

COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY 25 NOVEMBER 2014 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Burns (Chairman), Councillors Ellis, Gee, McDevitt, Mrs McKerrell (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Prest), Mrs Stevenson and Mrs Vasey.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Bradley – Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor Ms Quilter – Culture, Leisure and Young People Portfolio Holder
Councillor Mrs Riddle – Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder
Councillor J Mallinson – Observer

Ms Hilary Wade – Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board
Mr Roger Cooke – Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board
Mr Paul Croft – Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board

OFFICERS: Deputy Chief Executive
Director of Economic Development
Director of Resources
Contracts and Community Services Manager
Policy and Performance Officer

COSP.69/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Mrs Prest.

COSP.70/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

COSP.71/14 PUBLIC AND PRESS

It was agreed that the items of business in Part A be dealt with in public.

COSP.72/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Councillor Mrs Riddle advised that she had submitted apologies for the meeting held on 23 October 2014 which had not been recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED – 1. That the minutes of the meetings held on 8 September 2014 and 11 September 2014 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record of those meetings.

2. That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2014 be noted.

COSP.73/14 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS

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

COSP.74/14 OVERVIEW REPORT AND WORK PROGRAMME

The Deputy Chief Executive presented report OS.27/14 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 Deputy Chief Executive reported:

- that the Notice of Key Executive Decisions, published on 10 October 2014, included the following items which fell within the remit of this Panel.

KD.22/14 – Tullie House Business Plan – the matter would be considered by the Panel later in the meeting;

KD.23/14 – Carlisle Homelessness Strategy – the matter would be available to be considered by the Panel at the meeting on 15 January 2015

KD.25/14 – Budget Process 2015/16 – the matter would be considered by the Panel later in the meeting.

Following publication of the agenda, a further Notice of Key Executive Decisions had been published on 14 November 2014. The following items fell within the remit of this Panel:

KD.28/14 – Energy Company Obligation – Partnership Proposal – the Executive would make a decision on the proposal in private at their meeting on 15 December 2014;

KD.30/14 – Carlisle Plan – the Executive will consider the draft Carlisle Plan at their meeting on 14 January 2015 before making a final decision at their meeting on 7 April 2015.

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

The following items had been considered by the Executive on 10 November 2014 and were on the agenda for this meeting of the Panel:

- Budget 2015/16
- Tullie House Business Plan.
- The first meeting of the Asset Based Community Development Task Group had been held on 27 October 2014 when it was agreed that they would like to commence with further work. The Group will meet again on 2 December 2014 to consider a report prepared by the Principal Housing Officer (Private Sector).
- The Deputy Chief Executive reminded Members that the last meeting of the Panel was held at the Shaddongate Centre. Members were concerned that the centre was losing money and it was agreed that the Deputy Chief Executive would meet with Ms Lucas from the YMCA to discuss areas of work. The Deputy Chief Executive had since met with Ms Lucas and discussed the usage of the Centre and income. They had agreed to arrange work to create the opportunity to fulfil their work in respect of the Empty Homes Project. It was agreed that an update report would be brought back to the Panel in February 2015.
- The Work Programme for the Panel had been circulated as appendix 1 of the report.

RESOLVED – 1. That the Overview Report (OS.27/14) incorporating the Work Programme and Notice of Executive Decisions items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2. That a report on the Shaddongate Centre and the Empty Homes Project be brought to the Panel at their meeting in February 2015.

It was agreed to take the agenda item A.4 – Second Quarter Performance Report 2014-15 before agenda item A.3 – Tullie House Business Plan.

COSP.75/14 SECOND QUARTER PERFORMANCE REPORT 2014-15

The Policy and Performance Officer submitted report PC.18/14 that updated the Panel on the Council's service standards that helped measure performance, and included updates on key actions contained within the Carlisle Plan.

With regard to the information on the Carlisle Plan the intention was to provide the Panel with a brief overview of the current position without duplicating the more detailed reporting that had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels at earlier meetings.

