

RESOURCES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 25 AUGUST 2011 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Layden (Chairman), Councillors Allison, Bowditch, Bowman S, Craig (as substitute for Councillor Bainbridge), Hendry, Watson and Whalen.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor J Mallinson – Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder
Councillor Ellis – Performance and Development Portfolio Holder
Councillor Mrs Luckley – Chair of Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Councillor Glover – Vice Chair of Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel

ROSP.53/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillors Bainbridge

ROSP.54/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillor Ellis declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of any issues relating to Tullie House. The interest related to the fact that he was a member of the Trust Board of Tullie House.
- Councillor Luckley declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of any issues relating to the community. The interest related to the fact that she was a former Member of the Executive.

ROSP.55/11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- *It had been suggested that there would be feedback from the County Council relating to the Community Project and the YMCA providing the current states of the centre and what actions were being taken.*

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) advised that the item related to the Community Resource Centre rather than the YMCA Foyer project. He agreed to provide an update on that issue.

- *The Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had picked up on the need to drive the project forward. Funding had previously not been identified for the Foyer so it was good that the work would be picked up through the Resource Centre. The Member welcomed the input to the project.*

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meetings held on 21 July 2011 be noted.

ROSP.56/11 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS

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

ROSP.57/11 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) presented report OS.22/11 which provided an overview of matters related to the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work.

Mrs Edwards reported:

- That the Forward Plan of Executive key decisions, covering the period 1 August 2011 – 30 November 2011 had been published on 18 July 2011 and was included in the Overview Report. There were two items in the Plan relevant to this Panel and both would be considered by the Panel as part of the meeting:

KD.016/11 – The Medium Term Financial Plan (including the Corporate Charging Policy) and the Capital Strategy 2012/13 to 2017/18

KD.017/11 – Asset Management Plan 2011-16.

She added that the 1 September to 31 December 2011 Plan had been published on 18 August 2011 and two further items relevant to this Panel had been added. Those items were:

KD.024/11 – Budget Process 2012-2013 – items a, b, c, d, e, f and g would be available for consideration by the Panel on 6 December 2011 and items i, j and k available for consideration by the Panel on 5 January 2012, and

KD.028/11 – Willowholme Depot – Surplus Asset Disposal that would be available for consideration on 13 October 2011.

- It had been suggested that a member of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel should sit on the Disabled Facilities Grant Task and Finish Group. It was agreed that Councillor Layden would be the Panel's representative on that group.

- Mrs Edwards advised that the item on Transformation would be included on the agenda for the next meeting on 13 October 2011.

- The Chairman advised Members that it had been originally intended that a report on the Growth Fund Bid would be included on the agenda for the meeting. However, the item had been withdrawn as the report was not available in time for circulation of the papers. Members expressed their disappointment that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda. The item would be submitted for the meeting on 13 October 2011.

- *Which Member of the Executive was driving the Growth Fund Bid?*

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder advised that he believed Councillor Mrs Bowman was the relevant Member of the Executive. He advised that there was no provision for the Tullie House Trust as he wished to present the business case as part of the budget process and detail how a 3 year programme would be arranged.

RESOLVED 1) That the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Forward Plan items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2.) That the reports on Transformation and the Growth Fund Bid would be submitted to the next meeting of the Panel on 13 October 2011.

ROSP.58/11 CAPITAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

Minute Excerpt EX.095/11 was submitted setting out the decision of the Executive on 26 July 2011

The Executive had decided:

“That the Executive had considered the final report of the Capital Projects Task and Finish Group and would respond in detail at the next meeting of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 25 August 2011.”

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder advised that there were no issues that raised concern and that it had been a sensible report.

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

- *The Task and Finish Group recommended “That the allocation of capital funding for specific projects should only be made after a full, detailed and rigorous examination of each project, its time scale, value for money and longer term revenue implications are examined.” Has any progress been made on getting ideas with regard to the use of capital receipts? And were there any specific projects in mind?*

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder advised that the allocation of the capital sum would be decided as the projects progressed and that the bulk of the revenue from the Asset Management Plan would be used to improve performance of the retained assets.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) advised that there had been no firm decision made with regard to proposals for reinvestment of the capital receipts. Officers in Resources were looking at the best use of the capital while protecting the revenue income of the City Council.

