



Leicester
City Council

MINUTES EXTRACT

Minutes of the Meeting of the STRATEGIC PLANNING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Held: WEDNESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2003 at 5.30pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Farmer - Chair
Councillor Thomas - Labour Spokesperson

Councillor Fitch
Councillor Thompson
(for Councillor O'Brien)

Councillor Wann
(for Councillor Kitterick)
Councillor Waddington

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Hunt – Cabinet Link Member for Environment, Regeneration and
Development

* * * * *

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any interests they may have in the business on the agenda, and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applied to them.

Councillor Thompson declared a personal interest in Paper B '2002/03 Capital Programme Monitoring – Outturn' as he was a member of the Board of Greater Humberstone Community Development Limited; and in Paper A 'Revenue Outturn 2002/03' as he was a Director of the Northfields Employment Development Initiative.

43. DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE PLANNING PROCESS

The Corporate Director of Environment, Regeneration and Development submitted a report that sought to clarify the process and framework for negotiating developer contributions that could be sought as a result of development in the city.

Further to the report, the Service Director, Planning and Sustainable Development reported that the Highways and Transportation Scrutiny Committee were not supportive of the Members Panel as described in the report but felt Ward Members should be involved in the process. Also he

circulated an addendum report which contained examples of recent developer contributions.

Councillor Sandringham was in attendance at the meeting and commented on this report. She suggested that the Committee consider supporting a proposal to remove all contributions to public art and divert these in to funds for public parks. The Committee expressed a variety of opinions on this matter and agreed to consider three proposals for the Committee's recommendation to go forward to Cabinet. These were as follows, with the voting results:-

- i) Retain the public art contribution, but fund projects that were considered to be more worthwhile and popular – **2 votes.**
- ii) End the public art contribution and divert this into funding for parks – **3 votes.**
- iii) End the public art contribution and use the funding for any other priority areas – **1 vote.**

It was noted that although there was no absolute majority, the Committee agreed ii) above should go forward as the Committee's recommendation.

The Committee also discussed the possibility of including the provision of jobs for local people as part of any planning agreement. Officers commented that there were no legal provisions to ensure this could happen. However agreements were being made with developers in certain cases such as the Hammerson's Shires development. Hammerson's had previously proved successful at this with the Bull Ring redevelopment in Birmingham where recruitment efforts were directed at areas of low employment.

The Committee also discussed the Developer Contributions post. Members were generally not supportive of employing a consultant to undertake this role. They did however note the difficulties in funding for the post, which was short term and possibly for only one year depending on bid submissions. Considering these difficulties the Committee suggested that consideration be given to recharging Council departments who were beneficiaries of the contributions from developers. This would then fund the post indefinitely. Officers noted this was in operation in other authorities and they would find out how well this method of funding worked. The views of Council departments would also need to be considered.

Members of the Committee were not supportive of the proposal for a Members Advisory Panel, but did support ward Member involvement in considering developer contributions.

RESOLVED:

- (1) that the Committee recommends that contributions for public art be stopped and these contributions be diverted to funding for parks;

- (2) that the Committee recommends that the Developer Contributions post be an internal city council employee, not a consultant;
- (3) that a further report be submitted to the Committee considering the possibility of funding the Developers Contributions post by recharging Council departments who are beneficiaries of Developer Contributions; and
- (4) that a further report be submitted to the Committee on how local labour agreements can be further developed.