



CORPORATE SELECT COMMITTEE

Meeting: Monday, 28 September 2020 at 6.30 pm in Virtual Meeting

Present: Councillor T Ashton (Chair)

Councillors J Collins, O Cross, S Flower, L Grooby, D Lomax, R McKeown, E Siddall, M Stone and E Thrane

Councillors Barrow and Todd were also in attendance.

20/62 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
(Agenda Item 4)

With reference to minute 20/57, concern was expressed that to date, there had been no acknowledgement of, or progress with, the establishment of a joint working group to work on issues arising from COVID-19 and it was requested that this matter be moved forward as soon as possible. The Executive Councillor for Finance and Corporate Resources undertook to refer this matter to the next meeting of the Executive to progress.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2020 be approved as a correct record.

20/63 FIRST QUARTER PERFORMANCE, PROCUREMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW 2020/21
(Agenda Item 5)

The Committee considered the council's overall performance and financial position for the period ended 30 June ("First Quarter").

The projected outturn for the General Fund for 2020/21 is an overspend of £459,580 which was due to a number of service areas having projected overspends mainly due to the Covid 19 pandemic. It was noted that the projected overspend on the General Fund had taken account of received and projected government funding, including an estimation from income compensation. It was noted that the sundry debts had increased.

Reference was made to the specialist external drain network works undertaken, and it was hoped that the situation had now been resolved, but further updates would be made if required.

Regarding performance, 59% of indicators were on track with 49% exceeding target. 44 compliments had been recorded, but members commented that many more compliments had been received direct,

particularly around the refuse service, and members asked that their thanks be conveyed to staff.

RESOLVED:

That the First Quarter 2020/21 financial, procurement and performance position detailed in appendices A, B and C and summarised at paragraph 3.3 of the covering report be noted.

20/64 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN
(Agenda Item 6)

The Committee considered an updated summary version of the Medium Term Financial Plan 2020/21 – 2023/24. Forecasting the longer term impact the coronavirus pandemic has had on the financial position of the authority.

The table at 3.9 of the report set out the forecasted deficit at the end of 4 years of £1.7M, and by utilising the Covid-19 earmarked recovery reserve and re-designating the pensions earmarked reserve would result in a drawdown of £1,278,910, assuming no further government support. The HRA had been less impacted by COVID and a £2,060 surplus was projected for year 4.

In response to a query regarding the impact of the McCloud judgement around pensions, members were advised that this had been accounted for and it was anticipated that the McCloud judgement would be not as severe as anticipated. It was clarified that the pension reserve to be used to offset the forecasted deficit on the general fund was now not required and was right to be re-deployed.

The view was expressed that consideration needed to be given to the funding arrangements around priority projects to ensure that reserves can be re-established at the end of this period. Particular reference was made to the Future High Streets Fund, Glossop Town Halls and Climate Change Emergency projects.

RESOLVED:

That the forecast updated MTFP position be noted,

20/65 REVISED PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK
(Agenda Item 7)

The Committee considered the proposed amendments to the current performance targets for 2020/21, which have been made necessary due to the effects of the coronavirus pandemic on the council's ability to meet its previously agreed targets.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed amendments be noted.

20/66 **CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM CONSULTATION**
(Agenda Item 8)

The Committee considered the proposed changes to the current planning system as set out in the Government's Consultation Document published on 6 August 2020.

The four main proposals with the consultation document were set out at paragraph 3.1 of the report and a summary of the proposals together with the possible implications for High Peak was appended to the report.

The importance of providing a cross party response to the consultation copied to the local MP was stressed by members. Members of the committee endorsed the points set out within the appendix and made the following comments

:

- Draw attention to the proximity of High Peak to the national park
- the geography of High Peak and the limited land supply on which to build
- traditional heritage of our communities
- affordable housing – removal of smaller sites, emphasis on starter homes as opposed to differences in tenure
- unfairness of judging High Peak on numbers
- local control, local knowledge, small mixed communities – proposals do not suit smaller communities
- affordable housing – house prices are high, people may struggle to buy homes in the High Peak
- should be a unique policy for rural areas
- unclear how national parks would be dealt with and do requirements on housing requirements apply
- housing requirement for High Peak – constrained by geography and topography – will inevitable start to encroach on key views etc – problem with applying standard methodology
- concern regarding rural areas such as the High Peak used for small to medium developments and affordable units will be in city centres

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted and the above comments be included within the Council's response to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government before the end of the consultation period on 1 October 2020.

20/67 **VISION DERBYSHIRE - VERBAL UPDATE**
(Agenda Item 8a)

The Executive Councillor informed the Committee on a project called Vision Derbyshire, which had developed two options for the future of local government in Derbyshire pending publication of the Government's white paper on local government re-organisation which was due to be published. The two options were (1) Vision Derbyshire, which was non-structural change, but would allow the seeking a devolved powers for the East Midlands Region and the development of an East Midlands Combined

Authority; and (2) the establishment of a single tier of unitary local government for Derbyshire on a county footprint, should option 1 be not successful.

The Chair had requested this item be included on the agenda and made reference to discussions in previous years where no specific proposals had been agreed.

Members expressed great concern at the absence of any information being shared or discussed around these proposals, particularly since a report to Derbyshire County Council's Cabinet on 15 September 2020 stated that all Derbyshire authorities had signed up to the submission of a letter on 4 September seeking a meeting with the Secretary of State to discuss the proposals.

Concerns were raised regarding the geographical position of High Peak within Derbyshire, and that the majority of its residents looked to either Manchester, Stockport, Tameside or Sheffield rather than Derby for services. Reference was also made to the fantastic work done within the High Peak in response to the coronavirus pandemic and the Whaley Bridge incident.

RESOLVED:

That the Executive Councillor be requested to convey the concerns of members as set out above to the meeting of the Executive on 8 October 2020.

20/68 SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME
(Agenda Item 9)

Add a report on assets to the November meeting.

Add a verbal update on HAZ to October meeting of E & G.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the above additions, the work programmes be noted

The meeting concluded at 7.52 pm

CHAIR