



Record of decision

THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS WERE TAKEN ON THURSDAY, 14TH JANUARY, 2021 BY THE CABINET

THE CALL IN PERIOD FOR THESE DECISIONS EXPIRES AT 5.00 PM ON MONDAY, 25TH JANUARY 2021

Members of the Cabinet who were present:

Cllrs D Stewart (Chairman), S Hutchinson (Vice-Chairman), B Abraham, P Brading, S Hastings, C Mosdell, G Peace, B Tyndall, I Ward, W Whittle

Members also present(non-voting):

Cllrs D Andre, R Hollis, P Fuller, S Smart

Officers Present:

C Ashman, S Crocker, L Gaudion, J Metcalfe, A Minns, S Newton, W Perera, C Potter, C Rowland and C Shand

Confirmed as a true record of decisions taken

Leader of the Council

Agenda item	Minutes
Decision reference	46 – (20/21)
Decision Taken	<u>RESOLVED:</u> That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2020 be agreed.

Agenda item	Declarations of Interest
Decision reference	47- (20/21)
Decision Taken	There were no declarations received at this stage.

Agenda item	Public Question Time - Maximum 15 Minutes for Written Questions and 15 Minutes for Oral Questions
--------------------	---

Decision reference	48 – (20/21)
Decision Taken	Written questions were received relating to minute number 53 – (20/21) (the Isle of Wight (Parking Places) Order 2020 from Steve Cole (PQ 03/21), Emily and Ian Moore (PQ 04/21), Richard Newnham (PQ 05/21), David Titley (PQ 06/21) and Mr & Mrs G Hall (PQ 07/21). The Leader read out the questions and provided a response.

Agenda item	Chairman's Announcements
Decision reference	49 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	The Chairman expressed his appreciation to all staff for their work carried out during the period of COVID and reinforced the message to the public to stay at home and protect the NHS.

Agenda item	Forest Road/Whitehouse Road Junction
Decision reference	50 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport expressed condolences to the family of the people involved in the fatal accident which had led to this report. The police investigation had now concluded and a report into the junction had been produced. There had been seven accidents at the location in the previous five years. Although no fault had been identified with the layout of the junction, the Cabinet would consider whether measures could be taken to improve safety at the junction.</p> <p>The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had noted the recommendations in the report.</p>
Decision Taken	<p>To approve Option 1:</p> <p>Realign the hedge to improve visibility when entering Forest Road from Whitehouse Road which as part of the 2021 capital works programme.</p> <p>Reevaluate any future works to the junction following the completion of the Island-wide Speed Review, and as part of the network's safety and management programme.</p>
Reason for the	Any improvement to road safety will positively impact on

<p>decision and corporate objective it aligns with</p>	<p>the corporate objective of protecting our community by ensuring an effective, resilient and safe public highway.</p>
<p>Options considered and rejected</p>	<p>Option 2 – Installation of Traffic signals</p> <p>The installation of traffic lights, as requested in the petition, would need to be fully designed in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. Detailed modelling would need to be undertaken to assess the implications of installation and operation.</p> <p>This modelling includes expected queue lengths to ensure that it does not increase the risk of rear end shunts as vehicles exit the bend to the west of the junction.</p> <p>The Highways Safety Inspector has determined that installation of traffic signals may not reduce the risk of conflict at the junction and could increase the number of collisions due to rear end shunts. There is 325 metres between junction and bend and during peak periods with the installation of traffic lights the risk of rear end shunts would increase. The transit of the sun may reduce the drivers view of the traffic signals on clear days during certain times of the year. Failure to recognise the signals at these times may also result in junction overshoots.</p> <p>An installation of signals at this junction is expected to cost in the region of £400,000 to £600,000 not including ongoing maintenance costs. In addition to ensure the junction was safe and efficient, dedicated right hand turn lanes may be required, increasing the cost due to the requirement of purchasing private land to widen a rural road.</p> <p>The request for a signalised junction has been discounted due to the likely increase in the number of collisions, the rural nature of the junction and other factors present in this location. Traffic lights are not recommended as a suitable solution to highway safety at this junction without a full review of all other potential options.</p> <p>Option 3 – Take no further action</p> <p>Taking no further action is not recommended at this junction due to the seriousness of the recent incident and the potential for further collisions occurring at this location.</p>

