

# Portfolio Holder Decisions/Leader Decisions

Friday 10 March 2023

## Minutes

### Attendance

#### Committee Members

Councillor Andy Crump

Councillor Jeff Morgan

Councillor Wallace Redford

Councillor Isobel Seccombe OBE

#### 1. Approval to remove flood risk schemes from the DEFRA programme

##### Resolved

The Portfolio Holder for Fire, Rescue & Community Safety gives:

Approval is given to remove the following schemes: Princethorpe, Coughton, Shottery (Stratford-upon-Avon), Gaydon, Long Itchington and Long Marston, from the 6-year DEFRA Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management programme (2021-2027).

Where sufficient evidence of internal property flooding is received, further investigation will be undertaken to determine whether a viable scheme can be submitted into the next DEFRA capital programme.

#### 2. Developer - Funded S278 Highway Scheme Approvals

##### Resolved

That the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property gives approval to the addition of the following s278 fully developer-funded highway improvement schemes to the Capital Programme for 2022/23:

- a) C5 Orton Road, Warton (Warton Allotments) – widening and realignment of Orton Road, new footways, culverting of existing ditch and new drainage infrastructure of approximate value £839,600
- b) B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) - Ghost Island and footway -Construction of a right turn lane into the Longford Road and widening of the footway of approximate value £212,900
- c) B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) – Temporary and minor access – Construction of a temporary access in a form of a dropped kerb vehicle of approximate value £40,000

### **3. Proposed Prohibition of Vehicle Movements - Moors Lane, Houlton, Rugby Resolved**

That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves that the below named proposed Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised:


The Warwickshire County Council (Moors Lane, Houlton) (Prohibition of Vehicle Movements) Order 2023

### **4. Youth Investment Fund - Hatters Space development proposal Resolved**

The Portfolio Holder (Children and Families) approves the submission of a bid to the Youth Investment Fund for funding to facilitate the extension, adaptation and improvement of Hatters Space Community Centre, Nuneaton. Hatters Space is a WCC owned building.

## Portfolio Holder Decision

### Approval to remove flood risk schemes from the DEFRA programme

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Fire &amp; Rescue and Community Safety</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>10 March 2023</b>
	<p><b>Signed</b></p> 

#### 1. Decision taken

Approval is given to remove the following schemes: Princethorpe, Coughton, Shottery (Stratford-upon-Avon), Gaydon, Long Itchington and Long Marston, from the 6-year DEFRA Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management programme (2021-2027). Where sufficient evidence of internal property flooding is received, further investigation will be undertaken to determine whether a viable scheme can be submitted into the next DEFRA capital programme.

#### 2. Reasons for decisions

The Environment Agency (EA) have approached all Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) to remove schemes that have low delivery confidence within the current DEFRA 6 year programme, so that they have a realistic programme for delivery. In the case of Warwickshire, these schemes are in; Princethorpe, Coughton, Shottery (Stratford-upon-Avon), Gaydon, Long Itchington and Long Marston.

The Council has the option to move these schemes back further into the next programme (delivery beyond 2027) but, given that the evidence indicates (see Background information) that there are currently not viable schemes in these locations, the recommendation is that the schemes are removed from the DEFRA list. Should new information become available, the Council can resubmit these schemes for funding.

Removal of the schemes now gives more flexibility in the next DEFRA programme to either be more responsive to a potential future flood event, or to reprioritise through the updated risk ranking due later this year. The schemes submitted into the current 6-year DEFRA programme (2021-2027) in Warwickshire were based on the top 40 communities identified at risk from surface water flood risk, using the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) produced by the Flood Risk Management (FRM) team in 2015, this can be found at the link below.

<https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/flooding/flood-risk-management-surface-water->

## management-plan

A number of the schemes that are currently being delivered, were submitted in the previous DEFRA programme period, but have all experienced delays in delivery and viability. The remaining locations, listed in section 1 above, recommended for removal from the DEFRA list have already been deferred twice, due to ongoing concerns regarding viability. Since the schemes were first proposed more than 7 years ago some of the communities have experienced little or no further flooding and if a refreshed economic appraisal were to be undertaken now the schemes are unlikely to be categorised as viable.

