Public Document Pack

Mid Devon District Council

Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 19 January 2015 at 2.15 pm Exe Room, Phoenix House

Next ordinary meeting Monday, 16 February 2015 at 2.15 pm

Those attending are advised that this meeting will be recorded

Membership

Cllr Mrs J Roach Cllr E J Berry Cllr Mrs J Rendle Cllr T W Snow Cllr Mrs M E Turner Cllr N A Way Cllr A V G Griffiths Cllr Mrs S Griggs Cllr T G Hughes Cllr M R Lee

AGENDA

Members are reminded of the need to make declarations of interest prior to any discussion which may take place

1 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

To receive any apologies for absence and notices of appointment of substitute Members (if any).

2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

To receive any questions relating to items on the Agenda from members of the public and replies thereto.

Note: A maximum of 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

3 MEMBER FORUM

An opportunity for non-Cabinet Members to raise issues.

4 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 5 - 8)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the last meeting of this Committee (attached).

The Committee is reminded that only those members of the Committee present at the previous meeting should vote and, in doing so, should be influenced only by seeking to ensure that the minutes are an accurate record.

5 **DECISIONS OF THE CABINET**

To consider any decisions made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 8 January 2014 that have been called-in.

6 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive any announcements that the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee may wish to make.

7 HARLEQUIN VALET (Pages 9 - 12)

At the request of the Committee, following their consideration of the Independent Review Report in 10 November 2014, the Head of Planning and Regeneration will present a report to address the queries raised.

8 REORGANISATION AND REDUNDANCIES WITHIN THE COUNCIL

The Chairman has requested that the Committee discuss the way in which the authority has handled the recent redundancies and reorganisation within the Council.

9 **DRAFT BUDGET REVIEW FOR 2015-16** (*Pages 13 - 30*)

A Budget Report 2015/16 from the Head of Finance for the Committee to consider, prior to its final recommendation by the Cabinet.

10 **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP** (Pages 31 - 42)

The Committee to receive a report from the Procurement Working Group updating them on their findings.

11 CABINET MEMBER FOR WORKING ENVIRONMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES (Pages 43 - 46)

The Cabinet Member for the Working Environment and Support Services will update the Committee regarding areas covered by this remit.

12 COUNCILLOR D F PUGSLEY HAS REQUESTED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE DISCUSSED BY THE COMMITTEE;

Proceedings against Councillor Wilson. (We can all remember the very unpleasant atmosphere in the Council after the Court decision in February.) It is time now to have a calm post mortem to see what lessons can be learnt for the future.

13 UPDATES AND ITEMS TO NOTE REGARDING OUTSTANDING ITEMS (Pages 47 - 56)

- Safeguarding no update.
- Planning Committee Procedures: Members are asked to note

Committee Administrator: Julia Stuckey Tel: 01884 234209 that there has been a delay in the issue of this report which will be considered by the Planning Committee. Following this, the report will be further considered by the Scrutiny Committee at the next available meeting.

 Devon County Council – Closure of Care Homes Attached –

A copy of the letter sent to DCC, CCG and local MP's A copy of an email chasing responses from the above

A response from Councillor Barker regarding working with other agencies

A response from Councillor Barker regarding questions about the closure of care homes.

14 IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Members are asked to note that the following items are already identified in the work programme for the next meeting:

Cabinet Member for Housing Performance and Risk Planning Policy on Communal Bin Stores Car parking update from Cabinet Member

Note: - this item is limited to 10 minutes. There should be no discussion on items raised.

Kevin Finan Chief Executive Friday, 9 January 2015

Anyone wishing to film part or all of the proceedings may do so unless the press and public are excluded for that part of the meeting or there is good reason not to do so, as directed by the Chairman. Any filming must be done as unobtrusively as possible from a single fixed position without the use of any additional lighting; focusing only on those actively participating in the meeting and having regard also to the wishes of any member of the public present who may not wish to be filmed. As a matter of courtesy, anyone wishing to film proceedings is asked to advise the Chairman or the Member Services Officer in attendance so that all those present may be made aware that is happening.

Members of the public may also use other forms of social media to report on proceedings at this meeting.

Members of the public are welcome to attend the meeting and listen to discussion. Lift access to the Council Chamber on the first floor of the building is available from the main ground floor entrance. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair

access, are also available. There is time set aside at the beginning of the meeting to allow the public to ask questions.

An induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter. If you require any further information, or

If you would like a copy of the Agenda in another format (for example in large print) please contact Julia Stuckey on:

Tel: 01884 234209

Fax:

E-Mail: <u>istuckey@middevon.gov.uk</u>

Public Wi-Fi is available in all meeting rooms.

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a MEETING of the SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held on 8 December 2014 at 2.15 pm

Present

Councillors Mrs J Roach (Chairman)

E J Berry, Mrs J Rendle, T W Snow, Mrs M E Turner, A V G Griffiths, Mrs S Griggs, T G Hughes, M R Lee and

P F Williams

Apologies

Councillors N A Way

Also Present

Councillors R M Deed, Mrs B M Hull, D F Pugsley and K D Wilson

Present

Officers: Kevin Finan (Chief Executive), Nick Sanderson (Head of

Housing and Property Services), Catherine Yandle (Internal Audit Team Leader), Jill May (Head of HR and Development), Liz Reeves (Head of Customer Services) and Julia Stuckey

(Member Services Officer)

Member	Minute No	Type of Interest
P F Williams	111	Pecuniary

101 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Councillor N A Way was substituted by Councillor P F Williams.

102 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mrs Amanda Walker, referring to item 7 on the agenda, asked the Chairman of the Committee if she intended to invite Councillor Barker to another meeting to answer questions for which a response had not yet been received.

The Chairman informed Mrs Walker that her question would be answered during item 7 on the agenda.

103 MEMBER FORUM

There were no issues raised under this item.

104 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Subject to the addition of the wording 'and the appropriate Officer that had knowledge about this particular issue be in attendance at the meeting' being added to minute 97, the minutes of the last meeting were approved as a correct record and **signed** by the Chairman.

105 DECISIONS OF THE CABINET

The Committee **NOTED** that none of the decisions of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 November 2014 had been called in.

106 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Harlequin Valet would be discussed at the next meeting of this Committee.

She also informed the Committee that no replies had been received from Devon County Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group or the local MP's following the letter that she had sent on behalf of the Committee regarding working together and using care beds more imaginatively. It was **AGREED** that another letter be sent, asking for a response.

107 DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL - CLOSURE OF CARE HOMES

The Committee had before it a response from Devon County Council to questions raised by this Committee regarding the closure of care homes and a letter that the Chairman had sent in response to this *.

Discussion took place regarding the fact that the Chairman had written to Councillor Barker but had not as yet received a response. In his written answers Councillor Barker had offered to attend a meeting of the Committee once a decision had been made regarding the Judicial Review. It had now been confirmed that there would be no Judicial Review.

It was **RESOLVED** to invite Councillor Barker, who had already agreed that he would, to attend a meeting of the Committee to answer as yet un-answered questions regarding the closure of care homes in Devon.

(Proposed by Cllr T G Hughes and seconded by Cllr T W Snow)

Note: * Report previously circulated, attached to the minutes.

108 PERFORMANCE AND RISK (00.19.03)

The Committee had before it and **NOTED** a report * of the Head of Communities and Governance providing Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for the second quarter of 2014/15 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

Discussion took place regarding the use of colour to indicate red, amber and green in the report for the chart showing risks. It was **AGREED** that this chart would be shown on the white board at future meetings of this Committee and that a colour key be added to the report.

The Head of Customer Services informed the Committee that the method for recording missed collections was being explored by the Head of Finance and may be recorded differently in the future. The Committee discussed the difficulties of keeping accurate records when only those households that telephoned to report their collection being missed were logged. It was also difficult to know whether the collection had actually been missed by the staff or whether the refuse had been put out too late.

Discussion took place regarding targets for housing repair times, numbers of calls made to Customer First, risk levels for chemicals and asbestos and document retention.

Note: * Report previously circulated, attached to the minutes.

109 COUNCILLOR D F PUGSLEY HAD REQUESTED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE DISCUSSED BY THE COMMITTEE; (00.56.25)

Exclusion of Press and Public. The minutes of Scrutiny Committee on 11 March 2013 and Cabinet on 28 March 2013 are relevant.*

Councillor Pugsley explained to the Committee that in his opinion the resolution shown on the agenda had been agreed in March 2013 and then forgotten for 18 months.

It was confirmed that training had taken place in December 2013 and that this would be repeated annually.

The Councillor requested that an additional paragraph, as stated on the agenda, be added to the Constitution:

It was **RECOMMENDED** to the Standards Committee that Procedure Rule 21 have the following text added as a second paragraph referring to 12.02.d.

Whenever there is a possibility that an item may need to be discussed in part two the agenda should include a brief explanation as to why this might be the case, in plain English, and make reference to the Constitution, Article 12, which mentions a presumption in favour of openness and transparency.

(Proposed by Cllr Mrs M Turner and seconded by Cllr Mrs J R Rendle)

Note: Paperwork previously circulated, copy attached to minutes.

110 **STAFF RECRUITMENT (01.11.00)**

The Committee had before it a briefing paper* from the Head of Human Resources, Learning and Development, giving an overview of recruitment, both internal and external, to the Authority.

The Officer tabled information regarding the use of consultants. Discussion took place regarding this and the Officer explained that the money spent had not been additional and that funding had been allocated in budgets for this, particularly in Planning. The use of Consultants was necessary for some planning applications and for some legal work. In one instance the secondment of a member of staff from Devon County Council had been used, which had proved beneficial to both Councils concerned. It was the responsibility of each Service Manager to ensure that the use of consultants was cost effective.

Discussion took place regarding:

- The recruitment process;
- Sharing of staff with another authority;
- The use of scenarios and assessment in addition to traditional interview methods;
- Making best use of and developing current staff;
- The use of Human Resources staff in the interview process;
- The removal of the compulsory retirement age.

Note: * Briefing paper previously circulated, attached to the minutes.

111 ASBESTOS (01.59.05)

The Committee had before it a report* from the Head of Housing and Property Services providing Members with an update on the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) investigation into the alleged Asbestos Insulating Board (AIB) asbestos soffit removal by an unlicensed contractor at Brays Close, Crediton.

The Ward Member for Brays Close, Crediton had been unable to attend the meeting but had submitted questions which were answered by the Head of Housing and Property Services.