The report was reviewed by the Senior Management Team at their meeting on 11 November 2014 when it was decided that, as the sample size was too small, the service standards relating to customer satisfaction had been temporarily removed from the report. A more appropriate methodology to measure ongoing customer satisfaction was being developed.

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

In response to a query from a Member the Director of Resources explained that there was concern about the average number of days to process new benefits claims. The Director advised that the Chief Executives from the three authorities concerned had met and a board had been set up to drive performance up and the improvement would be seen in the next quarter. Extra resources had been put in and the latest figures were showing a reduction in the number of days taken to process new claims.

The Director further explained that he was not certain what the impact of the introduction of Universal Credit would be seen.

- *The report stated that there could be an increase in unauthorised encampments if the leaseholder of the Hadrian's Camp acquired the freehold or decided to close the site. What was the situation in respect of the lease?*

The Director of Economic Development explained that the freehold lease had been transferred to the City Council under the Community Benefit Scheme.

RESOLVED – 1) That Report PC.18/14 be noted.

COSP.76/14 TULLIE HOUSE BUSINESS PLAN

The Chairman welcomed Ms Wade, Mr Cooke and Mr Croft to the meeting.

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report SD.21/14 which introduced the Tullie House Museum and Art Gallery Trust's Business Plan for the period 2015-2018.

The Executive had considered the Business Plan at their meeting on 10 November 2014 and requested that the plan be referred to this Panel.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the purpose of the report was to facilitate consideration of the Business Plan in order that the Council may, in due course, agree core funding for the Trust. That was in line with Section 5 of the Partnership Agreement signed at the establishment of the Trust, that the Business Plan submitted by the Trust to the City Council should be used as the basis for agreeing funding.

Ms Wade reminded Members that the Business Plan had been presented to the Panel a year ago. That meeting was held in Tullie House and Members had been invited to view the Crosby Garrett Helmet, which had attracted 20,000 visitors. The mechanical circus had attracted a further 12,000 visitors.

Ms Wade outlined the awards that Tullie House had achieved over the past year including the best large visitor attraction in Cumbria. Tullie House would now go forward for a national award to be held in January 2015. Ms Wade outlined the funding that had been awarded and some of the projects undertaken.

The Board were now working on becoming more resilient as an organisation. They were aware that savings had to be made in 2015/16 and had appointed a Head of Fundraising to assist. A membership scheme had been introduced and the function room and retail area revamped and improved. The Board were now working on the transformation programme to take the Museum and Art Gallery forward into the next ten years.

The Board were also working on a bid for a 20:20 Museum project which was a transformational capital development project. Members of the Board and staff were working to ensure the bid was submitted by the deadline which was the end of the week.

Mr Cooke advised that the Board were working closely with the City Council and were aware that the Council owned the collections and building and that the Trustees were operating Tullie House on behalf of the Council and the residents of Carlisle. The Trust were keen to show that they were competent and had worked closely with City Council Members on the Board and the Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executive over the last two years.

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

- *Which of the displays had an entrance free and which are free?*

Ms Wade explained that there was a charge for all areas of Tullie House. Tullie House cards enable the cardholder to access all areas apart from special exhibitions for which there was an additional charge.

Mr Cooke advised that in the past the old Tullie House area was free of charge but he believed it was confusing for visitors that they could access some parts for no charge and had to pay to enter other parts. The present system was simpler and encouraged circulation around the museum.

- *Explain the membership scheme and the effect it will have on the Tullie House card.*

Ms Wade explained that the individual membership scheme would be available from December 2014. A corporate membership scheme would also be available. The individual

membership scheme would not replace the Tullie House card but there would be a knock-on effect. The Trustees would monitor the membership scheme to see how it worked and review the scheme after six months. It was anticipated that there would initially be eight corporate members in the first year.

