

**Confirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Cabinet** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, on **Tuesday, 4 February 2020 at 6:30 pm**

**Members of the Cabinet present:**

Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Stephen Burroughes, Councillor Maurice Cook, Councillor Steve Gallant, Councillor Richard Kerry, Councillor James Mallinder, Councillor David Ritchie, Councillor Craig Rivett, Councillor Mary Rudd, Councillor Letitia Smith

**Other Members present:**

Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Graham Elliott, Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Tracey Green, Councillor Mark Jepson, Councillor Rachel Smith-Lyte

**Officers present:** Martin Baker (Project Manager/Business Analyst), Stephen Baker (Chief Executive), Alistair Bissett (Property Lawyer), Kerry Blair (Head of Operations), Lewis Boudville (Car Parking Manager), Neil Cockshaw (Programmes and Partnership Manager), Karen Cook (Democratic Services Manager), Phil Gore (Head of Environmental Services and Port Health), Rupert Grass (Asset Management Consultant), Andy Jarvis (Strategic Director), Sandra Lewis (Business Solutions Manager), Eloise Limmer (Design and Conservation Officer), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Chris Phillips (Senior Estates Surveyor), Andrew Reynolds (Environmental Protection Manager), Lorraine Rogers (Finance Manager), Robert Scrimgeour (Principal Design and Conservation Officer), Simon Taylor (Chief Finance Officer & Section 151 Officer), Paul Wood (Head of Economic Development and Regeneration)

---

**1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cackett.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Deacon declared two local non pecuniary interests as follows:-

In respect of agenda item 15 - Felixstowe South Seafront Cafe / Restaurant Build - as a member of Felixstowe Town Council.

In respect of agenda item 16 - Purchase of Land in Felixstowe - as a member of Felixstowe Town Council and as Chairman of a local sports club charity trust.

Councillor Cooper declared a local non pecuniary interest in respect of agenda item 17 - Acquisition of Offices in Lowestoft and Leiston - as a member of Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council.

### **3 Announcements**

The Leader of the Council announced that, in the future, East Suffolk Council would be introducing webcasting for some of its meetings. The Council was in the process of putting this in place and testing would be undertaken during the Cabinet meeting. It was confirmed that this meeting would not be webcast to the public, but it would be viewed internally after the meeting and it may be used for training purposes in the future.

The Leader also announced that one of the reports on the Cabinet agenda would be withdrawn; this was agenda item 5, Acceptance of Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Rough Sleeping and Grant Funding; this was because the Council had received more funding than anticipated, which was of course excellent news, but it did mean that, constitutionally, the report needed to be considered by Full Council rather than Cabinet.

Finally, the Leader welcomed Councillor Cook to his first Cabinet meeting, as Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources.

### **4 Minutes**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 December 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **5 Acceptance of Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Rough Sleeping Grant Funding (WITHDRAWN)**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

### **6 Extensions to Existing Conservation Areas and Adoption of New Conservation Area Appraisals and Supplement**

Cabinet received report **ES/0292** by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management who reported that legislation stated that from time to time the local planning authority should review its conservation area designations and determine whether any further parts of their areas should be designated as conservation areas. The Design and Conservation Team had undertaken such an exercise and determined that areas of Woodbridge and Yoxford not currently within the conservation areas were of sufficient special architectural and historic interest to be included.

Alongside these proposed extensions work had also been undertaken to update four of the Council's existing conservation area appraisals; these covered Felixstowe, Holton, Homersfield and Wissett. These updated documents set out the special interest of the conservation areas and included a street by street appraisal of the buildings that made

a positive contribution to the character of the conservation areas. If adopted these comprehensive conservation area appraisals would be valuable tools for the Design and Conservation Officers and Planning Officers to use when considering applications with conservation areas.

