

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 5 APRIL 2012 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Rutherford (Chairman), Councillors Bowditch, Craig, Mrs Farmer (until 1:45), Mrs Robson (until 12:45), Mrs Vasey and Watson.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Bloxham – Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder

EEOSP.20/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There was an apology for absence on behalf of Councillor McDevitt.

EEOSP.21/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

EEOSP.22/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED – 1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2011 and 19 January 2012 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

2.) That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2012 be noted.

Councillor Watson indicated that his name was omitted from the attendance list when he had been present at the meeting. The Committee Clerk agreed to amend the minutes accordingly.

EEOSP.23/12 CALL IN OF DECISIONS

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

EEOSP.24/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman announced that she was not standing for re-election in the forthcoming elections and expressed her thanks to the Members past and present who had contributed to the work of the Panel, Portfolio Holders who had attended and Officers who had supported the Panel

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder gave his thanks to the Chairman on behalf of the Members for her input both at the Panel meetings and at the Executive when she had attended. The Portfolio Holder added that he had always found Councillor Rutherford to be courteous and helpful and thanked her for her support.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder added her thanks for the work Councillor Rutherford had done and stated that she had done a good job both as Chair of the Panel and as a Councillor.

The Vice Chairman, on behalf of the Panel, thanked Councillor Rutherford for her work as Chairman and added that the Panel had enjoyed working with her and that she would be missed.

EEOSP.25/12 OVERVIEW REPORT INCORPORATING THE WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN ITEMS

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) presented report OS.11/12 which provided an overview of matters related to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work. Details of the latest version of the work programme were also included.

Mrs Edwards reported that:

- The Forward Plan of the Executive covering the period 1 April 2012 to 31 July 2012 had been published on 16 March 2012. There were six items that related to the work of this Panel:
 - KD.004/12 – Interim Planning Statement – Housing – The Chair and Vice Chair had met with the Planning Manager (Mr Hardman) to look at the report. As there was no change to policy it was agreed that it was not necessary for the Panel to scrutinise the statement. A note had been circulated to all Panel members and no concerns were raised about the proposal.
 - KD.003/12 – Enterprise Centre – There would no longer be a report to the Executive as the decision had been made as part of the 2012/2013 budget process. An update on implementation of the Task Group recommendations was on the agenda for the meeting

It had been decided that as the Executive would be making a decision on the following items it was agreed that they would not be required for consideration at the meeting on 23 June as scheduled within the Forward Plan:

- KD.008/12 – Castleway Cycle Ramp (also know as “Caldew Cycle Plan” in Sainsbury S.106-687 Document)
- KD.010/12 – Castle Street Public Realm Improvements

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder explained that the decision to release funding for the completion of the Castleway Cycle Ramp would be made at the Executive meeting immediately following the Panel meeting. Apart from two small areas all of the cycleway that was originally intended would be completed once the Castleway Cycle Ramp was completed.

With regard to the Public Realm the Executive would also be making the decision on the release of funding with regard to the area close to Abbey Street. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged that there were still issues with large vehicles turning from Castle Street and damaging kerb stones. However the vehicles were necessary to make deliveries to stores in town and the situation would be monitored.

