

COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2012 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Luckley (Chairman) Councillors Mrs Bradley, Glover, Layden (until 1.45pm) (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Prest), Nedved (until 1.05pm), Mrs Riddle (as substitute for Councillor McDevitt) and Scarborough (until 1.05pm).

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Geddes, Community Engagement Portfolio Holder
Councillor Bloxham, Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor Ellis, Performance and Development Portfolio Holder
Mr Paul Taylor, Head of Operations, Riverside Carlisle
Kim Doran, Head of Development, Riverside Carlisle
Mr Tim Linford, Shaddon Gateway Centre Manager
Mr John Cronin, YMCA

COSP.15/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor McDevitt, Councillor Mrs Parsons and Councillor Mrs Prest.

COSP.16/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Layden declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Agenda Item A.3 Riverside Carlisle Partnership. His interest related to the fact that he was a City Council representative on the Riverside Carlisle Board.

Councillor Mrs Luckley declared personal interests in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of the following Agenda Items:

A.3 Riverside Carlisle Partnership – She was a City Council representative on the Riverside Carlisle Board;

A.6 Neighbourhood Working – She was a Member of the Carlisle Partnership

Councillor Mrs Luckley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Agenda Item A.4 Accommodation and Foyer Service. Her interest related to the fact that she had previously made a decision regarding the Service as a Member of the Executive.

COSP.17/12 AGENDA

RESOLVED – That agenda item A.2 Overview Report be considered after items A.3, A.4 and A.5 avoid any unnecessary delay to external organisations attending the Panel.

COSP.18/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2012 be noted.

COSP.19/12 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS

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

COSP.20/12 RIVERSIDE CARLISLE PARTNERSHIP

The Chairman welcomed Mr Taylor, Head of Operations and Ms Doran, Head of Developments from Riverside Carlisle to the meeting.

The Director of Community Engagement (Mr Gerrard) submitted report CD.10/12 giving an update on the work being undertaken under the Partnership Agreement with Riverside Carlisle.

The Communities, Housing and Health Manager (Ms Miller) also circulated supplementary documents including the proposed Riverside criteria for major adaptations which were unlikely to receive Landlords consent, a copy of a Riverside Carlisle report on Aids and Adaptations which had been considered by the Board on 23 January 2012, a list of the joint meetings which took place between Riverside and the City Council and the Ward Walks schedule. She added that meetings were taking place to look at the opportunities that were available to the Council and Riverside to maximise the investment in Carlisle Communities.

Mr Taylor updated the Panel on issues which had arisen at the previous meeting:

- work had been carried out on improving the Out of Hours Service and a senior manager would be on call during severe weather to ensure all issues were dealt with quickly and to minimise the impact on customers.
- the partnership agreement was still in place but there had been a move to more face to face contact between Riverside and the Council on a variety of levels throughout both organisations. It was hoped that a facilitated event would give both organisations the opportunity to talk to other partners and organisations and look at how they could all work more efficiently.
- the ward walks were working very well and there had been progress under the three themes of Place, Property and People.

- Riverside continued to work closely on the homelessness issue and both the City Council and Riverside would be involved in the Choice Based Letting review because it was in the interest of both organisations to ensure that the most vulnerable were given priority.
- Discussions were taking place with regard to Riverside becoming a primary stakeholder as they were the main housing stock holders.

Ms Doran informed the Panel that the Aids and Adaptations Policy had been reviewed as Riverside had a high percentage of disabled tenants. The criteria had been formed in collaboration with the City Council, Occupational Therapists and Tenant Focus Groups and had been approved by the Riverside Board in January. To date Riverside had achieved their targets and approximately seven people had been re-homed in more suitable accommodation, the money saved by not adapting properties was put back into the budget to help meet more needs.

The Environment Housing Portfolio Holder commented that he was delighted with the relationship between the City Council and Riverside. He confirmed that there had been discussions with regard to the primary stakeholder and, although it was recognised that Riverside had the largest amount of housing stock, there had to be consideration given to the other Registered Social Landlords in the area. He commented that Carlisle paid for the highest percentage of disabled facilities in Cumbria.

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

- Members congratulated Riverside on the recent refurbishment of York Court.
- Was there enough alternative accommodation to support the Aids and Adaptations criteria?