Cabinet was further advised that three large extensions were proposed to the Yoxford Conservation Area, to include the mansions, parklands and associated structures of Cockfield Hall, Grove Park and Rookery Park. These extensions were accompanied by a newly written conservation area appraisal that clearly set out the special interest of the existing conservation area and the extension areas.

Four extensions were proposed in Woodbridge to ensure that the whole riverfront was included in the conservation area alongside Kingston Playing Fields, a 19th century terrace at the top of Deben Road and the Edwardian villas along Ipswich Road. A supplement to the existing conservation area appraisal was proposed to be adopted that described the special interest of all of the extension areas. A very small area was proposed to be removed from the Woodbridge Conservation Area to correct a past error.

In conclusion, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management advised Cabinet that extensive public consultation was undertaken for each proposal in 2019. A total of 159 responses were received with a large majority of responses in favour of the proposals. Summaries of the proposals could be found in the appendices of the report.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That the changes to the Woodbridge Conservation Area boundary as shown on the map attached at Appendix A and including those properties and land included in the schedules attached at Appendices B and C be agreed.
2. That the adoption of a Supplement to the existing Woodbridge Conservation Area appraisal be agreed.
3. That the extension of the Yoxford Conservation Area as shown on the map attached at Appendix F and including those properties and land included in the schedule attached at Appendix G be agreed.
4. That the adoption of new replacement Conservation Area appraisals for Felixstowe, Holton, Homersfield, Wissett and Yoxford be agreed.

#### **7 Parking Services: Parking Management and CPE**

Cabinet received report **ES/0286** by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport who reported that East Suffolk Council had completed a thorough review of its parking services, and alongside projects its economic development service was undertaking, had developed a modern approach to parking services which considered the requirements and travel patterns of visitors, residents and businesses. The report before Cabinet provided some detail of the considerations and data analysed in order to achieve some radical improvements in its parking service delivery. These included a simpler tariff structure, better use of technology, the introduction of a free half hour for parking in many of the Council's car parks where on-street parking opportunities were limited, the introduction of on-street enforcement patrols, and a new parking administration system. The details of all of the proposed changes were outlined by

the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport, and the Parking Services Manager, who gave a detailed presentation.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport advised Members that, in response to concerns which had been raised, and following further thought, he would be making a change to the recommendations within the report. This was in respect of the introduction of a free half hour for parking in many of the Council's car parks. He, with officers, was working on a system whereby a ticket could be retrieved from the pay and display machine as well as through RingGo.

Councillor Brooks also referred to errors within the report, in respect of paragraph numbering, which were duplicated within the recommendations. As such, his recommendations would be amended to reflect the correct paragraph numbering.

In response to a question from the Assistant Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Health relating to parking non-compliances, the Parking Services Manager advised that consultants, where regulations existed, had determined frequencies for patrols. That work had been further developed to produce a schedule of patrols; that schedule would be the starting point. Some areas had more regulations in place than others and that would highlight the areas that would require more attention than others. Using the system, there would be a record of where officers had been and where penalty charge notices had been issued. This would be reviewed, monthly initially, in order to understand where drivers were parking in contravention of the regulations.

Clarification was provided that the new charges, if approved, would come into effect on 6 April 2020; at the same time as civil parking enforcement.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Housing stated that he welcomed the proposals in respect of the half hour's free parking in 34 selected car parks across East Suffolk. However, he sought clarification in respect of a situation where somebody went over the half hour and whether or not the payment could be retrospectively paid. It was explained that this was one of the advantages of using RingGo in that they would not have to return to their vehicle to pay but, equally, they could alternatively pay using a pay and display machine.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Health asked for clarification in respect of disabled parking. In response to this, Cabinet was advised that tariffs varied a little bit but, essentially, blue badge holders had to abide by the rules and regulations of the parking place the same as all drivers. Clarification was provided in that the blue badge itself applied only for the highway. If they parked in a car park then they received an enhanced service in the form of priority location together with accessibility bays that were safer to manoeuvre in and out of. It was explained that Blue Badge holders would pay for the time needed; further consideration was necessary regarding a grace period for overstay.