- KD.011/12 – Events Policy – this item had been withdrawn from the Forward Plan to allow further work to be undertaken
- KD.006/12 – Core Strategy Preferred Options – Members would have the opportunity to consider the report at their meeting on 21 June 2012 before the Executive make their final recommendations on 2 July 2012.
- The draft of the Scrutiny Annual Report had been attached to the report and aimed to summarise the work carried out in the Civic Year and discuss issues for the future. Suggestions made by the three Overview and Scrutiny Panels would be used to amend the draft before it was considered by the Scrutiny Chairs Group for agreement prior to being submitted to full Council. The report had been considered by the Resources and Community Overview and Scrutiny Panels and their comments incorporated. There were no further comments from members of the Panel.
- The Carlisle Economic Partnership Chair had agreed to work with the Chamber of Commerce and its own core membership to look at the development of an information exchange forum/platform around skills provision and demand. The matter would be considered by that group at their meeting in April. Work had progressed to try to address concerns around communication with hard to reach 16-18 year olds. The City Council, Carlisle College, the Youth Zone and Inspira had met to develop a work programme to improve the use of, and communication through, digital technology and social media specifically targeted at NEET (not in education, employment or training) young people. A workshop was scheduled for 30 May 2012 followed up by a “hack lab” where NEET young people and service users worked directly alongside developers and programmers to establish new communication mediums. The Director of Community Engagement would update the Panel at a future meeting.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder confirmed that she had attended the Carlisle Economic Partnership meeting in February and that there had been a very full agenda.

- Members of the Panel, with members of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel, had been invited to attend Richard Rose Morton Academy to hear about the Career Academy. Kate Holt, Principal of 14-19 Education explained about the Career Academy before introducing some of the employees and several students involved in the scheme. The visit ended with a tour of the Academy. The Chairman gave an overview of the visit and the work of the Academy and stated that she would work with Officers and Members with regard to the possibility of the City Council providing a mentoring facility for the Academy as there were a number of services for which officers from the Council could mentor students.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Mr Crossley) advised that work through the Economic Partnership would look at education as part of the skills agenda and that there would be intervention and support at all levels of education.

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.

EEOSP.26/12 TOURISM REPORT

The Economic Development Manager (Mr Pearson) submitted Report ED.16/12 which sought to update Members on the action currently being undertaken in relation to tourism. He reminded Members that in 2009 the City Council had agreed, with Cumbria Tourism, Hadrian's Wall Heritage and NWDA, to establish a Tourism Partnership for Carlisle and North Cumbria which aimed to improve the tourism product further and grow the industry locally. Each of the partner agencies had contributed staff resources. However, the economic downturn, the abolition of regional agencies and the subsequent loss of funding to key partners resulted in a withdrawal of resources from the Partnership and a need for the Council to take stock and re-assess how it could best support tourism in the area with the resources available. There were also proposals for the Old Town Hall that needed to be reviewed.

The review of the tourism service that included the Tourist Information Centres (TICs) in Carlisle and Brampton, marketing and branding, events and the use of technology was currently underway. A pilot project was also being undertaken at Brampton Tourist Information Centre that involved the Parish Council running the TIC with volunteers.

Mr Pearson explained that marketing and branding were key issues for Carlisle and the tourism partnership. The "Discover Carlisle" brand had been successful and the Council, with the Carlisle Economic Partnership, were looking at ways to use the brand across all sectors of the economy and as part of the growth agenda.

The review was also looking at events and how they should be managed in the future, particularly partnership working with external parties such as the Business Improvement District.

An implementation programme would be developed when the surveys and baseline information was completed.

With regard to the Old Town Hall, the Executive had, at its meeting in March, approved a substantial scheme of works to help secure the fabric of the building in the short to medium term. Mr Pearson outlined the cost of the works and the source of funding. The works were programmed to take place between September 2012 and February 2013 and would include structural repairs and upgrading the internal fabric.

Mr Pearson reminded Members that the Carlisle Tourism Partnership Board had been set up when the Carlisle Tourism Partnership was established. Following the loss of resources it was necessary to review the role of the Board and consider how tourism could best be supported. As tourism was highly diverse with a large number of businesses there were a variety of bodies that existed to promote tourism and there was a role for a public/private partnership that could bring those together.

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

Members raised concern at the lack of content within the report and reminded Officers that reports in the past had contained more detail on actions and what was happening. Whilst Members realised that the tourism service was under review they were disappointed that there were no details of the current status of the review.

Members were disappointed that the proposed Business Improvement District (BID) did not expand to the tourism sector and asked whether that was still a possibility?

