

Contact Officer: Jenny Bryce-Chan

KIRKLEES COUNCIL

CABINET

Tuesday 22nd September 2020

Present: Councillor Shabir Pandor (Chair)
Councillor Viv Kendrick
Councillor Naheed Mather
Councillor Peter McBride
Councillor Carole Pattison
Councillor Cathy Scott
Councillor Rob Walker

Observers: Councillor Martyn Bolt
Councillor Anthony Smith

Apologies: Councillor Musarrat Khan
Councillor Graham Turner

259 Membership of Cabinet

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Graham Turner and Councillor Musarrat Khan.

260 Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

261 Admission of the Public

All agenda items were considered in public session.

262 Deputations/Petitions

Cabinet received a deputation from Heather Peacock, Greenhead Trees Group.

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

263 Questions by Members of the Public (Written Questions)

Cabinet received the following questions from Members of the Public:

Question from Gary McAdam

“The latest statistics show that Kirklees Council has one of the worst rates for test-and-trace in England. Given that less than 50% of all contacts were reached by the council. What is the council planning to change in order to prove to residents that

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

filling in test and trace forms is a worthwhile endeavour and what are they doing to ensure they reach the government target of at least 80% contacts reached”?

A response was provided by the Leader of the Council (Councillor Shabir Pandor)

Question from Gary McAdam

“When will the council be returning to meetings in public rather than using the online virtual meeting system?”

A response was provided by the Leader of the Council (Councillor Shabir Pandor)

Question from James Taylor

“I've been looking at the planned "improvements" that Kirklees have been advertising along with the WYCA for the Mirfield to Leeds (M2D2L) Transport scheme consultation which raises several issues. Firstly, who has drawn up the plans for this regarding the Mirfield section and although there's the Kirklees logo on the plans with Kirklees be actually making comments on these proposals. I was wondering if Kirklees or WYCA had recently had some work experience pupils in or if they had suddenly employed Bob the Builder.

I ask because whoever has drawn up the plans for the Mirfield section sees fit to remove some grass verges and trees along the route, move the main bus stops and bus lay-by where buses can pull in if they're ahead of time and move the bus stops to outside the library which has the narrowest bit of pavement in the town centre as well as making a road no entry that has a veterinary surgery there?”

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

Question from James Taylor

“Do Kirklees Highways and Planning departments actually speak to each other? Regarding this transport scheme consultation there is a plan to install a new pelican crossing in Mirfield on Huddersfield Road. A couple of weeks ago at the virtual Strategic Planning Committee there was an application for a new supermarket on Huddersfield Road, Mirfield. The planning committee was told that a pelican crossing wouldn't be suitable on Huddersfield Road by a highways officer but now we have a situation where a pelican crossing would be suitable about 100 yards away through this transport scheme consultation, why when a developer could be asked through s106 to pay for a pelican crossing is the answer no way according to highways but then when its coming out of KMC/WYCA is it suddenly yes?”

Councillor Peter McBride to refer the matter to officers for a response

Question from James Taylor

“The former Swan pub on the A644 literally on the Mirfield border recently got planning permission for a petrol station and shops, part of the conditions granted

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

were that the developer had to contribute a lump sum in s106 to widen the A644 in proximity to the site. Going back to this transport scheme by KMC/WYCA there are no proposals on the plans to increase road width on the A644 by the former Swan public house, so why is a developer paying s106 monies for road improvements that aren't part of this transport scheme consultation.”

Councillor Peter McBride to refer the matter to officers for a response

Question from James Taylor

“I understand that the final proposals for the rail improvements between Huddersfield and Dewsbury are going to the Department of Transport this Autumn to be signed off. What plans have Kirklees put in place and planning to put in place for what is going to be an extremely busy time. We are possibly going to be in a situation with no trains in Mirfield for several years, there's these proposed works from the KMC/WYCA transport scheme, there's also the proposed improvements to Cooper Bridge and the motorway.

Could we be in a situation where there is no train service for several years and two major highways programmes all running at the same time affecting Mirfield which would obviously have a major impact on the infrastructure and not forgetting any day that has a "Y" in it can also guarantee the motorway having accidents on it and the likes of Yorkshire Water, Northern Gas Networks and Northern Powergrid digging up somewhere.?”

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

264

Questions by Elected Members (Oral Questions)

Cabinet received the following questions from Members of the Council:

Question from Councillor Martyn Bolt

The question relates to the Bradley to Brighouse Scheme and the lack of information about Cabinet's strategy for Active Travel Routes. Which one is the priority to be delivered and what order will all the active travel corridors be delivered in? Bradley to Brighouse Greenway, what is your definition of a greenway. For the majority of people since we started developing them in 1998, it's a walking, cycling and horse riding route. There is no information in the literature about how much this is costing the public purse, so why is the material so lacking in detail and definition yet asking people to comment on it.