As outlined in the background information section, Warwickshire schemes do not attract large amounts of external funding and are usually Property Flood Resilience (PFR) schemes which can only be delivered with the express consent of the property owner to work on their home fitting measures such as flood doors and self-closing airbricks. The affordability of a PFR scheme is dependent on the number of residents who sign up to the scheme. The schemes being recommended for removal from the DEFRA list have experienced low uptake, with some having less than 50% of residents taking up the scheme. In some communities, such as Welford on Avon, no properties have signed up for PFR, despite active concern from residents regarding flooding over the past 5 years and multiple rounds of engagement. Common reasons for residents not taking up the scheme include; perception that it will blight their home, unwillingness to take on ownership and maintenance of the assets, scepticism that PFR is the correct solution, or they do not believe that they are at risk. **The low uptake impacts the affordability by reducing the properties included and reducing the amount of funding available, which in turn either makes the scheme economically unviable or requires a disproportionate contribution from the Council.** Funding is awarded based on schemes having a positive cost-benefit ratio, and where low numbers of properties are included in the scheme, the cost of installations are higher than the benefits of flood damages avoided.

Whilst we have been delivering current schemes, we have not yet commenced community engagement in the communities related to the schemes proposed to be removed. As such, the schemes recommended for removal have not yet been discussed and delivery promised to the communities, meaning there is no current expectation for delivery of a flood scheme. The schemes it is proposed to remove are highlighted below with a brief description of their flooding mechanisms and some of the issues;

**Princethorpe (Dunsmore & Leam Valley District)**

Located in Rugby Borough, the village suffers from flooding from an ordinary watercourse that runs along the highway and is crossed by several private drives, in addition to surface water from the Fosse Way. The proposed scheme is PFR to better protect 5 properties, however only 2 of them have been confirmed to have previously flooded over 10 years ago, which is not enough for a viable scheme.

**Coughton (Studley Division)**

Located in Stratford District, the village suffers surface water flooding from a small unnamed ordinary watercourse located west of the settlement which impounds (holds water back) flows against the highway of the A435. The proposed scheme is PFR to better protect 10 properties however, more recent interactions and reports suggest

that some of the reported flooding may be due to spray from vehicular traffic, getting through the leadwork of windows. Such ingress would not meet the Defra definition of internal flooding, meaning we are not able to secure funding for these properties. Consideration will be given as to whether this location is suitable for retro-fit Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) trial in conjunction with County Highways.

#### **Shottery (Stratford West Division)**

Shottery is an area of Stratford town which has historically had issues with main river flooding from the Shottery Brook and as such must be led by the Environment Agency as the appropriate Risk Management Authority. The Council is unable to move a scheme forward in this location, as previous schemes with main river flooding have not been taken forward in partnership due to PFR not always being appropriate for main river flood depths and ensuring the uptake is sufficient. The proposed scheme is PFR to better protect 14 properties.

#### **Gaydon (Kineton & Red Horse Division)**

Located in Stratford District, Gaydon has historically suffered from surface water flooding from a mixture of overland flow, exceedance of culverts and ditches and surcharge of the highway network. Exceedance is when there is more water than the culvert has capacity to cope with, leading to surcharge when water backs up into pipes that can no longer discharge because of high water levels in the culvert. 13 properties have previously been identified as at risk of surface water flooding with the main risk areas Church Road, Church Walk and Banbury Road. However the reports do not contain sufficient detail to confirm the extent of flooding or whether properties were internally flooded. It should be noted that the last significant flooding reported in Gaydon was 15 years ago in 2007, and as such information to put together a business case for a viable scheme is not available.

#### **Long Itchington (Feldon Division)**

Located in Stratford District, Long Itchington has previously suffered from flooding from the main river Itchen and surface water flooding from smaller watercourses. The main river flooding has had a defence installed by the EA to better protect the properties at risk and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have not had any reports of internal flooding since the EA scheme was implemented. Properties previously protected by the EA scheme have to be excluded, as this would constitute double counting, and as such we would not be eligible for funding for enough properties to make the scheme viable.

