

**ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**THURSDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 4.00pm**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Brown (Chair), Councillors Mrs Atkinson, Denholm, Mrs Glendinning, Meller, Mitchelson and Mrs McKerrell.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Mallinson, Leader  
Councillor Ellis, Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Nedved, Economy Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder  
Councillor Christian, Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder

Mr Deans, Carlisle Ambassadors  
Ms Masters, Carlisle Ambassadors

**OFFICERS:** Deputy Chief Executive  
Corporate Director of Finance and Resources  
Corporate Director of Economic Development  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Head of Planning Policy  
Principal Planning Officer  
Policy and Performance Officer  
Overview and Scrutiny Officer

**EGSP.53/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were submitted.

**EGSP.54/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest submitted.

**EGSP.55/20 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

It was agreed that the items of business in Part A be dealt with in public and Part B be dealt with in private.

**EGSP.56/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED – It was noted that Council, at its meeting on 3 November 2020, received and adopted the minutes of the meetings held on 20 August and 1 October 2020.

**EGSP.57/20 CALL IN OF DECISIONS**

There were no items which had been the subject of call-in.

**EGSP.58/20 CARLISLE AMBASSADORS**

The Corporate Director of Economic Development submitted report ED.43/20 which provided an update on the Carlisle Ambassadors initiative including its 2020 programme of activity.

The Chair welcomed Mr Dean and Ms Masters (Carlisle Ambassadors) to the meeting.

Ms Masters and Mr Dean delivered a presentation covering: membership; projects – past and present; Young Carlisle Ambassadors Update; Carlisle Ambassadors' Partners; Marketing

Group Update; Collaboration with partners; events; Carlisle Ambassador statistics and, Small Business Support Group Carlisle.

In considering the report and presentation, Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Was Carlisle Ambassadors a Limited Company?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that Carlisle Ambassadors was not a Limited Company.

The Member asked whether a contract existed between the Council and Carlisle Ambassadors.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development responded that initially, the Council had set up Carlisle Ambassadors and Officers had run the initiative. Michelle Masters Consulting had subsequently been appointed to undertake that work, with payment for those services being funded via membership subscription fees and Council funds. That work was subject of a contract and the Corporate Director undertook to circulate a copy to the Panel.

- Was there data available showing what level of membership each of the 263 subscribed organisations had taken out?

Ms Masters undertook to circulate that data to the Panel.

- To what extent was the Council's involvement with Carlisle Ambassadors promoted?

Ms Masters responded that the Council participated by attending and delivering Carlisle Ambassador events which allowed for effective communication between the authority and businesses. It was important that an appropriate balance was struck in the promotion of any organisation involved with the initiative, which was primarily business focussed.

The Member responded that he would like Carlisle Ambassador literature to indicate that the initiative was sponsored by Carlisle City Council.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that the matter could be considered. She reiterated the importance of balance in terms of promoting a particular organisation, so as not to create the impression of it being taken over.

Mr Deans appreciated the Member's point and noted that the support from the Council in terms Officer attendance and presentations, along with Carlisle branding was well received. However, it was important that the Carlisle Ambassadors was not perceived as too public sector focussed.

A Member commented that she had latterly attended an event held by Carlisle Ambassadors where she had learned a lot about the initiative. She acknowledged the need for balance between the businesses and Council involvement and cautioned against affording the Council too much promotion.

- What follow up work was undertaken following the "Give A Day" project to assess the impact of the project?

Ms Master undertook to provide a written response on the methods used to assess the impact of the "Give A Day" project.

A Member commented that she had participated in the “Give A Day” event, she asked whether it was possible for Ward Members to be involved during the early stages of projects so that they were aware of activities in their area with a view to promoting and participating in them.

Ms Masters welcomed the suggestion. The Corporate Director of Economic Development proposed, in addition to the update on Carlisle Ambassadors provided in the Leader’s report to Council, that she circulate a leaflet to all Members of the Council updating them on work of Carlisle Ambassadors.

The Panel indicated its agreement.

A number of Members praised the work of the Young Carlisle Ambassadors initiative and hoped the number of schools involved would expand.

Ms Masters noted that schools were often heavily involved in Carlisle Ambassadors events and, in addition to the Young Carlisle Ambassadors which was made up of individuals, schools were able to become Ambassadors if they wished to do so.

