

# **NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

**21 FEBRUARY 2017**

**CABINET REPORT FOR NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2016**

**Leader and Access and Affordable Housing – Councillor Graham Carr-Jones**

### **PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT**

#### **Food and Safety**

The North Dorset team are working with partnership colleagues to implement the new Tascomi Public Protection IT system replacing Civica. This provides the basis for unified service practice across the three authorities that will have many benefits including flexible use of resources and consistency. This system should also better support officers working in North Dorset as it will be a faster operating system and suit modern technology needed for field officers working from different locations following the closure of the main Nordon offices.

The food safety inspection targets for the current year are expected to be met target and at the moment there are no exceptional concerns concerning food, safety or infectious disease issues in the district. Good partnership working relationships are being developed that will be of assistance to all three councils to help with resilience for the inevitable occasions when intensive investigations are needed: this is one factor why the team can, and has been operating on a reduced level of resources.

#### **Housing**

**Below is a breakdown of the Housing Register for the 5<sup>th</sup> February 2017:**

Emergency – 2

Gold – 102

Silver – 278

Bronze – 372

Ineligible – 61 shared Ownership

Total – 815 **live** applications

The numbers on the register have more or less remained the same within the last quarter

#### **Applications**

Throughout the last 6 months of 2016 we have received on average 89 applications per month, total of 532 applications.

Throughout January the applications have increased to 121 of these 86 have been processed. The applications are being processed within the 20 days target – average of 6 days

### **Housed Applicants**

Throughout January we have housed **12** households, which can be broken down into the following bed sizes:

The bed needs for applicants housed are as follows:-

1 beds = 3

2 beds = 6

3 beds = 2

4 beds = 1

In addition we have housed a further **3** households by direct let with the Registered Provider. This can be for a variety of reasons for instance:

- To help the RP with efficient management of their stock.
- To move applicants into Trailway Court which is an extra care property, the vacancies are not advertised through the Locata system.
- Single applicants being housed into supported accommodation which again is not advertised through the Locata system

### **Reception/Triage**

We no longer receive help from Customer Services on reception which has a massive impact on the housing team. Below are some figures we have been collecting, from mid-April we will be collecting extra data and asking customers where they have travelled from:

**From 1 Oct 2016 – 31 Dec 2016 196 people seen:**

Housing register = 345 minutes or 7 hours 45 minutes

Housing register application = 380 minutes or 6 hour 20 minutes

Scanning = 775 or 12 hours 55 minutes

Homelessness = 180 minutes = 3hour

Trailways Enquiries = 25 minutes

Food Parcels = 100 minutes = 1hour 40 mins

Other = nil minutes

Housing Application on Line = 140 mins = 2 hours 20 minutes

Using the Local Housing Allowance Broad Rental Market Areas (BRMA) we have gathered information as to where are clients have travelled from

Mid and West Dorset **121**

Salisbury **34**

Yeovil **29**

Out of LHA area **12**

### **Homeless information**

#### **Approaches for advice and assistance**

We had **57** approaches from households requiring housing advice during **January 2017**

#### **Of which:**

Appointment at Blandford – **21**

Drop in at Blandford - **9**

Gillingham Direct – **19**

Home visits – **1**

Telephone interview - **7**

Multi-Agency meeting – **0**

Of those that approached and were given advice **13** were considered to be non-priority needs ie were not owed a duty by the Council.

#### **Homelessness applications**

In **January** there were **10** homeless forms given and **6** decisions made, of which:

**5** were accepted, **1** Not Homeless/advice given

There were **2** households in B&B at the end of **January 2017**.

## **CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on 7 November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

No items for this meeting

*Cabinet on 12 December 2016 considered the following items within this Portfolio.*

No items for this meeting

## **PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

Deed to be signed by NDDC as Spectrum shareholder to enable Spectrum/Sovereign merger to be implemented.

