

BUSINESS AND TRANSFORMATION SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 22 MARCH 2018 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Riddle (Chairman), Councillors Allison, Birks, Mrs Bowman, Mrs Glendinning, Mallinson J, Mrs Mckerrell (as substitute for Councillor Robson) and Watson.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Southward – Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder (until 10.35am)
Councillor Dr Tickner – Deputy Leader, and Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder (until 11.11am)
Mr David Campbell representative of WYG
Mr David Burgess representative of WYG

OFFICERS: Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Deputy Chief Executive
Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services
Regulatory Services Manager
Deputy Chief Finance Officer
Contracts and Community Services Manager
Strategic Asset Investment Services Manager
Policy and Communications Manager

BTSP.21/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Robson.

BTSP.22/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were submitted.

BTSP.23/18 PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

BRSP.24/18 AGENDA

RESOLVED – That agenda items A.6 and B.1 (Civic Centre Ground Floor Flood Reinstatement) would be taken after agenda item A.1 to allow for the Portfolio Holder to be present for the scrutiny of the agenda items.

BTSP.25/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED – To note that Council, on 6 March 2018, received and adopted the minutes of the meeting held on 4 January 2018 and the minutes of the Joint meeting of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel and the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel held on 29 January 2018. The minutes were signed by the Chairman.

BTSP.26/18 CALL - IN OF DECISIONS

Councillor Bainbridge, Mrs Bowman and J Mallinson had called-in for scrutiny Portfolio Holder Decision PF.001/18 – Closure of Carlisle City Council Car Parks which had been taken by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder. (PF.001/18 had been circulated with the agenda document pack).

The reasons given for the call-in were:

Review the Decision both in respect of the Decision itself and circumstances surrounding the date of the Decision. The publication of the Decision Notice and the variance between the Decision as originally enacted and the Decision Notice itself.

The Chairman then outlined the Panel's options for dealing with the Call-in as detailed on the agenda.

Councillor Mallinson detailed the reasons for the Call-in explaining that there had been a number of issues which had arisen from the Portfolio Holder Decision. He informed the Panel that the regulations stated that a decision notice should be produced 'as soon as reasonably practicable' and the Call-in Members had felt that the decision notice had been produced out with the suggested timescales.

Councillor Mallinson reported that he had visited the car parks in question and had noted that that there were new gates on the car park and he asked when the decision had been made to erect the gates and lock them. The decision notice had only been produced when the proposed closure times had been changed. The gates had been locked yet there had not been a decision taken to close them.

In response to the Call-in the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder detailed the history to the decision to close the three car parks in the evening. He explained that the matter of anti-social behaviour in city car parks had been a persistent problem. The suggestion to close the car parks at night had come through the Multi Agency Hub. The Portfolio Holder informed the Panel that he had understood at that time that the decision was an officer decision which he had fully supported.

There had been a press release regarding the closures and the Portfolio Holder had made assurances that the closures would be reviewed to find a final solution. A number of letters had been received as a result of the closure, most of the letters raised issues with the closure time for West Walls car park and the problems an eight o'clock closure may cause for events in nearby venues. The Portfolio Holder had considered the responses and the proposed closing time of West Walls had been changed to 11.00pm.

Councillor Mrs Bowman clarified that the reason for the call-in had been because a decision had been taken to close three of the Council's car parks without going through the proper Council process. She asked who had been responsible for the decision and when the decision had been made as the decision notice had been prepared on 1 March 2018.

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder confirmed that he had made the decision to change the car park closing times and he had thought the decision was an officer decision in response to a Multi Agency Hub request.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive stated that he had been aware of the decision and had been confident with it; he reiterated that the suggestion had come from the Multi Agency Hub. The decision making process was very clear and on this occasion there had been an error. He added that in retrospect the decision notice should have been handled differently, a mistake had been made and officers and Members would learn from it and it would not happen again.

A Member supported recommendation c as set out on the agenda. She accepted the explanation from the Town Clerk and Chief Executive and felt that the decision was the correct decision for those living in the surrounding areas. Anti social behaviour in the car parks had been persistent and it had taken a number of years to reach the decision to close the car parks at night.

