

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 2 DECEMBER 2010 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Rutherford (Chairman), Councillors Bowditch, Craig, Mrs Robson, Vasey and Watson

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Bloxham – Local Environment Portfolio Holder
Councillor Mrs Bowman – Economic Development Portfolio Holder
Councillor Allison – Chair of Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel

EEOSP.77/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors C Farmer, Mrs N Farmer and Hendry.

EEOSP.78/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in respect of the business to be considered.

EEOSP.79/10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED – 1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2010 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2010 be noted.

EEOSP.80/10 CALL IN OF DECISIONS

There were no matters that had been the subject of call in.

EEOSP.81/10 OVERVIEW REPORT INCORPORATING THE WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN ITEMS

The Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) submitted report OS.28/10 providing an overview of matters related to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work. Details of the latest version of the work programme were also included.

Mrs Edwards reported that:

- The Forward Plan of the Executive covering the period 1 December 2010 to 31 March 2011 was published on 17 November 2010. The issues that fell within the remit of the Panel were:

KD.029/10	Budget Process 2011/12
KD.031/10	Parking Connect – Joined Up On/Off Car Parking Enforcement for Cumbria
KD.033/10	Policy Framework
KD.037/10	Core Strategy Issues and Options

The above items were discussed at the meeting.

KD.36/10 – North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Planning Guidelines and Building Design Supplementary Planning Document. The Panel had decided at its meeting on 21 October 2010 that they did not wish to consider the item.

KD.040/10 – Carlisle Old Town Hall – Heritage Lottery Fund Application. The item would be available for consideration at the meeting on 20 January 2011. However, the decision was scheduled to be taken by the Executive on 17 January 2011. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) advised that an announcement was expected at any time regarding the first stage of the development and a strategy on how to take the development forward. Money from English Heritage and the Lottery Commission was earmarked for the project. Mr Hardman agreed to give a verbal update on progress at the next meeting of the Panel.

- The Executive had considered the notes of the Car Parking Task and Finish Group at their meeting on 22 November 2010 and accepted all recommendations whilst acknowledging that further work was still to be done including budget considerations.
- Councillor Bainbridge had started working on the problems in the City regarding seagulls. As he had now been selected to sit on the Executive Mrs Edwards advised that she would speak with Councillor Bainbridge before consulting with the Panel whether the work would continue.

RESOLVED: 1) That, subject to the issues raised above, the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Forward Plan items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2) That Mr Hardman to provide a verbal update on the progress of the Old Town Hall project at the next meeting

3) That Mrs Edwards would speak with Councillor Bainbridge regarding the work on seagulls and bring the matter back to the Panel to consider whether they wished to continue with the work.

Revenue Budget Reports

(a) Summary of New Revenue Spending Pressures

The Assistant Director (Resources) (Mr Mason) submitted report RD.56/10 summarising the new revenue spending pressures that had emerged as part of the current year budget monitoring process and which would need to be considered in light of the Council's corporate priorities ie Economy and Environment.

The Executive had on 22 November 2010 (EX.186/10) received the report and forwarded it to Overview and Scrutiny Committees to give their initial views on whether the bids were to be supported in principle and whether, subject to available funding, they should be progressed any further. The requests cannot be considered in isolation and need to be viewed alongside the current forecast budget position as set out in the report.

Members then considered the following new pressures and raised the following comments and questions:

- *Some of the charges were set at a national level eg planning and others indicated a range of charges. What flexibility did the Council have regarding those charges?*

Mr Hardman advised that Building Control had the opportunity to set its own fees and work was under way to set the fees. With regard to Planning fees consultation was taking place that would indicate the fees by October 2011, but there would be a shortfall in income initially and it would probably take a couple of years to address the imbalance. Officers were costing applications to determine a realistic figure for Planning.

The Assistant Director (Local Environment) (Ms Culleton) advised that some Local Environment charges were set nationally and that they may rise but would not know until later.

- *The report stated that a review of fuel and energy costs was to be undertaken to determine the effect of fuel and energy usage across the Council. When will that review happen and who will carry it out?*

Mr Mason advised that the review was ongoing and was being carried out by the Buildings and Facilities Manager (Mr Kay). Significant savings in energy had already been made and the next big saving would be made by moving staff from Bousteads Grassing to the Civic Centre. With regard to Tullie House capital allocation had been brought forward to look at energy consumption as a result of which energy consumption had reduced. Mr

Mason was confident that the savings would extinguish the indicated overspend.

- *What caused the losses in Pest Control?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that less people had been using the service and the ingredients used by the officers was expensive.

Ms Culleton advised that there had been a shortfall for a number of years but officers were looking at where the target should be and the matter would then be addressed. One of the aims was to ensure a realistic target and the Portfolio Holder believed that officers had now got it right.

RESOLVED – (1) That Report CORP.56/10, Summary of New Revenue Spending Pressures be noted.

(b) Summary of Savings Delivered and New Proposals

Report RD.57/10 had been circulated to the Panel by way of background information.

Mr Mason advised that the savings delivered had been successful but the RSG settlement and grant cuts meant that the Council would have to make an additional saving of £2-3m on top of what had already been saved. The Senior Management Team and the Executive were looking at the Savings Strategy including the Asset Review and discretionary services.

Mr Mason advised that in 2010/11 an actual saving of £422,000 had been made within Local Environment and that although the service review was still going through he was confident that further savings would be delivered.

- **Transformation** – Mr Mason reported that the report showed the savings that had been achieved to date against the original £3m transformation target. Those savings had been/would be achieved through various service reviews and directorate restructures.
- **Concessionary Fares Grant** – Mr Mason reported that concessionary fares administration and funding would become the responsibility of the County Council with effect from 1 April 2011. The £200,000 saving was made by the Council no longer funding enhancements to the concessionary fares scheme once the responsibility for the function transferred to the County Council.
 - *The report indicated savings throughout the 5 year period in relation to Tullie House. How would those savings be made?*

The Strategic Director (Mr Crossley) advised that savings would be made prior to the transfer to Trust through the transformation process. Following

the implementation of Trust status the savings were indicated in the Business Case for a 3 year period and thereafter.

- *Would there be a reduction in staff numbers?*

Mr Crossley advised that the savings would be as a result of a reduction in staff numbers, energy savings and other changes proposed.

Mr Mason advised that there would be a discretionary rate relief of £116,000 if Tullie House was taken into Trust status.