To appoint the Housing Finance Institute (HFI) to undertake a housing business ready review for North Dorset DC. To agree £4,000 + VAT of funding for this work, to come from Housing budgets.

## **PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT**

### **Parliamentary Briefing**

It has been a very busy few months in Planning and on 26<sup>th</sup> October I was invited to speak at a Parliamentary Briefing with Sajid Javid, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. It was a very useful session though every question I asked was met with the same answer: "That will be addressed in the upcoming White Paper". I therefore changed tack and because I was sat next to the Leader of Milton Keynes Council who were building out a development of 30,000 houses. I used that point with the Minister, to push that the "One Policy Fits All" theory was hugely flawed and a 30,000-house development in an Urban environment could not be treated the same as 1,800 houses in a rural one, for one, the urban area already has supporting infrastructure in place whereas in a rural area everything has to be provided from scratch. "Wait for the White Paper."

### **TCPA Annual Conference**

I was invited to speak at the TCPA's (Town and Country Planning Association) Annual Conference on 24<sup>th</sup> November. I was asked to give my views on the White Paper and how it would affect North Dorset. The White Paper was due to be released the day before on the 23<sup>rd</sup> but when it was realised that this was not going to happen, I was asked to address the Conference on what I would like to see in the Paper.

#### **"White Paper – what should it contain?"**

We've heard a lot of interesting, thought provoking views today about the potential for a new planning system. We've heard that, for a number of reasons the English planning system is in crisis. One of the clearest and pressing symptoms of this is the housing crisis.

Communities Minister Sajid Javid highlighted in his speeches at the Conservative Party Conference, focussing on the UK's housing crisis, that the administration's track record on delivering housing was poor. A fact that will not be challenged by anyone here, today.

So what should his response be to the housing crisis in the White Paper? Well, the indications of his intent have been contradictory and we need clarity.

Firstly, He said:

"So, my message is very clear: it's time to get building. The big developers must release their stranglehold on supply. Time to stop sitting on land banks, delaying build-out: the homebuyers must come first.

"Almost 280,000 planning permissions were issued over the last twelve months. I want to see each and every one of those homes built as soon as possible."

Good stuff so far. He recognizes that the developers aren't developing. He recognizes that the public sector has performed well; very well in fact given the austerity measures each Council has faced and the impact that has had on their planning departments.

However, then Sajid Javid went on to say: "Local leaders must be prepared to make difficult calls, even if they're unpopular. And so, must MPs and councillors.

"Of course, there are valid reasons to oppose some planning applications. But all of us have a duty to think about the long-term consequences of every decision we make.

"As elected representatives, we are here to take the right decisions – not the easy ones. Ultimately, we have a responsibility to build more houses."

Confused? I am. So, then he blames local politicians for not approving planning applications, the implication being that this is the reason for non-delivery!?!

This dichotomy perfectly illustrates what the White Paper needs to address.

Now, I was very pleased to read in a recent CBI paper that:

*"The "one size fits all" approach has passed its sell-by date. ....As the demographic landscape changes, we must have homes in the right places that fit the needs of people who live in them, creating vibrant and attractive communities. Equally, we must see different types of players in the market, like small housebuilders, more innovation and new partnerships between business to boost our supply base."*

A recent LGA document reads:

*"Every area is different and councils are continuing to lead the local effort. They are approving nine in 10 planning applications, providing homes that are needed and are affordable, and wanting to create environments where people are healthy and happy"*

And

*"Councils are well placed to bridge the gap between housing need and future building levels, and are providing local leadership and seeking new approaches to financing and supporting house building directly and in partnership with developers."*

This seems to me what local authority leaders and I have been saying at all levels and nationally, so I would hope that the White Paper would respond to that.