#### **Long Marston (Bidford & Welford Division)**

Located in Stratford District, Long Marston has experienced flooding issues from surface water and small ordinary watercourses. The scheme proposed is PFR for 15 properties, however the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has not had reports of internal property flooding in Long Marston for 15 years since 2007. The reports on record do not hold enough detail to be able to claim funding without further significant investment on appraisal, as outlined in the financial implications section.

Work is currently on-going to update the risk rankings on which the original list of schemes put forward for the DEFRA 6 year programme was based upon. This update to

the risk rankings will include more recent flood records from flood events since the previous version produced in 2015, with 868 new reports of flooding (254 of these internally affecting property). Along with an increase the accuracy of surface water mapping, this will provide a more up to date and better understanding of risk in the county, which will lead to a revised rank of communities at risk. The recommendation to remove the remaining schemes will allow for future appraisals to take account of the revised risk rankings and give a more updated picture of where resource would be best focused. The schemes highlighted can be readded to the programme at a later date if further flooding occurs in these locations.

### 3. Background information

#### **DEFRA 6 year programme process**

The Flood Risk Management (FRM) team acting as LLFA are able to bid for funding from the national Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Grant in Aid (FCERM GiA) funding, administrated for DEFRA by the Environment Agency (EA). In order to obtain this funding, the LLFA must submit an Outline Business Case (OBC) to the EA outlining the preferred scheme to better protect properties from flooding. Until the OBC is approved the funding is not secured and as such, these schemes are not part of the Council's capital programme, they remain only as a strategic allocation on the DEFRA 6 year programme.

The OBC must demonstrate that the preferred option meets the specified cost benefit returns and the necessary reduction in flood risk to qualify for FCERM GiA. The vast majority of funding is secured to reduce risk to residential properties, that are at risk of internal flooding. Additionally, partnership match-funding must be provided from the Local Levy and the Council. The process to compile the necessary data and technical justification for the OBC and get this approved by the EA can take up to 2 years prior to the year of delivery. Issues arising during this process including community engagement and ensuring the economic appraisal of the schemes has the appropriate benefit-cost ratio to gain approval, can further increase the time taken or show the scheme to not be viable at all.

#### **Warwickshire PFR**

As previously outlined, flood schemes are funded through a combination of FCERM GiA and Local Levy. The amount of FCERM GiA that schemes are eligible for is based on the severity of flooding and the number of properties better protected by the scheme. The nature of Warwickshire's communities being spread out with small pockets of properties at very significant surface water flood risk, means that OBC's for our schemes often do not attract large amounts of external funding. The funding is based on the number of properties better protected, and as such small clusters of properties do not provide enough benefits in comparison to larger groups. This leads to the most cost beneficial option in all schemes delivered so far in Warwickshire being Property Flood Resilience (PFR). Unlike more traditional schemes, such as flood embankments, flood storage areas and flood walls; PFR can only be delivered with the express consent of the property owner to work on their home fitting measures such as flood doors and self closing airbricks.

Relative to other LLFA's, Warwickshire has a lot of experience delivering PFR, with 8 schemes delivered, better protecting 102 properties. Delivery of these schemes has

identified common issues with affordability and uptake, which have been highlighted in this paper.

#### 4. Financial implications

The six schemes on the DEFRA list are not part of the Council's capital programme. Approval to add the schemes to the capital programme only happens when they receive DEFRA approval. At this point the County Council is also required to resource its share of any matched funding.

The removal of the six schemes from the DEFRA 6-year programme will mean the future cost of resourcing any matched funding is avoided. The table below lists the future years schemes and the amount of FCERM GiA they have as a strategic allocation (not yet secured by an OBC). It shows that the total cost of the six schemes is £1.050m, with a third of the funding coming from an FCERM GiA allocation and two-thirds from local funding sources including the County Council. The figures are based on the average PFR cost per property of £15,000 (total scheme cost divided by the number of properties). However, larger and more complex properties in existing schemes have been double or triple this cost per property.

