

Cabinet**Thursday, 21 June 2007, County Hall, Worcester (10.00 a.m.)****Minutes****Present:**

Dr G H Lord (Chairman), Mr S J M Clee, Mrs E A Eyre, Mr S E Geraghty, Mr W P Gretton, Mr A I Hardman, Mr D W Prodger.

Also attended:

Mr R W Banks, Mr J W Buckley, Mr R A A Bullock, Mr A E Davies, Mr B P Gandy, Mr P A Mould, Mrs B Passingham, Mr E J Sheldon, Mr J H Smith, Mr W G Stewart.

Available papers:

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. Agenda item 10 - "Draft Annual Report/Best Value Performance Plan 2007"- The Annual Report 2007 (previously circulated);
- C. Correspondence from the South Worcestershire Joint Advisory Panel dated 20 June 2007 in relation to Agenda item 9 – "Strategic Transportation Issues" (circulated prior to the meeting);
- D. The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24 May 2007 (previously circulated).

(A copy of the documentation referred to at A – C above will be attached to the signed Minutes).

**686. Apologies and
Declarations of
Interest
(Agenda item 1)**

Mr S E Geraghty declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in agenda items 7 and 9 and a prejudicial interest in item 12, as a member of Worcester City Council. He withdrew from the meeting before the consideration of agenda item 12.

Mr P A Mould declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 as a Governor at Woodrow First School.

**687. Public
Participation
(Agenda item 2)**

Mr C T Wareing, Chairman of Governors at Dingleside Middle School, made representations in respect of agenda item 4 - "Dingleside Middle School, Redditch". Mr Wareing opposed the proposed closure of the school and put forward a number of arguments in support of the school remaining open. He urged the Cabinet to take these points into consideration and make a decision to

allow Dingleside to remain open and continue to serve the local community in Redditch.

688. Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 3)

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2007 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

689. Dingleside Middle School, Redditch (Agenda item 4)

Dingleside Middle School was in the Kingsley pyramid of schools and was one of 3 middle schools in that pyramid. The school had been inspected by Ofsted in April 2007 and following that inspection was placed in "Special Measures". When a school went into "Special Measures" the Council had to consider closure as one of the options.

The Council had explored the possibility of federating Dingleside Middle School with another middle school in the pyramid but this was deemed unviable. In addition, the implementation of an Improvement Action Plan to assist in the recovery of the school was considered as an option but there were serious concerns that this would be unsustainable even with further significant resources. Dingleside Middle School had also received a high level of support and intervention from the Council. However, a number of barriers had prevented a working solution to be realised to allow the school to remain a viable entity within its community.

At the time of the Redditch Review in 1998/99 one of the options specifically consulted on was to merge Dingleside and Ridgeway Middle Schools as there were concerns about the long term viability of 3 middle schools in this part of Redditch. However, the decision at the time was to retain all 3 middle schools in that pyramid. Pupil numbers in Dingleside Middle School had been declining over the last few years. This had put pressure on the school budget and the ability of the school to attract and retain staff. Analysis showed that after allowing for the possible closure of Dingleside Middle School there was more than sufficient capacity at the remaining schools in Redditch.

If the recommendation was agreed, a draft consultation document on the possible closure of Dingleside Middle School would be circulated in July. Consultation on the school catchment areas in the Kingsley College pyramid (and those schools adjacent to it) was proposed so that if closure was agreed, decisions on changes of catchment areas were available for parents when applying for school places in September 2008. The results of the consultations would then be brought back to the Cabinet in September 2007.

The financial implications of the school both remaining open and closing were set out in the report. It was anticipated that any plan to try and recover the school would be expensive in both revenue and staff time. Realistically the chances of recovering the school were very slim and critically pupils were failing to get a good quality of education at the present time. It was therefore considered necessary to act swiftly in order to secure education certainty for the children in the school.