At a recent Parliamentary briefing with Sajid Javid, it was said that in Planning, one policy definitely does not fit all. The national picture is too diverse and a 30,000 homes scheme in an environment such as Milton Keynes cannot be treated in the same way as a development of 1,800 houses in Rural Dorset, even though the latter would be delivering an expansion of 34% to a Rural Market Town, nor does it even fit locally, for in Dorset we have both Urban and Rural areas which have to be treated very differently.

Councils are best placed to deliver the right homes in the right places to fit the needs of those in their area. Every Local Authority has researched its own evidence base and we now need

some Autonomy; Autonomy to be able to actually deliver the homes in our areas that we KNOW we need.

Some whispers emerging from government are that LAs not delivering enough starter homes in their areas will be penalized this is regardless of whether those types of houses fit the needs of our new communities. In Dorset and other rural areas homes at 80% of their price are still the unaffordable affordable homes because in our areas the skills levels are low attracting low salaries in an area where house prices are high and the gap between the two is unbridgeable; and of course, developers will only build the houses they know they can sell.

Recent Ministerial articles talk of using the carrot and the stick approach with developers to get more delivery, not a moment too soon if it can be achieved because the only stick that I can see is being raised in the direction of Local Planning Authorities threatened with designation for not delivering enough housing even though the Planning Authority has given more than enough consents.

It is time for the government to use the carrot with Local Authorities and say “How can we help you?” Does the government realise that we actually want development and growth? We are not asking for less housing, but that we determine through our own evidence bases the make-up of that housing based upon actual assessed need.

To understand whether the measures in a Housing White Paper will be enough, we should be clear about the key causes and current conditions.

Essentially, the key causes include: lack of investment;

Lack of investment in the economy and skills;

Lack of investment into lending opportunities;  
and

Lack of investment into the public sector to enable the professionals, such as planners, to deliver what their professional training prepares them to do.

The other key cause, which I've just been highlighting, is misdirected government intervention: Beating local authorities with the five-year housing land supply stick, despite all the evidence showing that planning permissions are at record levels;

Essentially, the lack of resources of the many –  
the families even on moderate incomes accessing mortgages to pay hugely inflated prices even for the most modest of homes;

the communities and SME builders accessing finance to pay hugely inflated land prices to deliver homes on smaller plots,

This is Balanced against the might of the few -

including the major housebuilders and lenders who influence government policy, results in a continuing division of an unbalanced society and compounds the problems it faces.

So, **what should the White Paper do** to help deliver housing the country so desperately needs?

The only way to create sustainable housing delivery and a fair planning system is to tackle the root causes and to start to focus on some key actions:

1. **Introduce sanctions .....to land promoters who land bank a significant proportion of their fixed asset in withholding land from the market.**

It is of course recognised that a certain level of land acquisition is needed to stabilise investment and create certainty for the business model. However, this should not be allowed to skew land prices to such an extent that it creates market failure.

2. **Remove sanctions from local planning authorities that do not correlate with the intended policy outcome.....**

The requirement of a five-year housing land supply should not be linked with delivery, which local planning authorities do not control. The current performance link to delivery simply transfers an enhanced and unbalanced level of control to land promoters and developers which then undermines sustainable site delivery and placemaking.

If the Government and the Housing and Communities Ministers are committed to tackling the housing crisis, these two measures should be absolutely fundamental in supporting a strategic housing plan that all government departments are signed up to delivering and is funded on accelerating housing development initiatives across the board.

In addition, **other measures that the Housing White Paper should propose** include:

**A duty to collaborate between the public and the private sectors** – one of the key factors which delays planning applications progressing through the planning system is lack of demonstrable commitment from applicants to deliver the objectives set out within the development plan. Placemaking and infrastructure delivery should be the foundations of housing delivery, and collaboration benchmarks would provide a clear framework by which planning application timelines can be realistically assessed. Garden City and Village principles are an exemplar, but there shouldn't be a two-tier system of land assembly correlating with quality.