Scheme Location	DEFRA original planned year of delivery	Unsecured Strategic Allocation (FCERM GiA)	Number of properties	Shortfall in funding
Princethorpe	23/24	£21,275	5	£53,725
Coughton	24/25	£43,035	10	£106,965
Shottery (Stratford-upon Avon)	25/26	£55,000	14	£155,000
Gaydon	26/27	£108,000	13	£87,000
Long Marston	26/27	£53,115	13	£147,887
Long Itchington	26/27	£66,248	15	£158,752
			<b>Total:</b>	<b>£703,329</b>

Table 1: Schemes to be removed economic and property figures

As highlighted in Table 1 all of the future schemes have a significant shortfall in funding which will require bids to Local Levy and a WCC contribution. The removal of the schemes will remove the financial requirement on WCC, to make a contribution to ensure the schemes are fully funded.

The strategic allocation of funding from the DEFRA programme is not secured until an OBC is submitted and as such this does not represent a loss of funding to WCC if these schemes do not go ahead. Additionally, the shortfall highlighted in Table 1 is also based on all properties taking part in the scheme. If the uptake is less than 50%, as per the current trend, the contribution required from WCC will also be higher as the amount of FCERM GiA will drop.

The removal of the future years' schemes will release capacity in terms of officer time taken to progress the scheme from start to finish of the process of applying for FCERM GiA and Local Levy and engaging with residents to have the appropriate number of

properties 'signed up'. The capacity will instead be redirected towards partnership schemes with partners such as Severn Trent or the EA.

Additionally, there will be a cost saving from not incurring technical appraisal costs, such as hydraulic modelling. This up-front appraisal cost is not recoverable, so for schemes that are then shown to be unviable or have no uptake such as Welford, these represent sunk costs. For the last 5 schemes in delivery, £76,325 has been spent on appraisal costs up to the submission of the OBC. In locations such as Lower Brailes, where technical issues meant multiple consultants were used, the appraisal cost is not always proportionate to the number of properties in the scheme.

The above considerations all demonstrate a future saving to WCC, in terms of both cash and releasing capacity for higher priority activity. The removal of the schemes does have financial implications for residents, associated with their properties flooding if the schemes do not go ahead. This cost is likely to be passed on to their insurers but there may be associated costs for the Council, such as emergency accommodation etc, should a flood event occur.

## 5. Environmental implications

The proposed schemes would have had minimal impact on the environment given that PFR measures are fitted to individual houses, and so do not have an impact on loss of habitat or the water environment that are sometimes associated with more traditional schemes.

The environmental benefit of the schemes not taking place would be a reduction in carbon associated with manufacture and installation of the products. This is especially pertinent where measures have been installed and then subsequently not taken care of by residents, leading to replacement products being required with a further carbon input.

<b>Report Author</b>	Jagjit Mahal, Sophie Wynne jagjitmahal@warwickshire.gov.uk, sophiewynne@warwickshire.gov.uk,
<b>Assistant Director</b>	Scott Tompkins Assistant Director for Environment Services
<b>Strategic Director</b>	Mark Ryder, Strategic Director for Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	Portfolio Holder for Fire & Rescue and Community Safety

<b>Urgent matter?</b>	No
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	No
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	No

## List of background papers

Environment Agency Exception Report January 2023



### **Members and officers consulted and informed**

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Andy Crump

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Virginia Rennie, Strategy and Commissioning Manager (Strategic Finance)

Equality – Joanna Kemp

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Councillors – Clarke, Chilvers and D’Arcy

Local Member(s): Cllr Roberts, Cllr Mills, Cllr Kettle, Cllr Kerridge, Cllr Fradgley, Cllr Pemberton

This page is intentionally left blank

## Portfolio Holder Decision Developer - Funded S278 Highway Scheme Approvals

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>10 March 2023</b>
	<p><b>Signed</b></p>  <p>Pp</p>

### 1. Decision taken

- 1.1 That the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property gives approval to the addition of the following s278 fully developer-funded highway improvement schemes to the Capital Programme for 2022/23:
- a) C5 Orton Road, Warton (Warton Allotments) – widening and realignment of Orton Road, new footways, culverting of existing ditch and new drainage infrastructure of approximate value £839,600
  - b) B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) - Ghost Island and footway - Construction of a right turn lane into the Longford Road and widening of the footway of approximate value £212,900
  - c) B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) – Temporary and minor access – Construction of a temporary access in a form of a dropped kerb vehicle of approximate value £40,000

### 2. Reasons for decisions

- 2.1 On 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021 Council reconfirmed the delegated power to the Leader, or body nominated by them, to approve the addition to the capital programme of projects costing less than £2.0 million, which are fully funded from external grants, developer contributions or from revenue. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property is that nominated body.
- 2.2 Under the Constitution, the power is delegated onwards to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property.