The Leader stated that disabled parking was very important and it was absolutely right to consider the impact of any changes. He understood that for some people with a disability it may take them longer to reach one place from another but he was of the view that the Council also needed to take into account fairness across the board, eg a

person with children and a buggy may also take longer to reach one place from another and the Council did not offer a concession in those circumstances.

In response to a question regarding the promotion of RingGo, it was confirmed that large signage would be used together with a relaunch of the service.

In response to a further question regarding RingGo, and potential problems with connectivity, it was confirmed that, through officers, connectivity would be checked.

Councillor Deacon sought clarification in respect of the current free half hour parking slots, for example in Felixstowe town centre, he asked if they would still remain that way. The Leader responded, saying that they would not, he added that they were not actually in the town centre. The Leader stated that if one looked at Felixstowe town centre and examined the number of half hour restricted bays, which were at the moment abused, the proposed changes would generate churn on those bays and so the half hour free bays that would be in existence in Felixstowe would be freed up on a regular basis because of the enforcement taking place.

Councillor Elliott stated that, within the report, he could not see any differences between evening and weekend charges. It was confirmed that the regulations would apply between 8.00 am and 6.00 pm so, for the evening economy, there would be free parking. Councillor Elliott felt that this was not clear within the report and he asked that it be made clear for residents and visitors; he stated that a proper advertising campaign would be required.

Councillor Elliott stated that it would have been useful, within the report, and indeed within other reports such as the fees and charges report, to be able to compare previous year's figures; he asked that, in future, both existing and proposed figures be included. The Leader, in response, stated that he acknowledged and understood this, but felt that the reality was that it made reports confusing, his view was that the public knew what they were currently paying and they wanted to know what was being proposed. Councillor Elliott responded stating that he would welcome simplification; he requested that if there was a review in 2021, that the report be more straightforward. The Leader confirmed that it would be.

Councillor Green referred to the Council's communications to drivers using East Suffolk Council car parks; she stated that she would like to see the Council's website have a page for each car park, with information in respect of access and exit roads, the number of spaces, disabled spaces, information in respect of the free 30 minutes, businesses served by the car park, etc. Councillor Green also referred to the glossary of terms and said that there were a lot of abbreviations within the report; she asked that if these were used on penalty notices etc they needed to be clear. Councillor Green requested that this be actioned before April 2020. The Leader, in response, stated that there were ambitions in respect of the website, but, bearing in mind other related work, these would not be achieved, in full, by April 2020. In respect of the glossary, the Leader agreed, stating that the Council needed to ensure that all information was clear and understandable.

Councillor Fisher referred to parking fines and asked what collection rates were achieved. The Parking Services Manger explained that there was a legislative process in place, and collection rates at different stages in the process varied; they were not 100% but the fines, eventually, would be passed to the bailiffs, now known as enforcement agents.

Moving into debate, the Leader spoke of the opportunity to take parking forward for the next 100 years. He stressed that this was not just about parking, it was about moving forward the Council's whole vision, ie digital transformation / solution; the environment, reducing the number of trips that people took in their cars and making those trips more useful. Also, the dwell time in a town was important for economic development and opportunities for businesses. The dwell time needed to be improved for those people going into East Suffolk towns.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Housing stated that he welcomed civil parking enforcement; it would, he said, be positive for town centres.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment reminded Members that the Council had declared a climate emergency and this was a really positive change which would encourage people to make fewer journeys, but spend more time at their destinations. He reminded Members that small changes would, over time, make a big difference.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development, referring to the digital transformation, spoke of the welcome convenience factor. He referred to having renewed his passport, and how good that service was, and he stated that people should be able to expect those kinds of transformations in East Suffolk towns.