- *What opportunity was there for Members to be involved in the process?*

Dr Gooding advised that Members would be involved in any decision as part of the normal democratic process. Any reinvestment of substantial amounts of capital would be discussed widely with Members.

- *Where was the money currently held?*

Dr Gooding confirmed that the capital could not be used to offset expenditure against revenue budgets and that it sat in capital reserves and could be deployed at the wishes of Members. A substantial element of the capital receipts was the disposal of land at Morton the clear purpose of which was to generate revenue. Members would make a decision on what was the most beneficial way to use that capital.

- *Previous discussions had stressed that local Councillors should be involved in the strategy and planning of projects. The Task and Finish Group had recommended "That the development of a long term Capital Programme should seek political consensus and full public consultation when this programme is drawn up and when it is being reviewed. This would facilitate an agreed longer term vision and economic plan for the future of Carlisle."*

Dr Gooding advised that the Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mrs Meek) was working on the programme but that the final decision was subject to political consensus and that Members would be involved more than they had been in the past.

RESOLVED – That the response from the Executive was noted.

**ROSP.59/11 DRAFT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN
(INCORPORATING THE CORPORATE CHARGING
POLICY) – 2012/13 TO 2016/17**

DRAFT CAPITAL STRATEGY 2012/13 TO 2016/17

The Draft Medium Term Financial Plan (incorporating the Corporate Charging Policy) 2012/13 and 2016/17 and the Draft Capital Strategy 2012/13 to 2016/17 were considered together following a presentation given by the Assistant Director (Resources) (Mr Mason).

With regard to the Draft Medium Term Financial Plan (incorporating the Corporate Charging Policy) 2012/13 and 2016/17 the Executive had on 26 July 2011 considered the report (EX.082/11 refers) and decided:

"1. That the Report of the Assistant Director (Resources) (RD.27/11) on the draft Medium Term Financial Plan (incorporating the Corporate Charging Policy) 2012/13 to 2016/17 be received.

2. That the report be made available for consideration by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel."

With regard to the Draft Capital Strategy 2012/13 to 2016/17 the Executive had on 26 July 2011 considered the report (EX.083/11 refers) and decided:

“1.) That the Report of the Assistant Director (Resources) (RD.28/11) regarding the Draft Capital Strategy 2012/13 to 2016/17 be received

2.) That the Draft Capital Strategy be made available for consideration by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel.”

Mr Mason submitted report RD.27/11 on the draft Medium Term Financial Plan (incorporating the Corporate Charging Policy) 2012/13 to 2016/17.

Mr Mason advised Members that the Medium Term Financial Plan set out the current framework for planning and managing the Council's financial resources, developing its annual budget strategy and updating its current five year financial plan. The Plan further sought to link the key aims and objectives of the Council, as contained in the Corporate Plan, to the availability of resources thereby enabling the Council to prioritise the allocation of resources to best meet its overall aims and objectives.

He reported that some of the figures in the Plan would be affected by external influences and would be subject to amendment during the Council's Budget cycle.

Mr Mason added that the Medium Term Financial Plan was reviewed annually commencing with the assumptions made in the Budget resolution approved by Council on 1 February 2011. In addition, the Corporate Charging Policy had been reviewed and included within the Medium Term Financial Plan. The Charging Policy provided a framework for potential policy options for each charging area, but recognised the different approaches that might be required for different services and the various influences which needed to be acknowledged in setting individual charges.

Mr Mason also submitted Report RD.28/11 on the Draft Capital Strategy 2012/13 to 2016/17. He informed Members that the Draft Capital Strategy was a key policy document, intended to direct the Council's Capital Programme and the allocation of resources for the five year period 2012/13 to 2016/17 and would supplement guidance contained in the Medium Term Financial Plan. The Capital Strategy was reviewed annually alongside the Medium Term Financial Plan, commencing with the assumptions made in the Budget Resolution approved by Council on 1 February 2011. The position had been updated to reflect any known changes since that date.

