Cabinet

Wednesday, 12 July 2023

Attendees: Councillor Michelle Burrows, Councillor Mark Cory, Councillor Martin Goss, Councillor Alison Jay, Councillor David King , Councillor Andrea Luxford Vaughan, Councillor Natalie Sommers

No. **Publication and Call In Arrangements**

Date Published 13 July 2023

Date when decisions may be implemented (unless 'called in') 5pm 20 July 2023

NB All decisions except urgent decisions, those subject to pre-scrutiny and those recommended to Council may be subject to the Call-in Procedure.

Requests for the scrutiny of relevant decisions by the Scrutiny Panel must be signed by at least ONE Councillor AND FOUR other Councillors to countersign the call-in form OR to indicate support by e-mail. All such requests must be delivered to the Proper Officer by no later than 5pm on Thursday 20 July 2023.

763 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2023 be confirmed as a correct record.

764 **Urgent Items**

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that he had agreed to take the recommendation from the Scrutiny Panel from its meeting on 4 July 2023 as an urgent item, as it was important that issues to prevent a further data breach were considered before the next meeting in September 2023. A copy of the recommendation had been circulated to each member.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, and Councillor Cory, Portfolio Holder for Resources, explained that the Council had taken the data breach very seriously and had been honest and direct with residents affected. It had been caused by human error at Capita. The recommendation would ensure that any contract would have to comply with the Council's data protection requirements. Many contractors had more stringent requirements, but this would ensure a minimum standard would be applied which would help protect Council data.

RESOLVED that;-

(a) All contractors be required, in writing, to agree to comply with the data protection requirements and policies of Colchester City Council.

(b) Internal Audit be asked to review the Council's data protection policy and arrangements, specifically regarding ensuring that the Council's requirements are met by its contractors and third-party data processors.

REASONS

Agreeing the recommendation would ensure that the Council's data was protected by ensuring that the Council's data protection requirements were applied to all contractors.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

It was open to Cabinet not to agree the recommendation from the Scrutiny Panel.

765 Have Your Say! (Hybrid Cabinet Meetings)

Sir Bob Russell attended and addressed Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 5(1). He stood by the comments he had made to the last Cabinet meeting about the administration's lack of moral legitimacy, as 36 Councillors were not represented by the administration. The Cabinet system of Council governance had been introduced by the Labour government in the 1990s, but the coalition government had legislated to allow Councils to return to a Committee system. However this was not supported by the local Liberal Democrat Group. Following his comments, at the last Cabinet meeting, an anonymous complaint had been made about his comments to the national Liberal Democrat party This had been investigated and rejected, as he was speaking in an individual capacity and was not bound by collective responsibility. The Council should follow the example of other Liberal Democrat Councils and return to the Committee system.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that he was not aware of who had made the complaint and noted that they could be made by anyone. Whilst he could not offer redress, he was welcome to carry on attending Cabinet meetings as a critical friend. A switch to a Committee system required a two thirds majority on Council and he did not believe that there was appetite across the political groups for change. However, the administration would continue to work in a spirit of co-operation and openness.

Robbie Spence attended and addressed Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 5(1). Outhouse had received a three year grant in the previous year, despite having assets worth over £900,000 and income of over £600,000. This compared with favourably with a number of other charities such as the Citizens Advice Bureau. The provision of a 3 year funding settlement to a charity that was so well funded was questioned. Concern was also expressed about Outhouse's promotion of discredited ideas on gender neutrality which posed a danger to school

children. For instance, there had been a recent report of a serious sexual assault in a gender neutral toilet in an Essex school. The Council should reassess its grant funding to Outhouse in the light of these factors.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that multi year finding grants helped charities by giving them greater certainty over their long term funding. The Council would look at the issues raised and discuss with Outhouse if necessary. Councillor Cory, Portfolio Holder for Resources, explained that he worked with Outhouse and fully supported them They provided support to those being bullied at school and undergoing traumatic times through confusion about their sexuality. Their funding was quite volatile which was why the Council had given them a three year funding agreement. As a school teacher he understood the issues that arose all too frequently in schools. Good sex education and relationship training was essential and he was pushing for that nationally. Looking at gender issues more broadly in society would be more productive than concentrating on issues arising from gender neutral toilets.

