

**BOROUGH OF KETTERING**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Meeting held: 17<sup>th</sup> April 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Russell Roberts (Chair)  
Councillors Lloyd Bunday, Mark Dearing Scott Edwards, David Howes, Ian Jelley and Mark Rowley, Lesley Thurland

**Also Present:** Councillors Don, Dutton, Hakewill, Scrimshaw, Stanton and Tebbutt.

**18.EX.75 APOLOGIES**

None.

**18.EX.76 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**18.EX.77 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**18.EX.78 WORK PROGRAMME**

The Council's draft Work Programme to be published on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2019 was noted.

**18.EX.79 MAINTAINING A DURABLE BUDGET**

A report was submitted which:-

- (i) Reminded members of the context/background to the Council's budget and medium term financial strategy;
- (ii) Illustrated the latest budget model, the delivery of efficiencies for 2019/20 and the estimated level of efficiencies that may be required over the next few years; and

- (iii) Agreed the high level budget process for 2020/21

Councillor Jim Hakewill addressed the Committee in relation to commercial investments, requesting that future meetings of the Asset Management Board be open for other members of the Council to attend and observe. He also commented on the General Fund projected variance in respect of Homelessness and the composition of 2019/20 efficiencies with regard to Recycling credits.

In response to Councillor Hakewill's comments, it was noted that variance figures quoted in the report were against the revised budget. The final outturn report would be submitted to the Executive at the July meeting of the Executive Committee.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance pointed out that Kettering Borough Council had a balanced budget and that income from its Capital Investment Programme, which had brought in £1.385m to date, had protected front-line services and enabled a zero Council Tax increase to be maintained. This proved the Council's Capital Investment Programme was working and saving local people money through its investment management strategy, which had been agreed by the cross-party Asset Management Board.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (i) the budget process for 2020/21 as outlined in Section 2.5 of the report be approved; and
- (ii) the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and associated guiding principles be noted.

#### **18.EX.80     RESIDENTS' PARKING**

A report was submitted which provided members with the outcome of the consultation on proposals for residents' parking in Kettering and sought approval to progress the residents' parking scheme in Zone M (extension) in conjunction with Northamptonshire County Council.

Members noted that, as it was the local highways authority, implementation of the scheme had to be agreed by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC).

The Councils approach had been to consider zones as eligible for new schemes rather than individual streets, but NCC had indicated that smaller, discrete areas, might operate a smaller scheme, if there was sufficient public support and there were no adverse impacts on surrounding streets.

Twelve members of the public attended the meeting and addressed the Committee under the provisions of the Council's Right to Speak Policy. All speakers were residents living in Zone J (Extension) or spoke on behalf of residents living in this area. Comments made are summarised below:-

#### General Comments

- There was a lack of transparency around the voting process, which had been undermined because it had been misunderstood by residents
- Commuter parking problems were compounded by the proximity of three schools in the vicinity. Sixth-formers were not allowed to park on the car park at Bishop Stopford School
- Some people felt trapped in their homes because they did not want to lose their parking space, which could be devastating for families who had nowhere else to park.
- Residents of Ostlers Way were not consulted.

#### The Drive/Headlands

- NCC had agreed that The Drive could be looked at as a discrete area. 15 properties had accesses onto the Drive. 74% voted for residents' parking. Another three properties in The Drive had accesses onto Headlands.
- Residents of The Drive were in favour of the scheme because of issues relating to the proximity of the railway station, long-term on-street parking, difficulty of access for emergency vehicles and reported incidents of vehicle damage
- Zone J should be considered as an entire community. There was a high demand for parking spaces, which included an element of commuter parking, but the majority of demand was from within the community and it therefore needed a community solution.
- There was concern that to deal with The Drive on an isolated basis would impact on the wider community, as some residents in the vicinity did not have driveways and used The Drive for parking.
- If a discrete scheme was introduced for The Drive, parking would be displaced to Headlands and Broadway. The area should therefore be considered as a whole and not offer a solution to specific areas in isolation.

- Many people parked on The Drive who did not live there. The problem was getting worse to the extent that people could not park near to their homes to unload cars.