He reminded Members of the objectives of the Capital Strategy in ensuring that capital investment decisions and capital resources contributed to the achievement of the Council's corporate priorities; co-ordinated strategic priorities and ensuring that investment opportunities were maximised; managed performance and decision making processes to make best use of available capital resources and setting out processes to monitor and evaluate proposed and actual capital spending on projects to ensure that value for

money was obtained. The Strategy had been developed using a number of overarching guidelines.

Mr Mason outlined the current capital programme forecasts, reminding Members of the key assumptions which had been considered in making the projections including the Capital Programme of £7.534m for 2011/12 and £2.730m for 2012/13. The impact of the 2010/11 outturn and the carrying forward of budgets into 2011/12 and 2012/13 had increased the programme by £1.418m in 2011/12 since the budgets were approved in February.

Mr Mason indicated that the current capital programme forecast spending on capital projects of around £2.7m - £1.2m per annum for years 2012/13 to 2016/17, although past experience had indicated that actual spending would be much higher due, in the main, to the fact that a number of initiatives were still at an early stage of development and had not therefore been included in the projections. He identified a number of schemes currently under review, including the Asset Review Programme; Vehicle Replacement Programme; and Disabled Facilities Grants, commenting that the position on those schemes would need to be updated during the budget process when an indication of capital schemes coming to fruition and their timing could be made more accurately.

The report further set out an estimated level of capital finance resources which would be generated over the next five years and highlighted the current position regarding borrowing, capital receipts, reserves and balances, Government and other capital grants and external funding, and revenue contributions. Also summarised was the level of capital spending and available financing for the period 2011/12 to 2016/17 which indicated that currently there was approximately £1.8m uncommitted estimated capital resources available to support any future capital programme.

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

- *What percentage of the Council's gross budget was the £3.8million identified as the minimum level of reserves for the Council? The information was not clear and difficult for members of the public to understand.*

Mr Mason confirmed the percentage was approximately 5%. He added that the level was not statutory but was based on a series of calculations.

Mr Mason indicated the issues for consideration in the 2012/13 to 2016/17 budget process.

- *Was there any Government support available in respect of Council Tax increases?*

There were no current plans for the Government to provide additional grant to support a 0% Council Tax increase in 2012/13.

- *With regard to transformation savings was there any indication from professional organisations that schemes such as partnership working and shared services were successful.*

Mr Mason advised that local Government was being held as an example of how to make savings and although the schemes were doing well at present it was not clear what the future impact would be.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) advised that the shared ICT service had delivered savings as anticipated and while shared services and partnership working appeared to be successful at a local level it had not been so successful at a national level.

- *One of the key workstreams in the community was housing. Had a risk assessment been carried out of the potential impact of the Welfare Reform Bill as there could potentially be an increased demand for housing and potentially more people becoming homeless?*

Mr Mason advised that at the present stage it was too early to be able to assess the potential impact. Consultation had begun with responses required for early October; the lead officers were Keith Gerrard and Margaret Miller. Mr Mason intended to cover the issue at the informal Council meeting scheduled for 13 December 2011. Mr Mason added that a report would be presented to the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel indicating the potential implications of the Welfare Reform Bill at a future meeting. The potential impact of the move from housing benefit to universal credit would be slow but would increase over the years.

Mr Mason informed Members that there was significant pressure on the capital reserves and indicated the issues for consideration as part of the budget process. He then gave Members the timetable for the budget process.

- *Why can't Officers make use of the £30million held in the bank?*

Mr Mason advised that those reserves were raised through income from Council tax etc and fluctuated throughout the year. However it could be used if necessary for short term borrowing.

- *With regard to the Asset Business Plan what sort of rates could be obtained from those reserves and were there any built in projections?*

Mr Mason stated that officers were looking for short term treasury management actions to maximise the use of those reserves.