Councillor Barber attended remotely and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to raise rh following issues:-

- Whether, in the context of recent discussion on Ultra Low Emissions Zones, the Leader would rule out a congestion charge. Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that there were no plans to introduce a congestion charge. However in view of the evidence emerging of the health impact of air pollution, the Council needed to keep abreast of any developments that might address air pollution. Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Services and Waste stressed that there were no plans to introduce a congestion charge or introduce any polices designed to restrict residents' movements out of the communities in which they lived.
- Whether unused space in car parks could be utilised for the storage of bicycles. Councillor King welcomed the principle of this which was consistent with the Council's Active Travel approach. The Council had recently opened a new cycle storage unit in the City Centre.
- Was the Council reviewing the latest information from National Grid on pylons and whether the Council would be submitting a consultation response and whether the Leader would be supportive of the Local Plan Committee reviewing the Council's policies. Councillor King and Councillor Luxford Vaughan, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Environment and Sustainability, stressed that the Council had responded to National Grid at every stage and opposed the proposals. Officers could be invited to review the relevant policies and look to see if there was any further guidance or information that could be provided.
- What was the Leader's view of Council vehicles parked on pavements and on yellow lines? Councillor King explained that he would be concerned by this and expected that officers would park in accordance with regulations and good practice.

Councillor Scordis attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet in respect of the recent garden waste proposals. There remained concern about the fairness of a system which charged residents for a bin under the new system, when residents in areas were wheeled bins had previously been introduced had received them without charge. Further information was requested as to how the system would

be introduced in areas such as Rowhedge which were not suitable for wheeled bins due to narrow pavements. There was anecdotal evidence that the Neighbourhoods Team were struggling to keep up with the demands on the service and further consideration needed to be given to the resourcing of the team.

Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Services and Waste, highlighted that the Labour Group had supported the introduction of charging for garden waste. The full details of the scheme had not yet been agreed and a request had been made to the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel for a separate item to examine the detail and make recommendations to Cabinet. Charging for the wheeled bins was one area it could look at. However it needed to be understood that the Council was not seeking to make a profit, only to recover its costs. Also, the more expensive the scheme became to introduce or administer the smaller the saving that would result. The Council was looking at the provision of smaller wheeled bins in those areas of the City with issues such as narrow pavements.

He had recently met with the Neighbourhoods and Enforcement Teams and had a robust discussion on priorities. Like many teams across the Council, they were under pressure and if tasks were missed or not completed in accordance with agreed priorities, Councillors should raise this with the team or with him.

Councillor J. Young attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to express her concern about recent press reports that the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities was handing significant funding back to the Treasury after struggling to find projects to spend it on, and that a commitment to build 300,000 houses a year was being dropped. There was a real housing crisis in Colchester so it was a surprise money was going back to the Treasury. Could the Portfolio Holder for Planning give a reassurance that the Council would keep pace with its housing delivery targets?

Councillor Luxford Vaughan, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Environment and Sustainability, explained that she believed the removal of the 300,000 cap was sensible as it led to houses being built without the necessary infrastructure. There was an affordability crisis for young people and low income families. The commitment to meet, but not exceed, the housing delivery targets remained. The Council remained committed to increasing its stock of housing and looking at other methods of increasing the stock of affordable housing, such as ending right to buy. Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, stressed that the commitment remained unchanged from when the Labour Group had been part of the administration. The Council was looking to increase the stock of Council housing and would be radical in its approach. There was also concern that changes in policy by the Home Office would exacerbate matters by ending the housing of refugees in hotels, which would significantly increase demand for temporary and affordable housing. The Council was discussing with colleagues in the Ministry of Defence and Essex County Council what could be done to mitigate the impact of this policy.

