

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET		
SUBJECT:	RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY INQUIRY INTO DISTRICT CENTRES		
DATE OF DECISION:	5 JULY 2010		
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Robin McDonald	Tel: 023 8083 2874
	E-mail:	robin.mcdonald@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

NONE

SUMMARY

A report into Southampton's town and district centres, produced by the Economic Well-Being Scrutiny Panel, was presented to Cabinet in March 2010. This report sets out Cabinet's response to the 19 recommendations contained within the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) Approve the response to the 19 recommendations as detailed in Appendix 1.
- (ii) That the role of co-ordinating actions of various relevant departments within the Council, to improve the economic climate of the District Centres, be delegated to the Head of City Development and Economy after consultation with local interest such as traders' associations and residents' associations.
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Head of City Development and Economy to negotiate and look to other departments for supporting resources with regard to the prioritising and monitoring of district centre improvements.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The current actions by Economic Development and their help with the District Centres and work with the Traders' Associations is in line with the aims and objectives of the 19 recommendations and demonstrates the ability to deliver and or co-ordinate many of the recommendations.

CONSULTATION

2. The following departments have been asked their views and these are recorded in Appendix 1
 - a) Economic Development & Regeneration
 - b) Planning and Sustainability
 - c) Highways and Parking
 - d) Property Services
3. Local consultation has and will continue, with the Shirley, Bitterne and Woolston Traders' Associations and their views are reflected in Appendix 1.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

4. Do nothing – meets neither the aspiration of the City Council nor aids the economic climate within the district centres.
5. Create specific District Centre Manager/s role was rejected due to current financial pressures.

DETAIL

6. The 19 recommendations of the Economic Well-Being Scrutiny Panel have been responded to in detail in Appendix 1 where comment is made on the action taken.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

7. None.

Revenue

8. Some increased travel costs and other small resources will need to be utilised from the current Economic Development budget. It is anticipated that various departments will support the prioritising and monitoring of the district centres.

Property

9. None.

Other

10. None.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

11. Section 2 Local Government Act 2000

Other Legal Implications:

12. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

13. **Community Strategy** – meets with objective 3 – A Dynamic Business Environment
14. **Local Area Agreement** – meets with objective SO3 - A Dynamic Business Environment
15. **Corporate Improvement Plan** – meets with Sec 5. Economic Development Portfolio – part of Southampton Economic Development and Regeneration Plan (SEDRAP)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	DRAFT RESPONSE TO DISTRICT CENTRE INQUIRY – Summary of Recommendations – 5 th July 2010
----	--

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s)

Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

1.	None.	
----	-------	--

Background documents available for inspection at:

KEY DECISION? NO

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	Woolston, Peartree, Portswood, Shirley, Coxford
------------------------------------	---