- *Members had been informed that a report on Transformation had been taken off the agenda as the proposals had not been discussed with JMT. A Member queried why that had not happened, when it would be discussed with JMT and when it would be brought to the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel?*

Dr Gooding advised that savings had been identified by the Senior Management Team but had not been discussed with Portfolio Holders or Joint Management Team. He advised that there was a half day meeting arranged for 15 September with the Joint Management Team and the report would be submitted to the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel at their meeting on 13 October 2011. He did not believe it would be appropriate to discuss the proposal before the Assistant Directors had had the opportunity to discuss them with the relevant Portfolio Holders and he apologised for the slippage in the timetable.

- *The budget documents are complex and it would be useful to have a workshop to discuss the underlying issues such as The Lanes and car parking.*

Dr Gooding agreed that it would be useful to gain an understanding of the issues. He advised that it had to be recognised that whatever the Council could do to assist the Lanes had to be realistic. Dr Gooding further advised that the Assistant Director (Local Environment) (Ms Culleton) had started work on car parking including charges for car parking.

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder stated that figures for the Lanes were now performance related and it was unfortunate that the change had coincided with the economic downward shift.

- *A Member stated that he was pleased that work on car parking was to be undertaken as it had a massive impact on the City Centre. He believed that the work needed to consider parking costs and whether to increase the costs or provide free or reduced charging. Those issues would create other problems but the whole matter should be investigated.*

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder agreed with the comments and added that consideration should be done with the impact on the revenue budget in mind. He added that as the cost of parking increased the charges became counter productive as people stopped using the car parks. While he could not envisage a point when all car parking would be free the Portfolio Holder stated that Officers and Members should investigate at what point charging became counter productive. Dr Gooding confirmed that Ms Culleton would obtain that information as part of the work on car parking. He added that the work was within the remit of the Panel and that the Panel could have an early input into the discussions.

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder reminded Members that the City Council did not have the monopoly on car parking but he did believe that Carlisle was the only city in England that provided some free parking in the City Centre.

- *When the report on car parking was undertaken would Officers ensure that all costs were considered including maintenance of machines and admin costs?*

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder added that Officers and Members had to be cautious when looking at available assets and ensure that there was a balance between out of centre businesses such as at Kingstown and businesses located in the city centre that would create incomes.

- *There had been some criticism that grant funding had been missed. Where was the information regarding access to grants maintained? And what was the success rate for applications for grants?*

Mr Mason explained that most of the grants included in the report were statutory grants but small grants were accessed by Officers within Economic Development and Community Engagement. The Chief Accountant (Mr Tickner) advised that there was a database that held the information about available grants.

- *Did that database cover large regeneration grants and European grants? How successful were the bids for grants?*

Mr Mason confirmed that the database covered those grants and while applications for grants had been successful in the past the situation was now more difficult.

Dr Gooding explained that with regard to on street parking Carlisle and Eden enforcement services were efficient and broke even. It was hoped that when the County Council considered car parking enforcement within the County that on and off street parking enforcement would not be split. The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder advised that he believed the intention was that the County Council would take over control of on street parking but he was aware that there could be problems within Carlisle if parking enforcement was split.

RESOLVED – 1) That Reports RD.27/11 and RD.28/11 be noted.

2.) That a workshop be arranged for early Autumn to allow the Panel the opportunity to have early input into the budget setting process.

3) That the Panel looked forward to receiving the report on the car parking review and welcomed the opportunity to have input into the review.

ROSP.60/11 DRAFT ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2011-2016

“The Executive had on 26 July 2011 considered the report (EX.084/11 refers) and decided:

- 1.) That the Executive noted the position as set out in Report RD.37/11
- 2.) That the Executive approved the update to the draft Asset Management Plan and made it available for consideration by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel, before coming back to the Executive and full Council in September 2011.”

The Property Services Manager (Mr Simmons) presented Report RD.37/11 and advised that the Plan was reviewed annually. The current Plan had been updated to reflect the key issues and changes affecting the future management and use of the property resource, the impact of the Asset Review Business Plan and the performance of the portfolio.