- *There is nothing in the report to indicate that any research had been done to prove that the indicated savings were achievable. Where does that information come from? And is the Portfolio Holder confident that the measures proposed to make the savings will work?*

Mr Mason explained that the information was gathered from service reviews, risk measures and mitigation and through consultation with staff.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that the Executive may take up some of the suggestions made and that some of the figures may alter. He was confident that the proposed measures would work but that he would liaise with Ms Culleton.

Ms Culleton stated that the savings would be met by reduced spending on discretionary services and better service efficiencies and that officers were piloting a methodology to assist in the process.

- *With regard to transformation where would the costs of redundancies and advertising for recruitment be found?*

Mr Mason advised that those issues had been taken into account in last year's budget. £1.5m had been allocated to meet the costs of redundancies and to date £1m had been used. With regard to recruitment costs all directorates had their own budgets.

With regard to the Equality Impact Assessment and confidence in the budget proposals, Mr Crossley advised that officers in the Policy team were liaising with the Assistant Directors regarding the impact of the proposed changes. These were to be considered alongside savings being proposed at the County Council and other public bodies. There would also be an impact on resident groups in Carlisle and the Policy Manager (Mr O'Keeffe) was looking at the County Council proposals as well as the City Council proposals.

With regard to concessionary fares Mr Mason explained that the administration and funding would become the responsibility of the County Council from April 2011 and there would be a saving of £200,000 as the City Council would no longer be funding enhancements to the scheme.

- *Was there an overall strategic percentage cuts within directorates or were the cuts linked to the Corporate Plan? Some departments were concerned that savings of 10%-15% would be required.*

Mr Crossley explained that the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review indicated a saving of 26% could be required and whilst the Council were still awaiting details it was rumoured that the savings would have to be front loaded; that would mean more savings required in the earlier years. The details would be known by 21 December 2010 at the latest. Officers had tried to line up savings with the Corporate Plan requirements.

RESOLVED – That Report RD.57/10 be noted.

c) Review of Charges 2011/12

- **Local Environment**

Report CS.28/10 was submitted, setting out the proposed fees and charges for the services falling within the responsibility of the Local Environment Directorate.

The Executive had on 22 November 2010 (EX.181/10) considered the report and decided that the report be noted and referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for their consideration.

Car Parks – Officers had reviewed the short and long stay car parks and had proposed changes to maximise income and create a shoppers car park at Upper Viaduct. It was proposed to maintain the differential in costs between short and long stay car parks. That would take account of the changes expected by the increase in VAT in January. Contract car parking charges would be maintained at current levels plus VAT.

Bulky Waste/Special Collections – a flat rate would be introduced as the current system was confusing for customers, officers and Members. The new system would assist customers who wished to use the internet although customers would still be able to contact the Council by telephone. However it was expected that there would be a decrease in demand due to the changes in charges.

Purple Sacks – it was proposed that the provision of purple sacks would cease and that residents would be required to purchase sacks. Recycling rates had been successful and therefore the number of purple sacks being left for collection had reduced.

Bereavement – charges would be increased to cover the cost of replacement of the cremators.

- *When the work undertaken by the Task and Finish Group was presented to the Executive, it was stated that the recommendations*

were accepted and that the relevant proposals would be included in the budget recommendations. In many cases that had not been done, eg pro rata contracts for car parking, possibly charging different rates for less popular car parks.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that many of the recommendations had been agreed and would be put into the budget. That had not been done due to a lack of time. He had considered the car parks and functions with Ms Culleton and they were looking at options. Car parks would be reviewed and they were looking at a system of paying by mobile phone. With regard to people losing money due to machines not providing change, it had been agreed to round the charges up to £1.

In response to a Member's query the Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that the Panel may wish to make a recommendation that all car parks were similarly round up. However that would not encourage commuters to park outside the city centre and could result in commuters filling shopper car parks. .

- *The Executive had said they were looking at linear parking charges. Was there a timetable for that charging or would it be part of the ongoing car parking review?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder stated that the Executive would like to implement pay by phone but they were being guided by officers. While Parking Connect was underway it would be best to wait until all the information had been gathered then implement all the changes at once.

Ms Culleton advised that there would be a lot of change if Parking Connect was implemented but that a lot of good work had been done.

In response to a Member's query the Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that there would not be any concession for Cathedral users.

The revenue from Talkin Tarn would be ring fenced for woodland and leisure maintenance. Income from the car park and restaurant helped but next year the Council would lose the £40,000 concession from the County Council.

- *What was happening with the Green Travel Plan?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that parts of the Plan had been introduced. People were using cycles more to get around and staff were sharing cars. Members did not believe the time was right to start charging staff and Members for car parking but that it may be considered in the future.

- *Would it be possible to provide the removal of bulky waste free of charge for elderly residents?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that there would be no free collections but that if people had bulky items they could contact Centre 47

who would remove it free of charge if it could be reused. All items for removal by the Council would be charged and the Portfolio Holder recognised that the wording in the report would need to be amended to clarify the situation.

There was further discussion around the provision of purple sacks to residents. A Member was concerned that he was provided with a wheelie bin while other residents would have to pay for sacks. The Portfolio Holder explained that people who used wheelie bins put their refuse in sacks that they had purchased so the situation was no different for people purchasing purple sacks.

- *If people bought their own sacks there would be no guarantee that they would be good quality. The cheaper sacks would be more likely to be ripped by cats, dogs or birds. That would lead to a litter issue. When looking at a saving in one area officers should consider the impact in other areas. Would the saving in not supplying purple sacks be taken up by the need to clean up litter from torn sacks?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that the purchase of the sacks cost the Council £30,000. There were two options in the report regarding purple sacks and the Executive recommendation was to cease providing sacks to residents. A Member believed that people on low income would not be able to afford to buy sacks and requested that the Executive consider the matter again and present further options and recommendations to the Panel. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that there was insufficient time to re-consider the proposals but that the Executive would take on board the suggestions made by the Panel. Sacks could be made available to be collected at the Civic Centre at a charge.

RESOLVED – (1) That the observations of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel, as outlined above, be conveyed to the Executive.

(2) That the status quo be maintained regarding the supply of purple sacks

- **Economic Development**

Report ED.37/10 was submitted, setting out the proposed fees and charges for the services falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate.

The Executive had on 22 November 2010 (EX.183/10) considered the report and decided that the report be noted and referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for their consideration.

