



Council Offices, Kiln Road,  
Thundersley, Benfleet,  
Essex SS7 1TF.  
Tel. No: 01268 882200  
Fax No: 01268 882455



**David Marchant** LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) CEng FICE FCMI  
**Chief Executive**

## **CABINET AGENDA**

**Date:** Wednesday 15th March 2017

**Time:** 7.00pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber

**This meeting will be webcast live on the internet.**

### **Membership:**

<b>Councillor Riley</b>	<b>Chairman - Leader of the Council</b>
<b>Councillor Stanley</b>	<b>Finance and Resources</b>
<b>Councillor Dick</b>	<b>Health &amp; Wellbeing</b>
<b>Councillor Mrs Egan</b>	<b>Homes and Customer Engagement</b>
<b>Councillor Howard</b>	<b>Waste, Floods and Water Management</b>
<b>Councillor Isaacs</b>	<b>Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure</b>
<b>Councillor Sharp</b>	<b>Strategic Partnership Working</b>
<b>Councillor Skipp</b>	<b>Environment, Street Scene &amp; Halls</b>
<b>Councillor Smith</b>	<b>Regeneration &amp; Business Liaison</b>

**Cabinet Enquiries:**  
**Reference:**  
**Publication Date:**

**John Riley Ext 2417/Ann Horgan ext. 2413**  
**8/2016/2017**  
**Tuesday 7th March 2017**

---

---

**AGENDA  
PART I  
(Business to be taken in public)**

---

---

**1. Apologies**

**2. Members' Interests**

**3. Minutes**

To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

**4. Forward Plan**

To review the Forward Plan

**5. Public Health and Wellbeing**

**5 (a) Waterside Farm Athletics Track – Lease to Canvey Island Youth FC**

*(Report of the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods Safer Communities and Leisure)*

**6. Environment**

**6 (a) Borough wide Dog Control Order for Dog Fouling Conversion to Public Spaces Protection Order**

*(Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment Street Scene and Halls)*

**6(b) Halls leased/occupied by RVS at South Benfleet Recreation Ground, Richmond Avenue, South Benfleet and at John H Burrows, Hadleigh**

*(Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment Street Scene and Halls)*

**7. Transforming Our Community**

**7(a) 'Fixing our broken housing market' Government consultation on Housing White Paper**

*(Report of the Leader of the Council Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Business Liaison)*

**7(b) Update on Regeneration Matters**

*(Report of the Leader of the Council Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Business Liaison)*

**7 (c) Funding Support for Castle Point Youth Council**

*(Report of the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods Safer Communities and Leisure)*

**8. Efficient and Effective Customer Focused Services**

**8(a) Corporate Scorecard Quarter 3**

*(Report of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources)*

**9. Matters to be referred from /to Policy & Scrutiny Committees**

**10. Matters to be referred from /to the Standing Committees**

---

---

**PART II**

**(Business to be taken in private)**

**(Item to be considered with the press and public excluded from the meeting)**

---

---



## **CABINET**

**15TH FEBRUARY 2017**

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor Riley, Chairman	Leader of the Council
Councillor Stanley	Finance and Resources
Councillor Dick	Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Mrs Egan	Homes and Customer Engagement
Councillor Howard	Waste, Floods and Water Management
Councillor Isaacs	Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure
Councillor Sharp	Strategic Partnership Working
Councillor Skipp	Environment ,Street Scene & Halls
Councillor Smith	Regeneration & Business Liaison

**APOLOGIES:** There were none.

### **ALSO PRESENT:**

Councillors: Acott, Campagna, E.Egan, Greig, Ladzrie, May, Mumford, Palmer, Mrs. Sach, Taylor, Varker and Wood.

### **62. MEMBERS' INTERESTS:**

There were none.

### **63. MINUTES:**

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 18.1.2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **64. FORWARD PLAN:**

To comply with regulations under the Localism Act 2011, the Leader of the Council presented a revised Forward Plan to the meeting which outlined key decisions likely to be taken within the next quarter 2017. The Plan was reviewed each month.

Under this item the Councillor Howard Cabinet Member for Waste, Floods and Water Management gave a briefing on take up of the new Garden Waste Collection Service.

**Resolved –** To note and approve the Forward Plan.

**65. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) – 2017/18 RENT LEVELS, REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PLAN FOR 2017/18 AND 2016/17 REVISED**

The Cabinet received a report submitting for determination Rent levels for Council dwellings and garages for 2017/18; HRA Revenue budget for 2016/17 (revised) and 2017/18 together with the HRA Capital Plan for 2016/17 (revised) and 2017/18.

**Resolved:**

1. To agree a rent reduction of 1% for all social rent HRA dwellings, resulting in an average reduction of £0.90 per week.
2. To agree a rent reduction of 1% for all affordable rent HRA dwellings, resulting in an average reduction of £1.72 per week.
3. To increase Garage rents by £1.00 per week (excluding VAT).
4. To approve the HRA revenue budget for revised estimate 2016/17 and estimate 2017/18, as set out in Annexe A to the report.
5. To approve the HRA capital plan for revised estimate 2016/17 and estimate 2017/18, as set out in Annexe B to the report.

**66. RISK BASED VERIFICATION POLICY**

The Cabinet received a report presenting for approval details of a Risk Based Verification Policy to be used in assessing and determining applications for Council Tax and Housing Benefits.

**Resolved:** To approve the Risk Based Verification Policy and Verification Standards Matrix as set out in Appendix A in the report for implementation from April 2017.

**67. POLICY FRAMEWORK AND BUDGET SETTING FOR 2017/18**

The Cabinet considered the report submitted by the Head of Resources (Section 151 Officer) containing proposals and recommendations for the Council's Policy Framework and Budget Setting for 2017/18 for

recommendation to the Special Council meeting to be held following the Cabinet meeting that evening.

**Resolved: to refer the report and recommend to Council:**

**Implementation of Council policies and related spending plans**

1. That the Cabinet note the efficiency savings, cost reductions and additional income summarised in table 2.1.
2. That the Cabinet approves the continued funding of priority projects and other items of discretionary expenditure, as set out in table 9.1.
3. That the Cabinet notes the cost pressures and other budget increases (growth) as set out in table 9.2.
4. That subject to recommendations 1 to 3 above, the revenue spending plans for 2016/17 (revised) and 2017/18, set out in section 9, tables 9.3 (summary) and 9.4 (net services expenditure) of the accompanying report, are approved.

**Capital spending plans and prudential indicators**

5. That the capital spending plan described in section 11 of the accompanying report (tables 11.2 and 11.3) is approved in respect of 2016/17 (revised) and 2017/18.
6. That it is noted that as stated in paragraph 21 of section 11 of the accompanying report, and based on current plans and proposals, gross external borrowing is not expected to exceed the capital financing requirement in the current or forthcoming two financial years.
7. That as required by section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003 and the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, the following Prudential Indicators are approved as set out in the appropriate sections of the accompanying report:

<b>Prudential Indicator - Reference to sections 11, 12 and 13 of accompanying report</b>	
Capital expenditure	Tables 11.2 and 11.3
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream	Table 11.4
Capital financing requirement	Table 11.5
Authorised limit for external debt	Table 11.6
Operational boundary for external debt	Table 11.7
Incremental impact of capital investment	Table 11.8
Housing Revenue Account limit on indebtedness	Section 11 para 34
Maturity structure of fixed rate borrowing - upper and lower limits	Table 12.2
Upper limits of fixed and variable interest rate exposures	Table 12.3
Maximum period and counterparty limits for specified investments	Table 13.1

8. That the Statement of Minimum Revenue Provision for 2017/18, as stated in paragraphs 35 to 37 of section 11 of the accompanying report is approved.
9. That no new capital proposals are allowed until:
  - the proposal has been evaluated in accordance with all relevant evaluation criteria;
  - the Cabinet has confirmed affordability and compliance with the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities;
  - the Cabinet has considered and approved details of the proposal.
10. That the policies and strategies supporting the budget framework and contained within the accompanying report are approved.