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder stated that Officers and Members had tried to encourage proposals to include both retail and tourism within the BID but it had become apparent that those people involved did not want the two to be linked.

Mr Crossley added that the two may be linked at some point as he believed that once the BID was in place it would be easier to build in the work of tourism. Businesses wanted footfall and events within the City Centre and that involved tourism.

Members requested further information regarding the pilot scheme at Brampton Tourist Information Centre.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder explained that it was intended that the Tourist Information Centre in Brampton be run by volunteers to enable it to open all year. The volunteers would be trained by the Tourist Information Centre staff and a member of staff would always be available when volunteers were running the Centre. In response to a query from a Member the Portfolio Holder explained that Brampton Parish Council had advertised for volunteers and as a result 42 people had been selected to train to run the Centre. Members of the Parish Council had visited Settle Tourist Information Centre which was also run by volunteers to see how they operated. Other Tourist Information Centres around the country were also run by volunteers.

The Economic Development Manager (Mr Pearson) advised that all volunteers would receive a full day's training at the Carlisle Tourist Information Centre and that they would be supported over the coming weeks. He believed that the use of volunteers would be a positive step for Brampton as they realised the importance of the Tourist Information Centre being open all year and it was not possible for the City Council to provide that service.

Mr Crossley informed Members that there were two major projects underway – the Moot Hall at Brampton and the Old Town Hall in Carlisle. He reminded Members that most of the space in the Old Town Hall was taken up by the Tourist Information

Centre but agreed that it needed modernisation but that there was a problem with funding. The City Council were trying to make the best use of the facilities while getting something back from the use of the floor space and also reviewing the booking system. Discover Carlisle was also under review and it was intended that an enquiry system regarding, for example, businesses and education could be built in but there was still a lot of work to do.

When the improvements to the Old Town Hall were presented to the Panel there was a substantial amount of work to be done. None of that information was included in the report. How will the Council inform the public of the work to be undertaken and what are the long term plans for the building?

Mr Pearson reminded Members that the report was based on the information that was presented to the Executive at their meeting on 12 March 2012. He explained about issues with funding and advised that the Executive had agreed a scheme of works, which were mainly to the external fabric of the building and that they were awaiting approval for the work by English Heritage.

Funding for the proposed internal works was largely being provided by the City Council and that work would include limited improvements to the area occupied by the Tourist Information Centre.

Mr Crossley advised that Officers would work with partners regarding the internal works and look for something that would sustain the area on the first floor.

Carlisle was such a small city that the retailers should work together and with the City Council and that tourism should be part of the City Centre Partnership.

Mr Crossley stated that he believed that the focus of the retailers had been diluted and that they did not realise that tourism benefitted everyone. He added that Officers would continue to work with retailers on tourism and the BID.

The BID was a vehicle to obtain funding and people should work together to secure that funding but the City Council needed to know what people wanted before they made a final decision.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder believed that when the BID was in place the retailers would link with the City Council to improve the City Centre.

Following the success of the Radio 1 weekend who was now organising major events such as the Olympic torch event?

Mr Crossley explained that the Communities, Housing and Health Manager (Mrs Miller) was involved in the organisation of the Olympic torch event and that the Community Involvement Officer (Mr Dunn) was involved in the organisation of music events. Officers were working with the CN Group with regard to the Jubilee celebrations.

Mr Crossley informed Members that a report would be submitted to the Executive regarding the Events policy that would include more specifically how functions would be organised by the Council now and in the future.

How was the work of the Tourist Partnership Board Progressing?

Mr Crossley explained that Officers were endeavouring to keep partners informed but added that the group had not met this year and believed that the City Council had carried out the majority of the work so far. The Portfolio Holder advised that the work of the Board needed to be reviewed.

The report referred to surveys. Who had carried out the surveys and who was involved?