Incentivise diversification and innovation within the housing market by **helping local authorities to take control over delivery by re-visiting regulations around CPO powers**. Birmingham City Council has shown its support for a new 'use it or lose it' policy which allows the Council to compulsorily purchase undeveloped land from developers, and empty homes. One of the difficulties with CPO is the extraordinarily long time frame of the process without any guarantee that it will succeed. The Housing White Paper should address any statutory and regulatory constraints which restrict the CPO powers being used by Local Authorities to take control over its housing delivery.

Basically, the White Paper should be about how Government is going to assist Local Planning Authorities to implement their Local Plans and deliver the types of homes that they know their communities need."

Sound Bites from the speech were being tweeted before I had finished. I was very well received.

**TCPA New Communities Group**

On the 8<sup>th</sup> December I met with Gavin Barwell the newly appointed Minister for Housing and Planning replacing Brandon Lewis.

#### Summary of the key issues

- 1. The NPPF 5-year land supply** is a blunt instrument and is causing perverse outcomes particularly where a local authority has committed to long term growth at scale. Members have been put under immense pressure from hostile applications, which demoralises communities and officers. 5-year land supply versus build rate is a big issue, since local authorities have few powers to ensure the private sector builds out at a reasonable rate. There should be planning freedoms for Garden Villages – large scale sites should be exempt, or it should be split between a large site and the rest of the authority area. NCG members welcome the suggestion of some form of certification for 5-year land supply and the prospect of clearly defined planning freedoms set out in the Housing White Paper.
- 2. Encourage developers to build out permissions.** NCG members are keen to explore measures which could penalise developers who have permissions, but are land banking and not building. There was recognition that the private sector need a pipeline of sites, but that this had become unbalanced. NCG members welcome the Minister's commitment to focus on infrastructure provision and to more transparent data from developers on build out rates. A firm commitment to introducing requirements for developers on completion rates would be a powerful piece of leverage for the NCG members.
- 3. Pooling of S.106 for infrastructure costs** associated with large-scale development. The NCG members welcome the Minister's commitment to allow pooling of S.106 funds and the increase in resources through the Housing Infrastructure Fund. Infrastructure provision and particularly the upfront delivery of social and transport infrastructure remains one of the key issues in delivering at scale and in securing public consent.
- 4. Resources for planning departments are a key factor in having enough capacity for growth.** Some members want locally determined fees on planning applications – so that they can spend more money on planning. Members welcome the prospect of greater freedom, but recognise that this would only go so far in building the capacity necessary to manage large scale growth.
- 5. Local development corporations** - will be a useful tool to have in reserve for local authorities to use if need be. NCG members support the updating of this approach in the Housing White Paper.
- 6. Treasury enforced spending and debt caps** – local authorities want to build good quality homes themselves (e.g. social housing for rent), to help alleviate homelessness and unaffordability but are unable to do so. NCG members are keen to bring in SME builders to speed up delivery. There is an issue of the building trade's assessment of housing demand – does not reflect true situation – there is more demand than they think.

Members of the NCG strongly welcome the Minister's positive approach to the role of local authorities directly delivering housing. While changes to Treasury rules on borrowing will be difficult, this level of local freedom could be transformative and the debate should not be lost.

7. **Confusion about devolution** and local authority reorganisation – members want stability and clarity. Members welcome the commitment that change would not be imposed.
8. **Land value capture** – members want a standardised approach - (East Hampshire DC can share their learning on this). There is also an issue of land value inflation.

## **Housing White Paper**

The Housing White Paper was only released yesterday and so we are still closely analysing it. There are lots of new ideas and policies to help unlock sites and accelerate development and to give Local Authorities tools to ensure delivery actually happens after permissions have been granted. There is mentioned the possibility of changing the time for developers to commence development from 3 years to 2 years. I am wary of the new policy on "Housing Delivery Test" which have the potential to give LA's falling short of their housing numbers severe headaches but we will have to see how that pans out. One section that I was very relieved to see included was:

### **Step 1: Planning for the right homes in the right places**

- Making sure every part of the country has an up-to-date, sufficiently ambitious plan so that local communities decide where development should go;
- 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;

Finally we do get some autonomy!