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

- (a) pupil numbers at the school were in steep decline, the school had set a deficit budget in the last few years and there were staff recruitment problems in both Key Stages 2 and 3;
- (b) Ofsted believed that the school was failing to provide the children within it with a good standard of education and therefore it was important that the Council acted quickly to address this;
- (c) various options had been explored to try and sustain the school and prevent its closure, however, they had proved unworkable;
- (d) if closure was eventually approved, the Council would seek to maximise parental choice by exploring the potential for extended services provision and making use of services from local Children's Centres and local community groups;
- (e) if Dingleside were to close, the Council may have to provide transport to some pupils to alternative schools if the distance to those schools was above the statutory walking distance;
- (f) closure was recommended in December 2007 or August 2008 to ensure continuity of education and minimise disruption;
- (g) one of the local members for the area raised a number of points of concern including the need for the pupils living in the Woodrow area to continue to feed into Kingsley College, the issue of surplus places and the disruption the proposal would cause. Officers indicated that the points raised would be considered as part of the consultation process;
- (h) the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Children and Young People intended to establish a Working Party to support the process. She hoped to draw on

the knowledge of local members of the schools in the area in order to contribute to its work.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) consultation takes place on the possible closure of Dingleside Middle School, from Monday 2 July until Friday 3 August 2007;**
- (b) consultation on school catchment areas in the Kingsley Pyramid (and those schools adjacent to it) takes place, so that if it is decided to progress closure, decisions on changes of catchment areas are available for parents when applying for school places for September 2008;**
- (c) a report is brought to the Cabinet in September 2007 on the results of both consultations.**

690. Possible Amalgamation of the New Lickhill and Stourport Primary Schools to create a 2 Form Entry Primary School on the current Lickhill Middle School Site (Agenda item 5)

In December 2006, the Cabinet approved consultation on the possible amalgamation of the new Lickhill and Stourport Primary Schools to create a 2 form entry (FE) primary on the current Lickhill Middle School site. An extensive consultation exercise followed. By the 23 March closing date, 88 responses had been received. 54 were against the creation of a new 2 FE primary school and 29 were for (5 responses did not state a particular preference). The report set out the detail of the responses in favour and against the amalgamation and the alternative options suggested during the consultation. The response of the Director of Children's Services to the issues raised was also set out in the report.

Under the 2006 Education and Inspection Act, the Local Authority responsible for education was required, in most circumstances, to undertake a competition when opening a new primary school. It may decide different approaches to put forward its own proposals to establish a new school in different ways:-

- (a) irrespective of whether its proposals were for a foundation or community school, it may apply to the Secretary of State under Section 10 of the Act for consent to publish those proposals without going through the competition process at all; or
- (b) go through the competition process and as part of that, at the appropriate point, put forward a proposal to establish a new community or foundation school as part of the competition.

There was no recent experience of the Secretary of State's predisposition to requests to publish proposals for a primary school without a competition. On balance it was therefore recommended that if members were supportive of the 2 FE primary school being a community school that, as a first step, an application be made to the Secretary of State for consent to publish proposals for a new community school without a competition. If consent was given, that officers then proceed to publish the statutory notice for the closure of Lickhill and Stourport Primary schools on the 31 August 2010 and the opening of a new 2 FE primary school on the current Lickhill Middle School site from 1 September 2010. If the Secretary of State did not give consent and members wished to pursue the option of a community school, a competition may be initiated and proposal for a community school be included.

Two draft timetables had been given in the report. One was for the establishment of a 2 FE community primary school involving an application to the Secretary of State for consent to publish a proposal without competition and the other for a competition for a new primary school. The financial implications of the proposal had not changed since the December Cabinet report.

Having considered all the arguments presented, the Director of Children's Services believed that the establishment of a 2 FE primary school on the site of the current Lickhill Middle School was the best long term option for educational provision. It was preferable that this change should take place at the beginning of the academic year. In line with an estimated build programme it was recommended that this take place in 2010 when the new building should be ready for occupation.

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

- (a) the closing date for the consultation had been 30 March 2007 and not 23 March as set out in the report;
- (b) it was acknowledged that the proposed amalgamation would reduce choice in the area but there were strong educational arguments in favour of it;
- (c) the new 2 Form Entry primary school would provide state of the art 21st century accommodation, fit for purpose with excellent facilities to maximise educational achievement;