A Member suggested that Councillors could assist with directing schools in their area to Young Carlisle Ambassadors, subject to the provision of up to date information.

RESOLVED – 1) That report ED.43/20 and presentation be noted.

2) That the Corporate Director circulate a copy of the contract between the Council and Michelle Masters Consulting in relation to the running of Carlisle Ambassadors to Members of the Panel.

3) That data relating to the membership levels of the Carlisle Ambassadors be circulated to the Panel.

4) That the Corporate Director of Economic Development circulate a leaflet to all Members of the Council updating them on work of Carlisle Ambassadors.

#### **EGSP.59/20      BUDGET 2021/22 – 2025/26**

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources submitted report RD.32/20 providing a summary of the Council’s revised revenue base estimates for 2020/21, together with base estimates for 2021/22 and forecasts up to 2025/26 for illustrative purposes. Potential new spending pressures, bids and savings had also been considered in the report.

The report set out known revisions to the MTFP projections, although there were a number of significant factors affecting the budget that were currently unresolved, details of which were recorded at Section 1.3. A summary of the outstanding key issues, together with the resource assumptions were also provided at Section 4. The Panel’s agenda set out the matters which fell within their remit.

The Executive had on 9 November 2020 (EX.122/20) received the report and resolved:

“That the Executive:

- (i) Noted the revised base estimates for 2020/21 and base estimates for 2021/22;
- (ii) Noted the current MTFP projections, which would continue to be updated throughout the budget process as key issues became clearer and decisions were taken;

- (iii) Noted the initial budget pressures, bids and savings which needed to be taken into account as part of the 2021/22 budget process;
- (iv) Noted the review of the earmarked reserves as outlined in paragraph 9 and Appendix F.”

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions and comments:

- In relation to the £45,000 Development Control income shortfall, the Chair asked whether it was expected that income would increase post Covid 19?

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources anticipated the shortfall being a single year event. The recovery of the development sector was linked to that of the wider economy following Covid 19, therefore close monitoring of the Development Control income would take place.

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources also provided an overview of the emergency funding already received by central government to assist with income shortfalls and costs. Furthermore, the recent Government Spending Review had allocated £3 billion nationally for 2021/22 to assist local councils in covering costs related to Covid, the amount Carlisle City Council would be awarded was not yet known, but that detail was expected to be provided by mid – late December 2020.

RESOLVED – That report RD.32/20 Budget Update – Revenue Estimates 2021/22 to 2025/26 had been submitted to the Panel.

### **(b) Review of Charges 2021/2022**

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources presented the Review of Charges reports informing the Panel that there was a 3% increase on the overall level of income in line with the Corporate Charging Policy.

### **Community Services**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report CS.30/20 which set out the proposed fees and charges for 2021/22 relating to those services falling within the Community Services Directorate.

The charges highlighted within the report would result in an anticipated level of income of £2,518,400 against the MTFP target of £3,006,000 which represented a shortfall of £487,600 against the MTFP target. Details of the proposed charges in relation to those areas within the Panel's remit as detailed on the agenda, were contained within the report.

The Executive had on 9 November 2020 (EX.123/20) received the report and decided:

“That the Executive:

1. Had reviewed the proposed charges as set out in the body of Report CS.30/20, the Addendum and relevant appendices with effect from 1 April 2021, noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.
2. Made the report of proposed charges and the Addendum available to relevant Scrutiny Panels for their review and comment.”

In relation to car parking charges, the Neighbourhood Services Manager advised that the 3% increase in charges had been applied, in addition the charges were rounded up to the nearest 10p figure. As part of the Review of Charges parking permit prices had been standardised to provide a 10% discount, it was anticipated that the continued impact of Covid 19 would reduce

the take up of permits as commuters continued to work from home. Therefore, Officers would monitor and assess levels of take up going forward.

Analysis of Paddy's Market car park demonstrated that it was principally used as an all-day car park, therefore it was proposed to remove the hourly rate payment options from that facility. The Council also operated an "early bird" scheme which offered a reduced fee for all day parking, take up of that scheme had been very low in West Walls car park, which was used rather more by shoppers than commuters, therefore the early bird offer would be removed from that car park and would be replaced by a "check in – check out" systems where users would only pay for the actual time they used the facility for. A trial of that scheme had commenced but data on its usage had been limited by the impact of the second national lockdown.

