

**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**

**CABINET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee  
held on Thursday 18 September 2014 at 6.00 pm  
in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn.**

**PRESENT:**

Councillors C Joyce (Chairman)  
J Collop, P Foster (Vice-Chairman), J Loveless,  
A Lovett, T Manley, Mrs K Mellish,  
Miss S Sandell, J M Tilbury and D Whitby.

**Portfolio Holder Present:**

Councillor N Daubney, Leader

**Management Team/Officers:**

D Gates, Executive Director  
J Curtis, Project Manager Regeneration

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor I Gourlay

CSC46: **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 36 – RECORDING OR BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED:** That in order to comply with Statutory Instrument 2014 no 2095, The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2011, Standing Order 36 be suspended for the duration of the meeting.

CSC47: **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 August 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

CSC48: **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business to report.

CSC49: **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

CSC50: **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

There were no Members present under Standing Order 34.

CSC51: **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

The Chairman had no correspondence to report.

CSC52: **RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

There were no previous Committee recommendations.

CSC53: **MATTERS CALLED-IN PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 12**

There were no matters called-in pursuant to Standing Order 12.

CSC54: **COASTAL COMMUNITIES FUND APPLICATION**

Councillor Joyce suggested that when the Administration was applying for external funding all Members should support it, and when the money was secured it would be scrutinised. He asked how big the project was going to get, if there was a limit to how much the Council was prepared to put into the project and whether the Council was close to that limit.

In response, Councillor Daubney commented that the Hunstanton Regeneration Programme and the individual projects arising from it were costed and were not a blank cheque. He was not able to give a detailed breakdown of the overall budget as it was not his portfolio, but the Regeneration Programmes Manager was present should members have such detailed questions. Councillor Daubney confirmed that such schemes were costed, then if funding opportunities arose a decision was taken to decide to apply to take advantage of them. He commented that Hunstanton was in a prime position to develop in terms of water sports.

Councillor J Collop raised concern about the decision taken as it was different to that recommended at the Resources and Performance Panel. He had wished to ask the Portfolio holder for an explanation as to why it had been amended to being included in a letter rather than as the Panel had recommended that the Memorandum of Understanding be amended to reflect suggestions made at the Panel meeting.

Councillor Joyce reminded Members that Councillor Daubney as Chairman of the Cabinet, and the Regeneration Programmes Manager should be able to answer any questions.

Councillor Collop drew attention to the site visit previously made by the Resources and Performance Panel for the first round of work, which he felt had permitted informal discussion on the project with the Sailing Club. He had previously asked the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Panel for a follow up site visit which wasn't taken on board but the Club came to the meeting to update

the Panel. The recommendations coming from those discussions were not adopted by Cabinet.

Councillor Joyce suggested that the question may be why did the Cabinet reject the recommendation from the Panel.

In responding, Councillor Daubney suggested to Members of the Committee that they were all able to come to the Cabinet Meetings to hear discussions held. He commented that the recommendations from the Panel were noted, but Cabinet felt it was more appropriate to achieve the same end result in a letter which set out the requirements rather than amending the Memorandum of Understanding. The Cabinet report looked at whether or not to progress with a funding application, the recommendation from the Panel would not have altered that decision.

Councillor Tilbury asked if the letter agreed at Cabinet would have to be submitted to the Body and complied with for the funding to be released. The Regeneration Programmes Manager explained that the Memorandum of Understanding had to be submitted with the application from both partners to show commitment between the parties to deliver the project. The Coastal Communities Fund (CCF) had a set of strict guidelines with what it required from an application, and the Memorandum would set out what both parties would do to meet the guidelines. She further explained that the specific suggestions made at the Panel were better set out in the Council's offer to the Club in the form of a letter to prevent any confusion with the CCF.

Councillor J Collop stated that he was not convinced the Council or Resources and Performance Panel would be able to keep track of progress.

Councillor Joyce asked how the Council would keep track of progress.

Councillor Daubney re-iterated that the Letter was the most effective way of achieving what the Resources and Performance Panel wanted.

Councillor Joyce asked if the Panel would be able to monitor the financial aspects of the project, to which Councillor Daubney responded that the Panel would be able to undertake whatever review it wished, Cabinet was not trying to prevent them doing that.

Councillor Tilbury commented that he recalled seeing in the Panel minutes that the Chairman had agreed to put the review on the agenda for the Panel in six months' time on the grounds that the funds may or may not have been awarded, and if they had been there would be an opportunity to visit if the work had started.

Councillors Mellish and Loveless agreed with this recollection of the discussion at the Panel.

Councillor J Collop stated his dissatisfaction in that he had asked for the visit to be on the agenda for the Panel for its recent meeting. Councillor Daubney stated that the issue of the site visit was not something the Cabinet had on its agenda, as it was a matter for the Panel to decide.

Councillor Mellish suggested that Councillor Collop have the discussion with the Chairman of the Resources and Performance Panel.

There were no other questions.

CSC55: **PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

Councillor Joyce drew attention to the Cabinet Members decision which had been issued earlier in the day on Car Parking Promotions. He stated that he had asked Chris Bamfield to look into the issue of equalities around the proposals for the free 20 minute parking bays, and he had agreed to do so.

Councillor Mrs Mellish drew attention to the brevity of the meeting questioned whether the absence of the portfolio holder or the lack of questions on the item which a member had asked to come forward were reason for the meeting to take place. Councillor Joyce acknowledged the difficulty for members, but explained that the absence of the Cabinet Member when the Chairman of Cabinet was present was not responsible for the brevity of the meeting.

Councillor Tilbury commented that if the Leader had not been present he would have been uneasy about continuing with the meeting, but had been happy to continue with him there.

CSC56: **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to be held on Thursday 16 October 2014 at 6pm.

**Meeting closed at 6.25 pm**