Agenda item	Permission to proceed with the commencement of Compulsory Purchase Orders
Decision reference	51 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing explained that the Council's Empty Property Strategy had previously been approved. Empty and derelict properties had an adverse impact on communities and this report was the last resort in a long process of attempting to engage with the owner of the property which had been derelict since 2004. No progress with the owner had been made. There were also other properties in other parts of the Island which would be considered for the same process. The local member spoke in support of the recommendation.</p> <p>The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had noted the recommendations in the report.</p>
Decision Taken	<p>Option 1.</p> <p>To agree in principle to the use of Section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 to acquire the CPO land by way of CPO and that a final report, having completed all necessary legal enquiries and with all necessary documentation be presented to cabinet for formal approval for submission to the Secretary of State; and to identify if any development or housing association partner would wish to enter into an indemnity agreement to underwrite the costs of the CPO process; and that the Director of Neighbourhoods be granted delegated authority in consultation with the Cabinet Member to negotiate, agree and complete the purchase of the CPO land up to the current open market valuation at the point of purchase if concluded prior to the final report being prepared.</p>
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	<p>The Council has set out in its Empty Property Strategy the intention to reduce the number of long-term empty properties on the Isle of Wight and made this one of its strategic housing aims.</p> <p>These Properties are considered a priority for intervention due to the length of time being left empty, 12 years at least. The Strategy prioritises premises that have been empty for over 2 years and to prevent serious issues arising. Including continued detriment or blight, or anti-social behaviour to neighbours and the local community.</p> <p>There has also been a significant amount of officer</p>

resources to encourage the owner to bring them back into use over that 12-year period.

In summary officers have sent the owner twenty-eight letters, carried out twenty-three telephone conversations, nine emails and undertaken five meetings. They have worked in partnership with him by introducing three Housing Associations and four developer groups to enable him to bring the properties back into use, but he failed to engage with each except one who pulled out due to ceasing their activities on the Isle of Wight. Officers have also engaged with other Council departments over these properties with a view to re-occupation and assisting the Council to receive income.

A CPO supports the following Council strategies;

- The Island Plan by assisting in providing housing to meet the needs of Island residents.
- By taking this action it supports the Housing Strategy by signalling to owners of long term empty properties that the Council will continue to use its powers and interventions to maintain the high standards already achieved, as well as bringing long term empty properties back into use for housing purposes.
- The Housing Strategy also indicates that action will be taken against landlords if properties are mis-managed or left empty in accordance with the Neighbourhood Directorate Enforcement policy 2019.
- The Housing Strategy also states that the Council will target empty properties that have been empty for two years or more and fully utilise the Councils' powers to bring those homes back into use.

A CPO would assist in meeting the following corporate objectives:

- Support economic development and regeneration by bringing these long term empty properties back into use;
- Community needs are met by the best public services possible, in that considerable informal intervention and assistance has been tried and formal action is now required to improve the community visually and financially.
- By bringing the Properties back into use it can help support vulnerable people by increasing the available housing stock.
- The aim of facilitating reoccupation of the properties as residential dwelling supports the corporate objective of people having a place to call home where they can live

	<p>with independence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By removing these Properties from their long term empty status it will also reduce the temptation of crime against the property which will make the local community feel safer, as well as removing an eyesore property in one of the Islands leading holiday towns.
Options considered and rejected	Option 2- Undertake further negotiations with the owner to bring these Properties back into active residential use.

