



# EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

## DECISIONS MADE AT THE EXECUTIVE MEETING HELD ON 1 JUNE 2015

**Date of Publication: 3 JUNE 2015**

<b>CALL IN PERIOD ENDS 10 June 2015 at 1700</b>
---

### Notes:

- (a) Decisions may be called-in by the Chairman or any three Members of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (b) Requests to call -in must be delivered to the Committee Section (by phone, email or in writing) by the date and time specified.
- (c) In the absence of any call-in, decisions will take effect and can be implemented 5 working days after publication of these Decisions.
- (d) Decision marked \*\* may not be called-in as they were made under special urgency rules.

<b>Committee Section:</b>	<b>Email – <a href="mailto:CommitteeServices@carlisle.gov.uk">CommitteeServices@carlisle.gov.uk</a></b>
Morag Durham – Democratic Services Officer	01228 817036
Rachel Rooney – Democratic Services Officer	01228 817039
Sheila Norton – Committee Clerk	01228 817557

## **EXECUTIVE**

**MONDAY 1 JUNE 2015 AT 4.00 PM**

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor Glover (Leader / Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs Martlew (Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder)  
Councillor Mrs Bradley (Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder)  
Councillor Mrs Riddle (Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder)  
Councillor Dr Tickner (Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder)

### **OFFICERS:**

Chief Executive  
Deputy Chief Executive  
Director of Resources  
Director of Governance  
Director of Economic Development  
Director of Local Environment

### **ALSO PRESENT:**

Councillor Burns (Chairman of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel)  
Councillor Ms Patrick (Chairman of the Audit Committee)

Councillors Allison and Nedved (Observers)

### **WELCOME**

The Leader welcomed all those present to what was the first meeting in the new Municipal Year.

### **APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Ms Quilter (Culture, Leisure and Young People Portfolio Holder).

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 2 March 2015 were signed by the Chairman as a true record of the meeting.

**EX.38/15      PROVISIONAL GENERAL FUND REVENUE OUTTURN 2014/15**  
(Key Decision – KD.04/15)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder presented report RD.07/15 summarising the provisional outturn for the 2014/15 General Fund Revenue Budget. He informed Members that the outturn position showed that the net underspend for Council services as at 31 March 2015, once committed expenditure totalling £671,600, transfers to provisions of £390,100 and £1,020,900 transfers to earmarked reserves were taken into account, was £1,434,744.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder stated that, as Members would recall, the Executive had in 2012 inherited a really difficult financial position. Although still challenging, through hard work the authority continued to deliver services. He emphasised that difficult decisions would require to be taken in the future.

The outturn showed that a robust budget strategy was now in place which enabled priorities, including the Old Fire Station, to be delivered. Officers were working really well and the current administration proving it could manage finances.

The table at Section 2.1 of the report showed that the Council's updated budget for 2014/15 was a total of £13,364,700. A summary of the expenditure for individual Directorates and an explanation of the significant variances in those budgets were provided. Also itemised were the budget headings which had achieved savings and provided increased income.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder highlighted some of the significant service expenditure and income variances set out at Section 3.2. He added that the reallocation of central departments' balances to service areas still had to be carried out, which explained many of the small balances held on some management and support service centres. That reallocation would be completed before the Statement of Accounts was prepared and had no impact on the overall out-turn position.

Members' attention was also drawn to the carry forward requests submitted by Directorates, details of which were set out at Appendix B to the report.

Turning to the use of reserves, the Portfolio Holder explained that details of the transfers into new/existing reserves and provisions requested as part of the outturn process were contained within Appendix B2 and summarised at Section 5.1.

The Executive was asked to consider for release £144,000 from the Repair and Renewals Reserve to fund Digital Information Services costs as detailed in the table at Section 5.2 and profiled as £48,000 in 2015/16, £48,000 in 2016/17 and £48,000 in 2017/18.

It was anticipated that there would be further Digital Information Services costs in relation to server and system upgrades in accordance with the IT Strategy which would require to

be funded from that reserve. Those would be subject to further reports to the Executive for approval following the competitive tendering exercise.

The level of Council reserves had been approved by Council in February 2015 and showed that there would be pressure on reserves from 2015/16 onwards if ambitious transformation savings were not delivered to plan. Due to the level of underspend identified within the report after all carry forward requests were approved and transfers to/from earmarked reserves, approximately £1,434,744 would be returned to the General Fund Reserve. That would replenish the usable revenue balances which were forecast to be below minimum requirements.

The Council's bad debt provision had been increased in respect of housing benefit overpayments, and reduced in respect of penalty charge notices and sundry debtors, and that had been allocated directly to the services. Further details could be found in Report RD.10/15 elsewhere on the Agenda.

Section 7 dealt with the Council's balance sheet, recording that 2014/15 was the second year of the Business Rate Retention Scheme and new Collection Fund Accounting Regulations, and the first year the Council had participated in the Cumbria Pooling arrangement.

At the time of writing the report the figures for Business rates were still being calculated. Accordingly, an Addendum had been circulated providing an update on the performance of the Business Rate Retention Scheme in 2014/15 and the final position of the Cumbria Business Rates Pool.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder summarised the background position (detailed in the Addendum). There were three elements to the 2014/15 outturn, namely the performance of the City Council's Business Rate Retention; the performance of the Pool; and the performance of the Collection Fund. Full details of each element were provided at Section 3 of the Addendum.

It was noted that Business Rates income had performed well in 2014/15 and had exceeded budgeted expectations by £300,000. The Council had achieved growth in Retained Business Rates income of £667,000 in 2014/15 and by participating in the Cumbria Pool had managed to retain £492,000.

The Collection Fund deficit for 2014/15 was £1,062,399 with the Council's share being £424,960 which would be recovered in 2016/17.