**Statutory Report of the Head of Resources**

11. That as required by Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, the report of the Head of Resources set out in section 16 of the accompanying report in respect of robustness of the estimates is noted.
12. That as required by Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, the report of the Head of Resources set out in section 8 of the accompanying report in respect of the adequacy of proposed financial reserves is noted.

**Statutory calculations in respect of the budget requirement & Council Tax as required by the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (“the Act”)**

13. That as set out in section 5 of the accompanying report it is noted that acting under delegated authority and in consultation with the Cabinet Member responsible for Finance & Resources and the Head of Resources has calculated:
  - a) A tax base for the Borough of Castle Point of **30,077** being the amount **T** required by Section 31B of the Act; and
  - b) A tax base for Canvey Island to which a Town Council precept applies as **11,647**.
14. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

Ref	Amount £	Item
(a)	<b>62,017,745</b>	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish (Town) Councils.
(b)	<b>54,458,161</b>	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.

(c)	<b>7,559,584</b>	being the amount by which the aggregate at 14(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 14(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.  (Item <b>R</b> in the formula in Section 31B of the Act)
(d)	<b>251.34</b>	being the amount at 14(c) above (item <b>R</b> ), divided by item <b>T</b> (14(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish (Town) precepts).
(e)	<b>243,345</b>	being the aggregate amount of the (Parish (Town) precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
(f)	<b>243.36</b>	being the amount at 14(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 14(e) above by item T (14(a) above), calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

15. That the Cabinet recommends that Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each category of dwelling. This information is included within section 17 of the accompanying report:

Castle Point Borough Council Tax 2017/18, including and excluding Town Council precept, for each of the following categories of dwelling:

<b>Band</b>	<b>Council Tax Including Town Council £</b>	<b>Council Tax Excluding Town Council £</b>
<b>A</b>	175.98	162.24
<b>B</b>	205.31	189.28
<b>C</b>	234.64	216.32
<b>D</b>	263.97	243.36
<b>E</b>	322.63	297.44
<b>F</b>	381.29	351.52
<b>G</b>	439.95	405.60
<b>H</b>	527.94	486.72



16. To note that the County Council, the Policy Authority and the Fire Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwelling in the Council's area, as indicated in the table below:

Band	Castle Point Borough Council £	Essex County Council £	Essex Fire Authority £	PCC for Essex £	Total Excluding Town Council £	Canvey Island Town Council £	Total Including Town Council £
A	162.24	775.80	46.02	104.70	<b>1,088.76</b>	13.74	<b>1,102.50</b>
B	189.28	905.10	53.69	122.15	<b>1,270.22</b>	16.03	<b>1,286.25</b>
C	216.32	1,034.40	61.36	139.60	<b>1,451.68</b>	18.32	<b>1,470.00</b>
D	243.36	1,163.70	69.03	157.05	<b>1,633.14</b>	20.61	<b>1,653.75</b>
E	297.44	1,422.30	84.37	191.95	<b>1,996.06</b>	25.19	<b>2,021.25</b>
F	351.52	1,680.90	99.71	226.85	<b>2,358.98</b>	29.77	<b>2,388.75</b>
G	405.60	1,939.50	115.05	261.75	<b>2,721.90</b>	34.35	<b>2,756.25</b>
H	486.72	2,327.40	138.06	314.10	<b>3,266.28</b>	41.22	<b>3,307.50</b>

17. To note that, in accordance with the requirements of section 52ZC of the Act the Council has determined whether it's Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 is excessive.

For 2017/18, the relevant basic amount of council tax for Castle Point would be deemed excessive if the authority's relevant basic amount of council tax for 2017/18 is:

- (a) 2%, or more than 2%, greater than its relevant basic amount of council tax for 2016/17; and
- (b) More than **£5.00** greater than its relevant basic amount of council tax for 2016/17.

Ref	Amount £	Item
(a)	<b>238.68</b>	being the Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2016/17, excluding local precepts.
(b)	<b>2.0%</b>	being the percentage increase above which the Secretary of State has determined the Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 would be excessive.
(c)	<b>243.45</b>	being the amount above which the Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2017/18, excluding local precepts, would be excessive (rounded down to the nearest penny).
(d)	<b>243.36</b>	being the Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2017/18, excluding local precepts.

The Relevant Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 is therefore, not excessive and the duty to make substitute calculations and hold a referendum does not apply (Chapter 4ZA of Part 1 of the Act).

**68. MATTERS TO BE REFERRED FROM/TO POLICY SCRUTINY COMMITTEES:**

There were no matters.

**69. MATTERS TO BE REFERRED FROM /TO THE STATUTORY COMMITTEES:**

There were no matters.

Chairman



# **Castle Point Borough Council**

## **Forward Plan**

**MARCH 2017**

# **CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **FORWARD PLAN**

**MARCH 2017**

This document gives details of the key decisions that are likely to be taken. A key decision is defined as a decision which is likely:-

- (a) Subject of course to compliance with the financial regulations, to result in the local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the savings which are, significant having regard to the local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates subject to a threshold of £100,000; or
- (b) To be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more Wards in the area of the local authority.

The Forward Plan is a working document which is updated continually.

<b>Date</b>	<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b>Council Priority</b>	<b>Decision by Council/ Cabinet</b>	<b>Lead Member(s)</b>	<b>Lead Officer(s)</b>
March 2017	<u>Regeneration Update Report</u>	Transforming Our Community	Cabinet	Regeneration & Business Liaison	Local Plan and Regeneration Adviser
March 2017	<u>Housing &amp; Planning White Paper (if available)</u>	Transforming Our Community	Cabinet/ Council	Leader of the Council	Local Plan and Regeneration Adviser
March 2017	<u>Corporate Scorecard</u>	All	Cabinet	Finance and Resources	Head of Performance & Service Support
March 2017	<u>Waterside Farm Athletics Track: - Lease to Canvey Island Youth FC</u>	Public Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet/ Council	Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure	Head of Environment
March /June 2017	<u>Borough wide Dog Control Order for dog fouling</u> – Proposed consultation on conversion to a Public Spaces Protection Order	Public Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet	Environment, Street Scene & Halls	Head of Environment
March 2017	RVS Halls Hadleigh & Benfleet	Transforming Our Community	Cabinet/ Council	Environment, Street Scene & Halls	Head of Environment

April 2017	<u>Revised RIPA Policy</u> – for approval	Public Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet	Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure	Head of Law
April 2017	<u>Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement</u> – for approval	Public Health & Wellbeing	Cabinet	Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure	Head of Law
April 2017	<u>Resources Strategies :</u> To note revisions( if required)	All	Cabinet	Resources & Performance	Head of Resources
May/July/Sept 2017	<u>Financial Update</u>	Efficient and Effective Customer Focussed Services	Cabinet	Resources & Performance	Head of Resources
July/October 2017	<u>Treasury Management Report – Updates</u>	Efficient and Effective Customer Focussed Services	Cabinet	Resources & Performance	Head of Resources
June 2017	<u>Halls Review</u>	Transforming Our Community	Cabinet	Environment Street Scene & Halls	Head of Environment

**CABINET**

**15 March 2017**

**Subject: Waterside Farm Running Track – Request for lease**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Isaacs – Neighbourhoods, Safer Communities and Leisure**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

**To consider a request from Canvey Island Football Club to lease the running track at Waterside Farm Recreation Ground**

**2. Links to Council Priorities and Objectives**

**Environment**

**3. Recommendations**

**It is recommended that the Council enters into a 15 year lease agreement with the Canvey Island Football Club for the use of the running track and interior grassed area on the terms set out in the report.**

---

**4. Background**

Canvey Island Football Club has three senior sides (including one ladies team) and approximately 20 youth sides. The club has been trying to secure additional pitch provision to meet the needs of its expanding youth teams and it approached the Council last year about the possibility of leasing the inside of the running track for a further football pitch for use by its Youth sides which play mainly in the Alliance League.