Agenda item	Beach Management Strategy
Decision reference	52 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for Environment, Heritage and Waste Management explained that the strategy was a result of an internal audit report into the processes and procedures in place to manage water safety. The RNLI had offered to carry out an audit of the council's beaches at no cost to the council. It was reported that there had been incidents with jet skis and swimmers and it would be desirable if funding could be agreed, for the marker buoys, which had previously been removed, to be reinstated prior to the RNLI's audit. It was explained that the framework provided a list of all activities with an action plan for the future to improve the beach environment. Clarification was provided that the bathing season is usually considered to be 1 May to 30 September each year.</p> <p>The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had noted the recommendations in the report.</p>
Decision Taken	<p>To adopt options 1 and 4 and to agree: -</p> <p>Option 1 – Adopt the draft beach management strategic framework attached at appendix 1, including the action plan for beach safety, and produce/publish the final plan.</p> <p>Option 4 – Investigate the provision of marker buoys in advance of the RNLI safety audits subject to funding being agreed in the 2021/22 Medium Term Financial plan.</p>
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	The introduction of the beach management strategic framework will support the delivery of the outcomes set out in the corporate plan 2019-22, it will assist the council in being financially balanced and viable. It also contributes to being effective and efficient in everything we do and ensuring everyone is treated equally.

	Delivery of the items in the action plan will ensure that all of the council owned, and leased beaches will be managed to the same consistent high standard and accordingly will contribute to the Isle of Wight being a leading UK visitor destination.
Options considered and rejected	<p>Option 2 – Propose amendments to the draft beach management strategic framework and/or action plan for beach safety, and produce/publish the final plan</p> <p>Option 3 – Not to adopt the draft beach management strategic framework</p>

Agenda item	The Isle of Wight (Parking Places) Order 2020
Decision reference	53 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the proposed Order was lawful. A previous decision by Full Council in February 2020 had provided for additional income from the use of on-street parking and off-street car parks. However there were some inconsistencies in different areas. The reports sought to address these. It was accepted that parking was an emotive subject, and some genuine concerns had been raised during the consultation, however the principle of the report was to bring fairness and consistency. Some questions had been received from the public which had already been dealt with under Public Questions.</p> <p>The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had noted the recommendations in the report, however the Chairman of that committee asked whether the sailing club could have a dispensation from parking charges. The Chairman indicated that if there were any special cases these could be considered, and the Cabinet Member would have ongoing dialogue with such people.</p>
Decision Taken	<p>To adopt option (ii) and to agree: -</p> <p>(ii) To approve the changes to parking places as set out in the Isle of Wight Council (Parking Places) Order 2020 at appendix 4 and implement as soon as practically possible.</p>
Reason for the decision and corporate objective it aligns with	The implementation of the parking order supports the aspirations of the council to be an organisation that, “meets its statutory duties and enables and delivers services at the right quality and cost effectively within the resources available”. It may also help to, protect and support most

	<p>vulnerable and provide support to the economy, if the income earned from the changes helps the council to sustain and improve some of its highways and policy objectives as set out in the Local Transport Plan (see earlier) and contribute to its statutory responsibilities under the Traffic Management Act.</p> <p>In relation to the Corporate Plan 2019 - 22 the proposals contained with the parking order will assist the council in being financially balanced and viable. It also contributes to being effective and efficient in everything we do and ensuring everyone is treated equally.</p>
Options considered and rejected	<p>i) Not to approve the changes to parking places as set out in the Isle of Wight Council (Parking Places) Order 2020 at appendix 4.</p> <p>iii) To approve the changes to parking places as set out in the Isle of Wight Council (Parking Places) Order 2020 at appendix 4 with amendment and implement as soon as practically possible.</p>

Agenda item	Cabinet Member Announcements
Decision reference	54 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	<p>The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education and Skills reported that through the Winter Grants funding scheme the council was about to relaunch the Connect 4 Communities grants. The council had given out 10 grants previously totalling £56,600. A grant pot of £145,000 was available for small groups to apply for funding to help families and young children at this time.</p> <p>800 laptops had been supplied in the summer term for vulnerable children. Another 780 laptops would be delivered imminently, to ensure that every child had access to IT to home educate. Parents could contact their child’s school for assistance.</p> <p>The annual report was presented on the partnership with Hampshire Children’s Services which had been in place since 2013. A good deal of progress had been made. A further five years had been agreed from 2018. Hampshire were outstanding in all areas and were bringing their experience to the island. The council was working towards becoming outstanding with Hampshire’s help. Staff had worked well during the pandemic to ensure business as usual.</p>

The report would be included in the next Quarterly Performance Management Report. Other members would then have the opportunity to ask questions.

The paper was noted and thanks expressed to colleagues by the chairman.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Digital Transformation reported that Ventnor Town Council had asked him to pass on thanks to council officers for the transfer of gardens from IW Council to Ventnor TC.

