

COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 13 JANUARY 2011 AT 10.00AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Clarke (Chairman) Councillors Bowman S, Mrs Bradley, Cape, Mrs Farmer (until 12noon), Glover (until 1.05pm), Nedved, Scarborough (as substitute for Cllr Mrs Riddle)

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Bainbridge – Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor Mrs Geddes – Community Engagement Portfolio Holder
Councillor Ellis – Performance and Development Portfolio Holder
Sue Pennycook, Chief Executive Carlisle Youth Zone
David Allen, Chairman of the Carlisle Youth Zone
Maggie Mooney as Director of the Carlisle Youth Zone
Mr Patrick Leonard, Director of Riverside Carlisle
Mr Paul Taylor, Head of Operations, Riverside Carlisle

COSP.01/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Mrs Riddle.

COSP.02/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest submitted.

COSP.03/11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 25 November 2010 be agreed as a correct record of the meetings and signed by the Chairman.

COSP.04/11 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS

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

COSP.05/11 QUESTION FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman informed the Panel that a member of the public had submitted three questions to the Panel, unfortunately the questions had been submitted after the deadline and so were unable to be considered at this meeting. The Chairman stated that the questions would be placed on the agenda for the February meeting for consideration by the Panel if the member of public so wished.

COSP.06/11 CARLISLE YOUTH ZONE

The Chairman welcomed Ms Pennycook, Chief Executive of the Carlisle Youth Zone and Mr Allen, Chairman of the Carlisle Youth Zone to the meeting.

Ms Pennycook gave a presentation to the Panel. She explained the need for the Youth Zone and how it had been modelled on the Bolton Lads and Girls Club. She informed the Panel that the OnSide Northwest Aim had been to :

“to build a network of 21st Century Youth Centres across the North West which will give young people top quality, safe and affordable places to go in their leisure time”

There was a three step support plan for the Youth Zone which included private sector development, local engagement and facilities development. Each partnership would be established as a fully independent charity with its own board of trustees.

Ms Pennycook outlined the ‘ideal’ fundraising ratio for the Zone and explained that the Youth Zone in Carlisle was the very first of its type. She outlined the consultation that had taken place for the Zone and what the emerging themes had been. She also outlined the four aims of the Youth Zone:

- To encourage healthy lifestyles
- To develop positive behaviour, helping young people to deal with challenges and build positive relationships
- To reduce crime , discriminatory and anti social behaviour
- To raise aspirations – exposing young people to new and inspiring experiences, building confidence, self esteem and self efficacy

Ms Pennycook explained that there was a mixture of private sector expertise and public sector interest in the Zone and reminded the Panel that the Board was private sector led. The Zone was keen to provide additional activities and would not duplicate work that was already underway in communities. The Zone would provide placement opportunities through partners and would have open and transparent working practices with local groups.

She explained that the Young People’s Development Group had helped with the bid and the design of the building and would continue to be involved in the Youth Zone.

The presentation also included the staff structure for the Zone, what facilities would be available in the building and what activities would be on offer. The membership for the Youth Zone would cost £5.00 per year or 50p per session; it would be open 52 weeks a year when the schools were closed. It had 50 volunteers’ enrolled and 13 full time staff. There would be a £1m annual running cost.

The Youth Zone would be a learning organisation and would assist with volunteer development, placements, training, and apprenticeships and would strengthen local youth work economy.

Ms Pennycook also outlined the key considerations and issues for the Youth Zone and explained how the success of the Zone would be monitored.

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

- *The presentation showed that 10% of the required funding would come from the membership fees which were very low, had this been intentional?*

Mr Allen explained that the membership fees had been set low to encourage everyone to attend. In response to a further question he informed the Panel that the Youth Zone would be open when the schools were closed, the evening opening hours would be 3.00pm to 10.00pm and weekends and holidays would be 8.00am/9.00am to 10.00pm.

- *Members were concerned that the activities available in the Youth Zone would affect local clubs and youth organisations.*

Ms Pennycook responded that work would be carried out on the timetable of activities to avoid clashes with other organisations. There had been a lot of work carried out to map the activities and organisations that already existed in the area, and unless they wanted to be involved or required support, they would not be affected by the work of the Youth Zone. The Youth Zone would provide an opportunity for local clubs and organisations to hold 'taster' sessions in the building and the Youth Zone could also signpost local clubs and events. The Youth Zone wanted to add value and offer choice; it did not want to duplicate what was already available.