Councillor Elliott stated that, broadly, he welcomed civil parking enforcement, but he was concerned at the lack of town centre parking for some residents; Bungay was, he said, a big concern, and he said that there would be many towns with the same issues. Councillor Elliott thought that simplification of the tariffs was welcome; however, he took issue with the proposed Beccles charges, which were in the higher of the two main bands. Smaller towns, he said, were in the lower band. Councillor Elliott asked Cabinet to re-consider this.

In response to Councillor Elliott's points, the Leader stated that the Council should balance the needs of residents and visitors. He added that in a number of towns within east Suffolk it was becoming impossible for people to park. For each town, he said, the Council could start to look at residents' parking schemes. In response to the proposed charges for Beccles, the Leader said that it would not be appropriate to make a change at this point; he commented that many other ward councillors were not in attendance, but may wish to see changes to their wards. There would be a review in the future where such changes could be considered.

Councillor Deacon referred to proposed charges of £1.50 in the towns of Lowestoft, Felixstowe and Aldeburgh, and asked if it was possible that these could be reviewed over a period of time, to see if there were any adverse effects on footfall. The Leader confirmed that this would be considered as part of the overall review process.

Councillor Deacon referred to what he said was in problem in Felixstowe whereby people could not park; he hoped, going forward, that when this was looked at, the affected residents would be consulted. The Leader responded stating that if there were not regulations in place, this could not be addressed through civil parking enforcement; as such, the Council's enforcement officers could not take any action.

Councillor Deacon stated that Felixstowe was a resort; he referred to the town centre of Felixstowe and said that it was difficult to reach that from the resort area. Councillor Deacon asked if it would be possible to have transferable parking tickets so that people could more easily move from one area to the other. The Leader, in response, stated that the Council was trying to collect and measure data in respect of parking. Referring to the RingGo App, he said that this needed to give information in respect of space availability. This would not work with transferable tickets being used. In conclusion, the Leader referred to parking charges being set a reasonable cost.

Councillor Deacon referred to Garrison Lane car park in Felixstowe and said that it was currently free to park in for a reason; this related to traffic congestion. There was now a proposed charge and Councillor Deacon hoped that this would not have a detrimental effect. The Leader, in response, referred to a bus station that used to be in existence, but was no longer. However, he confirmed that this would be monitored going forward.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That the parking demand management approach discussed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.10 and 4.12 to 4.15 be approved.
2. That the RingGo 20 pence 'convenience fee' be incorporated in the cost of parking services delivery (paragraph 4.12).
3. That the tariffs set out in Appendix A be approved.
4. That the 30 minutes free parking can be accessed by RingGo and by use of pay-and-display machines.

## **8 Trends in East Suffolk Town Centres**

Cabinet received report **ES/0286** by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development who reported that following on from a successful pilot project completed in Southwold in 2018, in January 2019 East Suffolk Council commissioned People and Places to undertake a baseline study of 11 town centres across east Suffolk to determine the challenges and issues these centres faced. This involved directly surveying town centre businesses and users to obtain their views across a number of nationally recognised town centre performance indicators. The aim of this work was to understand current trends in the performance of these centres and thereby inform future partnership work and project development between the Council and local stakeholders.

The Deputy Leader reported that this research and development activity was important since east Suffolk's principal town centres performed a vital role for the communities they served by providing a range of local services. Furthermore, such centres were also local economic drivers providing employment and enterprise opportunities and contributing to the overall economic health of the district.

The study had been against the backdrop of significant decline in town centres across the country and therefore understanding the specific issues locally was crucial in being able to enable local stakeholders to maintain and enhance their town centres.

Cabinet was advised that, in respect of headline trends, at the east Suffolk level, town centres performed positively against national benchmarks in areas such as physical appearance, food and drink offers and serving the tourist market but, less positively in terms of availability of labour, servicing local customers, and affordable housing.