- (d) a great deal of time and care had been spent in analysing the risks posed to staff by the amalgamation and trying to reduce uncertainty for them;
- (e) it was proposed that, if the Secretary of State did not grant consent to establish a community primary school without the need for a competition, a report be brought back to the Cabinet to consider the alternative approach of closing one of the schools and expanding the other to create a 2 FE community primary school.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the results of the consultation undertaken between 19 February and 30 March 2007 be noted;**
- (b) a 2-Form Entry community primary school on the site of the current Lickhill Middle School as the preferred option to be established from 2010, be supported;**
- (c) the Director of Children's Services be authorised to apply to the Secretary of State for Education and Skills for consent to publish proposals to establish a community primary school without the need for a competition;**
- (d) if such consent is granted by the Secretary of State that statutory notices be published for the proposed closure of Lickhill and Stourport Primary Schools on 31 August 2010 and the proposed establishment of a new 2 Form Entry community primary school on the site of the current Lickhill Middle School site from 1 September 2010;**
- (e) if such consent is not granted, that a report be brought back to the Cabinet so that further consideration can be given to the alternative approach of establishing a 2 FE community primary school, by the closure of one of the schools and the expansion of the other.**

**691. Scrutiny Report -
Highway
Maintenance
(Agenda item 6)**

In July 2006, the Overview and Scrutiny Steering Committee (OSSC) established a scrutiny task group to undertake a scrutiny of Highway Maintenance. A final report, endorsed by the OSSC, was published and submitted to the Cabinet on 8 March 2007. The Cabinet referred the report to Council for discussion and would

then consider the report in the light of the Council's discussion. Council discussed the scrutiny report at its May meeting, whilst noting that the report would return to the Cabinet.

The principal points raised by full Council were set out in the report. The Director of Environmental Services noted those points raised. In particular, in relation to the point that current mechanisms to review geographical allocations of resources appeared to allow some areas to benefit from generous allocations whilst others fell behind in terms of spending, he reported that following the Highway Partnership restructure, planned maintenance was now undertaken centrally because highway condition was assessed on a County-wide basis. Consequently, resources were allocated on a worst first basis as opposed to an even spread between Districts. However, he thought it was a good scrutiny exercise.

The following main points were made in the ensuing discussion:-

- (a) the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Steering Committee welcomed the Cabinet Member with Responsibility's response and was pleased that he had endorsed the Task Group's recommendations. He asked the Cabinet Member to look further into the Task Group's invest to save recommendation and to make all efforts to identify additional funding that could be made available to maintain and improve roads and footpaths in the County;
- (b) a commitment had already been made to progress modelling work in order to assess the programme of work, and its cost, to stabilise the road network and improve the condition of roads;
- (c) the Director of Environmental Services was currently exploring more efficient ways of working with Ringway;
- (d) a motion was proposed to adopt the response of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility as the way forward.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the Scrutiny Report on Highway Maintenance, together with the response from the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for the Environment and comments from Council be received;**

692. Revenues and Benefits Shared Service - Governance Arrangements

(b) the Report's recommendations be welcomed and the response of the Cabinet Member with Responsibility be adopted as the way forward.

Malvern Hills District Council, Wychavon District Council and Worcester City Council had agreed to form a joint local authority committee with the County Council for the purpose of establishing a shared service for Revenues and Benefits. (The other District Councils in Worcestershire had declined to participate at the present time). This required each of the participating district councils to delegate functions relating to Revenues and Benefits to that Joint Committee. The County Council's involvement in this shared service had been one of leadership, co-ordination and impartiality as it had no Revenues or Benefits function. Additionally, the Worcestershire Hub was at the 'heart' of the model for a shared Revenues and Benefits service and the County Council's involvement was key.

A draft legal agreement dealing with the creation and terms of reference of the Joint Committee and the agreement of the partner authorities to participate in the shared service, initially in respect of Revenues and Benefits, was being finalised. The agreement had been structured with the scope to take on other shared services in the future, if required and specifically agreed. It was proposed that 2 members from the Cabinet be appointed to serve on the Joint Committee as nominated from time to time by the Leader of the Council. It was intended that the Joint Committee would assume responsibility for the Revenues and Benefits functions across the three authorities with effect from 2 July 2007. Current plans showed the shared service being operational by April 2009.