The Youth Zone would have 13 full time staff and 50 volunteers. There would also be a number of part time staff but the number would not been finalised until the activities on offer were agreed. She added that no one would have worked in a facility such as the new Youth Zone as it was the first of its kind. The staff would be a mixture of new people to the area and people who were already very experienced in youth work within Carlisle.

- *The facilities on offer and the Youth Zone itself was very modern and it was essential that the marketing was strong to enable young people to engage fully.*
- *The presentation had shown that the Zone had hoped that 40% of the £1m required to run the Zone each year would come from public money. There was some concern about the financial sustainability of the Youth Zone in the current financial climate.*

Mr Allen explained that the presentation showed the perfect model and it was clear that this was unattainable so other plans had been put in place. He was confident that the Youth Zone would be sustainable because of the people and organisations that were supporting it. He added that £83,000 had been granted from Children in Need and an application had been submitted for a Lottery bid for £297,000.

- *Members were pleased that the Youth Zone would be working in partnership within the City but sought reassurance that local clubs would not be affected by the Youth Zone and that activities held in the Zone building would not affect the viability of community buildings.*

Mr Allen responded that the Youth Zone had been discussed for two years and there was still some detailed dialogue required with some groups but it was the intention of the Youth Zone to raise awareness of the activities and clubs being held throughout the communities and feed into them.

- *What kind of support and opportunities would be available within the Youth Zone for young carers?*

Ms Pennycook confirmed that there was a need to support young carers in more ways than just providing respite. The Youth Zone worked closely with Carlisle Young Carers Project to identify the needs of young carers, one of which was the need to be integrated.

Mr Allen added that one opportunity which could be developed in the future was to provide respite care in the home so the young carer could spend whole evenings at the Youth Zone without having to worry about the person at home. During the time at the Youth Zone the young carer would have the opportunity to talk to other carers and have access to other organisations that could provide more support.

- *The Youth Zone had a mini bus, how would it be used in such a large City?*

Ms Pennycook informed the Panel that it was important for the Youth Zone to start the partnership working with the transport providers as quickly as possible to cover the area. The mini bus would be used to fill any gaps in the transport links.

RESOLVED – That the Panel fully support the work of the Youth Zone and looked forward to an update in January 2012.

COSP.07/11 RIVERSIDE CARLISLE: PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT AND UPDATE

The Chairman welcomed Mr Leonard, Director and Mr P Taylor, Head of Operations, Riverside Carlisle to the meeting.

The Housing Services and Health Partnership Manager (Mr S Taylor) submitted report CD.24/10 which provided updated information on responsive and void repairs; tenants top ten performance indicators, partnership working and redevelopment of sheltered housing.

Mr Leonard gave a brief outline of the summary annual report to tenants 2010 that had been circulated to Members. The report gave an overview of Riverside Carlisle's performance and how it was measured. The report highlighted the Tenants Top Ten performance indicators which the Panel had previously requested information on. He reminded the Panel that the Audit Commission's Inspectors report had shown a need to improve the repairs and Riverside Carlisle had carried out a lot of work. A review

had been carried out and the findings had been excellent. They showed that Riverside Carlisle had one of the best value for money repairs in the County. There were, however, issues with regard to vacant property repairs. The performance was satisfactory but came at a high cost so Riverside Carlisle was addressing a number of questions and points to improve the value:

- Riverside Carlisle needed to understand what the costs were and what the objective was

- Riverside Carlisle had used an over elaborate 'one size fits all' scheme for vacant properties, this would have to be simplified and be more bespoke. Consideration would need to be given to what the property needed within a particular area.

- Riverside Carlisle had a good repair service and had potential for growth. Consideration would need to be given to how this could happen without reducing the service to tenants.

Mr P Taylor gave a brief outline on the progress with the redevelopment of sheltered housing in particular the work at Westhill House, Freshfield Court, York Court, Arnside Court, Ladyseat, Morton Court and Barras House.