766 Local Government Peer Challenge Action Plan Progress

The Chief Operating Officer submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Dundas attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed Cabinet. The Action Plan showed progress on many areas raised by the Peer Review. However, the Peer Review had stressed the need for the Council to agree its position on Local Government reorganisation and the report before Cabinet was vague on this issue. Did the Cabinet have an agreed position on the proposals coming forward, which seemed to favour a Greater Essex Combined Authority and an Elected Mayor. The Peer Review had also encouraged the Council to look again at the electoral system and suggested that election by thirds was holding Colchester back. Whilst it was appreciated that the Council had taken on board the views of an all party group, if the Council did not look to change the system now it would be stuck with election by thirds for at least the next ten years. The Council should reconsider this issue and put Colchester first.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that he understood the arguments in favour of four yearly elections. However, it required a two thirds majority in Council to change and there was not sufficient support across the Chamber for this. In terms of devolution, there was no clarity on the final outcome. The Council continued to contribute to discussions on the way forward to ensure the best outcome for Colchester residents. Essex County Council was keen to involve districts in the discussions, even though there was no requirement to do so, and Colchester was engaged in the process and its views were respected. It was seeking to achieve the maximum powers from government and there were potential gains on skills, transport and health agendas. The principles of devolution supported the shared services agenda that the Council was pursuing.

Councillor Sunnucks attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet. The Peer Review had identified that the capital programme needed immediate action and need to be reviewed urgently in view of the external environment. The report before Cabinet was unclear about what action was being taken to address this. It was not clear if the review was just looking at whether projects could be managed better, rather than a fundamental review. It was also unclear whether the Council was looking properly at the appraisals for the projects in the programme and the income streams that would be necessary to pay the interest charges that would result.

Councillor King explained that he would arrange for a briefing on the current position. Substantial work had been undertaken. The Council was looking to understand first of all the projects that were currently in the programme and the commitments and risks involved, rather than looking at significant additional commitments. The results so far were encouraging. Work on additional projects that could be undertaken had not yet been completed.

Pam Donnelly, Chief Executive, was invited to contribute and explained that the requirement to review the capital programme had received immediate and urgent attention. The gaps in the Council's strategic finance capacity had been addressed through the recruitment of the Section 151 Officer and access to his wider team. The review was wide ranging and the Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer were

giving it their full attention. It was not an isolated piece of work and fitted in with other elements such as the CIPFA review of the Asset Strategy. A full and far reaching set of recommendations was expected in September.

Councillor Cory, Portfolio Holder for Resources, endorsed the Chief Executive's comments. Councillor Sunnucks was meeting with the Section 151 Officer and had been invited to a workshop on the Capital Programme Review in September. An information pack would be circulated in advance of the workshop.

Councillor King introduced the report to Cabinet. The response to the Action Plan gave a clear and comprehensive indication of the current position. Significant progress had been made but there was more to do. The Peer Review team would visit again on 28 July and it would be interesting to hear their views. They would concentrate on those areas that were most challenging.

RESOLVED that Cabinet noted the progress in responding to the Peer Challenge recommendations.

REASONS

To ensure the Council responds appropriately to the key recommendations made by the Local Government Association Peer Challenge and in turn support the continuous improvement of how the Council is operated.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were presented to Cabinet.

767 Acquisition of Four New Build Homes from a Developer as Part of the Council's New Housebuilding Programme

The Client Services Manager submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Rippingale attended and with the consent of te Chair addressed to cabinet to ask the following questions of the Portfolio Holder for Housing:-

- Despite the financial pressures on the Council, new housing was welcomed. The cost of living crisis was increasing homelessness, particularly for private renters who could not afford rent increases and homeowners who were facing interest rate rises. How would the Portfolio Holder adapt to these changing circumstances and what would be done to ease the looming housing crisis facing these two groups?
- Given the increasing pressure temporary accommodation was putting on the general fund, Councillors had recently received complaints about the standard and management of temporary emergency accommodation. Could the Portfolio Holder provide reassurance that temporary accommodation paid for by the Council was regularly checked to ensure that it was of a good standard. Could he assure Councillors that the temporary accommodation met the necessary standards within

the Statutory Code of Guidance, particularly in relation to the Globe Hotel and Riverside development.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that Councillor Smith was not present but that a written response would be sent. He was aware of the challenge posed by the looming housing crisis which would be exacerbated by the eviction of Afghan refugees from hotel accommodation. The administration would continue to work with the Labour group and look for radical solutions to mitigate the crisis as far as it could.