It was hoped that the LeBlanc cycle race/food extravaganza which was to be held at the end of 2020 would now be held from 23 – 25 April 2021. Several famous cyclists would be attending.

Cowes Week would be 5G powered in 2021 with cameras on many boats. Spectators and fans could log on and become immersed. This fitted with the Digital Island Strategy and superfast fibre rollout which would put the island on the map with one of the fastest broadband in the world, enabling the council to push forward the digital agenda.

Environmental Health and police had issued the first COVID lockdown fines on 10 January against the operators of a gym in Ryde for operating outside COVID rules.

It was recognised that consideration should be given to those who cannot work at home such as certain tradespeople. There should be extra measures e.g. more lateral testing in place. The council would be looking into what could be done to support them.

The Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration reported that the Regeneration team continued to move projects forward. Branstone Farm development was moving forward. Planning had been obtained and funding confirmed from the Local Enterprise Partnership and Homes England and was well underway.

A film company had filmed at the Barracks in summer. The council had enabled Rapanui to expand their business into the Albany building. The team had prepared a bid for the government's Levelling Up fund. East Cowes volunteers had improved East Cowes Esplanade around the landslip area ready to provide better amenity and seating areas

	<p>later in the year. This was a good community project in action.</p> <p>There were four different business grants available, details of which were on the council's website.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources reported that staff in the Revenues department had been processing business loans and had received an email of thanks for their support and efficiency from an IW business.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Environment, Heritage and Waste Management reported that he had recently taken on responsibility for beaches and had been looking at enforcement of rules around personal water craft. A coastal community forum had been established and would be meeting on 25 January. He had spoken to his counterpart in Bournemouth and would be sharing views. Consideration would be given to joining the LGA forum with the aim to get a uniform policy through other local authorities.</p> <p>The Chairman extended an offer to interested people who deliver the seaside offer to visitors to become involved and looked forward to updates in the future.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing reported that in order to increase transparency there was now more information being provided to the public around the receipt and spending of Section 106 payments which come from developers via Planning. These could help bring forward specific projects to mitigate the impacts of new developments. New software had been obtained which could provide information in real time to the public. Town and Parish Councils would be able to engage with the council over the collection and expenditure of these payments.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Housing Needs reported that demand on services was increasing due to COVID-19.. The workforce had been affected due to isolation and illness. Providers were struggling to maintain capacity and safe services and the council was working closely with all partners.</p> <p>The NHS Trust had opened a vaccination hub to front line workforce including carers, council and private care workers, which would help to reduce workforce challenges. The Housing Needs service had continued to support rough sleepers. There had been none in the previous two</p>
--	--

	<p>weeks.</p> <p>The Local Outreach and Reablement and Shared Lives services had received their first CQC inspections following registration and both had achieved a good result.</p> <p>Following a lengthy procurement process three new locality home care providers had been appointed, which could change the way the council commissioned support for people in their own homes from February 2021.</p> <p>New strategies for dementia, carers and Learning Disabilities were in progress in consultation with key stakeholders. All three strategies would be launched in due course.</p> <p>Congratulations were expressed to Laura Gaudion, Assistant Director for Commissioning being awarded the British Empire Medal and thanks given to all staff in the whole council for all they were doing at this time.</p> <p>The Leader thanked his Cabinet team for their strong leadership throughout this time, and the media for publishing the latest information regarding the pandemic. News was awaited in terms of funding support for the island's lifeline ferries. The Leader was preparing for a meeting with government, with the island's MP and the Chief Executive regarding the Island Deal.</p> <p>There was a good relationship with Town and Parish Councils at present and the Leader thanked them also for their determination to do the best for the island.</p>
--	--

Agenda item	Consideration of the Forward Plan
Decision reference	55 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	Members considered the Forward Plan and noted the items which were due for decision over the next four months. The Chairman indicated that the council was working with the Tour of Britain organisers for the event in 2022, and that a festival of cycling for 2021 was also under discussion.