#### Broadway

- In the Broadway, of 28 occupiers of houses located between Queensbury Road and the zebra crossing by school, 25 were in favour of residents' parking permits. This section of Broadway bore the brunt of the commuter parking problem, with householders being unable to park near their homes. A petition had been signed by all 28 residents and was handed over at the meeting.
- Properties on Broadway did not have driveways or car parking space and not all residents had voted

#### Business/community users

- The area was a vibrant and busy area that also contained local businesses. Two-hour parking was important for people who needed to use the doctors' and dental surgeries and other local businesses. People using the doctors' surgery and pharmacy may be vulnerable, elderly and disabled and introduction of residents' parking would impact on those accessing medical care. It would also affect those visiting the osteopath and visitors to the architectural practice
- Hawthorn School had 50 staff. The Drive provided 25 community parking spaces with most properties also having off road parking solutions.
- Businesses relied on fluidity of movement. There was a need for a more considered environmental impact assessment, an equality impact assessment and an economic impact assessment.
- St Michael's Church was part of a vibrant community and used by many local organisations, including vulnerable adult groups.

Councillor Mick Scrimshaw addressed the Committee, commenting on general parking problems in Kettering Town Centre. He raised questions about the consultation and referred to previous consultations in other areas of the town which had been considered for residents' parking in the past.

Councillor Maggie Don addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor, citing several examples of where residents of Zone J had reported problems with the consultation and confusion about the application of the criteria for implementation of a residents' parking scheme. Councillor Don asked that these problems be looked at before going forward with any scheme in the area of Zone J (Headlands area).

It was noted that the Ward Councillors had held a public meeting during the consultation period, where the need for 60% of all households in the area to vote for the scheme was required for it to go ahead had been made clear.

In discussion, the Committee felt that it was important to go back to NCC and look at a zone that included the three contentious areas (Headlands, Broadway and The Drive) taking into account the views of the Police and others not previously consulted, but who would be affected by the introduction of a residents' parking scheme. Additionally, it was important that any scheme should not cause problems for adjacent areas. It was also evident through comments made at the meeting that many residents had been unclear as to what the 60% threshold meant for introduction of a scheme.

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration thanked public speakers and Councillors Scrimshaw and Don for their comments and attendance at the meeting. He assured speakers that comments would be taken seriously. He urged the Executive Committee to look at Zone J again, particularly as residents felt there were technical issues and problems around communication.

It was proposed by Councillor Dearing, seconded by Councillor Rowley and subsequently agreed that:

*“Together with Northamptonshire County Council, to look at areas and parts of streets in Zone J which strongly support parking restrictions to consider if a smaller zone could be created.”*

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:-

- (i) an extension to the existing Residents' Parking Zone in the Westhills area (Zone M) be agreed;
- (ii) together with Northamptonshire County Council, to look at areas and parts of streets in Zone J which strongly support parking restrictions to consider if a smaller zone could be created; and
- (iii) power be delegated to the Head of Public Services, in conjunction with the Head of Democratic and Legal

Services, to work with Northamptonshire County Council to implement the residents' parking Zone M extension as set out in the report.

(Voting: For 7; Against 1)

**18.EX.81      LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that it involved items of business including the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by paragraphs 1-7 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

**18.EX.82      LAND OFF ROTHWELL ROAD, SOUTH DESBOROUGH**

A report was submitted which advised Members of the outcome of the recent marketing exercise concerning land at South Desborough, and which sought approval to enter into a disposal contract with the preferred bidder to develop the site for housing.

The report was considered in private and confidential as it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons, including the Council which held that information.

Councillors Jim Hakewill and Mick Scrimshaw addressed the Committee, thanking the Leader of the Council for the opportunity to participate and comment on the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Head of Commercial and Economic Development, in collaboration with the Head of Democratic and Legal Services, be authorised to:-

- (i) confirm Developer A as the preferred bidder; and
- (ii) progress and finalise disposal of associated land by initiating Heads of Terms.

(Voting: Unanimous)

*(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and ended at 8.13 pm)*

Signed .....

Chair

AI