A main concern was that the work at these properties to mitigate the problem had been carried out correctly. Also that the authority had learnt from this situation and that no stone had been left unturned in order that Members could be satisfied it would not happen again. The Member also asked if other properties in the District had been checked for asbestos.

The Head of Housing and Property Services explained that works were ongoing and that an appropriate contractor was being used to carry out the work. Testing would take place to ensure that the area was clear of any fibres of asbestos.

With regard to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) investigation the Officer confirmed that although the Authority had felt it was acting in a satisfactory manner the HSE found that procedures had been 'loose' in some areas and needed to be more concise. The HSE were not carrying out any enforcement; they considered that the authority had learnt from what had happened and now had practices in place to ensure there was no reoccurrence.

Discussion took place regarding the contractor that had been employed by the Authority at the time of the incident. The officer confirmed that this contractor was still being used for painting work but would not be involved in other types of work. The HSE were satisfied with the measures the contractor had put in place to ensure that such an incident would not occur again and method statements had been signed off by the HSE. In the previous incident the authority had not been clear and concise when instructing them.

The Officer went on to explain that there was a possibility that asbestos material could be found in any property and that testing took place to establish the risk. If not damaged the material was safe. 75% of properties in Mid Devon had been surveyed for asbestos with the remaining 25% being 'clone' surveyed. A full survey was carried out on any property scheduled for work.

It was confirmed that ex-authority houses that were now in private ownership were no longer the responsibility of the Council. They had been sold and it was the responsibility of the purchaser to get a survey, prior to purchase.

- Notes: i) * Previously circulated, attached to the minutes.
 - ii) Cllr P F Williams declared a Pecuniary Interest and left the meeting during the decision thereon as he was the owner of an ex-local authority property.

112 UPDATES AND ITEMS TO NOTE REGARDING OUTSTANDING ISSUES: (02.40.05)

The updates were noted.

113 IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

The following items were agreed for inclusion on the agenda for the next meeting:

Review draft budget review for 2015-16
Cabinet Member for Working Environment and Support Services
Reorganisation/Redundancies within the Council
Harlequin Valet update
Procurement Working Group Report

(The meeting ended at 1700)

CHAIRMAN

SCRUTINY COMMITEE 9 JANUARY 2015

HARLEQUIN VALET PREMISES, CULLOMPTON - FURTHER REPORT FOLLOWING THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW REPORT CONSIDERED ON 10 NOVEMBER 2014

Cabinet Member Cllr Richard Chesterton

Responsible Officer Head of Planning and Regeneration

Reason for Report: The report was requested by Scrutiny following their consideration of the Independent Review Report considered on 10 November 2014. The Scrutiny Committee requested this report address the time-line and any gaps within it, and also wished to see recommendations developed from the section entitled summary and points for consideration in the November report.

RECOMMENDATIONS: That the Scrutiny Committee recommend Cabinet consider and adopt the recommendations set out in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.6.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Community well-being is a key component of the Corporate Plan.

Financial Implications: Policies set out in the recommendations identify a more proactive approach by the Council in dealing with dangerous structures. This more proactive approach is likely to incur greater expenditure on dangerous structures and legal work.

Legal Implications: There will be additional legal work in adopting a more proactive approach. Both on terms of obtaining court orders and reclaiming expenditure incurred in legal and intervention costs.

Risk Assessment: Costs may not always be recovered. Owners may contest the amount of work undertaken as the minimum necessary. Owners may contest that emergency intervention was necessary.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting on 10 November 2014 the Scrutiny Committee resolved that consideration of the **Independent Review Report** into matters concerning **Harlequin Valet, Cullompton be deferred** until the next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee so that:-
 - A) Officers could further investigate the time-line and fill any gaps, and
 - **B)** Bring forward recommendations developed from the section entitled summary and points for consideration.
- 1.2 The original Independent Review Report completed by the Head of Communities, Governance and Monitoring Officer (considered at the November meeting) is attached for Members information at appendix 1.
- 1.3 Set out below are the answers to questions A and B above.

2.0 A) - Time line and any gaps

- 2.1 There are no additions to make to the time line in the original report. The last formal written communication from the Council's Building Control department prior in respect of the dangerous structure was in December 2011 when the owner was requested to take action to secure the safety of the render and cob at first floor level. Action was taken by the owner boarding the wall at that time and it was considered the minimum works necessary had been carried out to remove the danger at that time. Contact between the owners agents and the Planning Department were maintained during the processing of the various planning applications between the time of the fire and the wall collapse and reference is made to the involvement of building control officers in those considerations. This history is fully set out in the earlier report.
- 2.2 The first floor cob wall collapsed in January 2014.

3.0 B) - Considerations and Recommendations

- 3.1 Before considering the recommendations under item two it may help to identify the provisions in the Building Act 1984 which provide powers to deal with dangerous structures.
 - Dangerous structures are the responsibility of the building owner.
 - The owner has a general duty of care in law to protect other people from any harm arising from the unsafe condition of their property.
 - The involvement of the local authority does not remove this liability from the owner.
 - The Council has legal powers under the Building Act, <u>but not an obligation</u>, under sections 77 and 78 of the Building Act 1984, to investigate and to take whatever action is necessary to remove the danger.
- 3.2 **Section 77** is used where a building or part of a building is in such condition or used to carry such loads as to be dangerous.
- 3.3 The Council can apply to a Magistrates court for an Order.
- 3.4 If the court is satisfied that the danger exists then an Order is given and the owner must remove the danger. Or the owner can demolish the building within a stated time period.
- 3.5 If the person does not carry out the work in the stated time, the Council can carry out the work and attempt to get back the costs from that person.
- 3.6 Also, the person may be given a fine for not to complying with the original order.
- 3.7 **Section 78** is used in similar circumstances to the above, but this is when action needs to be taken right away to remove the danger.

- 3.8 The Council carries out work to remove the danger, but in getting back its costs from the owner it may have to show to the Court that it (the Council) could not reasonably have gone ahead under Section 77.
- 3.9 The Council would only deal with a 'dangerous structure' under these provisions if the owner:
 - cannot be contacted
 - is unable or refuses to remove a danger, or
 - is in default of a court order

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 Following the initial assessment and any remedial action to make a dangerous structure safe, the structures shall (unless fully demolished or fully repaired) be monitored on a two monthly basis to ensure any further decay is identified as early as possible. A detailed record of those inspections and any actions requested will be kept.
- 4.2 Ward Members will be notified following inspections of the findings and any proposed action.
- 4.3 A leaflet will be published on the Council's website identifying the powers the Council has with regard to dangerous structures and the actions the Council may pursue where public safety is being put at risk where no action is taken by the owner. The proposed policies are set out in 4.6 below.
- 4.4 Information should also be displayed on the Council's website of the risks that poorly maintained cob structures can create.
- 4.5 Delegated authority be given to Building Control officers to take action under Section 77 and 78 of the Building Act, as deemed necessary, and that expenditure incurred in those cases be agreed by the Cabinet Member for Planning and the Head of Finance as an expenditure outside of set budgets on a case by case basis. (The Council will always seek to recover its costs in such circumstances but recovery cannot be guaranteed).
- 4.6 The Council will set out the following policies (subject to Cabinet and Council approval) on its website for dealing with dangerous structures as follows:-
 - In an <u>EMERGENCY</u> situation, without prior notification to the owner, the Council will employ a contractor to do the minimum amount of work necessary to remove the danger. The owner will later be notified of the action and the fact that he/she is liable for the Council's full costs.
 - Where a dangerous structure is identified <u>BUT IS NOT AN EMERGENCY</u>, the Council will attempt to obtain a verbal commitment from the owner to remove the danger immediately. If not achieved, formal notice will be served on the owner requiring that the danger is removed within a week. If the owner fails to comply, the Council will employ a contractor to do the minimum amount of work necessary to remove the danger.

Contact for more Information: Jonathan Guscott, Head of Planning and Regeneration. 01884 234938 (jguscott@middevon.gov.uk)

Circulation of the Report: Jonathan Guscott, Richard Chesterton, Jenny Roach, Nikki Woollatt, Linda Holloway

List of Background Papers: The Previous Independent Review Report considered on 10 November 2014 can be found on the following web link.

http://www.middevon.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=24558&p=0

Scrutiny 19 January 2015

Budget for 2015/6

Cabinet Member Responsible Officer Cllr Peter Hare-Scott Head of Finance

Reason for Report:

There is a statutory requirement for Scrutiny to consider the draft budget prior to its final recommendation by the Cabinet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Scrutiny reviews the draft 2015/6 budget and makes any necessary comments/recommendations to the Cabinet to be considered at its meeting on the 5 February 2015.

Relationship to Corporate Plan:

This budget is driven by the key priorities contained within the Corporate Plan, which seeks to deliver a wide range of cost effective services. All budget decisions have taken account of these priorities and pledges.

Financial Implications:

Sound financial management underpins the entire report.

Legal Implications:

It is a legal requirement to set a balanced budget under the Local Government Act 2003 and for a scrutiny process to be conducted prior to the final recommendation by Cabinet to Full Council.

Risk Assessment:

The production of the budget has taken full account of prior year figures, current year budget monitoring information, changes in legislation, adequacy/levels of reserves, business risk and assumptions in the Medium Term Financial Plan.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Attached to this report is the generic draft budget report that was considered by all three of the PDG meetings and the Cabinet in November and December. In addition, the draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) considered at the Decent & Affordable Homes PDG is also attached. These reports were compiled in the absence of finalised information with regard to Formula Grant, the Council Tax Freeze and housing benefit limits relating to rent increases.

2.0 January PDGs and Cabinet – Budget Update

2.1 Due to the late timing of this key information a verbal update of the draft budget position will be tabled at PDG and Cabinet meetings in January and a final draft HRA budget will be discussed at the Decent & Affordable Homes PDG on the 20 January 2015. In order for the Scrutiny Committee to have a formal position on the draft budget at its most current position Appendix 1 has been included which provides the information being verbally updated to the PDGs.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 Budget scrutiny is an important part of a robust budget setting process and feedback from this meeting will be considered at the final draft budget Cabinet meeting on the 5 February 2015, prior to recommendation to Full Council.