### 3. Background information

#### **C5 Orton Road, Warton (Warton Allotments)**

3.1 A planning application was submitted to North Warwickshire District Council by Countryside Partnerships in respect of Warton Allotments. Planning consent was granted with conditions on 28 June 2019 (ref: PAP/2016/0289) for the development of 71 residential no dwellings. The conditions require works to be carried out in the public highway and the Council will enter into an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to facilitate these works. The s278 works required are the widening and realignment of Orton Road, construction of new footways, culverting of existing ditch and new drainage.

#### **B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) Ghost Island and footway**

3.2 A planning application was submitted to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council by IREEF-UK Logistics Propco Ltd in respect of Land Southeast of Wilsons Lane, Longford Road, Exhall, Coventry. Planning consent was granted with conditions on 24 December 2021 (ref: 037021) for the development of 6,953sqm of B1 light industry for parking, access, and landscaping. The conditions require works to be carried out in the public highway and the Council will enter into an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to facilitate these works. The s278 works required are the construction of a right turn lane and widening of the footway.

#### **B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) – Temporary and minor access**

3.3 A planning application was submitted to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council by IREEF-UK Logistics Propco Ltd in respect of Land Southeast of Wilsons Lane Longford Road, Exhall, Coventry. Planning consent was granted with conditions on 24 December 2021 (ref: 037021) for the development of 6,953sqm of B1 light industry for parking, access, and landscaping. The conditions require works to be carried out in the public highway and the Council will enter into an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to facilitate these works. The s278 works required are the construction of a temporary access in the form of a dropped kerb vehicle crossover.

### 4. Financial implications

4.1 As the new highway assets which are being created through these schemes will come on to the Council's balance sheet once completed, the costs incurred by the Council need to be treated as capital expenditure.

4.2 Section 278 schemes are fully funded by developer contributions which are ring-fenced for the schemes described in the sections above. There are no alternative uses for the contributions and the addition of these schemes will not affect the overall level of available capital resources.

4.3 The respective Developers have already committed to funding the technical review work by accepting the Council's fee estimates. The Council's fees for technical review are always collected in advance of the s278 agreement being signed.

4.4 Procurement and subsequent award of construction contracts will only take place subject to the applicable Section 278 agreements being signed, which will provide 100% of the funding. The Section 278 agreements will also require both Developers to provide a bond or cash security at least 150% of the costs of the works. The commencement of the works is dependent on the completion of the technical review, procurement and contractor mobilisation processes. Any slippage or increase in costs due to changes in the scope of the works will be reported in the normal quarterly monitoring process.

## 5. Environmental implications

5.1 The environmental impacts of developer-funded highway schemes are considered through the planning approval process.

5.2 The contractors on the Council's Framework Contract for the Provision of Engineering and Construction Works (WCC 6012) have all demonstrated that they hold a certificate of compliance with BS EN ISO 14001 (or equivalent) or have otherwise satisfactorily demonstrated their policies and arrangements for the management of construction-related environmental issues.

<b>Report Author</b>	Kudzai Chengeta kudzaichengeta@warwickshire.gov.uk,
<b>Assistant Director</b>	Scott Tompkins - Assistant Director Environmental Services
<b>Strategic Director</b>	Mark Ryder - Strategic Director for Communities
<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property

<b>Urgent matter?</b>	No
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	No
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	No

### List of background papers

N/A

### Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Peter Butlin

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality –n/a

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Councillors – Warwick, Singh Birdi, Board, Philipps and W Roberts

Local Member(s):

C5 Orton Road, Warton (Warton Allotments) - Cllr Andrew Wright (Warton Polesworth)

B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) - Ghost Island and footway -Cllr Bhagwant Singh Pandler (Bedworth)

B4113 Longford Road, Exhall (Wilsons Lane) – Temporary and minor access – Cllr Bhagwant Singh Pandler (Bedworth)

## Portfolio Holder Decision

### Proposed Prohibition of Vehicle Movements - Moors Lane, Houlton, Rugby

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>10 March 2023</b>
	<b>Signed</b> 

#### Decision taken

1.1. Recommendation:

That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves that the below named proposed Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised:

The Warwickshire County Council (Moors Lane, Houlton) (Prohibition of Vehicle Movements) Order 2023

#### Reasons for decisions

2.1. A copy of plan PTRO21-016-001 detailing proposals for a prohibition of motor vehicles restriction can be found as Appendix B. Objections and comments were received to these proposals; the following tables detail the objections and comments received together with the officers' responses.