RESOLVED – That the decision of the Executive be noted.

Capital Budget Reports

d) Revised Capital Programme and Provisional Capital Programme

The Assistant Director (Resources) (Mr Mason) submitted report RD.53/10 detailing the revised capital programme for 2010/11, together with the proposed method of financing as set out in Appendices A and B. The report also summarised the proposed programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 in light of the capital bids submitted for consideration, and summarised the estimated and much reduced capital resources available to fund the programme.

The Executive had on 22 November 2010 (EX.188/10) considered the report and decided that the Executive:

- “1. Noted the revised capital programme and relevant financing for 2010/11 as set out in Appendices A and B of report RD.53/10;
2. Recommended that the City Council approve slippage of £3,654,300 and savings of £99,700 from 2010/11 identified in Phase 1 of the Review;
3. Had considered the proposed criteria, as suggested by the Senior Management Team, to be used in determining the revised Capital programme (Phase 2) based on capital resources available;
4. Had given initial consideration to the capital spending requests for 2011/12 to 2015/16 contained in Report RD.53/10 in the light of the estimated available resources; and
5. 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.”

Details of the new capital spending proposals which fell within the area of responsibility of the Committee were as detailed on the Agenda for the meeting.

Mr Mason advised that Phase 1 of the review had resulted in the revised capital programme included in the report. Phase 2 indicated that it was important to reduce capital grants over the next few years. The diagram indicated that there would be a loss of over £10m over the next 4-5 years. Funding would be available for 2 mechanical sweepers if savings were made in other areas.

Ms Culleton informed Members that the mechanical sweepers that the Council had did not sweep pathways but the new ones would.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Panel were satisfied with the explanation that project savings were not just a fixed percentage sliced off departments but would take into account the new Corporate Plan.

- 2.) That the Panel had concerns that it was not always clear in the report whether the transformation savings were a reduction or whether other appointment costs had been taken into consideration.
- 3.) That the Panel were happy with the proposed increase for charges in short and long term car parks.
- 4.) That the Panel were happy with the re-designation of car parks to maximise income.
- 5.) That the Panel were pleased that the Executive had taken on board the recommendations of the Car Parking Task and Finish Group and hoped that some of the recommendations would be in place in the near future.
- 6.) That the Panel accepted that pay by phone and changes to on-street parking would be held in abeyance until the current car parking review with the County Council was completed.
- 7.) The Panel understood that the charges from car parking at Talkin Tarn would be ring fenced to reinvest in facilities at Talkin Tarn.
- 8.) That, with regard to the provision of purple sacks to residents, following considerable debate, the Panel voted in favour of the status quo.

EEOSP.83/10 CORE STRATEGY KEY ISSUES PAPER

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) presented report ED.39/10 that had been prepared as the first opportunity to open up the discussion about the issues that were affecting and would affect Carlisle now and over the next 20 years. It was intended that the responses received to the consultation would help to shape the statutory issues and options stage of the Core Strategy preparation process that would follow on from the consultation. Public consultation at that stage was important as it would help to ensure that the issues identified and the options that would be developed to address them were locally relevant ensuring that ultimately a more robust Core Strategy was produced.

Members were asked to consider the suggested issues in the consultation papers and the evidence base used in the identification of the issues, and whether any issues had been omitted from the Key Issues Paper that should be included.

Mr Hardman advised Members that a workshop had been held that looked at where the report would sit within the Core Strategy. A lot of important work had been done that would have an impact on how the work would develop. In the report to Executive the timescale indicated adoption by February 2014 and that it would form part of the Policy Framework for consideration by the Executive, Overview and Scrutiny and Council. The first stage would be considered by the Executive at their meeting on 20 December 2012 with

comments from the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting and the workshop. The report outlined the current position and Mr Hardman advised that whilst the Local Plan would form the basis of the Strategy it was important to identify the right issues before the paper went out for consultation.

The matter had been considered by Executive on 22 November 2010 (EX.192/10).

The Executive resolved:

‘That the draft Core Strategy Key Issues paper be made available for consideration by the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel; and that subject to any additional information arising from the Scrutiny Panel, it be reported back to the Executive on 13 December 2010 to consider referral to Council for approval for public consultation on 12 January 2011.’

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder stated her thanks to Mr Hardman and his team for the workshop and added that she believed that as the work progressed, it would become clear how important the strategy was. Every time there was consultation the feedback was positive and the Portfolio Holder believed that should be included in the document.

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

- *Where the report mentions historic buildings would only those indicated be considered or would there be a complete list?*

Mr Hardman confirmed that the list highlighted a number of historic buildings but that all Grade 1 Listed Buildings would be included.

- *With regard to the economic scope of the Core Strategy it was important to ensure that remote areas and those with poor access would be included and that communications with those areas was also important.*

Mr Hardman agreed that those areas were fundamental to the economy and officers would ensure they would not be disenfranchised. Officers were aware of the problems with broadband and were trying to identify further needs.

- *The issues were complex and it was important that the framework did not stifle the development within the Council.*
- *Members would be required to agree the issues outlined before the Strategy went out for consultation. When looking at housing in rural areas in the past resources for housing had been allocated on a 70(urban)/30 (rural) split. How would officers address the changes to the rules and regulations regarding housing?*

Mr Hardman advised that when preparing the current Local Plan officers had looked at the settlement split and amended it to 80/20 between Carlisle and rural areas. The number of settlements had also been reduced from 80 to 23 in order to develop a more sustainable strategy. Mr Hardman had received correspondence from some of the Parish Councils and advised that some of the issues would be dealt with through the Core Strategy.

- *With regard to economic issues where would the LEP fit in?*

Mr Hardman explained that, in theory, the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework would implement the delivery of the solutions, while the LEP would give the spatial steer for Cumbria, and it would have a planning role. The Council would need to ensure that the Core Strategy had a Cumbria wide perspective and the sub regional aspect would come through the LEP.

- *Would officers be working with the private sector to bring work in?*

Mr Hardman advised that with regard to the economic work, that would be done with the Local Strategic Partnership and the Enterprise and Economic Development sub-group looking at actions and priorities working towards a replacement for Carlisle Renaissance. Mr Hardman confirmed that relationships were already in place with the Cumbria Inward Investment Agency and the Large Employers Affinity Group.

