

## Cabinet

22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021

### PRESENT:-

Councillors S. Brady (Chair), D. R. Hale (Deputy Chair), J. Black, P. Clark, D. Craker, A. Harrison, G. Lunn, R. Pantelakis, M. Thompson and Councillor P. Webster.

### IN ATTENDANCE:-

M. Jukes (Chief Executive), D. Bell (Director of Finance and Transformation), M. Jones (Director of Regeneration), I. Anderson (Director of Legal Services and Partnerships), P. Turner (Director of Children's, Young People and Family Services), J. Weldon (Director of Public Health and Adult Services) and L. Scholes (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

A. Codd (Assistant Director Economic Development and Regeneration) – minutes 223-225

A. Burton (Assistant Director of Streetscene) – minute 226

G. Taylor (Assistant Director Major Projects and Infrastructure) – minute 227

N. Harne (Assistant Director of Neighbourhoods and Communities) – minute 228

A. Smith (Project Officer Co-ordinator Manager) – minute 228

### APOLOGIES:-

None.

<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Description/Decision</b>	<b>Action By/Deadline</b>
<b>PROCEDURAL ITEMS</b>		
214	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in minute 221 insofar as he is a Director of Kingstown Works Limited.	
215	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2021</b>  <b>Agreed</b> – that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 25 <sup>th</sup> January, 2021, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chair	
216	<b>PUBLIC QUESTIONS</b>  <b>Questions to Councillor Hale, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning, Land and Property:</b>	

- a) Why are the planning dept. looking for a 4 week extension to the East Carr Master plan SPD no.6 when they could not answer any questions posed to them during the 6 week consultation of what benefit would a 4 week extension be to the local residents.

Answer

This is standard practice for all SPD's as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement which is an approved document outlining how the Council will consult on planning documents. Which means it is not peculiar to this SPD, the Council has the right to do this on any SPD and is doing so in this case.

- b) Considering 600 plus objections were received by the planning dept. regarding the East Carr Master plan SPD no.6 why has this not been scrapped now due to the level of objections from local residents.

Answer

In planning terms, the number of responses is not in its own right a reason for not progressing with the SPD. Although, I am sure Members will take account of that when coming to decisions and take into account any representations for any scheme.

- c) 600 plus objections, 53 residents attended the consultation at Saltshouse Tavern, these figures are on the conservative side to say the least what are the exact figures of objections and attendance at the consultation.

Answer

The exact number of representations is set out in the Consultation Statement within the Cabinet report and when we discuss that later on the Cabinet agenda I am sure that will be spoken about.

- d) Will the highways and environmental assessment be made public to the residents if so when.

Answer

Absolutely it will obviously be made public as part of that process. We have no indication of timescales yet other than a commitment that it has to happen before any planning application is determined.

- e) 600 plus objections mainly objecting to the use of a

quiet cul de sac and an unfit highway, we ask that you remove any reference to the use of Danby Close and East Carr Road as any access to any proposed development.

Answer

I think we are unable to do that currently because those two roads remain a preferred route into the site. As we have said already there would have to be a full transport assessment and a flood assessment as part of any process if the recommendations are passed today.

- f) Why can't the planning dept. be open and honest with the local residents they obviously already have the answers to all or most of the questions that were presented to them during the consultation? I.e. drainage connections, East Carr road highway upgrades, Living with water, proposed development access from one development to the other as they are two land owners. Some of which are already covered by various supplementary planning documents.

Answer

The planning department is open with all information it holds and is committed to sharing any technical assessments as they are submitted. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment produced to support the allocation of sites in the current plan is already available on the Council's website.

- g) Detrimental effect to the residents of Danby Close and the East Carr Road and the local area by 10 years of building works, heavy trucks, heavy machinery, mud, contractors, noise and the pollution this will bring is this acceptable because it wasn't in 1995 that's not forgetting the proposed Bus route.

Answer

When any site is developed in the City there is disruption in the construction phase. This matter would need to be considered as part of the SPD and conditions would be attached to any planning application to mitigate these impacts.

