

EXECUTIVE

WEDNESDAY 22 DECEMBER 2010 AT 11.00AM

PRESENT:

Councillor Mitchelson (Chairman and Promoting Carlisle Portfolio Holder)
Councillor J Mallinson (Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder)
Councillor Bainbridge (Housing Portfolio Holder)
Councillor Bloxham (Local Environment Portfolio Holder)
Councillor Mrs Bowman (Economic Development Portfolio Holder)
Councillor Ellis (Performance and Development Portfolio Holder)

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillor Allison (Chairman of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel)
Councillor Mrs Farmer (Observers)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Mrs Geddes, Community Engagement Portfolio Holder, Councillor Mrs Clarke, Chairman of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel and Councillor Mrs Rutherford, Chairman of the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

EX.220/10 REVENUE ESTIMATES: SUMMARY OF OVERALL BUDGETARY POSITION 2011/12 TO 2015/16 (Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

Pursuant to Minute EX.180/10, the Assistant Director (Resources) submitted report RD.61/10 summarising the Council's revised revenue base estimates

for 2010/11, together with base estimates for 2011/12 and updated projections to 2015/16. The report had been updated since the Executive meeting in November 2010 and set out the impact of new savings and new spending pressures currently under consideration, and the potential impact on the Council's overall revenue reserves.

He added that it was clear, even at this early stage of the budget process, that all of the pressures currently identified could not be accommodated within existing Council resources. Decisions would need to be made to limit budget increases to unavoidable and high priority issues, together with maximising savings and efficiencies. Those were currently going through the budget process, and were being considered by the Executive and relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

The Assistant Director (Resources) informed Members that there were still a large number of significant issues affecting the projections, the outcomes of which would not be known for some time, but which were nonetheless key to the Council's budget process including the Government Finance Settlement - RSG and NNDR (including implications of grant funding for Concessionary Fares moving to the County Council); triennial revaluation of the Pension Fund; and implications of the above on the Council's transformation savings targets.

The Revenue Support Grant announcement had not been made at the time of preparation of report RD.61/10, and the Assistant Director (Resources) had therefore issued an Addendum to his report, copies of which had been circulated. The addendum provided updated projections on Treasury Management, Asset review and draft Revenue Settlement Grant allocations which had been announced on 13 December 2010.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Executive note the updated budget projections for 2010/11 to 2015/16 including the update projections contained within the addendum and made recommendations, in the light of the budget pressures and savings submitted to date, together with the potential use of balances and reserves, in order to issue a draft Budget for consultation purposes.

Reasons for Decision

To enable the Executive's draft budget proposals for consultation purposes to be prepared.

EX.221/10 PROVISIONAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011/12 TO 2015/16
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

Pursuant to Minute EX.188/10, the Assistant Director (Resources) submitted report RD.62/10 providing revised details of the capital programme for 2010/11, together with the proposed method of financing. He reminded Members that, due to the severe resource constraints on the capital programme over the next five years, a fundamental review had been undertaken to prioritise capital schemes with the aim of ensuring that the Council maintained a minimum level of capital receipts. The outcome of that review was set out within the report.

The report also summarised the implications of the review on the proposed programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 in light of the capital bids submitted to date for consideration; together with the estimated and much reduced capital resources available to fund the programme.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Executive:

1. Note the revised capital programme and relevant financing for 2010/11 as set out in Appendices A and B of Report RD.62/10.
2. Recommend that Council approve slippage of £3,654,300 and savings of £99,700 from 2010/11 identified in Phase 1 of the review.
3. Recommend that Council approve further slippage of £409,100 (Industrial Estate Improvements) from 2010/11 and additional capital budget requirement of £734,000 (Capitalisation Direction, Sub Region Employment Sites and Old Town Hall) in 2010/11 identified in Phase 2 of the review.
4. Made recommendations on the Provisional Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 in the light of the capital bids submitted to date, together with the estimated available capital resources, for budget consultation purposes as set out RD.62/10
5. Approved the release of £638,000 from the Asset Management Reserve to fund improvements to Industrial Estate Roads in 2011/12.
6. 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 by the Executive.

