

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY PANEL**

THURSDAY 5 APRIL 2018 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillors Nedved (Chairman), Betton, Bowditch, Mrs Birks (as substitute for Councillor Burns), Christian, McNulty (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Coleman), Mitchelson, and McDonald.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor Ms Quilter – Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder
Ms Paton – Regional Director, Riverside Housing Association

OFFICERS: Green Spaces Manager
Investment and Policy Manager
Regeneration Manager
Contracts and Community Services Manager
Housing Development Officer
Tourist Information Officer

EGSP.28/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Burns and Mrs Coleman, the Deputy Chief Executive and the Corporate Director of Economic Development.

EGSP.29/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest affecting the business to be transacted at the meeting.

Councillor Birks declared an interest in Item A.2 - Riverside Update. The interest related to her being a former employee of Riverside Housing Association.

EGSP.30/18 PUBLIC AND PRESS

It was agreed that the items of business in Part A be dealt with in public and Part B be dealt with in private.

EGSP.31/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A Member noted that at the Panel's meeting of 1 March 2018, the Deputy Chief Executive had undertaken to circulate a Position Statement in relation to the Council's rights and responsibilities as Riparian owner of the River Petteril.

The Chairman advised that the information had been circulated to Members of the Panel the previous day. The Member responded that he had not seen the information.

The Green Spaces Manager summarised the details of the written response, emphasising that the Council owned a number of stretches of the riverbank on both sides of the watercourse. He outlined the Council's responsibilities as follows: the reporting of incidences of flooding, pollution, obstructions, changes in the flow, collapsed or damaged riverbanks; maintaining natural water flow (only removing obstructions which may cause flooding); keeping trash screens clear; preventing pollution through the removal of litter, animal carcasses, etc;

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

protection of wildlife including bird's nesting habitat, fish spawning areas and the removal of invasive species

As part of its ownership, the Council undertook inspections on a regular basis and programmed in the necessary repair and maintenance work to ensure it discharged its responsibilities. He emphasised that Council was fully aware of its Riparian Ownership responsibilities and was meeting those, he stressed that flood prevention and alleviation activities such as clearing the water channel, dredging, etc was the responsibility of the Environment Agency.

The Chairman stated that the Green Spaces Manager had clearly set out the scope of the Councils' responsibilities and those of the Environment Agency. He advised the Member to look at the information which had been sent to the Panel, and in the event that he required further detail, the Chairman directed the Member to contact Officers individually.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2018 be approved.

EGSP.32/18 CALL IN OF DECISIONS

There were no items which had been the subject of call-in.

EGSP.33/18 RIVERSIDE UPDATE

The Chairman welcomed Ms Paton to the meeting. Ms Paton presented the Riverside Update (ED.14/18) which updated the Panel on matters relating to; Riverside's proposal to make a legally binding variation to the Stock Transfer Agreement with the Council; regional planning; investment; development programme; transformation programme, and customer service and neighbourhoods.

In relation to the Stock Transfer Agreement, Ms Paton noted advised that a formal written request had been submitted to the Council by Riverside Housing Association (Riverside), proposing the replacement of the existing Divisional Board with a Regional Liaison Group (RLG), which, if agreed would be a legally binding agreement. The proposed RLG would be made up of representatives from the Council and Riverside for the purpose of discussing issues of importance to communities and Riverside's customers in Carlisle. The Group would not be part of Riverside's formal governance structure, but it would be consulted on matters affecting customers in the district.

In terms of future investment, the report stated that Carlisle had been identified as one of two areas in the country which had been selected for major investment. A pan-Carlisle Area Renewal Plan would be created detailing how monies would be spent and what works would be undertaken.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- How much power would the proposed RLG have to influence decision making within Riverside?

Ms Paton responded that the level of influence afforded to the RLG would be dependent on its form. She outlined the governance structures at a national level within the organisation and advised that the Riverside Board was the final decision making body in relation to financial and high level policy matters and that the proposed RLG would address matters relevant to Carlisle.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

In response the Member noted that no Terms of Reference for the proposed RLG had been submitted to the Council, which would have assisted the Council to determine whether the proposal was the most effective way to manage the relationship between the Council and Riverside going forward.

Ms Paton responded that Riverside had been developing its proposed changes to the Stock Transfer Agreement over the preceding year and acknowledged that an aspect of agreeing the proposal would be mutually agreeable Terms of Reference. The request submitted to the Council, sought the agreement, in principle, for the proposed amendments, Ms Paton noted that the agreement of new Terms of Reference would, in due course form part of the negotiations between Riverside and the Council.