- h) Can the planning dept. please explain why Western Gales Way have the opportunity to have a consultation letter to be delivered regarding the traffic assessment why isn't the same courtesy being

	<p>given to all residents of Howdale.</p> <p><u>Answer</u></p> <p>I think it will be, when a transport impact assessment is undertaken all residents will be given the opportunity able to comment on its findings and be made aware of the process.</p> <p>i) The developments build on Noddle Hill Way, Whisper Wood Way and Leadhills Way both have the same access as Danby Close to the fields behind them with the potential to develop the land behind them how have this fields been left out of any Hull Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Answer</u></p> <p>The Local Plan that was produced and the accompanying Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identified these fields as a functional floodplain. Accordingly the Local Plan allocated this land as a functional floodplain. The same description did not apply to the site of the SPD which was, at that time, allocated for housing.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> – that the response be sent to Mr Ashton.</p>	<p>Senior Democratic Services Officer - LS</p>
--	---	--

NON-EXEMPT ITEMS

Key Decisions

<p>217</p>	<p><b>COUNCIL BUDGET REPORTS 2021/22</b></p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which presented the suite of reports that would be considered by Council on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2021.</p> <p>The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b></p> <p>(a) That Cabinet approve the Leader’s Budget Proposals for 2021/22 and beyond as set out in the recommendations of each report and specifically;</p>	<p>(a-d) Director of Finance and Transformation</p>
------------	---	---

	<p>(b) That Cabinet approve the Revenue Budget savings and Service expenditure allocations as set out in Appendix B (i) and D; subject to any budget amendments properly notified to and approved by Council in line with the Constitution;</p> <p>(c) That Cabinet endorse the levels of Council Tax, noting the precepts of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Humberside and the Fire Authority are yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>(d) That Cabinet note the comments of the Director of Finance and Transformation (section 151 Officer) on the robustness of the budget and the adequacy of reserves as set out in paragraph 66 of the General Fund Report.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide a set of clear proposals that will enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2021/22 and to provide authorisation from Cabinet for the implementation of the budget savings, subject to the agreement by Council of the Budget.</li> </ul>	(Section 151 Officer)
218	<p><b>GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET 2021/22 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2022/23 TO 2023/24</b></p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which set out the Leader's General Fund Revenue Budget 2021/22</p> <p>The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members endorsed the comments of Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission in relation to the excellent work by Streetscene Services and Communications Team.</p> <p><b>Agreed – that Cabinet recommends to Council as follows –</b></p> <p>(a) That Council note the Leader's Budget Statement 2021/22 as set out in Appendix A(ii);</p> <p>(b) That Council approve the Council's 2021/22 Revenue Budget savings and Service expenditure allocations as set out in Appendices B (ii) and C;</p>	(a-i) Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer)

	<p>subject to any budget amendments properly notified to and approved by Council in line with the Constitution;</p> <p>(c) That Council note the Medium Term Financial Plan as set out at Appendix D;</p> <p>(d) That Council approve the Capital Receipts Flexibility Strategy set out at Appendix E:</p> <p>(e) That Council approve the contribution to/from reserves and levels proposed at Appendix G;</p> <p>(f) That Council note the Health and Social Care Integrated Financial Plan, showing the expected spend in the City of both the Council and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), and support decision making relating to funds within this Plan being subject to consideration and approval by the Committees in Common.</p> <p>(g) That Council approve the levels of Council Tax, noting the precepts of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Humberside and the Humberside Fire Authority as set out at Appendix I (TBC)</p> <p>(h) That Council approve the allocations of Direct Schools Grant (DSG) including those relating to High Needs and Early Years as set out at Appendix J.</p> <p>(i) That Council note the comments of the Director of Finance and Transformation and Section 151 Officer on the robustness of the Budget and adequacy of reserves as set out at paragraph 65 and informed by the CIPFA resilience index summarised at paragraph 60 and Appendix K.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is required to set a balanced budget and the revenue budget forms part of this process</li> </ul>	
219	<p><b>REVIEW OF LOCALLY DEFINED DISCOUNTS FOR COUNCIL TAX IN 2021/22</b></p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which set out the options for</p>	

locally defined Council Tax discounts for 2021/22.

The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.

Members discussed the comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission, they were broadly supportive of the proposals. This would help reduce the impact of empty properties in the City and persuade people to bring empty properties back into use.