Follow this link for the White Paper

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/590463/Fixing\\_our\\_broken\\_housing\\_market\\_-\\_accessible\\_version.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/590463/Fixing_our_broken_housing_market_-_accessible_version.pdf)

## **CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

*No items for this meeting*

*Cabinet on December 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet considered and adopted the Western Dorset Economic Growth Strategy which was looking at the principle growth areas of Gillingham, Blandford and Shaftesbury in the North and Weymouth and Dorchester in the West. An action plan showing more

detail would follow in the new year and a bid for growth deal funding had been submitted to the LEP and the outcome was awaited.

Cabinet considered a report on the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan, which was the first such Plan to go to a referendum in North Dorset. If the referendum was favourable, the Plan would cover the period 2016 – 2031.

#### **PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

The designation of the whole of the parished area of Hazelbury Bryan as a neighbourhood area.

Kington Magna Conservation Area Appraisal and Colesbrook Conservation Area Appraisal agreement for public consultation

## **Environment – Councillor Michael Roake**

### **PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT Joint Committee DWP 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Finance and Performance Report.

There is a predicted underspend of £1.28m which is slightly improved since the previous Joint Committee held in November meeting and represented 3.7% of the original budget against a revenue budget of £34.25m

The reasons for the underspend were primarily:  
Household Recycling Centre contract, £302k  
Recyclate price, £264k  
Reduction in winter HRC opening hours, £158k.  
Commercial Waste, £306k  
Garden Waste, £157k-(1 in 5 use the garden waste service)

Key Performance indicators;  
202,00 bins emptied every week  
Annual cost per household £153  
Recycling, reused, recycling or composted in North Dorset 61%  
Landfill tax per tonne £84:40 per tonne  
Current waste sent to landfill 21.5%

Joint Committee considered a report by the Treasurer to the Dorset Waste Partnership which contained revenue estimates for 2017-18 totalling a net cost of £33.1m was adopted.

Charging for "Recycle for Dorset" Containers –  
The Joint Committee approved charging for:  
New Development  
Larger rubbish bins.  
Additional refuse sacks  
There would be no charge for lost or damaged containers other than communal bins  
The net savings in a full year would £98.5k

The UK's recycling and composting levels appear to be falling however pleased to report Dorset has become the joint top county area for recycling.  
In the top 3 councils that both collect and dispose of their waste.  
In the top 15 overall, out of 350 local authorities.  
A recent survey shows that the overall satisfaction rate for the Recycle for Dorset service is 94%.

### **CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on 7 November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

No items for this meeting.

*Cabinet on 12 December 2016 considered the following items within this portfolio:*

Cabinet considered and approved in principle the draft revenue estimates for the Dorset Waste Partnership for 2017/18.

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

To approve the increase in the price of swimming lessons as proposed by the council's operator of Blandford Leisure Centre, SLM Ltd, with affect from January 2017.

## **PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT**

### **Community Development**

In July 2016 Cabinet took the decision to recommend a reduction to the Community Services budget for 2017/18. This difficult decision was driven by the severe financial forecast. The proposal has been the subject of a full consultation with the public and stakeholders the outcome of which was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Taking account of the views expressed in the consultation, Cabinet have recommended a reduction of £100,000 to this budget, with a one off project completion fund of up to £10,000. This is reflected in the Budget Report to Council.

There will therefore be no NDDC funding for the Community Partnerships and the Community Resource Workers in the coming financial year. However, it is hoped that some or all of the Partnerships will continue, albeit in a different guise, using funds of their own or from other sources, and that some of the activity of the Community Resource Workers will be taken up by other bodies.