Ms Doran responded that there was a development programme in place which included an increase in the number of bungalows in developments. Riverside had a lot of accommodation that was already adapted in some way but some would require further adaptation to become suitable for clients requirements. It was felt the combination of adapted properties and new developments would meet the demand for adapted properties.

- How was Riverside preparing for the future which would see an increase in disabled and vulnerable tenants?

Ms Doran explained that part of the review was to ensure that one to one contact was carried out with each of the tenants to ensure Riverside were doing what the customer wanted. She added that Riverside had begun to work better with Occupational Therapists and there was better communication at an earlier point.

- Tenants had been consulted on the regeneration of Botcherby, would this model be used in other neighbourhoods?

Ms Doran informed the Panel that Riverside were developing Neighbourhood Plans for each neighbourhood but the model of consultation would depend on the neighbourhood and if any vehicles for consultations were already in place.

- Why had the City Council and Riverside not submitted a bid for HCA funding to bring empty homes back into use?

Ms Doran reported that the Riverside Group had taken the decision not to move forward with an empty homes bid as they felt there were other priorities. Riverside Carlisle did not have the capacity or resources to go against the decision.

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder stated that the Council had been disappointed with Riverside's decision but there would be another opportunity to place a bid.

Ms Miller added that any community organisation could place a bid and the YMCA would be able to add funds so that the Council could use a different route for investment.

- How well prepared were Riverside for meeting the needs of the homeless?

Mr Taylor responded that over a third of Riverside's stock was flats or bungalows so there was still significant suitable accommodation for single people, however, the new Aids and Adaptations policy and the changes from the Welfare Reform would increase demand for smaller properties. Riverside would continue to priorities homeless people and Riverside would continue to provide accommodation and develop accommodation where possible.

- Was there a forum where all Registered Social Landlords could discuss issues?

Ms Doran confirmed that there were a number of various forums available for Riverside to discuss issues with other social landlords as well as other partners and organisations.

- Had Riverside began to consider how it would manage the impact of the welfare changes and ensure that vulnerable people were not made more vulnerable?

Mr Taylor responded that Riverside had carried out a lot of work in preparation for the changes including guidance notes for each division on how to handle the reform. He agreed that a number of the proposed changes would not benefit tenants and Riverside had carried out some lobbying nationally and locally. The next stage for Riverside would be to increase the public awareness of the changes and Riverside was working closely with tenants' representatives to ensure this was done correctly. Riverside had prepared a

budget to support people who wanted to downsize their accommodation where possible. He added that Riverside were also working with the Task group and hoped that the model they were using would be used across the County and information on suitable accommodation would be shared across partners.

Ms Doran added work was also being carried out with regard to employment and Riverside was promoting the use of apprentices with their contractors.

- When would an update on the Choice Based Letting Review be available?

Mr Taylor confirmed that the Review was underway but was not aware of the finishing date for the review.

- Had there been any progress made with joint working with the health agencies with regard to Disabled Facilities Grants?

Ms Doran informed the Panel that an integrated health meeting had been arranged by Robert Cornwall, Project Manager, Disabled Facilities Grant – Cumbria, for 10 February and it was hoped that an integrated approach could be reached to allow everyone to achieve more.

- What was the Strategic Tenancy Policy?

Ms Miller reported that the Localism Act required each local authority to have a Strategic Tenancy Policy to look at what offer was available within the area, what work was being undertaken in partnership with Registered Social Landlords and the best way of meeting housing needs. There would be constraints in the Policy but it looked at the best use of housing stock and how to ensure vulnerable people got the housing they needed in the most efficient way. The Policy would be made in consultation with the Housing Partnership Group and stakeholders and, although the legislation did not require private landlords to be included, private landlords would be taken into account when developing the Policy.

- Was the Council able to enforce the Policy or was it an agreement?

Ms Miller explained that the Policy was statutory but in keeping with the legislation it would be carried out through a partnership approach. She confirmed that the Policy would be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder stated that the Policy would be applicable to all housing providers and the legislation would be more applicable to authorities who still owned housing stock.

A Member raised concerns that the Policy could be open to interpretation under the Human Rights Act.

Ms Miller stated that more work was required on the Policy and would have to be implemented within 12 months of the start of the Localism Act.

RESOLVED – 1) The Panel thanked Mr Taylor and Ms Doran of Riverside Carlisle for their input into the meeting and welcomed the update on the partnership.

2) The Panel looked forward to receiving an update on the City Council's Strategic Tenancy Policy at the appropriate time.

