

## **RESOURCES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016 AT 10.05AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Watson (Chairman), Councillors Allison, Bowditch, Mrs Bowman, Mallinson J, McDonald, Mrs Riddle and Robson.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder

**OFFICERS:** Town Clerk and Chief Executive  
Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services  
Chief Finance Officer  
Chief Accountant  
Building & Estates Services Manager  
Policy and Performance Officer

### **ROSP.86/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence submitted.

### **ROSP.87/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **ROSP.88/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

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

### **ROSP.89/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016 were circulated to Members.

A Member felt that the resolution of Minute ROSP.84/16 from the 20 October 2016 did not reflect his views in the meeting. He had not requested that the Executive consider the Panels concerns but had stated clearly that he felt that the decision to extend the head lease of the Market Hall should not fall to officers. He felt that the matter should be a decision for full Council due to the financial implications.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services reminded the Panel that the decision to delegate to officers had already been taken by the Executive on 26 September 2016. The Panel's resolution had been referred to the Executive and they had considered the it on 21 November 2016, a copy of the minute excerpt EX.117/16 had been circulated to Members as part of the Overview report, and the Executive had agreed that they would make the final decision for the agreement of the proposed head lease and under lease extension instead of officers.

**RESOLVED – 1)** That the minutes of the meetings held on 8 September 2016 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

**2)** That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016 be noted.

## **ROSP.90/16 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS**

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

## **ROSP.91/16 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Policy and Performance Officer presented report OS.25/16 and provided an overview of matters that related to the work of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Notice of Executive Key Decisions which had been published on 18 November 2016 contained the following items which fell within the remit of the Panel:

KD.21/16 – Budget Process 2017/18 – included on the agenda.

KD.24/16 – Polling Station Review 2016/17 – annual review of Polling Stations to be considered by the Executive on 19 December 2016.

Members did not raise any questions or comments on the items contained within the Notice of Executive Key Decisions.

The Executive had responded to the Panel's reference and their response, Minute Excerpt EX.117/16 – Market Hall Roof, had been included in the Report.

The Panel's Work Programme for the current year had been circulated and Members were asked to consider the framework for the meeting on 5 January 2017, which only had the Budget Setting scheduled.

It was reported that the Scrutiny Chairs had recently discussed the possibility of changing the current panel remit structure, to better align with the Council priorities, current challenges faced by the Council and to address current Scrutiny best practice. They resolved that the proposals for three new Overview and Scrutiny Panels be considered by each of the Political Groups with feedback being submitted to the Scrutiny Chairs Group. The Chair of Environment and Economy Overview & Scrutiny Panel had requested that the views of this Panel were sought.

The Environment and Economy and Community Overview and Scrutiny Panels had supported the decision of the Scrutiny Chairs Group and agreed that three new Overview and Scrutiny Panels be established, as set out in the Overview and Scrutiny Report, with further work on the remits of each new Panel. The Scrutiny Chairs Group had met on 11 November and agreed to receive feedback from all three Panels before any decision for change was taken.

A Member questioned the rationale behind the Scrutiny Chairs Group's decision to retain three Panels instead of moving to two. She asked what Scrutiny had achieved in the last three years as she felt it no longer held the Executive to account or made any meaningful resolutions. She also asked what the cost implications would be if the number of Panels reduced.

The Chairman reiterated the need for Scrutiny to adapt to match the way the Council operated and explained that there was very little difference in cost for two or three Panels. He felt that the amount of work within the remit of two Panels would be overwhelming and he felt that the current system was reasonably successful.

The Vice Chairman informed the Panel that her recommendation at the Scrutiny Chairs Group had been to move to two Panels which would be more focussed in the scrutiny they undertook, more cross cutting and have more opportunity to carry out meaningful task and finish work.

The Panel discussed the options and potential issues and benefits in some detail and it was proposed that the Council move to two Overview and Scrutiny Panels. Following voting thereon it was agreed that Overview and Scrutiny remain at three Panels as set out in option 1 of the report.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report incorporating the Work programme and Key Decision items relevant to this Panel (OS.25/16) be noted.

