Present: Councillors Gurney, Hodges (in the Chair) Kramer and

Scott (as the duly appointed substitute for Councillor Hodges for consideration of part of minute 5 – Foreshore

Trust Grants 2012/13 (Round 2) only). Also in attendance Mr Chris May, Protector.

#### 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following councillors declared their interests in the minutes as follows:

Councillor	<u>Minute</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Hodges	5 - Foreshore Trust Grants 2012/13 (Round 2) in so far as that concerned Xtrax Young Peoples Centre	Prejudicial – He was a trustee of Xtrax
Kramer	5 - Foreshore Trust Grants 2012/13 (Round 2) in so far as that concerned The Bridge Community Café, which was an unsuccessful application	Personal – She was Chair of The Bridge

#### 2. MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

#### 3 WHITE ROCK BATHS

The Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy presented the Director of Regeneration's report on the current position regarding White Rock Baths and proposed some next steps. At its meeting on 12 December 2011 the Committee had agreed that the possibilities of the use of White Rock Baths (WRB) for the Lifecycle project would continue to be pursued. It was also agreed that if this venture was not practicable the Committee would wish to see the opportunities opened to a wider number of potential proposers.

The report contained information about discussions with Lifecycle and the resultant risks to which the Trust would be exposed if this use were to be progressed. The report considered the options for marketing the site, capping it off and doing nothing.

The Coastal Users Group (CUG), at a previous meeting, had expressed its preference for re-advertisement. The report gave details of its preferences in the current situation, which included unanimous endorsement of the approach proposed in the report and set out in the resolution below.

Councillor Kramer moved approval of the recommendations to the report, which was seconded by Councillor Gurney.

Mr May commented that the Committee should formally confirm that at present it did not wish to pursue the option suggested by Lifecycle, as suggested in the report. This was accepted by the mover and seconder and added to the original Motion.

# RESOLVED (unanimously) - that: -

- (1) the Committee confirms that at present it does not wish to pursue the option suggested by Lifecycle;
- (2) all the following options are explored and proposals presented to a future meeting: -

Marketing of the premises;

Limited improvements to the premises; and

Capping off and use of the space above; and

(3) any decision relating to White Rock Baths is taken in the context of potential alternative demands upon the Trust and that the business plan is revised if that proves to be appropriate.

## Reasons for the decision: -

- (1) to enable the Committee to consider the desirability of a different approach to the future of White Rock Baths; and
- (2) that this be done in the context of the Trust's overall business plan.

## **4** FORESHORE TRUST CAR PARKS

The Head of Amenities and Leisure presented a report seeking agreement to resurfacing and expansion of Pelham Place car park, subject to receipt of satisfactory tenders. The present surface had been in place beyond its expected life and patch repairs were no longer practical. In presenting the report she amended recommendation 2 so that the results of tendering would be reported to the December meeting. The works should then take place between January and March 2013.

The seafront car parks, Pelham Place and Rock a Nore, were the primary source of the Foreshore Trust's income. Preliminary designs for increasing the number of spaces at Pelham Place had been produced. The Charity Committee was asked to consider the construction of additional spaces at the same time as resurfacing Pelham Place, to contain disruption and to maximise income.

The Head of Finance commented that the works were in the business plan for next year. If the works were brought forward the business plan would have to be changed and also a loss of interest would occur. In answering a question from Mr May he confirmed that the payback period would be reasonable, the car park and additional spaces would be an asset to the Charity and that he considered it to be a reasonable investment.

Councillor Gurney moved approval of the recommendations to the report, which was seconded by Councillor Kramer.

# RESOLVED (unanimously) - that: -

- (1) tenders are sought for resurfacing and expansion of Pelham Place car park;
- (2) the results of tendering are reported to the meeting of the Charity Committee to be held in December;
- (3) a further report on proposals for Rock a Nore car park and signage be brought to a future meeting; and
- (4) the commitment in the business plan for this work in 2013/14 be brought forward to 2012/13.

## Reasons for the decision: -

Pelham Place car park was in need of full resurfacing as the present surface had been in place well beyond its expected life and patch repairs were no longer practical.

The seafront car parks, Pelham Place and Rock a Nore, were the primary source of the Foreshore Trust's income. Preliminary designs for increasing the number of spaces at Pelham Place had been produced. The Charity Committee had considered whether it was sensible to construct additional spaces at the same time as resurfacing Pelham Place, to contain disruption and to maximise income.

#### 5 FORESHORE TRUST GRANTS 2012/13 (ROUND 2)

The Chair of the Foreshore Trust Grants Advisory Panel submitted a report recommending which organisations should be funded and the allocations that could be made to each.

The report set out the background to the approval of the criteria for awarding of grants and the previous decision of the Charity Committee on setting the budget of £50,000 for each round of Foreshore Trust Small Grants funding. The report contained information about the procedure undertaken to advertise the availability of grant funding and subsequently to appraise the grant requests received. Appended to the report was a list of 16 applications recommended by the advisory panel for funding totalling £49,978. A list of the 15 unsuccessful applications was also appended.

Councillor Kramer moved approval of recommendations to the report in respect of the first five applications listed. She also proposed that the advisory panel be thanked for their hard work in dealing with the applications. This was seconded by Councillor Gurney.

Councillor Scott moved approval of the recommendation to the report in respect of the application by Xtrax, which was seconded by Councillor Gurney.

Councillor Gurney moved approval of recommendations to the report in respect of the last ten applications listed, which was seconded by Councillor Kramer.