Mr Cooke advised that it had not yet been finalised how the membership scheme would work with the Tullie House card which was a vital way to raise funds. The Friends of Tullie House group had also raised funds but that group had now been dissolved although it formed the basis of the new membership scheme. Mr Cooke believed that there would only be a small reduction in the number of individuals memberships compared to the Tullie House cards.

Ms Wade advised that it was anticipated that there would be 350 people who would take part in the individual membership scheme.

- *What would be the benefits of the membership scheme?*

Mr Croft explained that membership schemes were common and successful in other museums and art galleries. He could not say at this stage how the scheme would affect the Tullie House card but they would be careful that it would be affected too much.

Mr Cooke advised that the Trustees had tried to make the membership more attractive to join and the target was up to 600 members within three years. If the scheme was successful there may not be any changes to the Tullie House card as the Trustees were aware of the importance of the card to residents of Carlisle. Mr Cooke confirmed that there would be no changes to the Tullie House card without prior consultation with members of the board, City Council Members and residents.

- *A Member asked for assurance that the membership scheme would not reduce the benefits of the Tullie House card.*

Mr Cooke confirmed that the last thing that Trustees wanted was to reduce the benefits of the Tullie House card.

- *Would the work of the Head of Fundraising post be reviewed and what was the post expected to achieve?*

Ms Wade explained that the post would be paid from the core salary budget and was fundamental to enable the museum to move forward. At present the Head of Fundraising was working on the bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). The postholder had been in post for four months and had targets to reach as part of the Business Plan. The work done by the head of Fundraising would be reviewed regularly.

Mr Cooke further explained that there were two roles for the head of Fundraising – to raise unrestricted funding and raise restricted funding for more ambitious targets. Fundraising was a standard item on the Board's agenda and provided a flavour of income generated.

In response to a query from a Member Ms Wade confirmed that holders of the National Art pass could gain free access to the museum.

- *Did the salary figures in the Business Plan reflect the proposed changes in the City Council grant funding?*

Ms Wade advised that the Business Plan dealt with the £250,000 saving in 2015/16 but any further changes had not been taken into account.

- *The budget proposals included a reduction the following year of £214,000. Had the Board of Trustees digested what that meant?*

Mr Cooke explained that the additional reduction of £214,000 had not been included in the Business Plan as the information had been given to the Trustees as the Business Plan was being printed. The Trustees were in discussion with the Finance, Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder to determine whether the second round reduction could be phased in over a couple of years rather than in one big hit. The Business Plan was still a draft document and once Trustees were advised of the second round figures it would be re-written.

- *There was a feeling that because the Board were amenable and quiet with the Council it could become an easy target for funding reductions. Other organisations launch campaigns against cuts in funding.*
- *It was not in the nature of the Council to target organisations in that way. Savings proposals were discussed fairly and were not graded according to the level of opposition to them.*

Mr Cooke advised that the Board understood the financial constraints and they had a duty of running the museum as effectively and efficiently as possible but there was more work to be done. Mr Cooke confirmed that the Board had a positive and robust relationship with senior Officers of the City Council and would continue to discuss the implications of the cuts in funding.

- *The Business Plan stated that Central Services would be reduced next year. What services were the Board intending to remove from the City Council?*

Ms Wade advised that there would be discussion and consultation on any changes in central services. At present only payroll had been taken out and the Board were currently reviewing HR, IT and health and Safety. Ms Wade believed that maintenance would probably remain within the City Council.

- *Had the removal of payroll been factored into the City Council's budget? And at what point would it be included in the MTFP?*

The Director of Resources explained that the implication of the removal of payroll from the central services charge was small but Officers were aware that it could cause a budget pressure in future years. The Director of Resources further explained that discussion were still being held in respect of central charges and Tullie House would be required to give notice of any changes to service provision. If Tullie House could reduce the costs there would be an effect on the budget that would feed in but at present there was not sufficient detail to be included.