The Housing Development Officer reminded Members that the then Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had held a workshop for all Councillors in March 2017 which had considered what requirements were integral to any revised arrangements with Riverside, feedback from which had been circulated to Riverside. A report to the September 2017 meeting of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel had detailed Riverside's response to those issues, and had indicated that a formal request to vary the Stock Transfer Agreement would be submitted to the Council. The written request had been received in the preceding week and was being considered by the Legal Services Team.

A number of Members expressed strong concerns in relation to the proposed Deed of Variation, regarding its potential to detrimentally impact the local representation and the addressing of local issues. They stressed the importance of the Terms of Reference to the Council's agreement of the proposed variation to the Stock Transfer Agreement, in order that the authority could ensure it was fully satisfied with the proposals in relation to the Group's representation and powers.

A Member recalled the workshop and the Panel's consideration of the report in 2017, whilst he appreciated that the decision as to whether the Deed of Variation was to be agreed would be taken by the Executive, he felt that it was vital that the Panel were able to scrutinise the Terms of Reference to ensure that it was satisfied with the proposals.

The Housing Development Officer advised that the Panel would need to request that the Executive circulate the Terms of Reference to the Panel.

The Chairman asked what the likely timescale would be for the Panel to receive a report on the Terms of Reference.

The Housing Development Officer advised that the formal request for a Deed of Variation had only been received from Riverside during the preceding week, however, Officers would look to progress the matter as quickly as practicable.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder welcomed the Panel's request to scrutinise the Terms of Reference, she advised that the recent receipt of the formal request meant it was difficult to indicate when Terms of Reference would be available to the Panel, however, she assured Officers that the Legal Services Team were scrutinising the proposal fully.

- Did Riverside intend to have tenants' representative on the RLG?

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Ms Paton responded that currently there were no plans to include tenants' representatives on the RLG, but she indicated that matter could be discussed in the negotiation on the Terms of Reference for the RLG. She outlined the structures for tenant representation with the organisation nationally and noted that not all tenants wished to participate in such groups.

- Would the proposed merger between Riverside and Impact Housing Associations mean that competition for funding between tenants of the two groups?

Ms Paton advised that the proposed merger with Impact Housing would not affect Riverside's spending on its own properties within the city.

- How were negotiations regarding the proposed merger with Impact Housing Association progressing?

Ms Paton stated that Impact Housing Association would join the Riverside Group as a subsidiary and would continue to operate as a separate brand for a period of three years, after which time a review of arrangements would be carried out.

The Member further asked whether the proposed merger comprised the furniture selling service operated by Impact Housing Association.

Ms Paton confirmed that the merger did include the furniture selling service.

- With reference to the Annual Report, the Chairman noted a 79% satisfaction rate amongst tenants regarding maintenance and repairs, he asked whether Riverside was able to meet its maintenance needs.

Ms Paton advised that the reported satisfaction was a national statistic, and that for Cumbria that satisfaction rating was 97%. She noted that Impact Housing had its own repair contracts, and that Riverside would be looking at its repair and maintenance service on a nationwide basis.

The Chairman requested that copies of Riverside's Regional Plan be circulated to Panel. Ms Paton undertook to provide the Plan.

- Would the proposed Deed of Variation affect the Council's ability to meet its obligations in relation to homelessness?

Ms Paton responded that she did not anticipate that the Deed of Variation would change the Council's capacity to meet its homelessness obligations. Were the Council to identify an issue regarding homelessness provision, Riverside would be prepared to discuss the matter outwith the negotiations pertaining to the Deed of Variation, which she noted related to a single aspect of the Council's agreement with Riverside. She further advised that Riverside were not seeking to secure any additional obligations from the Council, and that the Large Scale Voluntary Transfer as a whole was not being reconsidered.

- Did the proposed increase in investment indicate more of a focus on neighbourhood areas?

Ms Paton advised that the investment was likely to be directed at improving hot spot areas, where particular types of properties were no longer attracting interest, rather than whole estates. Another stream of the investment would be targeted at the development of new sites.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

In relation to important strategic sites in the city, for example the Old Brewery Residences (currently owned by Impact Housing) on the western approach to the city centre, plans would need to be developed and submitted to the Council. She anticipated that would take place in the next year.

- What plans for development did Riverside have beyond 2020?