As at 31 March 2015 balances totalling £1,822,144 were held in respect of Section 106 agreements and other commuted sums, with a further £5,055,587 expected, relating to agreements for sites yet to be developed. Those sums were to be used for the provision and future maintenance of public open spaces, children's play areas, cycleways and transport facilities etc. The City Council acted as custodian only for £1,172,604 of the sums held, in respect of projects for which Cumbria County Council was responsible, including the Castle Way and Public Realm. Should the County Council not progress those projects, or they remained incomplete before the agreed deadlines, the custodial sums must be repaid along with a premium for interest to the Developers. Further details of the balances retained were set out in the table at Section 7.7 of the report.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder pointed out that the information contained within the report was provisional and subject to the formal audit process.

In conclusion, the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder formally moved the recommendations, including those set out in the Addendum to the report, which were duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

- (i) Noted the net underspend as at 31 March 2015 of £1,434,744 after carry forwards as set out in (ii) below, net transfers to/from earmarked reserves as noted in (iii) below, and transfers to provisions as noted in (iv) below;
- (ii) Noted the committed expenditure totalling £671,600 to be met in 2015/16 to 2017/18 which had been approved by the Director of Resources under delegated powers, and the release of £645,600 in 2015/16, £13,000 in 2016/17 and £13,000 in 2017/18 from the General Fund Reserve, for recommendation to Council;
- (iii) Approved for recommendation to Council, the creation of new reserves and transfers into the new and existing reserves of £720,900 as detailed in paragraph 5.1 and Appendix B2 of the report;
- (iv) Approved for recommendation to Council the creation of a new provision and transfers into the new and an existing provision of £390,100 as detailed in paragraph 5.1 and Appendix B2 of the report;
- (v) Approved the release of £144,000 from the renewals reserve to fund Digital Information Services expenditure as detailed in paragraph 5.2;
- (vi) Noted the final outturn on Retained Business Rates with achieved growth of £666,958, the Council's share being £333,479;
- (vii) Noted that the benefit of participating in the Cumbria Business Rate Pool was £157,698;
- (viii) Recommended to Council that the Volatility Reserve be established as per recommendation (vi) of Report RD.07/15, and that £38,708 is added to the reserve in line with the Pooling agreement;
- (ix) Noted that the deficit on the Collection Fund for 2014/15 was £1,062,399, with the Council's share being £424,960;
- (x) Noted that the additional income generated of £300,143 over the budgeted funding position be returned to General Fund Reserve.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To receive the Report on the Provisional General Fund Revenue Outturn and make recommendations to the City Council

**EX.39/15      PROVISIONAL CAPITAL OUTTURN 2014/15 AND REVISED CAPITAL  
PROGRAMME 2015/16**  
(Key Decision – KD.04/15)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder presented report RD.08/15 summarising the Provisional Outturn for the Council's Capital Budget, together with details of the revised Capital Programme for 2015/16. He informed Members that the outturn showed that the net underspend for Council services as at 31 March 2015 once committed expenditure totalling £2,269,600 was taken into account was £416,945.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder set out the position with regard to carry forward requests on the Capital Programme. He also identified for Members the resources which had been used to fund the 2014/15 Capital Programme and detailed the 5 year Capital Programme for the period 2015/16 to 2019/20.

The programme for 2015/16 totalling £7,046,600 was based upon the programme as agreed by Council in February 2015 of £4,912,000, the commitments brought forward from 2014/15 of £2,269,600, less Asset Review Expenditure of £135,000 brought forward from 2015/16 to 2014/15.

The Executive was asked to recommend to Council an increase in the 2015/16 capital programme of £151,700 for new capital projects funded from revenue carry forwards as detailed in Appendix B1. The revised capital programme for 2015/16 would total £7,198,300.

The 2015/16 programme would be continually reviewed to ensure that the Council had the capacity to deliver that level of programme. The main challenge for future years was funding the vehicle replacement programme.

The proposed funding arrangements for the revised 2015/16 programme were also outlined within the report.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder pointed out that the information contained within the report was provisional and subject to the formal audit process. He then moved the recommendations, which were duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

**DECISION**

That the Executive:

- (i)     Noted the net underspend as at 31 March 2015 of £416,945 which included expenditure to be met totalling £2,269,600, which had been approved under delegated powers by the Director of Resources;
- (ii)    Made recommendations to Council on the increase of the 2015/16 capital programme of £151,700 funded from revenue carry forwards as detailed in paragraph 5 and Appendix B1 of the report;
- (iii)   Had considered the revised programme for 2015/16, together with the proposed methods of financing, as detailed at paragraph 5 and Appendix B, for recommendation to Council on 14 July 2015.



## Reasons for Decision

To receive the report on the Provisional Capital Outturn for 2014/15 and make recommendations to the City Council on the 2015/16 Capital Programme

### **EX.40/15      TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN 2014/15** (Key Decision – KD.04/15)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Resources

## Subject Matter

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder presented report RD.09/15 providing the annual report on Treasury Management, as required under both the Financial Procedure Rules and the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management. He also submitted the regular report on Treasury Transactions for the period 1 January 2015 to 31 March 2015. Members' attention was further drawn to developments in the Money Markets over the previous twelve months and their effect on the Council's investments, together with the various performance statistics included within the report.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted in particular that:

- The financial year began with bank base rate remaining at 0.50%, and that rate remained constant for the whole of 2014/15
- Investment income in 2014/15 at £280,000 was above the original estimate of £226,000
- At 31 March the investment in the CCLA Property Fund was yielding a return of 4.85%
- Dividends received since July 2014 to 31 March 2015 totalled £101,864
- The investment also grew in capital value since the investment was placed from £2,836,000 (after entry costs of £163,106) to £3,095,332 (an increase of £258,439). The decision to invest was therefore a good decision.

The City Council had only one substantial long term loan i.e. the £15m stock issue, which was likely to remain on the books for some time yet as the cost of making a premature repayment would be very prohibitive in the present climate, particularly with interest rates being at such depressed levels. There were no plans to undertake any prudential or other borrowing in the current financial year, however the Medium Term Financial Plan did anticipate external borrowing to fund leisure facilities in 2018/19, but that would be further assessed during future planning of the MTFP. The focus of the authority's treasury management activities therefore remained very much on the investment aspect of the function.