Contact for more information: Andrew Jarrett, Head of Finance

DL 01884 234242

Background Papers: None

File Reference: None

Circulation of the Report: Management Team

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT DRAFT BUDGET SUMMARY 2015/16

NET COST OF SERVICES 9,092,760 122,938 9,215,698 Provision for the financing of capital spending 122,520 28,440 150,960 Finance Lease interest 8,110 (8,110) 0 Interest from Funding provided for HRA (110,000) 40,910 (69,090) Interest Received on Investments (65,000) 0 (65,000) Contribution to Capital Programme 125,000 0 125,000 TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE 9,173,390 184,178 9,357,568 Funded by:- (4,230,060) 656,000 (3,574,060) NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K (54,000) (54,000) (54,000) Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 (49,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (50,000) 65,000 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000) 0 (50,000)<		Net Direct Costs Budget 2014/15 £	Budget Changes £	Draft Net Direct Costs Budget 2015/16 £
Decent & Affordable Homes	Managing the Environment	2 204 220	26 000	2 424 440
Community Well Being 2,755,730 48,131 2,803,861 Cabinet 3,743,760 122,250 3,866,010 TOTAL NET DIRECT COST OF SERVICES 10,304,080 135,051 10,439,131 Net recharge to HRA (1,211,320) (12,113) (1,223,433) NET COST OF SERVICES 9,092,760 122,938 9,215,698 Provision for the financing of capital spending 122,520 28,440 150,960 Finance Lease interest 8,110 (8,110) 0 Interest from Funding provided for HRA (110,000) 40,910 (69,090) Interest Received on Investments (65,000) 0 (65,000) Contribution to Capital Programme 125,000 0 125,000 TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE 9,173,390 184,178 9,357,568 Funded by:- (4,230,060) 656,000 (3,574,060) NDDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K (49,000) (64,000) (64,000) CTS Funding Parishes 98,000 (33,000) 65,000 (50,000) (50,000) (50,000)		· · ·	,	, ,
Cabinet 3,743,760 122,250 3,866,010 TOTAL NET DIRECT COST OF SERVICES 10,304,080 135,051 10,439,131 Net recharge to HRA (1,211,320) (12,113) (1,223,433) NET COST OF SERVICES 9,092,760 122,938 9,215,698 Provision for the financing of capital spending 122,520 28,440 150,960 Finance Lease interest 8,110 (8,110) 0 Interest from Funding provided for HRA (110,000) 40,910 (69,090) Interest Received on Investments (65,000) 0 (65,000) Contribution to Capital Programme 125,000 0 125,000 TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE 9,173,390 184,178 9,357,568 Funded by:- Formula Grant (4,230,060) 656,000 (3,574,060) NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K (54,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (49,000) COINCIT Tax freeze - for 2014/15 (49,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,000) (50,		l ' '	, ,	•
Net recharge to HRA (1,211,320) (12,113) (1,223,433) NET COST OF SERVICES 9,092,760 122,938 9,215,698 Provision for the financing of capital spending Finance Lease interest 8,110 (8,110) 0 Interest from Funding provided for HRA (110,000) Interest Received on Investments (65,000) Contribution to Capital Programme (65,000) TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE 9,173,390 184,178 9,357,568 Funded by:- Formula Grant NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K (54,000) CTS Funding Parishes 98,000 CTS Funding Parishes 98,000 COllection Fund Surplus (75,000) Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 (4,917,330) TOTAL FUNDING (9,173,390) 466,000 (8,707,390)	,	· · ·	*	, , ,
NET COST OF SERVICES 9,092,760 122,938 9,215,698	TOTAL NET DIRECT COST OF SERVICES	10,304,080	135,051	10,439,131
Provision for the financing of capital spending Finance Lease interest Interest From Funding provided for HRA Interest Received on Investments Funded by:- Formula Grant NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 Collection Fund Surplus Collection Fund Surplus Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 Provision for the financing of capital spending 122,520 28,440 150,960 16,900 0 (69,090) 0 (69,090) 0 (65,000) 0 (65,000) 0 (65,000) 0 (65,000) 0 (65,000) 0 (65,000) 0 (3,574,060) 0 (49,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (49,000) 0 (54,000) 0 (50,0	Net recharge to HRA	(1,211,320)	(12,113)	(1,223,433)
Finance Lease interest 8,110 (8,110) 0 Interest from Funding provided for HRA (110,000) 40,910 (69,090) Interest Received on Investments (65,000) 0 (65,000) Contribution to Capital Programme 125,000 0 125,000 TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE 9,173,390 184,178 9,357,568 Funded by:- Formula Grant (4,230,060) 656,000 (3,574,060) NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K (54,000) (54,000) Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 (49,000) 0 (49,000) CTS Funding Parishes 98,000 (33,000) 65,000 Collection Fund Surplus (75,000) 25,000 (50,000) Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 (4,917,330) (128,000) (5,045,330) TOTAL FUNDING (9,173,390) 466,000 (8,707,390)	NET COST OF SERVICES	9,092,760	122,938	9,215,698
Funded by:- Formula Grant NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 CSTS Funding Parishes Collection Fund Surplus Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 TOTAL FUNDING (4,230,060) (54,000) (54,000) (656,000 (649,000) (75,000)	Finance Lease interest Interest from Funding provided for HRA Interest Received on Investments	8,110 (110,000) (65,000)	(8,110) 40,910 0	0 (69,090) (65,000)
Formula Grant NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 Collection Fund Surplus Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 (4,230,060) (54,000) (54,000) (49,000) (49,000) (49,000) (50,000)	TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE	9,173,390	184,178	9,357,568
Council Tax - 27,289.8 x £184.88 (4,917,330) (128,000) (5,045,330) TOTAL FUNDING (9,173,390) 466,000 (8,707,390)	Formula Grant NNDR revenue based on last year actuals + 54K Council Tax freeze - for 2014/15 CTS Funding Parishes	(49,000) 98,000	(54,000) 0 (33,000)	(54,000) (49,000) 65,000
		· ' '	,	, ,
REQUIREMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET 0 650,178 650,178	TOTAL FUNDING	(9,173,390)	466,000	(8,707,390)
	REQUIREMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET	0	650,178	650,178

Current Assumptions:

- 1 Formula Grant reduced by £656k based on provisional figure rec'd 12 months ago.
- 2 A Council Tax income based on a 1.5% rise for illustrative purposes only. A 1% rise in Council Tax will generate circa £50k. It is assumed any Council Tax freeze grant given in 2014/15 will be added into the final settlement for 2015/16.
- 3 Most of the savings and cost pressures proposed in the budget review meetings have been included.
- 4 2015/16 salary budgets include an increase of 1%.
- 5 All income flows have been reviewed and adjusted for changes in demand and unit price.
- 6 Investment income has been based upon the existing lending criteria now in force.
- 7 Nil transfer from the General Fund Balance .
- 8 Support services have been inflated in accordance with the pay award.
- 9 Budget for car parking income based on fee structure currently on place and 14/15 level of usage.
- 10 Budget for refuse and recycling is based on 14/15 scheme and reviewed for known budget pressures.
- 11 The grants budget has been left at the 2014/15 level prior to the special Community Well Being PDG meeting.

Summary of Cabinet

Service Unit	2013/14 Actuals	2014/15 Budget	2015/16 Budget	Movement £
SCM01 Chief Executive	149,976	159,080	163,160	4,080
SCM03 Corporate Fees/Charges	233,540	153,110	162,030	8,920
SCM06 Pension Backfunding	796,628	731,790	788,070	56,280
SFP01 Accountancy Services	413,212	400,930	399,390	(1,540)
SFP02 Internal Audit	99,198	98,870	97,380	(1,490)
SFP03 Procurement	74,465	51,910	52,280	370
SFP04 Purchase Ledger	45,760	45,100	45,570	470
SFP05 Sales Ledger	33,558	34,710	40,280	5,570
SHR01 Human Resources	228,409	203,160	217,990	14,830
SHR02 Mddc Staff Training	2,883	119,730	94,770	(24,960)
SHR03 Payroll	60,879	58,950	65,280	6,330
SHR04 Learning And Development	54,346	39,850	32,760	(7,090)
SIT01 It Gazetteer Management	58,198	63,810	64,200	390
SIT02 It Information Management	28,171	27,450	28,050	600
SIT03 It Information Technology	821,914	822,400	839,500	17,100
SLD01A Election Costs	(23,280)	20,000	20,000	0
SLD01 Electoral Registration	120,751	111,040	159,740	48,700
SLD02 Democratic Rep And Management	400,182	414,720	416,620	1,900
SLD04 Legal Services	193,868	187,150	178,940	(8,210)
TOTALS	3,792,658	3,743,760	3,866,010	122,250

Summary of Community Well Being PDG

Service Unit	2013/14 Actuals	2014/15 Budget	2015/16 Budget	Movement £
SCD01 Community Development	393,071	419,900	431,720	11,820
SCD02 Economic Development	(2,820)	(21,910)	1,810	23,720
SCS20 Customer Services Admin	136,532	154,910	117,380	(37,530)
SCS22 Customer First	509,319	642,450	686,670	44,220
SES01 Emergency Planning	1,245	0	0	0
SES03 Community Safety - C.C.T.V.	(873)	3,100	2,880	(220)
SES11 Pool Cars	(8,794)	6,480	6,480	0
SES16 Es Staff Units/Recharges	561,764	609,390	532,490	(76,900)
SES17 Community Safety	53,716	55,440	55,980	540
SES18 Food Safety	(3,120)	(1,530)	1,330	2,860
SES19 Health And Safety At Work	23,181	22,710	42,350	19,640
SES20 Health Education	(740)	0	0	0
SES21 Licensing	25,020	(12,500)	(20,339)	(7,839)
SES22 Pest Control	5,006	5,500	5,000	(500)
SES23 Pollution Reduction	(6,231)	2,710	2,840	130
SPR01 Building Regulations	86,118	11,640	(5,250)	(16,890)
SPR02 Enforcement	152,664	97,800	97,270	(530)
SPR03 Development Control	(256,433)	75,160	178,270	103,110
SPR04 Local Land Charges	(41,450)	(20,450)	(20,450)	0
SPR06 Economic Development	88,381	(60,360)	62,960	123,320
SPR07 Tourism Pol, Marketing & Devel	606	0	0	0
SPR09 Forward Planning	325,774	249,310	183,320	(65,990)
SPR11 Regional Planning	42,581	62,520	76,500	13,980
SRB01 Collection Of Council Tax	293,757	275,020	237,870	(37,150)
SRB02 Collection Of Business Rates	(105,052)	(58,400)	(76,640)	(18,240)
SRB03 Housing Benefit Admin & Fraud	(102,582)	56,760	103,890	47,130
SRB04 Housing Benefit Subsidy	(95,659)	0	0	0
SRB06 Debt Recovery	39,625	38,170	39,170	1,000
SRS01 Recreation And Sport	340,615	141,910	60,360	(81,550)
TOTALS	2,455,220	2,755,730	2,803,861	48,131