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

- (a) those District Councils that had chosen not to participate in the arrangement at the present time still had the option to do so in the future;
- (b) it was hoped that this approach would eventually be extended to other shared services;
- (c) the increasing utilisation of the Hub would be beneficial to the County as a whole;
- (d) the Cabinet Members with Responsibility for Corporate Services and Financial Services would be appointed to serve on the Joint Committee.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the Director of Corporate Services be authorised to enter into a shared services partnership agreement for Revenues and Benefits with Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council;**
- (b) a Shared Services Joint Committee with those authorities be established for the purposes of the partnership agreement; and**
- (c) two members from the Cabinet be appointed to serve on the Joint Committee as nominated from time to time by the Leader of the Council.**

693. Review of Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Agenda item 8)

The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) for Herefordshire and Worcestershire was prepared by the Joint Members' Waste Forum and adopted by Herefordshire Council, Worcestershire County Council and the six Worcestershire Waste Collection Authorities in 2004. The Strategy formed a framework for the management of municipal waste in Herefordshire and Worcestershire until 2034. The Strategy reflected an integrated partnership approach to waste management across all authorities in the two Counties.

One of the key principles of the Strategy was to carry out a three yearly review to determine progress and update it in the light of new legislation, new technologies or other significant developments. Consequently, the Strategy was due for a review in 2007. A commitment had been given to ensure that all stakeholders were made aware of any changes. The County Council's Consultation Strategy required the Cabinet to approve any strategic or potentially contentious consultations before they commenced. The JMWMS would be reviewed by the stakeholders during Spring/Summer 2007. The public consultation exercise was planned for Autumn 2007. All the partners would need to approve the revised Strategy through their Cabinets/Executives. The revised Strategy was scheduled to be published late Spring/early Summer 2008.

A question had been raised as to whether the review should be used as an opportunity to change the name of the Strategy by removing or replacing the word 'Municipal'. Members were advised that the name of the Strategy would have to remain unchanged.

RESOLVED: that the commencement of the review of the Joint Municipal Waste Management

**694. Strategic
Transportation
Issues
(Agenda item 9)**

Strategy be approved.

The Local Transport Plan for 2006-11 (LTP2) outlined the overall transportation strategy for Worcestershire and contained specific policies to undertake a transportation and land use study for Worcester as well as a transportation study for the Wyre Forest area. For Major Scheme funding bids under LTP2, the DfT had introduced a scheme whereby funding was allocated to each Government Region in the form of a Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) and local authorities had to bid for funding through the relevant Regional Assembly. The DfT would still assess all Major Scheme funding bids but would rely heavily on advice given on such bids by the Regional Assembly.

The first round of the RFA occurred in 2005 at which the Council submitted 4 schemes: Stourport Relief Road, Worcestershire Parkway; Worcester Transport Strategy and Wyre Forest Transport Strategy. The former were assessed as Band Three and Band Four schemes respectively. Insufficient information was available on the latter two to permit assessment to be made. Since then, progress had been made on these Strategies and it was now felt appropriate that the Council submit updated RFA bids for them. DfT had also advised the Council to submit a bid for Worcestershire Bridges to the RFA process following the rejection of a Major Maintenance funding bid for this project in December 2006.

LTP2 identified the need for a strategic transportation study to investigate options to address transport problems in Worcester as well as providing the necessary transport infrastructure to cope with the proposed growth of the City. Phase One of the study tested the potential for major new highway infrastructure to meet the increased travel demand generated by the land use options based upon the housing and employment figures included in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), Options One, Two and Three.

The modelling work had shown that significant development was required in Worcester's transport network to meet the RSS Options. In addition, Phase Two, of the Worcester Transport Study aimed to assess the potential for major passenger transport (bus and rail rapid transit) enhancement schemes to meet the RSS Options without compromise to the sustainable development of the City. It was recommended that a RFA bid be prepared based on the early indications from Phase Two of the Worcester Transport Study with a view to continuing the development of a robust Worcester

Transport Strategy.

LTP2 identified the need for a strategic transportation study to investigate options to improve accessibility to the Stourport Road Employment Corridor as well as addressing congestion problems in Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn. Work to date had identified that significant investment was required in the local transport network in both towns. The RSS Options consultation had highlighted similar transport and land uses issues in Redditch to those faced in Worcester. The County Council was to work with Redditch Borough Council and other bodies on a study of the transportation impact of the travel demand created by land use development that would be required to meet the RSS housing and employment figures in that area.