Agenda item	Members' Question Time
Decision reference	56 – (20/21)
Summary of Discussion	There were no Members' questions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 14 January 2021

Written question from Steve Cole to the Leader

As the council seems to be willing to put aside the well-being of users of the esplanade, and ignore the views of more than 3000 objectors on various platforms, I feel it is fair to assume that revenue generation is the main driver of these proposals. Can we be assured that the predicted income of £66000 is realistic given that with approx 150 spaces there will need to be a take up of at least one hour per space per day for every day of the year?

With the conditions that the meters would be subject to, along with the unrestricted view of any approaching warden I cannot believe that the income generated would offset the detrimental affect to all users.

Response

As set out in the cabinet report the council received 449 valid objections to the proposal to introduce charges between Egypt Point and Gurnard. The income estimate reflects the seasonal use of the esplanade and is based on known comparable data; accordingly it is considered realistic and achievable.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 14 January 2021

Written question from Emily & Ian Moore to the Leader

Following the proposal to implement parking charges on Princes' Esplanade, I am writing to give our point of view as owners of beach hut 24 at Gurnard. We are Gurnard residents and purchased the beach hut in 2018 for use by us as a family with children and also for my Mum in her 70s who loves to be at the beach. She has had a double hip replacement, and therefore being able to park nearby and access the beach hut easily is really important.

Since we bought the beach hut in 2018, the IW Council has increased the rent by 300%, which is a staggering inflation. It therefore seems unbelievable that you are now intent on forcing us to pay to park near our own beach hut, which we already pay the Council a considerable of money for!

We would prefer that the parking remain free for everyone to access and enjoy the seafront without cost. However if there are to be charges brought in, can you confirm whether there will be parking passes or concessions for beach hut owners?

Response

The implementation of charges between Egypt Point and Gurnard will ensure a consistent approach to parking charges across the island and in particular esplanades. There are many areas across the island where parking charges have been implemented adjacent to beach huts; as concessions for hut owners have not been implemented at any of these locations it would not be reasonable or consistent to do so here.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 14 January 2021

Written question from Richard Newnham to the Leader

As 449 direct objections and over 3000 change.org objections have been raised to the Council who are proposing to 'Tax' residents to use the public green, beach huts, playground and GSC and not having provided a detailed and realistic breakdown or timescale of the full expenditure and projected income, can the Cabinet reject this proposal on both well-being and financial grounds?

Response

The implementation of charges between Egypt Point and Gurnard will ensure a consistent approach to parking charges across the island and in particular esplanades; as such it clearly does not constitute a tax on residents.

There are many areas across the island where parking charges have been implemented adjacent to beach huts, clubs, play areas and outdoor areas used for recreation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 14 January 2021

Written question from David Titley to the Leader

Whilst understanding the need to raise revenue at this time, the introduction of these parking charges between Egypt Esplanade and Gurnard will most definitely have a negative impact on the footfall to both the local businesses and to the Gurnard Sailing Club. We experienced this when meters were installed in Queens Road opposite our business.

Accepting that this has to be an estimate, how confident does the Cabinet feel about the projected income figures against the initial substantial investment needed to install the meters, bearing in mind the existing low take of the meters in Queens Road?

Response

The income estimate reflects the seasonal use of the esplanade and is based on known comparable data; accordingly, it is considered realistic and achievable.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 14 January 2021

Written question from Mr & Mrs Hall to the Leader

We hold the licence to trade on Princes Esplanade with our ice cream van.

You will be aware we pay IWC for our trading site. We also pay Island Roads an additional fee.

This facility creates 2 direct jobs and supports a total of 4 employees. It also supports jobs from local suppliers, to the national economy and also local residents and visitors wellbeing.

With the installation of the parking meters this will put these jobs and IWC income in jeopardy.

This goes against your Corporate Plan which states to **Support Regeneration, Local Business and Residents Physical & Mental Wellbeing**. It also goes against the Governments promise to help businesses recover.

Has this loss of revenue and the loss of jobs been considered in respect of this proposal as despite raising concerns in the consultation we see no mention in your published agenda?

Response

The proposal to implement charges will replicate parking arrangements in all other coastal towns across the island and there is no evidence to substantiate that it will have an adverse impact on business revenue and a subsequent loss of jobs.

This page is intentionally left blank