
EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON 16 JUNE 2011

ROSP.36/11 CAPITAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

The final report of the Capital Projects Task and Finish Group (OS.16/11) had been submitted.

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

- The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder asked for clarification with regard to recommendation one.

Dr Gooding reminded the Panel that the Asset Business Plan had been approved by Council, the purpose of which had been to protect the revenue position of the Council. If there was a choice between a capital receipt and options to lease the land the recommendation would be whichever best protected the position of the Council but the Executive would take that decision. There would be an update on the proposed Morton development in August and the agents brief was to protect revenue by generating revenue. Montagu Evans had been appointed the City Council agents for the disposal of Morton.

- A Member asked for confirmation that Ward Members were being involved in the consultation on any proposed asset sales in their Ward as previously requested.

Dr Gooding confirmed that the views of Ward Members had been sought and formed part of the Executive report for decision.

- A Member asked for clarification with regard to the appointed agent for the proposed Morton development.

Dr Gooding explained that the Authority required specialist advice and was required to tender for an agent in accordance with procurement procedures and specialist advice was required for the site. He added that it was also appropriate for the Council to tender to test the market and ensure that the Council received the best value for money.

- It was understood that the Asset Business Plan had been approved by Council but was recommendation four still possible?

Dr Gooding confirmed that the Asset Business Plan, the programme of disposal as policy framework and the reinvestment, in principle, of capital receipt had all been agreed. Although there had been a commitment made in the Medium Term Financial Plan and the Asset Business Plan there had not been a decision on how the reinvestment would be carried out and Council would take this decision.

A Member commented that the social and cultural impact of the decisions had to be taken into account as well as the financial implications.

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel that the Capital Programme was part of the budget process and part of the consultation process for the budget. He, however, acknowledged that the Budget Consultation process could be improved.

RESOLVED – That the five recommendations as set out in the Capital Projects Task and Finish Group final report OS.16/11 be agreed and be referred to the Executive for a formal response.