



Record of decision

**THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS WERE TAKEN ON TUESDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2010
BY THE CABINET**

**THE CALL IN PERIOD FOR THESE DECISIONS EXPIRES AT 5.00 PM ON
THURSDAY, 21 OCTOBER 2010**

Members of the Cabinet who were present

Cllrs David Pugh (Chair), George Brown, Dawn Cousins, Edward Giles, Tim Hunter-Henderson, Roger Mazillius

Members also present (non-voting)

Cllr Chris Welsford

Apologies

Cllr Barry Abraham,

Confirmed as a true record of decisions taken

Leader of the Council

Agenda item	<u>Minutes of the Last Meeting</u>
Decision reference	39 (10/11)
Decision Taken	THAT the minutes of the meeting held on <u>14 September 2010</u> be agreed.
Questions / Amendments	None.

Agenda item	<u>Declarations of Interest</u>
Decision reference	40 (10/11)
	Councillor Roger Mazillius declared a personal interest in Paper C, decision reference 43 (10/11), as his son was a Director of a company who provided an architectural related service to Medina Housing and therefore abstained from the vote.

Agenda item	<u>Public Question Time</u>
Decision reference	41 (10/11)
Questions	<p>Mr Dave Stewart from Niton put an oral question on the proposed decision of the future of the Military Road to the Cabinet and asked whether it would continue to bear in mind that if an affordable solution could be established in the future to preserve the road for a longer period of time, it would be considered by the council.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by stating that, subject to approval of the recommendation of Option C within Paper B, namely to retain the road on its current alignment for as long as is possible by intercepting groundwater from the adjoining land, then works should be finished by the end of 2010. If an affordable solution was established at some point in the future and approved by all parties, then the council would of course consider such proposals.</p> <p>Mrs Jill Wareham of Brighstone put an oral question on the proposed decision on the future of the Military Road and compared the decision to close the highway with that of bus routes, post offices and schools and asked whether the Cabinet could support Option D, namely to realign the road further inland?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded by stating that the councils budget and the resources available were not sufficient to allow for Option D due to the works having to be delivered from the capital budget and not revenue resources. It was also noted that bus route and post office closures were not of the council's making and that any closure of schools was due to the school reorganisation. However, five new secondary schools were opening on the Island.</p>

Agenda item	<u>Military Road (A 3055) - Options</u>
Decision reference	42 (10/11)
Summary of discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for the Environment, Transport and Corporate Services presented to members a report which considered the outcome of the consultation undertaken with regards to the future of the Military Road and also sought the approval of the council's approach to stability issues, specifically at the cliff edge between Brook Bay and Hanover Point.</p> <p>It was noted that Cabinet was mindful of the further public consultation that had taken place on sites around the military</p>

	<p>road via an exhibition panel which also explained the history of the road, the geology of the area, local policies, finance and the position taken by the relevant environmental bodies such as Environment Agency (EA), Natural England (NE), the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership (IOWAONBP) as well as the National Trust (NT).</p> <p>The Cabinet Member advised that a re-route would not likely get the support from the NT as they owned the land. Support from EA and English Nature (EN), two of the statutory consultee's would also be unlikely.</p> <p>It was noted that a letter from the previous Cabinet Member for Resources and the Ward Member for Central Wight had been received and gave support of the option to prolong the life of the road and hoped that the council would be in a position to safeguard its future at a later date should a viable solution be found.</p> <p>Cabinet Members were in agreement that the consultation had been thorough and was well carried out and that a number of attributes had been embraced.</p>
<p>Issues Raised by Other Members</p>	<p>Cllr Welsford asked if the possibility of a Bond Scheme to finance the Military Road could be explored.</p> <p>The Strategic Director for Resources advised that whilst the option of a Bond Scheme, in which the public could be involved, had been carried out by various authorities in the past, the sum still had to be repaid and as such, owing to the current financial restraints being experienced, was not a viable option.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member also stated that even if the Bond Scheme were to be pursued and had the support and approval from all relevant parties, the high risk of not gaining approval from the NT, EA and EN would prove the scheme to be impractical.</p>
<p>Decision taken</p>	<p>Option C) – THAT the road on its current alignment be retained for as long as is possible by intercepting groundwater from the adjoining land</p>
<p>Reason for decision and corporate themes it aligns with</p>	<p>To improve the condition of our local roads, make them safer and increase travel choice which was an integral part of the Council's Corporate Plan and the PFI investment programme.</p> <p>To act on responses received from the consultation period and retain the section of road that is under threat as it currently was, thus extending the life of the road by three to four years.</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A healthy and supportive Island • A safe and well-kept Island
Options considered and rejected	<p>Option A) - Protect the coastline under immediate threat by the construction of sea defences.</p> <p>Option B) - Retain the existing road by drainage through pile foundations.</p> <p>Option D) - Realign the road further inland.</p> <p>Option E) - Construct a by-pass for Brook.</p> <p>Option F) - Close the road either side of the failure, install turning points, improve car parking, revise road signing and divert traffic via existing roads.</p>
Declarations of Interests	None declared.