Investment conditions were very similar to 2013/14. Although the effect on the City Council's investment interest was slightly down on the previous year, the performance achieved was significantly better than bank base rate levels. For the authority, as indeed for most others, the reduction in investment income posed a very significant financial challenge. That had been alleviated somewhat by the decision to invest in the CCLA property fund which had performed well since initial investment.

The outlook for interest rates in the UK remained uncertain but there was a general expectation that bank base rates would not start to rise again until well into 2016.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder then moved the recommendation, which was duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That Report RD.09/15 providing the Annual Report on Treasury Management be received and recommended to the City Council for approval.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To receive the annual report on Treasury Management

**EX.41/15      PROVISIONAL OUTTURN FOR COUNCIL TAX AND NATIONAL NON DOMESTIC RATES 2014/15**  
(Key Decision – KD.04/15)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Resources

## **Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder presented report RD.10/15 setting out the 2014/15 provisional outturn and performance position for Council Tax and National Non Domestic Rates.

He informed Members that the estimated outturn of 99% suggested that overall liability raised and Council Tax collected would exceed the budgeted projections of 98.5% due in the main to reduced losses on liability (if the collection pattern for recovering 2014/15 arrears followed that of previous years). The net impact of increased collection performance was an overall surplus on collection fund of £528,222, the City Council's share of the surplus being £68,266 (with £35,647 being distributed in 2015/16).

The Council had maintained collection performance so that for the fourth year running Carlisle was in the 3rd quartile when compared to districts nationally. Whilst that was the Council's joint second best ever collection performance, the Council would never be in a position to move into the higher collection quartiles for the reasons set out at Section 3.1 of the report.

2014/15 was the second year of the Business Rate Retention Scheme and new Collection Fund Accounting Regulations and the first year the Council had participated in the Cumbria Pooling arrangement.

The report recorded that the figures for Business rates were still being calculated at the time of writing. The Council budgeted for additional income of £500,000 and early estimates forecast that was unlikely to be achieved due to a high level of appeals being



submitted before 31 March in order to qualify from backdating of those appeals. Any shortfall on the budget would be a call on general fund reserves, and would reduce the amount returned to reserves as part of the revenue outturn report considered elsewhere on the agenda.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder drew Members' attention to the Addendum which provided an update on the performance of the Business Rates Retention Scheme in 2014/15 and the final position of the Cumbria Business Rates Pool, copies of which had been circulated for consideration. He also highlighted in turn each of the recommendations set out at Section 5.1 thereof.

As part of the Cumbria Business Rate Pooling arrangements, an element of all the growth achieved by the participants of the pool was used to establish a volatility reserve. That reserve allowed a cushion so that should any member suffer a loss in income, then the reserve ensured that they did not fall below the safety net level. Each member was required to show their share of the reserve on their balance sheets and as such a new earmarked reserve was to be established.

In accordance with the Director of Resources delegated authority for the write-off of outstanding debts, without limit, the Executive was asked to note that debts totalling £77,532.97 had been written off for the period 1 January 2015 to 31 March 2015; such bad debts were summarised for the Executive's information in Table 1 of the report. The total amount written off in 2014/15 of £585,015 (mainly due to Business Rates written off) compared to total write-offs in 2013/14 of £633,068

The write-ons itemised in Table 1 totalling £2,132.12 were in respect of balances originally written off that had since been paid and credit write-offs for the period 1 January 2015 to 31 March 2015. Also noted in Table 1 were the cumulative write offs and write-ons 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015. Total write-ons for 2014/15 were £67,961.53 compared to £31,373 in 2013/14.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder commented upon the authority's approach to debt recovery, namely to spread payments so that they were more affordable. That approach had contributed to what was an excellent recovery rate. He then moved the recommendations, which were duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

- (i) Noted the provisional outturn position at 31 March 2015 for Council Tax and National Non Domestic Rates; together with the position with regard to write offs and bad debt trends;
- (ii) Noted the final outturn on Retained Business Rates with achieved growth of £666,958, the Council's share being £333,479;
- (iii) Noted that the benefit of participating in the Cumbria Business Rate Pool was £157,698;

- (iv) Noted the recommendation to Council that the Volatility Reserve be established as per recommendation (vi) of Report RD.07/15, and that £38,708 be added to the reserve in line with the Pooling agreement;
- (v) Noted that the deficit on the Collection Fund for 2014/15 was £1,062,399, with the Council's share being £424,960;
- (vi) Noted that the additional income generated of £300,143 over the budgeted funding position be returned to General Fund Reserve.

### **Reasons for Decision**

To advise the Executive of Council Tax and Business Rates Collection Performance

**EX.42/15 ELECTED MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES – PROVISIONAL OUTTURN FOR 2014/15**  
(Key Decision – KD.04/15)

**Portfolio** Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel** Resources

### **Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder presented report RD.11/15 setting out the amount of allowances paid to Members as part of the Elected Members' Allowances Scheme for 2014/15. He informed Members that £343,301 had been paid in allowances to individual Members which represented an underspend of £9,099.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder then moved the recommendation, which was duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected** None

### **DECISION**

That Report RD.11/15 be received and the overall underspend of £9,099 on Elected Members' Allowances for 2014/15 be noted.

### **Reasons for Decision**

To receive details of the 2014/15 Provisional Outturn in respect of Members' Allowances

**EX.43/15 COMMUNITY TRIGGER**  
(Key Decision – KD.10/15)

**Portfolio** Communities, Health and Wellbeing

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel** Community

## **Subject Matter**

The Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder reported (SD.07/14) that the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 was aimed at focussing responses to anti-social behaviour (ASB) on the needs of the victim. The Act introduced a number of new tools and powers to replace existing provisions, including the introduction of anti-social behaviour case reviews, also known as the Community Trigger. The Trigger gave victims, or victims' representatives, a right to ask local agencies to review how they had responded to previous ASB complaints and consider what further action might be taken where the behaviour persisted. She added that the Community Trigger would sit alongside existing processes and practices for responding to ASB.