Members thanked officers and the Portfolio Holder for the plan to offer those most in need the £30 hardship payment which meant for those people there would effectively not be an increase in Council Tax payments. The Council Tax would appear to go up, this was due to not receiving the £150 from the government that had been available in the last financial year.

**Agreed** – that Cabinet recommends the following to Council –

- (a) That Council confirm they wish to continue to award 0% discounts for 2<sup>nd</sup> homes and those homes that are empty and uninhabitable (Class D) and empty and unfurnished (Class C), option 7.1.
- (b) That Council confirm the continuation of the empty property premiums on the Council Tax charge for properties empty for over 2 years (100% extra charge) and those empty for over 5 years (200% extra charge) option 7.5, and an increase in that premium to 300% extra in 2021/22 for those properties empty for 10 years or more, option 7.6.
- (c) That Council confirm the continuation of provision to remove the empty property premium on a discretionary basis for up to 12 months from date of purchase for new owners who are actively renovating the property to sell or place on the rental market, option 7.7.
- (d) That Council confirm they wish to continue the Special Constabulary (Police) Discount, option 7.2 or cease this arrangement with effect from 31 March 2021, option 7.3.
- (e) That Council confirm they wish to continue the Volunteer Reserve Forces Discount, option 7.4, for

(a-g) Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer)

which there have been no claims in 2020/21.

**As Decision maker:**

- (f) That Cabinet agree that available Covid-19 Council Tax hardship funding be applied to fund a £30 hardship payment to meet the all working age recipients of a Council Tax Reduction during 2021/22, option 7.11.
- (g) That Cabinet approve the introduction of a discretionary hardship fund to contribute to the recoverable Court costs where formal action is required to recover Council tax and the debt owed is below £60.

Reasons for recommendation

- With regard to providing zero discounts for empty properties and charging an additional 100% premium for those that have been empty more than 2 years, an additional 200% premium for those properties empty for 5 years or more and an additional 300% for those empty for 10 years or more. The city currently has a demand for accommodation that exceeds the number of properties available within its boundaries and there is ongoing concern regarding owners leaving properties empty. The historical Government Council Tax exemption scheme pre April 2013 rewarded such lack of activity, but by using new local powers since to reduce the level of discount awarded on empty homes and by introducing a premium for those empty more than 2 years, there is evidence that the number of long-term empty properties has reduced.
- From 01 April 2021 the Government has amended Council Tax legislation to enable Local Authorities to increase the additional premium for properties that have been empty for more than 10 years to 300% of the standard Council Tax charged as well as the current charge of 100% more for those properties empty more than 2 years and 200% more for those properties empty for 5 years or more. The purpose of this increase is to encourage empty properties to be brought back into use and this report recommends the Council apply the 300% premium to those properties empty 10 years or more for this reason. However, in order not to deter or penalise new owners of properties that have purchased them

to renovate for occupation, to sell, or to place on the rental market it is recommended that Council Tax officers continue to be given the discretion to remove the additional premium for a period of up to 12 months from date of purchase for owners who are actively renovating the property for these reasons.

- The Special Constables local discount encourages citizens living in the City to volunteer as Special Constables by providing a reward for their work.
- The discount for Volunteer Reserve Forces recognises the service of local reservists called up to serve their country abroad.
- From April 2013 Local Council Tax Reduction replaced the national Council Tax Benefit scheme, with reduced Grant funding from the Government for the scheme meaning Local Authorities either had to find funds to subsidise the scheme, or start to charge some households who previously did not pay Council Tax. The Council decided to implement a scheme requiring all working age households to pay a minimum of 20% of their liability.
- Members could choose to change the minimum amount that working age households have to pay from the current 20%, however there is a requirement that Local Authorities wishing to vary their schemes must hold a formal public consultation. As it is recommended that the scheme remains at 20%, a consultation has not taken place.
- In 2014/15 when the 20% minimum payment was introduced the in-year collection rate for Council Tax was 93.63%, with collection in 2019/20 being 93.44%. It is therefore considered to be the correct option to continue with the same scheme for 2021/22 as payment levels of Council Tax have remained consistent.
- The payment of an additional £30 hardship payment to working age Council Tax payers receiving a Reduction in their Council tax would help those on the lowest income pay their Council Tax for 2021/22. Supplementing this with a discretionary hardship fund to contribute to the recoverable Court costs where formal action is required to recover Council tax and the debt owed is below £60 mitigates the risk of additional court and recovery costs being imposed through the debt recovery process which