Councillor Mallinson responded that he had been surprised that the issues in car parks had caused such problems for residents and he questioned how many complaints regarding anti-social behaviour had been received and whether the number of complaints regarding the closure of the car parks outweighed the number of complaints.

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder clarified that there had been five pieces of correspondence received in response to the proposed closures and there had been far more complaints received regarding anti-social behaviour as the issue had been going on for a number of years. He added that he had received thank you letters from residents for closing the car parks at night.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder report to Council in January had reported on the barriers being fitted to help eliminate night time misuse along with adequate signs to explain the new procedures.

The Finance, Governance Resources Portfolio Holder clarified that the decision was not that of one officer acting alone, it had been a collective decision to reduce anti social behaviour in City Council owned car parks at the request of the Multi Agency Hub which the Council had been instrumental in establishing and supporting.

In addition Councillor Mallinson felt that the £45 fee to release any vehicles after the closure of the car park was unfair. He understood that occurrences happen which make people late and then they would have to pay to get their own property back.

A Member commented that the car park closure matter had been discussed at full Council and questioned how all Members did not know that there was a problem with anti-social behaviour in the car parks as it had been an issue for a number of years. With regard to the release fee he felt that people returning late to their car with excuses was a consistent problem faced daily by car park attendants.

It was proposed that the Panel not refer the matter back to the decision making body and following a vote it was:

RESOLVED – That Portfolio Holder Decision PF.001/18 – Closure of Carlisle City Council Car Parks not be referred back to the decision making body, in which case the decision shall take effect from the date of this meeting.

BTSP.27/18 CIVIC CENTRE – GROUND FLOOR FLOOD REINSTATEMENT

The Panel welcomed Mr Campbell and Mr Burgess, representatives of WYG to the meeting.

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report GD.21/18 which outlined the final proposals for the reinstatement of the Civic Centre.

The reinstatement included a new entrance, reception area and customer contact centre; a new Council chamber and conference facilities, open meeting space for Council staff and partners, additional storage space, office units for potential new partners, toilets and other ancillary accommodation. The redesign of the ground floor would seek to improve customers, partners, members and staff usage of the entire site. The work would resolve the current poor access arrangements to the Chamber by bringing that facility to ground floor level. The work would also follow good practise on design for physical access, dementia, sight and hearing loss across the property.

The report also finalised proposals for an extension to the Civic Centre public car park. The Deputy Chief Executive reported that since the initial design work had taken place Council officers had worked closely with WYG to review each element of the design on a room by room

basis and the work had resulted in a revised ground floor layout to better reflect the Council's needs. In addition the work had allowed options for resilience planning to be reconsidered and had identified more accurate costs for delivery.

Details of the building proposals in respect of the ground floor accommodation; further ground floor considerations; timescales; and partnership proposals were set out at Section 2 of the report.

Subject to Member approval of the proposals, the next steps would be:

- Final approval of budget
- Undertaking a tender process
- Resolution of any planning issues
- Award to the contract
- Completion of the build process

The Executive had considered the report on 12 February 2018 (EX.17/18 refers) and resolved:

"That the Executive:

1. Had reviewed the final layout and design proposals contained within Report GD.11/18, both for the ground floor reinstatement and the other plans for the entire site.
2. Had reviewed the final arrangements for funding the development, using the Council's insurance settlement, capital programme and the proposed 'invest to save' initiative as included within private Report GD.11/18.
3. Approved the acceptance of the insurer's offer in full and final settlement of the insurance claim.
4. Sought the views of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel (22 March 2018) before finalising recommendations to full Council (24 April 2018)"

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder commented that he was excited by the design and the level of detail within the report. All Members were aware of the issues in the Council Chamber and the proposed design resolved the issues and made the Chamber accessible to all users. He added that a key area of the plans had been the inclusion of development for partnerships to enable the Civic Centre to become a one stop shop and to future proof the building.