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

- *Members raised concerns about the quality of the out of hours service that Riverside Carlisle offered following a number of complaints over the Christmas and New Year period.*

Mr Leonard responded that December 2010 had been the coldest December in 100 years and the impact had placed enormous pressure on the service. He commended colleagues for the work that they had carried out during a difficult period. He agreed that the service could be improved and a review had been carried out. When the outcome of the review was known work would be carried out to improve the service. He confirmed that there had been an issue with freezing pipes in some of the combi boilers in homes and work was being undertaken to find a permanent solution to the issue.

- *What was the demand for Sheltered Housing in Carlisle?*

Mr P Taylor responded that Riverside Carlisle had a waiting list of over 8,000 for accommodation generally. The new Regional Choice Based Letting system would commence in April 2011 so the whole system for applying for a property would change. Riverside had already discussed the issues of sheltered housing and had agreed that there was a need to treat them differently. In principle the property would still be advertised in the same way as other accommodation on the website and with all housing providers across the County so everyone would be aware of the accommodation that was available. He added that Riverside had a wide range of accommodation available for older people. The accommodation was primarily flat accommodation and as a result Riverside Carlisle was trying to provide more bungalow accommodation through new developments. They would also be improving the standard of the flat accommodation.

- *There were many properties throughout the City that had been adapted through the Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs). Each year the demand on the DFGs increased and in the current climate the pressure was likely to increase further. What happened to the properties when they were vacated? Was there a register of properties that had been adapted?*

Mr Leonard explained that the properties could be profiled including the facilities in the property. He agreed that the recycling of properties could be improved and a project would begin in 2011 to investigate how properties with adaptations could be recycled. There was concerns regarding the sustainability of the adaptations in the long term and both Riverside and Carlisle City Council would need to look at the viability of the adaptations.

An added issue for Riverside Carlisle was the new Government legislation which encouraged people to move on from social housing so there was a question whether adaption's should take place or different accommodation should be provided.

- *The satisfaction levels for dealing with Anti Social Behaviour was one of the lowest satisfaction levels, could anything be done to improve the levels?*

Mr Leonard informed the Panel that Anti Social Behaviour was not a big problem in Carlisle; evidence showed that the figures were low and falling. The feedback from tenants showed that, although it was still a priority it was no longer at the top of their priorities. Mr Leonard agreed that the satisfaction level should be better but Carlisle level was average within Riverside and performed better than other landlords of similar size. He explained that the best way to improve the level was to talk to tenants who had raised a complaint and ask them what they thought of the way the issue had been dealt with and ask them how it could be improved.

- *A Member congratulated Riverside Carlisle on the regeneration scheme that was underway in the Botcherby Ward and for the excellent work that had been carried out at Freshfield Court.*
- *Did tenants hold copies of the gas certificates for their properties and were there regular electrical safety checks as well as gas checks?*

Mr Leonard confirmed that it was a top priority for Riverside to ensure the safety of their tenants and there was a lot of work undertaken to ensure the homes were safe. There was a rolling programme for safety checks and it was routine to carry out the checks and necessary work when a property was vacated.

- *Was there a reason why Riverside Carlisle did not get value for money from the void repairs?*

Mr Leonard explained that Riverside carried out the work on void properties themselves and there had been issues in the way the repairs had been organised. There would be more emphasis placed on what the tenant wanted rather than the same for everyone. Any work would be following consultation with the tenant, it would not cause rent differentials.

RESOLVED – 1) That Mr Leonard and Mr Taylor be thanked for attending the meeting and for their valuable input;

2) That the Panel looked forward to receiving a further update in 6 months times which included:

- feedback from the out of hours review
- an update on the action plan to reduce the cost of void repairs
- the annual action plan
- feedback on the work of the three focus groups.

COSP.08/11 HOUSING STRATEGY ACTION PLAN UPDATE

The Housing Services and Health Partnership Manager (Mr Taylor) submitted report CD.26/10 which provided an update on the Housing Strategy Action Plan and the work regarding the Housing Strategy.

Mr Taylor gave the Panel an outline of the progress of the Actions which related to the three themes; Supporting Vulnerable, Decent Homes including Empty Properties and Affordability and Balancing the Housing Market.