Mr Pearson advised that the surveys were a way of benchmarking against other towns to gain a way of understanding what they were doing and what tourists wanted and needed. One example could be a QR (Quick Response) code displayed on the tourism display in the railway station that allowed for an app to be obtained that would link to the Tourist Information Centre. The Portfolio Holder believed it was important that tourism took advantage of new technology as well as more traditional methods.

There was a train package that ran from Settle to Carlisle that allowed a three hour stopover in the City. Was there a plan to provide information for people on that train?

Mr Pearson advised that that would be looked into and discussed with partners.

A Member saw scrutiny as a way of helping the Executive to make decisions and added that he would like the Executive to bring matters to the Panel for discussion.

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder reminded Members that the use of mobile phones for payment of car parking had been as a result of the work of the Panel. There often seemed to be difficulties put in the way of progress but other authorities had undergone similar projects; therefore the City Council needed to work with them. While new technology was interesting and exciting the Council must also remember those who do not use such technology.

The Chairman stated that Members were initially disappointed with the report that had been submitted but by questioning the Portfolio Holders and Officers it had been clear that there was a lot more work underway and a lot to commend in the tourism department. Everyone shared the concerns that tourism was not part of the BID process and that a combined effort would avoid duplication of work and lead to an improved outcome for Carlisle. Members were encouraged that once the BID process was completed there may be scope to return to the tourism element. The Chairman hoped that future Panel members would support Officers and Portfolio Holders in their work to ensure the BID was successful.

RESOLVED – 1. That Report ED.16/12 be noted.

2. That the Panel were concerned that the public should be involved in proposals for the Old Town Hall to enable them to understand the reasoning behind the decision to carry out the work and support the Council in their endeavours to make the building more attractive and cost effective.

EEOSP.27/12 CITY CENTRE PARTNERSHIP

The Economic Development Manager (Mr Pearson) submitted report ED.17/12 that provided an update on progress with regard to the proposal for the creation of a Business Improvement District (BID) for Carlisle City Centre and the next steps in the timetable. Mr Pearson reminded Members that the proposal for the creation of a City Centre Business Improvement District (BID) was first suggested in 2010. The Executive had agreed to provide seed funding towards the creation of a BID and that had been considered by the Panel at their meetings in June and September 2011.

Mr Pearson explained the definition of a Business Improvement District and how the funds would be managed.

A project steering group had been established in September 2011 to drive forward the principle of a BID for Carlisle City Centre. Mr Pearson explained the makeup of the group and advised that an initial round of communication with city centre businesses had been carried out. A newsletter and questionnaire had been circulated to around 400 businesses in February 2012. Over 80 of the questionnaires had been returned and Mr Pearson gave a summary of those responses and advised that they would help to inform the business plan of the proposed BID company. Communication would continue with City Centre businesses with the retained BID consultant meeting individually with managers from both national chains and locally owned independent businesses. At each meeting the business representative would be invited to become part of the project Steering Group.

An interim company, which is now the formal proposer of the BID, had been formed with Councillor Mrs Bowman as the Director representing the City council. The inaugural meeting of the company was scheduled to meet on the afternoon of 4 April 2012. The company served the required statutory notice to the Secretary of State of the intention to hold a BID ballot on 15 March 2012.

Mr Pearson reminded Members that the City Council already delivered a range of services within the City Centre area and as part of the BID process a formal baseline position of such service delivery had to be established. The City Council would carry out the formal ballot of businesses and collect the additional levy on behalf of the BID company. Therefore there had been extensive discussion with the various City Council departments that currently delivered services and those that would be involved in the creation of the BID. Those discussions would form part of the business plan of the BID that required an agreed baseline agreement of services delivered by the City Council within the proposed BID area.

The next phase of communication with businesses was now underway by way of circulation of a second newsletter. Mr Pearson advised that a dedicated website would be launched as an additional source of information and would be used to publish the formal documents as required for the ballot.