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

- A Member highlighted the existing meetings which were held off site that could utilise the new Chamber resulting in lower costs. She asked how many attendees were present at each of the listed meetings, how often they met and if they needed such a large space to meet. In addition she asked how many conferences were held within the City and who would use this type of facility.

The Deputy Chief Executive clarified that the proposal was to use the space in a multi functional way to make better use of the space. He added that the Carlisle Partnership and the Carlisle Ambassadors meetings were in excess of 150 people and the space would be useful for meetings such as Management Briefings due to the proposed audio/visual equipment.

He explained that none of the proposed uses for the meeting space were expected to generate significant income rather they were examples of how the space could be used. He clarified that the decision to use the space in such a manner had not been predicated on the potential income generation. The design had been prepared so that the space could be used for more than Council and Development Control Committee meetings.

- A Member felt strongly that, although he agreed that the notion of a new Council Chamber was not a bad idea given all of the issues, the idea of placing it on the ground floor was. He

questioned the size of the space and potential use as there were no catering facilities to support it. The size of the Chamber was quite large for Council especially given the proposed reduction in Councillors and he asked if any consideration had been given to putting the Council Chamber on a different floor in the Civic Centre tower. He felt that deliberately spending money on the ground floor was a mistake when it was inevitable that there would be future flooding events. He questioned the time it would take to strip out the area and reinstate it if flooding did occur.

The Deputy Chief Executive reiterated that the report had been an opportunity to explain how the space could be used in a multi-functional way which would give life to the main body of the building. He agreed that there was concern regarding future flooding events and the Council had a Business Continuity Plan in place for such events. He added that future recovery of the reinstated ground floor would take months opposed to years due to the resilience built into the design.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive explained that the Council had as much understanding as possible on what the flood risk to the building was and this was how the risk was managed. The information available to the Council showed that future flooding events were high impact low probability events. The risks of future flood events were managed through good business continuity planning.

A Member requested that future reports included information on how quickly all of the demountable equipment from the ground floor could be removed should a flood event be predicted.

- Members asked that careful consideration be given to the acoustics, hearing loop, material used and lighting in the new Council Chamber and one Member felt that all the seating on one level would not be suitable.

The Deputy Chief Executive assured Members that that their concerns would be taken on board and that careful consideration was being given to the actual design of the Chamber and the materials used. The details would be finalised going into the tender/delivery stages. The Strategic Asset Investment Services Manager added that all aspects of the design would be considered and a specialist sound engineer would be engaged to ensure that the acoustics were right.

- There was concern that establishing the Civic Centre as a meeting/conference facility would be at the expense of local businesses who had already invested in providing those facilities.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel that the proposed design was not predicated on having a conference/meeting facility. This was an opportunity that arose from the design.

- A Member commented that she accepted that the Council Chamber was no longer fit for purpose but was concerned that the plan was to move it to the ground floor. She agreed with the principle to use the tower block but had concerns that many of the rooms on the ground floor would be void and questioned what plans were in place to reinstate the void areas.

The Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder responded that the financial options for the void areas were covered in the private part B section of the report.

- How would the provision of services from the Civic Centre be managed during construction?

The Strategic Asset Investment Services Manager responded that the development would be phased to allow the building to remain open and services to be delivered.

- What was the cost of building in flood resilience to the design?

Mr Campbell responded that the resilience cost had not been specifically identified at this point. He agreed to identify the cost and circulate it to Members.

The Deputy Chief Executive added that each part of the design had been reconsidered to identify less expensive methods of resilience, comparison work on the cost and benefits had been carried out and as a result some of the initial design had been altered.

- A Member reminded the Panel that the impact of future flooding events on Councillors was negligible compared to the impact on the provision of services for the public. It was important to remember that the priority for Members was the people of Carlisle.