- *If the Board and the City Council were still so far from agreement on the matter why was it included within the Business Plan?*

Ms Wade advised that the Board were trying to achieve that deadline and it was included as a budget assumption.

The Director of Resources confirmed that there was still a lot of discussion to be had before a final decision was made.

- *The work of the Board was ambitious and admirable and they were doing a brilliant job.*
- *What was the deadline for submission of the bid in respect of the 20:20 project? And what would happen if the bid was not successful?*

Ms Wade confirmed that the deadline was 30 November 2014 and Officers working on the bid had received a lot of support from the City Council. Ms Wade believed there would be a lot of competition for the award as it was a national award.

Mr Cooke explained that it was not unusual for a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund to be rebuffed at the first attempt and because the bid was for national funding it had to be considered by the national Lottery Fund. If the Board were not successful in their bid the heritage Lottery Fund would work with the Board on a re-bid. If the bid was not successful the Board would not be disheartened as they would be able to submit a stronger bid the following year. If the bid was successful the funding would be good for Carlisle and the historic quarter.

- *Would it be better if the proposed cuts to funding could be phased in?*

Mr Cooke agreed that it was more important that there was an orderly progression in the reduction of funding rather than two big cuts. The Board were not arguing the size of the reduction but were in discussion with the City Council with regard to phasing those cuts in.

The Culture, Leisure and Young People Portfolio Holder stated that the Business Plan was ambitious and positive and would make a big difference to the City. The Portfolio Holder thanked the Trust and staff and Officers of Tullie House for their hard work with the Executive in producing the Business Plan.

The Portfolio Holder disagreed that the Council treated Tullie House as a soft target and stated that they had worked hard to recognise their potential. The Portfolio Holder stated that she would like to see more information on demographics of visitors and was concerned about the impact that the individual membership scheme could have on the Tullie House card but believed that there was room for debate. The Executive were also looking for further debate on the 2016/17 reduction in funding to Tullie House and would look at where savings could be made to ensure another reduction would be in line with the Business Plan ethos and the museum's achievements. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Executive were happy to engage in any discussion to determine a positive way forward.

- *If the total of the proposed reduction in funding was not changed how could the reduction be phased in that would be best for the organisation?*

Mr Cooke advised that the Trustees would like the two proposed reductions to be combined and phased in over a number of years starting on 1 April 2015 and believed that to be a more reasonable solution.

- *The Business Plan was to be presented at the budget meeting so there would be no further opportunity for the Panel to scrutinise the Plan.*

The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that the Business Plan would be taken through the normal passage of meetings and there would be the opportunity for the Panel to scrutinise the

Business Plan again before the Council consider the budget proposals in February 2015. It was important to find the right balance so as not to impede progress of the Plan and all of the information was not always available before that meeting.

Mr Cooke confirmed that he was happy for an updated Business Plan to be submitted to the Panel before February 2015.

- *Did Tullie House keep a record of postcodes for visitors and Tullie House card holders?*

Ms Wade advised that it was important to know the demographics of visitors to the museum to ensure all residents could be reached. There were 14,000 Tullie House card holders and while some were used regularly others were used only occasionally. The current system does not allow access to that information and it would be costly to install a new management information system.

In conclusion Ms Wade stated how much the Board appreciated the support of the City Council and the people of Carlisle. She added that Tullie House had a loyal and committed staff who were working hard in the submission of the bid for the 20:20 project.

The Chairman thanked Ms Wade, Mr Cooke and Mr Croft for their input and asked that the thanks of the City Council be taken back to the staff at Tullie House and to other members of the Board.

RESOLVED – That the Tullie House Business Plan be noted.

COSP.77/14 BUDGET 2015/16

Revenue Budget Reports

(a) Summary of New Revenue Spending Pressures

The Director of Resources submitted report RD.37/14 that provided a summary of the Council's revised revenue base estimates for 2014/15 together with base estimates for 2015/16 and updated reserve projections to 2019/20.