The following main points were made in the ensuing discussion:-

- (a) Cabinet members had received correspondence from the Chairman of the South Worcestershire Joint Advisory Panel which set out the views of that Panel on the County Council's proposals. The letter referred to a number of key points which the Director of Environmental Services responded to at the meeting;
- (b) it was clear that in order for the Worcester bid to be successful the focus needed to be on the provision of a comprehensive highway infrastructure to meet the planned growth of the City but supported by a well developed system of public transport;
- (c) the Director of Environmental Services and the Cabinet Member with Responsibility would work with the South Worcestershire District Councils to produce a bid for Worcester which would meet the bid submission deadline of 14 July;
- (d) the options for the Wyre Forest Transport Strategy would be assessed to determine the most cost effective approach to include in the bid.

RESOLVED: that the submission of bids to the Regional Funding Allocation for the following major transportation projects be endorsed, and the Director of Environmental Services be authorised to develop the detail of these bids in consultation with the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for the Environment:-

- (a) Worcester Transportation Strategy;

695. Draft Annual Report/Best Value Performance Plan 2007 (Agenda item 10)

(b) Wyre Forest Transportation Strategy;

(c) Worcestershire Bridges;

(d) Redditch Transport Study.

Each year the Council was required to produce a statutory Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) for publication by 30 June. In keeping with previous years, Worcestershire had produced an Annual Report which included BVPP information in accordance with the Local Government Act, and also contained other Council information such as the Financial Summary . The Audit Commission held up Worcestershire's Annual Report 2006 as an example of good practice and as such, the 2007 Annual Report followed the same format.

The Local Government White Paper proposed changes to BVPI and the way in which performance was measured and reported. Whilst it was anticipated that reporting in 2008 would remain the same, content and format would change in 2009. The content of this year's Report was important in that it would help the Auditors form a judgement of the Council when undertaking the Corporate Assessment in 2007/08. The audience for this year's Annual Report was the Council's strategic partners, members and other stakeholders as appropriate (as in previous years). Financial information for 2006/07 had not been updated in this draft as final outturn figures had not yet been agreed.

The Overview and Scrutiny Steering Committee (OSSC) considered the Draft Annual Report on 16 May 2007. It made a number of comments and concluded that it was pleased to be able to comment on an early draft of the report and thought that it was well presented and easy to read.

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

- (a) the Director of Planning, Economy and Performance advised the Cabinet of a number of small amendments to the Annual Report following its circulation;
- (b) the Annual Report was a very readable document and the approach to combining past performance, financial information and forward plans in one document was particularly praised;
- (c) the Council was showing excellent progress in

achieving its priorities, despite the difficult financial climate, and it was important to get this message across to the citizens of Worcestershire;

- (d) the Annual Report was a very useful reference document in assisting members to respond to issues raised by their constituents;
- (e) members were reminded that performance in the Annual Report had been measured against past performance and targets. All councillors had been invited to an Improvement briefing on 20 July at which the Council's performance compared with that of other local authorities would be considered;
- (e) the Chief Executive was pleased to report that the new Joint Director of Public Health, Richard Harling was making his first appearance in the Annual Report.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: that

- (a) the draft Best Value Annual Report 2007 be submitted for approval by Council; and**
- (b) the Directors of Planning, Economy and Performance and Financial Services, in co-operation with their relevant Cabinet Member with Responsibility, make minor factual textual amendments to the Best Value Annual Report 2007 and update the out-turn figures for 2006/07 and financial matters before the publication date of 30 June 2007.**

696. Waste Core Strategy for Worcestershire (Agenda item 11)

In accordance with the Council resolution in January 2007, the Waste Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State. The Strategy was prepared over a 3-year period in accordance with a programme agreed with Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM) and subject to three stages of extensive public consultation. After submission, a further statutory 6 week consultation was undertaken. Only at this point did GOWM express reservations about the approach taken - in direct contradiction with the comments they had made at the previous stage. The Planning Inspectorate appointed to examine the Waste Core Strategy had also made it clear that it was very likely that upon examination the Inspector would find it "unsound" (i.e. it could not be adopted).