The Deputy Chief Executive agreed and explained that the 2015 flood had demonstrated that customer services could be provided through pop up facilities, the proposed design would enhance this ability through improved technology. The design of the ground floor had taken into consideration the reduction in face to face enquiries and the requirement for more private one to one space. Residents of Carlisle were the number one priority and first purpose of the Council.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Panel had considered the proposals as details in report GD.21/18 and wanted the design to be flexible and resilient to future flooding events;

2) That information on the time it would take to remove all of the demountable equipment from the ground floor be provided;

3) That specific consideration be given to lighting, acoustics and furniture in the new meeting space and that further consideration be given to having all of the seats for the Council Chamber on one level;

4) That further reports on the design detail of the ground floor be submitted to the Panel at the appropriate time

5) That WYG provide the panel with the cost of building resilience into the design.

Councillor John Mallinson wanted it recorded that he did not support the proposals and his view was that they should be rejected and the project looked at afresh.

BTSP.28/18 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 3 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

BTSP.29/18 CIVIC CENTRE – GROUND FLOOR FLOOD REINSTATEMENT

The Deputy Chief Finance Officer presented private report GD.21/18 containing the commercially sensitive and financial aspects of the proposals for the reinstatement of the Civic Centre ground floor set out in the public part of the report.

The Deputy Chief Finance Officer provided an overview of the financing proposals including the final settlement offer by the insurers and proposals for any potential funding shortfalls.

The Executive had considered the matter on 12 February 2018 (EX.18/18 refers) and resolved:

“That the Executive:

1. Had reviewed the final layout and design proposals contained within Report GD.11/18, both for the ground floor reinstatement and the other plans for the entire site.

2. Had reviewed the final arrangements for funding the development, using the Council's insurance settlement, capital programme and the proposed 'invest to save' initiative as included in the Part B report.
3. Approved the acceptance of the insurer's offer in full and final settlement of the insurance claim.
4. Sought the views of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel (22 March 2018) before finalising recommendations to Full Council (24 April 2018)."

In response to questions from the Panel the Deputy Chief Finance Officer clarified what the final insurance settlement covered and details of the remainder monies. He explained the potential funding from the proposed changes to the car park and how the monies would be invested.

The Strategic Asset Investment Services Manager explained the detail of some of the refurbishment work costs and gave details of some of the resilience works which had been built into the design and the associated costs.

RESOLVED – That the Panel considered the proposed financing options as detailed in report GD.21/18 (part B) and requested that further reports be submitted to the Panel on the financial aspects of the design at the appropriate time.

BTSP.30/18 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Policy and Communications Manager presented report OS.07/18 providing an overview of matters relating to the work of the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel.

The Notice of Executive Key Decisions had been published on 9 February 2018. Two items fell within the remit of the Panel and both had been included in the Work Programme:

KD.34/17 – Civic Centre Ground Floor Reinstatement (on the agenda for this meeting)

Kd.01/18 – 2017/18 Provisional Outturn Reports – May meeting

The report included a table of the progress on resolutions from previous meetings, since the publication of the report resolution 12 had been completed and the response to resolution 7 would be circulated to Members.

The Panel's Work Programme had been attached as appendix 1 to the report for the Panel's consideration.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Key Decision items relevant to the Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel (OS.07/18) be noted.

2) That the discussion paper on the city centre redevelopment, which had been presented to SMT in November 2017, be circulated to Members of the Panel as a private and confidential document.

BTSP.31/18 DRAFT ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2017/18

The Policy and Communications Manager submitted the draft Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel sections for the scrutiny Annual Report 2017/18.

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

A Member commented that the two previous agenda items had been very important and the two relevant Portfolio Holders had been unable to stay for the duration of their items. In addition there was no other representative of the Executive in attendance for the rest of the agenda items. The Panel agreed that representatives of the Executive should be in attendance at all Scrutiny meetings and it was

RESOLVED – 1) That the draft Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel sections for the Scrutiny Annual report 2017/18 as attached to report OS.10/18 be agreed.

2) That Chairman of the Panel write to the Leader expressing the Panel's disappointment that Portfolio Holders were not able to stay for the scrutiny of their items and that no other representative of the Executive had been in attendance at the meeting.