In considering the Action Plan update Members raised the following comments and questions:

- *Would the external management agent for the Community Training and Resource Centre provide staff and resources and if so at what cost?*

Mr Taylor reminded the Panel that at the beginning of the process it was the aim that the Resource Centre would revenue neutral, the external management agent would be responsible for the running of the Centre, staff, maintenance and funding.

- *Members were pleased that funding towards the Disabled Facility Grants(DFGs) had been secured from Riverside Carlisle and asked if funding could be gained from other organisations.*

The Principal Housing Officer – Private Sector (Mr Dickson) informed the Panel that discussions had been held with the other Registered Social Landlords and the Council had explained to them that funding had been extremely tight and that they should be providing the service themselves. The other landlords and they provide the service themselves so funding could not be requested from them.

- *There were properties within the City in disrepair and affected those living in the area, what powers did the Council have to deal with those properties?*

Mr Dickson confirmed that the Council had extensive powers and the ultimate sanction they could use was the Empty Dwelling Management Order. The Order allowed the Authority to take control of properties, repair them and rent them out for a period of time up to a maximum of 7 years. Unfortunately the Orders were extremely time consuming for staff and were expensive. They could only be used on empty

properties. The Order could be used after 6 months but the Government is changing the timing to 2 years so the effect on surrounding communities would increase.

- *Was there any information available on the changes to funding for housing and any proposed legislation that may affect the Authority in their role as Strategic Housing Authority? Would any of the changes have economic impact on the growth point in Carlisle?*

Mr Taylor reminded the Panel that the Government's Spending Review affected all housing providers and the Council would no longer receive the Regional Housing Pot. Specific grants would, however, remain for matters such as Disabled Facility Grants and Homelessness Prevention. He added that new legislation was coming through that laid out new sources of development funding and the reform of central housing. New Homes Bonus laid out a pot for new properties but there was no guidance available, more would be known in the next six to nine months.

The Town Clerk and Chief Executive (Ms Mooney) added that consultation was taking place on where the Bonus would go, one proposal was for the District Council to receive 80% and the County Council to receive 20%. The City Council's response was that they should receive 100% of the Bonus. The Localism Act would bring in a lot changes to planning and there was great emphasis on move the decision making out into the communities but there was still no information on how this would be funded.

The Housing Portfolio Holder added that the Council would have to bid for homelessness funding and would have to work closely with partners.

- *What as the level of homelessness within the City?*

Mr Taylor referred Members to Appendix 1 in the report which showed that for 2009/10 251 decisions had been taken. He explained that it was difficult to find exact numbers as many homeless people lived with friends or relatives. The proposed changes to the benefits rates would potentially increase the pressure on people being able to access accommodation.

RESOLVED – That report CD.26/10 be welcomed;

COSP.09/11 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) presented report OS.02/11 which provided an overview of matters relating to the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work and included the latest version of the work programme and Forward Plan items which related to the Panel.

Mrs Edwards reported that:

- The Forward Plan of Executive key decisions, covering the period 1 January 2011 to 30 April 2011 had been published on 17 December 2010. All items within the remit of the Panel had been included in the Work Programme

except for KD.002/11 – Acquisition and Disposal Policy for Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery. Members were asked to consider whether they would like to scrutinise the matter.

- A Response from the Executive, Minute Excerpt EX.216/10 Overview Report and Work Programme, had been included in the report.
- All three Overview and Scrutiny Panels had scrutinised a report that detailed suggested changes to the Policy Framework and as a result a workshop had been held on 21 December 2010. From the workshop, Members agreed that the Economic Development Strategy, Homelessness Strategy and Discretionary Relief Rate Policy should be included within the Council's Revised Policy Framework along with the policies which were suggested in Appendix 2 of Report GD.61/10. The workshop also agreed that the Corporate Charging Policy should be included in the definition of policies inside the budget. The report would be further considered by the Executive on 19 January before being referred to full Council in March 2011.
- The 50+ Task Group met with the Health Improvement Officer on 8 December 2010 and Members were updated on current initiatives and the work of the Carlisle Partnership. The Group would meet again at the beginning of February 2011 to look at the Draft Health Improvement Action Plan.
- The joint Shared Customer Service Task and Finish Group held their first meeting on 15 December 2010 and their Terms of Reference were attached to the report for the Panel approval.

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 Forward Plan item KD.002/11 – Acquisition and Disposal Policy for Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery would not be considered by the Panel.

