p>(3) the Director of the County Sports Partnership be invited to make a presentation to the Panel at a meeting to which Members of the Cabinet and others be invited; and</p> <p>(4) the East of England Development Agency Project Manager also be invited to make a presentation to the Panel to which Members of the Cabinet and others be invited.</p>	be undertaken within existing budgets.	Borough Council Sports Development Service must be effective and working to its full potential and, therefore, it was considered appropriate for a Sports Development Review to be undertaken.	development activities of the Borough Council.	Neil Anthony (01284-757064)
21	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Environment Performance – Annual Update (Aug06/15)	X144	That the corporate environmental targets be revised as set out in Report X118.	There are no direct financial implications in reviewing the environmental targets.	It had been agreed that the environmental targets were now monitored annually through the Key Performance Indicator Report process, and the latest review recommended changes in respect of three of these targets, namely, biodiversity, procurement and waste.	Options were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Jeremy Farthing (01440-820763) Peter Gudde (01284-757042)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
22	Car Parking Working Party (Aug06/04)	X145	<p>Bury St Edmunds Transport Strategy</p> <p>(1) the Borough Council accept the findings of the report and agree that it be a consideration in the preparation of the local development document and a material consideration in the determination of major planning applications in Bury St Edmunds and the adjoining area;</p> <p>(2) the Borough Council request that Suffolk County Council accept the findings of the report as a basis for highway and transportation investment in Bury St Edmunds;</p> <p>(3) the Borough Council work with Suffolk County Council to agree an action plan for implementing the various short and medium term measures required to deliver the Strategy;</p> <p>(4) the Borough Council work with Suffolk County Council to secure an adequate level of Local Transport Plan (LTP)2 and developer funding to deliver the action plan in the short and medium term;</p> <p>(5) in addition to allocating LTP2 funding, the Borough Council invite Suffolk County</p>	There are no immediate financial implications to the Borough Council, as funding should be provided by the Highway Authority.	In June 2005, Faber Maunsell had been commissioned by Suffolk County Council and the Borough Council to prepare a transport strategy for Bury St Edmunds. The Strategy was completed in June 2006 and was subject to scrutiny by the Car Parking Working Party.	Detailed consideration of the Strategy was undertaken by the Car Parking Working Party.	<p>Terry Clements (01284-827161)</p> <p>Jerry Massey (01284-757302)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>Council to invest all on-street car parking income accrued in Bury St Edmunds over the next five years in key interventions necessary to deliver the Strategy;</p> <p>(6) as a matter of priority the Borough Council work with Suffolk County Council to investigate the proposal for a short distance shuttle park and ride scheme linking long stay car parks located nearer the central and eastern interchanges of the A14 and serving the town centre and possibly the West Suffolk College site; and</p> <p>(7) the eastern relief road be accepted as a short term measure.</p>				
23	Planning Policy Panel (Aug06/01)	X146	<p>(a) Stansted Airport Expansion: Planning Application for Consultation by Uttlesford District Council</p> <p>(1) The Borough Council object to the planning application on the grounds contained within paragraph 3.4 of Report X100.</p>	There are no direct financial implications as the Council was responding to consultation on a planning application.	On 11 October 2005 the Planning Policy Panel had received a presentation from a representative of the British Airports Authority outlining the background to and requirements for the future submission of a planning application to make better use of the existing runway at Stansted Airport. Subsequently a planning application had been submitted to Uttlesford District Council. The application submitted was	Having considered the evidence it was considered appropriate for the Council to object to the application.	<p>Terry Clements (01284-827161)</p> <p>Ian Poole (01284-757350)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>(b) East of England Spatial Strategy (1) the Borough Council expresses concern about proposals to delete Haverhill from the Cambridge Sub-Region and discussions take place with neighbouring local authorities to lobby the Government Office for its re-inclusion within the Cambridge Sub-Region; (2) that officers seek clarification on the proposed policy for Bury St Edmunds and the ability to plan for future growth beyond 2016; and (3) the Council raise concerns at the sustainability of the level of growth proposed at Thetford and the potential</p>	<p>Responding to the consultation on the East of England Spatial Strategy, will be done within existing resources.</p>	<p>broadly similar to that referred to in the presentation and as such, based on the conclusions reached at that time, it was considered appropriate for the Borough Council to object to the application on the grounds of the main impacts which were considered to be:- (1) air traffic; (2) surface access; and (3) water resources.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector's report on the examination in public of the draft East of England Plan was published on 22 June 2006. If the content was accepted and included in the final Regional Spatial Strategy by the Secretary of State there would be a number of implications for St Edmundsbury. In addition the Cabinet was concerned at the omission of Haverhill from the Cambridge Sub-region and whether the infrastructure would be sufficient to sustain the growth proposed for Thetford.</p>	<p>Detailed options were considered by the Planning Policy Panel.</p>	<p>Terry Clements (01284-827161)</p> <p>Ian Poole (01284-757350)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			implications on the Borough, including the capacity of the A134 and the medical facilities within Bury St Edmunds.				