Appendix 1 shows a plan of the running track. Phase 1 of the club's proposal is that they would remove the hard surfaces areas marked A, B, C E and F and make good at its cost which they have estimated would be in the region of £3K.

They would cut, seed, sand and verti-drain the grass area at a cost of £4.8K. Portacabins for the storage of equipment would be placed on the area marked D. Goals would be taken in/out so would only be out for matches.

The club would provide any signage required, fully maintain the area at its cost and ensure that all health and safety requirements are complied with.

The running track area would remain open to the public; mats or suitable protective covering would be placed where the players/spectators cross over to the pitch.

Matches would mainly be played on Sunday mornings but some may be arranged for Sunday afternoons.

The club also indicated initially that they would wish to provide a refreshment area along with changing facilities on the area marked D but the refreshment area has been discounted because refreshments can be purchased from the leisure centre.

In the longer term (phase 2) the club has indicated that it would like to use the running track and pitch for its senior sides' training to supplement their facilities at Park Lane. Training is on a Tuesday and Thursday evening if there is no mid week game and starts at 7.00 p.m. and runs until 9.30 p.m.

The training nights would require lighting and the club would wish to apply for planning permission to reinstate low level floodlighting.

### Conclusion

The running track whilst suitable for informal training is not suitable for competition athletics. Minimal maintenance is undertaken on it to ensure that it is maintained in a safe condition.

The offer by the Canvey Island Football Club provides an opportunity to improve the condition and usage of both the running track itself and the interior area of the track at no cost to the Council. The Club is very community minded and is keen to encourage greater use of the track by organising junior activities on the track. Better utilisation of this area on training evenings should help to deter anti social behaviour.

## **5. Corporate Implications**

### **a) Financial Implications**

An annual rental of £600 is proposed with the club being responsible for all maintenance of the land which forms part of the lease agreement.

### **b) Legal Implications**

The club is seeking a 15 year lease. As the land is designated public open space there is a requirement to advertise the disposal of the land (via lease) by way of a Public Notice for a continuous two week period.

The club would be responsible for applying for planning consent where required.



**c) Human Resources and Equality Implications**

The running track would remain available to the public when not being used by the club.

**6. Timescale for Implementation and Risk Factors**

If Cabinet is supportive of a lease agreement with the club, the intention would be to progress the lease agreement with immediate effect but there is a legal process that the Council must follow as the land in question is public open space.

**Background Papers:**

None

**Report Author:** Trudie Bragg, Head of Environment



**CABINET**

**15th March 2017**

**Subject: Borough wide Dog Control Order for dog fouling –  
Proposed consultation on conversion to a Public  
Spaces Protection Order**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Skipp – Environment, Street Scene and  
Halls**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

**The purpose of this report is:**

- (1) To advise Cabinet of the need for the Council to convert its existing borough wide Dog Control Order for dog fouling to a Public Spaces Protection Order under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014 and of the process and consultation requirements that the Council is duty bound to follow;**
- (2) To seek agreement on the organisations to be consulted in respect of the making of a Public Spaces Protection Order; and**
- (3) To seek agreement to the proposed increase in the Fixed Penalty Notice fine from £80 to £100.**

**2. Links to Council's priorities and objectives**

**Keeping land clean and free from dog faeces links with the Council's Environment objective.**

**3. Recommendations**

**It is recommended that Cabinet:**

- (1) Notes the content of this report and the need to convert the current borough wide Dog Control Order for dog fouling to a Public Spaces Protection Order under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014;**
- (2) Endorses the proposed list of organisations to be consulted as part of the Public Spaces Protection Order making procedure; and**

- (3) Endorses the proposed increase in the Fixed Penalty Notice fine from £80 to £100.**
- 

#### **4. Background**

In 2010, the Council utilised the powers available to it in The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 and adopted a borough wide Dog Control Order for dog fouling. The Fouling of Land by Dogs (Borough of Castle Point) Order 2010 as it is known became effective on 1 February 2011 and made it an offence for persons not to pick up faeces after their dog had fouled on all open land to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) within the Castle Point Borough boundary. A person can be prosecuted (level 3 fine, currently £1000 maximum) or served with a Fixed Penalty Notice (up to £80) for failure to clean up after a dog under their control has fouled.

The Anti – Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 (“the Act”) has made some previous powers to deal with anti social behaviour obsolete and introduced some new more effective powers. Public Spaces Protection Orders replace Dog Control Orders and allow a local authority to deal with a particular nuisance or problem such as dog fouling that is detrimental to the local community’s quality of life by imposing universal conditions on the use of that area. Whilst Dog Control Orders are now obsolete any which were in place when the new legislation came into effect remain enforceable for three years from the commencement date of the Act but after that time there is a requirement for them to be reviewed and converted to a Public Spaces Protection Order.

The Council must therefore now review and convert its existing Dog Control Order to a Public Places Protection Order if it wishes to continue to encourage responsible dog ownership and enforce dog fouling contraventions on land to which the public have access.

Prior to issuing a Public Spaces Protection Order the Council is required to consult with the police, Police and Crime Commissioner and other relevant bodies. It is intended that Canvey Island Town Council, the RSPB and Essex County Council each of whom have publicly accessible land within the Borough will be included in the consultation.

The fine in place for a Fixed Penalty Notice under the current Dog Control Order is set at £80.00. Under a Public Spaces Protection Order the Council can set the Fixed Penalty fine up to a maximum of £100.00. Being mindful of the public’s concerns about dog fouling and the potential adverse effect on public health it is proposed to increase the fine for a Fixed Penalty Notice to the maximum permissible amount, i.e. £100.00.

The Fixed Penalty Notice is a Notice offering the person to whom it is issued the opportunity to discharge any liability to conviction by payment of the Fixed Penalty within 14 days of it being served. Failure to pay the Fixed Penalty will result in the offender being prosecuted under Section 59 of the Anti – Social

Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014, and on summary conviction being liable to a fine not exceeding Level 3 on the standard scale i.e. up to £1000.00.

## **5. Corporate Implications**

### **a. Financial implications**

Whilst the Council can keep any income it receives through the service of Fixed Penalty Notices the primary purpose of the Public Spaces Protection Order would be to deter offences from being committed.

It is envisaged that any costs relating to the Public Spaces Protection Order will be met from within current budgets.

### **b. Legal implications**

The existing Dog Control Order will no longer be enforceable after 19 October 2017, i.e. three years after the commencement date of “the Act”.

The land covered by the Public Spaces Protection Order will include all land covered by the existing Dog Control Order and will include any land which is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) within the Castle Point Borough Council area. This includes highway land as well as parks and open spaces.

A Public Spaces Protection Order may not have effect for a period of more than 3 years, unless extended. Any extension can be for no more than three years, and it can be extended no more than once.

To avoid legal challenge the Council will need to satisfy itself that the making of the Order is necessary and proportionate to the dog fouling problems in the Borough. The proposed Order would not prohibit dogs but would require that owners clean up after their dog has fouled.

The Order would be enforced by existing Borough Council and Town Council staff who are authorised and trained to ensure that correct procedures are followed.