2) That the following item be included on the agenda for next meeting on 5 January 2017:

- Budget Monitoring 2016/17

3) That Minute Excerpt EX.117/16 – Market Hall Roof from Executive on 21 November 2016 be noted;

4) That the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel supported the decision of the Scrutiny Chairs Group and agree that three new Overview and Scrutiny Panels be established, as set out as option 1 of appendix 3 of report OS.25/16.

## **ROSP.92/16 BUDGET 2017/18**

### **(a) Minutes of the Community and Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panels**

The excerpts of the minutes of the meetings of the Community and Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panels held on 24 November and 1 December respectively were submitted for consideration.

### **(b) Budget Update – Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.35/16 providing a summary of the Council's revised revenue base estimates for 2016/17, together with base estimates for 2017/18 and forecasts up to 2021/22 for illustrative purposes. The base estimates had been prepared in accordance with the guiding principles for the formulation of the budget over the next five year planning period as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and Charging Policy; Capital Strategy; and Asset Management Plan approved by Council on 13 September 2016.

The report set out known revisions to the MTFP projections, although there were a number of significant factors affecting the budget that were currently unresolved, details of which were recorded at Section 1.3. A summary of the outstanding key issues, together with the resource assumptions was also provided at Section 4.

Turning to the issue of savings and additional income proposals, the Chief Finance Officer added that the current MTFP included a savings requirement to be found by 2018/19 of £3.475 million. Further savings / additional income had already been identified in the budget process for 2017/18, details of which were set out at Section 6 of the report.

Also summarised were the movements in base budgets; the updated MTFP projections; the projected impact on revenue balances; together with a summary of the financial outlook and budget discipline 2017/18 to 2021/22.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.98/16) received the report and agreed

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the revised base estimates for 2016/17 and base estimates for 2017/18.
2. Noted the current Medium Term Financial Plan projections, which would continue to be updated throughout the budget process as key issues became clearer and decisions were taken.
3. Noted the initial budget pressures / savings needing to be taken into account as part of the 2017/18 budget process."

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

- A Member asked for further information with regard to the Pension Fund Revaluation.

The Chief Finance Officer explained that the triennial revaluation of the Pension Fund was likely to increase the pension contributions payable by the Council from April 2017. The City Council contribution was set for the next three years and there was an option for the Council to pay the three year contribution in advance and receive a discount. The County Council Pension Fund would benefit from having the money to invest. The information used for these calculations would be available late December from the actuary.

- There was a lot of vacant space within the Civic Centre, was there any projection for how this would be used?

The Chief Finance Officer responded that there was a recurring pressure on the budget whilst decisions were being made about how the Civic Centre could be used following the flood.

A Member commented that he was disappointed to see a recurring pressure and asked if the Civic Centre was being marketed for companies such as Edinburgh Woolen Mill.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the Civic Centre was difficult old office accommodation which did not appeal to modern businesses or their way of working. Currently there was no demand for office space in the building and the only real option for the future was the redevelopment of Rickergate into mixed use as per the City Centre Masterplan and have a more agile workforce which reflected the reduction in City Council staff numbers.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder explained the circumstances of Edinburgh Woolen Mill's move to Carlisle. She stated that they had wanted their own prestigious building to accommodate their staff. It was known within Carlisle that there was office accommodation available in the Civic Centre and there was a willingness to rent out the accommodation but the budget had to plan for the Council being unsuccessful.

- Was there any indication of the impact Primark has had on the Lanes?

The Chief Finance Officer reported that there had been an increase in rent and footfall to the Lanes.

- Which Panel would monitor how successful the Funding Officer was?
- Was the salary for the Funding Officer post covered by any potential monies that they secured?

The Chief Finance Officer responded that the position was a full time permanent post and the budget reflected the cost and there was no income target set.

- Would the Capita review of the Minimum Revenue Position (MRP) be considered by Overview and Scrutiny?

The Chief Finance Officer responded that the Panel was welcome to have a copy of the final report; however, the information from the report would be included in the Treasury Management Strategy which would be approved by Council.