Reasons for Decision

To enable the Executive's draft budget proposals for consultation purposes to be prepared

EX.222/10 DRAFT TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT, INVESTMENT STRATEGY AND MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION STRATEGY 2011/12 (Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

Pursuant to Minute EX.189/10, the Assistant Director (Resources) submitted report RD.60/10 setting out the Council's draft Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2011/12 in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

He informed Members that the draft Investment Strategy and the draft Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy for 2011/12 were incorporated as part of the Statement, as were the draft Prudential Indicators as required within the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.

The Assistant Director (Resources) added that, whilst the final version of the Strategy would be issued following the consultation period on the draft budget for 2011/12, there were no substantive changes to the form and content of the Statement as compared to the previous year. The matter would go forward to the City Council in February 2011.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Executive approve the draft Treasury Management Strategy Statement incorporating the draft Investment Strategy and draft Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy, together with the Prudential Indicators for 2011/12 for draft budget consultation purposes as set out in Appendix A to Report RD.60/10.

Reasons for Decision

To enable the Executive's draft budget proposals for consultation purposes to be prepared.

EX.223/10 CHARGES REVIEW
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Cross Cutting

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

Pursuant to Minutes EX.181/10, EX.182/10, EX.183/10 and EX.184/10, further consideration was given to the Charges Review in respect of charges falling within the responsibility of the Local Environment; Community Engagement; Economic Development and Governance Directorates. Copies of reports CS.28/10, CD.21/10, ED.37/10 and GD.62/10 had been circulated.

Copy Minute Extracts from the meetings of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 25 November (COSP.91/10); Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 2 December (EEO.SP.82/10); and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 7 December 2010 (ROSP.109/10) in respect of the charges were also circulated.

The Leader indicated that the Executive had taken on board feedback from the Overview and Scrutiny Panel meetings in formulating its budget proposals, and thanked Panel Members for their contribution.

The Chairman of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel commented that the Panel looked forward to a further opportunity to consider the issues regarding the future of the purple refuse sacks. He added that the Panel were also pleased that a review of the Enterprise Centre was being carried out in line with the Council's Corporate Plan. He commented that the Panel felt that there could be potential contentious issues arising from the review of the Concessionary Business Rates and looked forward to scrutinising the matter.

The Local Environment Portfolio Holder then moved the recommendations contained in report CS.28/10, he commented that further options of charging for car parks had been investigated and the Executive had taken into account the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels. He added that the Council would be investigating different ways for motorists to pay for parking in the future. He added that there would also be a review of the purple refuse sacks in the next year. In the meantime the budget had remained the same for 2011/12 whilst the review was underway.

The Performance and Development Portfolio Holder moved the recommendations contained within report CD.21/10.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder moved the recommendations contained within report ED.37/10.

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder moved recommendations contained within report GD.62/10.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

1. That the fees and charges as set out within Report CS.28.10, be approved with effect from 1 April 2011 In respect of services falling within the remit of the Local Environment Directorate other than the fees and charges relating to Car Parks which are approved with effect from the earliest practicable date following the statutory procedure to implement the specified increases due to the higher rate of VAT applicable from 4 January 2011.

2. That the fees and charges, as set out in the relevant Appendices to report CD.21/10 be approved with effect from 1 April 2011 in respect of the service areas and functions falling within the Community Engagement Directorate.

3. That the fees and charges, as set out in the relevant Appendices to report ED.37/10 be approved with effect from 1 April 2011 for areas falling within the responsibility of the Economic Development Directorate.

4. That the fees and charges, as set out in Appendix A to Report GD.62/10, be approved with effect from 1 April 2011 in respect of the service areas and functions falling within the Governance Directorate.

5. That the Executive noted the Licensing Charges which had been approved by the Regulatory Panel on 13 October 2010, and further noted that there would be an income shortfall of £10,500 against current Medium Term Financial Plan projections.