Payment of the fixed penalty fine is required within fourteen days to discharge the offence. Failure to pay the fine could result in the offender being prosecuted. There is scope within the legislation to offer a discount for early payment and the guidance recommends that this should not be more than ten days. It is not proposed to offer a discount for early payment as it is likely to cause confusion and offer little benefit to the Council.

The ability to serve a Fixed Penalty Notice serves as a useful deterrent, albeit people tend not to commit an offence when other people are about.

### **c. Human resources and equality implications**

There are no additional human resource implications. There are six Castle Point Officers authorised to serve Fixed Penalty Notices and one Town Council

Officer. Overt joint patrols are undertaken with the Town Council with the aim primarily of educating dog owners and encouraging responsible dog ownership.

## **6. Timescale for implementation and risk factors**

There is a prescribed procedure which must be followed before a Public Spaces Protection Order can be made. It is proposed that the Order will come into effect by 1 October 2017 and a further report detailing the public consultation feedback will be presented to Cabinet once completed.

### **Background Papers:**

The Fouling of Land by Dogs (Borough of Castle Point) Order 2010

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Reform of anti-social behaviour powers - Statutory guidance for frontline professionals

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

**Report Author: Stuart Jarvis, Contracts Manager**

**CABINET**

**15 March 2017**

**Subject: Halls leased/occupied by RVS at South Benfleet Recreation Ground, Richmond Avenue, South Benfleet and at John H Burrows, Hadleigh**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Skipp, Environment, Street Scene and Halls**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

**To seek approval to proceed with the demolition of the halls previously leased to and occupied by the RVS at Benfleet Recreation Ground, Richmond Avenue, South Benfleet and at John H Burrows, Hadleigh.**

**2. Links to Council Priorities and Objectives**

**Environment  
Efficient and Effective Customers Focused Services**

**3. Recommendations**

**Cabinet is recommended to endorse the demolition of the halls previously leased to and occupied by the RVS at South Benfleet Recreation Ground, Richmond Avenue, South Benfleet and at John H Burrows, Hadleigh.**

---

**4. Background**

**RVS Hall, John H Burrows, Hadleigh**

The RVS had been holding over on the lease for the hall it occupied at John H Burrows since 15 October 2012. Late last year it took a business decision to not renew the lease and to vacate the hall by 31 December 2016. The hall is now vacant. It is in a poor state of repair, looks unsightly and has reached the end of its useful life.

Cabinet at its meeting on 15 September 2015 resolved to approve a masterplan for the John H Burrows recreation ground which amongst other things envisaged at an appropriate time, the demolition of the RVS Hall and the provision on an additional sports pavilion on the footprint of the existing RVS hall which would be funded in its entirety by third party contributions.

Now that the RVS has vacated the hall and the Hadleigh and Thundersley Cricket Club pavilion is nearing completion and able to accommodate many of the community groups/clubs which previously used the RVS hall, it is an appropriate time to demolish the hall. The masterplan for the site will be on the agenda for the next meeting of the Hadleigh Members' Group.

#### RVS Hall, South Benfleet Recreation Ground, South Benfleet

The RVS has occupied this facility since 15 January 1995. It had been holding over on the lease for the hall since 15 January 2016 when the lease agreement ended. Late last year it took a business decision to cease its operations from the hall, to not renew the lease and to vacate the hall by 31 March 2017.

The hall is of similar age and construction to the one at John H Burrows. It too is unsightly, prone to vandalism and has reached the end of its useful life. It is proposed that this hall should be demolished and that alternative community use options such as an independent living complex or a health drop in centre for the site be explored. In the Council's Local Plan the land is designated for community use. Any development would therefore need to meet the "community use" criteria.

### **5. Corporate Implications**

#### **a) Financial Implications**

£70k has been allocated in the 2017/18 budget to cover the cost of the demolition of the two halls. Packaging the two demolition projects together should ensure that the Council secures a lower price than if they were done separately.

#### **b) Legal Implications**

Both halls were leased to the RVS on a full repair and maintenance basis at a rent of £92.90 pa for the hall at John H Burrows and £100 pa for the hall at South Benfleet Recreation Ground.

Neither of the halls has been maintained in accordance with the lease terms and conditions. If the terms and conditions had been complied with this could have extended the life of the two halls. It would be usual practice to prepare a Schedule of Dilapidations for service on the RVS setting out the items of disrepair that are covered by the repairing obligations contained in the lease to cover breaches of tenants covenants relating to the physical state of the premises at the end of the lease. It is hoped that the formal legal process of serving the Schedule of Dilapidations on the RVS will not be necessary if the Council is able to negotiate a satisfactory contribution towards the demolition costs by way of damages from the RVS instead.

#### **c) Human Resources and Equality Implications**

It is understood that all the community groups that used to use the RVS hall at John H Burrows have been accommodated elsewhere or have disbanded. Community Groups using the RVS hall at South Benfleet have been contacted by Council officers with a view to helping them find alternative suitable accommodation.

### **6. Timescale for Implementation and Risk Factors**



Demolition of both halls will be undertaken without undue delay. The longer the halls remain empty, the greater the likelihood that they will be the target of anti-social behaviour.

**Background Papers:**

None

**Report Author:** Trudie Bragg, Head of Environment

**CABINET**

**15th March 2017**

**Subject: “Fixing our broken housing market”  
Government consultation on Housing White Paper**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Riley -  
Leader of the Council – Strategic Partnerships**

**Councillor Smith -  
Regeneration & Business Liaison**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 This report is to inform the Cabinet of the publication of the Government’s consultation on its Housing White Paper entitled “Fixing our broken housing market”.**
- 1.2 It also seeks the Cabinet’s agreement to a broad response to the consultation, with detailed responses to 38 individual questions to be prepared by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to be issued by the closing date of Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.**

**2. Links to Council’s priorities and objectives**

- 2.1 The matters described in this report are directly linked to the Council’s “Transforming our Community” priority – incorporating objectives for putting the right planning framework in place to create a sustainable future.**

**3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 That the Cabinet notes the publication of the Government’s consultation on its Housing White Paper.**
- 3.2 That the Cabinet agrees to the general responses to the consultation as set out in Section 5 of the report below, and that detailed responses to the 38 questions be prepared and sent by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.**

## 4. Background

- 4.1 On 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017, the Government published a White Paper concerning housing related matters, entitled “Fixing our broken housing market”.
- 4.2 The document runs to 104 pages and seeks responses to 38 questions covering a wide range of issues which the report considers has contributed to the significant issue of insufficient new homes being built.
- 4.3 The report identifies the problem as threefold – first, not enough local authorities plan for the homes needed, secondly house building is too slow, and thirdly the house building industry is too reliant on a small number of large concerns.
- 4.4 The report then analyses these issues and brings forward proposals to address them in four chapters;
  1. Planning for the right homes in the right places
  2. Building homes faster
  3. Diversifying the market
  4. Helping people now
- 4.5 Chapter 1 - Planning for the right homes in the right places - brings forward eight proposals;
  - *Making sure every part of the country has an up-to-date, sufficiently ambitious plan so that local communities decide where development should go;*
  - *Simplifying plan-making and making it more transparent, so it's easier for communities to produce plans and easier for developers to follow them;*
  - *Ensuring that plans start from an honest assessment of the need for new homes, and that local authorities work with their neighbours, so that difficult decisions are not ducked;*
  - *Clarifying what land is available for new housing, through greater transparency over who owns land and the options held on it;*
  - *Making more land available for homes in the right places, by maximising the contribution from brownfield and surplus public land, regenerating estates, releasing more small and medium-sized sites, allowing rural communities to grow and making it easier to build new settlements;*
  - *Maintaining existing strong protections for the Green Belt, and clarifying that Green Belt boundaries should be amended only in exceptional circumstances when local authorities can demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements;*
  - *Giving communities a stronger voice in the design of new housing to drive up the quality and character of new*