Mr Simmons commented that one of the key aspects of the Asset Review Business Plan was to segregate the portfolio in order to provide a clearer focus on the management and delivery of outputs. The objectives were to consolidate the portfolio, reducing the number of assets, increase overall returns and therefore lower management costs.

Mr Simmons informed Members that the Disposal Programme was a 4 year plan to consolidate the non-operational portfolio in order to raise capital and generate income. The operational section of the portfolio was used to deliver services and an Accommodation Review was being undertaken to rationalise back office space, the depots and subsequently other service premises.

Mr Simmons explained that the performance of the portfolio was measured on CIPFA models. He provided an explanation of the indicators, which showed year on year improvements. He stated that against the backdrop of cutbacks and recessionary difficulties the challenges ahead were to continue the process of efficiency improvements and the rationalisation of the non-operational portfolio through the delivery of the Asset Review Business Plan and the Disposal Programme.

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

- *With energy prices increasing had Officers investigated alternative forms of energy?*

Mr Simmons explained that increasingly energy consumption was being monitored at the point of use and Officers were looking at the opportunities available for renewable energy sources to be used. A business case was being looked at for a scheme involving photovoltaic panels as an alternative energy source and if that would be a worthwhile investment.

- *Members requested that the paragraph regarding surplus property be amended to reflect the comments of the Task and Finish Group.*
- *A Member was concerned about the cost of work to be undertaken at Tullie House.*

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder stated that as part of the discussions for the funding arrangement the Buildings and Facilities Manager (Mr Kay) had identified savings for energy usage that could be used to carry out the work at Tullie House. The Council would continue to carry out improvements to provide savings in energy costs. He confirmed that Tullie House remained in City Council ownership and reminded Members that they

had been informed of the issues as part of the detailed negotiations that took place prior to Tullie House becoming a Trust.

The Assistant Director (Governance and Resources) advised that the capital schemes special project fund allocations had been presented to the Executive at their meeting on 26 July 2011.

- *It was important that the assets of the collection were properly cared for and that adequate levels of heating and lighting were in place and the proposed work was appropriate.*

RESOLVED –That the report be noted.

ROSP.61/11 CAPITAL BUDGET OVERVIEW AND MONITORING REPORT – APRIL TO JUNE 2011

The Assistant Director (Resources) submitted report RD.30/11 providing an overview of the budgetary position of the City Council's capital programme for the period April to June 2011. The position as at June 2011 showed an overspend of £167,048.

In accordance with the City Council's Financial Procedure Rules, Mr Mason provided details of the overall budget position, including the monitoring and control of expenditure against budget allocations and the exercise of virement on a regular basis. He added that the 2011/12 programme had been kept to a level that took account of the Council's ability to deliver schemes with regard to capacity and available resources. He further drew attention to the level of carry forwards that had been agreed, pointing out that Council approval did not take place until July this year which was the main reason for the overspend to date. Work was ongoing to continue to monitor the profiling of budgets which would be adjusted to reflect progress in current capital schemes. The review of the 2011/12 capital programme would reduce the level of carry forwards at the year end, but it was likely that there would still be a requirement for some carry forwards at the year end due to further slippage and delays on projects.

Mr Mason added that the Senior Management Team would provide strategic overview and monitor the effectiveness of the overall programme of work in delivering the Council's priorities and objectives. Technical project support and quality assurance of business cases and associated project management activities would be managed by a Project Assurance Group chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive. In conclusion, he advised that a review of all capital expenditure incurred was ongoing to ensure that the expenditure had been correctly allocated between revenue and capital schemes. That work would facilitate the year end classification of assets.

Mr Mason advised that the report would be available for consideration by the Executive at their meeting on 30 August 2011 before being considered again by Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

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

- *What was the position with regard to the Lovells agreement?*

The Chief Accountant (Mr Tickner) advised that when the agreement was set up it was anticipated that receipts would be generated. Given the current economic conditions it was unlikely that the agreed levels of income could be achieved.

- *With regard to Economic Development Environmental Enhancements much of the allocation had not been spent and was unlikely to be spent in the current financial year.*

At present there were no plans for the actual work to commence. Mr Mason agreed to keep Members updated. Mr Mason confirmed that as the land was owned by the City Council it was the Council's responsibility to remedy any contamination issues.

