

COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 24 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 10.05AM

PRESENT: Councillor Burns (Chairman), Councillors Bloxham (as substitute for Councillor Layden), Ellis, Mrs McKerrell, McNulty, Paton, Mrs Riddle (as substitute for Councillor Ms Franklin) (until 12.45pm) and Ms Williams.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor Miss Lee Sherriff – Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder (until 12.20pm)
Ms S Paton – Regional Director (North), Riverside
Mr P Taylor – Assistant Director Operations, Riverside
Mr R Cooke – Chair of Board of Trustees, Tullie House
Mr A Mackay – Director, Tullie House
Councillor J Mallinson – Observer
Councillor Bell – Observer (until 11.00am)

OFFICERS: Deputy Chief Executive
Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services
Corporate Director of Economic Development
Chief Finance Officer
Environmental Health and Housing Manager
Private Sector Housing Technical Team Manager
Contracts and Community Services Manager
Policy and Communications Manager

COSP.70/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors Franklin and Councillor Layden.

COSP.71/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

COSP.72/16 PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

COSP.73/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

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

2) That the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 October 2016 be noted.

COSP.74/16 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS

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

COSP.75/16 RIVERSIDE HOUSING ASSOCIATION

The Chairman welcomed Sarah Paton, the new Regional Director (North), Riverside and Paul Taylor, Assistant Director Operations, Riverside, to the meeting.

Ms Paton gave a brief presentation detailing the direction of travel for Riverside in Carlisle in the coming months.

Ms Paton reported that a number of changes had affected the way Riverside operated.

The changes included:

- an increase in customers under the age of 45 in employment which changed the way services would be accessed by customers
- changes to customer income through Government changes including Welfare Reform, Universal Credit and 1% rent reduction for five years
- changes in the economy had affected how Riverside could develop

Ms Paton highlighted the changes that had and were taking place at Riverside which were, overall, about value for money. Riverside wanted to ensure a consistent, fair, high quality service for all with a focus on customer experience. The changes to the service would help achieve the required £30million per year savings and make the services flexible to meet future challenges; there would also be clarity of role and purpose including amendments to the governance arrangements.

A review of the services and staff was taking place to ensure systems and processes were in place to support the services Riverside wanted to provide and to reduce duplication. A review of the governance arrangements was also taking place to support the changes and to ensure local priorities were being represented and to provide challenge when necessary.

Riverside was in the process of changing from five regions to three and Regional Directors had been appointed. The governance arrangements had been developed so it was based on business activity rather than geography and changes in the staff structure would follow.

Ms Paton set out Riverside's commitment to Carlisle which included high quality properties and services, an office hub which allowed mobile staff in some roles, retaining jobs in Carlisle, neighbourhood planning which fed into Riverside's corporate plan, local partnerships, customer involvement and representation and flexibility in how Riverside worked with the City Council. She assured the Panel that Carlisle was a priority area for Riverside.

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

- In response to a Members comment Ms Paton explained that the £30m required savings was the national figure and she would provide details of the savings for Carlisle.
- Members felt that the community commitment that Riverside had shown at the time of the transfer had diminished and they were disappointed that Riverside had not consulted or communicated any changes in recent months with the Council directly. Members hoped that the relationship could be repaired and that the replacement of the Divisional Board included local people.

Ms Paton responded that it was difficult for her to comment on previous communications but wanted to discuss future communication methods with the Council to identify what changes they would like to be notified of, who should be notified and how.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development agreed that the discussions were important and suggested that the issues be explored in more detail at a future meeting.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services added that there was a legally binding contract between Riverside and the Council with regard to the Divisional Board. There had been correspondence with Riverside with regard to the contract and the Board and it was understood that any changes to the Board had to be with the agreement of the Council.

- How would the new Hubs work?

Ms Paton explained that the review of the office space had resulted in Hubs which allowed for mobile staff in certain roles to be based in one of the three Hubs. Technology had allowed for staff in performance roles etc to be based anywhere, however, repair jobs and similar would remain as local positions.

- There had been some changes over the last 12 months that had seen a reduction in community involvement, it was hoped that the £30m savings would not reduce the involvement further.

Ms Paton responded that she was not aware of any savings that had resulted in a reduction in community involvement.

Mr Taylor added that he would report in detail at a future meeting on the community engagement that Riverside undertook. Riverside had moved away from traditional tenants groups nationally as tenants no longer wanted that type of engagement. Some of the current engagement included scrutiny panels, a resource centre and a worklessness programme to help people back into work.

- Riverside had an operational surplus which had a 25% margin yet were still looking for savings.