Cumbria Constabulary had conducted intensive research into the Community Trigger legislation and had, and would continue to provide local authorities with advice and support on the new process.

Members of the public would be able to request a Community Trigger via telephone, email, letter or online reporting form on the Councils website, as detailed in Appendix 1. The Community Development Officer would act as the single point of contact (SPOC) for Carlisle City Council, which was a new development under the Act.

On receipt of the trigger application, the SPOC would forward the request and associated information to the designated Officers for consideration. Those partners would then research the complaint and within 10 days reply back to the SPOC as to whether it met the trigger threshold or not. If it did meet the threshold then the identified partners would be required to convene and carry out a full review of the Trigger Complaint. If it did not meet the threshold, the reporting person would be informed of the decision and the rationale behind it.

Once all the information had been returned a review panel date would be set and all relevant partners and officers invited to attend. A process map and list of designated Officers and key representatives were attached as appendices to the report. The panel would be chaired by the Chair of the Community Safety Partnership. Following the review panel the SPOC would notify the reporting person of the outcome. If the reporting person was unhappy or disagreed with the review panel outcome they could request an appeal within a 10 day period.

All Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) around the County, including the Carlisle and Eden CSP, had worked together to develop a countywide approach to implement the new Community Trigger legislation.

The Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had, on 9 April 2015, considered the matter and resolved:

“1. That report SD.05/15 be noted.

2. That the Executive be requested to provide information to the Panel on any reports made under the legislation and any cases that continued to the end of the process.

3. That the Community Trigger be reported to the Panel as part of the performance measures.”

A copy of Minute Excerpt COSP.24/15 had been circulated.

The Chairman of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel was in attendance at the meeting. He informed the Executive that the Panel had received a presentation and several questions had been asked.

Concern had been raised as to how the Community Trigger would be publicised. In response the Panel was advised that the legislation would only be publicised online. Leeds, who were involved in the pilot, had spent a significant amount of money on advertising the legislation and they received only 35 requests only one of which met the threshold. They had advised that they would not advertise that way again. Other failsafe mechanisms were also in place to capture incidents.

The Chairman added that the Panel had asked that the Community Trigger be reported to them as part of the performance measures.

In conclusion the Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder moved the recommendations which were duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

1. Had considered the proposals for handling Community Trigger requests locally and approved the adoption of the countywide approach, as detailed in Report SD.07/15, to the arrangements about carrying out anti-social behaviour reviews by the relevant bodies pursuant to the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
2. Published the Review Procedures.
3. Appointed the Community Development Officer as Point of Contact at the Council (S103(4)) of the said Act.

## **Reasons for Decision**

It was recommended that Carlisle City Council's Executive consider the countywide approach for the new Community Trigger legislation and approve it on behalf of Carlisle City Council. That would bring Carlisle City Council in line with its legislative requirements and partners across the county

**EX.44/15      LOW COST HOME OWNERSHIP POLICY**  
(Key Decision – KD.11/15)

**Portfolio**      Economy, Enterprise and Housing

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Community

## **Subject Matter**

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder reported (ED.17/15) that the Council's Housing Team began managing a Low Cost Home Ownership Scheme over 15 years ago to help local people who had been priced out of the housing market. Properties were sold at a fixed percentage discount, with the owner passing on the discount upon each successive re-sale. For over 10 years properties provided through the scheme had been at a 30% discount from open market value; however, the older properties were at a 20% discount and a few of the earliest homes included in the scheme were at a 10% discount. The allocation of properties and the waiting list were managed using a bespoke Microsoft Access database but currently the Policy consisted of a double-sided leaflet.

The Portfolio Holder explained that the number of Low Cost Home Ownership Schemes had increased steadily over time, and the Council now managed 298 discounted sale properties (detailed in Appendix 1 of the draft policy) through its Low Cost Home Ownership Register, with many more currently in the pipeline, including 143 on schemes already on site or with planning permission approved.

Those affordable homes had been funded by substantial levels of planning obligation contributions, through Section 106 Agreements, with the cost borne by the landowner and developer. Yet despite the significant level of equity invested in the Scheme the Council had never had a detailed Low Cost Home Ownership Policy.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that the new policy sought to give increased priority to households in the greatest housing need for a particular property type. Low Cost Home Ownership properties were currently allocated to qualifying persons, based solely on the date of application, without taking into account the needs of a particular household. She further outlined the key recommendations to make the Low Cost Home Ownership Policy fairer and add clarity as set out in sections 2.2 and 2.3 to the report.

In conclusion the Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder moved the recommendation which was duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive endorsed the Low Cost Home Ownership Policy and referred it to the 11 June 2015 meeting of the Community Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Despite the multi-million pound investment in discounted sale housing through planning obligations, yielding some 300 properties with many more in the pipeline, the Council currently had no detailed Low Cost Home Ownership policy. Endorsement of the policy would add clarity and provide a higher level of priority for those households with a greater housing need for particular property types

**EX.45/15 ASSET REVIEW BUSINESS PLAN – REFRESH OF DISPOSAL PROGRAMME 2015**

(Key Decision – KD.12/15)

**Portfolio** Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel** Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder submitted report GD.20/15 concerning the Asset Review Business Plan – Refresh of Disposal Programme 2015.

The Portfolio Holder outlined the background and current situation. He informed Members that the overall position in terms of disposals, acquisitions and the impact on the estate and rental income was as summarised in the table at Section 1.2 of the report. The Programme to date had exceeded target receipts for those assets sold to date and met the initial aspirations to support rental income generation, fund investment, economic development and operational property purchases and to support budget and efficiency savings (total target receipt - £7,825,500; total gross receipts - £9,576.335). The cost to date of realising sales including marketing, agency fees and ancillary disbursements amounted to circa £201,500 which at 2% of gross receipts was within budget targets.

