

Time Commenced – 18.00
Time Finished – 18:55

Integrating Communities Overview and Scrutiny Board 30 November 2015

Present: Councillor Bayliss (Chair)
Councillors Froggatt, Hassall and J Khan

In attendance: Councillor Afzal

10/15 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Poulter, Skelton and Sandhu.

11/15 Late items introduced by the Chair

The Chair agreed to accept a late item on the Proposal to Reinstate Active Monitoring - Public Area CCTV. This report is due to be considered by the Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Integration on 3 December 2015. The Chair requested the report will be considered prior to the first substantive item on the agenda.

12/15 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

13/15 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meetings held on 17 August 2015 were confirmed as an accurate record.

14/15 Items Referred from Corporate Scrutiny and Governance Board

There were no items referred.

15/15 Proposal to Reinstate Active Monitoring - Public Area CCTV

The report was summarised for the Board by the Director of Environment and Regulatory Services. It was reported that funding has been identified from the Business Improvement Districts and Police and Crime Commissioner Community Safety Fund to secure the reintroduction of a pilot, limited active monitoring service. If introduced this would operate alongside a reintroduced the collaboration between Pubwatch and Shopwatch radio systems with the CCTV system at weekends and for key events for a period of 12 months. If the Council

approve this proposal, a procurement waiver would be required to reintroduce the pilot active monitoring service before December 2015, which is the city centre's busiest period.

It was reported that external funding has been identified to cover staffing costs and provide an active monitoring service to December 2016, but to date no funding has yet been identified for the estimated £60k required to cover the CCTV infrastructure maintenance costs from April 2016. It was noted that if funding cannot be secured for the period from April 2016, it would not be prudent to enter into an active monitoring contract for the period beyond 31 March 2016.

The Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Integration informed the Board that funding from within the Council's budget for maintenance would not be possible, and any ideas for alternative sources of funding would be welcomed. The Board sought clarification on the possibility of continuing to run the system without funding for maintenance costs and were informed that the system is likely to require maintenance throughout this period. It was also clarified that the system had been maintained throughout the recent period. Members sought clarification on the historic maintenance issues for CCTV equipment and were informed that there have been issues with both the cameras themselves and the transmission of signals from the camera to the CCTV monitoring location in the Council House. Once in the Council House the equipment is relatively new and reliable.

Members queried the possibility of channelling the CCTV images from the Council to Derbyshire Constabulary, but were informed that this would be technically too difficult to achieve at a reasonable cost.

Members questioned whether the interim period from December could be used to look for alternative sources of funding. The Service Director for Environment and Regulatory services confirmed that this period would be used to try and seek additional funding, however, a break clause would need to be included in the contract in the event of no additional funding being identified. Members suggested that a wider range of possible funders could be approached for assistance that may be adversely affected by the lack of CCTV monitoring, including Rolls Royce, supermarket companies and other large businesses based in the city.

The Board resolved to:

- 1) support the continued use of CCTV monitoring;**
- 2) to recommend that the council continues to seek additional funding support from external business and other organisations in the city for the maintenance of CCTV monitoring equipment to allow the pilot active monitoring service to continue to December 2016.**

16/15 East Midlands Devolution Agreement

Members received a report of the Chief Executive updating the Board on progress of the East Midlands devolution agreement with the Government. The Acting Strategic Director of Communities and Place informed the Board that a joint bid on behalf of all 19 local authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership

in the D2N2 area was submitted to Government which would allow for greater powers and control in order to improve economic growth.

It was reported that five key areas/themes of; Skills to Employment, Built Environment, Transport, SMART infrastructure and Enterprise had been identified as part of a prospectus submitted to Government in March 2015. Members were informed that the prospectus has since been reviewed and updated with refined proposals negotiated and agreed across the 19 Local Authorities by Leaders and Chief Executives and submitted to Central Government in September 2015.

It was reported that there were no further details in relation to these reforms and any reforms will be subject to further detailed negotiations, however it was likely that significant powers would only be devolved if a directly elected Mayor position is created. It is proposed that the directly elected Mayor would act as Chair to a single devolved authority for the area. Members were also informed that if powers are to be devolved to any newly created Mayoral role, it is likely that Government will postpone the 2016 Police and Crime Commissioner elections as a result.

Members were informed that the agreement of a draft devolution deal would be a starting point which would develop over time and that a meeting of the authorities leaders was due to take place on 01 December 2016 to look at the final version of the draft.

Members requested that a final version of the draft be circulated to the Board for more detailed scrutiny at an appropriate time. Members also queried if there would be a cut off for a decision to be made on the Police and Crime Commissioner elections. Members were informed that officers did not think there would be a danger of getting close to the election without more certainty around what would be happening.

Members questioned what the timescales would be for further tranches of devolution deals if Derby does not end up securing a deal under the first tranche. It was reported there was some uncertainty about this, however that there was a fair degree of confidence on all 19 authorities agreeing to sign a draft deal.

Members requested that officers keep members of the Board up-to-date on the progress of the devolution deal.

The Board resolved to request that:

- **a copy of the draft devolution deal is circulated to the Board and that officers keep members of the Board up-to-date on the progress of the devolution deal;**
- **a special meeting of the Board is convened to further scrutinise the East Midlands Devolution Agreement and its implications at an appropriate time.**

Members considered a report of the Cabinet Member for Communities and City Centre Regeneration outlining the main stages in negotiating a Section 106 Agreement and where money is spent. The report also outlined how the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be used to at least partially replace Section 106 Agreements. However, members were informed that viability work undertaken for suggests that at the present time, more can be gained through the 106 process as opposed to CIL.

It was reported that a review of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which is used to help draw up Section 106 Heads of Terms will be needed at some point, especially if CIL is introduced, but that this should not take place until there is more certainty over adopting a CIL.

Members were informed that two viability studies have helped inform the Council's position on the use of S106 funds and the CIL. It was reported that viability studies undertaken to date indicate only very limited funds being available for CIL, especially once an allowance for affordable homes is made. In practice, the Section 106 process is more flexible and allows more to be secured. It was also reported that CIL takes away some the link between the development and mitigation. For the time being, therefore, a CIL has not been brought into place and individual negotiations under Section 106 remain.

Members queried the use of S106 in developments on peripheries of the city boundaries. It was reported that the Council holds discussions with neighbouring authorities where developments outside of the city boundaries have an impact within the city. Members were informed that negotiations are held on the inclusion of mitigating measures in development Heads of Terms, including the allocation of S106 funds.

Members requested that the Board is kept informed on any progress towards a firm position on the use of S106 or the introduction of a CIL.

The Board resolved to recommend that a report is scheduled early in the work programme of the next municipal year updating the Board on:

- **the Council's position in relation to the use of S106 funds;**
- **the possible adoption of a CIL; and**
- **results of the Government consultation exercise.**

MINUTES END