	<p>place individuals in greater hardship than would be the case under the actual debt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the Care Leavers Council Tax discount, the Government's care leavers' strategy, Keep on Caring, published in July 2016, encouraged councils to consider the role of a corporate parent 'through the lens of what any reasonable parent does to give their child the best start in life'. Local Authorities were encouraged to consider exempting care leavers from Council Tax using the powers already at their disposal. Local Authorities must plan for looked after children so that they have the support they need as they make their transition to the responsibilities of adulthood.</li> <li>• In its role as Corporate Parent for those young people in Local Authority care from 1 April 2018, the Council introduced a local Council Tax Discount under section 13A(1)(c) of the LGFA 1992 for young people leaving the care system as a result of reaching the age of 18. The discount enables the Local Authority to support those care leavers who would otherwise struggle with the transition from care to independence, enabling them to avoid debt and giving them more time to learn to manage their finances.</li> </ul>	
220	<p><b>CAPITAL STRATEGY 2021-22 TO 2023-24</b></p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which sought approval of the Council's 2021/22 Capital Strategy which incorporated the 2021/22 to 2023/24 Capital Programme.</p> <p>The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members discussed the need for the Council to use its spending power to support and improve the local economy. The Council was doing its best to invest in the community and support more people in the City into work.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b> That Cabinet recommends to Council the approval of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The Capital Strategy as set out in this report.</li> <li>(ii) The Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2023/24 as described at section 11 of the report and</li> </ul>	Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer)

	<p>detailed at Appendix A.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure the Council adopts the requirements of the revised Prudential Code for Capital Finance 2017.</li> <li>• The Council is required to set a balanced budget and the Capital Strategy and subsequent Capital Programme form part of this process, along with the governance process to monitor and manage the programme.</li> </ul>	
221	<p><b>HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET SETTING 2021/2022 AND BEYOND REPORT OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>(Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in this matter insofar as he is a Director of Kingstown Works Limited.)</p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which set out the Leader's Housing Revenue Account Budget 2021/2022.</p> <p>The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members discussed the tenant led budget of £26million that was spent on repairs, there being a number of properties which were yet to meet the Decent Homes Standard, these were due to the tenants not wishing for work to be carried out and £11.7million spent on cladding and improving the energy efficiency of the properties and therefore reducing tenants heating bills. The Council's new homes programme was progressing however overall there continued to be a reduction in stock.</p> <p>Members raised concerns over the expected forthcoming problem relating to homelessness over the next few years with the potential impact from Universal Credit changes and the end of furlough and potential redundancies. The Council was expecting an increase in need for properties and would continue to turn properties around quickly to ensure it could respond to need.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> – That Cabinet recommends to Council approval of:</p>	Director of Finance and Transformation

	<p>(a) The revenue budget as set out in paragraph 8.1;</p> <p>(b) The capital budget as set out in paragraph 13.1;</p> <p>(c) The rent and service charge changes as set out at Appendix 1 (11) and 1 (12) respectively; and</p> <p>(d) The Rent Policy (appendix 2)</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires the Council to maintain a Housing Revenue Account in accordance with proper practices. The Council must approve a budget for the HRA that does not go into deficit. There is, therefore, no legal option to not set a budget. The HRA budget must be set during the months of January or February.</li> <li>• Notice of changes to rent must be given to tenants giving at least 28 days' notice of the changes coming into force which means that the notice must be in their physical possession no later than 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019.</li> <li>• This report enables the Council to fulfil those statutory obligations.</li> </ul>	(Section 151 Officer)
222	<p><b>TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT, MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION POLICY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2021-22</b></p> <p>The Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer) submitted a report which set out details of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (incorporating Prudential and Treasury Indicators), Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy proposed for the financial year 2021-22.</p> <p>The comments of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members discussed the importance of getting the best possible deal and the current difficulties in making a return on investments.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b></p>	