COSP.21/12 ACCOMMODATION AND FOYER SERVICE

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the matter Councillor Mrs Luckley left the meeting and Councillor Glover chaired the item.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Cronin, YMCA and Mr Linford, Shaddon Gateway Centre Manager to the meeting.

The Director of Community Engagement (Mr Gerrard) submitted report CD.09/12 updating the Panel on the Accommodation and Foyer Service.

Mr Gerrard reminded the Panel of the history of the Shaddon Gateway and dispersed foyer support services. He explained that the City Council was working in partnership with Carlisle YMCA in the development and provision of progressive and holistic services to the community as part of a long term strategic shared vision with the focal point for the integration of the services being the Shaddon Gateway.

He added that the YMCA had updated the project development and delivery, risk management, public relations and indicative financial plans to reflect the updated timescales and milestones. The indicative budget showed an operational loss of £80,000, this figure had been analysed by the Council's financial section and it was felt that the break even position would be achieved. This was an important issue and business development would be a year 1 priority.

Meetings with stakeholders, officers and service providers continued to take place to develop business opportunities and it had been agreed that the handover and the opening of the Shaddon Gateway would be 1 April 2012. The YMCA had start up monies of £140,000 from the sale of the YMCA building on Fisher Street and they would recycle the money into the Shaddon Gateway Centre. They had also confirmed that they had money in reserves in case the sale of the building was delayed.

Mr Gerrard reported that the YMCA were exploring options and were in discussion with private developers and Riverside Carlisle to discuss accommodation options for young people and they would explore opportunities with successful providers of young people accommodation based services. The YMCA had had submitted applications for grant funding

to a number of distributors including Northern Rock Foundation, Esmee Fairburn Foundation, Francis C Scott Charitable Trust and Henry Smith Charity specifically in relation to the development of services for young people.

Mr Gerrard outlined the next steps and key dates for the project and highlighted the risk management plan and the YMCA's progress report which had been attached to the report.

Mr Cronin updated the Panel on the YMCA's position with regard to the population of the building and the promotion of the Centre. He informed the Panel that a Community Audit had been carried out which allowed the YMCA to map the offer that was available within the community and ensure that the YMCA did not compete with existing resources, the YMCA wanted to enhance resources not replace them. He added that the YMCA was very optimistic about the future of the Centre.

Mr Linford informed the Panel that he had been visiting groups to inform them of the offer of the Centre and to establish links within the community. He looked at how to make the building sustainable and how to maximise income whilst ensuring the offer was affordable.

- The risk register contained within the report highlighted the generation of cash flow as a risk.

Mr Cronin responded that the building had to be sustainable and finance was the key. The YMCA had no grants and no government funding, it was stand alone and had 12 to 18 months to achieve a sustainable model. The Centre would not initially operate with a sustainable model and it would take 12 months to achieve this. He explained that there were three markets where income could be achieved:

- Rental/Lease – The Centre would be rented or leased out to organisations that fit the overall vision of the YMCA and this would be an instant income stream.
- YMCA programme – The YMCA's existing programme was based on a social enterprise model and activities would be available from September.
- Homeless Services – This income stream would take longer to achieve as many factors were unknown due to tendering processes.

He explained that the Centre would have to have an income of at least £30,000 per year. In response to a question he confirmed that the YMCA had an exit strategy in case the Centre was not sustainable within the YMCA's vision.

- Would the work that was undertaken by the YMCA in Fisher Street be relocated to the Shaddon Gateway?

Mr Cronin confirmed that the work would be relocated to the Centre. He outlined the contract that the YMCA had in the City for the next two years and informed the Panel that the building on Fisher Street would be sold by auction.

- How would the YMCA be involved in housing services?

Mr Cronin informed the Panel that the YMCA provided accommodation in their other resource centres and would work closely with the Council and social landlords to build a relationship which would allow the YMCA to identify gaps in the provision for young people. This line of work would be developed once the building was sustainable. He explained that the YMCA would look at the empty homes route and once accommodation was secured they would look to secure resources to support it.

- The Action Plan stated that the Centre would provide activities through services deliverers; would the providers be paid for the provision?

Mr Cronin responded that the providers would deliver their services from the building with no financial recompense if they could but this would not be achieved until the building was sustainable. Once the income levels had been achieved then the Centre could bring providers which added value to the Centre. He reminded the Panel that the YMCA did not want to compete with existing resources but wanted to enhance the offer.