A significant part of the Business Plan delivery, and the re-engineering of the Council's Portfolio, hinged on the release and disposal of the latent value in the Council's retail and residential assets at Morton. The residential asset transfer to the Church Commissioners and the acquisition of land from the Church Commissioners to increase the Council's employment offer had now completed.

However, the proposed disposal of the Council's retail asset to a supermarket developer had fallen through. As a result of the collapse of the retail food market the Council now needed to reconsider and refresh out proposals for that asset going forward.

The report recorded that the 2014 Disposals Programme Refresh highlighted 18 assets as having housing development potential through various potential delivery mechanisms. Following disposal on the open market of one of the sites, desktop and further detailed investigation of the remaining sites, and the adoption of the recommendations within the 2014 Disposals Refresh, 6 sites had been confirmed as having residential development potential with detailed investigations underway to ascertain the development potential of a further 3 sites. A plan identifying the location of those sites was attached at Appendix 4, with an outline of the current status of each of the sites shown in the schedule attached at Appendix 5.

The original Disposals Programme adopted in 2011 as a result of the Asset Management Business Plan Review was now nearing the end of its 4 year anticipated lifespan. As stated earlier, the Programme to date had exceeded target receipts and met the initial aspirations to support rental income generation, fund investment, economic development and operational property purchases and to support budget and efficiency savings. Further changes in 2014 to the content of the Programme supported proposals to bring forward a pipeline supply of future housing development sites.



Due to changing circumstances and emerging Council priorities, some of the original assets within the Disposal Programme could either no longer be brought forward for disposal or the disposal had stalled. It was therefore proposed to continue with the assets in the pipeline as outlined in Appendices 1 and 4 and to deal with the assets outlined in Appendix 2 on a stand alone basis as and when circumstances, opportunities, and the market allowed.

In conclusion the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder stated that the report was scheduled for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny and he would not therefore elaborate further at this time. He moved the recommendations which were seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

1.     Noted the current position and progress with the Disposals Programme as outlined in Report GD.20/15.
2.     Had considered the proposed changes to the Disposal Programme before passing the report to Overview and Scrutiny for comment.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To update Members as to the current position with the Disposals Programme, and to more effectively manage the Council's assets in line with the wider strategic and budgetary objectives, and to bring forward sales

**EX.46/15     CONTAMINATED LAND STRATEGY (Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy)**  
(Key Decision – KD.13/15)

**Portfolio**     Environment and Transport

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**     Environment and Economy

## **Subject Matter**

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder submitted report LE.04/15 presenting the revised 2015 Contaminated Land Strategy.

The Deputy Leader summarised the background position, commenting that the Strategy set out a plan for how Carlisle City Council would approach land contamination, including the adoption of a Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy. The Strategy ensured a rational, ordered, timely, efficient and consistent approach to dealing with potentially contaminated sites. It was also a point of reference for developers and land owners.

The Deputy Leader stated that the report contained some very interesting facts and congratulated Officers on its presentation. She further expressed the hope that Members would take the opportunity to read it thoroughly.

The draft Strategy proposed the following priorities for Carlisle City Council:

- a. To ensure that investigations were concentrated on areas of land where it had been identified there existed the greatest risk of a contaminant linkage (contaminant, pathway, receptor) being present.
- b. To determine whether any land identified as potentially contaminated land fell within the definition of a 'special site' and, if so, refer it to the Environment Agency (EA) as the enforcing authority for 'special sites'. A special site was one where the contamination was significantly affecting a water body.
- c. To ensure that all new development was appropriate for its location and potential land contamination issues were considered in strategic planning and development control decisions.
- d. To encourage, where practicable, redevelopment of brown field sites within Carlisle City Council's area.
- e. To ensure that procedures were in place for the open provision of information to the public, developers and any other interested parties.
- f. To prevent, as far as was reasonably practicable, any further contamination of land within the city, including land owned or leased by Carlisle City Council.
- g. To encourage voluntary remediation of contaminated land, either through Part 2A or the planning system. To date two sites had been determined as contaminated and had been voluntarily remediated.
- h. The Council would seek to recover all costs associated with the remediation of contaminated land, subject to decisions of the Hardship Panel detailed in Section 18 of the Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy.

The Deputy Leader further advised that the Council was required to have in place a Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy. She added that the constitution of the Hardship Panel should reflect both the legal and financial obligations on the Council. Adoption of the Contaminated Land Strategy 2015 and the associated Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy would assist the Council should it need to apply for Government funding in the future to remediate determined Contaminated Land.

In conclusion the Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder moved the recommendations.

The Leader seconded the recommendations.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

1. That the Executive had considered:
  - The priorities of the Contaminated Land Strategy 2015 outlined in section 2.3 of Report LE.04/15.
  - The constitution of the Hardship Panel outlined in the Cost Recovery and Hardship Policy (Appendix 1 Page 59) contained within the attached Contaminated Land Strategy 2015.

2. Referred the Strategy to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

### **Reasons for Decision**

To present the revised 2015 Contaminated Land Strategy for consideration

### **EX.47/15 FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE PLAN** (Key Decision – KD.14/15)

**Portfolio** Environment and Transport

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel** Community

### **Subject Matter**

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder presented report LE.06/15 concerning the Food Law Enforcement Service Plan (Appendix 1), which set out how the Environmental Health Service would deploy its resources in 2015 to 2016 to improve hygiene standards, prevent food borne diseases and help people live healthier lives.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder explained that the Food Law Enforcement Policy set out how the Environmental Health Service would protect food safety in Carlisle during 2015 to 2016. The Policy sought to direct resources into achieving the priority outcomes for regulatory services as detailed in the Better Regulation Delivery Office document “Priority Regulatory Outcomes – A New Approach to Refreshing the National Enforcement Priorities for Local Authority Regulatory Services” (November 2011).