At the individual town level, there was a much more mixed picture, a digital diagnosis had been undertaken as part of a survey which had identified businesses seeking digital skills to promote products / business; businesses / users wanted town wide digital infrastructure, eg free wi-fi; and users were keen to extend online shopping services eg click and collect. Each town had received initial feedback in Autumn 2019 and they would receive detailed reports in the coming weeks.

Cabinet was advised that the Southwold pilot had been very successful, leading to £1.2m in external funding being secured. The evidence base was already being used to support the East Suffolk Council led Smart Towns initiative and the East Suffolk Council car parking review. It would align strongly with the Community Partnership initiative.

In conclusion, the Deputy Leader reported that an equality impact assessment had been carried out and there were no negative impacts on the prescribed groups; town centres played an important role in the life of the whole community and it particularly provided local employment and enterprise opportunities for the prescribed groups.

Councillor Deacon commented that the Council clearly employed very talented officers; he asked why consultants had been used. The Deputy Leader, in his response, stated that People and Places were nationally recognised; they had helped form the Local Government Association guidance on this subject. He stated the importance of council tax funds being used efficiently and effectively and was confident, with their track record, that this was the case. The Head of Economic Development and Regeneration added that it was also a question of expertise and capacity; People and Places brought a very specific level of experience that the Council would not necessarily expect to employ. Added to this, the majority of funding used was within existing budgets and some external funding had been levered in too.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That Cabinet supports the approach so far taken through the People and Places work to support and enhance east Suffolk's town centres and approves the next, action planning phase.
2. That Cabinet approves the allocation of £30k from ESC reserves, which has been ring fenced to support the action planning phase of the town centres work and will form part of £128k seed fund budget to support towns to develop and address their priorities in this next phase.

Cabinet received report **ES/0287** by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources who reported that the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) considered by the Cabinet on 3rd December 2019 provided a baseline forecast of income and expenditure and looked at the overall financial climate. It provided a framework within which the Council's overall spending plans would be developed.

Overall, this period and the long-term Local Government financial picture continued to be characterised by an increased shift towards locally generated resources, with an accompanying transfer of both risk and opportunity. The Government had been working towards significant reform of the Local Government Finance System from 2020/21. However, with the announcement of a one-year only Government Spending Round and Local Government Settlement for 2020/21, these reforms had now been delayed until 2021/22. Consequently, whilst this brought a significant degree of certainty for next year, there was considerable uncertainty for the Council going forward in the MTFS period. The report before Cabinet set out the assumptions made in identifying resources for the MTFS.

Cabinet was advised that the predecessor councils had signed up to a four-year Local Government Finance Settlements for the period 2016/17 – 2019/20 (with East Suffolk receiving the final year of the settlement), covering the elements of Revenue Support Grant, Transitional Grant, and Rural Services Delivery Grant. To take advantage of this offer each authority needed to submit an Efficiency Plan. Although not required in respect of the one-year 2020/21 Settlement, an updated Efficiency Plan would be produced during the year as the East Suffolk Strategic Plan was finalised.

A technical consultation on the 2020/21 Local Government Finance Settlement was issued on 3rd October 2019. As well as deferring reforms to the system, the proposal for 2020/21 was essentially to roll forward the 2019/20 Settlement with relevant uplifts for inflation. These proposals were included in the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement issued on 20th December 2019. Consequently, the Council would receive Revenue Support Grant and Rural Services Delivery Grant and would also benefit financially from an additional year under the Business Rates Retention system in its present form. Partly offsetting these elements, the allocations for New Homes Bonus (NHB) for 2020/21 would also be for one year only for 2020/21, rather than for four years. The Government would consult further on incentives to promote housing growth, and indications were that NHB may not continue beyond 2020/21 in its present form. Council tax referendum principles would remain the same as in previous years. Only business rates pilots in the original "devolution" areas would go ahead in 2020/21, with all other pilots cancelled.

The draft MTFS had been continually revised with updates including those resulting from budget monitoring forecasts; and the emerging replacement for the East Suffolk Business Plan.