- *Who would the consultation be going out to?*

Mr Hardman explained that initially the consultation would go to 100 organisations that play an active role in working with the community. Thereafter consultation would be widened and the press would be notified.

- *The Local Plans office advised of a web link to the SHLAA site that contained a lot of information and comments could be left.*

Mr Hardman advised that it could be accessed through the planning section of the Council's website. He agreed to circulate the e-mail link to Members.

RESOLVED: 1) That the Panel thanked Mr Hardman and his team for the report.

2.) That officers should ensure that housing allocations and rural settlement figures should be looked at again.

EEOSP.84/10 TRANSFORMATION SAVINGS UPDATE

(a) Economic Development

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) (Mr Hardman) presented report ED.40/10 that updated Members on the transformation savings so far

delivered or proposed, including staff structure changes, as part of the Transformation Programme.

Mr Hardman reminded the Panel of the context and background of the Transformation Programme. He explained that as part of the process of management review and transformation, the Economic Development Directorate had undertaken a staffing review, that, in consultation with staff and trades unions established a revised management structure and the establishment of the Economic Development team area, which was brought about by the amalgamation of Carlisle Renaissance staff and the existing City Council Economic Development team. The amalgamation of Development Control and Local Plans and Conservation teams had brought together a revised Planning Team.

Mr Hardman explained that the Local Plans and Conservation Manager post and the Business Development Officer post had been vacated and were to be deleted. The Development Manager – Carlisle Renaissance post had been vacated. Other posts to be vacated were the Development Control Manager, External Funding Officer and the Programme Director – Carlisle Renaissance. A new post of Economic Development Manager had been appointed and a new post of Planning Manager had been created and recruitment was underway. An Interim Planning Manager had been appointed in the short term. There was no substantive change to Building Control.

Mr Hardman advised that the Tourism Service was also provided from staff within the Economic Development Directorate but with the establishment of the Carlisle Tourism Partnership there was also a post created of Director. That post was funded by Cumbria Tourism (with funding from NWDA) and therefore not employed by the City Council. It would however have an integral role in the operation of the tourism service and fulfil management responsibilities in the revised structure from phase 1 review.

Mr Hardman outlined the established savings made in 2010/11 and the recurring savings up to 2014/15, an overall saving of £129,000 per year. He added that as part of the ongoing Programme the Directorate was continuing its programme of management restructure from phase 1 and review of revenue. Phase 2 of the review of management and staffing structures was currently being considered and consultation with staff and trade unions was due to begin in December 2010. He added that due to the funding nature of the Director of Carlisle Tourism Partnership post, the role and function of that post and the City Council tourism employees were being considered as part of the ongoing staff review.

Mr Hardman explained that while the report in the budget papers indicated zero savings made that was due to the fact that the savings would not be made while people were still working their notice. That saving would not take effect until 31 December 2010.

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

- *The post of Development Manager (Carlisle Renaissance) had been vacated. Was the post still vacant?*

Mr Hardman explained that Carlisle Renaissance had been disbanded following the Board decision at its June meeting and the staff who were originally employed by the City Council absorbed into the Economic Development team. Some of the staff were on fixed term contracts some of which were due to end in March 2011 and a couple in 2012. The Development Manager had been recruited to the post of Economic Development Manager. The Council had funded some of the posts but that funding would stop in 2011.

- *Two posts had been merged – Local Planning Manager and Development Control Manager. What was the rationale behind that decision?*

Mr Hardman advised that the role of manager would be a strategic role and previously the Development Control Manager had a case load that the new post would not.

Mr Crossley explained that posts would not be removed at all levels but it was hoped that the Planning Manager would be able to work across both areas and in time staff would be able to work across the team. That would not only keep costs down but would help career development.

With regard to discretionary services Mr Hardman advised that it was important to look at the way statutory functions were devolved and how best to deliver front line services. There had been some private finance agreed over a three year programme but there were implications around how funding could be sourced. How services would be delivered was a priority and Mr Crossley stated that things would have to be done differently in future.

RESOLVED: 1) That the report be noted.

The meeting was adjourned from 12:30 to 12:35.

(b) Local Environment

The Assistant Director (Local Environment) (Ms Culleton) presented report CS.30/10 that updated Members on the transformation savings so far delivered or proposed, including staff structure changes, as part of the Transformation Programme.

Ms Culleton reminded the Panel of the context and background of the Transformation Programme. She explained that work had already begun to transform the Local Environment in the form of a savings and efficiency review and informed Members on the work that had been delivered as part of that process.

In consultation with staff and trades unions the Local Environment Management Structure review (phase 1) had identified and established a revised management structure, which included the transfer of Bereavement Services from the Community Engagement Directorate into the Local Environment Directorate, and the establishment of a new team, the Neighbourhoods and Green Spaces team, to enhance an area based approach to service delivery and a Performance Improvement Manager to co-ordinate the programme of service improvement and savings and efficiency reviews. As part of the review the posts of Environmental Health Manager (Environment Quality), Environmental Health Manager (Food and Health and Safety), Area Maintenance Manager, Bereavement Services Manager and Green Spaces Manager had been deleted. Posts of Highways Manager and Waste Services Manager had been post holder matched. The new post of Neighbourhoods and Green Spaces Manager was filled by internal recruitment in line with the Council's assimilation procedure. The posts of Environmental Health Manager and Performance Improvement Manager were currently vacant and under recruitment.

Work on budget revisions/income maximisation had included reviewing operational costs, expenditure and commissioning of the box recycling collection service.

Ms Culleton outlined the established savings made in 2010/11 and the recurring savings up to 2014/15 as indicated in the report. She added that as part of the ongoing Programme the Directorate would make further contributions to meeting corporate savings targets by the reduction of funding in Local Environment that would result in a reduction in resources available to deliver some work programmes and some discretionary services may need to cease. Ms Culleton indicated various services that would be considered in an approach of service cuts/reductions, working more efficiently and increasing income. She stated that Local Environment must refocus on priorities to minimise the impact of reducing resources on front line services that the public value. Workshop and public view were that the cleanliness of the streets, anti-social behaviour such as dog fouling, better quality highways and rural services were priority areas.

Ms Culleton advised that various approaches would be considered to meet savings targets and that initial savings were proposed using the strategies detailed in the report.