She added that, as Members would recall, the Food Law Enforcement Policy (Appendix 2) outlined the decision process Environmental Health Officers would go through when breaches of Food Safety Legislation were found. The Policy was written with regard to the Food Standard Agency’s Framework Agreement with local authorities and the Enforcement Concordant and the Regulators Code. Following the introduction of the new Regulators Code (2014) and the revised Food Law Code of Practice (England) 2015, the Enforcement Policy had been reviewed and amended. The amendments made related to a change in definitions and no changes had been necessary to the Enforcement Policy decision making criteria.

In improving food standards the Environmental Health Service was contributing towards ensuring a safe, healthy and sustainable food chain for the benefit of consumers. Service Plans were an important part of the process to ensure that national priorities and standards were addressed and delivered locally.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder informed Members that, although the Food Standards Agency’s Food Law Codes of Practice detailed national food policy, they did afford local authorities flexibility in terms of how to deliver the national food controls. She added that the Plan set out how and at what level official food controls would be provided in accordance with the Codes of Practice.

The Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Controls by Local Authorities (2010) set out what the Food Standard Agency (FSA) expected from Carlisle City Council in delivering official controls on feed and food law. In 2012 the FSA had carried out a review on the delivery of “Official Controls for Food Safety” concluding that, although under pressure, the local authorities were able to deliver a food safety service. The FSA Board confirmed the strategic importance of the delivery of official controls and the relationship between the FSA and local authorities.

To help ensure local transparency and accountability, and to show the Service’s contribution to the authority’s Carlisle Plan, the Framework Agreement recommended that food service plans were approved at the relevant level established for that local authority. The Food Law Enforcement Plan was included within the Council’s Policy Framework at Article 4 of the Constitution.

The Plan covered the period 1 April 2015 to the 31 March 2016 and included targeted educational and promotional work undertaken by the Section along with the required food premise inspections.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder also took the opportunity to commend members of staff for their excellent work in the past. That work integrated well with the Healthy City objectives.

In conclusion the Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder requested that the Executive agree the recommendations as detailed in the report, which course of action was seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

1. Agreed the key actions of the Food Law Enforcement Plan and Food Enforcement Plan.
2. Referred the said Plans to Council for approval in accordance with the Council’s Budget and Policy Framework.

## **Reasons for Decision**

The recommended key actions had been identified following consultation and reflected the resources available to the Environmental Health Service in the financial year 2015 to 2016

**EX.48/15      CAPITAL RELEASE FOR S.106 CRINDLEDYKE CYCLEWAY**  
(Key Decision – KD.15/15)

**Portfolio**      Environment and Transport

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Environment and Economy

## Subject Matter

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder reported (LE.10/15) that the City Council had in 2012 received £281,000 from Story Homes under a S106 planning obligation agreement in relation to the new Crindledyke development, for the construction of a cycleway between Kingmoor and the City Centre. The agreement specified that the route should follow the Connect 2 Kingmoor – Caldew Cycleway proposals between Kingmoor and the City Centre

The Connect 2 Kingmoor – Caldew cycle scheme was a £4m project initiated in 2008 to try and improve the cycle links between the south and north of Carlisle. The scheme delivered many improvements, particularly along the southern sections, but when Sustrans removed funding in 2011 the project as a whole stalled.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder explained that it was proposed to use the S106 planning obligation funding from the Crindledyke development to create non-traffic cycle paths through City Council land by:

- Improving the existing non-tarmac “green” routes through Kingmoor Nature Reserve to make them suitable for dual use (Cycle and pedestrian traffic) whilst being sensitive to the nature of the site. The City Council would retain the maintenance.
- Upgrading existing adopted footpaths to dual use or building new “adoptable” standard dual use tarmac paths in the open spaces in Belah.
- Providing signage throughout the route and linking the routes.

She added that consultation had been undertaken with Cumbria County Council; Ward Councillors; and Cycle Carlisle.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder then moved the recommendation which was seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## DECISION

That the Executive approved the release of £281,000 from the S106 monies received from Story Homes in respect of the Crindledyke development for the construction of traffic free “green” cycle paths between Kingmoor and Carlisle city centre.

## Reasons for Decision

The Section 106 contribution accompanying the Crindledyke development must be expended by 2017 and the scheme was specified in the planning obligation agreement signed in 2011. If the scheme did not go ahead then the funds would be returned to the developer

**EX.49/15      LAND TRANSACTION – DISPOSAL OF LAND AT PORTLAND SQUARE, CARLISLE**  
(Key Decision – KD.17/15)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder reported (GD.26/15) that Cumbria County Council had proposals to restore, convert and dispose of their largely vacant office accommodation in Portland Square and Alfred Street North.

Members' attention was drawn to Section 1 to the report which set out the background position, including information on Portland Square Gardens; the Cumbria County Council Property and Scheme; Highway and Parking Issues; Stopping-up principles; Repair and Restoration of the Gardens; together with the Asset Management Plan and Statutory Considerations.

The Portfolio Holder advised that, in order to assist facilitate the County's regeneration scheme for Portland Square and improve the prospects of financial viability, the City Council had been asked to transfer its interest in the highway land at either end of the Square, shown edged black and cross hatched on the Plan Appendix 1, to the County Council. That was subject to the County Council first obtaining any Planning and Listed Building Consent for the scheme, and stopping up the highway with an Order under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act, and secondly completing works to the gardens.

He added that, in exchange for the transfer of the City's land for use by the County for parking and access in connection with the Portland Square development and regeneration proposals, it had been provisionally agreed by way of consideration in lieu of a cash receipt that the County Council would undertake works to the City's garden in accordance with an agreed specification and schedule of works. At this stage the precise detail around the works had yet to be finalised, but preliminary estimates based on survey findings indicated the costs of repairs to be in the order of £100,000 to £120,000.

It was proposed to transfer the Council's interest in the highway land to the County Council by way of a leasehold interest at a peppercorn rent. The City Council would retain the freehold interest. That would be undertaken by initially granting the County Council a Licence to undertake the prescribed works to the gardens, and an Agreement for Lease setting out all the proposed leasing terms and conditions. Once the works to the gardens had been satisfactorily completed the Lease would be granted to the County Council.