Ms Paton explained that the surplus was standard operating procedures for Housing Associations at the present time. Housing Associations had to borrow money to build and lenders needed to see that the Association was sustainable.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that Housing Associations had been affected by Government reductions and the changes to the Homes and Community Agency Home Building Fund had a huge impact on Housing Associations ability to build especially with the right to buy scheme and requirement to replace properties one for one. The publication of the white paper should help clarify changes in policy; however, the change to the definition of starter homes may also have a huge impact.

- The presentation reported that staff levels had not reduced, however, Members understood that there had been a number of staff redundancies in Carlisle.

Ms Paton confirmed that staff had reduced in one sector but increased on other sectors. She stressed that Riverside did not want to make job cuts but changes in services meant changes in staff requirements.

- It was reported that there was an increase in younger residents; was there a breakdown available of the demographics of tenants? How would the shift to younger tenants influence the channels of communication?

Ms Paton confirmed that there had been an increase in younger tenants who wanted to access services in a different way but this did not mean Riverside was digital by default. There were still a large number of older residents who wanted to access services in a traditional way and so Riverside catered for all requirements.

Mr Taylor explained that Riverside had developed a digital platform which could be accessed by all tenants and would be accessed by call centre staff on behalf of tenants so all tenants had access to the same service. In addition Riverside had a digital apprentice based in Carlisle who went out into the district to help get people on line.

- A Member congratulated Riverside on the excellent work that had been carried out at Ladyseat, Longtown.

RESOLVED –1) That Ms Paton and Mr Taylor be thanked for their presentation;

2) That a Task and Finish Group be established to investigate how the relationship between the City Council and Housing Associations could be developed;

3) That the next report from Riverside Carlisle includes details of the impact of the £30m savings requirement in Carlisle and further detailed information on the community engagement undertaken by Riverside in Carlisle.

COSP.76/16 TULLIE HOUSE BUSINESS PLAN 2017/18

The Chairman welcomed Roger Cooke, Chairman of the Tullie House Art Gallery and Museum and Andrew Mackay, Director of Tullie House Art Gallery and Museum.

Report SD.29/16 was submitted introducing the Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust 2017-2020 Business Plan.

Mr Cooke reported that the last 12 months had seen two major developments at Tullie House. The first development had been the reduction in grant from the City Council, the learning curve had been a productive experience with some negative aspects but Tullie House had presented a balanced budget for the first year. The second development had been the appointment of Mr Mackay as the new Director.

The Business Plan had two key focusses of financial stability and community engagement. One positive effect of the reduction in grant had been that the Trust had been forced to think radically about Tullie House and rediscover and strengthen the links with Carlisle and make the museum a museum for local people as well as tourists.

Mr Mackay explained that the Trust had created a Manifesto, which had been included in the report. The Manifesto set out the direction of travel to create a museum for 21st century audiences with a focus on the Carlisle community. The Manifesto would also be used to attract potential investors.

The reduction in grant had made the Trust look at the Museum's weaknesses and how it managed performance. It had renewed the focus on culture change and was more driven by income streams which had resulted in a change to IT and financial systems. The Trust was more commercially aware and members of the Trust and staff had attended training on how to develop relationships with high net worth individuals and generate income.

The community engagement aspects had been extremely successful in particular with hard to reach groups. Work had taken place with young carers, early opening for autistic children and youth offenders. All staff had been trained to develop dementia friendly services at the Museum.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.108/16) received the report and decided:

“That the Executive:

1. Had given consideration to Report SD.23/16 and the proposed Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust Business Plan 2017 - 2020.
2. Made the report available for consideration by the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel.”

In considering the Business Plan Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Did Tullie House still offer a pass for local residents?

Mr Mackay confirmed that residents could have a Tullie Card which allowed entry throughout the year for a fee of £4.

- The report stated that there was an increase in visitors, was there a record of where visitors came from and had there been an increase in local visitors?

Mr Mackay reported that information was recorded but it needed to be improved and it was an area that was being looked at through IT provision. There had been a growth in visitors from the Allerdale and Eden areas and as a result the Trust was looking at introducing a new level of admission for surrounding areas.

- Had the application to have the Natural Sciences Collection Designated as being of ‘national importance’ been successful?

Mr Mackay responded that they had not yet been informed of the decision. The Trust recognised that the collection was of vital importance as Cumbria was so diverse, should the collection be given the national importance designation it would open more opportunities for the Museum and help secure investment to maintain the collection.

- The Plan showed an increase of 10,000 visitors could this attributed to the younger age group visiting?

Mr Mackay stated that the focus in the year had been to increase the number of families visiting and this had shaped the activities on offer. In addition the museum had held the national Telegraph Family Friendly award which had increased visitors. The Trust had a clear focus on audiences and wanted to make sure all audiences were catered for not just families.