Summary of Decent and Affordable Homes PDG

Service Unit	2013/14 Actuals	2014/15 Budget	2015/16 Budget	Movement £
SES15 Private Sector Housing Grants	(165,152)	110,460	129,590	19,130
SHG02 Housing Advice	97,601	103,710	0	(103,710)
SHG03 Homelessness Accommodation	105,498	206,190	218,560	12,370
TOTALS	37,947	420,360	348,150	(72,210)

Summary of Managing the Environment PDG

Service Unit	2013/14 Actuals	2014/15 Budget	2015/16 Budget	Movement £
SCP01 Parking Services	(519,196)	(434,000)	(365,920)	68,080
SES02 Cemeteries	(30,219)	(39,670)	(16,250)	23,420
SES04 Public Health	(22,207)	2,160	2,260	100
SES05 Open Spaces	207,898	156,900	163,710	6,810
SGM01 Grounds Maintenance	513,601	542,680	537,390	(5,290)
SPS01 Asset Management	8,174	8,750	8,750	0
SPS03 Flood Defence And Land Drain	24,812	26,430	26,430	0
SPS04 Street Naming & Numbering	6,834	8,280	8,450	170
SPS05 Administration Buildings	234,267	243,500	242,340	(1,160)
SPS06 Mddc Depots	74,459	58,610	54,260	(4,350)
SPS07 Public Transport	(12,116)	(17,440)	(15,150)	2,290
SPS08 Office Building Cleaning	53,848	54,930	55,710	780
SPS09 Property Services Staff Unit	246,887	256,860	271,550	14,690
SPS11 Public Conveniences	122,884	122,870	90,420	(32,450)
SPS12 Gf Properties Shops/Flats	2,086	(7,360)	(135,630)	(128,270)
SWS01 Street Cleansing	250,026	342,880	402,020	59,140
SWS02 Waste Collection	1,215,685	1,203,760	1,312,560	108,800
SWS03 Recycling	512,337	623,400	599,830	(23,570)
SWS04 Waste Management	201,272	230,690	178,380	(52,310)
TOTALS	3,091,333	3,384,230	3,421,110	36,880

2015/16 Budget Savings Summary

	GENERAL FUND SUMMARY	FTE	Budget Direct	+ - %	Budget	Target	Target	Appendix 3a
			Cost		Meeting	Savings	Savings	
	(Direct costs)	2015/16	2014/15		Savings 2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Comments
	Cabinet	2013/10	2014/13		2013/10	2010/17	2017/10	Comments
SCM01	Chief Executive	2.0	159,080	0.0%				
SCM03	Corporate Fees/Charges	0.1	153,110	0.0%				
SCM06	Pension Backfunding	1.0	738,310	0.0%				
SFP01	Accountancy Services	8.5	400,930	-1.5%	-6,000			0.21 FTE staff saving
SFP02	Internal Audit	2.7	98,870	-3.5% 0.0%	-3,500			Reduced hours in team
SFP03 SFP04	Procurement Purchase Ledger	1.6 1.5	51,910 45,100	0.0%				
SFP05	Sales Ledger	1.5	34,710	0.0%				
SHR01	Human Resources	4.8	203,160	0.0%				
SHR02	Mddc Staff Training	0.0	119,730	-20.9%	-25,000			Reduced based on last yrs actuals and commitment to new system by L&D
SHR03	Payroll	2.0	58,950	0.0%	.,			
SHR04	Learning And Development	0.8	39,850	0.0%				
SIT01	It Gazetteer Management	2.0	63,810	0.0%				
SIT02	It Information Management	1.0	27,450	0.0%				
SIT03	It Information Technology	12.7	822,400	-5.3%	-43,900	-5000		Phone lines, IDOX licences, taken out vacant post, allowing for trainee, paper
SLD01	Electoral Registration	4.0	111,040	0.0%				
	Election Costs	0.0	20,000	0.0%				
SLD02	Democratic Rep And Management	2.8	414,720	0.0%	0.00-		1	Now for attricture to be implemented 4.14.0.14.4
SLD04	Legal Services	5.0 54	187,150 3,750,280	-4.3% -2.3%	-8,000 -86,400	-5,000	0	New fee structure to be implemented 1/10/14
	Community Well Being PDG	54	3,750,260	-2.3%	-00,400	-5,000	- "	1
SCD01	Community Well Being PDG Community Development	5.2	419,900	-6.8%	-28,500	-20000	I	Reduce grants by £20k. Reduction staff hrs £6k. Citizen panel (£2.5k)
SCD01	Economic Development	2.0	-21,910	18.3%	-4,000	20000	1	Agreed to recruit Market Officer for 30 hrs pw not 37hrs as budgeted.
SCS20	Customer Services Admin	3.5	154,910	0.0%	-1,000		1	o
SCS22	Customer First	23.0	642,450	-1.9%	-12,000		I	Not renewing MD Talk -£12k. Push comms through web site
SES01	Emergency Planning	0.0	0					
SES03	Community Safety - C.C.T.V.	0.2	3,100	0.0%		1	1	
SES11	Pool Cars	0.0	6,480	0.0%				
SES16	Es Staff Units/Recharges	14.1	609,390	-13.0%	-79,000			Restructure
SES17	Community Safety	1.7	55,440	0.0%				
SES18 SES19	Food Safety	0.0	-1,530	0.0%				
SES20	Health And Safety At Work Health Education	1.0 0.0	22,710	0.0%				
SES21	Licensing	2.8	-12,500	0.0%				
SES22	Pest Control	0.0	5,500	0.0%				
SES23	Pollution Reduction	0.0	2,710	0.0%				
SPR01	Building Regulations	5.0	11,640	-618.6%	-72,000			Restructure
SPR02	Enforcement	2.5	97,800	0.0%				
SPR03	Development Control	23.2	75,160	-33.3%	-25,000			Restructure and increase in income (incl pre app advice)
SPR04	Local Land Charges	1.8	-20,450	0.0%				
SPR06	Economic Development	2.5	-60,360	39.8%	-24,000			Member of staff going part time - see cost pressures - staff restructure
SPR07	Tourism Pol, Marketing & Devel	0.0	0	0.00/				
SPR09 SPR11	Forward Planning Regional Planning	7.2 0.0	249,310 62,520	0.0%				
SRB01	Collection Of Council Tax	8.8	275,020	-4.4%	-12,000			Additional Court Costs Income from £73k to £85k - JC to work on forecast
SRB02	Collection Of Business Rates	1.0	-58,400	77.1%	-45,000			NNDR Charity Rate Relief no longer required under new NNDR Scheme
SRB03	Housing Benefit Admin & Fraud	13.5	56,760	0.0%	,			8
SRB04	Housing Benefit Subsidy	0.0	0					
SRB06	Debt Recovery	1.5	38,170	0.0%				
SRB08	Council Tax Benefit Subsidy	0.0	0					
SRS01	Recreation And Sport	53.9	141,910	-211.4%	-300,000			Target for service (EV enhancement?, pricing policy, increase off peak activity & corp members)
	Beauting Affectable 11 1 225	174	2,755,730	-21.8%	-601,500	-20,000	0	-
05045	Decent and Affordable Housing PDG		440.400	0.00/				
SES15 SHG02	Private Sector Housing Grants Housing Advice	4.1	110,460 103,710	0.0%			1	
SHG03	Homelessness Accommodation	0.0 6.5	206,190	-12.1%	-25,000	1	1	20k DCC grant for Yth Homelessness post, 5k cut Dom Violence grant.
511000		11	420,360	-5.9%	-25,000 -25,000	0	0	
	Managing the Environment PDG		.20,030	3.0 70	_0,000	Ť	i i	1
		1					1	Consider including amenity car parks on charging order? Review of current year income from P
SCP01	Parking Services	0.0	-434,000	0.0%			I	and D and overnight charging.
	Cemeteries	1.1	-39,670	0.0%		1	1	
SES04	Public Health	0.0	2,160	0.0%				
SES05	Open Spaces	2.2	156,900	0.0%		1	1	
SGM01	Grounds Maintenance	18.5	542,680	0.0%			1	
SPS01	Asset Management Flood Defence And Land Drain	0.0	8,750	0.0%			I	
SPS03 SPS04	Street Naming & Numbering	0.0	26,430 8,280	0.0%		1	1	
SPS05	Administration Buildings	0.2	243,500	-4.1%	-10,000		1	Rates reduction P/House, increase rent from Prospect
	Mddc Depots	0.0	58,610	-10.2%	-6,000	1	1	Rent from leasing Lords Meadow Depot
SPS07	Public Transport	0.0	-17,440	0.0%	0,000		1	
SPS08	Office Building Cleaning	3.1	54,930	0.0%		1	1	
SPS09	Property Services Staff Unit	8.9	256,860	0.0%			1	
SPS10	Tourist Information Centre	0.0	-7,360	40.8%	-3,000		1	Rent for 1 Phoenix Lane more than budgeted for
	Public Conveniences	1.7	122,870	-41.8%	-51,340		I	PDG report on PC provision
SWS01	Street Cleansing	8.2	342,880	-2.2%	-7,500		1	Recharge for sweeping Market Walk
	Waste Collection	30.8	1,203,760	-3.6%	-43,000		1	Estimated income for charging for Garden Waste
SWS03	Recycling	25.8	623,400	-24.0%	-149,500	1	1	Sinking fund savings, glass income, rates at 16 shop, est saving on vehicle maint
	Recycling - OCT 15 New Scheme		200 000	0.04			1	
SWS04	Waste Management	5.3 106	230,220 3,383,760	-8.0%	-270 240	-54C 240	_	-
		100	3,303,700	-0.0%	-270,340	-516,340	0	l .
	GRAND TOTAL	345	10,310,130	-9.5%	-983,240	-541,340	0	-
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							-