Mr Linford added that the Community Audit highlighted the fact that the Castle Ward did not have a dedicated community facility. It was proposed that the Centre would fill any gaps in provision and develop the service provided.

- The Panel was in full support of the Centre but raised concerns that if it was not successful how would the facility be managed and asked if the City Council also had an exit strategy.

Mr Gerrard explained that if the Centre was not successful then the Council would look at alternative ways of working using the Economic Development process. The Council would not have an exit strategy but would look to using the building in a different way and would involve partners.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Mr Crossley) informed the Panel that the future of the building had been part of the discussions of Senior Management and Executive. He agreed that it would be a challenge to create a sustainable building from a zero base but discussions had taken place about the future of the building.

- Why did the City Council's risk management plan have 'failure to engage local community' as a risk?

Mr Gerrard explained that the risk reflected the stance the Council was taking with regard to the importance of the local community to the Centre.

Mr Cronin added that the Board for the Centre would include members of the local community to ensure the needs of the community were being met and that the community was engaged in the Centre.

- How well advanced were the applications by YMCA for grant funding?

Mr Cronin confirmed that some bids for funding had been submitted but further funding would be achieved when the YMCA had stronger relationships with partners and providers within the local community.

- A Member reminded the Panel that the outcome of the Supporting People Contract was known and Impact Housing Association had won the tender to provide the support services at John Street Hostel. There were serious concerns that there would be reduction in staff at the Hostel and Members asked how the partnership between the Council, Impact Housing and the YMCA would work and how any reduction in staff would impact the authority or the work at the Centre.

Mr Gerrard agreed with the Panel's concerns and informed them that work had begun on looking at the possible impact of the change in support provider at the Hostel. There was concern that if there was a reduction in service then the Council would fill the gap as they had a statutory responsibility.

Mr Crossley suggested a short piece of work to further investigate the impact of the outcome of the Supporting People Contracts.

RESOLVED – 1) That Mr Cronin and Mr Linford be thanked for their input into the meeting:

2) That an update on the Shaddon Gateway Centre be submitted to the Panel in six months time:

3) That the following information be provided to the Homelessness Task and Finish Group with regard to the impact of the outcome of the Supporting People Contracts and include the following information:

- the staff structure of John Street Hostel before and after the change in service provider
- the service provided at John Street Hostel before and after the change in service provider;
- training opportunities for residents at John Street Hostel before and after the change in service provider;
- the interrelation of the Supporting People contracts on other services provided by the City Council.

COSP.22/12 REVENUE AND BENEFITS SHARED SERVICE

Councillor Mrs Luckley returned to the meeting and resumed Chair of the meeting.

The Director of Community Engagement (Mr Gerrard) submitted report CD.11/12 giving an overview of the progress of the Revenue and Benefits Shared Service. He also submitted a copy of the review of the revenues and Benefits Shared Working Partnership which had been carried out by Meritec Limited.

Mr Gerrard reminded the Panel of the implementation of the Revenues and Benefits Shared Service between Carlisle City Council, Allerdale Borough Council and Copeland Borough Council.

He explained that the variation of salaries remained under consideration within the service as TUPE requirements had resulted in salaries differing across the three authorities. Whilst all TUPE requirements had been met, the Service was working to ensure that a fair and appropriate resolution could be applied for all staff across the Service.

Mr Gerrard reported that the second year of the Shared Service had commenced with the conversion of the document management systems at Carlisle and Copeland to create a common database for documentation accessible at all sites. This work had created some backlogs and there had been a major hardware failure at Copeland which had also affected the document conversion and added delays in assessment. Common systems were now in place and the Service was working towards establishing a Shared Desk Top platform to allow easier access to databases.

He added that the operational service delivery on a day to day basis remained the key priority. However, the range and nature of the services delivered would be directly affected by the growing legislative changes being implemented by Central Government. An evaluation of the impact of the proposed changes had begun and proposals to address the implications would be developed as the legislation was confirmed.

Mr Gerrard outlined the performance of the Service and explained that due to issues in the first six months of the current financial year performance for 2011/12 would be lower than 2010/11. A performance improvement plan was in place and operation performance was reviewed by the Joint Operation Board on a monthly basis.