The Executive had on 19 November 2014 (EX.112/14) received the report and forwarded it to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for consideration as part of the 2016/16 budget process.

The report set out known revisions to the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) although there were a number of significant factors affecting the budget that were currently unresolved. Decisions would need to be taken to limit budget increases to unavoidable and high priority issues, together with maximising savings and efficiencies, and probable use of reserves, to enable a balanced budget position to be recommended to Council in February 2015.

The Director of Resources explained that, in light of the current forecast deficits, proposals for new spending pressures had been kept to a minimum. The pressures identified in Section 5 of the report were regarded as unavoidable or were the highest priority in meeting the Council's corporate objectives.

With regard to savings, the Director of Resources stated that the current MTFP included a savings requirement to be found by 2018/19 of £3.939 million. Further savings/additional income had been identified in the budget process for 2015/16, details of which were set out in

Section 6 of the report. Also summarised were the movements in base budgets, the updated MTFP projections, the outstanding key issues, the projected impact on revenue balances, together with a summary of the financial outlook and budget discipline 2015/16 to 2019/20.

Members then considered the following new priority for revenue spending and reduced income which fell within the areas of responsibility of this Panel.

- **Events and Events Sponsorship Income**

The pressure represented the funding to allow the continuation of the City Events budget. It was anticipated that sponsorship income increased by £20,000 per year would be generated to offset that cost. For 2015/16 an additional "12,600 was anticipated as outlined in the Charges Report PC.16/14 considered later in the agenda.

- **DFG Fee Income**

Disabled Facilities Grants expenditure in the capital programme was decreasing and the amount of fee that was able to be charged against the projects had been challenged through the courts. That meant that a flat fee was no longer allowable. Those two factors meant that income would not achieve the MTFP target for 2015/16.

- **Re-profiling of Transformation Savings**

Proposals to achieve the £3.939 million transformational savings required were included Appendix D attached to the report.

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

- *Would it be possible to have a breakdown of the events budget and how the money had been spent?*

The Director of Resources confirmed that would be possible.

- *It would be useful if the Panel could have sight of the minutes of the Events Committee.*

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the Committee did not have formal minutes but a full audit trail was kept and a list of which events had been funded could be provided to the Panel.

- *Were all events funded via the events budget?*

The Director of Resources explained that the Leader had a small budget for events as part of his portfolio.

The Culture, Leisure and Young People Portfolio Holder explained that the group consolidated all of the requests for events funding and had produced an application process. That would open up the process to wider organisations and voluntary groups. The Events Committee had been in place for approximately nine months and if Members of the Panel wished to have more information she was happy to submit a report to a future meeting.

- *Would the proposed night time parking fee impact on the night time economy and users of the Sands Centre in particular?*

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that it was not anticipated that there would be any impact on the Sands Centre agreement. One recommendation looked at the potential means

to raised income and some disappointment was anticipated. However the matter was included in the budget proposal for consultation.

- *What was the current spend on grants to Community Centres and how was it determined which Community Centre funding would be reduced?*

The Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder explained that the proposed reduction had been included in the budget for 2016/17 which would allow a full year to enable discussions to take place with the Community Centres. The Portfolio Holder was against a blanket cut to Community Centres as they differed in income, turnover and resources and believed that any cuts should be customised to the Community Centre. The Executive would work with the Community Centres to make them more sustainable in future.

- *A Member hoped that the Executive would not make cuts to the more successful Community Centres and retain the funding to those less sustainable. The Member hoped that the Community Centres would be encouraged to improve themselves.*

The Portfolio Holder advised that the Executive would be forward looking and encourage innovation.