5. That the Overview and Scrutiny Panels be thanked for their consideration of and contribution to the matter.

Reasons for Decision

The proposed charges and options reflect the Corporate Charging Policy as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, whilst attempting to recognise service pressures and trends

EX.224/10 EXECUTIVE RESPONSE ON THE 2011/12 BUDGET
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

The Leader tabled the Executive's draft Budget proposals for consultation and made the following statement on behalf of the Executive:

He commented that the budget process was always going to be a challenge due to the financial climate of the Country. The Government's Comprehensive Spending Review had resulted in a 26% reduction in Revenue Support Grant over the next four years and this meant that the Council had to make substantial reductions to its budget to ensure that there was a balanced budget. These reductions were equivalent to an actual saving of £5.8million in total over the five year period commencing 1 April 2010.

He added that the Executive appreciated the difficult circumstances that the residents of Carlisle were facing and were aiming to deliver a budget with no Council Tax increase next year. The Executive had always shown prudence in their finances which had stood the Council in good stead over the years and had made sure that they were in a position to continue to present a balanced budget which was robust and sustainable.

The Leader added that the budget had presented considerable challenges for the Council as the Executive had to make sure that the savings identified were achieved and delivered. In anticipation of those challenges the Council had embarked more than a year ago on a major transformation review of the management structure which meant that the Council was on its way to delivering £3million worth of savings. However, this left a further £2.8million worth of savings still to find over the next four years.

The Leader set the Executive's key principles for delivering additional savings which were:

The ongoing Transformation programme;

Discretionary Services Savings;

Delivering Services differently, sharing services, re-modelling, changing the patterns of delivery together within the longer term income generation through the Asset Review.

He added that there was no doubt that the Executive would be taking tough decisions about services and spending, however, they were committed to protecting frontline services, especially to the most vulnerable residents and delivering on the Council's Corporate Priorities of the Environment and Economy.

He stated that the Executive also had to review the Capital Programme and he was pleased to say that there was still money on the budget for investment in important projects for the City including the Resource Centre and new families accommodation.

The Leader concluded by saying that whilst the Executive had identified savings in the Budget Proposal which needed to be achieved for year 2012/13. Those proposals would now be discussed with relevant partners to find out how the savings could be achieved.

The Governance and Resources Portfolio Holder reiterated the Leader's comments regarding the difficulties faced by every authority in the country. He also congratulated the Town Clerk and Chief Executive and Senior Managers on the success of the Transformation programme.

He recommended that the budget proposals be approved for consultation and looked forward to feedback in January 2011, prior to submission to full Council in February 2011.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

The Executive's draft budget proposals as tabled at the meeting and appended to these Minutes as Appendix A be agreed and circulated for consultation.

Reasons for Decision

To produce the draft budget proposals for consultation purposes

EX.225/10 REVISED PROCUREMENT AND COMMISSIONING STRATEGY 2010-12
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not in the Forward Plan)

The Assistant Director (Resources) submitted report RD.65/10 recommending the adoption of a revised Procurement and Commissioning Strategy for the period 2010-12.

He reported that the Council's Procurement Strategy was first produced in April 2003 and revised in 2006 to ensure that issues contained in the National Procurement Strategy were incorporated within the Council's procurement activities.

The Assistant Director (Resources) referred Members to the draft Strategy and Appendices to his report which had been submitted to the Senior Management Team following scrutiny and feedback by the Audit Commission as part of their annual audit inspection. The Audit Commission had assessed the Council's arrangements to achieve value for money and concluded that the Council had satisfactory arrangements in place to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. He explained that the 2010-12 Strategy included a number of amendments and revisions intended to strengthen and clarify the Council's approach to the provision of goods, works and services. The aim of the Strategy was to set a clear framework for activity throughout the authority, which reflected the Council's Corporate Plan and complemented its Constitution and Contract Procedure Rules. He further outlined the objectives which had been set in considering revised corporate objectives and values and the requirements of Central Government and European legislation.