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

Supplementary question from Councillor Martyn Bolt

I am surprised to hear Councillor McBride say that the details are not known to us because on the website it says the scheme is being delivered by Kirklees Council in

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

partnership with Calderdale Council. Kirklees Council is the lead authority on it. You would image that when a scheme is being put forward to West Yorkshire Combined Authority, and I did ask how much this is costing it is £2.4million and it is so scant on detail which is a concern. Two years ago, we were consulted on the major highway scheme on the same alignment, the Cooper Bridge consultation scheme. Residents over many areas engaged with the council submitted responses and two years down the line there has been no report back to Cabinet on the outcome of that consultation process. Three options were formally submitted, and residents submitted many more. In any normal environment those consultation responses would have been analysed and a report would come back on options for future development.

What we are seeing now is another £2.4 million being spent on the same corridor for 2 conflicting schemes. The Cooper Bridge Scheme already had active travel measures embedded in it, it is a concern. Why do we know so little about this scheme? How can people comment on such scant regard and why 2 years later have you not brought anything back on the Cooper Bridge Scheme.

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

Question from Councillor Martyn Bolt

We referred earlier to the massive scheme which is the Trans-Pennine route upgrade. Again, we have seen no information back through Cabinet from Kirklees' submission on this and, what submission has Kirklees made? What plans is it making to dovetail into the much needed bridge replacement at Colne Bridge near the Royal and Ancient Pub to tie in with what Network Rail will be doing when they replace other bridges. Obviously, there will be disruption while Network Rail replaces bridges. You can't pass through while the road is closed it would make sense for the other bridges on that corridor between, the White Cross traffic lights and Bog Green Lane to all be replaced at the same time and enhance the corridor. Has this been factored in and, as a matter of interest where in Mirfield is the A629 you mentioned earlier?

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

Supplementary question from Councillor Martyn Bolt

There was nothing in that response that answered the questions I asked which was relating to the other road bridges on Colne Bridge which are the responsibility of Kirklees. You are mistaking the rail bridges, but then you have bridges which cross the river Colne and they cross the canal. Those carry the highway; those are highway bridges.

A response was provided by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration (Councillor Peter McBride)

265 Potential Reorganisation in the Dewsbury West School Place Planning Area – Outcome Report

Cabinet received a report which outlined the outcome from the non-statutory consultation on the potential reorganisation of school places at St John's CE(VC) Infant School and Westmoor Primary School.

On the 14 January 2020, Cabinet approved officers to undertake a non-statutory consultation on school led proposals for the potential reorganisation of school places at St John's CE(VC) Infant School and Westmoor Primary School. Members requested that officers report back on the outcome and conclusions of the non-statutory consultation to Kirklees Council Cabinet for further consideration of the next steps.

The appended report detailed the findings from the consultation and officer recommendations. Cabinet noted that the impact of the proposed changes to the two schools, St Johns and Westmoor had become clearer. Whilst parents, particularly of St Johns would approve the school becoming an all through infants and junior school, the financial impact and sustainability of Westmoor School and possibly other schools nearby could not be guaranteed. There are sufficient school places in the area and numbers in the area are decreasing. Following the consultation, some of the consultees, and officers concluded that the proposals could lead to severe financial pressures on schools other than St Johns and the local sustainability of school places in the area would be at risk.

RESOLVED – That Cabinet does not support the current proposals at this time on the grounds that it does not meet the criteria the Council would normally apply to such proposals and agrees that engagement be facilitated with all parties to discuss the outcome of the consultation and explore opportunities for other options/proposals either now or in the future

266 Small Affordable Housing Sites Programme Update - Disposal of land at Plane Street, Newsome

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 36(1) Cabinet received representations from Councillor Bolt)

Cabinet received a report which provided an update on the Small Affordable Housing Sites Programme. The report was seeking Cabinet approval to dispose of a site at Plane Street, Newsome, Huddersfield and varying the terms of the previous Cabinet authority of 29 August 2018 to enable the disposal of the at less than market value.

Cabinet was advised that the development will provide 30 new affordable homes on the site of the former Stile Common School, Plane Street, Newsome. While this might not be the most ideal way of achieving the objective of increasing the number of affordable houses as it is expensive, the programme is being subsidised by Homes England and the aim is to get the right number of houses, of the right type in the right place. This will be achieved jointly with the public agency and is another one of those programmes that is being additionally funded by Homes England and is welcomed.