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions or comments:

- Were the Council's car parks competitive with those offered by other providers in the city?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager responded that the Council's car parking fees were competitive. There were a number of providers in the city, therefore, their pricing structures needed to be taken into account when considering what level of fee to apply to the Council's facilities.

The Deputy Chief Executive added that the Council had also made improvements to its car parking sites in terms of surfacing, layout and different payment methods. He was of the view that the Council's fees were competitive, and that its site was safe and sited in good locations.

- What was the level of admin fee associated with parking permits?

The Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that the production of permits generated an admin fee by the service provider of 92 pence per transaction that was currently charged to the Council; for an annual permit that charge was applied once, for monthly permits the Council had to pay that charge 12 times. It was proposed that the administrative fee now be incorporated into the permit price.

- A Member expressed support for the use of the "check in – check out" payment model at West Walls car park, considering it would support the economic vitality of the city centre by affording users greater flexibility.
- The report proposed to increase the cost of a parking permit at Talkin Tarn from £55 to £60, which was a 9% increase, were the number of permits for that car park still restricted?

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that the additional percentage increase was as a result of cost rounding. The permit scheme at Talkin Tarn had been in operation for several years, with 50 permits being made available on an annual basis. It was likely there was sufficient usage data available to assess effectiveness of the permit scheme. Therefore, if Members were minded to have the scheme reviewed, subject to the agreement of the relevant Portfolio Holder, Officers could undertake that work.

The Neighbourhood Services Manager noted that the scheme was significantly 'over-subscribed', moreover as existing permit holders were invited to renew permits. This effectively created a waiting list for new people to be able to access the permit, was an issue that could be considered as part of any future review of the scheme.

A Member considered that the scheme ought to be reviewed as it was an issue that caused concern for a number of residents.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Charges Review Report 2021/22 – Community Services be endorsed (CS.30/20).

2) That a review of the parking permit scheme at Talkin Tarn be carried out.

## **Economic Development**

The Corporate Director of Economic Development submitted report ED.38/20 which set out the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate.

Members were reminded that Development Control fees was set nationally and that any income from those fees was ringfenced to be spent on the service. Similarly, Building Control Fees were ringfenced and the service was not permitted to generate either a profit or a loss. However, that service operated in a commercial market, therefore, proposed fees were considered in that context.

In response to Covid 19, the annual fee for use of the Shopmobility Scheme had been replaced by a daily usage charge.

The Executive had on 9 November 2020 (EX.122/20) received the report and resolved:

“That the Executive agreed for consultation on the charges, as set out in Report ED.38/20 and accompanying Appendices, with effect from 1 April 2021; noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.”

RESOLVED – That the Charges Review Report 2020/21 – Economic Development be endorsed (ED.38/20).

### **(c) Revised Capital Programme 2020/21 and Provisional Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2025/26**

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources submitted report RD.33/20 detailing the revised Capital Programme for 2020/21, totalling £29,915,800, together with the proposed method of financing. The report summarised the proposed programme for 2021/22 to 2025/26 in the light of the new capital proposals identified, together with the estimated capital resources available to fund the programme.

Section 4 provided details of the existing and capital spending proposals. Any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved. A summary of the estimated resources compared to the proposed programme year on year was also provided.

The Executive had on 9 November 2020 (EX.127/20) received the report and decided:

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the revised capital programme and relevant financing for 2020/21 as set out in Appendices A and B to Report RD.33/20;
2. Had given initial consideration and views on the proposed capital spending for 2021/22 to 2025/26 given in the report in the light of the estimated available resources;

3. Noted that any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved.”

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions or comments:

- What level of grant had the Council been awarded for the Future High Street Fund Market Square project?

The Corporate Director of Finance and Resources advised that a grant application for £2.3M had been submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Were that to be approved there would be a £390,000 funding requirement from the Council.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development provided an overview of the grant application process thus far and set out procedure the Council would undergo in the event of the grant being awarded.

RESOLVED – That the Revised Capital Programme 2020/21 and Provisional Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2025/26 (RD.33/20) be endorsed.