- A Member asked for more information on the dementia training that had taken place.

Mr Mackay explained that the Alzheimer’s Society had trained all staff in dementia awareness. Signage in the buildings had been changed and sessions had been delivered with Prism Arts using the collection in terms of memory.

- How would the Castle Street premises be used and why was the Librarian House to be used as a B&B was there a demand near the museum?

Mr Mackay responded that both of the buildings were part of the ten year strategic plan for the museum. The Castle Street buildings required more discussion with regard to the options available. In terms of the Librarian House, the Trust had been working with a consultant to help the museum to become more commercially sustainable. They had suggested using the Librarian House as holiday accommodation as a potential additional income stream. The exploration of this option would be part of the overall strategic plan.

Mr Cooke reminded the Panel of the ambitious £15m development that had initially been proposed to change the museum into a state of the art museum and art gallery. Part of the development had included the Castle Street property. The plans had changed but there would still be a requirement for additional space and this would take place as part of the ten year plan.

In response to a question Mr Cooke confirmed that initial development had relied on a successful bid from the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). The HLF had asked the Trust to submit another bid but the Trust felt the initial bid had been far too ambitious and so would return a less ambitious bid for the first Phase.

- Did the Trust keep a record of people who visited the café but not the museum?

Mr Mackay explained that they had started to record the number of visitors to the café. He added that the café would be refurbished before Easter 2017.

- Did the Trust anticipate an increase in footfall as a result of the new Crossing on Castle Way?

Mr Mackay felt that the crossing would help footfall as the road was a barrier between the Museum and Castle. The Trust was keen to work with the Castle and Military Museum and hoped that the crossing would help improve the offer.

Mr Cooke added that he had been strongly in favour of the project as it would give unity to the Historic Quarter and he would be disappointed if it did not increase footfall.

- How had Tullie House developed links with China as mentioned in the report?

Mr Mackay explained that Tullie House had been approached by a Museum in China who had been looking for a partner of similar size. Mr Mackay had visited the museum in China and held some sessions with children as well as take some Roman artefacts. The Trust hoped to put together an exhibition in 2018 to coincide with the Chinese New Year. The Trust also had a Mandarin speaker starting work in the New Year.

- A Member highlighted the historic stones that were in storage and asked if they could be placed in strategic locations such as the entrances to the City so they can be seen by the public.

Mr Mackay explained that the stones were not in the Museum's ownership and required some work by English Heritage to transfer them over. He agreed to look at the matter in more detail.

RESOLVED – That Mr Cooke and Mr Mackay be thanked for their detailed presentation of the Tullie House Business Plan 2017/18 (report SD.29/16).

COSP.77/16 LEISURE CONTRACT RETENDER UPDATE

The Contracts and Community Services Manager presented report SD.30/16 which provided an updated timetable for the retender of Carlisle City Council's Leisure Contract.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager reminded the Panel that preparatory work for an early retender exercise had been delayed following storm Desmond and the impact of the flooding in Carlisle.

The revised timetable for the retender, as set out in 1.6 of the report, brought the retender process to the natural end of the existing contract and would not be an early retender, this would not affect Council's Medium Term Financial Plan as savings required from the leisure contract were not profiled in until 2018/19.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager asked the Panel to consider at which points in the retender process that they would like further updates. He highlighted the Panel's work programme which included a review of the existing leisure operator's annual performance and suggested that, in the context of a live tender exercise, it may be preferable for the Panel to receive a written report by Council Officers instead of the operator presenting a report.

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

- Why had the tender been split into two?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager explained that the tender would be in two lots, one for the main leisure services and one for the golf provision. This gave the opportunity for specialist golf providers to bid on the golf provision and help to increase market interest.

- What would the decision process be for the tender?

The Deputy Chief Executive responded that the Executive had agreed the process and the costs associated and this Panel had received the same report. More discussion would need to take place with regard to member engagement following the results of Phase 1.

- Had there been any indication of the number of parties interested and had the interest been affected by the flood?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager responded that during the soft market testing which had taken place last year there had been nine parties interested. Four of the parties had been very interested and had retained their interest and sought regular updates.

RESOLVED – 1) That report SD.30/16 Leisure Contract Retender Update be welcomed;

2) That the annual Leisure Service performance report be submitted in February and be presented by officers of the City Council.

3) That the opportunities for Member engagement following the results of Phase 1 are included in the timetable.

COSP.78/16 HOUSING ASSISTANCE POLICY 2017

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services submitted report GD.66/16 concerning the Scheme of Housing Assistance.