3) That Minute Excerpt EX.216/10 Overview Report and Work Programme be noted and the Panel looked forward to an update from Councillor Mrs Parsons following the next meeting of the Cumbria Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee which is to be held on 25 January 2011.

4) That the recommendations of the Policy Framework Workshop held on 21 December 2010 be noted.

5) That the Shared Customer Services Task and Finish Group Terms of Reference as set out in appendix four of Report OS.02/11 be agreed.

COSP.10/11 ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO SUPPORTING YOUNG PEOPLE NOT IN EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT OR TRAINING (NEETs) AND THE PLAY STRATEGY MONITORING REPORT

The Play Development Manager (Ms Huntington) and the Green Spaces Manager (Mr Gray) submitted report CD.25/10 which highlighted progress made against the

objectives of the Play Strategy and included proposals for forward plans. The report also highlighted how progress supported NEET targets.

Ms Huntington explained that the report highlighted how the Community Engagement Directorate contributed to the worklessness and skills targets outlined in the Corporate Plan. She added that the Community Support Team and the Sport and Recreation Team facilitated and/or delivered a range of programmes accessed by NEETs. They did not run any specific targeted programmes but worked closely in partnership with support services.

Ms Huntington took the Panel through the various projects which the Team dealt with including BASE library drop-in, the outdoor skate park, and Abstract Magazine. She also took the Panel through the outcomes and progress to date within the Action Plan. She then gave a brief outline of the Summer Playschemes 2010 Report.

Mr Gray outlined the ongoing work with regard to play areas within Carlisle and the success of Section 106's and the Skate Park.

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

- *Which communities were consulted with?*

Ms Huntington explained that the team had initially tried to cover everyone for the play trail but found it was more successful to consult with the children who attended the playschemes. There had also been an increase in the communication with young people in rural areas.

- *Would the information mapped for the playschemes be used towards the City Councils performance indicators?*

Ms Huntington explained that the mapping was done through LPG but she would discuss mapping it for the Council's performance indicators with Mr O'Keeffe.

- *There was a large amount of good work being carried out by the Council that fed into NEET targets even though they were not the District Council's responsibility, Members asked how the Authority was engaging through economic development and employers to identify any gaps in skills so that employers were encouraged to come to the region. Members felt that the NEET issue should be addressed separately from the Play Strategy.*

The Assistant Director (Community Engagement) (Mr Gerrard) agreed that the NEET issue should be identified as an important issue. As a responsible Authority the Council should be considering the links including health.

The Policy and Performance Manager (Mr O'Keeffe) reminded the Panel that NEET National Indicators would be removed and the Council was looking to replacing them locally. He added that the issue of young people and the needs of the City were specific actions within the Council's Corporate Plan.

- *Members requested that Ward Councillors were notified of any activities that were programmed to take place in their Wards.*

- *Members were disappointed to see that staff would be lost from the Team as there was great value in the work that they carried out.*
- *The Youth Zone had similar aspirations and age groups as the work being carried out by the Council, was there a risk of duplication between the two?*

Ms Huntington commented that the Youth Zone would work alongside the Play Teams to avoid duplication.

Mr Gerrard added that the Youth Zone would support the Council's Young People work and reminded the Panel that it was a good opportunity for partnership working. He further added that not all staff would be lost from the play team and work would continue.

- *How was the Youth Exchange Programme developing?*

Mr Gerrard responded that the Programme was a discretionary programme and the budget was under pressure but he felt that the Programme was very valuable and wanted it to continue. There was work being carried out to look at different ways in which it could work and there was an opportunity to work with the Youth Zone. This would also potentially bring the opportunity to draw funding in.

The Community Engagement Portfolio added that she had attended a meeting with students during the 2010 Exchange and found that they were very proactive in looking to raise European funding.

- *A Member thanked officers and the Secretary and Chairman of the Friends of Hammonds Group for the work that had been carried out at on the play area at Hammonds Pond.*

RESOLVED – 1) That a more detailed report on Young People not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel and that a Member of the Connexions Team be invited to the Panel when the report was considered.

2) That officers informed Ward Councillors of activities that were arranged to take place in their Wards.