Councillor Sommers, Portfolio Holder for Communities, explained that the Financial Support Team worked hard with residents to provide support before they were made homeless to relieve the pressure on temporary accommodation.

Councillor Cory, Portfolio Golder for Resources, endorsed the proposals in the report and on the following item. They provided a good deal to taxpayers and to those on the housing waiting list. The purchases would be part funded by the disposal of 106/106A Shrub End Road, elsewhere on the agenda.

Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Services and Waste, explained that none of the houses on this part of the Chesterwell Development were owner occupied. All the properties had been sold by the developer to a rental company, which was an indication of the changing housing market.

RESOLVED that:-

(a) The Council shall pursue this opportunity as set out in the Client Services Manager's report and proceed with the offer, as outlined in Part B of the report, for the 4 units.

(b) Authority be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, to agree and negotiate any subsequent purchases of homes closer to completion, subject to normal viability and valuation considerations.

(c) Authority be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, to approve the exchange of conditional contracts to acquire the units, and any other related matters, to complete the purchase when all conditions are satisfied.

(d) Colchester Borough Homes be appointed as a "clerk of works" or "employers agent" to supervise the quality of the construction of the homes to be acquired.

REASONS

There are approximately 2,560 households on the Council's Housing Register seeking social housing and approximately 285 households in temporary accommodation. It is a priority of the Council, as shown by its New Housebuilding Programme, to try and find new ways to provide more homes in response to this need.

The Council is delivering affordable homes, but it is still continually seeking new and

innovative ways to increase the supply of affordable housing and provide good quality, affordable and secure homes for Colchester's residents who are in housing need.

Although there is a supply of new affordable housing through Section 106 provision via Registered providers, alongside Council led projects, supply is not meeting the need. The impact of Covid slowed affordable housing delivery in the market, and for the first year the Council delivered more affordable homes through its delivery Programme (including the Acquisition Programme/100 Homes) than all other Registered Providers combined; which evidences the importance of the Council's role.

These acquisitions will increase the Council's housing stock and diversifies the methods to bring forward additional affordable housing.

In Colchester, within the priority Bands A-C, there are approximately 640 applicants on the Housing register with a need for a 1 bed property. This makes up for 24% of the housing register need. There is an average waiting time of 11.7 months for a 1 bed property for applicants in bands B and C (Average waiting time of 4.4 months for applicants in Band A).

There are approximately 156 applicants in temporary accommodation within Colchester with a studio/1 bed need. Residing in temporary accommodation, over a prolonged period of time, may have a negative impact on the residents and their support network, as well as placing the Council's allocated general fund budget under significant pressure.

There are approximately 14 applicants, in priority bands, with a need of a 1 bed property in the Mile End Ward alone.

There are approximately 13 applicants on the housing register with a Code 1 need (fully Wheelchair accessible), in priority bands A-C, who require a 1 bed property. These applicants can often be waiting for an extended period of time, in unsuitable properties, due to a lack of supply of adapted properties, within the Council's housing stock.

Proceeding with this opportunity and other similar opportunities, to work with developers to acquire units as part of their development, will help to alleviate pressure on the housing register, temporary accommodation and relevant budgets as well as allowing developers to continue to develop within the Colchester area.

It is estimated that these units will be available between August 2023 and October 2023, providing much needed homes within a short timeframe.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The Council could do nothing, but this will mean the Council will miss out on opportunities to maximise the delivery of newbuild social rent housing in Colchester and it will mean that households on the housing register and in temporary accommodation will wait longer for a secure affordable home.

768 Acquisition of Six Additional New Build Homes from a Developer as Part of the Council's New Housebuilding Programme

The Client Services Manager submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

RESOLVED that:-

(a) The additional HRA capital budget that will allow the Council to pursue this opportunity as set out in the report and proceed with the offer, as outlined in Part B of this report, for the additional 6 units be agreed

(b) Authority be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, to approve the exchange of conditional contracts to acquire the units, and any other related matters, to complete the purchase when all conditions are satisfied.

(c) Colchester Borough Homes be appointed as a "clerk of works" or "employers agent" to supervise the quality of the construction of the homes to be acquired.