The Corporate Director informed Members that, following a significant increase in the City Council's Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) funding (to help disabled, elderly and vulnerable people to live independently), it was recommended that the City Council introduced additional discretion into its Housing Renewal Assistance Policy by broadening the scope of work that could be covered under a DFG and by the DFG funding for wider purposes.

The City Council was able to introduce such flexibility using freedoms given to it following the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 and recent Technical Guidance issued with the Better Care Fund.

Members' attention was also drawn to the further background information included in the Briefing Paper attached at Appendix 2, together with the revised Policy for Housing Renewal Assistance 2017 provided at Appendix 1. The revised Policy confirmed the position regarding Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants.

The Executive had on 21 November 2016 (EX.111/16) received the report and decided:

"That the Executive:

1. Had considered the proposed revised Housing Renewal Assistance Policy 2017, Appendix 1 to Report GD.66/16.
2. Referred the said Policy to the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel for consideration in accordance with the Council's Budget and Policy Framework."

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

- Why had there been an increase in the DFG funding?

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services reminded the Panel that the DFG funding had changed and was now provided through the Better Care Fund which was distributed by Cumbria County Council.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that the increase was in recognition of the importance of Adult Services and Local Housing Authorities in keeping people in their own homes for longer and in the reduction of 'bed blocking'. Often people could not be discharged from hospital as they did not have a suitable care package available when they got home. It was hoped that the additional funding and changes to the Policy would help address some of the issues.

The Environmental Health and Housing Manager explained that the amount given was based on the anticipated expenditure based on previous returns.

- Usually the cost of business decreased as the amount of business increased, however the DFGs agency cost had increased instead of reduced. The increase to the cost of DFGs administration fee (from 12.5% to 15%) equated to a 20% increase in the charge which was much higher than the Council's 3% Corporate Charging Policy for fees and charges.

The Corporate Director explained that the changes to the Policy would increase the amount of people the Council could help and, thereby, the amount of work to be done. The Council had

to seek to cover its costs. The full set of charges were set out in the Charges Review report later on the agenda which showed an increase in the cost of DFGs from 12.5% to 15%.

The proposed changes would bring more focus and purpose to the Homelife Team but the Authority had to get the balance right so that they did not make a profit or subsidise the scheme.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel that the initiative was County wide and a lot of consideration had been given to how the additional grants could be used.

- Was there a waiting list for DFGs and if not how was the additional money going to be used?

The Private Sector Housing Technical Team Manager confirmed that there was no waiting list for DFGs and adaptations took approximately 6 weeks to complete. The changes to the Policy would not change the statutory grants but would add discretionary grants.

- Why was Riverside the only Housing Association in the report when other Associations provided money towards DFGs? It would be better to change the report so it just said Housing Associations.

The Private Sector Housing Technical Team Manager explained that Riverside used to make a financial contribution to the DFG budget before taking the service in house. Riverside properties accounted for 1/3 of the DFG adaptations. Two Castles did contribute to the DFG budget when they had the funding to do so but no other Housing Associations contributed to the DFG budget.

In response to a question the Corporate Director detailed how Land Charges could be placed on properties that had works carried out on them.

RESOLVED – 1) That the changes to the Housing Assistance Policy 2017 be welcomed (GD.68/16);

2) That Section 1.1 of the Policy Document be amended to reflect the contribution from all Housing Associations not just Riverside.

COSP.79/16 BUDGET 2017/18 – 2021/22

(a) Budget Update - Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22

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

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

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

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

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

“That the Executive:

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

In discussing the Homelife budget the Chief Finance Officer explained that the pressure reflected the gross costs of the staffing team and the budget had been non-recurring previously for approximately five years. A Member raised other moves from non-recurring to recurring and stated that they represented a 4% increase in Council Tax.

The Deputy Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the funding commitment for Homelife had been for 1 or 2 years, the funding had finished and the Council wanted to continue the approach on an ongoing regular basis and therefore appears as a pressure.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder added that the decision to maintain Homelife had been taken to continue to employ staff and provide a service that was valued by residents. The Executive felt that it was worthwhile trying to retain the service if it was possible through the extension of the DFG funding.

RESOLVED – That the Budget Update – Revenue Estimates 2017/18 to 2021/22 (RD.35/16) be received.

(b) Review of Charges 2017/18 –

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

Community Services

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

The charges highlighted within the report would result in an anticipated level of income of £2,775,200 against the MTFP target of £2,835,200. That represented a shortfall of £60,000 against the MTFP target. The Panel were asked to consider the areas which were in their remit as set out on the agenda.