Mr Pearson outlined the next steps in the process that would end with the declaration of ballot results on 31 July 2012. Should the formal ballot result in a “yes” vote then it was proposed that the new City Centre BID company would commence operation in September 2012.

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

Would the management company be organising events themselves?

Mr Pearson advised that it was likely that the BID company would be a commissioner of events rather than a deliverer and that members of the Business Improvement District would say what they wanted and the City Council would consider delivery. Officers had faced difficulties when dealing with retailers as a lot of larger, national companies made decisions at Head Office level.

Who was involved in the project support group?

Mr Pearson advised that the group consisted of a number of retailers as well as Councillor Mrs Bowman but there was a need to encourage more small retailers to be involved.

Has there been any feedback on the geographical boundaries?

Mr Pearson outlined the boundary and explained that it did not include the Crescent as it was considered that it was more appropriate as part of the nighttime economy.

The Portfolio Holder explained which retail directors were involved in the BID.

Would the smaller retailers who would not have to pay the levy still have a vote on the BID?

Mr Pearson explained that every encouragement was being given to any business owner within the area to come forward and be a Director of the BID company. He explained that there were two success criteria to the BID ballot that had to be met for the BID to go through. There had to be a majority of businesses involved, which favoured small retailers, and a majority of Rateable Value of businesses involved.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder advised that she and Mr Pearson had visited Birmingham who had gone through the BID process some years ago. They had advised that it took approximately 5 years before the BID was successful in the City. She believed there needed to be better communication and co-ordination for the BID to be successful. Mr Pearson explained that once the ballot for the BID had been successfully achieved, the BID website would be realigned to sit alongside Discover Carlisle. The Portfolio Holder advised that there would also be links to other cities that had successful BIDs.

Members had been concerned about the slippage of the timescales at a previous meeting but they were now more assured of the dates.

RESOLVED – 1) That Report ED.17/12 be noted.

2. That a further update would be provided to the Panel following the ballot in July 2012.

EEOSP.28/12 DOG FOULING

The Environmental Health Manager (Mr Burns) submitted report LE.09/12 that advised on the concerns and significance of dog fouling in the Carlisle City Council area and outlined an Action Plan for 2012/13 to reduce the level of dog fouling.

Mr Burns outlined the health risks to both humans and livestock, including toxicariasis, neosporosis and sarcocytosis and stated that all responsible dog owners should have their dogs regularly checked and wormed and pick up after their dogs had fouled.

Carlisle had three Dog Control Orders one of which covered dog fouling meaning that after witnessing an offence the Council could serve fixed penalty tickets of up to £80 and/or progress to the Magistrates Court where a maximum fine of £1,000 could be issued.

Mr Burns detailed the number of complaints about dog fouling, the number of fixed penalty tickets issued since 2008/09 and the number of stray dogs collected since 2009/10.

Mr Burns explained that it was considered that there were three approaches to combating dog fouling. Those were street cleaning, education and enforcement. A dog fouling action plan for 2012/13 was under development that would use all three approaches. Additional funding had been allocated by the City Council and new street cleaning equipment and methods of cleaning were being investigated. A new education and enforcement team would deal with dog fouling through education and enforcement activities, and a dog fouling educational campaign would be run early in the new financial year to support that.

There had been an increase in the number of Council Officers who were trained to issue fixed penalty tickets and the targeting of eight areas in the District considered to suffer most from dog fouling. That would include high profile signage, door knocking and leaflet dropping educational work.

Whilst the City Council would take what action it could to ensure the streets and public places were free from dog fouling, it was the responsibility of dog owners to clean up after their dogs and the City Council would not hesitate to serve fixed penalty tickets to prosecute offenders.

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

Was there any information regarding repeat offenders?

Mr Burns advised that there was none as far as he was aware who had been served repeat fixed penalty notices. In the past Officers had handed out bags and offered advice when offences were witnessed. However they had noticed that they were talking to the same people on several occasions. In future if a person was served a fixed penalty notice on several occasions the matter would be referred to the Magistrates Court but the person would be prosecuted only if they refused to pay the fine.