Ms Culleton further advised that the next phase of staffing structure was currently being considered and consultation with staff and trades unions was due to begin in December 2010. Work was also going on to identify a reduction in departmental revenue expenditure, particularly in areas of discretionary spend. Efficiency reviews of statutory services, such as waste collection services, would be undertaken to find further savings with minimal reduction in services through maximising productivity and minimisation of waste.

Ms Culleton gave a presentation that highlighted issues in the report. She advised that there was a lot of work to do by the post of Performance Improvement Manager in delivering services and modernising the way the Council were delivering services. The post was part of a 5 year programme that would support the other 4 managers. Because the work of those managers was often reactive they did not always have the capacity to make the necessary changes but the Local Environment Performance Improvement Manager would work with the managers to make those improvements.

When a customer made a query staff would work alongside managers to resolve the issue. That would reduce mistakes and cut the number of complaints. There would also be a web facility that would enable customers to access the Council via the internet as well as by phone and face to face. The Improvement team would look at developing a database that would cut across all departments that would give all departments the information needed to look at performance and customer needs.

Ms Culleton informed Members that it was the intention to move staff from Bousteads Grassing to the Civic Centre and improving the technology used by Pest Control Officers so they would not need to come into the office as frequently and could attend more appointments. Staff were also working with GIS to look at area based demands and requests. Staff were also working with partners, and Officers were looking at better ways of working as well as looking at efficiencies.

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

- *There is a concern that all departments were losing skilled people and new people were floundering. Green Spaces and Area Maintenance had been merged but there did not seem to be an Action Plan to carry the work through.*

Ms Culleton advised that the Neighbourhoods and Green Spaces Manager was looking at that work and that he was developing an Action Plan.

- *Were Members being kept informed of the new officers to contact?*

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that an e-mail had been sent informing Members of the new appointments.

- *With regard to Bousteads Grassing would the vehicles remain at Bousteads Grassing?*

Ms Culleton explained that the vehicles and associated staff would remain at Bousteads Grassing along with the garage and depot for street cleansing vehicles. It had been difficult managing people at Bousteads Grassing while managers were based at the Civic Centre.

Ms Culleton informed Members that there had been a saving of £422,000 indicated for 2010/11 that had been made from the green box contract and fleet, closing the reception at Bousteads Grassing and the reduction in energy costs within Bereavement Services.

- *There was a concern that the Council were losing staff that had a lot of history of the organisation. Adverts to recruit externally were expensive and more posts should have been filled internally.*

Ms Culleton stressed that the Council would not make a post redundant unnecessarily, that there was a redeployment policy for staff and that the assimilation process had been adhered to. There had been opportunities for staff to apply for posts and posts had been matched or ring fenced where possible. She believed the Council had done all they could.

RESOLVED: 1) That there had been some concern about the number of redundancies and whether sufficient attention had been given to internal recruitment. However, the panel were satisfied that the proper procedures had been followed and staff had been given the opportunity to apply for posts.

EEOSP.85/10 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 limit of 3 hours.

EEOSP.86/10 ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE OF THE COUNCIL

The Health and Safety Manager (Mr Majhi) presented report GD.68/10 that provided an update on the environmental performance of the Council. The report included updates on the environmental performance indicators, current energy use within directly controlled City Council buildings, carbon dioxide reduction from local authority operations and made reference to the Local Climate Impact Profile developed by Cumbria Climate Change Task Group. Reference was also made to the progress regarding the Green Travel Plan, the continued success with regard to environmental awards and discussed the challenges and opportunities brought about by the Comprehensive Spending Review with particular reference to the status of the Carbon Management Programme.

Mr Majhi advised that Carlisle's Climate Change strategy, approved by Council in January 2009, outlined aims and objectives for the City Council to tackle climate change through its operations, service delivery and work with partners and communities it served.

Information in the report indicated carbon dioxide reduction from local authority operations and included all City Council owned premises, including those not directly controlled by the City Council, eg Carlisle Leisure Limited sites. Mr Majhi advised that an error in the figures in the previous report as a result of a significant over-estimation of gas and electricity usage from Carlisle Leisure Limited Centre Pool venue that had led to an over-reporting of reductions of carbon dioxide for 2008/09 of 5.3% compared with the true figure of 3.6%.

Mr Majhi advised that the City Council continued to make steady progress to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions in comparison to its 2007/08 baseline. Carlisle City Council's Climate Change Strategy had an aspirational target of a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 25% by the end of 2013 compared with the 2007/08 baseline year.

The indicator for the per capita reduction in carbon dioxide for the local authority area had been adopted as a key indicator in the Cumbria Local Area Agreement and the Carlisle Community Plan produced by the Carlisle Partnership. The indicator relied on statistics produced by DEFRA to measure end user carbon dioxide emissions in the local area from the business and public sector, domestic housing and road transport. The latest figures had been obtained from the Department of Energy and Climate Change.

Another indicator, NI 188 – planning to adapt to climate change – was used to assess the local authority's progress on tackling climate change. The indicator was based on qualitative information ensuring local authorities were prepared to manage the risks associated with climate change including service delivery, the public and local communities, local infrastructure, businesses and natural environment. Local authorities had to report on their level of preparedness graded 0-4. In 2008/09 the City Council was at level 0. A Local Climate Impact Profile for Cumbria was developed as a result of the joint work undertaken by the Cumbria Climate Change Task Group that allowed the City Council to achieve a grade 1 in 2009/10.

Mr Majhi advised that gas consumption had been reduced on all four main sites since 2007/08 with Tullie House achieving the largest reduction of 10% and the Civic Centre 7%. The actual data from a number of community centres was still awaited. Electricity consumption had been cut at Bousteads Grassing and Tullie House, but had risen at the Civic Centre and the Crematorium. The actual data from a number of community centres was still awaited.

Mr Majhi explained that the Green Travel Plan showed a 17.2% reduction in business mileage undertaken by staff and Members between 2008/09 and 2009/10. Business travel in private vehicles had reduced by 27.3% since 2007/08. There had been a reduction in fuel used for fleet vehicles and an overall reduction of emissions from overall fleet use.

There had been a joint initiative with Cumbria County Council supporting National Bike Week by providing a free 'bike to work' breakfast to staff cycling to work at the Civic Centre on 23 June.

There was a 'Green Travel Plan' page on the City Council's intranet that gave useful information to staff and Members regarding public transport, car sharing and annual events as well as promoting the use of bicycles for short journeys from City Council properties and hire cars for longer journeys.