RESOLVED –That report RD.35/16 - Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22 be noted.

### **(c) Review of Charges**

The Chief Finance Officer presented the Review of Charges reports informing the Panel that there was a 3% increase on the overall level of income in line with the Corporate Charging Policy.

### **Community Services**

Report SD.27/16 was submitted setting out the proposed fees and charges for 2017/18 relating to those services falling within the Community Services Directorate.

The charges highlighted within the report would result in an anticipated level of income of £2,775,200 against the MTFP target of £2,835,200. That represented a shortfall of £60,000 against the MTFP target.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.99/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive:

- (i) Agreed for consultation the charges as set out in the body of Report SD.27/16 and relevant appendices with effect from 1 April 2017, noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.
- (ii) Delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Chief Finance Officer, the agreement of discounts on the car parking permit process within agreed limitations.
- (iii) Delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Chief Finance Officer, the agreement of variations to car parking ticket charges within parameters agreed by the Executive.”

A Member highlighted the increase in charges for the annual car park permit for Talkin Tarn and asked for the rationale behind it. In response, the Panel was informed that the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel had scrutinised the matter in some detail and found that there was a waiting list for the annual permit and there was an intention to limit and manage the number of permits. Members asked for full details to be provided by the Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager.

A Member asked how the proposed increase to advertising income would be achieved and the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services highlighted section 8.1 of the report which stated that the increase would come from the digital banner. It was agreed that further information would be provided by the Contracts and Community Services Manager

RESOLVED – 1) That the Community Services Review of Charges report (SD.27/16) be noted;

2) That the Green Spaces and Bereavement Services Manager provide written details of the rationale for the increase to the annual car parking permit charge for Talkin Tarn;

3) That the Contracts and Community Services Manager provide written details regarding the increase to the advertising income.

## **Economic Development**

Report ED.45/16 was submitted setting out the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate.

The proposed charges in relation to Planning Services included Development Control income; Building Control income; and Local Plan income.

Acceptance of the charges highlighted within the report, with the exception of Building Control which was self-financing, would result in an anticipated level of income of £662,600 against the Medium Term Financial Plan target of £662,600.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.100/16) received the report and agreed:

“That the Executive agreed for consultation the charges, as set out in Report ED.45/16 and accompanying Appendices, with effect from 1 April 2017; noting the impact those would have on income generation as detailed within the report.”

RESOLVED – That the Economic Development Review of charges 2017/18 report (ED.45/16) be noted.

## **Governance and Regulatory Services**

Report GD.62/16 was submitted concerning the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Governance and Regulatory Services Directorate.

The report set out the proposed charges relative to Environmental Health and Housing; Homeless, Prevention and Accommodation Services; and Legal Services. The introduction of the proposed charges was forecast to generate income of £893,300 in 2017/18 as summarised in the table at Section 5.16 of the report.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.101/16) received the report and:

“That the Executive agreed for consultation the charges as detailed within Report GD.62/16 and accompanying Appendices, with effect from 1 April 2017; and noted the impact thereof on income generation as detailed within the report.”

RESOLVED – That the Governance and Regulatory Services Review of Charges 2017/18 report (GD.62/16) be noted.

## **Governance and Regulatory Services - Licensing**

Report GD.57/16 was submitted 16 setting out the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Licensing Section of the Governance and Regulatory Services Directorate. He advised Members that the Regulatory Panel had responsibility for determining the licence fees, with the exception of those under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013, which fell to the Executive.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.102/16) received the report and agreed:

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the charges which were considered by the Regulatory Panel on 26 October 2016.
2. Noted that the fees under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 had been determined by the Executive for a three year period on 1 August 2016.”

RESOLVED – That the Governance and Regulatory Services - Licensing Review of Charges 2017/18 report (GD.57/16) be noted.

**(d) Revised Capital Programme 2016/17 and Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.36/16 detailing the revised Capital Programme for 2016/17, now totalling £10,440,000, together with the proposed method of financing. The report summarised the proposed programme for 2017/18 to 2021/22 in the light of the new capital proposals identified, together with the estimated capital resources available to fund the programme based on the announcements by Government in the spending review.