- *The fairest way to make cuts would be to look at each Community Centre and start afresh. Some employ more staff than others but all represent wards of 4,000 people plus many under 18s. There would be some Community Centres who would lose but it would be a fairer method. Community Centres should be encouraged to get assistance.*

The Portfolio Holder reminded Members that Community Centres were independent and staffing and projects were their choice. The City council owned some of the buildings but the direction was the responsibility of the Management Committees. The Portfolio Holder advised that she had spent 30 years working in the voluntary sector and believed that the greatest strength to the Community Centres would be a strong Committee.

- *Some Community Centres were run by volunteers and they would need support. A Community Centre with a limited design or in a smaller building would not be as prosperous as another in a better location.*

RESOLVED – That Report RD.37/14 be noted.

(b) Summary of Charges review

• Chief Executive's Team and Deputy Chief Executive's Team

The Director of Resources presented report PC.16/14 that set out the proposed fees and charges for 2015/16 relating to those services falling within the responsibility of the Chief Executive's Team and the Deputy Chief Executive's Team.

The Director of Resources highlighted the proposed charges, which included the use of Event Assets by external organisations, promotion and marketing, and the use of the Old Fire Station which was a key priority within the Carlisle Plan and a major project for the City Council throughout 2014/15 and 2015/16. Details of the forecast levels of income for 2015/16 based upon the charging structure were also provided within the report.

Of particular note was Section 4.2 which recorded that a number of additional assets were being developed through project work, many of which were dependent upon planning permission. At their meeting on 10 November 2014, the Executive were asked to delegate the setting of those charges to the Deputy Chief Executive.

- The Panel raised no comments on the report.

RESOLVED – That Report PC.16/14 be noted.

- **Local Environment**

Report LE.03/14 was submitted, setting out the proposed fees and charges for the services falling within the remit of the Local Environment Directorate.

Details of the proposed charges in respect of City Centre usage by external organisations, car parking, allotments, sports pitches, environmental quality, food safety, waste services and bereavement services were provided.

On the issue of City Centre events charges, the Director of Resources advised that Officers were of the opinion that income levels and the range of events would be better served by having a charge of £60.00 per day for each individual item placed in the City Centre area.

By way of background, Members were reminded that a new charging structure had been introduced to the City Council pay and display in March 2012 to try and reverse the long term trend of falling car park usage and income. In order to establish the latest situation with car park usage and examine how that could be increased, a consultant had been engaged to report on options

In advance of his final report the consultant had prepared a dynamic model of car park income and usage over the last five years which could be used to predict the likely impact of future changes to car park charges. City council Officers had used that model and their knowledge of the City to prepare the current charges report and make initial proposals for future car park charges. When the final report from the consultant became available those proposals may need to be refined in line with the consultant's recommendations.

The Director of Local Environment gave an overview of car park usage and income, including pay by phone usage. In terms of the proposed charging structure for 2015/16 the Director explained that, although the changes set out could potentially increase income by £131,000, much would depend on successful marketing, the economic climate and the reaction of competitors in providing this service. Members were asked to note that, with effect from the 25 September 2014, the income from Cecil Street car park had been handed to the County Council as owners of the car park. That would result in an expenditure pressure of £75,400 in car park income thus reducing the potential increase in income to £55,600.

Attention was further drawn to Section 3.2 of the report which set out the existing pay and display charges, together with details of:

- proposed amendments to the car park charges for 2015/16 (including a number of reductions in charges, and the reaction of a new charging category to be used in Devonshire Walk and Lower Viaduct car parks which were underused);
- the proposed creation of a new car park category and amendment of some of the existing car park categories;

- the proposed revision of contract parking charges (saver permits); special event charges and granting of individual licences to car park traders where Officers considered that to be appropriate.

Section 4.3.2 recorded a proposal to implement a “dirty pitch penalty” system where litter was left following matches. Litter included, but was not limited to, plastic bottles, cans, sock tape and plastic bags.

With regard to Bereavement Services, it was proposed to introduce a charge of £20.00 to search burial records where a date was supplied, which was in line with neighbouring authorities. That service was previously offered free of charge, but it was now suggested that the Officer time taken up by such searches should be recompensed by the enquirer.