REASONS

There are approximately 2,590 households on the Council's Housing Register seeking social housing and approximately 285 households in temporary accommodation. It is a priority of the Council, as shown by its New Housebuilding Programme, to try and find new ways to provide more homes in response to this need.

The Council is delivering affordable homes, but it is still continually seeking new and innovative ways to increase the supply of affordable housing and provide good quality, affordable and secure homes for Colchester's residents who are in housing need.

Although there is a supply of new affordable housing through Section 106 provision via Registered providers, alongside Council led projects, supply is not meeting the need. The Covid impacts have slowed affordable housing delivery in the market, and for the first year the Council delivered more affordable homes through its delivery Programme (including the Acquisition Programme/100 Homes) than all other Registered Providers combined; which evidences the importance of the Council's role.

These acquisitions will increase the Council's housing stock and diversifies the methods to bring forward additional affordable housing. This will also strengthen the Council's investment partner status with Homes England and will provide more opportunities to bid for Affordable Housing Grant within the 2021/26 affordable homes programme.

In Colchester, within the priority Bands A-C, there are approximately 535 applicants on the Housing register with a need for a 3+ bed property. This makes up for 21% of the housing register need. There is an average waiting time of 16.5 months for a 3+

bed property for applicants in bands B and C (Average waiting time of 6.5 months for applicants in Band A).

There are approximately 90 families in temporary accommodation within Colchester with a 3+ bed need. Residing in temporary accommodation, over a prolonged period of time, may have a negative impact on the families and their support network, as well as placing the Council's allocated budget under significant pressure.

There are approximately 32 families, in priority bands, with a need of a 3+ bed property in the Mile End Ward alone.

Proceeding with this opportunity and other similar opportunities, to work with developers to acquire units as part of their development, will help to alleviate pressure on the housing register, temporary accommodation and relevant budgets as well as allowing developers to continue to develop within the Colchester area.

It is estimated that these units will be available between August 2023 and October 2023, providing much needed homes within a short timeframe.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The Council could do nothing, but this will mean the Council will miss out on opportunities to maximise the delivery of newbuild social rent housing in Colchester and it will mean that households on the housing register and in temporary accommodation will wait longer for a secure affordable home.

769 Disposal of 106/106A Shrub End Road

The Client Services Manager submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Cory, Portfolio Holder for Resources, introduced the report. The Council had owned the property and had looked at redeveloping itself but it had not proved viable. The disposal of the property would help the Council acquire further properties to help those in housing need so was a good deal for the Council and for taxpayers. The disposal was based upon a robust, independent valuation of the property.

RESOLVED that:-

(a) 106/106a Shrub End Road, Colchester be disposed of by open market sale for the amount stated in the report on Part B of the agenda.

(b) The Head of Strategic Housing in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, be authorised to agree offers made on the property, if the offer stated in the report on Part B of the agenda withdraws, and settle final terms and consequential matters to complete any sale.

(c) The money gained from the sale of the site, be recycled to acquire two family homes, with a preference of 4 bed properties, within the acquisitions programme, in addition to the annual target for acquisitions.

REASONS

Significant investment would be required to bring the energy performance of the two properties up to the Council's average Band C energy rating. The estimated cost to refurbish the property into one 4+ bed house, remodelling the current layout, is included in the report on Part B of the agenda.

The estimated cost to redevelop the unit into two x 4 bed houses is included in the report on Part B of the agenda.

If the property was sold for the amount offered, and two x 4 bed houses were acquired recycling these proceeds, the cost of the acquired units is in the report on Part B of the agenda (based on average market values).

By disposing of 106/106a Shrub End Road on the open market, the Council would be ensuring that the most value for money process is followed and this would likely be the quickest route to gaining the much-needed family homes.

By providing two further four-bedroom properties the Council would be providing secure larger accommodation to two families in housing need that is currently in short supply.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

To refurbish the property into a 4+ bed home. This option would only meet the needs of one family on the housing register rather than two families.

To remodel the unit into two x 4 bed homes, project managed by Colchester Borough Homes. There is a possibility that this option may not achieve planning permission, proving to be a costly exercise with no guarantee of the outcome.