Section 4 which provided details of the current commitments and new spending proposals. Any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved.

A summary of the estimated resources compared to the proposed programme year on year was also provided.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.103/16) received the report and resolved:

“That the Executive:

- 1) Noted the revised capital programme and relevant financing for 2016/17 as set out in Appendices A and B of Report RD.36/16;
- 2) Had given initial consideration and views on the proposed capital spending for 2017/18 to 2021/22 contained in the Report in the light of the estimated available resources;
- 3) Noted that any capital scheme for which funding had been approved by Council may only proceed after a full report, including business case and financial appraisal, had been approved.”

RESOLVED – That the Revised Capital Programme 2016/17 and Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 be noted.

**(e) Corporate Assets – 3 Year Repair and Maintenance Programme 2017/18 – 2019/20**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report GD.64/16 setting out the repair and maintenance programme budget proposals for the Council's corporate property assets for the three year period 2017/18 to 2019/20, required to ensure that the legal responsibilities of the City Council were met.

The Chief Finance Officer reminded Members that local authorities had a duty to manage their property assets, particularly operational assets, in a safe and efficient manner which contributed to the quality of service delivery. The maintenance strategy was fully integrated with the Asset Management Plan and environmental policy. In addition, the Council followed good practice by, where practical, allocating its budget 70% planned maintenance and 30% reactive maintenance.

The report recorded that the revenue maintenance budget amounted to approximately £736,400 spread across a wide range of assets; the Council had a capitalised major repairs and improvement programme with a provision of £150,000 included in the Capital Programme. The maintenance schedule figure on the operational buildings, based on a costed 5 year plan derived from a rolling programme of Condition Surveys, currently stood at £2,499,100. It was anticipated, however, that the reduction in the capital schemes special project fund to £150,000 per year would begin to affect future figures.



Turning to the issue of planned maintenance, the Chief Finance Officer reported that the projects detailed at Section 2 reflected the highest priority projects to be funded out of capital. The allocation of £150,000 for capital projects reflected the Council's current financial situation. The impact of a reducing budget was likely to result in an increase in the number of properties awaiting maintenance, although that could be alleviated by the disposal of properties with a high maintenance requirement.

She added that the maintenance budgets for the year and those for the next 3 years (as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan) were included as Appendix A. Whilst that allocation was necessary for budget purposes the Building Maintenance and Projects Manager (authorised by the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services) could re-distribute those funds to meet specific or emergency needs. That flexibility was essential to avoid any service disruption.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.103/16) received the report and resolved:

- “1) That the 3 year revenue maintenance programme set out in Appendix A to Report GD.64/16 be approved, with the budget of £736,400 for 2017/18, and considered as part of the budget process.
- 2) That the 2017/18 capital budget of £150,000 be approved for consideration as part of the budget process.
- 3) That the list of capital projects selected to meet the budget provision of £150,000 be approved.”

RESOLVED – That the Corporate Assets – 3 Year Repair and Maintenance Programme 2017/18 – 2019/20 be noted.

#### **(f) Treasury Management September 2016 and Forecasts for 2017/18 to 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.34/16 providing the regular quarterly report on Treasury Transactions, together with an interim report on Treasury Management as required under the Financial Procedure Rules. The report also discussed the City Council's Treasury Management estimates for 2017/18 with projections to 2021/22, and set out information regarding the requirements of the Prudential Code on local authority capital finance.

Since interest rates were not forecast to rise in the medium term, revisions had been made to the interest achievable. Average cash balances would need to be amended to reflect revised forecasts for anticipated capital receipts, capital expenditure and use of revenue reserves and that would adjust the final pressure/saving requirement from treasury management. The base Treasury Management estimates for 2017/18 with projections for 2021/22 were set out at Appendix C.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.104/16) received the report and resolved that Report RD.34/16 be received and the projections for 2017/18 to 2021/22 be incorporated into the Budget reports considered elsewhere on the Agenda.