	<p>That Cabinet recommends to Council for approval:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The Prudential and Treasury Indicators, as set out in the main body of this report and summarised at Appendix 1, numbered 1 to 9;</li> <li>(b) The Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2021-22, incorporating the Annual Investment Strategy 2021-22, as set out in the main body of this report, and specifically;</li> <li>(c) The Investment Instruments shown at Appendix 2;</li> <li>(d) The list of organisations used for the on-lending of surplus funds, shown at Appendix 3, up to the monetary limits stated;</li> <li>(e) The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement 2021-22 detailed at Appendix 4.</li> </ul> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of the annual Treasury Management Strategy and Policy Statements cannot be delegated and therefore is required to be approved by Full Council.</li> </ul>	<p>Director of Finance and Transformation (Section 151 Officer)</p>
<p>223</p>	<p><b>DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD 17): CRAVEN PARK MASTERPLAN</b></p> <p>The Director of Regeneration submitted a report which sought approval of the draft Supplementary Planning Document ‘Craven Park Masterplan’ for a consultation period of 6 weeks.</p> <p>The comments of the Planning Committee when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>The officer explained that in response to the Planning Committee comments, the roads mentioned that were not currently designated as a road would become designated and manage the access from Hemswell Avenue. Members discussed the potential opportunities for the future and the need to ensure ward councillors were involved and consulted on proposals. Members commented that access from Hemswell Avenue could be problematic due to the traffic issues and highlighted that although land was marked as residential there were a number of stages to go through before any houses were built.</p>	

Members raised concerns that the draft Masterplan identified demolition of the Waudby Centre as the preferred option, this was not an old building and currently included a library service, the building was felt to be in a good position and was well built so did not need to be demolished.

Members were also keen to see greenspace protected where possible.

The Chair invited Councillor Chaytor who attended to represent the Planning Committee to address the comments submitted for Cabinet's consideration.

Members discussed the Planning Committee comments, it was not possible to support them in full as they had different decision making roles, the comments were appropriate for that Committee, however, Cabinet would either support or amend the officer recommendations, all comments would then be fed back into the process to be considered. It was important to consider all available options. As the Council was one of the landowners it was right that it would establish a working group to take the site forward, this was not the case for all areas subject to an SPD.

**Moved by Councillor Brady and seconded by Councillor Black –**

- (a) That Members approve draft SPD 17: 'Craven Park Masterplan' for the purpose of seeking representations for a period of 6 weeks, subject to the amendment identified at (d) below
- (b) That if no substantive changes are required to the SPD, the Head of Planning in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning, are delegated to approve the final SPD.
- (c) If substantive changes are required to the SPD the revised version be brought to Cabinet for endorsement.
- (d) That on page 323 of the document pack (page 7 of the masterplan) the 'preferred option' be identified as the retention of the Waudby Centre, with demolition identified as an option.

**Motion carried.**

(a-d) Director of Regeneration

	<p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft SPD 17 Craven Park Masterplan will provide guidance and advice to developers and their design teams on the future development of the area known generically as 'Craven Park'. Craven Park sits within a large area of open space and buildings that, with the correct planning and design approach could be regenerated to provide improved open space, leisure, employment and residential uses.</li> <li>• In recognition that the existing Waudby Centre is not an old building and presently fulfils the function of a leisure centre and library</li> </ul>	
224	<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT 6 EAST CARR</b></p> <p>The Director of Regeneration submitted a report which provided an update on the progress made to date on the current stage in the process of producing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site known as East Carr (comprising Local Plan housing allocations 861 and 862).</p> <p>The comments of the Planning Committee and East Area Committee when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members discussed the site and development that could take place as a result of the SPD being in place, that local residents did not buy their houses expecting a 700 house development to be built on this land. Concerns were raised over the roads proposed as access to the site which were not suitable and felt a ring road option would be more suitable. Members supported the traffic and flood proposals in the SPD.</p> <p>Members also discussed the highways network and its ability to cope with the additional traffic when it struggled to cope with the existing traffic.</p> <p>Members commented that the current Local Plan had been passed with all party support which this land was allocated as housing. Currently, the landowners, who were not the Council, could submit an application for housing using the existing access to the site and as the land was identified for housing in the Local Plan, should the Council's Planning Committee refuse it and an appeal be made to the Planning Inspectorate, it was likely that it would be approved. This was due to the government trying to make sites of large</p>	

housing development easier to grant and in this case the principle of housing had been established. By adopting an SPD any development would need to meet the requirements set out in the SPD before an application could be approved, this meant there would be controls over any development and the developer would need to contribute to improvements.