Mr Majhi advised that the City Council had retained the Gold level of the Cumbria Business Environment Network Awards in March 2010 and the Green Flag Award status for Tullie House garden, Bitts park, Hammonds Pond, Richardson Street Cemetery and the Crematorium.

Mr Majhi explained the focus of the Audit Commissions Use of Resources Key Line of Enquiry Audit and the reasons why it was important. As part of the audit Mr Majhi had provided information on the environmental work undertaken that demonstrated the commitment the City Council was making to ensure it was meeting its obligations to reduce its own consumption of natural resources. The Audit Commission had verbally indicated that it was very satisfied with the progress being made. Unfortunately, as the Audit Commission was one of the casualties in the Government's reorganisation in 2010, the results were never published.

Mr Majhi gave the background to the Carbon Management Programme and advised that in 2009/10, as a result of existing budgetary pressures, the Carbon Management Programme budgetary bid for 2010/11 was not put forward and hence the programme was effectively put on hold. It was likely that it would remain on hold for the foreseeable future due to the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

In conclusion Mr Majhi advised that the City Council was committed in reducing carbon dioxide emissions, gas and electricity usage. Efforts would be made to continue to raise the need to maintain and improve practices and measures that employees could take to assist in the maintenance and reductions in energy use. New equipment had been installed to assist in the more accurate measuring of energy usage within the Civic Centre that would enable the Council to identify and target areas of high energy use and reduce them at source in 2011/12. The continued development and maintenance of the Environment Management System would also ensure legal environmental compliance as well as seeking to reduce the potential environmental impacts of the City Councils' operations.

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

- *The report indicated that oil consumption was up due to the additional requirements at Bousteads Grassing. What action was intended for future years?*

Mr Majhi advised that the oil was purchased as a bulk order and that made the cost look high over the year. He believed that the Council were investing in a larger, old building and that the matter needed to be looked into.

- *The cost of electricity at the crematorium was up dramatically. What was the reason for that?*

Mr Majhi explained that the cremator used gas but that the buildings used electricity. Officers had looked at ways of using gas as costs increased as the number of cremations increased.

Mr Majhi informed Members that at the Civic Centre equipment was in place that could map the use of electricity and identify where the electricity was being used. Staff could then be educated on use of energy. The work was focussing on floors 3 and 4.

Mr Majhi explained that, with regard to the National Indicator NI 188 – Planning to adapt to climate change, there would be year on year progress. There was a strategic approach across Cumbria but the Council was trying to be more prepared and that the next step would be to carry out a risk assessment to assess how the Council were doing and address any issues. In comparison to other districts Carlisle was one of the best.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder advised that the process had started some time ago and there had been many environmental changes introduced and the effects could be seen. Lighting to Swifts car parking was now using lower voltage and while there had been no change to the lighting produced consumption had been reduced. The Portfolio Holder believed that the issues were not just part of Governance but were cross cutting across all directorates.

- *With regard to the Green Travel Plan the report indicates a reduction in the number of miles travelled.*

Mr Majhi advised that staff were using public transport more and using video conferencing instead of attending meetings. Staff had also received training in how to drive more efficiently.

- *Had there been any follow up to National Bike Week?*

Mr Majhi stated that officers were concentrating on next year and that there were better cycle ways. The Support Officer (Mr Harling) was dedicated to the cause and looking at ways to get staff engaged.

RESOLVED: 1.) That the report be noted.

2.) That update reports be submitted to the Panel annually.

**EEOSP.87/10 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MONITORING
REPORT FOR YEAR TO DATE 2010/2011**

The Policy and Performance Manager (Mr O’Keeffe) presented report PPP.45/10 which provided the corporate performance for the months April to September 2010.

Mr O’Keeffe explained that the report was presented in the existing format but also in the proposed future format based around the delivery of the Corporate Plan. With the replacement of the National Indicator Set and the abolition of Comprehensive Area Assessment, Use of Resources and Place Survey, the Council was presented with an excellent opportunity to review performance management across the Authority.

Mr O’Keeffe outlined the background to the report and explained that the new report contained the standard performance information for the Mid Year Performance Report, however, the structure was different from previous reports. The information had been presented through the Corporate Plan key objectives and outcomes for the communities, and performance was measured against actions, performance indicators and risks. This approach provided an overview of the different types of activity the Council was taking to implement the plan and an opportunity to highlight their performance.

He added that a flag system would be developed for the new version of the report; green for good performance and red for poor performance. A red flag would highlight major challenges facing the Council where an intervention needed to take place to improve performance. A green flag would highlight areas of good practice or where the Council were achieving excellent outcomes in priority areas. He explained that there were many gaps in the information where activity may not be currently measured or recorded at a corporate level through Covalent.

Despite the abolition of the Local Area Agreement it was proposed that the reporting of relevant and useful National Indicators as local measures would continue to be measured until the end of the financial year. All indicators would be reviewed in January at a Member’s workshop and through consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Overview and Scrutiny Panels, Executive and senior managers.

Mr O’Keeffe then highlighted some of the relevant indicators outlined in the report. He reminded Members that there had been a workshop on Performance Monitoring and that a second one had been arranged for 25 January 2011.

In considering the performance information Members raised the following questions and comments:

- *While the new format is better there should be more control over the setting of Performance Indicators and they should be related to the Corporate Plan and the Council’s priorities. There should be caution*

that the right indicators were not too easy or unable to be fulfilled. With the abolition of independent organisations how would officers ensure the indicators were set appropriately?

Mr O’Keeffe advised that it could be an opportunity for the Local Strategic Partnership to draw in to help with the challenge with stakeholders and Members as the focal point to help to pull the work together as part of the work programme. It would be an opportunity for Task and Finish Groups to pull in other stakeholders to assist with their work.

- *The Government set out a number of targets and the Audit Commission added to those targets that led to information overload. Management information was important but managers had to be able to collect the information in the most efficient way possible. In the past money had been spent gathering information that was not useful. The Member suggested that the information should be gathered from Council officers rather than outside bodies.*
- *Would peer assessment be more appropriate?*

The Council had just gone through a peer assessment and officers were learning more about the principles of peer assessment.

Mr O’Keeffe explained that the Council needed to understand how other authorities develop their performance indicators and the processes and functions used and whether they were measuring indicators in the same way as Carlisle City Council. It was important to get the balance right as managers were under a lot of pressure and the Council had a unique range of services on offer.