RESOLVED – That the Treasury Management September 2016 and Forecasts for 2017/18 to 2021/22 (RD.34/16) be noted.

#### **(g) Local Taxation 2017/18 – 2021/22**

The Chief Finance Officer submitted report RD.38/16 considering aspects of Local Taxation decisions which needed to be made as part of the Budget process for 2017/18 onwards.



The Chief Finance Officer outlined the various considerations, including the levels of Council Tax for the City Council (including Parish Precepts), Council Tax Surplus calculations, Council Tax Base calculations, Local Support for Council Tax (LSCT), and Business Rate Retention (including Pooling arrangements). A summary of the assumptions made was also provided at Section 4.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.104/16) received the report and resolved:

“That the Executive:

1. Noted the contents of Report RD.38/16 including the current assumptions built into the MTFP with regard to local taxation issues.
2. Approved, for recommendation to Council as part of the budget process, the 2017/18 Local Support for Council Tax scheme as set out in paragraph 2.4.
3. Approved the continuation of involvement in the Cumbria Business Rate Pool arrangements for 2017/18, subject to the continuing involvement of the other partners which would be formally agreed in January 2017 with the final decision on participation being delegated to the Chief Finance Officer.”

A Member had concerns with regard to the impact of the review of Single Persons Discounts on the vulnerable in the community. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the review was county wide to ensure those receiving the discount were entitled to it. It was hoped that the results of the review would be received in time to be included in the budget process.

RESOLVED –That the Local Taxation 2017/18 – 2021/22 report (RD.38/16) be noted.

#### **(h) Budget Monitoring Reports**

The following reports had been circulated to the Panel by way of background information:

- RD.32/16 – Revenue Budget Overview and Monitoring Report: April to September 2016;
- RD.33/16 – Capital Budget Overview and Monitoring Report: April to September 2016.

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

- Why was there such a significant overspend in the Governance directorate?

The Chief Finance Officer responded that the overspend was mainly due to a shortfall of income at the Lanes, due to a prior year adjustment.

- There were concerns that the Tourist Information Centre was underachieving in terms of income following the recent investment.
- The Councillors Small Scale fund had been underspent and Members were encouraged to use the money to support their local community. There was a suggestion that Group Leaders wrote to those Members not using their funds.
- Why was the Lawn Tennis Association capital resource for 2016/17 was 0?

The Chief Finance Officer explained that allocation of £400,000 had not yet been received. She agreed to circulate details to Members.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Revenue Budget Overview and Monitoring Report and Capital Budget Overview and Monitoring report, RD.32/16 and RD.33/16, be received;

2) That the Chief Finance Officer circulate information to Members with regard to the receipt due from the Lawn Tennis Association.

## **ROSP.93/16 HALF YEAR PARTNERSHIPS REVIEW 2016/17**

The Chief Finance Officer presented report RD.39/16 which provided information relating to the Council's Partnership arrangements, the categorisation of partnerships and the monitoring of the main aims and objectives over the last six months.

The Chief Finance Officer reminded the Panel of the definition of Partnership and the five types of partnership classification which was monitored and reported to Members as set out in section 4 of the report.

Member's attention was drawn to paragraph 6 of the report which outlined the factors considered when a partnership review was conducted, and the appendices to the report which contained information on the latest position in respect of individual partnerships and contracts.

Further information on the achievements of the Carlisle Partnership and Economic Partnership, as requested by Members of the Panel, was included at appendices B & C.

A Member asked what the Council's annual contribution of £37,000 to the Carlisle Ambassadors Group was used for. She noted that the report stated that quarterly performance figures and reporting was scheduled to be scrutinised as part of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme and questioned which Panel would receive this information and if it happened.

Members asked what the benefits to Carlisle were, how the Group promoted Carlisle and how the meetings were arranged and recorded.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive responded that the Council's contribution principally covered the management and marketing of the Group. He reminded the Panel that the Group was independent of the Council and had been initially established to produce a prospectus which promoted Carlisle via the Carlisle Story to inform potential investors of what Carlisle had to offer. The Group continued to promote Carlisle and provide opportunities for local businesses to share ideas and carry out projects.