It had also been necessary to revise the Council's Contract Procedure Rules to accurately reflect the emerging changes through the implementation of electronic systems and procedures, and the utilisation of framework agreements and contracts. The revised Contract Procedure Rules had been accepted by Council in November 2010.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the draft Procurement Strategy as appended to Report RD.65/10 and made it available for consideration by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Following scrutiny the Executive would consider the Strategy at its meeting on 19 January, prior to making a formal recommendation to Council in February 2011.

Reasons for Decision

The proposed revisions to the Council's Procurement and Commissioning Strategy were intended to enable the Council to take advantage of alternative service delivery and tendering methodologies through changes in technology and efficiency legislation. The changes were intended to make procurement and commissioning more efficient, achieve greater cost effectiveness and also lead to competition between providers of goods, works and services.

EX.226/10 CORE STRATEGY KEY ISSUES PAPER
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Economic Development

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

(In accordance with Paragraph 15(i) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, the Mayor had agreed that call-in procedures should not be applied to this item)

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) submitted report ED.44/10 concerning the Core Strategy Key Issues Paper. He reminded Members that the matter had been referred for consideration by the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel, in addition to which Overview and Scrutiny Members had requested a Workshop open to all City Council Members on the Local Development Framework (LDF) / Core Strategy, which it was considered should be timed to coincide with the preparation of the Key Issues Paper. That Workshop had taken place on 26 November 2010.

The Assistant Director added that whilst an overview of the Core Strategy and Key Issues Paper was provided at the Workshop, along with information on the evidence base being developed to support preparation of the LDF Development Plan Documents, very few comments had been raised in respect of the Key Issues presented. It was, however, agreed that any Members who identified issues which had been omitted could raise them at the Panel meeting on 2 December 2010.

The Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel had, on 2 December 2010, considered the matter and resolved (EEOSP.83/10):

"1) That the Panel thanked Mr Hardman and his team for the report.

2) That Officers should ensure that housing allocations and rural settlement figures should be looked at again."

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

The Executive considered the additional issues and suggested amendments to the Core Strategy Key Issues Paper identified at the Overview and Scrutiny Workshop on 26 November, and at the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 2 December 2010 and recommended that the Core Strategy Key Issues Paper be referred to the City Council on 11 January 2011 for approval.

Reasons for Decision

To progress work on the Core Strategy by involving the public in identifying the Key Issues that affect Carlisle in preparation for development of the options for dealing with them.

**EX.227/10 CARLISLE COMMUNITY PLAN (SUSTAINABLE
COMMUNITY STRATEGY) 2011-2016**
(Key Decision)

Portfolio Promoting Carlisle

Subject Matter

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

(In accordance with Paragraph 15(i) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, the Mayor had agreed that call-in procedures should not be applied to this item)

Pursuant to Minute EX.194/10, the Carlisle Partnership Manager submitted report PPP.42/10 concerning the Carlisle Community Plan (Sustainable Community Strategy) 2011-2016.

He reminded Members of the background to the matter commenting that, to varying degrees, the Carlisle Partnership Executive Members, Carlisle City Council Executive Members, and Members of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had all suggested changes and amendments to the draft Community Plan. A summary of the changes requested was included in his report. The draft Community Plan had also been updated to reflect those requests and was attached at Appendix 4 to the report.

As stated above, the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had on 25 November 2010 considered the matter and resolved:

"1) That the Panel accepted the comments made and they appreciated that it was a work in progress.

2) The new delivery plans are to be presented to the appropriate Overview and Scrutiny Panel in February."

A copy of Minute Excerpt COSP.89/10 had been circulated.

The Carlisle Partnership Manager added that the changes that had been recommended by the Executive and the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel had been included into the Community Plan wherever practically possible and with consultation with various partners.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Executive:

1. Accepted the revised draft Carlisle Community Plan 2011-16, as appended to Report PPP.42/10, which had been updated to reflect feedback from Carlisle City Council's Executive and the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel.
2. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Community Engagement) in consultation with the Leader of the City Council and the Chair of the Carlisle Partnership, to make any further changes to the draft Carlisle Community Plan 2011 - 2016.
3. Recommend the draft Carlisle Community Plan 2011 - 2016 to the City Council for formal adoption onto the City Council's Policy Framework.

