

Cabinet**Thursday, 3 March 2016, County Hall, Worcester,
10.00 am****Present:****Minutes**

Mr S E Geraghty (Chairman) Mr M L Bayliss,
Mr A N Blagg, Mrs S L Blagg, Mr J P Campion,
Mr S E Geraghty (Chairman), Mr M J Hart,
Mrs L C Hodgson, Mr J H Smith and Dr K A Pollock

Also attended:

Mr P M McDonald, Mrs E B Tucker, Mr R C Lunn.

Available Papers:

The Members had before them:

- A. The Agenda Papers (previously circulated); and
- B. The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 4 February 2016 (previously circulated).

A copy of document A will be attached to the signed Minutes.

**1718 Apologies and
Declarations of
Interest
(Agenda item 1)**

None received.

**1719 Public
Participation
(Agenda item 2)**

None.

**1720 Confirmation of
the Minutes of
the previous
meeting
(Agenda item 3)**

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the Cabinet held on 4 February 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**1721 Chairman's
Announcement
- Public Health**

The Chairman made an announcement with regard to Public Health implications for Cabinet reports and invited the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Public Health to comment. Cabinet Members were reminded that as Public Health is a key priority, February Council had congratulated the Health and Well Being Board in its approach to Public Health Assessments, and resolved that all reports presented to full Council should have a Public Health Impact Assessment (PHIA). Council also

1722 Property Asset Strategy - Enabling Economic Development and Service Delivery for the Council (Agenda item 4)

requested that Cabinet followed the same procedure in its reports.

The Chairman and all Cabinet Members agreed that having a PHIA in all Cabinet Reports was a good idea and an approach to be adopted in future Cabinet Reports.

The Cabinet considered a new Property Asset Strategy. The details were set out in the report and its Appendix.

In the ensuing discussion, the following main points were made:

- (a) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Transformation and Commissioning introduced the report explaining that Worcestershire County Council was a large organisation with a significant property portfolio, it was therefore right for the Cabinet to look at how it could maximise resources and benefits from the asset portfolio.
- (b) There were significant benefits to be gained from the Place Partnership which was unique and sought to bring together assets from across the public sector.
- (c) The strategy would seek to both rationalise and increase assets as appropriate in order to assist frontline services
- (d) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Transformation and Commissioning wished to make clear that he did not foresee any reduction or rationalisation of small holdings and farms owned by the County Council as a result of this strategy, as they provided a good return to the Council and supported the rural economy. There may be an occasional sale to tenants but no radical alteration to the state or relationship with tenants.
- (e) The purpose of the Strategy was to increase operational efficiency, make the asset portfolio provide increased benefits for the Council, support cross-sector working and to look to reduce costs to the taxpayer.
- (f) 2 Member briefing sessions had taken place at the request of the Cabinet member for Transformation

and Commissioning to provide further details and opportunities for discussing the strategy. Attendance was disappointing but hopefully the sessions were helpful.

- (g) The Strategy was welcomed by Cabinet Members, the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and Families stated that he believed that the strategy would ensure that the County Council's assets would be 'worked' to ensure maximum benefit and return and would support Council priorities such as 'Open for Business'.
- (h) A Member from outside of the Cabinet was concerned that Place Partnership would asset strip and commented that the redevelopment of Parkside in Bromsgrove had resulted in an inadequate building and up to £7million spent. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Transformation and Commissioning disagreed and commented that the amount being quoted was not the number he had been given and, although there was a problem with the heating system at Parkside that it was being resolved, the building redevelopment had led to a much improved venue for the public evidence by an increase in library users at the site. He further commented that the Strategy would look to buy and sell assets as appropriate in order to deliver improved services.
- (i) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Localism and Communities commented that the Bromsgrove Library facility at Parkside was very popular and very well used; she believed that visits to the Library had significantly increased since the redevelopment to Parkside.
- (j) The Leader of Council stated that he saw the strategy presented as an evolution of the Property Asset Strategy, that taxpayers would expect there to be an efficient use of the County Council's resources and fully endorsed the strategy before Cabinet.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the Property Asset Strategy 2016-2020 (the Strategy) be approved;**
- (b) the Director of Commercial and Change be**

**1723 Worcestershire
County Council
Local Flood
Risk
Management
Strategy
(Agenda item 5)**

authorised to execute the Strategy; and

- (c) authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Transformation and Commissioning to approve individual business cases for specific development projects in accordance with paragraph 11 of the report, in consultation with the Director of Commercial and Change.**

The Cabinet considered the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015-21. The details were set out in the report and its Appendix.