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

RESOLVED -

- 1) That the programme update, and the proposed investment of the Preferred Partner and Homes England in enabling the acquisition and development of the third phase site at Plane Street Newsome, be noted.
- 2) That approval be given to the disposal of land at Plane Street, Newsome, as detailed in the considered report.
- 3) That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director (Economy and Infrastructure) to negotiate and agree terms and dispose of land at Plane Street.
- 4) That authority be delegated to the Service Director (Legal, Governance and Commissioning) to enter such agreements on negotiated and agreed terms for disposal.
- 5) That it be noted that the scheme will enable the delivery of the third phase of the SAHS programme and contribute to the delivery of the Council's Housing Strategy and Housing Growth Plan.

267 **Community Asset Transfer Policy 2020**

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 36(1) Cabinet received representations from Councillor Bolt)

Cabinet received a report requesting approval for a revised Community Asset Transfer Policy 2020. The revised policy will supersede the Community Asset Transfer Policy 2017 and has been developed to support the Council's Corporate Vision and shared outcomes.

Cabinet was advised that this policy is to further the aims of the authority by supporting communities in place-based working and giving local people greater control over the assets and services that are delivered in their area. Transferring an asset to a local community organisation can unlock community power, encourage volunteer commitment, help utilise local intelligence, and allow these organisations to attract the necessary capital investment to create a thriving community hub. It also provides an opportunity for more efficient and effective use of buildings and land and supports the delivery of the District's shared outcomes, as set out in the Corporate Plan.

All transfers are by long leasehold of a 125 years and freehold transfers will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and will be at the discretion of the Council. The revised policy will be a positive way forward for communities. Members were directed to section 2.5 of the appended report which outlined the revisions to the policy; and section 2.7 which provided details of the framework.

RESOLVED -

- 1) That the Community Asset Transfer Policy 2020 be approved.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director or Service Director, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation, and in consultation with the

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

Cabinet Portfolio Holder, for the determination of post transfer loan applications.

268 **Huddersfield and Dewsbury Town Centre Finance**

Cabinet received an update report on the current status of the Blueprint Programmes in terms of finance. Cabinet was advised that the report sets out how money is being assigned on the range of different schemes in Huddersfield Dewsbury Town Centres. There is a constant juggling of internal and external resources and it can be difficult to keep track and keep the momentum as money is being shifted from different programmes as cost and speed of access from external resources becomes available.

The report provided a summary of the budget available for Huddersfield and Dewsbury, showing each element agreed in the Council's Capital Plan and any additional funding that had been agreed. The revitalisation of town centres, in particular through the delivery of the projects identified in the Blueprint programmes represent Huddersfield and Dewsbury town centres' contribution to the overall economic recovery of the district as articulated by the Economic Recovery Plan. Much of the budget has now been allocated to specific projects.

RESOLVED -

- 1) That the projects and status of the budgets for the town centre programmes as set out in section 2.5, 2.6 and Appendix 1 of the considered report be noted.
- 2) That the Council's current contribution to the identified projects, as set out at para. 2.7, be approved.
- 3) That the agreed sums of match funding, as set out at para. 2.7, be approved and drawn into the capital plan, and that Officers be authorised to incur expenditure on the working up of plans and proposals for the project/s.
- 4) That approval be given to utilising up to £1m of town centre capital to develop and deliver a town centre programme of public realm improvements across both towns (para. 2.10 refers).
- 5) That approval be given to accepting appropriate development funds for projects as set out at para. 2.19, for use by Kirklees Council and its agents, and that Officers be authorised to enter into grant and other agreements, where necessary, and to incur expenditure on the working up of plans and proposals for the projects.

269 **Proposal to allocate funding from the Sustainable Economy Strategic Priorities Capital Plan to the Huddersfield Market Hall Multi-Storey Car Park Demolition Scheme**

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 36(1) Cabinet received representations from Councillor Bolt)

Cabinet - 22 September 2020

Cabinet considered a report which set out a proposal to allocate funding from the Sustainable Economy Strategic Priorities Capital Plan to the Huddersfield Market Hall Multi-Storey Car Park demolition scheme.

Cabinet was asked to approve £875K for the demolition of the Multi Storey car park and the creation of a temporary surface car park providing approximately 115 parking spaces. The capital expenditure would be funded from the Sustainable Economy Strategic Priorities section of the Council's five-year Capital Plan, which was approved by Council on 12th February 2020.

The report described that the extensive works outlined would be complex and involve substantial temporary works. Such works would take over a year to implement at a cost exceeding £5m.

RESOLVED -

- 1) That approval be given to the demolition of Huddersfield Market Hall multi storey car park.
- 2) That approval be given to the creation of a temporary surface car park on the cleared site of the former multi storey car park.
- 3) That approval be given to the proposed allocation of £875k to enable the works stated in (i) and (ii) above to be implemented, which would be funded from the Sustainable Economy Strategic Section of the Council's Five Year Plan, as approved on 12 February 2020.