*development, building on the success of neighbourhood planning; and*

- *Making better use of land for housing by encouraging higher densities, where appropriate, such as in urban locations where there is high housing demand; and by reviewing space standards.*

4.6 Chapter 2 – Building homes faster – also suggests eight proposals;

- *Providing greater certainty for authorities that have planned for new homes and reducing the scope for local and neighbourhood plans to be undermined by changing the way that land supply for housing is assessed;*
- *Boosting local authority capacity and capability to deliver, improving the speed and quality with which planning cases are handled, while deterring unnecessary appeals;*
- *Ensuring infrastructure is provided in the right place at the right time by coordinating Government investment and through the targeting of the £2.3bn Housing Infrastructure Fund;*
- *Securing timely connections to utilities so that this does not hold up getting homes built;*
- *Supporting developers to build out more quickly by tackling unnecessary delays caused by planning conditions, facilitating the strategic licensing of protected species and exploring a new approach to how developers contribute to infrastructure;*
- *Taking steps to address skills shortages by growing the construction workforce;*
- *Holding developers to account for the delivery of new homes through better and more transparent data and sharper tools to drive up delivery; and*
- *Holding local authorities to account through a new housing delivery test.*

4.7 Chapter 3 – Diversifying the market – suggests eight proposals;

- *Backing small and medium-sized builders to grow, including through the Home Building Fund;*
- *Supporting custom-build homes with greater access to land and finance, giving more people more choice over the design of their home;*
- *Bringing in new contractors through our Accelerated Construction programme that can build homes more quickly than traditional builders;*
- *Encouraging more institutional investors into housing, including for building more homes for private rent, and encouraging family-friendly tenancies;*
- *Supporting housing associations and local authorities to build more homes; and*
- *Boosting productivity and innovation by encouraging modern methods of construction in house building.*

4.8 Chapter 4 – Helping people now – carries eight suggestions;

- *Continuing to support people to buy their own home – through Help to Buy and Starter Homes;*
- *Helping households who are priced out of the market to afford a decent home that is right for them through our investment in the Affordable Homes Programme;*
- *Making renting fairer for tenants;*
- *Taking action to promote transparency and fairness for the growing number of leaseholders;*
- *Improving neighbourhoods by continuing to crack down on empty homes, and supporting areas most affected by second homes;*
- *Encouraging the development of housing that meets the needs of our future population;*
- *Helping the most vulnerable who need support with their housing, developing a sustainable and workable approach to funding supported housing in the future; and*
- *Doing more to prevent homelessness by supporting households at risk before they reach crisis point as well as reducing rough sleeping.*

- 4.9 Each proposal is supported by a more detailed commentary and specific recommendations for action.
- 4.10 In Chapter 1, for example, proposals for up-to-date plans restate the Government's intention to intervene when necessary, to require plans to be reviewed every five years and to make clear that when preparing plans the "duty to co-operate" would also include the requirement to prepare a statement of common ground.
- 4.11 Proposals to maintain strong protection for the Green Belt include a suggested change to national policy to make clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended when all other reasonable options have been examined; furthermore where land is removed from the Green Belt it is suggested that there should be compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt land. It is also suggested that higher contributions (whether via Section 106 Agreements or an infrastructure levy) should be collected from development on land released from the Green Belt.
- 4.12 In Chapter 2 proposals for boosting local authority capacity involve an increase in nationally set planning application fees by 20% from July 2017, but only if that income is reinvesting in planning. The Government is also minded to allow for a further 20% increase where authorities are delivering the homes need in an area.
- 4.13 Chapter 2 also proposes a new housing delivery test; the test would be applied annually in November; if by November 2017, housing delivery is less than 95% of the annual requirement, then an action plan will be required, and if in further years until 2020 delivery falls still further behind, a 20% "buffer" must be added to the housing land supply and finally the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) will apply automatically.

- 4.14 In Chapter 3 proposals for diversifying the market include a suggestion to amend the NPPF to require local authorities to plan proactively for Build to Rent where there is a known demand.
- 4.15 Proposals in Chapter 4 include recommendations that the NPPF be amended to make clear that starter homes should be available to those with an income of less than £80,000, and who must have a mortgage - rather than cash. The NPPF is also to be amended to include a clear expectation that housing sites have a minimum of 10% affordable home ownership units.

## **5. Recommendations for a response**

- 5.1 The Government seeks responses to the consultation by Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017. Its preference is that responses are provided to the 38 questions set out in the Appendix to the White Paper.
- 5.2 Cabinet is therefore recommended to indicate its support for the recognition by Government that the housing market is broken, and that it has proposals to address this significant national problem.
- 5.3 The Government's commitment to simplifying plan-making is also welcomed, but it will need to undertake a more significant intervention in terms of reform of the law, policy and regulations if that is to be achieved promptly. Some measures in the White Paper – for example promoting new policies to be incorporated into plans to require 10% of sites to be below 0.5 ha in size, having a housing target fixed annually, plan proactively for Build for Rent, the introduction of new requirements for starter homes and new affordable homes and new guidance on how the needs of older and disabled people are to be met - would serve to make plan making more time-consuming and complicated.
- 5.4 The Government's commitment to strong protection for the Green Belt is also welcome. However the corollary of that position, certainly in Castle Point, is that there simply not enough developable land on which to build sufficient homes to meet objectively assessed housing need. Whilst increasing densities in some built-up areas can be successful, in locations such as Castle Point that approach would be at odds with the intrinsic character of the Borough, and a point stressed elsewhere in the White Paper is that new development should respect the character accessibility and infrastructure of an area. The White Paper simply does not explain how the Government intends to reconcile its two competing policy objectives – of providing more homes, but continuing to protect the Green Belt.
- 5.5 In addition to those general comments above the Cabinet is recommended to allow more detailed responses to the 38 questions posed by the White Paper to be issued by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council by the deadline of Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

#### **a. Financial Implications**

- 6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report.
- 6.2 However Cabinet is asked to note that the suggested amendments to plan making may involve Council incurring additional costs as it attempts to meet any new legislative requirements. Cabinet is also asked to note that after the proposed 20% increase in planning fees in July 2017, the proposal for an additional 20% increase in fees beyond that would only appear to be available to those authorities meeting housing targets.
- 6.3 Cabinet will also be aware of the significant costs incurred by the Council in dealing with homelessness, exacerbated in part by the lack of suitable affordable housing, and that the current Homelessness Reduction Bill, passing through Parliament and which seeks to reform homelessness legislation, may add to those costs.

#### **b. Legal Implications**

- 6.4 There are no direct legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.
- 6.5 However Cabinet is asked to note that the suggested amendments to planning legislation and policy will create a tighter framework within which policy may be developed and put in place. This in turn will lead to the need for more detailed and robust evidence to support planning decisions taken by the Council.

#### **c. Human Resources & Equality Implications**

- 6.6 There are no implications of this kind arising from the recommendations in this report.

#### **d. Timescale for implementation & risk factors**

- 6.7 It is recommended that the Cabinet approves the broad responses set out in Section 5 above and authorises detailed responses to the 38 specific questions to be issued by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council by Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.

### **7. Conclusions**

- 7.1 The Government's White Paper represents a welcome acknowledgement of the significant problems associated with the delivery of new housing.
- 7.2 However the measures suggested are likely to introduce further additional burdens on local planning authorities in terms of plan making and reporting, and in locations such as Castle Point it is unclear how

two competing policy objectives – providing more homes and protecting the Green Belt – can be reconciled.