COSP.11/11 COMPREHENSIVE EQUALITY SCHEME PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Policy and Performance Manager (Mr O'Keeffe) presented report PPP.01/11 which provided feedback from the Diversity Peer Challenge Team following the Council's successful 'Achieving' assessment under the Equality Framework for Local Government.

Mr O’Keeffe explained that the City Council was the first authority to undertake the Diversity Peer Challenge as part of the Achieving Equality in Cumbria Project. The Project was a partnership with Cumbria County Council and all the District Council and the challenge had created the first truly independent view on the progress of the Council and was an indicator of the performance of the Comprehensive Equality Scheme. He reminded the Panel of the process that was undertaken and the completion of the self assessment.

Mr O’Keeffe added that the report included an update on the Carlisle and District Credit Union, the Benefit Advice Service and Age Concern as requested by the Panel at their meeting on 7 October. The Panel also requested information on the number and nature of hate crimes in the District and the details would be made available by mid January.

He added that the Panel would receive a new version of the Scheme and an Action Plan in draft form at their meeting in February 2011.

In response to a question Mr O’Keeffe explained that the next step for the Council was to work towards ‘excellence’ and the purpose of the report had been to inform the Council what work was needed to achieve that. He added that there was less national documentation available on Equality and Diversity and more focus on Authorities covering it themselves.

A Member commented that the Credit Union was extremely important in the current climate and Mr O’Keeffe agreed to circulate further information from Age Concern to Members.

RESOLVED – That the Panel welcomed the report and looked forward to receiving the draft Scheme and Action Plan at their next meeting.

COSP.12/11 SUSPENSION OF THE COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE

RESOLVED – That during the above item the Council Procedure Rule 9 in relation to the duration of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time of three hours.

COSP.13/11 UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MIGRANT WORKER’S TASK AND FINISH GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Policy and Performance Manager (Mr O’Keeffe) presented report PPP.02/11 which gave an update on the Council’s work to address the recommendations contained in the Migrant Workers’ Task and Finish Group report.

Mr O’Keeffe explained that each recommendation from the Migrant Worker Task Group had an update next to it in table 1 of the report. He added that the Community Cohesion Strategy, which had been adopted by the Carlisle Partnership (LSP) in March 2009, was of relevance to the report.

The Community Engagement Portfolio Holder thanked everyone who had been involved in the Task Group and for producing the recommendations.

Members asked that information regarding the health needs of the traveller communities and surrounding data and also evidence regarding domestic violence prosecutions within traveller communities be included in future updates.

RESOLVED – That the Panel thanked all officers involved in the Task and Finish Group for their time and input into such a detailed piece of work.

COSP.14/11 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME FOR CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL

The Assistant Director (Community Engagement) (Mr Gerrard) gave a verbal update on the Transformation on service areas within the remit of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

He informed the Panel that the new Communities, Housing and Health Services Manager had been appointed and would begin on 17 January 2011. The closing date for the consultation on the Community Engagement Directorate had been 24 December 2010 and he was considering responses and would be writing to all staff in the near future.

It was moved and seconded that the verbal update on the Transformation Programme be continued in private with public and press excluded as there would be information which was likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

COSP.15/11 PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

COSP.16/11 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME FOR CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL

(Public and Press excluded by virtue of Paragraph 2)

The Assistant Director (Community Engagement) (Mr Gerrard) gave a verbal update on the Transformation on service areas within the remit of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

He informed the Panel that Transformation of the Community Engagement Directorate, which included Tullie House, Customer Contact Centre, Revenues and Benefits, Community, Housing, Health and partnership work, was underway.

Most of the focus of the change had been around Community, Housing and Health, he was looking at the staffing changes and the impact on the way the service would be perceived by the public. Community Support, Sport and Recreation and Housing had been brought together under a single management umbrella under the Communities, Housing and Health Services Manager.

He outlined the changes made to the staffing structure and the potential impact on various services. He also gave a brief explanation of what support would be put in place for Community Centres.

Mr Gerrard responded to Members questions and gave the reasoning behind the proposed changes. He added that he had tried to minimise the need for compulsory redundancies by looking at different ways of working

Members requested a copy of each of the new Directorates structures as they were completed.

RESOLVED – That the update from the Assistant Director (Community Engagement) be welcomed.

(The meeting ended at 1.40pm)