The full terms and conditions which had been provisionally agreed for the grant of a licence and lease to the County Council were set out in detail within Appendix 2 to the report. Basically the City Council would grant the County Council a lease of the highway land for 250 years, for use only as private access and parking, in consideration for the works undertaken to the Portland Square gardens. Other normal standard commercial leasing conditions would apply and the County Council would make a contribution to the City's surveyor's fees and legal costs. The receipt of works to the gardens, in lieu of financial consideration, represented best consideration to the Council for the leasehold land transfer.

In conclusion the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder moved the recommendation which was seconded by the Leader.



**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

Subject to any necessary Planning and Highway consents, and the undertaking of agreed works of repair and renovation to Portland Square gardens, the Executive consented to the grant of a lease of land at Portland Square to Cumbria County Council, on terms and conditions recommended for approval by the Property Services Manager.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Subject to any necessary planning and highway consents, and the delivery of an agreed scheme of works to restore and repair the gardens at Portland Square, the City Council should contribute its leasehold land to the County Council, on appropriate terms and conditions, to assist with the delivery of the wider scheme to bring back redundant buildings for future use. The project would have mutual benefits for both public authorities and the City with the creation of employment and housing opportunities, and the improvement to the recreational and leisure experience in the gardens

## **EX.50/15      NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE KEY DECISIONS** (Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Cross-Cutting

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Community; Environment and  
Economy; and Resources

## **Subject Matter**

The Notice of Executive Key Decisions dated 1 May 2015 was submitted for information.

KD.17/15 – The Director of Governance’s report concerning the Disposal of Land at Portland Square, Carlisle (GD.26/15) was considered in public session only.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That, subject to the above, the Notice of Executive Key Decisions dated 1 May 2015 be noted.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable

## **EX.51/15      SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS** (Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Economy, Enterprise and Housing; and Environment and Transport

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Community; and Environment and  
Economy

**Subject Matter**

Details of decisions taken by Portfolio Holders under delegated powers were submitted.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

**DECISION**

That the decisions, attached as Appendix A, be noted.

**Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable

**EX.52/15      SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY OFFICERS**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Cross-cutting

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Community; Environment and Economy;  
and Resources

**Subject Matter**

Details of decisions taken by Officers under delegated powers were submitted.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

**DECISION**

That the decisions, attached as Appendix B, be noted.

**Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable

**EX.53/15      JOINT MANAGEMENT TEAM**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Various

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Community; Environment and  
Economy; and Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Management Team held on 2 March 2015 were submitted for information.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Management Team held on 2 March 2015, attached as Appendix C, be received.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable

**EX.54/15      TRIPARTITE MEETING**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Cross-Cutting

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Community; Environment and Economy;  
and Resources

## **Subject Matter**

The Minutes of the Tripartite Meeting between the County Council Local Committee for Carlisle, Carlisle City Council and Carlisle Parish Councils held on 9 March 2015 were submitted for information.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Minutes of the Tripartite Meeting held on 9 March 2015, attached as Appendix D, be received.

## **Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable

**EX.55/15      ANTI BRIBERY POLICY**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**      Resources

## **Subject Matter**

Pursuant to Minute AUC.33/15, the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder submitted report RD.04/15 providing Members with an Anti Bribery Policy which had been prepared in order to strengthen existing counter fraud and corruption measures, and to meet the requirement of the Bribery Act 2010.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder explained that the Bribery Act had come into effect on 1 July 2011 with the aim of reducing levels of corruption across the UK.

The Act generally defined bribery as giving someone a financial or other advantage to encourage that person to perform their functions or activities improperly or to reward a person for already having done so. The Act introduced four key offences: bribery of another person; accepting a bribe; bribing a foreign public official; and failure of an organisation to prevent bribery.

The Council already had in place procedures to prevent bribery and corruption and to regulate employee behaviour, including the Counter Fraud and Corruption Policy, the Code of Conduct for Council Employees and Gifts and Hospitality Rules.

Statutory guidance on bribery prevention measures had, however, been published and that had informed the new Policy. It was therefore recommended practice to adopt an Anti Bribery Policy to ensure compliance with the Act. Training on the requirements of the Bribery Act would form part of the Council's Ethical Governance programme.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee was in attendance at the meeting.

The Chairman informed the Executive that the draft Policy had come before the Audit Committee on 13 April 2015 for consideration, following which some minor changes were made. It was suggested that all staff and Members be made fully aware. She added that the Audit Committee was happy with what was a good and comprehensive Policy, designed to complement the other policies in that area.

In conclusion, the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder requested that every effort be made to ensure that all staff were fully aware of the Anti Bribery Policy. He then moved the recommendation which was seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive approved the Anti Bribery Policy for formal adoption by the City Council.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To seek adoption of the Anti Bribery Policy

**EX.56/15      2014/15 THIRD QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**      Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Community; Environment and Economy;  
and Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder submitted report PC.02/15 updating the Executive on the Council's service standards that helped measure performance and key actions contained with the Carlisle Plan.

The Portfolio Holder explained that details of each service standard had been set out in the table at Section 1 of the report. The table illustrated the cumulative year to date figure, a month by month breakdown of performance and, where possible, an actual service standard baseline that had been established either locally or nationally. The updates against the actions in the Carlisle Plan followed on from the service standard information in Section 2.

In conclusion, the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder moved the recommendation which was duly seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected**    None

**DECISION**

That the Executive had considered the performance of the City Council presented in Report PC.02/15 with a view to seeking continuous improvement in how the Council delivered its priorities.

**Reasons for Decision**

The purpose of the report was to highlight the third quarter performance of the City Council, acknowledge the key successes of the year so far and identify areas for improvement.