24	Report of the Policy Development Committee: Review of School Organisation in Suffolk (Aug06/11)	X147	Suffolk County Council be informed of the following comments to the consultation on Review of School Organisation in Suffolk:- (1) whatever structure is chosen should be that which is shown, through evidence, to be the best option for the children and young people of Suffolk, and should draw on the good aspects of all possible structures; (2) any changes must take account of potentially increased travel distances and the resultant effects on the environment; (3) any changes should be brought about in such a way as to have the minimum possible impact during the transition period on those pupils in the education system at the time; and (4) the financial cost of any changes to the school infrastructure should not be funded from the general education budget. (5) consideration be given to:- (a) the potential impact upon sustainable modes of travel to	There are no direct financial implications arising from responding to the Suffolk County Council consultation.	Detailed discussions on the proposed review of school organisation in Suffolk were held by the Policy Development Committee, which made recommendations to the Cabinet. The Cabinet received additional information, following the meeting of the Committee.	Options considered in the response to the consultation were considered by both the Policy Development Committee and Cabinet.	Nigel Aitkens (01284-735258) Adriana Stapleton (01284-757613)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			schools; (b) the planning issues around availability of/need for new school sites or extending existing sites; (c) the possibility of redundant sites; and (d) the quality/quantity of playing fields.				
25	Haverhill Area Working Party (Aug06/08)	X148	<p>(a) Haverhill Town Centre Regeneration: Capital Revenue Budgets (1) capital spending proposals, including feasibility projects, to be funded from the Haverhill Town Centre Generation Capital Allocation be recommended by the Area Working Party to Cabinet for consideration; (2) a quarterly budget monitoring report for capital and revenue project commitments be submitted to the Area Working Party; and (3) it be noted that £50,000 has been transferred from the underspend in 2005/2006 to the Haverhill Area Working Party Reserve as part of the approval process for 2005/2006 Statement of Accounts.</p> <p>(b) Branding and Marketing (1) the allocation of £18,600 from the Haverhill Reserve for</p>	<p>An additional £50,000 has already been allocated to the Haverhill Area Working Party Reserve.</p> <p>£18,600 be allocated from the Haverhill Reserve for brand</p>	<p>The amount initially allocated for 2006/2007 for the revenue implications to implement the Haverhill Masterplan has already been committed and, therefore, additional funds were required.</p> <p>It had already been agreed to develop a brand for Haverhill and the Design Office had already been</p>	<p>Options as to additional funding were considered in detail by the Haverhill Area Working Party.</p> <p>Detailed options had been considered by the Haverhill Area Working Party.</p>	<p>Jeff Stevens (01440-762511)</p> <p>Mike Dawson (01284-757060)</p> <p>Jeff Stevens (01440-762511)</p> <p>Mike Dawson</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			<p>brand development and marketing of the town be noted; and (2) development of a Haverhill promotional website be approved and the cost of up to £6,000 be met from the Haverhill Reserve.</p> <p>(c) Jubilee Walk Enhancement Scheme: Public Consultation</p> <p>That the commissioning of public works to include all of the principal features outlined in 'Option 3' detailed in Report W624 be approved to include:- (1) re-paving of Jubilee Walk and associated works such as handrails, new lighting, hanging baskets and electrical supply points for Christmas lights; (2) new hard and soft landscape works in the vicinity of the mature horse chestnut ('Chestnut Green'); (3) incorporation of 'incidental' seating and feature seating; (4) new bus shelters, of enclosed design and '3-glazed' panels; (5) re-graded, re-surfaced car park;</p>	<p>development and marketing of the town and a further £6,000 be allocated to develop a promotional website for Haverhill.</p> <p>A budget had already been allocated for the Jubilee Walk enhancement scheme. However, until detailed tenders had been received for the approved works the costs could not be finalised.</p>	<p>commissioned for undertaking this work. It was now considered appropriate to develop a promotional website.</p> <p>It had already been agreed that the enhancement of Jubilee Walk would be advantageous to Haverhill and options had been developed and subject to extensive consultation. Arising from the consultation it was decided that Option 3 be approved and, therefore, subject to tendering process.</p>	<p>Numerous options for this enhancement scheme had been considered by the Haverhill Area Working Party and these had also been subject to extensive consultation with relevant organisations and members of the public.</p>	<p>(01284-757060)</p> <p>Jeff Stevens (01440-762511)</p> <p>Mike Dawson (01284-757060)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			(6) new path to High Street across car park with tree planting; and (7) public art, to include the consideration of a clock.				