- *It is important to include the comments in the report as otherwise the information was not easily understood.*

Mr O’Keeffe confirmed that officers were putting the information into the system and that it was being stressed that comments were essential. He stated that although the Audit Commission had been disbanded the intention was to have new arrangements in place for auditing England’s public bodies.

RESOLVED – 1) The Panel were happy with the new format

2) The Panel agreed that exception indicators would be submitted quarterly with the remainder submitted annually

3.) The Panel would be happy for the Council to set their own Performance Indicators but they were aware of the danger that external monitoring may no longer be available.

EEOSP.88/10 POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Assistant Director (Governance) (Mr Lambert) submitted report GD.61/10 concerning the Council's Policy Framework. He drew Members' attention to Appendix 1 to the report which set out where the Policy Framework sat in the Council's constitutional arrangements and the number of policies and strategies presently comprising that framework.

He outlined the relevance of the Policy Framework in the authority's governance arrangements, commenting that the policies within the framework, along with the budget, were the fixed parameters set by Council within which the Executive must act. Short of that, the Executive were entitled to take whatever decisions they deemed appropriate in respect of virtually all the functions of the Council vested in them. He added that the purpose behind the legislation which brought in the new governance arrangements was to streamline and speed up decision making and, more particularly, to produce greater clarity as to where responsibility for actual decisions rested by vesting the decision making powers in a small, identifiable body (the Leader and Executive) or, where there was an elected Mayor, in that individual personally. Details of the intended checks and balances on the Executive's powers were provided. It should be noted that the legislation provided for a strict compartmentalisation of Council functions and responsibilities; and if the wrong body took a decision it would be ultra vires and potentially challengeable. It was also important to be able to identify clearly whether a decision was inside or outside the Policy Framework, since if it was inside then the Executive could take it but if it was outside then it would be a matter for full Council. The number of policies and strategies within the Policy Framework obviously had a bearing on the ease of identifying whether a potential decision was within or outwith the framework and thereby down to the Executive or the Council.

Mr Lambert explained that the legislation set out a limited number of core strategies which must be within the Policy Framework and therefore approved by full Council. Those were intended to be the most important governing strategies which went to the root of the authority's policy direction and aims, and must be included as part of the Policy Framework by law. For the purposes of the City Council those included the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy; Licensing Authority Policy Statements; Sustainable Community Strategy; and Plans and alterations which together comprised the Development Plan.

The legislation also allowed authorities to include other plans and strategies within its Policy Framework definition over and above the basic statutory core plans, the intention being to allow some local discretion in elevating a particular plan or strategy into their Policy Framework to reflect local preference and give some measure of local autonomy. When Carlisle first adopted its Constitution it took the view that all the authority's plans and strategies should be deemed to be part of the Policy Framework and thereby approved by full Council to reflect both their importance and the sovereignty of

Council in setting policy. The thinking at that time was that, on top of the statutory core plans, there would be very few additional plans and strategies which would require to be adopted and so the governance arrangements could cope with their adoption. That had proved not to be the case since, as Appendix 1 indicated, there were currently 80 plans listed in the authority's framework which number was growing annually.

Mr Lambert further outlined the consequences of having a large policy framework, as set out in the report. He drew Members' attention to Appendix 2 which specified what must be included within the Policy Framework, together with what the Government guidance recommended be included. It was also recommended that a sentence be added to the Constitution to clarify that the term 'Budget' included documents such as the Medium Term Financial Plan; Capital Strategy; Asset Management Plan and Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy (one document), the effect being that Council would retain the decision making authority over those documents.

It was proposed that the content of Appendix 2 became the Council's new Policy Framework as specified within Article 4 of the Constitution. In addition, there would be other policies, for example the Council's Gambling Policy, which were required by their respective enabling legislation to be dealt with by Council irrespective of what was specified in the Authority's Policy Framework. The table at Section 2.6 of the report illustrated, for comparison purposes, the number of policies reserved to District Councils rated as 'excellent' for CPA purposes and having gained a score of 4 in Use of Resources. There was no doubt that the leaner policy base assisted the Councils in achieving excellence.

In conclusion, Mr Lambert reported that, for the reasons mentioned, the case for reviewing the number of policies and strategies presently comprising the authority's Policy Framework was compelling, particularly given that the Transformation Programme was leading to a leaner Officer corps and would necessitate a much sharper focus by both Members and Officers on what was important to the authority and a more economical use of their time. A way forward would be to consider limiting the Policy Framework only to the statutory core strategies with (possibly) the addition of any other strategies which the authority concluded were of sufficient importance to warrant their inclusion, although the Council may be content to include only the statutorily prescribed strategies and nothing more. Although it was not possible to give a definitive estimate of what a smaller Policy Framework designation would save in monetary terms it should, apart from any other advantage, reduce the time demands on both Members and Officers and enable the reduced Officer establishment to service the authority's decision making processes from a lower staffing base.

He added that all of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels would consider the matter, following which it would be brought back to the Executive on 17 January 2011. Thereafter, if deemed appropriate, a report with a

recommendation would be presented to the Council at its meeting on 1 March 2011.

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder was pleased to see the report, commenting that the Policy Framework should have been reviewed some time ago.

The matter had been considered by Executive on 8 November 2010 (EX.171/10).

The Executive resolved that:

'That the Executive:

1. Noted the content of Report GD.54/10 and indicated that they were minded to recommend to Council the amendment to Article 4 of the Constitution and revision of its Policy Framework to those policies as specified in Appendix 2; and
2. Referred the report to all of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Panels for comment.'

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

- *There was some merit in reducing the number of policies as many go to full Council and are approved 'on the nod'. However, there was a concern about moving everything back to the Executive without safeguard or a better relationship between the Executive and Scrutiny. In the past Members could decide which items on the Forward Plan they wished to scrutinise after they had been to Executive.*

Mr Lambert explained that the Overview and Scrutiny Panels were the safeguard and that it was the role of the Panels to hold the Executive to account by the use of their call-in powers. That would create a brake in the process and be a check and balance to ensure the Executive properly scrutinised and made to further consider matters before acting (if necessary).

With regard to the Forward Plan Mr Lambert advised that officers were trying to review the Corporate Plan to link with the Forward Plan so it should be more accurate and user friendly. If a matter was to be brought to Overview and Scrutiny before being considered by the Executive, that would mean that there was no Executive 'buy-in' of any particular policy. That may lead to a situation where policies considered by Overview and Scrutiny were proposed directly by officers, a situation that would not be appropriate. Members are informed of the Committee dates a year in advance and should plan work to follow the process.