**EX.57/15    REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES**  
(Non Key Decision)

**Portfolio**    All areas

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Community; Environment and Economy;  
and Resources

**Subject Matter**

The Leader submitted report GD.36/15 seeking the nomination of Members to serve on various outside bodies.

Appendix A to the report set out details of those bodies to which the Executive was responsible for making appointments.

The Leader highlighted the following organisations to which appointments were made last year, and which had informed the Council that they no longer met and/or no further representation was required:

- Carlisle Leisure Board - had now merged with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL)
- Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Board – had been re-constituted and the Districts were now represented by a single representative nominated by the District Leaders' Board. For 2015/16 that would be himself.

A new Cumbria Public Health Alliance had been created to feed into the Health and Wellbeing Board which did have representation from each District. Representatives for Carlisle would be Councillor Mrs Riddle, with Councillor Ms Quilter as substitute.

- Hadrian's Wall Management Committee – was now more operational in nature and the City Council had Officer representation thereon.

The Leader stated that up to 9 representatives were invited for the Brampton and Beyond Community Trust Advisory Council (i.e. Councillor Layden plus up to eight further nominees). He added that if relevant Ward Members wished they could be so nominated.

The Deputy Leader, and Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder seconded the recommendations which were duly agreed.

**Summary of options rejected** None

## DECISION

1. That the City Council's representatives on the following outside bodies be as indicated:

Outside Body	Representation
Belah Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Ellis, Morton and Mrs Vasey
Botcherby Community Centre Management Committee	Councillor Scarborough
Brampton and Beyond Community Trust Advisory Council	Councillor Layden plus up to eight further nominees
Carlisle and District Citizens' Advice Bureau Trustee Management Committee	Councillors Earp and Wilson
Carlisle and Eden Community Safety Partnership Leadership Group	Councillor Mrs Riddle Councillor Mrs Stevenson (as substitute)
Carlisle Educational Charity	No nominations required
Carlisle Highways and Transport Working Group	Councillors Mrs Martlew and Tickner Councillor Mrs Stevenson (as substitute)



Carlisle Partnership Executive	Councillors Glover, J Mallinson, Mrs Martlew and Mrs Riddle
Carlisle Sports Council	Councillor Cape
Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Councillor Dodd
Cumbria Equality Champions' Group	Councillor Tickner
Cumbria Public Health Alliance	Councillor Mrs Riddle Councillor Ms Quilter (as substitute)
Cumbria Health Scrutiny Committee	Councillor Burns Councillor Watson (as substitute)
Cumbria Leadership Board	Councillor Glover Councillor Martlew (as substitute)
Cumbria Planning Group	Councillor Mrs Bradley
Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership	Councillor Mrs Martlew Councillor Stothard (as substitute)
Currock Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Mrs Bradley, Glover and Harid
Denton Holme Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors C Southward, McDevitt and Mrs Southward
Divisional Board of Riverside Carlisle	Councillors Bainbridge (since 2012), Caig (since 2014), Ms Franklin (since 2014) and Layden (since 2008)
The District Council's Network Assembly	Councillor Glover Councillor Mrs Martlew (as substitute)
Downagate Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Graham and Mrs Parsons
Greystone Community Association	Councillor Ms Quilter
Harraby Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Burns, Miss Sherriff and Ms Williams
Local Authority World Heritage Forum	Councillor Ms Quilter Councillor Dodd (as substitute)
Local Government Association – General Assembly	Councillor Glover Councillor Mrs Martlew (as substitute)

Local Government Information Unit	Councillor Tickner
Longtown Community Centre Management Committee	Councillor J Mallinson
Mary Hannah Almshouses	No nominations required
Morton Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Bell, Mrs Stevenson and Stothard
National Association of Councillors – English Region	Councillor Mrs Riddle
National Association of Councillors	Councillor Mrs Riddle
North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership	Councillor Scarborough
North West Local Authorities Employers Organisation	Councillor Glover Councillor Tickner (as substitute)
North West Regional Housing Forum	Councillor Mrs Bradley
PATROL (Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London) Adjudication Joint Committee Services	Councillor Mrs Martlew Councillor Bell (as substitute)
Petteril Bank Community Centre Management Committee	Councillors Cape, Mrs Warwick and Wilson
Settle – Carlisle Railway Development Company	Councillor Scarborough
Solway Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint Advisory Committee	Councillor Tickner
Solway Firth Partnership Board	Councillor Tickner
Stanwix Community Association	Councillor Nedved
Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board	Councillors Tickner and J Mallinson
West Coast Rail 250	Councillor Mrs Martlew
Yewdale Community Centre Committee	Councillors Mrs Atkinson, Bowditch and Dodd

2. That the position regarding those organisations for which appointments were no longer required be noted.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To make appointments to Outside Bodes for 2015/16

## **PUBLIC AND PRESS**

**RESOLVED** – That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Public and Press were excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraph number (as indicated in brackets against the minute) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

### **EX.58/15 ASSET REVIEW BUSINESS PLAN – REFRESH OF DISPOSALS PROGRAMME 2015**

(Key Decision – KD.12/15)

(Public and Press excluded by virtue of Paragraph 3)

**Portfolio** Finance, Governance and Resources

**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel** Resources

### **Subject Matter**

Further to report GD.20/15 considered earlier in the meeting (Minute EX.45/15), the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder submitted private report GD.20/15 concerning the Asset Review Business Plan – Refresh of Disposal Programme 2015.

The Portfolio Holder indicated that the report was scheduled for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny and he would not therefore elaborate further at this time.

In conclusion the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder moved the recommendations which were seconded by the Leader.

**Summary of options rejected** None

## **DECISION**

That the Executive:

1. Noted the current position and progress with the Disposals Programme as outlined in Report GD.20/15.
2. Had considered the proposed changes to the Disposal Programme before passing the report to Overview and Scrutiny for comment.

## **Reasons for Decision**

To update Members as to the current position with the Disposals Programme, and to more effectively manage the Council's assets in line with the wider strategic and budgetary objectives, and to bring forward sales

[The meeting ended at 4.40 pm)