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

“That the Executive:

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

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

- In response to a question the Chief Finance Officer explained that the decision to remove grants to Parish Councils had been taken as part of the 2016/17 budget process. The concurrent grants had now been removed apart from those Parishes which had burial sites.
- A Member highlighted the increase in the allotment fees commenting that the increase of 20% was much higher than the Corporate Charging Policy's 3%. Members also questioned the rationale behind the removal of the over 60 discount when the Council was trying to encourage more active lifestyles. It was felt that the change could cause issues for some people.

The Deputy Chief Executive responded that there had been a change in the trend for allotments and a wide range of age groups now used allotments. It was felt that the allotments should be kept affordable and a fair standard fee applied to all allotments. There was no intention to isolate people over 60 but there had been a shift in the demographic.

- Would the move to leasing football pitches on a peppercorn rent prevent other users having access to the pitches?

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the move to giving clubs the option to leasing a pitch on peppercorn was to encourage clubs to carry out more of the preparation and maintenance of the pitches themselves. The lease would mean that the pitch was the club's for their use during the season for the length of the booking. The pitches could still be accessed at other times. He added that the fees for the football pitches had never met the cost of the maintenance of the pitches and was therefore subsidised by the Council.

- Had the review of the charges for the Old Fire Station come from market demand?

The Contracts and Community Services Manager confirmed that the review had been based on supply and demand and the increase to evening hire prices had reflected the break that was required in the programme of events to accommodate private parties.

RESOLVED –1) That the Review of Charges 2017/18 – Community Services (SD.27/16) be received.

2) That a report be brought to a future meeting of the Panel on the concurrent grants to Parish Councils.

Governance and Regulatory Services

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“That the Executive:

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

RESOLVED – That the Revised Capital Programme 2016/17 and Provisional Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 (RD.36/16) be noted.

COSP.80/16 2ND QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT 2016/17

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

The Policy and Communications Manager reported that the table at Section 1 of the report illustrated the cumulative year to date figure, a month by month breakdown of performance and, where possible, an actual service standard baseline that had been established either locally or nationally. Only the service standard relevant to the Panel had been included in the Report.

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

Members discussed, in some detail, the usefulness of the performance report in its current format. They considered how the report had previously been presented and what information the Panel wanted in future reports and how it should tie in with the Carlisle Plan.

It was suggested that Performance Management be moved into the remit of one Panel who then identified any exceptions which the other Panels should scrutinise or have the Audit Committee perform that role. Members discussed the option and felt that each panel should be responsible for the Performance Monitoring within their own remits.

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

COSP.81/16 STANDING ORDERS

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.

COSP.82/16 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Policy and Performance Manager submitted report OS.23/16 which provided an overview of matters relating to the work of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel and included the latest version of the work programme and Key Decisions of the Executive which related to the Panel.

The Policy and Performance Manager reported that the Notice of Executive Key Decisions were published on 21 October 2016 and the following items fell within the remit of the Panel:

KD.20/16 – Tullie House Business Plan

KD.21/16 – Budget Process 2017/18

Both items had been included on the Panel's agenda.

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

The Panel's Work Programme for the current year had been circulated and Members were asked to consider the framework for the meeting on 12 January 2017. The following items had been included in the Work Programme for the next meeting of the Panel:

- Riverside Annual Report
- Task and Finish Group on the relationship with Housing Associations
- Performance reporting options
-

It was agreed that a report of the Old Fire Station be added to the Work Programme for April 2017.

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

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

Member's attention was drawn to Appendix 2 of the report which contained details of the proposals and rationale for the changes.

The Panel discussed the options set out in Appendix 2 and a proposal that an additional change to the Constitution be requested with regard to the Chairman of Scrutiny Panels. Some Members requested that the Constitution revert back to setting that the Chairman of the Panel be made up of 1 Labour, 1 Conservative and 1 from the next largest Political Group. The Panel voted on the proposal and agreed that the request should be referred to the Executive.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Overview Report incorporating the Work programme and Key decision items relevant to this Panel (OS.23/16) be noted.

2) That the following items be included on the agenda for next meeting on 12 January 2016:

- Riverside Annual Report
- Task and Finish Group on the relationship with Housing Associations
- Performance reporting options

3) That an update on the Old Fire Station be added to the Work Programme for April 2017;

4) That the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel supported the decision of the Scrutiny Chairs Group and agree that three new Overview and Scrutiny Panels be established, as set out in appendix 2 of report OS.23/16;

5) That the Executive consider a change to the City Council's Constitution which set out that the three Scrutiny Panels be Chaired by 1 Labour Group Member, 1 Conservative Group Member and 1 Member from the next largest Political Group.

(Meeting ended at 1.13pm)