### **Background Papers**

Department of Communities & Local Government;  
“Fixing our broken housing market”;  
February 2017

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/590464/Fixing\\_our\\_broken\\_housing\\_market\\_-\\_print\\_ready\\_version.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/590464/Fixing_our_broken_housing_market_-_print_ready_version.pdf)

**Report Author:** Steve Rogers – Local Plan & Regeneration Adviser



**CABINET**

**15th March 2017**

**Subject: Update on Regeneration Matters**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Riley -  
Leader of the Council – Strategic Partnerships**

**Councillor Smith -  
Regeneration & Business Liaison**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 This report is to inform the Cabinet of the strategic regeneration initiatives underway, as well as those activities which support local businesses in Castle Point.**

**2. Links to Council's priorities and objectives**

- 2.1 The initiatives described in this report are directly linked to the Council's "Transforming our Community" priority – incorporating objectives for a sustainable future and the regeneration of town centres.**

**3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 That the Cabinet notes the progress underway on these initiatives.**
- 3.2 That Cabinet approves the draw down of £15,000 from reserves in 2017/18 to complete the feasibility work for the Paddocks site.**

**4. Background**

- 4.1 One of the Council's four key priorities is "Transforming our Community". Objectives within this priority are the creation of a sustainable future and the regeneration of town centres.**
- 4.2 This priority and these objectives form a key component of the work of the Castle Point Regeneration Partnership (CPRP). This partnership comprises public sector and private sector organisations whose shared**

vision for Castle Point is “a community where everyone can prosper be safe and live in a high quality environment”. A key ambition below this high level vision is the regeneration of the local economy and places, through supporting the regeneration of town centres and key employment areas as well as assisting local businesses to grow and develop skills within the community.

4.3 It is this vision on which the Partnership focuses its work, and which was used to support successful bids for grant from government for master planning work. The grant awarded was used to prepare comprehensive master plans for Canvey Island town centre and Hadleigh town centre, as well as enhance industrial estates at Charfleets on Canvey Island and Manor Trading Estate in Thundersley.

4.4 This update on the activities of the Partnership and the initiatives underway in the borough to regenerate the borough's Town Centres, as well as to support local businesses, are more fully described in the attached Appendix. Particular highlights from the last quarter involve;

- *Hadleigh Town Centre – potential disposal of central island site*
- *Tarpots Town Centre – work on improved pathway to Aldi store*
- *Canvey Town Centre – development options work on key sites (where Cabinet is asked to note and agree funding for feasibility studies at the Paddocks site)*
- *West Canvey – landscape management planning for Site of Special Scientific Interest*
- *Canvey Town Team – priorities for funding bids*

## 5 Corporate Implications

### a. Financial Implications

5.1 For the Paddocks site on Canvey Island, approximately **£3,000** has been incurred in 2016/17 to date with a further **£2,000** to follow before the end of the financial year on initial feasibility work regarding options for community uses. These amounts have been funded from within existing budgets. An estimated further **£15,000** is required to be incurred during 2017/18 on additional consultants and architects fees to complete the design and feasibility studies at the Paddocks site.

5.2 No budgetary provision exists for this **£15,000**, and it would therefore need to be drawn from General Fund reserves in 2017/18.

5.3 The outcome of this work will then be reported back to Cabinet for further consideration.

- 5.4 All other initiatives described in this report are funded through existing approved Council budgets or by local and regional partners through their own resources.

**b. Legal Implications**

- 5.5 The Council on behalf of the Regeneration Partnership acts as the accountable body for the purposes of any grant. Accordingly it ensures that all contracts and expenditure are in accordance with its procedures.
- 5.6 The procurement of consultancy services regarding the Paddocks site has also been carried out in accordance with Council procedures.

**c. Human Resources & Equality Implications**

- 5.7 There are no implications of this kind arising from the recommendations in this report.

**d. Timescale for implementation & risk factors**

- 5.8 It is recommended that the Cabinet receives further updates on regeneration initiatives as described in this report together with any apparent risks which need to be managed at that time.

**6 Conclusions**

- 6.1 The Regeneration Partnership is continuing to pursue the ambitions described originally in the Regeneration Framework.
- 6.2 Furthermore officers continue to work with representatives of local businesses in order to provide any necessary advice as well as discussing potential initiatives that may improve their competitiveness as well as the local environment within which they operate.

**Background Papers**

None

**Report Author:** Steve Rogers – Local Plan & Regeneration Adviser

### Canvey Island

The regeneration of the **central Town Centre site** is a priority. The comprehensive redevelopment of the area remains an ambition; however discussion is underway on a number of alternative approaches to the redevelopment of some elements of the town centre with individual land owners and partners. In this way smaller scale options, discussed in the Town Centre Master plan, can be brought forward in advance of any comprehensive scheme.

One example of this approach includes the potential redevelopment of a site at the north-west corner of the town centre, close to the junction of Furtherwick Road, Knightswick Road and Vaagen Road. A number of options have been prepared which provide for new commercial floorspace and residential units together with improved access to and from the Lake and town centre.

Another example includes the evaluation of options for the Paddocks site for improved community uses, where feasibility work has been commissioned.

Work continues on the land management of the **former oil refinery site at West Canvey**, incorporating the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and areas of land nearby. The Land Trust has taken control of these areas and is preparing management regimes for the land in question. Partnership work is undertaken with Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and Bug Life. The West Canvey Members Liaison Group meets on a regular basis to review progress.

Commercial redevelopment proposals for the **land at Northwick Road, the land south of Roscommon Way and the land south of Morrison's Store** have all been considered and agreed by the Development Control Committee, which will ultimately bring forward long-anticipated business park and retail park developments.

**Canvey Town Team** has brought ambitious proposals for community uses, seafront improvements, town centre improvements and drainage enhancements in order to submit a bid to the Government's Coastal Communities Fund.

### Hadleigh

The **Hadleigh Town Centre Master Plan** continues to be used to guide development aspirations particularly those elements of the plan concerning shops and the central island site. Cabinet received a progress report on this project at its meetings in November 2016 and January 2017.

The County Council, together with relevant land owners is considering adjustments to the highways layout (involving the access and egress arrangements to Morrison's) consistent with the ambitions for regeneration of the town centre, as well as the views of the Hadleigh Town Centre Members Liaison Group.

The **Olympic Mountain Bike** venue operated by Essex County Council in partnership with the Salvation Army is now fully operational. The recreational trail

## **Cabinet - Regeneration Update Schedule – March 2017**

facilities and the visitor centre regularly host competitions as well as provide a unique leisure attraction in the Borough.

### **Business matters**

The **Castle Point Business Forum** meets on a regular basis to hear from guest speakers on matters of topical interest to local businesses. The events continue to be well-attended, and provide an opportunity for information exchange and networking.

### **Sub regional matters**

The **South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP)** (covering East Sussex, Essex, Kent, Medway, Southend and Thurrock) has become the vehicle through which bids for the Government's Growing Places Fund should be made.

The Partnership's 2016 growth deal proposal to the Government, suggested two transport schemes of particular relevance to Castle Point - access to Canvey and further medium and longer term works to the Fair Glen intersection. Regrettably neither scheme received funding on this occasion.

### **County matters**

In order to ensure that the priorities for Essex are promoted at the regional level, work has been taking place on a new growth and infrastructure framework for Essex. It is intended that this document will set out the case for improvements to infrastructure of all kinds across the county and its respective quadrants, and provide the basis for applications and bids for funds from the SELEP and Government.