Would it be possible to have more publicity about how to complain about dog fouling?

Mr Burns advised that that could be part of the education programme.

Was it possible to name and shame offenders in the press?

Mr Burns advised that if a person paid the fixed penalty notice they would not be named and shamed. At the time of issuing the notice the Officer would request the person's name and address. If they refused to give it the Officers could take a photograph of the person in an attempt to determine their identity. Officers needed to know where the offence took place, at what time and by whom. Then they could police that area and possibly witness an offence taking place.

However if a person refused to pay a fixed penalty notice the matter would be referred to the Magistrates Court and it was anticipated that there would be maximum publicity about the case in the press.

It would be useful if a future report included the results of complaints and how the additional funding that had been agreed had been used with regard to the complaints and the issuing of fixed penalty notices.

Mr Burns explained that before a further report could be submitted it was important that some benchmarking work was undertaken to enable Officers to monitor the scheme at the start, during the scheme and after a period of time.

Part of the education should include forceful language and information regarding potential blindness in children. Would it be possible to print something on the bags that were handed out? In another area the authority painted messages about dog fouling directly onto the pavement. Could that method be used in Carlisle?

Mr Burns stated that with regard to signage, people got used to seeing signs and eventually they were ignored. It was the intention to provide signage in the priority areas but that the signs would be moved regularly so people would not get used to them being in the same place and ignore them.

Has the Council received 562 complaints about dog fouling this year?

Mr Burns advised that that figure was up to 15 March 2012 and that the figure to the end of March was 594. There had been 12 fixed penalty notices issued 2011/12. Over the previous 2 years there had been a reduction in the number of Officers available but now there were more Officers trained to issue fixed penalty notices.

Mr Burns added that with regard to signage, people got used to seeing signs and eventually they were ignored. It was the intention to provide signage in the priority areas but that the signs would be moved regularly so people would not get used to them being in the same place and ignore them.

Why had there been a reduction in the number of fixed penalty notices from 2009/10?

Mr Burns advised that was due to the changes in the directorate and the number of Officers available to police the streets.

Was the increase in the amount of dog fouling related to the number of stray dogs in the area?

It was unclear why there had been an increase in the number of stray dogs. The City Council had a good relationship with the Animal Refuge where stray animals were taken. If the owner later collected the dog they would need to pay a fine before the dog would be released.

Was the Council doing enough about dog fouling? What resources were required to do more?

Mr Burns explained that the City Council now had the correct equipment and Officers to tackle the issue. In the coming year there would be an increase in the number of Officers and the Team Leader would be responsible for education and enforcement. Time would tell how successful the scheme had been.

Did dogs have to be on leads in public places?

Mr Burns explained that the remaining two Dog Control Orders related to dogs being on leads in controlled areas. If an Officer believed the dog was not under control a fixed penalty notice could be served. Mr Burns advised that there was a link to the Dog Control Orders on the Council's website.

The Environment and Housing Portfolio Holder believed in a zero tolerance attitude to dog fouling. He believed that the increase in the number of trained Officers, and increased education would help to resolve the issues. He suggested that schools could create posters to be placed in their area. The Portfolio Holder believed that stencils would be unsightly and would only be useful on paved areas and not on grass therefore he believed that signage would be a better solution.

The Portfolio Holder further suggested that information should be passed to Parish Councils, community centres and groups to bring the matter to their attention.

Some people picked up the dog mess in a bag then threw the bag into a hedge or over a wall. Was there extra funding available for additional bins in problem areas?

Mr Burns advised that all areas should have signs on bins indicating that people could dispose of their dog fouling in the bin and ensure that the bins are emptied regularly. He explained that legally there was no difference between not picking up dog waste and picking it up then throwing it into a hedge or over a wall. The responsibility lay in the proper disposal of the dog waste. Officers would be going into schools and community groups and engaging with dog walkers to educate them on the issue. If there was a repeated problem Officers could police that particular area.