**North Dorset Apprenticeship Grant Scheme.**

The District Council has developed and launched a pilot Apprenticeship Grant Scheme to support businesses in establishing apprenticeships in the area. This initiative supports the Council's strategic priority of promoting small business and the local economy.

Grants, which are paid to the employing business rather than the apprentice, are for new or additional apprenticeship and both the business and the apprentice must be based in North Dorset. The maximum grant is £1,500 per apprenticeship.

Awards are considered against a set of criteria which are broadly in line with the Government's own apprenticeship scheme, and final decisions are reported to the Economy Board. Ward Councillors will be informed of awards to business in their Ward. This is a pilot scheme which will be subject to review after 6 months.

The new scheme is being widely promoted within the business community.

### **Dorset Enterprise Adviser Programme.**

The Dorset Enterprise Advisor Scheme will improve links between schools, students and business by creating a network of volunteer Enterprise Advisors to offer first class career advice to young people. The scheme is funded by the LEP, DCC and our fellow Partnership Councils. We have agreed to contribute £5,000 for two years to support this project given that it will help to deliver against a key priority in the Skills Study Action Plan.

**Economic Growth Fund.**

A grant of £4,000 was made *to All in the Balance*, in Stalbridge, a start-up partnership specialising in the repair and maintenance of antique and vintage clocks and watches.

**Car Parking**

Twenty old pay and display machines in North Dorset car parks are to be replaced with up to date machines with credit card and coin payment facilities.

A review of signs and white lines in car parks is well underway in readiness for a programme of maintenance.

We are working with Blandford Town Team on a new refund scheme whereby certain retailers offer a refund on parking charges to shoppers who spend with them. Discussions are in hand with Morrison's regarding relocating some of the disabled and family friendly bays in the Marsh and Ham car park.

In Sturminster we are liaising with the Town Council over provision of more bicycle parking stands in Station Road and in Gillingham the long awaited work to create steps from the car park in Chantry Fields to Le Neuberg Way inches ever closer and is now in the relevant work programme.

The move in-house of cash collection and the maintenance of the pay and display machines is going well, with better service levels. Savings have been realised through the termination of the contracts with external providers.

Cabinet agreed to give the Head of Asset and Infrastructure delegated powers to make Traffic Regulation Orders and to cancelling Penalty Charge Notices in association with the Council's off-street parking. This brings the authority for managing and control of car parking for North Dorset in line with the Dorset Councils partners.

### **North Dorset Business Day, 17<sup>th</sup> November, the Exchange, Sturminster Newton.**

The District Council, in partnership with the Dorset Growth Hub, Sturquest, Shaftesbury and District Task Force and the Exchange, held the second North Dorset Business Day on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016, in the Exchange in Sturminster Newton. This half day business-to-business networking event was a considerable success with 43 businesses exhibiting and a further 150 business people attending. The event was opened by Simon Hoare MP.

The evaluation and the feedback at the post event review and was overwhelmingly positive, with helpful suggestions for improvement. The Council intends to hold a third event this year to build on this momentum.

#### **Democratic and Electoral Services**

The ModGov system has been working well since it went live on 3 October, and the Team has had good feedback from Members. A number of Members have already opted to go paperless ahead of the planned cut-off date for printing hard copy agendas, April 2017. A large number of members have downloaded the ModGov app on their tablets, to widespread enthusiasm. The app is very easy to use, allowing us to read, highlight and annotate reports on screen.

The Democratic Services Team are now working to allow officers to input their reports, in draft, directly to the system for circulation to relevant officers/councillors for comment.

There have been a number of drop-in sessions for Members to see a demonstration of the corporate laptops and tablets that are available for our use. Once the devices are issued full support will be available. If any member has not yet indicated their choice of device please do so as soon as possible. Printing is planned to cease on 1st April and any requests for printed papers after that date will have to be met by Democratic Services staff on the office printer, which will be costly and time consuming.