- *How many units would Lovells be likely to produce over the coming year?*

The Property Manager (Mr Simmons) advised that the agreement was for 234 houses to be built over a 10 year period. Initially houses sold well and that target was achievable. In the current economic climate it was apparent that the target would not be reached within the 10 year timescale. However Lovells had negotiated with Housing Associations and were building houses for rent. Therefore capital receipts continued to be received outwith the current agreement. The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder stated that the Lovells programme had been very successful and that the project had stopped the decline of that particular area.

- *There were still significant areas on that estate that were still dormant and social housing was becoming an increasing problem.*
- *The report indicated a maximum of 4 sales projected during the year with 2 sales as at 30 June 2011. That was an encouraging sign.*

Mr Mason stated that there had been 6 sales last year and this year there had been 2 within the first quarter.

RESOLVED – 1.) That the report be noted.

ROSP.62/11 REVENUE BUDGET OVERVIEW AND MONITORING REPORT – APRIL TO JUNE 2011

The Assistant Director (Resources) (Mr Mason) submitted report RD.31/11 providing an overview of the Council's overall budgetary position for the period April to June 2011 for revenue schemes.

He summarised the budgetary position as at June 2011 which showed a deficit against the income target for fees and charges; and highlighted the key issues, including performance against the Salary Turnover Savings Budget and employee budgets for 2010/11. Members' attention was also drawn to the main variances in the Revenue Budgets of the various Directorates.

Mr Mason added that the Council's financial position was affected by a number of external factors which would have a financial impact during the course of the year and ultimately at the year-end, including the general effect of the economic climate on the Council's income streams; fuel prices, energy costs and other inflationary issues; and the effects of the housing market and property prices, especially with regard to income from land charges and rents. He added that the overall projected position was negative and some of the positive benefits were non-recurring. It was therefore important to maintain a prudent approach so as to ensure a sustainable budget position for future years and to avoid any significant variance at the year end.

Members' attention was further drawn to a number of high risk budgets which had been identified as requiring detailed monitoring throughout the year, commuted sums currently held by the Council, details of the Council's Direction of Travel, and Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

Mr Mason advised that the report would be available for consideration by the Executive at their meeting on 30 August 2011 before being considered again by Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

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

- *A Member suggested that a Task and Finish Group be convened to assist the Panel to be informed and have a better understanding of the Council's £15million loan.*

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) stated that it was important that Members understood the information and suggested that a private report could be submitted for the next meeting of the Panel on 13 October 2011.

RESOLVED – 1.) That the report be noted

2.) That a private report be submitted to the Panel on 13 October 2011 clarifying the information in relation to budget Overview and Monitoring reports.

ROSP.63/11 COST OF SERVICES

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) submitted Report CE.24/11 and reminded Members that at the last meeting of the Panel a request was made for information on the costs of service delivery for the City Council and how that compared with other similar local authorities. Information was provided

that gave comparisons against the Historic Cities group and the CIPFA Nearest Neighbours.

Dr Gooding explained that some of the costs seemed higher for some of the Council's services as more was spent on the Council's priorities. He suggested that the information be held for future meetings to be referred to with regard to budget setting or allocation of resources.

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

- *What was the significance of the "minus" figures within the comparison documents?*

Dr Gooding explained that it indicated an income from that service. He agreed to provide an update to inform the next budget setting meetings.

RESOLVED: That the report be accepted with thanks.

ROSP.64/11 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORTS

(a) Corporate Plan: Performance Report

The Policy and Communications Manager (Mr O'Keeffe) submitted Report PPP.12/11 and advised that it was the first quarterly performance report presented in the new style as agreed at Executive on 22 November 2011. The report indicated progress made in the delivery of each of the Corporate Plan Key Actions along with any risks associated with the delivery of the action and relevant performance indicators.