Agenda item	<u>Priorities for Investment by the Homes and Communities Agency - Local Investment Plan</u>
Decision reference	43 (10/11)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Housing presented a report which sought to ensure that the Isle of Wight Council increased the investment to the Island from the Homes and Communities Agency's through the Local Investment Plan (LIP) process, delivering housing and regeneration schemes that met the local needs.</p> <p>The Cabinet was advised that the LIP was well received by a peer review team who had praised the succinct style, coherent story and clear prioritisation of needs.</p> <p>The LIP was a vital part of gaining the necessary funding to the Island in order to enable the delivery of a sustained plan to provide affordable housing for the Island in the years ahead to accommodate the needs of working Islanders in lower paid professions who, whilst contributing positively to the Islands economy, were unable to purchase a full mortgage on a privately bought home.</p> <p>It was noted that there would be £150 million worth of investment introduced to the Island over the coming years in relation to the Pan Meadows development and with the inclusion of sites at East Cowes, Worsley Road, Newport and Asheys in Ryde; there was also the element of additional jobs being created with Pan alone resulting in 65 specific new posts, including 10</p>

	<p>apprenticeships.</p> <p>Members were asked to note that the plan was a living document which would be regularly updated and amended as, when and if required.</p> <p>The Cabinet welcomed the plan and its positive implications to the Island and its residents and also recalled the support provided in 2007 by the authority to all Islanders needs through the Housing Strategy.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member clarified that on page C – 23 of Appendix 2 of the report, the tables fifth column should read 5 Year Target.</p>
Issues Raised by Other Members	No issues were raised.
Decision taken	Option 1 – THAT the Local Investment Plan (LIP) be adopted and be sent to the Homes and Communities Agency.
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	<p>To support economic development and regeneration, enabling everyone to share in the Island’s economic success and by increasing the skills of the whole community.</p> <p>To support people of all ages to have places to live and things to do in their local area.</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • A safe and well-kept Island • An inspiring Island
Options considered and rejected	<p>Option 2 – To not adopt the LIP, make further revisions subject to a delegated decision, and send to the Homes and Communities Agency</p> <p>Option 3 – To not adopt the LIP and to confirm this in writing to the Homes and Communities Agency</p>
Declarations of Interests	None declared