Ms Paton responded that the organisation worked on a three year development cycle and that the current one would conclude in 2020. She stated that Riverside was beginning to consider its next development plan, but that the work was at a very early stage.

In response to a question regarding Riverside's decision making process for selecting new sites for development, Ms Paton explained that the Riverside Board made the final decision on such matters. She further advised that the biggest challenge in the development of new sites was the identification of suitable locations.

A Member asked whether the decision over the development of new site would be a decision taken by Riverside's formal governance structures.

Ms Paton confirmed that such decisions would be taken by the Riverside Committee, and that it would be guided by the organisation's Regional Plan. Such decisions were a possible topic for the proposed RLG to monitor.

- What was the balance of Affordable and Social rented stock of Riverside's properties in the district?

Ms Paton stated that she was not able to provide detailed figures on the split of different tenures. She advised that affordability was a principal concern for Riverside and noted that in recognition of the issue of affordability, the organisation sought to keep rents as low as possible.

The Housing Development Officer added that affordable rents were linked to market level rents, which in Carlisle were comparably low, therefore the difference between affordable and social rents in the district was relatively small compared to other areas of the country and not considered to be a major issue.

- With reference to section 7 of the report, a Member asked how a neighbourhood was defined.

Ms Paton explained that in Carlisle there were 15 Neighbourhood Officers who each had responsibility for a specific geographic area, usually an estate. Other factors such as number of properties and level of tenant participation were also taken into account to ensure that the workload was shared equally and effectively between the Neighbourhood Officers. The Neighbourhood Officers were supported by central services which were based in Regional Hub Offices, of which Carlisle was one.

- Would long term empty properties, for example Barras House, Dalston, be addressed through Riverside's Regional Plan?

Ms Paton advised that in general, the empty properties listed in the report were in need of work being undertaken following an event such as flooding or that they were of a less desirable property type. In relation to Barras House, she explained that Riverside had identified 15

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

possible options for the site which had been shortlisted to 5. Riverside would identify which proposal was most in keeping with its priorities, but it was likely that the site would be converted to a mixture of housing and flats. She stressed that no consultation had yet taken place in the matter and that an application for Planning Permission had not been submitted.

The Member responded that the relevant Ward Members and Parish Council would be pleased to be consulted on proposals for the site.

- How did Riverside address areas of concern raised by tenants?

Ms Paton responded that the question was very broad, but in general terms Neighbourhood Officers were the front line in dealing with any matters raised and in the coming year the Officers would have access to a small budget to deal with issues, in line with the organisation's priorities.

At an organisational level, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were used to monitor the progressing of issues and customer satisfaction. When an issue was identified, consideration was be given to how best to address it, in the context of the relevant Neighbourhood Plan. In the event that a suitable solution was not found, options for going forward would be considered at a national level. Ms Paton advised that in relation to a local issue, the first point of contact should be with a Housing Officer, via the local Contact Centre, she undertook to provide the Panel with a list of contact details.

- A Member noted that the report stated that the Carlisle area was considered too small to report on customer satisfaction.

In response, Ms Paton advised that the data was dependent on the number of responders to each survey, which was variable. Whilst it would be possible to extract on the data relevant to Carlisle the number of responses was not likely to be high enough to ensure the validity of information.

The Chairman thanked Ms Paton for the report and her full and frank discussion with the Panel. He noted that the Members felt it was critically important that the Panel scrutinise the Terms of Reference for the proposed Regional Liaison Group, including constitution, representation and scope so that they could ensure their concerns were addressed and that the points raised by the Panel in its discussion of the Update on Riverside's Proposals to Vary the Stock Transfer Agreement (ED.29/17) at its September 2017 meeting be considered.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Riverside Update (ED.14/18) be noted.

2) That the Panel request that the Executive submit the Terms of Reference regarding the proposed Regional Liaison Group to the Panel for scrutiny when they are available.

3) That Ms Paton circulate local Contact Centre details to the Panel.

4) That Riverside continue to submit update reports to the Panel.

The Panel adjourned at 11:15am and reconvened at 11:30am.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

EGSP.34/18 CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL EMERGING HERITAGE ASSET STRATEGY

The Regeneration Manager submitted the Carlisle City Council Emerging Heritage Asset Strategy report (ED.16/18) which set out the progress made to date on the emerging Strategy.