Do nothing and leave the property as is. However, the property would fall into disrepair with further costs for keeping it in a dilapidated state.

770 Policy Panel Work Programme

Cabinet considered the recommendation made by the Policy Panel in respect of its work programme at its meeting on 28 June 2023, a copy of which had been circulated to each member.

Councillor Law, Chair of the Policy Panel, attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet. The Policy Panel had an important role in feeding the views of residents through to Cabinet. The proposal for the work programme echoed

residents' concerns and reflected the issues that impact on their lives. For example, there was a focus on infrastructure of people's lives, such as sport and leisure facilities and community assets. It also highlighted the way in which residents live, through looking at equality and diversity and commemoration issues. It also recognised the impact of the cost of living crisis. The contribution of the Deputy Leader to the Panel's debate on its work programme was welcomed. It was a strong Panel with a wealth of experience and she looked forward to working collaboratively with the Cabinet. Whilst it was appreciated that the list of items was lengthy, experience showed that sometimes items were not able to progress so it would be provide some flexibility and back up options.

Councillor King, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, stressed that the Panel's work on engagement was valued by Cabinet. The proposals were welcomed but consideration needed to be given to prioritisation. Some items would also require advice and input from external organisations. It was suggested that the Panel should concentrate initially on sports and leisure facilities and provision, as this was a public priority. It could also explore issues around the carbon impact of sports facilities It could also build on work undertaken previously on issues such as the Youth Zone. The items on community assets and development should also be prioritised as it fitted in well with the Asset Strategy.

RESOLVED that

(a) The Policy Panel be given approval to examine the following subjects:

a) Equality and Diversity Policy;
b) The Council's Policy on Procurement;
c) Commemorations locally, including benches, flags and statues;
d) Ways to support an increase in the retail offer of Colchester and economic draw of its shops;
e) Sport and leisure facilities and provision;
f) Mapping and examination of community assets and asset-based community development approach;
g) The Council's Licensing, Food and Health and Safety Policy;
h) Policy on rights to bid on assets of community value, when up for sale;
i) The Council's Parking Strategy.

(b) Particular priority be given to the items on sport and leisure facilities and provisions, mapping and examination of community assets and asset based community development and policy on rights to bid for assets of community value.

REASONS

Cabinet supported the recommendation that the Policy Panel look at the subjects identified but there was a need to prioritise the list.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

It was open to the Cabinet not to agree the recommendation or to only agree to certain elements recommended by the Policy Panel.

771 Progress of Responses to the Public

The Democratic Services Manager submitted a progress sheet a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Dundas attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Panel. At a recent meeting of the Environment and Sustainability Panel, some residents had expressed concern that they had not received responses to contributions made at the previous meeting of the Panel. It was suggested that the scope of the report should be widened to include all Committees and Panels to ensure that all those who spoke under Have Your Say! received an appropriate response.

Cabinet indicated that it agreed with this suggestion.

Councillor Burrows, Portfolio Holder for Leisure., Culture and Heritage, explained that a written response had now been sent to those who had raised issues about the provision of netball courts.

RESOLVED that:-

(a) The contents of the Progress Sheet be noted.

(b) The scope of the report be widened to include contributions made to all Committees and Panels.

REASONS

The progress sheet was a mechanism by which the Cabinet could ensure that public statements and questions were responded to appropriately and promptly. By widening the scope of the report, it would ensure that all contributions made under Have Your Say! were responded to appropriately.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were presented to the Cabinet.

772 Acquisition of Four New Build Homes from a Developer as Part of the Council's New Housebuilding Programme - Part B

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

This minute is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, including the authority holding the information).

773 Acquisition of Six Additional New Build Homes from a Developer as Part of the Council's New Housebuilding Programme - Part B

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

This minute is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, including the authority holding the information).

774 Disposal of 106/106A Shrub End Road - Part B

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

This minute is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, including the authority holding the information).

775 Colchester Northern Gateway Leisure Park Lease Arrangements

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

This minute is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, including the authority holding the information).

776 Colchester Community Stadium Services Agreement

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

This minute is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, including the authority holding the information).