Emails/letters	
Objections received	3
Police support	1
Support received	2

Ref	Objections received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Disruptions on the A428 Crick Road (e.g. National Rail bridge maintenance) see Moors Lane used as a local bypass	1
B	Moors Lane gives access to Crick and the M1 for people of Lower Hillmorton; the alternative route via Watts Lane and the A428 Crick Road is already busy, the closure will increase traffic	1
C	With no prospect of any traffic on Moors Lane it will become a no-go area for pedestrians due to the fear of assault	1
D	Moors Lane should only be closed off from the north end of the recently constructed housing estate; residents need access	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Objections
A	Moors Lane is not of a suitable nature to take traffic volumes in line with the A428 Crick Road in the event of disruption/closure, so should not be considered a viable diversion route. However, in the event of planned maintenance, consideration could be given to opening Moors Lane as an unsigned route by Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (subject to the usual statutory procedures).
B	The majority of the alternative route is via the A428 Crick Road, which as an A-class road is set up to carry large traffic volumes and has had infrastructure improvements alongside the residential development at Houlton to increase capacity and preserve traffic flow. Current traffic volumes using Moors Lane to access Lower Hillmorton are light, with minimal additional impact anticipated on the local road sections of the alternative route such as Watts Lane.
C	Moors Lane is an unlit, narrow lane with no footways and narrow verges. There is a perception of risk of assault associated with using such a route as a pedestrian; the use of the road by occasional passing vehicles should not be considered as a reliable mitigating factor against this risk, especially given that with vehicles present there is the additional risk of road safety incidents as vehicles and pedestrians share space with limited/poor intervisibility.
D	All properties on Moors Lane would retain access, either from the A428 Crick Road or via the internal road network of the estate (Lincoln Drive and Hemingbrough Drive); the proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles commences at the northern end of the recently constructed housing estate.

2.2. The published reasons for intervention in Moors Lane remain valid. It is recommended that the proposals in their current form be implemented as advertised.



## Background information

- 3.1. Prior to the development of Houlton to the east of Hillmorton, Rugby, Moors Lane was a very lightly trafficked route between Lower Street and the A428 Crick Road. Large scale housing development on previously rural land increases the likelihood of traffic using the narrow rural lane as a cut through to the north side of Hillmorton.
- 3.2. Proposals are for a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on a section of Moors Lane, for the following reasons:
  - (i) To prevent conflict between potentially increased levels of vehicular traffic and pedestrians and/or cyclists, avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road and for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.
  - (ii) for preventing its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road and adjoining properties.
- 3.3. Access would be maintained for emergency vehicles by means of removeable bollards and/or lockable gates.
- 3.4. No accesses to fields and/or off-street facilities lie within section of Moors Lane referred to in the proposals.
- 3.5. Proposals were advertised and consulted upon in accordance with statutory procedure on the 5th May 2022, with consultation open until the 27th May 2022.
- 3.6. The statutory criteria for decisions on making Traffic Regulation Orders are included as **Appendix A**.
- 3.7. Drawings showing published proposals for the prohibition of motor vehicles are found in **Appendix B**.
- 3.8. Copies of objections and comments received can be found in **Appendix C**.

## Financial implications

- 4.1. Costs associated with the introduction of the prohibition of vehicles in Moors Lane (including legal costs, consultation) would be approximately £3k, funded from existing contributions from developers at the Houlton site. Implementation costs are expected to be approximately £3k, with agreement in place for costs to be met by developers.

## Environmental implications

- 4.2. It is not anticipated that the prohibition of motor vehicles would have a significant adverse effect on air quality or noise levels, with low additional traffic volumes using the alternative route along the A428 and other local estate roads.