2015/16 Budget Cost Pressures Appendix 3b

	2015/16 Budget Cost Pressures							Appendix 3b
	GENERAL FUND SUMMARY SAVINGS SCHEDULE	FTE	Budget Direct	+ - %	Budget	Target	Target	
			Cost		Meeting	Savings /	Savings /	
					Savings / Cost Pressures		Cost	
					Pressures	Pressures	Pressures	
	(Direct costs)	2015/16	2014/15		2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Comments
	<u>Cabinet</u>							
SCM01	Chief Executive	2.0	159,080	0.0%				
SCM03	Corporate Fees/Charges	0.1	153,110	0.0%				
SCM06	Pension Backfunding	1.0	738,310	5.4%	40,000	45000	50000	New pension contribution rates/LEP contribution of £5k ongoing/ Review other corp fees
SFP01	Accountancy Services	8.5	400,930	0.0%	.,,,,,,			
SFP02	Internal Audit	2.7	98,870	0.0%				
SFP03	Procurement	1.6	51,910	0.0%				
SFP04 SFP05	Purchase Ledger	1.5 1.5	45,100 34,710	0.0%				
SHR01	Sales Ledger Human Resources	4.8	203,160	7.4%	15,000			Selling services income reduced
SHR02	Mddc Staff Training	0.0	119,730	0.0%				
SHR03	Payroll	2.0	58,950	8.5%	5,000			Impact of JE
SHR04	Learning And Development	0.8	39,850	0.0%				
SIT01 SIT02	It Gazetteer Management It Information Management	2.0 1.0	63,810 27,450	0.0%				
SIT02	It Information Technology	12.7	822,400	0.0%				
SLD01	Electoral Registration	4.0	111,040	0.0%				
SLD01A	Election Costs	0.0	20,000	5.0%	1,000			Impact of JE
								£2.5k for members transport, £7k for Mod.Gov but this should be cost neutral although
SLD02	Democratic Rep And Management	2.8	414,720	2.4%	10,000			savings will show against print budget in ICT
SLD04	Legal Services	5.0 54	187,150 3,750,280	4.0% 2.1%	7,500 78,500	45,000	50,000	Appointment of higher grade solicitor
	Community Well Being PDG	J-4	5,750,200	2.170	70,300	70,000	50,000	
SCD01	Community Development	5.2	419,900	0.5%	2,300			JE Regrade
SCD02	Economic Development	2.0	-21,910	-109.5%	24,000			Not achieving increased income budget at market. JE regrades.
SCS20	Customer Services Admin	3.5	154,910	0.0%				Madalana and San and Madalan El O El and El and El O El and El O El and El O El and El O El and El and El O El and El and El O El and El a
SCS22	Customer First	23.0	642,450	3.0%	19,500			Maintenance for new Kiosk 1.5k & 5k new EMR for replacement fund. Impact of JE and staff transfer
SES01	Emergency Planning	0.0	642,450	3.0%	19,500			ti dilbici
SES03	Community Safety - C.C.T.V.	0.2	3,100	0.0%				
SES11	Pool Cars	0.0	6,480	0.0%				
SES16	Es Staff Units/Recharges	14.1	609,390	0.0%				
SES17	Community Safety	1.7	55,440	0.0%				
SES18 SES19	Food Safety Health And Safety At Work	0.0 1.0	-1,530 22,710	0.0%				
SES20	Health Education	0.0	0	0.0%				
SES21	Licensing	2.8	-12,500	-72.0%	9,000			Increase in staff hrs -agreed 13-14 wasn't included in budget. LW still to review fees
SES22	Pest Control	0.0	5,500	0.0%				
SES23 SPR01	Pollution Reduction Building Regulations	0.0 5.0	2,710 11,640	0.0% 515.5%	60,000			Review income during year to check performance vs budget
SPR02	Enforcement	2.5	97,800	0.0%	00,000			Review income during year to check performance vs budget
SPR03	Development Control	23.2	75,160	0.0%				
SPR04	Local Land Charges	1.8	-20,450	0.0%				
								Economic Dev Post. Town Centre Manager £41k and Economic development officer £21k-
SPR06 SPR07	Economic Development Tourism Pol, Marketing & Devel	2.5	-60,360 0	-164.0%	99,000			poss fund from NHB?
SPR09	Forward Planning	0.0 7.2	249,310	0.0%				
SPR11	Regional Planning	0.0	62,520	0.0%				
SRB01	Collection Of Council Tax	8.8	275,020	0.0%				
SRB02	Collection Of Business Rates	1.0	-58,400	0.0%				
								Assumed 10% cut on DWP Admin grant. Info at this time DWP will not remove fraud element
SRB03	Housing Benefit Admin & Fraud	13.5	56,760	54.6%	31,000			as planned transfer of May 15 is after 1/5/15 - note if view changes this grant reduction could be up to 20% circa £62k.
SRB04	Housing Benefit Subsidy	0.0	0	34.070	31,000			Could be up to 20% circa 102k.
SRB06	Debt Recovery	1.5	38,170	0.0%				
SRB08	Council Tax Benefit Subsidy	0.0	0					
SRS01	Recreation And Sport	53.9	141,910	0.0%	044.000	<u> </u>		
	Decent and Affordable Housing PDG	174	2,755,730	8.9%	244,800	0	0	
	Private Sector Housing Grants	4.1	110,460	16.2%	17,900			Half post not budgeted for in E/health Restructure
SHG02	Housing Advice	0.0	103,710	0.0%]			
	Homelessness Accommodation	6.5	206,190	0.0%				
	Managing the Facility 1990	11	420,360	4.3%	17,900	0	0	1
	Managing the Environment PDG			1				
SCP01	Parking Services	0.0	-434,000	-10.1%	44,000			Income below profile and not looking to achieve additional £44k - review vs budget
SES02	Cemeteries	1.1	-39,670	-28.3%	11,220			Additional salary costs
SES04	Public Health	0.0	2,160	0.0%	1			
SES05	Open Spaces	2.2	156,900	0.0%				
SGM01	Grounds Maintenance	18.5	542,680	1.1%	6,000			Sinking fund of new Tractor.
	Asset Management Flood Defence And Land Drain	0.0	8,750	0.0%				
SPS03 SPS04	Street Naming & Numbering	0.0	26,430 8,280	0.0%				
SPS05	Administration Buildings	0.1	243,500	0.0%	1			
SPS06	Mddc Depots	0.0	58,610	0.0%	1			
SPS07	Public Transport	0.0	-17,440	0.0%				
SPS08	Office Building Cleaning	3.1	54,930	0.0%				Apprentice to work along side Technical officer. Could be more depending on cost of Agency
SPS09	Property Services Staff Unit	8.9	256,860	2.0%	5,100			for the Technical Officer
SPS10	Tourist Information Centre	0.0	-7,360	0.0%	3,100			
SPS11	Public Conveniences	1.7	122,870	0.0%				
	Street Cleansing	8.2	342,880	0.0%				
SWS02	Waste Collection	30.8	1,203,760	1.8%	21,500			1 additional member of staff Rent, forklifts, 1 add staff, baler loan+sfund+annual maint
SWS03 SWS03	Recycling Recycling - OCT 15 NEW SCHEME	25.8	623,400	11.5%	71,980 158,000	95,000		Pwlb loan recycling receptacles + estimated cost of administrating new scheme
SWS04	Waste Management	5.3	230,220	0.0%	130,000	33,030		Funding for new recycling vehicles??
		106	3,383,760	9.4%	317,800	95,000	0	
		0.7-	40.010.15			440.00		1
	GRAND TOTAL	345	10,310,130	6.4%	659,000	140,000	50,000	

Medium Term Financial Plan 2015/16 - 2018/19 - Ca	apital					Appendix 4
	С	apital rogramme 2015/16	Estimated Capital Programme 2016/17	Capital Programme 2017/18	Estimated Capital Programme 2018/19	Total
Estates Management		£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Leisure - Site Specific						
Lords Meadow leisure centre Main car park resurfacing		50				50
Replace main filters -including access arrangements Tennis Court resurfacing and lining (subject to need)		30	70 25			70 25
Swimming pool tiling and balance tank fabrication Squash Court roof -valleys steps		20		50		50 20
Exe Valley leisure centre						
* Fitness gym extension Inflatable dome for tennis courts (subject to business case)		500 0			80	500 80
Culm Valley sports centre						
* Fitness gym extension		0			500	500
	Total	570	95	50	580	1,295
* Figures included per Leisure consultants report - further work required & subject	ct to Business Case demonstrating a	cceptable payba	ck period			0
Other MDDC Buildings						
Pannier Market Pannier Market paving resurfacing (subject to planning) Pannier Market decoration -whole building out of hours			150		60	150 60
Town Hall						
Secondary means of escape-improved use of chamber High level maintenance on the structure -repointing etc				30 50		30 50
General Car parks						
Pay and Display and Amenity Car Parks Beck Square car park -resurface and lining			50	50		50 50
William Street Car Park-resurface and reline MSCP Improvements			50			50
Planned replacement expansion joint replacement Surfacing Road past M & S to MSCP		40	50	40		80 50
MDDC Depot sites						
Lords Meadow Depot -Replace/repair asbestos roof					50	50
Old Road Depot -Yard resurfacing and lining (subject to move) Station Yard- Yard resurfacing and lining (subject to move)			35	35		35 35
Old Road roof - permanent repairs					50	50
Depot relocation land purchase and fit out			2,500			2,500
Play Areas						
Play area refurbishment district wide		50	50	50	50	200
Cemeteries						
Chapel roofs Tiverton and Crediton				40		40
Other Projects						
Land drainage flood defence schemes		50	50	50	50	200
Sewage Pumping Stations (HRA)		50	50	50	50	200
	Total	190	2,935	395	310	3,830
HRA Projects		0.500	0.500	0.500	2.500	44.000
Housing Maintenance Fund Disabled Facilities Grants - Council Houses		3,500 291	3,500 297	3,500 303	3,500 309	14,000
Palmerston Park Tiverton - affordable dwellings Culmstock		4,000 700				4,000 700
Conversion of Shapland Place garages Tiverton - dwellings or starter units Round Hill Tiverton site development			1,000	3,000		1,000 3,000
	Total	8,491	4,797	6,803	3,809	23,900
ICT Projects						
Replacement of PC estate 330s Server farm expansion/upgrades		40 20	0	40 20	0	80 40
Unified Comms/telephony Digital Transformation		50	25 50	100	100	75 250
Mobile Working NDL MX		30				30
Members Mobile SQL/Oracles refreshes		25 20	50			25 70
HRA Digital Transformation (HRA)		30				30
InCab E-Financials Technical refresh		60 20				60 20
Uniform Technical refresh		20				20
Misc items in future years	Total	315	175 300	140 300	200 300	515 1,215
-	iotai	315	300	300	300	1,215