The Regeneration Manager explained that the emerging Strategy had sought to generate a vision that would inform actions taken in relation to Heritage Assets within the district. The emerging Strategy identified a number of key drivers, strategic priorities, and key themes which had been developed with reference to existing national and local policies covering Heritage Assets, such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Carlisle and District Local Plan 2015 – 30 (Local Plan).

The Regeneration Manager emphasised that the purpose of the Action Plan was to realise the delivery of the Strategy's objectives by focussing on deliverable activities the Council was able to undertake in order to meet its obligations in respect of Heritage Assets. Projects included in the Action Plan would need to secure external funding and support of partner organisations for their delivery to be achieved. If the Strategy were to be approved, monitoring would be undertaken to ensure that the Plan delivered the strategic objectives.

Carlisle's Heritage Assets were owned by the Council, other public sector agencies, and private owners, therefore it was important that the authority engaged the support of those other stakeholders to enable its vision for Heritage Assets to be embedded widely across the district. The next step in the development of the Strategy was to undertake consultation with stakeholders, after which the feedback received would be considered and the emerging Strategy would be refined accordingly. The emerging Strategy would then be subject to the appropriate democratic processes in due course.

The Regeneration Manager stressed that the emerging Strategy was in the early drafting stages, he invited Members' feedback on the document.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member welcomed the Council's desire to implement a Heritage Asset Strategy, and recognised the work that had been undertaken in its development to date. He considered that another key purpose of the Strategy was to enthuse the city about its Heritage Assets and expand civic pride in the District, he felt that aspect was missing from the Strategy, and asked whether it was possible for this to be addressed going forward.

The Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder appreciated the Member's comments and agreed on the importance of increasing enthusiasm for the city's Heritage Assets, and she was keen that the Strategy was developed as soon as possible to address that matter. In her view, the central aspect of the emerging Strategy was the Action Plan, which she considered would be a useful tool for supporting funding bids to manage assets within the city. Referring to paragraph 6.3 of the emerging Strategy, she noted that the Council was responsible for £1.9M of assets and that the securing of funding to effectively manage them was of great importance.

A Member commented that Carlisle had a great deal of notable Heritage Assets, and he felt it was critical that they were promoted as widely as possible both to residents and tourists. In general terms he considered that the emerging Strategy had focussed principally on the assets owned by the Council, he was of the opinion that there was scope for it to seek to influence both private and public sector partners in their management and promotion of assets.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Another Member considered that the Action Plan was also a vehicle for the marketing of Heritage Assets in the district.

The Chairman commented that Members appeared concerned that the emerging Strategy was somewhat lacklustre, and given the importance of heritage as a selling point for the city, it was important that the Strategy sought to build enthusiasm for the city's Heritage.

The Regeneration Manager acknowledged the Chairman's concern and reiterated that the document was still in a draft stage and that narrative and presentation would be considered as part of the ongoing development of the Strategy. He explained that a Heritage Asset Strategy was distinct from a Heritage Strategy, which were broader in nature and encompassed cultural and tourism aspect, whereas as the purpose of the Heritage Asset Strategy was to focus specifically on the management of those assets.

A Member responded that he appreciated the need to increase enthusiasm for heritage, but felt that the Strategy had an equally important role in aiding the management of assets by being a supporting tool in grant funding applications.

Another Member sought clarification as to whether the Council had a Heritage Strategy.

The Regeneration Manager advised that the Council's strategy and policy in relation to heritage were currently encapsulated in the Local Plan, however, were the Council minded to it could produce a stand - alone Heritage Strategy.

The Investment and Policy Manager reminded Members that the Council had a number of emerging strategies in development, for example, the Economic Strategy which would also seek to address tourism. The Council was becoming increasingly proactive in establishing key principles through its development of strategic documents, however, such policies would not, by their nature be able to encompass every aspect of an issue. In terms of the promotion of individual heritage and tourist assets, those were for the Economic Strategy to pick up, as well as existing outlets such as Discover Carlisle

The Investment and Policy Manager further added that he felt the feedback from Members was very useful, and suggested in order for Members to gain a full overview of the strategic direction that the emerging strategies be considered in tandem. The Chairman welcomed the Investment and Policy Manager's suggestion.

- Would the public be included in the consultation on the emerging Strategy?

The Regeneration Manager advised that due to the draft nature of the document, the forthcoming consultation would focus on stakeholders, once the Strategy had been further developed, a public consultation exercise would be undertaken.