Members commented that work was about to start on the latest revision of the Local Plan which would take a couple of years to be completed, during that time the allocation of this site as housing could be reviewed, however any change could be appealed. Until any revised Local Plan was adopted any application submitted would be considered under the existing Local Plan, without the SPD there would be little control over the development. The traffic and flood assessments would be carried out at the worst times to get an accurate picture by the Council as an independent party.

**Agreed –**

- (a) That Cabinet notes the level and nature of the representations received to the consultation draft and support the changes made to the document (as included in Appendix A) and as a consequence, approve a further four week consultation on the revised draft SPD.
- (b) Provided the forthcoming four week public consultation returns no significant issues, for the SPD to be adopted through delegated powers to the Head of Planning in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning.
- (c) Cabinet agree for a detailed Transport Assessment to be completed by the Council’s Major Projects team during 2021/22. Any highway improvements required by the assessment will then be considered for inclusion in the future capital programme.
- (d) Cabinet support the creation of the Castle Hill storage area and restrict any new housing development proceeding until these works are completed.

(a-d) Director of Regeneration

Reasons for recommendation

- Draft SPD6 ‘East Carr Masterplan’ will provide

	<p>important supplementary guidance to the planning policies in the Hull Local Plan for developers and their design teams on the delivery of two major housing allocations (allocations 861 and 862)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopting this SPD will have an important bearing on the form and quality of any development that may take place. With an SPD in place the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will be in a stronger position in terms of negotiating with any future developers and in terms of securing the best possible planning and design outcomes for the site.</li> <li>• Undertaking a Transport Assessment will ensure any development that is brought forward is informed by an independent assessment of the traffic issues relating to the development.</li> </ul>	
225	<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT 18 BRUNSWICK HOUSE AND THE STRAND DEVELOPMENT BRIEF</b></p> <p>(Councillor Hale declared an interest in that he was a union convener involved with Humberside County Council moving its Social Services to Brunswick House.)</p> <p>The Director of Regeneration submitted a report which set out the representations received to the public consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document and sought its adoption to be used as supplementary to Hull’s adopted development plan (Hull Local Plan 2016 – 2032).</p> <p>The comments of the Planning Committee and Wyke Area Committee when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Members commented on the challenge for regeneration of the area, this site being a difficult site to develop in the context of The Strand building. Members discussed the impact of the fact that the Strand is a listed building. The officer explained that this would impact on the potential capital receipt from the site, this SPD would support applications to be made to potential external funding. It was explained that the current status of The Strand having been damaged through arson would not affect the listed status of the building.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b></p> <p>(a) Members consider the results of the 6 week public</p>	

	<p>consultation, and subsequent revisions made to the draft SPD in response. Members then determine to approve a final four week public consultation on the revised SPD ahead of adopting it as a supplementary planning document to the Hull Local Plan.</p> <p>(b) That if no substantive changes are required to the SPD, the Head of Planning in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning, are delegated to approve the final SPD.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A draft SPD was consulted on between Friday 16th August 2019 and Friday 27th September 2019. The consultation draft included an expanded site area incorporating Brunswick Arcade and Kingston Youth Centre.</li> <li>• Brunswick Arcade is identified as a priority within the Beverley Road Townscape Heritage scheme. Its inclusion within the SPD coverage is to ensure future development of the whole site has regard for this important building. There were no representations received on its inclusion within the SPD.</li> <li>• Kingston Youth Centre was also included within the coverage of the draft SPD. Its inclusion within the portfolio of assets for disposal followed a request from the Council's Property and Asset team. All representations received to the public consultation in 2019 related to the proposed disposal of Kingston Youth Centre. A full transcript of all representation is included in Appendix 1 to this report (Consultation Statement).</li> <li>• Following the consultation responses, and subsequent discussion with the Council's Property and Asset team, Kingston Youth Centre has now been removed from the main development parcel covered in the SPD. The revised SPD acknowledges there may be potential for the redevelopment of Kingston Youth Centre as part of a wider development scheme but this is subject to a separate decision being taken to relocate to another suitable area, and required funding to achieve this being secured.</li> </ul>	(a-b) Director of Regeneration
--	---	--------------------------------

**SCULCOATES BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

(This matter was discussed in conjunction with minute 231.)