### **Thames Gateway matters**

The private/public sector partnership **Opportunity South Essex** has evolved from the former Thames Gateway South Essex Partnership. It meets on a quarterly basis, to review key business priorities and projects in the sub-region. It also provides an opportunity to advocate the case for investment in the area.

Its Growth Strategy, priorities and ambitions were successfully launched at the international business and property exhibition in London in October and will guide its activities for the forthcoming year.

**CABINET**

**15th March 2017**

**Subject: Funding Support for Castle Point Youth Council**  
**Cabinet Member: Councillor Isaacs - Safer Communities Neighbourhoods and Leisure**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

To consider a request to provide the support and funding required to deliver and develop a Youth Council in Castle Point.

**2. Links to Council's Priorities and Objectives**

This report is linked to the Council's Aim of Transforming the Community.

**3. Recommendation**

That the Cabinet considers whether it wishes to support funding the Youth Council at an estimated cost of £17,140 for 2017/18.

If Cabinet wishes to approve funding support to allow the Castle Point Youth Council to continue: Cabinet agrees:

1. To provide funding support for the Castle Point Youth Council for 2017/18 in the sum of £ 17,140
  2. To advise the Castle Point Youth Council that any future requests will be reviewed and considered annually.
  3. To approve the draw down from General fund reserves.
- 

**4. Background**

Youth Councils enable the voice of young people to be heard. A Youth Council has been formed in Castle Point. The Castle Point Youth Council is made up of a group of 12 young people between the ages of 11 and 19 who meet fortnightly at the Council Offices to examine the issues that affect young people living in the Borough. Youth Council meetings are held every other Tuesday from 6.30pm to 8.00pm.

**Present position:**

The Youth Council is currently sponsored and supported by Essex County Council who provide limited administrative services and staffing and advice on how to operate as a Youth Council and deal with external agencies and other parties.

Castle Point Borough Council supports the Youth Council by providing a meeting room at the Council Offices.

The support from Essex County Council is to be withdrawn, with the result the Youth Council will no longer be able to function as there will no longer be the specialist support worker to provide guidance and advice to the Group

The Youth Council has requested Castle Point Borough Council to fund its future activities so that the Youth Council can continue.

**5. Proposals**

In order to assist Cabinet in considering this request for funding support detailed below are the aims of the Youth Council together with examples of projects undertaken by the Youth Council and the Youth Council's Programme for the next year:

**Aims of Castle Point Youth Council:**

- To give young people in Castle Point a voice in the community at Council and public meetings and at youth and community events.
- To involve all young people including hard-to-reach groups, in democracy through community participation, consultation and active citizenship.
- To raise the profile of young people to ensure that local decision makers recognise that young people are the future generation and therefore an important part of Castle Point's future.

**Examples of projects are:**

- **Duke of Edinburgh Awards**
- Annual youth conference
- Mystery shopping health facilities
- Alcohol awareness projects
- Website informing young people of activities to do locally
- Participation at Young Essex Assembly

**Youth Council Programme for 2017/18:**

The CPYC 2017/18 Programme includes:

- Membership of the Youth Essex Assembly (YEA)
- Jack Petchey Achievement Award scheme
- Act as a consultation forum for young people's views in the Borough
- Project(s) for young people
- Networking with other youth councils across Essex

- Expansion of the Youth Council – recruiting new Members

### Estimated Cost

In order to assist the Cabinet in considering the request for funding the full costs to fund the Youth Council to an appropriate and suitable standard are shown in the following table.

Members will note that in order to sustain a Youth Council it will be necessary to retain a Youth Worker to support the Youth Council:

Description	Estimated cost £
Room hire 26 weeks of the year 6.30 to 8pm £75 for use of CR1 (evening charge).	FOC
Salary of Youth Worker: JNC Youth Service Level 1 £14,599 - £17,651 pro rata 14 hours per week	7,807.00
Training residential (10 – 12 young people)	1,750.00
Residential transport	700.00
External Facilitator for training residential 2 days	500.00
Accreditation £20.00 per head	240.00
Refreshments and snacks	195.00
Engagement & consultation	500.00
Project funding	4,000.00
Promotional material	300.00
Resources	1,000.00
Celebration event	150.00
<b>Total estimated cost for 2017/18</b>	<b>17142.00</b>

These costs are purely indicative of the resources/funding which are required to support the Youth Council and it would not be possible to establish a fully functional Youth Council for a lesser sum.

Cabinet will appreciate that the provision of a Youth Service is a function reserved to Essex County Council .It is entirely at the discretion of the Borough Council to provide this funding support to enable the Castle Point Youth Council to continue.



Mindful of this and having regard to the financial implications dealt with later in the report; if Cabinet wishes to provide funding support it is suggested that this is for one year. In providing this support to the Youth Council it is made clear that the Council cannot give a commitment to fund the Youth Council beyond 2017/18. Any request to support future years would need to be reviewed and considered annually.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

As detailed above, the cost of this support is approximately **£17,140** for 2017/18. No budgetary provision exists for this sum, and it would therefore need to be drawn from General Fund reserves. This represents funding for one single year and does not provide any ongoing commitment to support the Youth Council beyond 2017/18.

The Medium Term Financial Forecast presented to Council in February 2017, indicates a significant funding gap in each financial year from 2018/19.

Whilst at the current time reserves appear healthy, there are very real and significant financial risks which may or may not materialise in future years, particularly around planning appeals and associated legal costs. These risks, coupled with the projected budget gap, will result in a complete depletion of general reserves by 2021/22.

Until each financial year is balanced, the Council should not enter into new and ongoing financial commitments, nor should it take any actions resulting in a significant ongoing reduction in any income streams.

### **(b) Legal Implications**

As support for the Youth Council raises child protection and safeguarding issues it would not be possible to provide less funding than is required to properly support and deliver the Youth Council.

### **(c) Human Resources and Equality Implications**

#### **Human Resources**

A part time youth worker will need to be employed for 14 hours per week to support the Youth Council.

#### **Equality Implications**

An Equality Impact Assessment has not been completed but there is a potential for a positive impact for young people.

### **(d) IT and Asset Management Implications**

None to be addressed by this report.

## **7. Timescale for implementation and Risk Factors**

Youth work is highly specialised and adequate financial and staffing arrangements are required. Any young people who come under the

supervision of the Council and who enter Council premises for meetings of the Youth Council and other activities need to be properly safeguarded.

## **8. Background Papers**

### **Report Author:**

Melanie Harris - Head of Licensing and Safer Communities

**CABINET**

**15th March 2017**

**Subject: Corporate Performance Scorecard Quarter 3 2016/17**

**Cabinet Member: Councillor Stanley - Finance and Resources**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

**To set out the performance figures for the Corporate Performance Scorecard for Quarter 3, 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016.**

**2. Links to Council's priorities and objectives**

**The scorecard is explicitly linked to the Council's priorities.**

**3. Recommendation**

**That Cabinet notes the reported performance in Appendix 1.**

---

**4. Background**

**4.1 The Corporate Scorecard reports on performance indicators for important service outcomes that are relevant to the Council's priorities.**

**4.2 The indicators for the corporate performance scorecard for 2016/17 were discussed and approved by Cabinet in June, and include consideration of Council aims and objectives as well as indicators that are important in areas such as customer service and contractor performance.**

**5. Report**

**5.1 Summary of performance**

**5.1.1 The performance summary in Appendix 1 sets out the performance achieved by the Council against the measures in the scorecard. Performance is generally satisfactory. Of the 14 indicators reported, 10 are at or above target, and 4 have not met the target.**

**Performance is set out against the priorities as follows:**

## ***Public Health and Wellbeing***

The Environmental Health service continues to maintain high performance with the percentage of food premises that are awarded a score of at least 3 on the food hygiene rating system at 93%, which is the same for the quarter 3 period last year.