<b>Report Author</b>	Phil Mitton philmitton@warwickshire.gov.uk,
<b>Assistant Director</b>	David Ayton-Hill, Assistant Director for Communities
<b>Lead Director</b>	Mark Ryder, Strategic Director for Communities
<b>Lead Member</b>	Wallace Redford, Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning

<b>Urgent matter?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	<i>No</i>

### List of background papers

Letters and email objections along with large scale plans that can be produced if required.

Appendix A – statutory criteria for decisions on making Traffic Regulation Orders

Appendix B – drawing showing published proposals for the prohibition of motor vehicles

Appendix C – copies of objections and comments received

Appendix D – Public Notice

### Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Wallace Redford

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Virginia Rennie

Equality – Joanna Kemp

Procurement – John Hopper & Mark Baker

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Councillors – Leaders of the Party Groups, Communities OSC Chair & Spokespersons

Local Member(s): Councillor Yousef Dahmash

## Portfolio Holder Decision Youth Investment Fund - Hatters Space development proposal

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Children &amp; Families</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>10 March 2023</b>
	<b>Signed</b> 

### 1. Decision taken

- 1.1 The Portfolio Holder (Children and Families) approves the submission of a bid to the Youth Investment Fund for funding to facilitate the extension, adaptation and improvement of Hatters Space Community Centre, Nuneaton. Hatters Space is a WCC owned building.

### 2. Reasons for Decisions

- 2.1 In line with the Constitution of Warwickshire County Council, Portfolio Holder approval is required for any bid for external funding in excess of £250,000 or that will commit the council to funding in excess of £50,000 that cannot be met from a service's allocated budget
- 2.2 The proposed bid will be for £1.287 million of revenue and capital funding from the government funded Youth Investment Fund. Consequently, the approval of the Portfolio Holder is required.

### 3. Background Information

- 3.1 Following an initial expression of interest submission by the Council in November 2022, officers are seeking approval to submit a full bid to the UK Government funded Youth Investment Fund for the extension and improvement of Hatters Space in Abbey Green to enable high quality, accessible, open access youth work provision.

- 3.2 The total projected cost is £1,287,050.89. This figure has been reached through consultation between colleagues in Children and Families and Strategic Asset Management.
- 3.3 At present there is a lack of suitable and accessible venues to deliver core youth services in central Nuneaton. Hatters Space is also in high demand for use by revenue generating community groups, charities and businesses and as such, valuable youth work delivery space is required. Further, Hatters Space requires modernisation to contribute to the council's net zero plans.
- 3.4 The extension of the existing building at Hatters Space includes the introduction of a brand new, accessible, youth centre comprising of a two-storey building with central staircase, spacious entrance lobby with ramped access, a flexible multi use space with kitchen area, two unisex single occupancy bathrooms including one accessible wet room/shower, a private 121 space for counselling etc, drop-down group spaces and an outdoor enclosed courtyard with workshop and activity spaces.
- 3.5 The existing building at Hatters Space is used for a wide range of activities for all age groups. We anticipate minimal disruption to these activities as a result of the proposed works. The intention is to preserve most of the existing building, improve the reception area and create a bespoke youth centre in an area of need in Nuneaton.
- 3.6 The preservation of revenue streams from third sector hire mentioned at paragraph 3.3 is crucial and key stakeholders were consulted as part of the initial expression of interest.
- 3.7 Young people have also been involved from very early on in the process and have provided invaluable contributions to the outline planning ideas.
- 3.8 We are aiming to bring the full application to the Youth Investment Fund panel in the spring of 2023 following Portfolio Holder approval, architect support and pre-planning applications. Officers are currently procuring architectural support and hope to have a fee proposal back very soon.
- 3.9 Based on the works currently proposed, it is anticipated that the project duration will be in the region of 24 months from successful application to project completion.
- 3.10 Further information, plans, timescales and costings can be found at Appendix - Youth Investment Fund Project Brief (Hatters Space).