- *Changes to the Forward Plan does upset some of the work programme. Calling in a decision would lead to an additional meeting*

and officers and Members may have other commitments. Initially some issues were submitted to the Panel endorsed by an Executive decision as the Executive had been able to access information that the Panel had not seen. Better communication could have been arranged to prevent problems.

Mr Lambert suggested that Members could work with Portfolio Holders to discuss what issues were coming up that they would like to scrutinise. If the panel did not have access to the information they could call-in the decision.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder stated that he could understand the concerns about Overview and Scrutiny not seeing information before the Executive, but the Executive needed to take ownership of issues to be discussed by Scrutiny Panels. Lately, rather than refer matters to Scrutiny Panels, documents had been made available if they wished and that had been helpful. There was a concern that if all the information was not there the matter would have to go back to another Executive and officers needed to consider how to address that issue.

Mr Lambert advised that the present system (under which all policies required approval by the Council) allowed Council to change an Executive decision. With the new proposed system Members would have the ability to call matters in and refer them (as one possible course of action) to the Council for a debate. Ultimately, however, the decision, under the proposed regime, would rest with the Executive.

- *At the start of each year the Panel decided on any Task and Finish work they wished to undertake throughout the year. As Members had the work programme it made sense for them to see documents to allow them to make fuller recommendations to the Executive. However how would they see interim reports as they would not be included in the Forward Plan?*

Mr Lambert advised that the matter came back to the relationship with the Executive and policy development.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder reminded Members that the Task and Finish Group that looked at fortnightly waste collections forwarded reports to the Executive before they went through scrutiny and that project was very successful. If Overview and Scrutiny Panels said they were interested in an issue they needed to become more involved and the Executive would welcome that.

- *The new proposals would mean there would be fewer policies going to Council and that more power would be given to the Executive. The proposed system would be speeding up the process and that usually led to bad decisions. The Member asked for further explanation of the process as he could not see the benefits to individual Councillors.*

Mr Lambert confirmed that Overview and Scrutiny would act as a brake if Members thought decisions were being made too quickly. The Panel could use their powers to call-in a decision and refer it to Council for an extra debate in relation to any particular decision. The Executive would have to receive Council's comments but, ultimately, responsibility lay with the Executive.

- *There was a need to reduce policies but what about important issues such as the Asset Management Plan?*

Mr Lambert explained that such matters would be included within the budget process and that many of the remaining policies would be operational documents. The Asset Management Plan was specifically referenced as being a budget document and was, therefore, still within the rules appertaining to the Budget and Policy Framework.

Councillor Allison (Chair, Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel) informed Members that Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel had had sight of confidential documents before the matter had been considered by the Executive. That had given Overview and Scrutiny the opportunity for more involvement and made better recommendations to the Executive.

Mr Lambert reiterated that improved working relationships would be needed for the proposed scheme to be successful. The matter would be considered by the Executive in January before being considered at Council in March.

- *Members believed that the list of policies was long and that there should be a cross-party group to consider the matter.*

Mrs Edwards advised that the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had agreed the proposals in principle and also endorsed the Chairs' Group recommendation of a meeting with the Executive to discuss their relationship.

- *It would be difficult to assess the political group's view and there was a concern that the Executive would be making more decisions and Council less. The Member believed there had not been sufficient time to fully consider the matter.*

Mr Lambert advised that the reason for reducing the number of policies was to make the decision making process more robust and to make it easier to identify whether policies were inside or outside policy framework. He believed that at present when a decision was made by Council all Members were involved; however, responsibility lay with a small group of identifiable people, ie the Executive under the new proposals. Council would still have a role under the suggested regime.

RESOLVED – 1.) That the Panel had considered the proposals.

2.) That the Panel were concerned about how the streamlined procedures would work and recognised that there would need to be changes and improvements in the relationship between the Executive and Overview and

Scrutiny Panels that may require more informal strategies, meetings between Panel Chairs and relevant Portfolio Holders to ensure Panels could play an effective role.

3.) The Panel noted the reference made to call-ins but Members needed to ensure call-ins were not used excessively as members would not always be able to make time for call-in meetings. Members would need to ensure proper working relationships with the Executive

4.) The Panel were concerned that the list was long and they did not think Members would be comfortable that they would all go along with the new system as more detailed work was required. Mr Lambert and Mr O’Keeffe to arrange the informal meeting to discuss the list of policies

EEOSP.89/10 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 items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Paragraph Number 1 of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

EEOSP.90/10 PARKING CONNECT – JOINED UP ON/OFF STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT FOR CUMBRIA (Public and Press excluded by virtue of paragraph 3)

The Assistant Director (Local Environment) (Ms Culleton) submitted report CS.29/10 concerning Parking Connect – joined up on/off street parking enforcement for Cumbria.

The matter had been considered by Executive on 22 November 2010 (EX.211/10).

The Executive resolved:

‘That the Executive had:

1. Considered the potential risks and benefits of the various options presented in Report CS.27/10 and, subject to satisfactory negotiation with the County Council on any remaining risks, agreed to progress the Parking Connect proposal.
2. Agreed to invite other District Councils to have their off street services provided by Parking Connect delivered by Carlisle City Council.

3. Granted delegated authority to the Assistant Director (Local Environment), in consultation with the Executive Member for Local Environment and the Executive Member for Resources, to agree the terms of any agency agreements for on and off street parking services.

Ms Culleton gave a presentation that updated Members on the current position and advised that the matter was complex but that a robust decision was needed as it would affect the whole County. Ms Culleton had discussed the issues with officers from all districts and outlined to them the advantages and disadvantages of Parking Connect.

Ms Culleton advised that it was unlikely that Parking Connect could be implemented before September 2011, given the work still to be done on the project.

There was discussion on staff numbers and Ms Culleton assured Members that staff would be transferred to the scheme using TUPE arrangements and that negotiations would be done with officers in districts and the County Council regarding staff numbers and TUPE costs.

Ms Culleton outlined the risks, advantages and disadvantages of the scheme as well as the issues if another district or private contractor took on the scheme.

RESOLVED: 1) That the Panel were happy to endorse the Task and Finish Group's recommendation to support the proposal in principle.

[The meeting ended at 15.35pm]