- A Member noted that a number of assets within the district were not fully utilised, he suggested that the policies set out in paragraph 2.3 of the report add the words "and developing" to encourage development.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder responded that those policies formed part of the Local Plan, which had been adopted by Council, following approval by the Secretary of State. She reminded Members that the Council's role was to encourage the upkeep and preservation of Heritage Assets and to make them available, as far as possible, to the public. In

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

her view, the Council's role was one of providing non-financial support to owners of Heritage Assets, and that the emerging Strategy would serve that function by providing a useful tool too support grant funding applications.

- A Member asked why the Waverly Viaduct had not been included in the Action Plan.

The Regeneration Manager advised that the Waverly Viaduct was not a heritage project as such, but an infrastructure project, as it sought to expand the footwork network across the city. The asset was not owned by the Council, he outlined the current position with the Waverly Trust and noted that an application to develop the site had been submitted to the Council for Planning Permission. Following the determination of that application the Council would need to consider, via the appropriate democratic process whether it wished to support a footpath creation order.

In response, the Member commented that he felt the Council should support the opening of the Waverly Viaduct and moved that the structure be added to the Council's Action Plan. The proposal was seconded.

- The Chairman asked when the Local Listings document would be submitted to the Panel for scrutiny.

The Investment and Policy Manager stated that the document was in the final drafting stages and simply awaited being programmed for consideration by the Executive. In response to a further question from the Chairman regarding the timeframe for consideration by the Executive, the Investment and Policy Manager undertook to circulate a written response advising Members of the likely date.

The Chairman asked whether members of the public would be able to nominate items for the list.

The Investment and Policy Manager advised that in the first instance Officers were seeking approval for the process to establish the register, details of the process for approving items on the register and the appeals process. The public would be able to nominate assets with the forms to be published on the Council's website.

The Chairman indicated that he wished the item to be included in the Panel's Work Programme for the new civic year.

The Investment and Policy Manager advised that the report would be presented to the Council's Executive.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Carlisle City Council Emerging Heritage Asset Strategy (ED.16/18) be welcomed.

EGSP.35/18 BUSINESS AND MARKETING PLANS FOR THE TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE

The Contracts and Community Services Manager submitted the draft Business and Marketing Plans for the Tourist Information Centre (CS.20/18).

The Contracts and Community Services Manager explained that the purpose of the review being undertaken within the Car Parking, City Centre and Tourist Information Centre teams was realign the Council's resources towards tourism to support the economic growth of the city.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The new role of Destination Manager would manage a restructured Tourist Information Centre (TIC) team with the aim of moving away from the limited focus of traditional TIC functioning towards the implementation a broader approach to destination marketing. Restructure within the TIC team would provide the Team Leader with more capacity to expand the commercial development of the facility, including the retail offer and Assembly Rooms; as well as the cultivation of additional income streams.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised that use of digital technologies would be a key tool in the development of Carlisle as a destination, and the TIC. The Discover Carlisle website was the principal website for the marketing of the district, and going forward, the TIC would seek to increase its online activity to promote events, activities and destinations within the district. In addition, new income generation streams from third party content was another area of development the team would seek to promote going forward.

The report set out a series of recommendations in relation to: staffing; promotion and marketing; retail offer; the Assembly Rooms for the development; ticket sales, and accommodation booking, which the Contracts and Community Services Manager invited the Panel's views on.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member commented that he had visited the Discover Carlisle website which he felt was very well set out and navigable. He had accessed the site through a search engine and noted that the search terms used affected the position of the website in the results.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager explained that search engine optimisation was a key area of work, however, as search engines were commercial enterprises there were costs associated with that. Additionally, he noted that the terms used in the search engine would affect the page of the Discover Carlisle website that was linked by the search engine.

In response the Member further praised the Guides section of the website, particular the pages covering specific activities, such as cycling or walking. However, he felt that further information could be included, he asked whether it was intended that those tools would be expanded to include more information.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager confirmed that further development of those pages was intended and it was intended that they would link to other parts of the site for example to destination or events information.

- A Member commented that the website lacked directional information for users in terms of postcodes for destination and details about public transport.

The Tourist Information Officer advised that including a location map within the Discover Carlisle website was an additional facility that may be considered. She noted that TIC staff provided advice to customers using the facility about how to get to destinations and available transport.

Responding to a comment from the Chairman about the number of Hadrian's Wall bus services being operated, the Tourist Information Centre understood that it had increased since the previous year.