BTSP.32/18 ACTION PLAN – DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT 2017 TO 2019

The Regulatory Services Manager submitted GD.18/18 which proposed a spending plan for the City Council's Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) allocations.

The Regulatory Services Manager reminded the Panel of the Council's mandatory obligation to provide a DFG to assist with adaptations to disabled persons' homes and was available to eligible applicants for certain works, subject to a test of the applicant's resources.

Historically the amount of money required for mandatory DFGs within the district exceeded the Government grants and contributions from the City Council. The City Council did not have the budget to take advantage of the discretionary opportunities to extend the use of the DFGs as permitted by the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) Order 2002. However, in 2016/17 the City Council's Government Grant was significantly increased and the Council was able to take advantage of the increased funding to extend the scope of DFG assistance by adopting new discretionary grants through the Housing Renewal Assistance Policy 2017.

The Regulatory Services Manager explained that, since 2016, DFG funding was allocated through the Better Care Fund. Guidance on how DFGs should operate within the Better Care Fund was also provided. He drew the panel's attention to Appendix 1 which proposed a plan for how the City Council's DFG allocations would be spent over the next two years. The Action Plan proposed mandatory and discretionary expenditure directly through the City Council and (by using the authority to jointly agree as provided in National Condition 1) proposing that some of the City Council's grant was passed to the County Council for mutually beneficial purposes such as additional occupational therapy support and Care Act contributions to support mandatory DFG grants.

Some flexibility had been left in the Plan to ensure that the Council was able to take advantage of project opportunities with partners, the Plan could be varied with the agreement of the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services and the Portfolio holder for Communities, Health and Wellbeing.

The Executive had considered the proposed plan on 17 January 2018 (EX.05/18 refers) and agreed:

"That the Executive:

1. Had considered and approved the proposed Disabled Facilities Grant Action Plan 2017-2019 at Appendix 1 to Report GD.08/18.
2. Delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Communities, Health and Wellbeing, to vary the proposed Action Plan should opportunities arise which were conducive to improved service delivery."

In considering the draft Plan Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member asked for further information regarding arrangements for loans as detailed within the report.

The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that the table included in the report reflected the outcome of a 2016 Foundations Audit of the DFG Process and Draft Housing Renewal and Assistance Policy. The Audit made the suggestion that the Renewal Policy could consider loans and non means testing for certain discretionary grants. As part of the review process for the Housing Renewal Assistance Policy the possibility of providing loans would be considered along with details of how they would be processed and administered.

- The report identified a risk regarding the financial proposals and stated that further clarity on the accounting treatment was required. Should the risk be included in the Corporate Risk Register and was there an update on the accounting treatment?

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that the risk had been acknowledged. He explained that the entitlement for the Council to take a fee came from the Housing Renewal Grant (Service and Charges) Order 1996. The fee which could be collected related to professional work undertaken not the administration of the DFGs. He added that there was a significant difference in the total spend for DFGs of £1,129,000 compared to the fees collected of £38,000.

- A Member commented that the DFG process had previously been very inflexible and he asked if the review of the Policy would incorporate some flexibility.

The Town Clerk and Chief executive reminded the Panel that Council had agreed a Housing Assistance Policy which gave the Council more flexibility with regard to the DFGs.

The Regulatory Services Manager circulated a graph which demonstrated DFG grant receipt against the Council's expenditure from 2012 to date. The graph showed that in 2012/13 the grant income was £200,000 less than the Authority's expenditure. In 2002 the Regulatory Reform Order (Housing Assistance) provided Local Authorities with the flexibility to use funding in a less prescriptive way. The City Council was unable to take advantage of the flexibility due to the high demand and overspend of the DFGs. The graph showed that current grant allocations were much higher than the Council's expenditure due to changes to funding through the Better Care Fund.

- A Member asked for an update on the review of previous mandatory grants. There was some concern that people who had previously applied would not know that they could reapply.

The Regulatory Services Manager confirmed that due to the increase in workload created by the increased applications for DFGs officers had not proactively contacted previous unsuccessful cases. A lot of promotional work had been undertaken through the occupational therapists and publicity through Carlisle Focus and other information sources encouraging applications.