The Director of Regeneration submitted a report which set out the findings of an independent feasibility study (and subsequent independent per review) of the 146 year old Grade II listed structure, Sculcoates Bridge, known locally due to its location as Chapman Street Bridge.

The comments of the Infrastructure and Energy Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.

Members discussed the listing of the structure which meant that all works had to be in keeping with how the structure was built, a new bridge option would have meant building further down the river as well as also carrying out works to preserve this listed structure. The proposal was the optimum solution given the challenges presented but would repair the bridge and the managed system would control the traffic and protect the repair so it would last longer. This repair was expected to last 10-12 years and would take a couple of years to be completed. The alternative of developing a new bridge was not viable, it would take time to assemble land and work its way through the process, even before it started to be built. Members thanked officers for their work in getting this to this point.

Members commented on the history of the City being on water and the general support of the public in spending money to repair bridges due to the impact closed bridges had on the traffic in the City. It was important to ensure that there was consultation with the river users and for communications to be put in place setting out what was going to happen and when. The name of the bridge needed to be clear, most local people referred to it as Chapman Street bridge so this needed to be referenced in any communications and consultation.

Members also discussed the City's bridges being unique because there were so many within the boundaries, the Council did not receive any additional funding to deal with bridge repairs.

**Moved by Councillor Brady and seconded by Councillor Hale –**

- (a) That the preferred option F1 of appendix 1 is selected, whereby the bridge is fully refurbished and

	<p>brought back into service with an enforced restricted weight limit and measures to physically restrict prohibited vehicles (by way of height restriction) to protect the bridge from overloading and thus, the life expectancy of the bridge.</p> <p>(b) That the appropriate capital budget is allocated, and</p> <p>(c) The delegated authority is given to the Assistant Director – Streetscene to proceed to design and commission the complete works.</p> <p><b>Motion carried.</b></p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted by the Council’s bridge engineers that the original feasibility report had not addressed some of the residual risks identified by the Bridges Team, therefore a peer review and detailed assessment of the potential costs was also commissioned to reduce, as much as is possible, the risk of unforeseen risk and costs. It is standard practice for contingency to be included in projects such as these, however it was felt that the consultant’s preferred option had the potential to leave the Council vulnerable to incurring significantly increased, unplanned costs that were not budgeted for and would be covered by costly uncompetitive compensation events, or even result in the suspension of the scheme if the costs became untenable.</li> <li>• The peer review generally agreed with the officer assessment of the report and supported the validity of their concerns regarding the viability of the proposed options.</li> <li>• This preferred option also takes account of other associated issues that if left, would only mean revisiting the bridge again to undertake further works again in the near future.</li> <li>• This option negates the need for a replacement bridge and retains the listed building requirements and could therefore be justified under a spend to save business case.</li> </ul>	(a-c) Director of Regeneration
227	<b>ADDITIONAL RAIL HALT PROPOSAL</b>	

The Director of Regeneration submitted a report which set out the current status of potential funding available to develop a new rail halt in the Bricknell Ward area and identified the initial development work that would be required.

The comments of the Wyke Area Committee when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.

Members discussed the Council's priority being the electrification of the Hull to Selby/Hull to Sheffield line. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council had not sought electrification of the Hull to Scarborough line but would be able to as part of devolution discussions which could then open the discussions for other changes on that line such as a halt. The Council needed to focus on the electrification of the line from Hull to Selby/Sheffield as a rail priority for the City, this halt could not be put forward as a priority for general rail funding when the government was expected to pare back the funding of the plans for the strategic business case for Transport for the North rail funding.

**Agreed –**

- (a) That Cabinet do not agree to commit funding to develop a rail halt proposal further at the present time
- (b) That Cabinet agree to re-examine this decision at a future point, informed by the outcome of negotiations for a devolution deal.