For Waste Services and Street Cleaning, proposals included:

- to promote minimisation of waste, the charge would be kept at £18 but the number of items would be reduced from five to three;
- the charge for a 240 litre refuse or garden waste bin should increase to £35;
- the option to purchase a second garden waste bin for extra recycling was withdrawn as rounds were at capacity and the Council could no longer guarantee new properties a garden waste collection for garden waste recycling.

The charges highlighted within the report would result in an anticipated level of income of £2,575,400 against the MTFP target of £2,885,600. That represented a shortfall of £310,200 against the MTFP target.

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

- *The City Council bereavement service was award winning and competitively priced in the past. What was the current position?*

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the service was still competitive but it had to be efficient and attention given to charges. A charge was proposed for searches into burial records. The service did not receive many requests but it was time consuming.

- *As people got older or moved away from the area they would be less able to tend graves of their loved ones. A Member suggested a charge for planting on graves in such situations. That would provide an additional service and secure jobs.*

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that he would pass the idea back to the Director of Local Environment.

RESOLVED – 1. That report LE.03/14 be noted.

2. That the observations of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel, as outlined above, be conveyed to the Executive

3. That the Deputy Chief Executive speak with the Director of Local Environment with regard to providing a service to maintain graves if requested and make a charge for that service.

- **Economic Development**

Report ED.42/14 was submitted setting out the proposed fees and charges for areas falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate. The proposed charges related to Economic Development and Tourism, planning services, housing and hostel services.

Section 4 (Planning Services) highlighted proposed changes by the Government to the planning system, and extension of temporary changes already brought in. A consequence thereof would be a reduction in income of from £213 to £305 per planning application.

Section 6 (Disabled Facilities Grants) recorded that the proposed new fee charging structure was now based on the current cost of Officer time and the Officer time taken related to each task associated with guiding the applicant through the DFG process from initial referral to the payment of the contractor. The charge also related to the particular type of adaptation.

Acceptance of the charges highlighted within the report, with the exception of Building Control which was self financing, would result in an anticipated level of income of £1,236,900 against the MTFP target of £1,282,200.

RESOLVED – 1. That report ED.42/14 be noted.

2. That the observations of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel, as outlined above, be conveyed to the Executive

(c) Revised Capital Programme 2014/15 and Provisional Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2019/20

The Director of Resources submitted report RD.38/14 detailing the revised capital programme for 2014/15, together with the proposed method of financing. The report also summarised the proposed programme for 2015/16 to 2019/20 in the light of the new capital pressures identified, and summarised the estimated and much reduced capital resources available to fund the programme.

The Director of Resources drew Members' attention to Section 4 which provided details of the current commitments and explained that many of the new spending proposals had not yet been considered by the Corporate Programme Board. Accordingly, should they be approved for inclusion in the Council's Capital Programme as part of the budget process, the release of any earmarked reserve would be subject to verification of the business case by the Corporate Programme Board and a report to the Executive as appropriate.

The Director of Resources highlighted the summary of the estimated resources available to finance the capital programme for 2015/16 to 2019/20. A summary of the estimated resources compared to the proposed programme year on year was also provided.

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

- *In light of recent enforced temporary closures of the Pools, what impact would there be on the budget if there were any further incidents?*

The Director of Resources advised that the pools were included in the revenue budget and if there was a major breakdown Carlisle Leisure Limited would consult with the City Council.

The Contracts and Community Services Manager advised that there would be more risks and the Pools aged but maintenance was being maintained.

The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that reserves were ringfenced for the Pools.

In response to a query from a Member the Director of Resources advised that the energy efficiency of the Civic Centre had reached a higher level and was now one of the most efficient buildings in the City.

RESOLVED: 1. To accept the recommendations as set out in Report RD.38/14.

2. That the observations of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel, as outlined above, be conveyed to the Executive.

[The meeting ended at 11.45am]