Reasons for Decision

To consider, following consultation, the content of the Carlisle Community Plan 2011 - 2016 prior to recommendation to the City Council for adoption

EX.228/10 LOCAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND CONSULTATIONS
(Non Key Decision)

Portfolio Cross Cutting

Subject Matter

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report CE.38/10 informing Members that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was consulting on two types of review it would be conducting in the future, with a response deadline of 31 December 2010.

The Deputy Chief Executive drew attention to the document at Appendix 1 to his report "Striking the Right Balance" which was a consultation on the policies and procedures relating to electoral reviews, the main points in respect of which were outlined for Members.

He added that the document at Appendix 2 - "On the Right Lines" was about the policies and procedures in relation to principal area boundary reviews, the main issues for which were also set out.

Appendix 3 detailed the questions requiring a response from the Executive.

In conclusion, the Deputy Chief Executive reported that the proposals from the LGBCE presented in both documents added up to a clear, streamlined process for facilitating structural change over the coming years. The

proportionate approach proposed would help to ensure that change, where beneficial, could be delivered with the pace required. He added that it seemed clear that the LGBCE had recognised that many District Councils would need to consider substantial boundary changes in the interests of efficient and effective service delivery.

The Leader circulated a copy of the Executive's responses to the questions set out in both of the consultation documents.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Executive had considered the consultation questions presented in the Local Government Boundary Committee for England Consultation documents attached at Appendix 1 and 2 to Report CE.38/10, and agree a response from the City Council as set out below:

On the Right Lines Consultation Response:

Question 1a

Do you think that classifying PABRs is helpful and is the proposed classification appropriate?

Yes and the classifications seem to be appropriate.

Question 1b

Under what circumstances should 'compound' reviews be carried out?

It would be particularly important in our view to consider compound reviews when the merger of two or more district councils in a county is proposed. It may be desirable to conduct a compound review in the interests of a consistent pattern of local government across a sub-region.

Question 2a

Are the review criteria relevant and/or should there be other criteria?

The criteria are suitable and we are pleased to note the importance given to local support and community identities and interests.

Question 2b

Do you think that local authorities and others would be able to assemble evidence showing how a proposed boundary change would have merits in terms of the criteria?

Yes - similar work has been undertaken by local authorities during the recent round of unitary reviews. It will be helpful to do this in dialogue with the commission rather than submitting a competitive bid.

Question 3

Is the initiation process clear and reasonable? If not, how could it be improved?

The process seems clear and we appreciate the proportionality of application, which should ensure that reviews are processed in a timely fashion.

Question 4

Is the Commission's approach to evidence of local support clear and appropriate?

Yes - again the principal of proportionality depending on the type of review is welcomed. It will be important to be clear about the ground rules for authorities 'campaigning' for a particular view. - there is an obvious link here with the provisions of the localism bill.

Question 5

Is the assurance required about the financial implications of proposed changes clear and reasonable?

The principal of proportionality works well here also.

Question 6

Is the Commission's overall approach to consequential electoral arrangements clear and reasonable?

Yes, and it links clearly with the proposals in "Striking the Right Balance".

Question 7

How much notice of the Commission's intention to undertake a review would be necessary in order to give councils sufficient time to prepare the evidence to demonstrate the merits and other impact of a change to their boundaries?

If the initiative is coming from outside the authority, then we would need at least one year's notice of a review from "cold". Clearly if the initiative was coming from within the authority (i.e. The review was clearly desired by the authority) then timescales could be shorter as much of the preparatory work could be done before approaching the Commission.

Question 8

Are there any other matters which might be the subject of appropriate prompts?

We accept and appreciate that the business of PABRs is primarily about electors. However the issues around community identity and effective & convenient local government are relevant to service users who are not necessarily electors (for example visitors and businesses). We would like to see more explicit consideration of how these stakeholders might be engaged.