Another Member suggested that consideration be given to including suggested itineraries on the website.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

In response the Tourist Information Officer noted that within the Tourist Information Centre suggested itineraries were available or could be requested. She undertook to look into making such a facility available on the Discover Carlisle website.

- Had the Council considered offering a reward system for visitors attending venues?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised that Officers had been investigating the matter for some time, however, such a system would be difficult to implement without the involvement of external partners. To date no third parties had indicated a desire to partake in such a scheme. The Lanes shopping centre offered customers a reward card scheme and consideration was being given as to whether it would be feasible for that scheme to encompass visitor attractions.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager further noted that joint ticketing was area being considered as a way of streamlining the booking events and facilities for visitors.

A Member responded that would be a useful facility when used in conjunction with the suggested itineraries.

- How did the Council plan to capitalise on the opening of the airport to increase the profile of the district as a tourist destination?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager responded that discussions would need to be held with the airport operator on the matter, he considered that it would be commercially beneficial for the airport to promote the city as a destination.

The Regeneration Manager noted that part of the legal agreement attached to the planning permission required the airport operator to provide a bus link from the site to the city centre, consideration needed to be given as to how that would be implemented.

The Chairman asked whether there was an opportunity for promotional material to be distributed from the airport.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager indicated that the matter would be included in the Council's discussions with the airport operator.

The Chairman thanked the staff at the Tourist Information Centre for their work, especially during the recent redevelopment works.

RESOLVED – That the Business and Marketing Plans for the Tourist Information Centre (CS.20/18) be noted.

EGSP.36/18 DRAFT SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted the draft Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel sections for the scrutiny Annual Report 2017/18 (OS.12/18).

The Policy and Communications Manager reminded the Panel of the Constitutional requirement for Scrutiny to report annually to full Council on their workings and to make recommendations for future work programming and amended working methods if appropriate. He added that the

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Scrutiny Chairs Group had agreed a new layout for the annual report details of which were included in the covering report.

The Chairman advised that at its first meeting in the new civic year, the Panel would discuss and agree a new Work Programme. The Panel gave consideration to the Draft Scrutiny Annual Report.

RESOLVED – That the Draft Annual Scrutiny Report (OS.12/18) be noted and accepted.

EGSP.37/18 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Policy and Communications Manager presented report OS.09/18 which provided an overview of matters relating to the work of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel.

The Policy and Communications Manager reported that the most recent Notice of Executive Key Decisions, copies of which had been circulated to all Members, had been published on 9 March 2018. The following items included in the Notice fell within the Panel's remit:

Items which had been included in the Panel's Work Programme:

KD.03/18 City Centre Public Realm Improvements – Phase 2

Items which had not been included in the Panel's Work Programme:

KD.06/18 Making of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan

KD.07/18 Resurfacing of City Council Car Parks.

The Panel's Work Programme had been attached as appendix 1, and the Policy and Communications Manager noted that the City Centre Public Realm Improvements – Phase 2 would be included in the Panel's Work Programme in the new civic year.

In relation to items 16 and 18 in the Progress on Resolutions from Previous Meetings, the Policy and Communications Manager advised that in relation to the Listing of the Civic Centre, the building was part of the Rickergate Conservation Area which meant that it had weight as a local heritage asset. Any future efforts to add the building to the Local List would need to encompass the entirety of the building, not just the rotunda/Council Chamber.

With regards to the Authority Monitoring Report, it would be circulated to the Panel once it had been sufficiently developed.

A Member suggested that the issue of the Council's Riparian Ownership of the River Petteril be an item on the agenda for the next meeting of the Panel. The Chairman reiterated the points detailed above on the matter, he further noted that the Environment Agency would submit reports to future meeting of the Panel as their flood alleviation plans developed.

The Chairman noted that some items for the Work Programme 2018/19 had been identified and that at its first meeting of the new civic year, the Panel would discuss the inclusion of additional items and agree its Programme for the year.

RESOLVED – That the Overview Report and Work Programme (OS.09/18) be noted.

EGSP.38/18 CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Chairman thanked the Members of the Panel and Officers for their efforts and support in aid of the Panel's work over the year.

The Vice-Chairman noted that he was standing down from the Council at the forthcoming election, after 30 years as a Member of the Council. He recalled a number of projects in which he had been involved including the development of the Council's Carlisle and District Local Plan 2015-30. He thanked the Members and Officers for their comradeship during that time and wished everyone luck for the future.

(The meeting ended at 12:46pm)