The performance had been affected by changes in the systems, vacant posts, and absences due to maternity and sickness. Resources had been supplemented for a considerable period of time through remote working, the use of agency staff and overtime to reduce backlogs and improve performance. Whilst already proving effective, the ability to work across sites would be enhanced through the increased IT capability as the Shared Desk Top became fully operational.

Mr Gerrard reported that savings had been achieved in the first year; salaries had been under spent resulting in a saving of £23,847 for Carlisle. Capital provisions remained within the anticipated costs and the programme expenditure for the capital implementation had spanned both years of the

service. Current projects indicated that the overall capital expenditure would be under spent by between £39,000 and £99,000. Financial performance monitoring was established and maintained through monthly monitoring by Finance Officers and quarterly reporting to the Joint Operational Board.

Mr Gerrard informed the Panel that Meritec Limited had carried out a review of the Revenues and Benefits Shared Service Working Partnership. The Review looked at what the Partnership had achieved, where it was and where it was heading.

- Why were the problems with the new IT systems not identified before implementation?

The Shared Services Partnership Manager - Revenues and Benefits (Mr Bascombe) stated that some of the technical issues with regard to the hardware failure could not have been anticipated. The report was correct in that the timescales were very tight and the impact of the changes had not been fully acknowledged. He explained that the previous issues caused concern with regard to the changes that would be required for the Welfare Reform. The Government had set a very short timescale for the system to be implemented in but it was anticipated that the changes should be easier as the new IT systems were in place.

He added that the new hardware structure model had greater resilience and should be robust enough for the Welfare Reform changes. The system had been purchased from a major national supplier who provided the system for a large number of authorities.

- How did the high level of absence through sickness and maternity affect the performance?

Mr Bascombe confirmed that there had been a reduction in performance due to absence and the changes to the IT systems. The absences reduced the ability for flexibility within the service; they were covered by using overtime primarily and some agency work when necessary. The sickness absences were not work specific and the absences were managed within Council policy. The position had improved significantly since the production of the report.

- The Meritec report highlighted concerns from Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils with regard to culture and attitudes, would this be addressed?

Mr Bascombe was optimistic that this would be addressed as it had been envisaged that there would be issues regarding different cultures. One issue had been three authorities working with three systems, this had been addressed and all three authorities used the same system and processes. There was further work being undertaken with the Department of Works and Pensions around alignment and commonality and it was understood that this would further improve the situation.

He added that there was a heightened level of concern during the review and the work of the review helped address some of the concerns. A lot of the issues had been related to new partnership working and a demand on the service.

- Was there an improvement plan in place?

Mr Bascombe confirmed that there was an improvement plan in place and it was monitored, in detail, on a monthly basis by the Joint Operational Board. He added that an action plan had also been prepared based on the recommendations by in the Meritec report. The action plan would be finalised by the Joint Operational Board before being implemented.

- The perspectives of the three partners had been included in the Meritec report. Both Allerdale and Copeland had included their concerns with regard to the impact of delays in service to the customers and Members were disappointed that the City Council perspective had not included any acknowledgement of the impact of delays on the customer.

The Community Engagement Portfolio Holder highlighted the City Council's high performance rate and informed the Panel that Carlisle's performance had been much better than Allerdale and Copeland when the partnership began and so there it had taken time to get all three partners on an equal basis. She added that a great deal of work had taken place to bring in a common system for working and it was unfortunate that the Welfare reform would cause further changes. She stated that she had some concerns with the Department of Works and Pensions carrying out some of the work under the reform as they had a four month backlog.

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder commented that the fall in performance had been from a very high base point and the service provided had been exceptional.

- Were there any contingency plans in place in case Allerdale or Copeland decided to come out of the partnership?

Mr Gerrard responded that there was no appetite for any of the partners to move out of the partnership, savings were being delivered and performance was increasing. The partners were aware of the significant changes that were coming and the managers were meeting informally to discuss the issues and share ideas.

- Were there resources available to deal with the proposed changes?

Mr Gerrard responded that the only budget the service had was the operational budget and there was nothing in place to deal with the changes.

RESOLVED – 1) That the update on the Revenue and Benefits Shared Service be welcomed;

2) That an update on the outcome of the actions as set out in the Meritec report be submitted to the Panel in the next quarter;

3) That an update on the impact of the Welfare Reform changes be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel.

COSP.23/12 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

COSP.24/12 NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING

The Director of Community Engagement (Mr Gerrard) submitted report CD.3/12 which included the latest version of the work programme based on the recommendations set out by the Neighbourhood Working Task and Finish Group.