At the end of the 2020/21 budget process, in February 2020, the Council was required to approve a balanced budget for the following financial year and set the Band D rate of Council Tax. The report set out the context and initial parameters in order to achieve that objective and contribute towards a sustainable position going into the major changes now planned for the medium term.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance reported that when the Scrutiny Committee had recently met and considered the Draft General Fund Budget and Council Tax report it was concerned regarding the lack of information in years going forward. He commented that this was a concern but he felt that the Council was as prepared as it could be.

The Scrutiny Committee was also mindful that the Council would potentially be adding two new core themes to its Business Plan and asked if the Council had sufficient provision for these. The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance reported that he believed the Council did have sufficient provision to support these; he believed that the Council had sufficient resources and provisions for everything it anticipated coming its way. He commented on projects that were being looked at that would potentially not only help reduce costs but would bring in additional income.

Finally, the Scrutiny Committee had asked if the Council was confident in being able to deliver a balanced budget going forward. The Cabinet Member advised that his response had been that there were no guarantees, but he was optimistic because of the good position that the Council was in.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Housing sought clarification in respect of business rates; he asked for confirmation that the Council did not receive anything from the offshore side, but in respect of renewables, it collected from onshore installations. This was confirmed as being correct in that 100% was retained. Cabinet was advised that there was currently a review of the business rates system; Cabinet would be kept informed in respect of progress on this.

Councillor Elliott, referring to the fact that he had raised it before at other meetings, referred to Norse and said that there was some concern regarding the lack of certainty within the Norse budget; he said the significance of that was big. Councillor Elliott asked for reassurance that that was ok and he referred to the benefit of having Norse brought back under the direct control of the Council. The Leader gave reassurance that the communications and the negotiations were ongoing; he added, in respect of Norse, that there was a wider contract review going on, looking at the relationship with Norse and all other partners; as a new Council, he said, it was right that this was undertaken.

Councillor Deacon referred to Appendix A, paragraph 4.3, and the reference to the consultation that had been launched by the Government on 13 December 2018 (*A review of local authorities relative needs and resources*); he asked what progress had been made with this. The Chief Finance Officer advised that, due to Brexit, this had been delayed. For the purposes of the report, it had been assumed that there would be no funding going forward.

## **RESOLVED**

To recommend that Council:

1. Approves the General Fund Revenue Budget as set out in this report and summarised in Appendix A5 and notes the budget forecast for 2021/22 and beyond;
2. Approves the Reserves and Balances movements as presented in Appendix A6;
3. Approvesthat no further changes are made to Council Tax Discounts and Premiums for 2020/21;

4. Approves the Efficiency Strategy attached as Appendix B;
5. Note the Council Tax Base of 87,888.87 for 2020/21; and
6. Approve a Band D Council Tax for 2019/20 of £171.27.

## **10 East Suffolk Strategic Plan**

Cabinet received report **ES/0291** by the Leader of the Council who reported that a new Strategic Plan was proposed for East Suffolk as part of its formation as a new Council on 1 April 2019, to set the strategic aims and objectives of the Council for the period 2020 to 2024.

The proposed Strategic Plan covered five main themes, following on from the robust direction of the previous business plan: Growing our economy; Enabling our communities; Financial sustainability; Digital transformation; Our environment. All five themes were connected, they were overarching principles for the way in which the Authority would work as a whole, rather than being seen in isolation, the Plan aimed to present the themes and priorities as the ethos under which decisions would be made and the direction the Authority would travel over the next four years. Being a strategic level document meant that the detail, "how" it would be delivered, sat below the Strategic Plan within action plans from the appropriate service areas, and a governance arrangement had been proposed to manage this going forward.

Cabinet was asked to review the content of the Plan and proposed governance structure with a view to recommending its approval to Full Council.