## RESOLVED (unanimously) - that: -

- (1) the Small Grant allocations to the organisations that had successfully completed the selection process be approved as shown in Appendix A to the report of the Chair of the Foreshore Trust Grants Advisory Panel; and
- (2) the Foreshore Trust Grants Advisory Panel be thanked for its hard work in dealing with the applications.

#### Reason for the decision: -

To comply with and follow through the recommendations made by the Charity Committee at its meetings on 7 June and 7 September 2011.

(Councillor Hodges left the meeting during consideration of the application by Xtrax having declared his prejudicial interest. Councillor Kramer took the chair and Councillor Scott substituted for Councillor Hodges as a member of the Committee for this item)

# 6 APPLICATION FOR GRANT – HASTINGS PIER AND WHITE ROCK TRUST

The Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy presented a report from the Chair of the Foreshore Trust Grants Advisory Panel that referred to minute no. 40 (Community Showroom) of this Committee on 24 April 2012. Resolution (4) of that minute requested the Grants Advisory Panel to consider and make recommendations on a request from the Hastings Pier and White Rock Trust for an investment of £25,000 by the Foreshore Charitable Trust towards the costs of installing the facility. Details of the request were contained in the report to the Charity Committee in April.

The Chair of the Foreshore Trust Grants Advisory Panel addressed the Committee and reported that the Grant Advisory Panel had acknowledged that consideration of such applications was within its remit. However, the Panel felt that it had no agreed parameters or process for considering applications for grant funding of amounts larger than £5,000, so agreed that it could not make a recommendation in respect of the Hastings Pier and White Rock Trust application at this time. The Panel also asked the Charity Committee for its advice on what parameters should be set for processing applications of grant funding greater than £5,000 and what processes it should apply to administering such grants.

Mr May commented that the constitution stated that the Grant Advisory Panel must consider and make recommendations in respect of grant requests. He considered that the remit of the Charity Committee needed to be amended in order for it to consider applications for grant aid in the event of the Grant Advisory Panel being unable to make a recommendation. The Chief Legal Officer stated that the Grant Advisory Panel had been unable to discharge its

duty and therefore the Charity Committee could consider and make a decision on the grant. The relevant parties needed to consider and agree a procedure for adoption by this Committee in respect of future applications.

The Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy stated that the Grants Advisory Panel had been presented with the request and had discussed it. She recommended that a grant be made in light of the Charity Committee's decisions on 24 April 2012 in support of the Community Showroom proposal.

The Head of Finance commented that there was no provision in the business plan for this expenditure. However, reserves were available to meet this cost and therefore the Committee could afford to make the decision to agree the grant.

Mr May commented further that because the grant formed part of a larger project there was no competitive bidding process. He had no objection to the proposal being discussed.

Councillor Kramer proposed a Motion as set out in the resolution below, which was seconded by Councillor Gurney.

# RESOLVED (unanimously) - that: -

- (1) the points raised by the Grants Advisory Panel in respect of applications for funding which fall outside of the agreed "Small" Grants process and parameters be noted and a detailed procedure for consideration of such applications be drawn up for consideration at a future meeting;
- (2) the recommendation made by the Grants Advisory Panel in respect of an application for funding received from the Hastings Pier and White Rock Trust be noted; and
- (3) a grant of £25,000 be made to the Hastings Pier and White Rock Trust towards the cost of installing a moveable single storey structure on that part of the promenade that lies between the western light well and the escape stair of the White Rock Baths site.

#### Reasons for the decision: -

To provide further advice as to how the Grants Advisory Panel should proceed with the handling of applications for funding which fall outside of the agreed "Small" Grants process and parameters.

The request for a grant was part of a wider proposal for the establishment of a Community Showroom that was in accordance with the objects of the Trust and, although the Grants Advisory Panel was unable to make a recommendation, the legal advice was that the Committee could make a decision on this request. There were sufficient reserves available to meet the cost. The Charity Committee made decisions on the other aspects of the proposal at its meeting on 24 April 2012.

## 7 FORESHORE TRUST FINANCIAL REPORT

The Head of Finance presented a report on the financial position for 2011/12, the current year's financial position (2012/13) and reviewed the Reserves Policy. He pointed out that the Charity Committee had two income streams from Property rentals and car parking. There was a need to maintain large reserves particularly in view of forthcoming car park resurfacing and associated works and unknown costs associated with the White Rock Baths.

Mr May referred to the appended reserves policy and commented that two of the reserves listed in paragraph (f) appeared to be duplicated. He also said that it was good practice to identify designated reserves. Overall he was content with the report.

Councillor Kramer moved approval of the recommendations to the report, which was seconded by Councillor Gurney.

# RESOLVED (unanimously) - that: -

- (1) the financial position for 2011/12 and 2012/13 be noted and agreed; and
- (3) the reserves policy be retained and be subject to regular review.

## Reason for the decision: -

The Council had the responsibility for the proper management of the financial affairs of the Trust. The use of any potential surpluses generated by the Trust must be determined in the light of affordability. The level of Reserves to be maintained was dependent on the current and future plans of the Trust and also the potential financial risks that the Trust could face in the years to come.

Given that this still remained early days for the Council's financial management of the Trust the retention of a prudent level of reserves was recommended.

#### 8 COASTAL USER GROUP MEETING – 13 JUNE 2012

The Foreshore Trust items from the minutes of the meeting of the Coastal User Group held on 13 June were submitted.

#### RESOLVED - that: -

- (1) the Foreshore Trust items contained in the minutes of the meeting of the Coastal User Group held on 13 June 2012 be noted: and
- (2) the Coastal User Group be thanked for their continuing work and support.

(The Chair declared the meeting closed at 7.19 pm)