## **EGSP.60/20 ST CUTHBERT’S GARDEN VILLAGE MASTERPLAN FRAMEWORK**

The Head of Planning Policy submitted report ED.44/20 which provided a summary of the Masterplan Framework for St Cuthbert’s Garden Village. Appended to the report were: The St Cuthbert’s Garden Village Masterplan Framework; the St Cuthbert’s Garden Village Masterplan Framework – Infrastructure Schedule, and the St Cuthbert’s Garden Village Masterplan Framework – Design Guidance.

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions or comments:

- Did the Council plan to work with the Development Corporation to ensure that the Masterplan was brought to fruition?

The Corporate Director of Economic Development explained that an Expression Of Interest for the Development Corporation had recently been submitted and that the Council awaited a response from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

- A Member applauded the incredible amount of detail contained in the Masterplan Framework and agreed with the proposal that the development of the Garden Village be phased. Given the 30 year lifetime of the project, he felt the planning of infrastructure would be a key factor. He asked how Local Employment Sites would be tied into the development?

The Head of Planning Policy responded that infrastructure provision was a continually evolving area, the Council was already involving organisations such as Cumbria County Council (as the Highway Authority) and utility providers in discussion on the matter, and to ensure that it was a part of their future plans. Due to the long life cycle of the development of the Garden Village, the Council would take an iterative approach to matters such as infrastructure provision.

In terms of the Local Employment Sites, the Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder noted that land would be allocated for sites which would be linked to the Carlisle Southern Link Road. It was hoped that those sites would become a catalyst for growing economic activity in the district.

- Page 61 of the agenda document pack (page 36 of the Masterplan Framework) contained an illustrative residential and employment mix, the Chair asked whether any further information relating to the Indicative Housing Mix was available. She was concerned that there would be a differentiation between social housing and open market properties within the Garden Village development, and further asked whether that was a matter the Development Corporation would influence.

The Principal Planning Officer replied that the St Cuthbert's Garden Village Local Plan would provide a strong policy framework which would secure types of design across the Garden Village, it was also a primary mechanism for ensuring diversity in housing types. The Local Plan was an overarching document, aligned with it would be a suite of Supplementary Planning Documents which would augment the Local Plan by providing further details in relation to specific areas such as design.

The Head of Planning Policy added that Officers had data on the types of homes required now, through the Council's Housing Market Assessment which was considered in the development of the St Cuthbert's Garden Village Masterplan Framework and the St Cuthbert's Garden Village Local Plan. Affordable housing provision was no longer differentiated from open market properties, and due to the need to comply with minimum space standards may be larger than those on the open market.

RESOLVED – That the Panel had considered the final St Cuthbert's Garden Village Masterplan Framework and agreed its content as evidence to inform the St Cuthbert's Village Local Plan.

#### **EGSP.61/20 ST CUTHBERT'S GARDEN VILLAGE LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted report ED.42/20 which updated the Panel on the proposals for consultation on the St Cuthbert's Garden Village Local Plan preferred options policies, appended to the report were the Draft St Cuthbert's Garden Village policies.

The St Cuthbert's Garden Village Local Plan (SCGVLP) was still in its draft stages, the Principal Planning Officer advised that a further consultation known as the 'Publication' version would be issued in Spring 2021, prior to submitting the Plan to the Secretary of State for formal 'Examination'. It was an obligation of Housing Infrastructure Funding relating to the Carlisle Southern Link Road that it be adopted by the Council before July 2022.

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions or comments:

- The Chair felt that the Affordable Housing Policy was rather short, she also considered that requirement to provide 20% affordable homes across the Garden Village was too low. She asked whether the policy could be strengthened.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that national planning policy guidance described affordable housing as a pressure valve in the system where viability was a key factor, as such affordable housing was often reduced. Furthermore, the stipulation of a 20% provision of affordable housing at the Garden Village was a condition of the Housing Infrastructure Funding for the Carlisle Southern Link Road.

The proposed tenure split of affordable homes at the Garden Village was based on current need in the district, which would be amended if data indicated need had changed. The Affordable Housing policy would be reviewed in light of the consultation responses received prior to and following its adoption to ensure that it reflected current thinking.

The Head of Planning Policy noted that the policy was also linked to the existing policy in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 – 30, which allowed it to be more streamlined. Moreover, a Supplementary Planning Document would be produced which would operate in parallel with the overarching policy.