## 4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The total cost of the project is £1.287m. The funding for both the capital and revenue spend is being sought externally from the Youth Investment Fund.
- 4.2 The of the total cost, £145,347.36 is revenue cost and £968,982.41 is capital costs
- 4.3 A contingency fund of £111,432 has also been included in the total figure applied for to account for cost overruns and £61,288.14 for Tender & Construction cost inflation between the initial project costing and
- 4.4 Any funding received from a successful application to the Youth Investment fund must be spent by March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2025
- 4.5 Strategic Asset Management will procure professional services to support planning permission, feasibility studies and technical and architectural design to develop the project to the point of full tendering
- 4.6 As this development work is anticipated to cost under £25k, this will be procured by an existing framework agreement
- 4.7 This expenditure is included the total funding being sought and can be commissioned to run concurrently with the grant application with interim costs being met by Strategic Asset Development Funds.
- 4.8 If the bid is not successful, these costs will be met by Strategic Asset Management and will not need to be repaid unless the project goes ahead in the future
- 4.9 There will be additional revenue costs for the Authority from the running costs of the building once operational. The primary areas will be increased cleaning and maintenance which will be met by reprioritising existing resources.
- 4.10 We are currently unable to accurately estimate any potential increase in costs for electricity, gas, and water offset – it is planned that increased use of utilities should be offset by the design and sustainability measures included in the project brief, e.g. more efficient heating system and solar panels. This is a key point for exploration during the feasibility study stage of project development.
- 4.11 Hatters Space Generates VAT exempt income via hire of rooms to third sector organisations and community groups and as such, any expectation of increased income generation from charging for use of the space will be limited by and carefully considered as a proportion of the overall expenditure from grant funds. This will ensure that any use of the space does not increase the level of expenditure that results in VAT exempt income generation exceeding thresholds as this will impact on what the Local authority is able to reclaim on the grant funded costs of the project. The vision of the project did not focus on increasing income generation methods but creating a sustainable and inclusive space for young people as part of a community.

## 5. Environmental Implications

- 5.1 A Key focus of the design brief for this project is the exploration and inclusion of sustainable building methods
- 5.2 In looking at the Environmental impacts in the concept design for the project brief, the BREEAM Requirements for Local authorities for sustainable development were used.
- 5.3 Selecting an existing, well used community centre rather than looking to complete a new build project puts front and centre the benefits of retaining, improving and future proofing existing assets.
- 5.4 To support the energy and heating demands of the planned extension, complete replacement of the current Gas heating system of the has been included in the project specification and costing
- 5.5 Upgrading and improvements to the existing electrical systems are planned to incorporate on site sustainable energy generation in the form of solar panels to be placed as part of the build
- 5.6 The concept produced by young people has been heavily influenced by open plan sustainable spaces that use materials that have a reduced environmental impact i.e., recycled shipping container outbuildings, steel frame modular construction etc.
- 5.7 The concept for the building incorporates windows that collect solar energy in the winter but not heat in the summer and other ideas for passive environmental control
- 5.8 External Space, green roofs and vertical gardens have been incorporated into the concept for connection to nature and offers new potential for better wastewater management to be explored in the technical design stage.

<b>Report Author</b>	<p>Marina Kitchen  <a href="mailto:marinakitchenearlyhelp@warwickshire.gov.uk">marinakitchenearlyhelp@warwickshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Rob Harris <a href="mailto:robertharris@warwickshire.gov.uk">robertharris@warwickshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Phoenix Cooper  <a href="mailto:phoenixcooper@warwickshire.gov.uk">phoenixcooper@warwickshire.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Assistant Director</b>	<p>John Coleman</p> <p>Assistant Director Children and Families</p>
<b>Strategic Director</b>	<p>Nigel Minns</p> <p>Strategic Director for People</p>

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	Councillor Jeff Morgan Portfolio Holder for Children & Families
-------------------------	--

<b>Urgent matter?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	<i>No</i>

<b>List of background papers</b>
Appendix 1 - Youth Investment Fund Project Brief (Hatters Space)

<b>Members and officers consulted and informed</b>
<p>Portfolio Holder – Councillor Jeff Morgan</p> <p>Corporate Board – Nigel Minns</p> <p>Legal – Nic Vine</p> <p>Finance – Virginia Rennie</p> <p>Equality – Jo Kemp</p> <p>Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse</p> <p>Councillors – Dahmash, Roodhouse and Brown</p> <p>Local Member(s): Philipps</p>

This page is intentionally left blank