In the ensuing discussion, the following main points were made:

- (a) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment introduced the report, explaining that as the consultation responses had been analysed there were revised recommendations for the Cabinet to consider which he presented.
- (b) Worcestershire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority and is therefore required to produce a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for the County under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.
- (c) The Strategy would set out how the County Council will work at the top level with other Local Authorities, partners and the Environment Agency, ensuring a partnership approach to Flood Risk Management.
- (d) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment drew attention to the aims of the Strategy, as referred to in paragraph 12 of the report. He commented further that the Council had invested £14million of capital in flooding and drainage projects in the County to support both small and large schemes.
- (e) The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy was subject to public consultation from 7 December 2015 to 29 February 2016. An earlier targeted consultation took place during the summer of 2015 with partners and statutory agencies, there were 20 responses to the latter consultation and the Strategy was revised accordingly. There had been a total of 26 responses to the public

consultation exercise, attention was drawn to a number of responses set out in the addendum report and table.

- (f) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways explained that he sat on the Flood Defence Committee. He commented that since 2004 the County Council had contributed £2.8 million into the local levy but had taken out £17.5 million.
- (g) A Member from outside of the Cabinet asked if the Cabinet felt enough consideration was given to where homes were built. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment responded that he had responded to the Secretary of State as part of developing a national plan to tackle flooding with the view that you cannot just build irrespective of flood risk.
- (h) A Member from outside of the Cabinet asked is the Cabinet felt there was any multi-agency forum or meetings taking place that would ensure other responsible agencies were aware of problems and looking to address them? The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment commented that he worked in partnership with the District Councils, Warwickshire County Council, Severn Trent Water and the Environment Agency in order to build better business cases for flood scheme funding from Central Government.
- (i) The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy, Skills and Infrastructure commented that catchment management needed to be aware of issues both upstream and downstream. He further commented that the National Farmers Union had responded to the consultation and that consideration would need to be given to compensation schemes for farmers in cases where deliberate flooding of farmland lasted for a certain period of time.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the report on the draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015-21 be noted;**
- (b) the addendum report and table analysing the consultation comments and setting out proposed amendments to the Strategy in**

1724 Resources Report (Agenda item 6)

response be noted;

- (c) **the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015-21 as set out in the report be agreed subject to the amendments indicated in the 'Response' column of the addendum table; and**
- (d) **authority be delegated to the Director of Economy and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment to incorporate those amendments and finalise the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015-21.**

The Cabinet considered a Resources Report. The details were set out in the report.

In the ensuing discussion, the following main points were made:

- (a) The Leader of the Council introduced the report commenting that:
 - The Council would provide funding of up to £80,000 with contributions also being sought from partners towards the Pearl Izumi Tour Series cycle stage taking place in Redditch.
 - Approval was sought for the addition of £1.6 million to the capital programme from the uncommitted headroom allocation in order to continue the existing programme of IT asset replacement and renewal of software licensing.
- (b) A Member from outside of the Cabinet sought clarification on the funding contribution towards the Pearl Izumi Tour Series cycle stage taking place in Redditch. The Leader of Council commented that £80,000 was the maximum cost to the Council of the stage and that £10,000 would be provided by the LEP, there was a contribution from the Kingfisher Shopping Centre and support from Redditch Borough Council. He confirmed that the Council had agreed a one year deal of funding the stage and not a 3 year deal.
- (c) A Member from outside of the Cabinet asked if there would be any revenue generated by advertising for the cycling stage that could then be deducted from the County Council contribution.

The Leader of Council committed to seeking further details in order to provide a response.

- (d) A Member from outside of the Cabinet asked if the cost of IT equipment was covered within the contract with the Council's IT Contractor. The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Transformation and Commissioning commented that that the contract was for service and did not include cost of IT kit and hardware.

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the Cabinet Member's conclusions set out in the report concerning revenue budget monitoring up to 31 December 2015 be endorsed;**
- (b) that the proposal for Redditch to host a round of the Pearl Izumi Cycling Tour Series in May 2016 be noted and welcomed;**
- (c) that the current progress regarding the FutureFit programme be noted;**
- (d) that the Cabinet Member's conclusions concerning capital budget monitoring up to 31 December 2015 be endorsed; and**
- (e) to recommend Council to approve a £1.6 million addition to the Capital Programme to extend the ICT Replacement Programme for three years 2016/17 to 2018/19 and the capital cash limits are updated accordingly.**

The meeting ended at 10:56 am

Chairman