The introduction of ModGov has achieved huge efficiencies and, as a result, vacant posts within the Team have been released, making a saving of 2 FTEs – a great result.

### **Referendum and by elections**

North Dorset held its first Neighborhood Planning Referendum on 9<sup>th</sup> February in Shillingstone. The outcome is unknown as I write this report. This village has been the

pioneer for Neighborhood Planning in the district and The Neighborhood Planning Group; Parish Council and citizens are to be congratulated on their sterling work. There are currently two town by-elections scheduled for 9<sup>th</sup> March, in Shaftesbury, to elect 3 new Town Councillors. The cost of town or parish by elections is born by the Town or Parish Council. Work is also underway across the Partnership for the DCC elections on 4<sup>th</sup> May.

#### **Nordon closure**

The last meeting at Nordon will be the “Farewell” Council meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> March. From 1<sup>st</sup> April, Full Council and Planning Committees, and, if appropriate, some Licensing Committees, will take place at Durweston Village Hall with all other Committees taking place at SWH. The microphone system in the Council Chamber will be moved to Durweston Village Hall. The April Planning Committee will be the first Durweston meeting.

### **CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on 7 November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet received and noted the report on Community Partnership activity during the period April to August 2016.

*Cabinet on 12 December 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet considered and adopted the Western Dorset Economic Growth Strategy which was looking at the principle growth areas of Gillingham, Blandford and Shaftesbury in the North and Weymouth and Dorchester in the West. An action plan showing more detail would follow in the new year and a bid for growth deal funding had been submitted to the LEP and the outcome was awaited.

Cabinet considered Car Park Operational Efficiency Measures which would give delegated powers to the Head of Assets and Infrastructure to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the Council’s off street car parks, and the power to cancel Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) associated with the Council’s off street car parks. Portfolio Holder approval would be sought prior to making a TRO.

### **PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

That a grant of £3,200 is awarded towards equipment costs for Sweet Pea Café, Sturminster Newton.

## **PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT**

SVPP Budget to be set at Joint Committee on 6 February. Will show a budget for NDDC of £843,000 for 2017/18. This represents a reduction of £208,000 (20%) from the original budget entering the SVPP partnership of £1,051,000. The budget takes account of all pay changes and recent pension increases.

SVPP are on course to underspend for 2016/17 whilst seeing and improvement in Benefit Processing for the Council. The position for the year to December is an average processing time of 20 days for new claims and 8 days for changes. Last year at this time it was 25 days and 17 days respectively.

The CAT Team have been located successfully from NDDC to Northmead House since December and all costs of moving have been met within the 2016/17 SVPP Budget. Telephone call handling shows that the partnership took over 150,000 calls in the year to date with an average of 95% of all calls answered.

Staff from SDP / SVPP / Bmth are now working together to produce a Business Case for a Pan-Dorset shared Revenues and Benefits Partnership

## **CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on 7 November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet considered revised criteria for the determination of applications for discretionary rate relief which would ensure that each case was determined having regard to the merits of each case and the contribution they make towards the local community.

Cabinet considered the Interim Position Statement on Public & Stakeholder Consultation -Budget Savings Options on Grant to North Dorset CAB and Community Development Budget. (This was subsequently referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration).

*Cabinet on December 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio*

## **PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

None for this period

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S REPORT**

**CABINET DECISIONS WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

*Cabinet on 7 November 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet considered and noted the latest position and the projected outturn for the year in respect of the 2016/17 revenue and capital budgets.

Cabinet considered the Quarter 2 Business Review and noted the latest position and the projected outturn for the year in respect of the 2016/17 revenue and capital budgets.

*Cabinet on 12 December 2016 considered the following item within this portfolio:*

Cabinet received and noted a verbal update on the budget position for 2107/18 which had not changed since the September position.

Cabinet approved the updated Joint Risk Management Strategy which would be operational across the Partnership.

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS MADE WITHIN THIS PORTFOLIO**

None for this period