- What impact would the government's recent White Paper on planning have on the SCGVLP?

The Principal Planning Officer stated that the Council had been advised by the government to Chief Planner progress the SCGVLP through the adoption process. In terms of the White Paper, the number of consultation responses received was in excess of 44,000, as such it was not anticipated that the changes it proposed to the planning system would be progressed in the short term.

- Would the Stewardship Policy adopt a Community Land Trust Model?

The Principal Planning Officer explained that stewardship was considered to cover any area of development that did not pertain to residential development, as such there were a number of different models that may be used. The purpose of the policy was to encourage developers to show that they had considered stewardship and to demonstrate how their proposals would incorporate it.

- A Member noted that the last paragraph in the Self and Custom Build Policy stated that a construction on a plot must be completed in 3 years or it may revert back to the original developer. Given that the person(s) who were developing the plot would have purchased it, the Member questioned how feasible such an approach was.

The Head of Planning Policy advised that the wording had been included to try and prevent blighted sites occurring in the Garden Village. When Planning Permission was granted there was an expectation that the dwelling would be built, the policy would be reviewed in response to the responses received through the consultation on the Local Plan Policies.

The Principal Planning Officer noted that all the policies in the SCGVLP would have additional text incorporated following them in the next version of the Local Plan, some time known as a Reasoned Justification. In terms of the Self and Custom Build Policy, it would give greater explanation of the action the Council would take in the event of the site not being delivered. She advised that the Council would want to intervene in a positive way to see how the development could be completed, as such the policy may require some further, softer wording.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder stated that in September 2020 the Council had launched a Self and Custom Build Register which offered funding toward the costs of a project. Furthermore, the Council had been shortlisted for an award for its support of Self and Custom Build through its policies.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Panel had scrutinised report ED.42/20.

2) That the Affordable Housing Policy be revisited and consideration be given to raising the requirement for affordable homes provision.

3) That the wording of the Self and Custom Build Policy be reviewed.

The Policy and Performance Officer presented the Quarter 2 Performance Report 2020/21 (PC.28/20). The report contained the Quarter 2 performance against the current Service Standards and a summary of the Carlisle Plan 2015-18 actions as defined in the 'plan on a page'. Performance against the Panels' 2020/21 Key Performance Indicators were also included.

Key Performance Indicator CSe22: Actual city centre revenue as a percentage of city centre expenditure, had not been met as a result of the Covid 19 restrictions.

The Policy and Performance Officer advised that following feedback from Members on the content and presentation of the performance reports, a Task and Finish Group would be established would be held to consider the matter. An invitation to members of the Panel would be circulated in due course.

The Chair felt that the Panel understood that the exceptional circumstance that had led to KPI CSe22 not being met. She welcomed the Task and Finish Group to consider the content and presentation of future performance reports

RESOLVED – That the Quarter 2 Performance Report be noted.

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer presented report OS.26/20 providing an overview of matters relating to the work of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel. Following the dispatch of the report a further Notice of Executive Key Decision had been published on 13 November 2020. It contained two items within the Panel's remit: Carlisle Station Gateway Phase 1 and Towns Fund Capital Accelerated Fund. Those matters would be determined by the Executive at its meeting of 14 December 2020.

Members' attention was drawn to the Panel's Work Programme for 2020/21. The Overview and Scrutiny Officer advised that in addition to the items listed in the report, the Panel would also receive "For Information" reports relating to: further information on flood risk management and, key data on economic growth (Covid impact).

Regarding the Borderlands Inclusive Growth Deal report scheduled for the January 2021 meeting, a Member asked whether it would contain project specific details in relation to the Station Gateway and Citadels projects.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that the report would provide an update on the Borderlands Deal, an overview of all the Borderlands projects, and specific details covering the Carlisle based projects.

The Chair noted that the Panel were to have a workshop on the Economic Strategy on 30 November 2020, she asked if a report would then be submitted to the Panel on the matter.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development confirmed that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel and that she would liaise with the Overview and Scrutiny Officer regarding its scheduling in the Work Programme.

RESOLVED – 1) That report OS.26/20 be noted.

2) That the Corporate Director of Economic Development liaise with the Scrutiny Officer regarding the inclusion of the Economic Strategy in the Panel's Work Programme.

(The meeting ended at 6:35pm)