As a result of work undertaken with the Assistant Directors and service managers an assessment of each Key Action was made and a rating given. The report indicated that the majority of the Key Actions had shown good progress and would have been green if the risks were mitigated. The report also included a summary of recent consultation findings, an update on Transformation and key achievements.

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

- *The report indicated that there had been more than 12,000 visitors to Tullie House. Members stated that it would be useful to know how many were new visitors.*

Mr O'Keeffe confirmed that the figure related to the period 25 June 2011 to mid July.

- *How long had the passport service been operational in the Civic Centre and what was the uptake for the service.*

Mr O’Keeffe explained that the passport service were renting space in the Civic Centre and had been operational for approximately 2 weeks.

- *It was a pleasure to read of the achievements of the City Council. Which Committee picked up the indicators to be developed for the coming year?*

Mr O’Keeffe confirmed that the Business Plan for Tullie House was agreed by the Board in conjunction with the Manager and Assistant Director (Community Engagement). The remainder of the key actions were built into the business plans for each directorate.

- *Was the passport office dealing with new applications?*

The Assistant Director (Resources) (Mr Mason) informed Members that the passport office would be dealing with new applications from 18 to 25 year olds.

- *The Panel had discussed a substantial spend on the Enterprise Centre earlier in the meeting but the Performance report stated that a review of the Enterprise Centre was underway.*

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) explained that the budget report related to the substantial maintenance backlog and if the City Council continued to own the building it would be a liability. He advised Members that part of their consideration of the issue should take into account the review.

- *Was there any way that the success of the economic regeneration could be reflected in the indicators?*

Mr O’Keeffe advised that he was not aware of any specific survey work and that was a big gap in the indicators.

- *Members requested Officers to consider over the next 3 months how they could measure that information and to research how other authorities monitor that information to enable the information to be compared.*

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder advised that the Council’s capacity to influence the job market was limited and that the Government had made an announcement on apprenticeship schemes which the City Council embraced and had taken up.

- *The City Council has the capacity to be a leader in the area with Enterprise Zones, etc and the opportunity to champion improvements for economic regeneration.*

- *Several years ago graduates found it difficult to find a job once their course was completed. Something had to be done to remedy that situation.*

RESOLVED: That the report be accepted with thanks

(b) Organisational Development Plan

The Organisational Development Manager (Ms Titley) submitted Report CE.23/11 that outlined the Organisational Development Plan for 2011-2013 that was approved by the Executive in March 2011. The Plan set out key objectives, outcomes for employees, key actions and measures of success for organisational development issues. Most of the measures of success were indicators that were used previously but there were some that were based on questions from the 2011 employee opinion survey.

Ms Titley outlined the progress made within the priorities and advised of future further work to be undertaken. She explained that sickness absence figures were now reported as part of the Operational Development Plan rather than the Corporate Performance Report.

Ms Titley explained the work and progress made with the priorities of the Organisational Development Plan. With regard to sickness absence she reported that health and wellbeing events were held within the Civic Centre. A recent event focussed on the men's health initiative and a number of projects had been planned for the coming year including a football tournament.

Ms Titley confirmed that future reports would be presented on a quarterly basis.

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

- *Was the cycle to work scheme available to Councillors as well as staff? And was the health and well being events available to Councillors as well as staff?*

The Deputy Chief Executive (Dr Gooding) advised that as the cycle to work scheme was part of a salary sacrifice scheme it was not available to Members.

Ms Titley explained that Members were welcome to the health and wellbeing events and Members were e-mailed of such events. She added that she hoped specific events could be set up for Members in the future.

- *Were the sickness absence figures worse than the last quarter?*

Mr O'Keeffe explained that the sickness absence figures were for the first quarter and that as there were seasonal variations it was difficult to determine whether there had been an improvement at the present time.

- *Were the qualifications gained by staff all work related?*

Ms Titley confirmed that the qualifications were all work related.

RESOLVED: That the reports be noted.

ROSP.65/11 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

During consideration of the above Item of Business, it was noted that the meeting had been in progress for 3 hours and it was moved, seconded and RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 9, in relation to the duration of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time limits of 3 hours.

(The meeting ended at 1.05pm)