The Portfolio Holder informed Members that a machine had been ordered that picked up dog waste and disinfected the area.

Would it not be beneficial to bring back dog licensing?

Mr Burns advised that that had been discussed nationally but it had been agreed that it would be difficult to administer and that it would not be effective.

Officers may be reluctant to tackle some members of the public. What training had Officers received in that respect?

Mr Burns explained that the policy was always that the health and safety of the Officer was the key issue. If there was a concern Officers would police the area in pairs. The training regarding approaching people under difficult circumstances was very good and provided the skills to diffuse situations. Fixed penalty notices were not issued at the time of the offence; details were taken and the notice served later.

Was the Council working with other partners eg Riverside and how were Riverside working with tenants?

Within the Action Plan there was the intention to roll out the issuing of fixed penalty notices to Riverside officers. If there was an issue with dog fouling on a Riverside estate that would be referred to Riverside to determine the identity of the offender. At some point in the future it was intended that officers from Riverside would also be able to issue notices.

Of the twelve notices served this year how many had been paid?

Mr Burns advised that ten had been paid and one had been referred for prosecution. He was unsure of the status of the final notice.

Initially there may be an increase in the number of complaints as people become more aware and that would lead to an increase in the number of notices served.

RESOLVED – 1) That report LE.09/12 be noted.

2. That an updated report be presented to the Panel in six months' time which would include budget information.

3. That Mr Burns forwards information about dog fouling and enforcement to Parish Councils and community centres

EEOSP.29/12 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.

EEOSP.30/12 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 item of business on the grounds that it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) as defined in the paragraph number (as indicated in brackets against the minute) of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Local Government Act.

EEOSP.31/12 ENTERPRISE CENTRE

(Public and Press excluded by virtue of Paragraph 3)

The Economic Development Manager (Mr Pearson) submitted report ED.15/12 that updated Members on the review of the Enterprise Centre and any implications pertinent to the recommendations of the Task Group of November 2011.

Mr Pearson advised Members that the review as part of the ongoing Transformation Programme of the City Council had now been carried out and stated that the recommendations from the review carried out by the Panel's Task Group had been incorporated into the wider review.

Mr Pearson explained the scope and methodology of the review and outlined the issues arising from the review. Those issues related to the management and services offered to tenants, IT and telephony services, financial aspects the physical condition of the building and whether the Enterprise Centre met current business requirements. Mr Pearson outlined a range of options for future delivery of service that had been considered as part of the review.

In conclusion Mr Pearson informed Members of the conclusions and outcome of the review.

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

Members were disappointed on the content of the report and much of the work of the Task and Finish Group had not been included in the report.

The Economic Development Portfolio Holder believed that the report addressed the recommendations from the Task Group and that the report was a summary of that work and that all matters relating to the maintenance of the building had been covered.

The report contained figures with no explanation relating to them and they did not relate to the work of the Task and Finish Group.

A Member outlined a number of issues relating to the maintenance of the building that did not correlate to the previous report. There was also concern about the level of admin support to the units.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Mr Crossley) explained why he believed the issues raised had happened and that Scrutiny and the Executive had different views on the matter.

The Building and Facilities Manager (Mr Kay) explained that the figures with regard to the maintenance differed as the later figures contained all the associated work to be undertaken while the earlier figures were for the basic work only. Mr Kay explained about the wiring, fire alarms and the drainage issues.

Mr Crossley advised that the Director of Economic Development was in contact with the manager and admin support officer at the Centre and consideration was being given about how best to manage the situation.

There was discussion on how the support for businesses through the provision of workspace could move on into the future.

RESOLVED – 1. That Report ED.15/12 be noted.

2. That a further update report be submitted early in the next municipal year.

(The meeting ended at 1.50pm)