Performance for households in temporary accommodation for quarter 3 dipped significantly when compared to the same quarter period last year and continues to increase substantially, exceeding the revised target of 120. This is due to an increase in homelessness applications and the lack suitable housing. Demand for the service continues to increase and this remains a significant issue for many local authorities following the impact of Welfare reforms. There has been some adjustments to staffing arrangements, including the appointment of a temporary officer to help deal with administration tasks to allow the rest of the team to focus on Housing Options work. The team are exploring different approaches to meet urgent housing need for the future as this increase in demand is unlikely to subside.

## ***Environment***

The overall percentage of Household waste recycled or composted was approximately 50%, and above the target of 49%. The performance for waste recycling is broadly on target and similar when compared to the same period last year.

The performance information for the percentage of streets inspected which are deemed to be unsatisfactory using Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse methodology, shows decreasing performance when compared to the same period last year and has not met target. There has been a sharp increase in litter over November and December, but performance is expected to improve over the coming months.

Performance for fly tipping and grass verge cutting Indicators is generally strong and the contractual arrangements are proving effective.

## ***Transforming our Community***

Tenant satisfaction with repairs and maintenance was 88% compared to a target of 97% and similar previous performance. The sample size was relatively small and it is understood that one tenant was dissatisfied and several neither satisfied or dissatisfied. This reduces the overall satisfaction figure. The rate for voids completion is also strong at 20.8 days and better than the target of 21.5 days.

The percentage of planning applications processed within target times exceeds target in all three areas.

The building control service ensured all applications were processed within statutory timescales.

### ***Efficient and Effective Customer Services***

The Council's First Contact team continue to be very successful in limiting the number of calls that they transfer to the back office and are near the target.

Finally, the sickness absence rate for staff is over target. There are a small number of critical illness cases that have contributed to this

5.1.2 Further commentary on performance is set out in the table in Appendix 1.

## **6. Corporate Implications**

### **a. Financial implications**

Good performance on some indicators can lead to reduced costs (e.g. higher recycling leads to a reduction in payments for sending waste to landfill)

### **b. Legal implications**

There are no direct legal implications at this stage.

### **c. Human resources and equality**

There are no direct human resource or equality implications at this stage.




### **d. Timescale for implementation and risk factors**

Monitoring of the Corporate Performance Scorecard is ongoing throughout the year.

## **7. Background Papers:**

None

Report Author: Craig Watts ext. 2419 [crwatts@castlepoint.gov.uk](mailto:crwatts@castlepoint.gov.uk)

Key	
	More than relative 10% below target
	Less than relative 10% below target
	On or above target



## Appendix 1

# Corporate Scorecard 2016/17 (Public Health & Wellbeing)

Quarter 3: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016



**Note: All performance values are cumulative (i.e. from 1<sup>st</sup> April to end of June/September/December/March) unless otherwise stated**

PI Code & Short Name	Q3 Value 2015/2016	Q3 Value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
EH2 Percentage of food premises that are awarded a score of at least 3 on the food hygiene rating scheme.  Service Manager: Environmental Health Operational Manager	93%	93%	90%	↔		A total of 416 of 447 premises included as part of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme were classified as 3* or above.
HLess 3 Number of Households in Temporary Accommodation  Service Manager: Community Support Manager	80	138	120	↓		The Housing Options service continues to face significant ongoing pressure. The number of households who approach the service continues to increase. There is also a significant shortage of temporary housing stock. Some work is being undertaken to help deal with the issues created by the increased demand, including some changes to staffing arrangements as well as investigation of properties that may be suitable for development as a House in Multiple Occupation.

# Corporate Scorecard 2016/17 (Environment)

Quarter 3: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016

**Note: All performance values are cumulative (i.e. from 1<sup>st</sup> April to end of June/September/December/March) unless otherwise stated**

PI Code & Short Name	Q3 Value 2015/2016	Q3 Value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
OPS4 Percentage of Household Waste Recycled  Service Manager: Operational Services Manager	24%	25%	Annual Target 25%	↔	✓	Figure is estimated and rounded. Performance is on target.
OPS 5 Percentage of Household Waste Composted (including food waste)  Service Manager: Operational Services Manager	26%	25%	Annual Target 24%	↔	✓	Figure is estimated and rounded. Performance is on target.
SS2 Percentage of streets inspected which are deemed to be unsatisfactory using Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse methodology.  Service Manager: Contracts Manager	7.8%	13.3%	Less than 10%	↑	●	It has been noted by both the Council and Pinnacle that there has been a sharp increase in litter over November and December, whilst these months do generally produce a greater amount of litter it is normally within the 10%.



PI Code & Short Name	Q3 Value 2015/2016	Q3 Value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
ENV 4 Flytips removed within one working day  Service Manager: Contracts Manager	100%	100%	90%	↔	✓	There were 170 recorded issues of fly tipping in this quarter, and it should be noted that the number of fly tips recorded in November and December was less than the same period last year, with changes to the Recycling.
SS4 Number of rectification and default notices served in relation to Highway Grass Verge cutting.  Service Manager: Contracts Manager	1	0	Under 50	↔	✓	The winter months and a lack of grass growth minimises the possibility of Rectifications or Defaults being served.
SS5 Percentage of Rectification Notices served in relation to Highway Grass Verge cutting rectified within 72 hours.  Service Manager: Contracts Manager	0	0	90%	↔	✓	See above, as there were no rectification notices, the result will be zero.



## Corporate Scorecard 2016/17 (Transforming our Community)

Quarter 3: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016

Note: All performance values are cumulative (i.e. from 1<sup>st</sup> April to end of June/September/December/March) unless otherwise stated

PI Code & Short Name	Q3 Value 2015 / 2016	Q3 Value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
HOS1 Overall tenant satisfaction with repairs and maintenance.  Service Manager: Tenancy Services Manager	97%	88%	97%	↓		The sample size was relatively small and it is understood that one tenant was dissatisfied and several neither satisfied or dissatisfied. This reduces the overall satisfaction figure.
HOS6 Average Void Turnaround Time.  Service Manager: Tenancy Services Manager	20.1 Days	20.8 Days	21.5 Days	↓		Generally good performance and within target.

PI Code & Short Name	Q3 Value 2015 / 2016	Q3 Value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
DC2 to DC4: Percentage of planning applications processed within target time limits for major, minor and other applications  Service Manager: Planning & Development Enforcement Manager	67%	100%	Major 60%	↑	✓	Performance has exceeded target in all three areas.
	74%	81%	Minor 65%	↑		
	83%	99%	Other 80%	↑		
Percentage of Building Control applications processed within statutory time limits.	100%	100%	100%	↔	✓	All applications were processed within the required timescales.

# Corporate Scorecard 2016/17 (Efficient & Effective Customer Services)



Quarter 3: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016

**Note: All performance values are cumulative (i.e. from 1<sup>st</sup> April to end of June/September/December/March) unless otherwise stated**

PI Code & Short Name	Q3 2015/16 Value	Q3 value 2016 / 2017	Target	Trend	Status	Comments
<p>FC1 Percentage of calls taken from customers by First Contact that are dealt with without the need to transfer to the back office</p> <p>Service Manager: Community Support Manager</p>	95%	93.7%	Annual Target 94%	↔	✓	The First Contact service continues to maintain strong performance in this area.
<p>Average number of days Sickness absence per FTE staff for all Council Services (rolling year)</p> <p>Service Manager: Human Resources Manager</p>	6.2 Days	8.3 Days	7 Days	↓	●	This figure reflects the fact that we have had several employees with serious illnesses.