Agenda item	<u>Consultation On Possible Changes To The Post 16 Contribution For Home To School Term Tickets And With Regard To Discretionary Travel To Denominational Schools</u>
Decision reference	44 (10/11)
Summary of Discussion	The Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Childrens Services presented a report which sought approval on the following two aspects of travel:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposal to review the discretionary travel subsidy for post-16 transport from September 2011. • A proposal to review possible changes to the discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011. <p>The Increase would be from £27.50 to £60 per student and it was noted that following representations already received from relevant consultee's, an "in year increase in the cost could lead to a rise in young people currently "Not in Education, Employment or Training" (NEETS), thus leading to the proposal to recommend the increase from September 2011 in order to provide students more time to prepare for the increased cost.</p> <p>Consultation would take place with all 14-19 year old students as well as the IW College, parents, carers and staff along with the Youth Council, Christ the King College, all Catholic Primary schools and the Catholic and Church of England local dioceses and following presentations to the various Scrutiny Panel a final decision would be made later in 2010.</p> <p>Members were also mindful that children over the age of 16, could, on a means tested basis, receive an educational maintenance allowance. They also had the capability to engage in part time employment in order to earn an income. It was further noted that whilst the authority had certain statutory duties to uphold with regard to ensuring the safe arrival at school of under 16 year old children dependent on certain criteria, such legislation was not applicable to over 16 year olds.</p>
Issues Raised by Other Members	No issues were raised.
Decision taken	Option 1 – THAT consultation on possible changes to the discretionary transport subsidy of young people to denominational schools and for post-16 transport from September 2011 be carried out.
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	<p>To support the council's policy to reduce expenditure with regard to discretionary policies as well as support the corporate outcome to prioritise and rationalise resources</p> <p>To align with the following corporate themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thriving Island • An inspiring Island
Options considered and rejected	Option 2 – To continue the discretionary subsidy for travel for all young people (post 16 and students attending denominational schools) with no changes.

Declarations of Interests	None declared.
----------------------------------	----------------

Agenda item	<u>Consideration of the Forward Plan</u>
Decision reference	45 (10/11)
Issue Raised	<p>Members of the Cabinet reviewed the Forward Plan for the October 2010 to January 2011 period and the following issues was raised.</p> <p>It was noted that owing to the volume of work which was due to be presented to Cabinet on 7 December 2010 and 8 February 2011, there was a possibility that an additional Cabinet meeting could be held, subject to establishing a suitable date and confirmation of this would be made in due course.</p>
Declarations of Interest	None declared

Agenda item	<u>Delegated Decisions</u>
Decision reference	46 (10/11)
Questions	<p>It was noted that the following three Delegated Decisions were taken by the Cabinet Member for the Environment, Transport and Corporate Services since the last meeting of the Cabinet on 14 September 2010:</p> <p>Objections to The Isle Of Wight Council (Designated Loading Bays) Order No 1 2010 – Decision taken on 21 September 2010.</p> <p>Objections to The Isle Of Wight Council (Various Streets, Sandown) (Traffic Regulation) Order No 1 2010 – Decision taken on 21 September 2010.</p> <p>2011 / 2012 Concessionary Fares Scheme – Decision taken on 12 October 2010.</p>
Declarations of Interest	None declared

Agenda item	<u>Members Question Time</u>
Decision reference	47 (10/11)
Questions	<p>Cllr Chris Welsford asked, by means of a written question, why, with the consultation for the Gardens not due to close until 18 October 2010, should the Cabinet Member not wait for the outcome before committing to such a substantial capital expenditure</p>

	<p>The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for the Economy, Tourism, Leisure, Planning & Property responded by advising that the decision would not be signed off until after the period of consultation on VBG on 18 October 2010 and noted the large amount of representations received. The Deputy Leader also advised that any delay in acting on the issue of the new lift could lead to the expectations of visitors to the gardens not being met.</p> <p>Cllr Welsford also asked a supplemental question on whether the formal procurement process had been used to obtain a competitive quote for the new lift and how the figure of £220,000 had been arrived at.</p> <p>The Deputy Leader responded by advising that the costs were based on research carried out by the councils Property Services department and had been presented as a worst case scenario of costing. The formal procurement process would not commence until the decision had been signed, after which a full and proper tender process would be carried out which would be overseen and agreed by the councils internal Procurement Board to ensure full transparency.</p>
<p>Declarations of Interest</p>	<p>None declared.</p>