The Carlisle Ambassadors Group met on a regular basis and updates were submitted to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel as part of their work programme. A local marketing business organised the meetings, venues, admin support and marketing, and although the meetings were not minuted information was provided to members of the Group via a newsletter.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive encouraged Members to attend Ambassador meetings and agreed to report back to a future meeting on the contributions made to the Group. He added that some members of the Group provided resources to support the Group instead of financial support.

**RESOLVED – 1) That the Half Year Partnerships Review 2016/17 (RD.39/16) be received;**

**2) That a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel detailing the contributions made to the Carlisle Ambassadors Group and how those contributions were used.**

**3) That the Chief Finance Officer be thanked for her detailed and clear presentation and responses for the budget items and the Partnership Review item.**

*The meeting adjourned at 11.40am for a short break.*

*The meeting reconvened at 11.45am.*

## **ROSP.94/16 MARKET HALL – MARKET MANAGEMENT GROUP AND MANAGING AGENT**

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services submitted report GD.72/16 which outlined the working relationship and the work undertaken by the Market Hall Management Group and the Managing Agent.

The Corporate Director reminded the Panel of the background to the leasing arrangements and detailed the Management Policy Document which set out how the Asset should be managed. The document outlined the management structure:

- The head tenant, BAE Pension Fund, managed the Asset via its investment fund managers, LaSalle, who in turn employed Capita to undertake the day to day management of the Wilkinsons, TK Maxx and Arcade Shops occupations;
- The City Council and BAE Pension Fund had a joint management contract with Ryden, who undertook the day to day management of the stall holder area. Ryden provided an on-site Market Hall Manager who dealt directly with the tenants, with the overarching contract management allocated to a Senior Surveyor within Ryden.
- The management of the stall holder area was overseen by the Market Hall Management Group which consisted of two Members of the City Council, one Senior Officer from LaSalle and a number of Senior City Council Officers. BAE also had the ability to send as many representatives as they considered necessary to any of the Group's meetings.

The Market Hall Management Group met every six months and the last meeting was held on 2 November 2016. The Corporate Director set out the remit of the Group and the structure of the meetings along with the role of the Managing Agent as set out in section 2 of the report.

The Corporate Director drew Members' attention to section 2.3 of the report which detailed the recent achievements and future proposals for the Market Hall. He added that the Market Management Group had set up a separate group which would look at the promotion of the Market and how footfall could be stimulated.

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

- A Member commented that he had previously raised concerns with regard to issues the tenants had informed him of at the Market Hall and was pleased to see in the report that those issues were beginning to be addressed and that a Tenant Association was being formed.

The Building & Estates Services Manager responded that there was more interest from tenants in the Market Hall and they were beginning to come together to form a formally constituted Tenant Association.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel of previous difficulties in bringing the tenants together as a collective body. There had been an influx of new stall holders and this had helped the move towards a Tenant Association which would then address the tenants concerns and discuss how they could move the Market forward.

A Member added that she had experience of the difficulties in bringing the tenants together and praised the work of the Market Manager who tried to address each stall holder's issues individually. She understood that there were difficult conditions for the stall holders to trade in

and that they found it hard to compete with the supermarkets. She hoped that the proposals in the report would help maintain business for stall holders.

- Was there any evidence that the rent review had had a positive effect on occupancy in the Market Hall?

The Building & Estates Services Manager explained that the rent review had affected long term tenants as their stall holder lease document had allowed the rent to be uplifted annually in line with RPI, as a result the long term occupiers had been charged rent that was considered to be above market rent. The review allowed for the rates payable to be aligned and this had resulted in some tenants receiving a rental reduction.

A Member had concerns regarding the sustainability of some of the businesses in the Market Hall if they could not manage the annual RPI increase.

- Tenants had not been allowed to advertise their stalls outside of the Market, would this be looked at?

The Corporate Director responded that the Market Hall was a listed building and therefore advertisement was restricted. It would not be appropriate for each stall holder to advertise individually but there could potentially be information on the Market Hall offer as a whole.