Striking the Right Balance consultation response

Question 1a

Do you think that setting out principles by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?

Yes.

Question 1b

Are the principles set out appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?

Yes and, similarly to "On the Right Lines?" we support the principle of a proportionate approach.

Question 2

Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?

Yes. Moreover the links with the PABR review types seem clear and appropriate.

Question 3a

Is a criteria-based approach to determining council-size desirable?

Yes it is. Although we appreciate the reasoning for not adopting a strictly mathematical approach - we feel there should be strong and clear justification

for deviating from numerical "norms" in terms of the number of electors per representative.

Question 3b

Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?

The elements set out are clearly relevant - however if, for example, the current decision making framework of an authority currently requires many members, that should not naturally translate into a future requirement for a relatively large number of members. Form should follow the required function, with clear consideration of efficiency.

Question 4a

Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 2 clear and appropriate?

Yes.

Question 4b

Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?

Yes. It is important that reviews are conducted in a timely manner as there is likely to be a high degree of interest in PABRs, resulting in a substantial programme of work.

Question 4c

Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?

Yes. The importance of a PABR would lend itself to convening special meetings if necessary, but the indicated timescales would fit with the current arrangements in Carlisle.

Question 5a

Should LG BCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five years' time?

This seems sensible as long as the consideration of demographic change that has a high degree of certainty is utilised as indicated. It may be helpful to more clearly define the degree of certainty required.

Question 5b

How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend short-term imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five years' time?

By clearly communicating the options (and the supporting evidence) to facilitate an inclusive consultation on the issue. Electors will need to understand, and hopefully support, the reason for a short-term imbalance. At the conclusion of a comprehensive consultation the Commission should be in the best position to make informed choices. The last resort would be a future "type A" review to address the subsequent imbalance - much of the supporting work would have been already completed so this may only take around 16 weeks.

Reasons for Decision

To enable the Executive to respond to consultation from the Local Government Boundary Committee for England

EX.229/10 JOINT MANAGEMENT TEAM
(Non Key Decision)

Portfolio Governance and Resources

Subject Matter

The Minutes of the Joint Management Team held on 14 October and 11 November 2010 were submitted for information.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the Minutes of the Joint Management Team held on 14 October and 11 November 2010 be received.

Reasons for Decision

Not applicable

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 each minute) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

EX.230/10 DRAFT ASSET BUSINESS PLAN
(Key Decision)
(Public and Press excluded by virtue of paragraph 3)

Portfolio Cross-Cutting

Subject Matter

(In accordance with Paragraph 15(i) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, the Mayor had agreed that call-in procedures should not be applied to this item)

(With the consent of the Chairman, and in accordance with Rule 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, this item was included on the Agenda as a Key Decision, although not programmed within the Forward Plan for consideration at this meeting)

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted report CE.39/10 concerning the draft Asset Business Plan. He reminded Members that they had on 22 November 2010 considered the matter (Report CE.36/10 referred). The draft Plan was subsequently considered by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 7 December 2010 when it was resolved (ROSP.118/10):

- "1) That the Panel support the Asset Business Plan;
- 2) That Ward Councillors be involved in the process for the proposed disposal of relevant land or property within their Wards. It was suggested that reports to the Executive regarding proposed disposal of assets included a section for comments from the Ward Councillor(s);
- 3) That the Business Plan included more information on the lease periods and income of land and property."

A copy of the Minute Excerpt had been circulated.

The Deputy Chief Executive invited the Executive to consider the comments made by the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel and commend the draft Plan to full Council for adoption at their meeting on 11 January 2011.

The Chairman of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel thanked the Executive for the opportunity to scrutinise the document at an early stage.

Summary of options rejected None

DECISION

That the comments and observations of the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel be noted and the Executive commend a final draft of the Asset Business Plan to full Council for adoption on 11 January 2011.

Reasons for Decision

To more effectively manage the Council's assets in pursuit of wider strategic objectives

(The meeting ended at 11.45am)