Reasons for recommendation

- Previous feasibility work indicated that the proposal did not have a strong business case and it is unlikely to have improved significantly since 2009.
- The 2009 feasibility work also identified high capital and operating costs and better value for money could be achieved by developing the existing public transport network.
- There is no indication that Department for Transport (DfT) will make further funding available to support building of new stations.
- A devolution deal has the potential to enable Hull and East Riding to identify and deliver key transport priorities for the area.

Director of  
Regeneration

Non-Key Decisions		
228	<p><b>PROVISION OF A GYPSY AND TRAVELLER STOPPING PLACE AND ADDITIONAL PERMANENT PITCH PROVISION</b></p> <p>The Director of Legal Services and Partnerships submitted a report which provided a progress update regarding this provision of additional Gypsy and Traveller sites (permanent and stopping places).</p> <p>The comments of the People and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Commission when this matter was considered, were submitted for consideration, and were detailed at minute 229.</p> <p>Separate and separated access roads have been included into the proposed development to avoid potential conflict between the two sites. In addition 17 temporary pitches have been included which would have been adequate to meet the need for temporary caravan site provision to respond to unauthorised encampments that had taken place in the city over recent times.</p> <p>Members commented that all ward councillors had been asked in 2016 to nominate possible sites for this in their own wards, no sites were nominated by ward councillors from their own wards. The Council was committed to creating community sites for the gypsies and traveller communities. The consultation on this had been extensive with over 4000 residents and businesses, less than 2% of people responded which showed they were happy for the sites to be used. Members thanked officers for their expertise on carrying out the consultation.</p> <p>Members discussed equality and community cohesion issues around this provision, the hope that this would reduce the numbers of unauthorised encampments and this being a statutory duty of the Council to provide this.</p> <p>Members thanked the officers and Members for their work on this.</p> <p>Members also discussed this would be a regulated site which would include provision for the disposal of waste which should minimise the amount of waste left behind, any that was left where it shouldn't be would be prosecuted if there was the evidence to do so.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b></p>	

	<p>(a) That Cabinet note the outcome of the stakeholder consultation undertaken as set out at Appendix C.</p> <p>(b) That Cabinet supports the design proposals as set out at Appendix B to enable a planning application to be made.</p> <p>(c) That Cabinet provides in principle support to increase the funding for the site, and delegates to the Director of Finance and Transformation, authority to increase the Capital allocation to the proposal by a maximum of £0.7m,</p> <p>(d) subject to updating the allocation within the quarterly capital report to Cabinet.</p> <p>(e) That the Director for Legal Services and Partnerships is authorised to submit a bid and agree terms for and enter a grant funding agreement with Homes England through their Affordable Homes 2021-26 programme to meet the balance of funding required to deliver the site.</p> <p><u>Reasons for recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendations in this report support the delivery of the requirements under the Local Plan to meet the need for Traveller sites (Policy 8) and provide new sites to reduce the number of unauthorised encampments. The delivery of the new sites is also a priority under the Preventing Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2017-21 in order to prevent homelessness and meet the housing needs of gypsies and travellers.</li> <li>• The recommendations in this report support the Cabinet approval given in February 2020.</li> </ul>	<p>(a-b) Director of Legal Services and Partnerships</p> <p>(c) Director of Finance and Transformation</p> <p>(d-e) Director of Legal Services and Partnerships</p>
229	<p><b>COMMENTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS</b></p> <p>The Senior Democratic Services Officer submitted comments in relation to minutes 217-229 from the Council's committees and scrutiny commissions that had considered the reports following the circulation of the agenda for this meeting.</p> <p><b>Agreed –</b> That the comments be noted.</p>	
230	<p><b>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</b></p>	

	<p><b>Agreed</b> – that, in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public (including the Press) be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business, minute 231, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act information relating to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information an individual and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.</p>	
231	<p><b>SCULCOATES BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY - APPENDIX 2</b></p> <p>(This matter was discussed in conjunction with minute 226.)</p> <p>The Director of Regeneration submitted the exempt appendix.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> – that the appendix be noted.</p>	

Start: 9.30 a.m.  
Finish 11.15 a.m.

The above Executive Decisions will come into force and may be implemented on expiry of five working days after the publication of the decisions i.e. 4<sup>th</sup> March, 2021, unless called in by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

Published – 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2021.