- Was it possible for the Council to learn from other successful markets?

The Corporate Director agreed that there were opportunities to learn but any proposals would need agreement from all the stall holders.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel that the catchment area for the Market Hall was smaller and its location in the City was not as good as some of the large successful markets. The new group would look at all the options available to boost the offer and popularity of the Market.

RESOLVED –That the Market Hall report on the Market Management Group and Managing Agent (GD.72/16) be welcomed.

## **ROSP.95/16 CORPORATE PROGRAMME BOARD**

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive presented report CE.13/16 which updated Members on the work of the Corporate Programme Board and projects currently being undertaken by the Council.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive reported that a summary of the status of current projects and any relevant action being taken within the Council had been appended to the report. The majority of Council projects were progressing to schedule; those that had issues were indicated within the appendix with an amber rating for some issues and red for major issues. A summary of action that was being taken was also provided.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive drew Members attention to section 2.1 of the report which detailed the key achievements and achievements per project from the last six months.

In considering the report Members raised the following questions:

- A Member had been disappointed that the speed indication devices that would be placed on Castle Way, as part of the Crossing work, would be temporary and not permanent. She asked the Town Clerk and Chief Executive to raise the issue as part of the works.

The Panel discussed the effectiveness of permanent speed indication devices and a Member suggested that permanent equipment be placed along Castle Way which would enable the speed indication device to be reinstalled when required.

- Was Castle Way Crossing amber due to the petition which had been submitted to Council?

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the project had been amber previously due to an underestimation of the required consultation process, however, the petition had caused some further delay and the whole project had taken longer than anticipated.

- A Member asked that consideration be given to celebrating all of the women of Carlisle who worked in factories as part of the Caldewgate Public Realm instead of just one factory.

RESOLVED – That the Corporate Programme Board update (CE.13/16) be noted.

## **ROSP.96/16 2016/17 SICKNESS ABSENCE QUARTER 2**

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive submitted the Authority's sickness absence levels for the period April 2016 to September 2016 and other sickness absence information (Report CE.14/16).

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive reported that the 2015/16 sickness absence levels had decreased by approximately 30% to 8.6 days lost per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employee compared to the previous year. The percentage of sickness which was long term also decreased as managers ensured the support for their staff was available and accessible. It was noted that spikes in absenteeism would become more prevalent as the organisation's workforce shrank.

The 2016/17 performance was detailed in report and the table at appendix 1 provided absence levels split by Directorate. The information showed that half of the directorates had experienced a drop in sickness absence and the percentage of long term sickness had also reduced. The report set out the days lost by reason and Directorate and reported that 100% of all Return to Work Interviews had been completed.

RESOLVED – That the 2016/17 Sickness Absence Quarter 2 report (CE.14/16) be noted.

## **ROSP.97/16 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT 2016/17**

The Policy and Performance Officer presented report PC.23/16 which updated the Panel on the Council's service standards relevant to the Panel and included updates on key actions contained within the new Carlisle Plan.

The Policy and Performance Officer reported that the table at Section 1 of the report 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. Only the service standard relevant to the Panel had been included in the Report.

The updates against the actions in the Carlisle Plan followed on from service standard information in Section 2. As many of the key actions contained within the outgoing Carlisle Plan had been completed, actions and projects had recently been refreshed in the 2015-18 Carlisle Plan. Work was continuing on the future report content and the best way of presenting the information to future Panels and Members.

The Policy and Performance Officer reported that the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had considered how they would like the reports presented in the future and resolved "that

officers be asked to prepare some options for the future presentation of performance information to Scrutiny and present those options to the next meeting of the Panel.”

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive informed the Panel that the changes to the IT system would allow for the performance report to be provided directly from the database and live dashboard information could be interrogated during the meeting. This would give Members the opportunity to look in more detail at the information provided in the report.

RESOLVED – That the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Performance Report 2016/17 (PC.25/16) be noted.

(The meeting ended at 12.25pm)