		Provisional Capital Programme 2015/16		Estimated Capital Programme 2017/18		Total £k
Affordable Housing Projects						
Grants to housing associations to provide houses (covered by Commuted Sums) Affordable Housing 0.67 FTE Alexandra Lodge - contribution to Care Home Provision		0 26 300	26	300 26		900 104 300
_	Total	326	326	326	326	1,304
Private Sector Housing Grants						
Work in Default/Discretionary Grants Loans Scheme (Wessex Reinvestment Trust) Empty Homes Disabled Facilities Grants—P/Sector		0 0 102 459	0 104		0 108	0 0 420 1,891
_	Total	561	572	583	595	2,311
Economic Development Projects						
Schemes as yet to be identified		100	100	100	100	400
_	Total	100	100	100	100	400
Replacement Vehicles						
Grounds Maintenance Housing Repairs (HRA)		58 59	0			123 83
Street Cleansing Refuse Collection		50 195	0	0	67	117 840
Trade Waste Recycling		160 0	0	0	0	160 0
CCTV Initiatives		40				40
<u>-</u>	Total	562	320	214	267	1,363
Waste & Recycling						
No Costs included for new Refuse & Recycling scheme Oct '15 prior to PDG recom	mendations					0
_	Total	0	0	0	0	0
_						0
_	Grand Total	11,115		8,771	6,287	35,618 0 0
Funding		2015/16 £k		2017/18 £k		Total
Council House sales		-300	-300	-300	-300	-1,200
Council House sales (1 for 1 receipts - replacement Homes) Misc Land/Property sales		-300 -80		-300 -80		-1,200 -320
Disabled Facility Grants - Mandatory - Private Sector		-254		-254		-1,016
HRA Revenue Contribution HRA Revenue Contribution - Council House Building		-139 -4,400		-74 -2,700		-313 -7,800
Housing Maintenance Fund		-3,500	-3,500	-3,500	-3,500	-14,000
Decent Homes Backlog Funding						0
Affordable Housing S106s - matched to spend		-326 -65		-326 -65		-1,304 -260
General Capital Reserve 2014/15 capital programme forecast net u/spends		-65				-260
Regional Housing Pot Reserve		-12				-46
Revenue Contribution from General Fund		-125	-125	-125	-125	-500
Amounts req'd from New Homes Bonus		-1,039				-3,199
Contribution from UCR		-25				-100
Contribution from sinking funds Contribution from Private Sector Housing Grant EMR Contribution from CGU non specific reserve		-161 -311 -78	-286			-615 -1,167 -78
PWLB Borrowing		0				-1,500
Capital Receipt for Town Hall & depot Rationalisation			-1,000			-1,000
Total Funding		-11,115	-9,445	-8,771	-6,287	-35,618 0
Funding Gap		0	0	0	0	0

DECENT & AFFORDABLE HOMES PDG 25 NOVEMBER 2014

AGENDA ITEM:

HRA BUDGET 2015/16

 Cabinet Member
 Cllr Peter Hare-Scott, Cllr Ray Stanley

 Responsible Officer
 Head of Finance, Head of Housing

Reason for Report: This report provides an estimate of the budget required for the operation of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) in 2015/16. The remaining uncertainties are the specifics of the rent increase and the ongoing effect that welfare reform will have.

RECOMMENDATION: That the PDG note the content of this report.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: The financial resources of the Council directly impact on its ability to deliver its Corporate Plan objectives/pledges.

Financial Implications: A balanced and realistic budget must be set for 2015/16 in order that the HRA reserve is not threatened with unplanned expenditure. The rent convergence target of 2015/16 will need to be met in order that the 30 year business plan's need for much greater investment in the housing stock is achievable.

Legal Implications: It is a statutory requirement for the Council to set a balanced budget.

Risk Assessment: Service managers and Finance staff have assessed volatility in income and large contractor budgets. In addition, reserves will continue to be maintained at prudent levels and grown in some cases to meet future pressures.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Finance and Housing officers have now collated a draft budget for 2015/16 which proposes a balanced budget position, shown here in Appendix 1. This means that we are able to predict with relative certainty the majority of the HRA budget areas.

2.0 Draft Budget

- 2.1 We are required to set an HRA budget where expenditure is balanced by income. The income is made up primarily of dwelling rents whereas the expenditure consists of day-to-day operations, corporate overheads and capital expenditure. The largest expenditure in the HRA is an annual debt repayment of £2,645k that is made to the Public Works Loan Board.
- 2.2 Our rent income (both dwelling and non-dwelling) is expected to generate in excess of £13m in 2015/16.

- 2.3 The major challenge for managers in setting next year's budget is to meet the significant demand for investment in property maintenance in the long term. It is proposed that £2,113k be budgeted as an annual contribution to the Housing Maintenance Fund to provide for any spikes in demand in future years. The Repairs budgets are showing an increase at present due to increased use of external contractors. However, officers intend to put plans in place to reduce this budget in time for the final budget report in January.
- 2.4 Recharges between the General Fund and HRA are yet to be finalised, but overall the position between the HRA and the General Fund has been assumed as increasing in line with estimated salary growth.

Rent

- 2.5 MDDC rents currently lag behind Formula Rent (the target that we are tasked with meeting by 2015/16). DCLG are increasing Formula Rent by 2.8%. This means that MDDC need to increase rent even more if the gap is to be closed in time.
- 2.6 By increasing the rents by an average of 3.4%, we will ensure that the vast majority of properties have reached the Formula Rent and those that lag further behind are moved towards Formula Rent as quickly as is possible.

Other Fees & Charges

2.7 It is proposed that garage plot ground rents are increased from £165 to £185 per annum. This move is designed to align them more closely with residential parking permits, which will cost £375 in the coming year. In addition, it is proposed that garage rents increase by 2.3% to £11.25 per week.

HRA Reserve

- 2.8 It is anticipated that the HRA reserve balance will stand at approximately £2m at the beginning of 2015/16. There is no plan to utilise the reserve to fund revenue expenditure. It seems sensible for members to revisit the level of reserve and agree upon a level appropriate to the situation that the HRA now finds itself in.
- 2.9 The work identified in the most recent stock condition survey means that there will be increased pressure on the HRA reserve over the coming years. Managers will need to invest time in business planning and strategy in order to meet the funding demands of the work identified.

3.0 Future Issues

3.1 The single biggest issue facing social housing is welfare reform. Great uncertainty exists about the details of new arrangements for the future. What is more, the implications of these changes are difficult to quantify. Once new arrangements have bedded in, it will be clearer what action MDDC need to take. For instance, it is not clear when Universal Credit will be introduced, if at all.

- 3.2 The Supported Housing service is changing hugely in 2015/16 in that the Warden service will cease to operate from April onwards. This will reduce both income and expenditure and will give MDDC more certainty about its future income and expenditure streams.
- 3.3 This budget has been set on the basis of agreed funding, with a much reduced operational structure, following the decision by Cabinet. The service will then comprise Community Alarms provided to tenants and non-tenants as well as a small Warden service provided to clients with Learning Disabilities.
- 3.4 The prospect of building new social housing raises the issue of significant financing requirements. It means that reserves may need to be built up or additional debt taken on (subject to the cap on debt) in the near future, increasing the pressure on the revenue budget each year.
- 3.5 Further reports will be set before members as and when there are developments on any of these issues.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The proposals from this meeting will be used to prepare the final budget proposals, to be brought before this group on 20/01/15.

Contact for more information: Andrew Jarrett

01884 234242

ajarrett@middevon.gov.uk

Roderick Hewson 01884 234230

rhewson@middevon.gov.uk

Background Papers: None File Reference: None

Circulation of Report: Management Team

Housing Revenue Account Budget

Code	Best Value Unit	Previous Year Outturn	Current Year YTD Actuals	Current Year Budget	Movement	Proposed Budget 2015/16
BHO01	Dwelling Rents	(11,892,276)	(6,731,667)	(12,466,560)	(336,710)	(12,803,270)
BHO02	Non Dwelling Rents	(525,706)	(297,858)	(525,060)	(3,850)	(528,910)
BHO03	Warden Income	(330,507)	(101,156)	(329,080)	298,100	(30,980)
BHO04	Leaseholders' Service Charges	(12,712)	0	(13,500)	410	(13,090)
BHO05	Contributions Towards Expenditure	(37,860)	(18,530)	(35,300)	330	(34,970)
BHO06	Community Alarms Income	(133,637)	(115,110)	(133,930)	(4,240)	(138,170)
внообв	Miscellaneous & Solar Panel Income	(484,305)	(177,517)	(19,000)	(150,000)	(169,000)
BHO07	H.R.A. Investment Income	(27,108)	0	(41,000)	1,000	(40,000)
BHO09	Repairs And Maintenance	2,530,898	1,623,806	2,647,920	221,900	2,869,820
BHO10	Supervision & Management	1,437,182	966,022	1,800,000	160,580	1,960,580
BHO11	Special Services	394,796	190,165	382,970	(204,270)	178,700
BHO17	Bad Debt Provision Movement	(1,303)	0	25,000	0	25,000
BHO18	Share Of Corporate And Democratic	154,530	84,082	181,600	21,290	202,890
BHO20	Interest Payable	1,375,123	632,384	2,812,000	(1,344,210)	1,467,790
BHO22	H.R.A. Transfers between earmarked reserves	2,077,992	0	0	125,000	125,000
BHO23	Revenue Contribution to Capital	2,907,973	0	145,580	(17,180)	128,400
	TOTAL	(2,606,355)	(3,945,380)	(5,568,360)	(1,231,850)	(6,800,210)

Recharges	1,205,890 12,0	60 1,217,950
Capital charges	4,362,470 1,219,7	90 5,582,260
TOTAL	0	0

Social Rents to increase by an average of 3.4% to give an average of £81.20

Formula Rent to increase by 2.8%

Affordable Rents to increase by 2.8%

Arroraone Rents to increase by 2.8%
Garage rents to increase from £11.00 to £11.25 per week
95% occupancy in HRA retail units
The Warden Service to cease operation
Community alarm customer numbers to remain high + 50 customers from within the tenant population
HRA cash balances to remain high in the short term
Debt repayments of £2,645k to PWLB and £125k to GF