The Health and Wellbeing Manager (Ms Pilkington) asked the Panel for input on the format of the report for future meetings.

The Lead Member of the Neighbourhood Working Task and Finish Group (Councillor Mrs Bradley) highlighted a number of issues with regard to the update on the actions within the report and reminded the Panel of the reasons for the recommendations.

It was suggested that the Lead Member meet with Ms Pilkington to inform her of the background to the Task Group work and the reasons for each recommendation. It was hoped that this would then form what information should be provided in future reports to the Panel.

The Community Engagement Portfolio Holder commented on the good work that the Health and Wellbeing Manager and her team had been carrying out.

RESOLVED – That the Lead Member of the Neighbourhood Working Task and Finish Group meet with the Health and Wellbeing Manager to discuss the background to the recommendations and the format for future reports to the Panel.

COSP.25/12 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) presented report OS.06/12 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 February to 31 May 2012 had been published on 18 January 2012 and there had been no items in the Forward Plan within the remit of this Panel.
- The Homelessness Task and Finish Group held a successful workshop with a variety partners on 6 February 2012.
- The Disabled Facilities Task and Finish Group had been due to reconvene to look at other support which was provided to elderly people in their homes. Due to pressures of time it was suggested that the work be carried over to the next municipal year and a new Task and Finish Group be appointed to undertake the review.
- A special meeting of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had been scheduled for 16 March 2012 and would be held at Longtown Community Centre to would consider reports which related to rural issues.
- Work had begun on the Annual Scrutiny Report and all Scrutiny Members had been asked for their input. The Panel were given a further opportunity to submit any issues and a draft copy of the Report would be considered by the Panel at its meeting on 22 March 2012.

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 the Disabled Facilities Task and Finish Group be reconvened in the next municipal year to consider other support available to elderly people in their homes.

COSP.26/12 CORPORATE PLAN – THIRD QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Policy and Performance Officer (Mr Daley) submitted the third quarter performance report (PPP.01/12) against the 2011/12 Corporate Plan. He summarised the progress made in the delivery of each of the Corporate Plan Key Actions as detailed in Section 3 to the report, together with the further detail provided in Section 4 thereof.

Mr Daley advised that the content of the report had been determined by the Senior Management Team on 24 January 2012 and the Key Action Red, Amber, Green (RAG) ratings were assessed by the relevant Director. He added that the RAG rating and associated progress columns referred to work that was being carried out during 2011/12. It may be that the Key Action would be carried forward into 2012/13 but the rating was based on this year's activity.

A Member drew Mr Daley's attention to the RAG rating for the Revenues and Benefits Shared Services, the rating was on target and green yet the report the Panel had considered earlier in the agenda showed a drop in performance.

Mr Daley agreed to look in more depth at the difference between the two performance figures and report back to Members.

He explained that the progress of a project was shown by the progress bar and not all projects were over a 12 month period so the progress bar may have a low figure because it covered more than one year.

RESOLVED – That the Corporate Plan Third Quarter Performance Report be welcomed.

COSP.27/12 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 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.28/12 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME FOR CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL

(Public and Press excluded by virtue of Paragraphs 2 & 4)

The Director of Community Engagement (Mr Gerrard) submitted report CD.22/12 updating the Panel on the progress of the transformation and restructure process linked to the Communities Housing and Health Service within the Community Engagement Directorate.

Mr Gerrard reported that the consultation document had been circulated to all staff and the comments and feedback received had been placed into a table with a response from management and had been included in the report circulated to Members. The consultation period had been extended to allow for more one to one meetings to address the concerns of staff. He added that all of the proposed changes had been in consultation with Robert Cornwall, Project Manager, Disabled Facilities Grant – Cumbria.

Mr Gerrard informed the Panel of the proposals for the Communities Housing and Health Service, how the staff would be structured and where they would be based within the building. He added that the City Council had been successful in the tender submitted under the Supporting People Contracts to operate the new Women and Families Accommodation.

Members raised concerns with regard to the Benefits Advice Centre and Mr Gerrard informed them of the proposed changes to the service and how it would improve services for customers. He agreed to look at retaining a separate number for the Benefits Advice Centre if possible.

RESOLVED – That the update on the Transformation Programme for the Communities Housing and Health Service within the Community Engagement Directorate be welcomed.

(The meeting ended at 1.55pm)