This was not a purely local experience. Other local authorities have had a similar experience with their Waste Core Strategies. Officers had become aware of

emerging draft guidance about how government policy should be interpreted, but the status of this guidance was currently unclear. Until this had been clarified and GOWM could give clearer advice, officers considered it unwise to continue as any future work, and the considerable expense involved in holding a formal examination in public of the Waste Core Strategy, would be wasted.

Under the terms of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the associated Regulations, the Council could not withdraw a Core Strategy once submitted for independent examination, though the Secretary of State had the power to direct its withdrawal.

Officers' advice was that Council should formally request the Secretary of State so to direct. They did not anticipate any difficulty with, or objections to, this course of action from the Secretary of State. However, as the Waste Core Strategy was part of the policy framework which had been approved by full Council, it was considered proper to seek Council's formal endorsement for a request for a direction that it be withdrawn. If this was agreed, officers proposed to press GOWM to clarify what Waste Core Strategies should include and, in the interim, to undertake limited consultation with stakeholders about related issues.

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

- (a) the Council should be able to expect to receive clear and consistent advice on such national issues from the national agencies. This, coupled with the fact that conflicting advice was being given to councils on this issue across the country was very disappointing and financially damaging;
- (b) the Council had taken up GOWM's offer of joining them in a Working Party to progress the Strategy. It was hoped that by working with them the Strategy could be resubmitted in around 15 months time;
- (c) officers had been assured by GOWM that DEFRA were aware and concerned about this development, however, they still intended lobbying the Local Government Association and the County Surveyors' Society.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND: that in accordance with section 22(2)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, full Council ask the Secretary of State to direct withdrawal of the

697. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED: that pursuant to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public shall be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item on the grounds that there would be disclosure to them of information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Summary of the Proceedings of the Meeting during which the Press and Public were Excluded

698. Proposed Development Opportunity - St. John's, Worcester (Agenda item 12)

The report indicated that there had been a proposal for a new Sainsbury's food store on the land to the north of Christopher Whitehead Language College for a number of years. Previous approaches by the City Council and Sainsbury's for the County Council to become involved in the proposed project had been rejected as the Tesco proposal on the school site would have provided a replacement high school for the value of the existing site.

Unfortunately, this proposal could not be brought to fruition and it was decided not to pursue a replacement of Christopher Whitehead Language College at the present time and await the crystallisation of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. Having regard to the likely timescales, a decision was however taken by Council on 29 June 2006 to invest £3 million in building works, adaptations and alterations at the school.

An opportunity had now arisen for Worcester City Council and Worcestershire County Council to reconsider the Sainsbury's proposal. The development would involve land owned by the City and County Council as well as land within the school site. The Sainsbury development had detailed planning permission and the company were keen to proceed quickly. No redevelopment of this site could commence without replacement facilities (enabling works) being provided. Discussions between both Councils and the College had resulted in an agreement on the specification and location for the replacement facilities as follows:-

- a new joint use Sports Hall to be sited on land owned by Sainsbury's adjoining the school

fronting Malvern Road

- a new joint use all weather sports pitch to be sited on Christopher Whitehead Language College site
- a new free standing Youth Centre to be sited on land owned by Sainsbury's to the rear of 19-21 St John's, close to the existing facility.

Sainsbury's would be required to provide all necessary replacement facilities to the satisfaction of the parties involved prior to the commencement of the construction of the new food store.

The financial implications of the development were discussed by the Cabinet and are set out in the exempt section of these Minutes.

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

- (a) if the recommendation was agreed it was anticipated that negotiations with Sainsbury's could be concluded by the end of July which would allow work at Christopher Whitehead Language College to take place over the school holidays. Replacement facilities should be provided by the end of the year and the new supermarket in place by the end of the following year;
- (b) the proposals would provide the Council with a capital receipt and new school and community facilities which should lead to improved services and help to regenerate the St John's area;
- (c) it was acknowledged that investment was needed in Christopher Whitehead Language College and the proposals would help to reduce repair and maintenance costs at the College;
- (d) young people had been involved in the design of the new Youth Centre already and this involvement would continue.

RESOLVED: that

- (a) the proposed jointly negotiated deal with Sainsbury's be approved; and**
- (b) the Head of Property Services be authorised, after consultation with the Director of Financial Services and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, to finalise all aspects of the**

negotiations (including a detailed financial appraisal and legal formalities).

The meeting ended at 12 noon

Chairman