26	Cattle Market Redevelopment Working Party (Aug06/03)	X149	<p>(a) Revised Layout for Hanchett Square (1) That the minor amendment to the approved plans for Hanchett Square, adjacent to the Bury Free Press building to accommodate parking spaces for two vehicles, be endorsed.</p> <p>(b) Public Building (Venue): First Floor Lettable Area (1) That a full appraisal be undertaken, to include financial and operational issues, into combining the management of the Public Building (Venue) with the first floor lettable area.</p>	<p>There are no direct financial implications of amending the layout of Hanchett Square.</p> <p>A full appraisal has been requested and this is to include financial as well as operational issues.</p>	<p>As part of the negotiations for the acquisition of part of the Bury Free Press site, the need for limited car parking adjacent to the office building had been identified. As a result it had been necessary to revise the layout of Hanchett Square to exclude a small area of land from the square. It was considered that the proposed amendments to be acceptable as there be no detrimental impact on Hanchett Square.</p> <p>In December 2004 the Council reached agreement with Centros Miller concerning part of the first floor area of the Public Building (Venue). It was agreed that this area would transfer to Centros Miller. However, subsequent to the decision potential problems have been identified, and it was now considered that there were two main options:- (1) to continue with the</p>	<p>Options were considered by the Cattle Market Redevelopment Working Party.</p> <p>Two options were considered as to whether to continue with the current proposals or combine the management of the first floor lettable area.</p>	<p>John Griffiths (01284-757136) Jerry Massey (01284-757302)</p> <p>John Griffiths (01284-757136) Jerry Massey (01284-757302)</p>

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
					current proposals; or (2) combine the management of the first floor lettable area with the management of the Venue. It was considered essential that full information including financial and operational details be required before a decision could be taken.		
27	Haverhill Masterplan: New Cinema (Aug06/08)	X150	(1) The Council enter into a development agreement with Parkway Securities Ltd, guaranteed by Citygrove Securities Plc, to deliver the project, on the basis of the terms contained in Report X150 and in Exempt Appendix 1 to Report X150; and (2) the Development Agreement to include planning gain arrangements for payment at completion of the scheme, of £75,000 by the developer and £25,000 by the Council.	The net cost of this project can be accommodated within the existing Five Year Financial Model.	The proposal to develop a cinema, three restaurants and one shop adjacent to the Haverhill Leisure Centre had already been agreed by Council and this report sought to approve the Development Agreement with the developer, Parkway Securities Ltd to develop the project.	The Council had received and considered a proposal from another developer/operator.	Jeff Stevens (01440-762511) Betty Albon (01284-757307)
28	Asset Management Plan: Ground Lease Portfolio (Aug06/05)	X151	That the proposals identified in the Exempt Appendix 3 to Report X151, which relate to individual assets, be approved. These proposals include: retain; sell when opportunities arise; and consider further as part of service reviews or in connection with other developments.	The income received through rents from the ground leases is minimal in relation to the entire non-operational portfolio. Therefore, implementing the options proposed	The proposals detailed in Exempt Appendix 3 which relate to individual assets detailed the reasons for decision.	The proposals included the options to:- (1) retain; (2) sell when opportunities arise; and (3) consider further as part of service reviews or in connection with other developments.	Nigel Aitkens (01284-735258) Betty Albon (01284-757307)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
				for particular assets will not impact on the five year financial model. However, it will still be important where sales are considered to ensure that at least an equivalent amount of revenue can be raised from any ensuing capital receipts.			
29	Printing Services: Future Provision (Aug06/13)	X152	<p>(1) The provision of the printing services be tendered as soon as possible;</p> <p>(2) until the tender process is completed, an agreement be entered into with Suffolk County Council Traded Services (SCCTS) to manage the design and printing services for the Council from October 2006;</p> <p>(3) an exemption from Contract Procedure Rules, in accordance with clause 2.2(i) be noted;</p> <p>(4) the service be operated from the print room at the Borough Offices;</p> <p>(5) during the term of the agreement, the procurement of all printing requirements, and where appropriate design work, be provided by the</p>	The cost of using Suffolk County Council Traded Services (SCCTS) managing the service for six months will be approximately £10,000 and the long-term cost will not be known until contracts are awarded.	Following the resignation of the Print Services Manager and impending resignation of the Senior Printing Operator, a review of the future delivery of the Printing Services Section has been undertaken. The results of the review concluded that the service should be provided by others.	Options considered included:- (1) recruit staff and seek external business; (2) out source the business completely to SCCTS; and (3) out source part of the business.	Sara Mildmay-White (01359-270580) Ivan Sams (01284-757304)

Item No.	Subject (Forward Plan Ref)	Report No.	Decision	Financial Implications	Reason(s) for Decision	Other Option(s) Considered	Contact(s)
			SCCTS printing service; and (6) Cabinet reaffirm the Council's commitment to source all its printing through the in-house service.				

Joy Bowes, Head of Legal and Democratic Services
4 August 2006