- Clarity was sought with regard to the temporary Flood Grant Officer.

The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that the post holder had been employed to assist people in applying for the flood grants; the post had not been to support the process of administering the grants.

- How was the relationship between the City Council and County Council with regard to DFGs?

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that there had been some very positive work undertaken with the Occupational Therapists and some good ideas had been submitted for the

renewal of the Policy. Some work had been slow in being processed and there could be some improvements made to the relationship.

- There was concern that the average wait of 16 weeks to progress a referral was a long time for those who were in need and a Member asked if the proposal to use some of the grant to employ additional occupational therapy support would reduce the timescales.

The Regulatory Services Manager responded that the speed of the process was dependant on the type of adaptation being made. There was often some delay with Occupational Therapists as they had a duty to ensure that the adaptation was necessary and appropriate and the Council had a duty to ensure the adaptation was reasonable and practical. It was hoped that additional Occupational Therapy support would improve timescales and ease the process.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services took the opportunity to thank the Regulatory Services Manager and his team and the Finance team for all of the work they had carried out in helping to determine different ways to spend the grant money. The Panel endorsed the Corporate Director's comments.

The Regulatory Services Manager informed the Panel that the review of the Regulatory Reform Policy would come through the Council process including Scrutiny before it was adopted by full Council.

RESOVLED – 1) That the proposed Disabled Facilities Grant Action Plan 2017-2019 be approved (GD.18/18).

2) That the Panel thank the Regulatory Services Manager and his team and the Finance team for the work they have undertaken which supported the most vulnerable in the community.

BTSP.33/18 CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report CS.19/18 providing an update on the management of the Council's Corporate Risk Register.

The Deputy Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the Corporate Risk Management Group (CRMG) was responsible for delivering and reviewing the Risk Management Strategy, maintaining and improving risk management processes and monitoring and advising on the Council's Corporate Risk Register.

The review of the Risk Management Policy was underway and was being considered alongside work being led by internal audit which focused on the Council's approach to assurance.

The Deputy Chief Executive informed the Panel that the Corporate Risk Register was last reviewed on 9 March and now reflected the most update version of the Carlisle Plan and had taken into account the preparations for the forthcoming 2018/19 budget and Medium Term Financial Plan. The CRMG had recommended that three risks be removed from the register:

- Failure to play a leading role in developing the key industrial sectors within the functional economic area and these did not develop to assist in the growth of the local economy.
- Failure to influence the delivery of an adequate supply and mix of homes to meet local need and to support population growth and step change in Carlisle's demographics.
- Failure to play a leading role in determining the current and future skills required to sustain and grow the local economy and create higher value jobs.

The CRMG believed that the Council had sufficient arrangements in place to ensure that the Council play an appropriate role in mitigating the above risks to Carlisle and its wider economic functional area. The arrangements included the development of a new Economic Strategy,

production of a new Housing Strategy, leading contributions to the Borderlands Project and the implementation of the Local Plan and its associated policies.

In considering the Corporate Risk register Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Was it sensible to remove risks from the register when the Council did not have a Housing Strategy, Economic Strategy or Regeneration Strategy in place?

The Deputy Chief Executive responded that the draft Economic Strategy had been presented to the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel. The other two Strategies were due to go through the same process.

- The risk register did not include any flood risk, why was this?

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive explained that the Corporate Risk Register included risks which required some action to take the risk from where it was to where the Council wanted it to be. In terms of the flood the Council had taken the necessary actions by producing a Business Continuity Plan and an Emergency Plan.

The Panel asked that the Business Continuity Plan be added to their 2018/19 Work Programme along with some training on the matter.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Corporate Risk Register be welcomed (CS.19/18).

2) That then Business Continuity Plan be added to the Panel's 2018/19 Work Programme along with some training on the matter.

BTSP.34/18 CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

The Chairman thanked Members and Officers for their input and contribution to the work of the Panel during the last year.

(The meeting ended at 12.45 pm)