The Leader reported that the content of the Strategic Plan had been reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee; the Plan was well received and positive comments were made by the Committee in relation to the collaborative way in which it had been developed. The Leader further reported that the Scrutiny Committee had recommended some minor wording amendments to the theme names, to turn all five themes into 'action' based statements:

Growing our economy - remain as proposed  
Enabling our communities - remain as proposed  
Financial sustainability - change to Being financially sustainable  
Digital transformation - change to Delivering digital transformation  
Our environment - change to Caring for our Environment

The Leader advised that he agreed with the Scrutiny Committee; he felt that its suggestions gave more meaning, and he gave thanks for its recommendations.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Finance suggested a further change in respect of the financial theme; he suggested "Maintaining financial sustainability".

Debate took place regarding Councillor Cook's suggested change, with other names being suggested, but it was agreed by Cabinet that "Maintaining financial sustainability" would be most appropriate.

**RESOLVED**

That the East Suffolk Strategic Plan be recommended for approval by Full Council.

#### **11 East Suffolk Performance Report - Quarterly Performance Quarter 3 (2019-20)**

Cabinet received report **ES/0281** by the Leader of the Council which provided a summarised overview of the performance of the Council, and was aligned to the strategic deliverables within the East Suffolk Business Plan. This quarterly report covered quarter 3, the period from 1 October 2019 to 31 December 2019.

Cabinet was advised that any instances where performance was not adequately meeting targets were highlighted in the report detailing the actions being taken.

The Leader advised members that, going forward, there would be a new performance system put in place, aligned to the new Business Plan.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the East Suffolk Performance Report for Quarter 3 be received.

#### **12 Public Space Protection Orders - Dog Controls**

Cabinet received report **ES/0289** by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment who reported that in November 2019 he had approved the commencement of consultation on three Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 at the request of a number of town and parish councils to deal with dog related matters within their areas.

A public consultation on the draft proposals closed for comments on 13 January 2020 and the report before Cabinet provided the results of the consultation and sought approval for the adoption of two of the draft PSPOs attached as Appendix A and delegated authority for the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment to adopt the third, subject to the outcome of further consultation with the Broads National Park Authority.

Cabinet was advised, as set out fully within the report, that the consultation exercise had produced mixed responses to the proposed introduction of PSPOs. Subject to a minor amendment in the case of the proposal affecting Lound Lakes, the results supported the introduction of the PSPOs and this now required Cabinet approval before the orders could be made.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment stated that he wanted the Order to be put in place because he felt that it was the right thing for protecting nature, particularly ground nesting birds, and also he felt that it opened up the countryside a little bit more for those who may be nervous of dogs. In conclusion, he stated that it matched the Council's principles of being inclusive.

In response to comments made by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Housing relating to Orders being put in place at Landguard at Felixstowe, the Leader stated that the vast majority of people were law abiding, most people complied with what was required.

Councillor Elliott touched on the fact that there were 20 orders currently in place across east Suffolk; he asked how many fixed penalty notices had been issued. It was confirmed that, in respect of dogs not on leads, during the last five years, probably no more than six, but the ones that had been issued had been very high profile. Councillor Elliott was pleased to be reassured that they did work.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the draft Public Space Protection Orders in respect of Charsfield Churchyard, as proposed, be adopted.
2. That an amended version of the consultation draft for Lound Lakes which preserves an existing field comprising approximately 4 Hectares, where dogs may safely be exercised off the lead, be adopted.
3. That delegated authority be given to the Cabinet Member for The Environment to adopt the draft Public Space Protection Order for Herringfleet Hills, subject to the outcome of further consultation with the Broads National Park Authority.

**13 Exempt/Confidential Items**

**RESOLVED**

That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A.

**14 Lowestoft Infrastructure Review**

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**15 Felixstowe South Seafront Café/Restaurant Build**

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**16 Purchase of Land in Felixstowe**

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**17 Acquisition of Offices in Lowestoft and Leiston**

- Information relating to any individual.
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting concluded at 8.40 pm

.....

Chairman