£2,113k contribution to the Housing Maintenance Fund to be made

Recharges to grow with salary inflation

15/16 Budget Changes (since PDG's)

Budget gap estimated at November/December PDGs and Cabinet		£ 650,178
Cost Centre	Description	
Housing Benefit Corporate Fees/Charges Collection Fund	HB Admin Grant - Circa £10k reduction - awaiting confirmation Sector fees overbudgeted in first draft Projected C/Fund suplus (at 05/12/14) lower than budgeted	10,000 Revised figure from DWP -9,050 6,670
Community Development - Grants Community Development - Grants Car parks RCCO reduce - as NHB funding capital shortfall	Reduction in group 1 and 2 grants as agreed Reduction in seed fund to offset savings not achieve on grants Updated with current income levels	-6,475 -13,825 -10,000 -125,000
Waste/recycling - new scheme savings Revised Formula Grant Rev'd leisure income/costs	Agreed to set a global figure of £200k	-200,000 1/2 year savings + set up costs -83,000 -25,000
E/Health Riams Webbase Software Feed in tariff (Leisure sites)	Web base software for Health	2,000 -30,000
Dev Control Fees Pollution Licenses Income	Note - JC recommended £40k further increase Budget set too high in 14/15	-70,000 2,500 £13.5 - Reduced to £11k
	Total changes to be agreed	-551,180

New budget gap after the above changes/revisions

98,998

Notes

Formula grant agreed on 18/12/14 - confirming a grant cut of £574k - which was £83k better than the provisional sum announced 12 months earlier Council tax freeze grant offered for 2015/16 @ 1% - so circa = £50k. Note - if Ctax freeze grant accepted budget gap increases by £25k Referendum limit agreed at 2% for 2015/16

Nothing included at the moment for: shared ICT work, Mkt Walk or Fore St properties

Cabinet 8 January 2015

Budget 2015/16 - Update

Portfolio Holder Responsible Officer Cllr Peter Hare-Scott Head of Finance

Reason for Report:

To consider options available in order for the Council to

move towards a balanced budget for 2015/16.

RECOMMENDATION:

To consider and agree the updated budget proposals for

2015/16 included in Appendix 1.

Relationship to Corporate Plan:

To deliver our Corporate Plan's priorities within existing

financial resources.

Financial Implications:

Now the Council has received notification of its Formula Grant Settlement it is imperative that it matches current and ongoing expenditure plans to estimated sources of

income/funding.

Legal Implications:

It is a statutory requirement for the Local Authority to set a

balanced budget.

Risk Assessment:

Service Managers and Finance staff have assessed volatility in income and large contractor budgets, taking account of current and estimated future demand patterns. This position has been revised based on an additional 2 months of financial monitoring information. In addition prudent levels of reserves will also continue to be

maintained.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 On the 18 December 2014 the Council received formal confirmation of its Formula Grant Settlement (but no provisional notification for 2016/17 – which clearly doesn't assist any future financial planning) and details relating to a Council Tax Freeze Grant and the Referendum Limit.

2.0 2015/16 general Fund Budget - Revised Position

- 2.1 Since the first round of PDGs and Cabinet meetings the Finance team and service managers have been revisiting a range of budgets to strive to deliver more savings or increased income levels.
- 2.2 This process (excluding the Formula Grant Settlement) has improved the General Fund budget by circa £468k (see Appendix 1) and now only leaves a budget gap of £99k. This reflects a lot of hard work and constructive negotiation over the past 2 months.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 The Council still has approximately 1 month until the Cabinet will meet on the 5 February 2015 to formally recommend the overall budget and level of Council Tax for 2015/16 and officers will continue to work towards delivering a balanced budget position.
- 3.2 As the Head of Finance has discussed on a number of occasions over the past few years, the Council's financial future is only going to become increasingly challenging, not helped by receiving no indicative grant figures for 2016/17 and it therefore remains apparent that difficult decisions will have to be made in the future where we attempt to balance the needs of our residents with the available funding at our disposal. This will a very challenge for our new Council in May 2015 but at least the Council is in a strong/healthy financial position at the current stage and has demonstrated a solid track record of delivering significant savings over the last 4-5 years and still delivers a wide range of high performing services.

Contact for more information: Andrew Jarrett – Head of Finance Background Papers: Draft 2015/16 Budget Papers Grant Settlement Email 18/12/14

File Reference:

Circulation of the Report: Management Team, Members & Relevant Service

Managers

15/16 Budget Changes (since PDG's)

Budget gap estimated at November/December PDGs and Cabinet		£ 650,178
Cost Centre	Description	
Housing Benefit	HB Admin Grant - Circa £10k reduction - awaiting confirmation	10,000 Revised figure from DWP
Corporate Fees/Charges	Sector fees overbudgeted in first draft	-9,050
Collection Fund	Projected C/Fund suplus (at 05/12/14) lower than budgeted	6,670
Community Development - Grants	Reduction in group 1 and 2 grants as agreed	-6,475
Community Development - Grants	Reduction in seed fund to offset savings not achieve on grants	-13,825
Car parks	Updated with current income levels	-10,000
RCCO reduce - as NHB funding capital shortfall		-125,000
Waste/recycling - new scheme savings	Agreed to set a global figure of £200k	-200,000 1/2 year savings + set up costs
Revised Formula Grant		-83,000
Rev'd leisure income/costs		-25,000
E/Health Riams Webbase Software	Web base software for Health	2,000
Feed in tariff (Leisure sites)		-30,000
Dev Control Fees	Note - JC recommended £40k further increase	-70,000
Pollution Licenses Income	Budget set too high in 14/15	2,500 £13.5 - Reduced to £11k
	Total changes to be agreed	-551,180

New budget gap after the above changes/revisions

98,998

Notes

Formula grant agreed on 18/12/14 - confirming a grant cut of £574k - which was £83k better than the provisional sum announced 12 months earlier Council tax freeze grant offered for 2015/16 @ 1% - so circa = £50k. Note - if Ctax freeze grant accepted budget gap increases by £25k Referendum limit agreed at 2% for 2015/16

Nothing included at the moment for: shared ICT work, Mkt Walk or Fore St properties

This page is intentionally left blank

Briefing Report to Scrutiny Committee 8 December 2014

Update from Procurement and Accounts Payable/VFM working group.

At a Scrutiny Committee on the 14 April 2014 it was agreed to form a small member Task and Finish group to assess the Council's financial arrangements in relation to securing value for money particularly in relation to Procurement and Accounts Payable service areas.

The T&F member working group consisted of: Members - T G Hughes (Chair), E J Berry, T W Snow and N A Way. Officers – AJ, JM, CB, CC and JS.

The initial meeting of this group agreed a brief of the items/areas that they wanted to explore in more detail. These main areas were:

- 1 Basic overview of the Procurement and Accounts Payable processes
- 2 To interview a senior member of staff from a procurement team of a neighbouring authority
- 3 To interview the Head of BIS to give an overview of the cost of running the ICT service

Meeting 1 – 12 June 2014 (minutes attached)

Summary points from discussions:

- Interview with HofF to gain overview of what procurement does
- Establish what pan Devon work was ongoing
- Whether we could directly promote work to local companies
- Ask for HofBIS to attend next meeting
- Interview with Procurement Manager
- To agree next steps and establish further information that was required

Meeting 2 – 21 August 2014 (minutes attached)

Summary points from discussions:

 Interview with Procurement Manager from Devon CC to high light Devon-wide purchasing arrangements

Meeting 3 – 29 September 2014 (minutes attached)

Summary points from discussions:

• Interview with HofBIS to discuss systems/applications, costs and comparable benchmarking figures with other Councils.

Meeting 4 – 29 October 2014 (minutes attached)

Summary points from discussions:

Final and concluding meeting which agreed the following:

Members were pleased with the work of the Council's Procurement Team

It was AGREED that the positive work of the Procurement team should be promoted internally as there was an assumption that the team were just there to help buys things. This is already being helped by the quarterly Procurement workshops being run.

It was found very useful to have an external Procurement Manager to give an overview of what joint working was happening across the County

It was AGREED that this joint working should continue

It was AGREED that service managers are the buying experts – but it is the role of Procurement to carry out the tender exercise(s) and ensure all legal requirements are complied with once the service had specified the goods/services they needed.

It was AGREED that the HofF would provide an overview of the Accounts payable process.

AP process the payment of an invoice only after the service requistions whatever goods/services are required (this is then checked by a supervisor/manager to agree whether the goods are needed, are within budget, and whether the fin regs have been followed – goods that are bought regularly are on preferential terms with agreed suppliers – that services have to use. If this is all ok the service manager will approve the requisition. Then once the goods have been rec'd – the original requistioner has to log onto to the finance system to agree the goods have been rec'd (check quantity and standard of delivered goods). Only after this process has been concluded and we then receive an invoice for the goods will the AP team will pay the bill. This evidences a very clear audit trail and shows the many steps that must be completed prior to a purchase invoice being released for payment.

Findings/Conclusion

Members of this working group expressed their thanks to officers for providing a significant amount of information/time to enhance their knowledge of both the procurement and accounts payable functions.

It was agreed that Procurement could do more to enhance others (staff & members) knowledge of their role – this is being helped by the quarterly user group meetings now being held.

Members felt the existing arrangements with the other Devon authorities were working very well in order to maximise purchasing power with regard to a number of regular purchase items (e.g. stationary, utilities, etc.) and also worked well together in sharing resources to work on specific contracts that were Devon-wide (e.g. Devon Home Choice)

Members were made aware of neighbouring Authorities costs of ICT services and were re-assured that our costs were broadly comparable.

Members of the group felt that the current accounts payable process was very robust.

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

SUMMARY of a **MEETING** of the **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP** held on Thursday 12 June 2014 at 10.00am in the Members Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton.

Present

Councillors: E J Berry, T G Hughes, T W Snow and N A Way

Officers: A Jarrett (Head of Finance), J May (Head of Human

Resources, Learning and Development), C Busby (Procurement Manager), J Stuckey (Member Services Officer)

and S J Lees (Member Services Officer

1. Election of Chairman

Cllr T G Hughes was appointed Chairman of the Working Group.

2. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

3. Aims, objectives and desired outcomes – project outline

A general discussion took place as to what 'Procurement' means.

General background

The Head of Finance (HOF) explained that the Council had lost circa £2m of central government funding over the past 4 years. It was expected that the Formula Grant would be further reduced by £656k next year. Securing value for money had never been more important. Procurement as a service is audited annually and all arrangements heavily scrutinised. A half yearly report is presented to the Cabinet on the Procurement area detailing the work plan and the tenders and contracts being worked on.

The Procurement team comprised of 3 members of staff, 2 of which were part time. They primarily have an administrative / legal function and are <u>not</u> the buyers. They are not experts in particular fields of activity e.g. building therefore this is left to the officers who work in these areas.

MDDC operates within a pan Devon Procurement Strategy (signed by all Chief Executives) which is designed to secure value for money for all those all the agencies involved. Merging together ensures better buying power. The Strategy is due to be reviewed this year. By definition it is a strategic top level document, there are no supplier details listed. Other advantages in signing up to this Strategy is that the same sort of contract does not have to be negotiated 8 different times, it needs to only be done once. However, whilst the intention is to use the pan Devon Contract wherever possible there is flexibility to go outside of this for exceptional circumstances.

A general discussion took place as to what constitutes as 'local'. Ultimately the Council must bear in mind what is best for the tax payer and needs to ensure best price and best quality.

The Working Group expressed a desire to find out more about our ICT department and to perhaps visit other authorities (although the HOF asked whether Members were technically skilled enough to be able to compare complex IT systems across authorities and their associated costs?). Members asked why DCC and MDDC could not have the same ICT systems. The HOF explained that there were different contracts, different suppliers, whoever switched would incur thousands of pounds in compensation. Members suggested therefore that compatible systems should be a goal for the future.

MDDC currently spends £1m per annum on 30 different service areas, different systems, licences, staff etc. The HOF referred to Cornwall County Council who still did not have an integrated system 3 years down the line.

See separate scoping document attached.

4. Interview with the Procurement Manager

The Chairman requested that the Procurement Manager provide information in relation to where the Procurement Team go for advice, how the system works on a daily basis, how do they liaise with other authorities and how officers of the Council engage with the team. He also asked whether, given the further reductions expected in central government funding, any further savings / improvements could be made?

The Procurement Manager provided the following information:

- The Council operated under European Procurement laws since there was currently no specific British legislation in place. In addition to this the Council had its own Financial Regulations. The tender process followed very closely that prescribed by European legislation. This legislation was currently under review. One of the biggest challenges nationally was trying to ensure compliance. The Cabinet Office operated a system of 'mystery shoppers'. Mid Devon had one experience of this and it had been very positive in demonstrating our procedures are robust and fit for purpose.
- Further information was provided regarding the Devon Procurement Partnership. A range of public sector agencies were involved not just local authorities e.g. the Fire Service. Framework agreements were set up for on average a 3 year period, this would be subject to the nature of the contract. Individual Authorities set up framework agreements which were then shared with other authorities, for example, the furniture one was set up by DCC. There are two different ways that framework agreements work, one by a catalogue system with fixed prices and alternatively by further competition between the suppliers on the framework.
- A major benefit of being in the Partnership was the training costs being shared across the agencies taking part and the opportunities that this afforded.
- The Council was linked into the same e-tendering system as other partners.

- Confirmation was provided that the contract was always between the Council and the supplier, no third parties were involved.
- There has to be a prescribed objective process in place when dealing with tenders and contracts. Meetings are set up with potential suppliers where the process is fully explained so that they understand the Council's system up front.
- On the issue of using local suppliers she explained that the Council
 was not able to say 'it can only use Devon suppliers'. The legislation
 does not allow for this. However the Council could specify timescales
 which may prevent a supplier form far away places such Scotland from
 engaging with us.
- She explained that officers were responsible for entering information onto the eProcurement system when they received the goods and services they have ordered. This information was mandatory before any supplier invoice could be paid.
- Payment terms could be flexible, suppliers could have immediate or 7 days rather than 30 days if they requested it.
- The Procurement Manager was asked what happens when a supplier puts their prices up. She explained that some markets are very changeable but the Council was able to build in a clause to a contract to state for example that prices could only be amended after 12 months or that if a price goes above a certain figure the contract will be terminated. This very much depended on the type of goods and services being supplied.

5. Next Steps

- a) Members need to receive information relating to ICT costs what does it cost in terms of IT per head of population? (CC / AJ / CB)
- b) Copy of the pan Devon Procurement Strategy to be circulated to Working Group Members as well as a copy of the work plan. (AJ / CB)
- c) Members need to see a copy of the Contracts Register and what the current prices are. (AJ / CB)
- d) SL to set up a meeting with Procurement representatives from Devon County Council and Torridge District Council. (SL)

6. **Date of next meeting**

To be confirmed

The meeting closed at 12.00pm

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

SUMMARY of a **MEETING** of the **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP** held on Thursday 21 August 2014 at 10.00am in the Lowman Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton.

Present

Councillors: E J Berry, N V Davey and T G Hughes

Officers: A Jarrett (Head of Finance), J May (Head of Human

Resources, Learning and Development), and J Stuckey

(Member Services Officer)

Others Present: Kevin Balding DCC Procurement Officer

1. Notes of the previous meeting – 12 June 2014

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.

2. Discussion with Kevin Balding DCC Procurement Officer

The Chairman welcomed Mr Balding to the meeting.

The Officer explained to the Group that DCC were facing a similar cut to funding, in terms of percentage, as Mid Devon, but that in money terms this equated to around £110m. He explained that the County Council were approaching the cuts from a number of angles.

They were looking at statutory duties that must be done, non-statutory duties that were nice to do but could be considered for cuts and were also considering other methods of delivery. He felt that DCC were going to become more of a commissioning authority with staff actually employed by the authority being reduced. Internal departments would be externalised and the authority would be working with community led organisations. Partnerships were already in place with other organisations, such as Norfolk.

With regard to partnership working he explained that the authority were keen to do this but it was important to ensure that the right partners were chosen and that both were going in the same direction. Some partnership working had not been successful because the organisations involved were looking for different outcomes.

He explained that Mid Devon was part of a Procurement Partnership with all Devon Authorities. This gave many benefits, such as an electronic procurement system which provided one portal for the entire south west. It gave savings on common goods and services such as stationary. The energy contract had created great savings when all of the local authorities had combined their spend to gain greater efficiences.

Examples of joint buying included stationary, furniture, water coolers, tree services, agency staff and many more.

Mid Devon had hosted an event for local companies to find out how to tender for local authority work. This had been successful with several hundred companies represented.

DCC were currently working on electronic ordering and paying regular bills automatically so that the cost of paying invoices could be reduced.

Next steps included an annual spend analysis. Mid Devon had agreed to be part of this. The Devon Procurement Group would look at all spend by all of the authorities to identify high areas of expense. These areas could then be tendered for as a group which would generate cost savings.

The Group then discussed IT issues. The Officer from DCC and the Head of Finance agreed that in order to make savings with IT systems it would be necessary for authorities to join together. However, this would probably involve investment in order to ensure that the authorities were all using the same systems. The admin costs may outweigh any savings. At the moment there were many different software applications in use, with contracts at varying stages. East Devon, Exeter City and Teignbridge were in the process of joining their IT provision and the Head of Finance and the Head of Business Information Systems would be keeping an eye on this.

The Devon Procurement Group used Exeter University to provide training in order to keep their Officers up to date.

Mr Balding explained that Procurement at DCC had already reduced its staffing levels but he did not expect any further cuts in the next three years. This was because the service was itself being used to implement further cuts.

The Chairman thanked Mr Balding for his time.

3. General discussion

The Head of Finance provided the Group with a copy of the MDDC Contracts Register and the Procurement Workplan.

4. Date of next meeting:

The Head of Business Information Systems would be attending the next meeting. The Clerk would arrange a suitable date.

The meeting closed at 11.45am

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

SUMMARY of a **MEETING** of the **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP** held on Monday 29th September 2014 at 3.30pm in the Exe Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton.

Present

Councillors: T G Hughes and T W Snow

Apologies

Councillors: E J Berry and N A Way

Officers: A Jarrett (Head of Finance), C Cross (Head of Business

Information Services) and J Stuckey (Member Services Officer)

1. Notes of the previous meeting – 21 August 2014

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.

2. Head of Business Information Systems

The Head of Business Information Systems gave a presentation in which she explained the progress that had been made in her service and plans for the future. (Copy of the presentation attached to notes.)

Discussion took place regarding:

Applications and software – there were several software applications available for Revenues and Benefits and Local Authorities were able to use whichever suited their needs. If there was to be more joint working this would need to be taken into consideration.

Most Devon Authorities used one of a choice of two software systems for Finance. When Mid Devon needed a new system only these two were considered, so that should there be joint working in future the same software could be used.

There had been large financial savings made by the removal of desk top printers.

Property data had previously been held on seven different applications. This had been consolidated to one system and had highlighted properties that had slipped through the net previously.

The total paid on licences was in the region of £405K, which included support and maintenance.

The Head of Business Information Services was about to start joint arrangements with North Devon District Council. This was not just a case of her time being split between the two authorities as had happened before when Managers had been shared, she explained that her aim was to run one IT Service for the two authorities, with multiple delivery points.

Salaries totalled £451,000K for 12 staff, software £405,000K including support and maintenance and hardware £14600K. £300K was allocated for capital bids.

The Officer had asked 18 other Authorities within Devon, Somerset and Dorset what their IT spend was. Only 4 Authorities (Sedgemoor, Mendip, Torridge and West Somerset) had responded. The Officer reported that Mid

Devon's expenditure was within the norm for these Authorities. **These** figures would be given to the Clerk for issue to the Group.

The Members of the Group present then requested a visit to the IT Service and the Head of Service took them there.

3. Next Steps

Cllr Snow requested that the Head of Finance explain procurement of vehicles and plant at the next meeting.

It was agreed that a further meeting of the Group would be required in order to discuss the information that had been gathered in previous meetings and form conclusions. From these conclusions the Group would need to agree on any recommendations and a draft report would need to be written to go back to the Scrutiny Committee.

4. Date of next meeting:

16th October 2014 at 10.00am

The meeting closed at 16.40

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

SUMMARY of a **MEETING** of the **PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP** held on 29th October 2014 at 10.00am in the Exe Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton.

Present

Councillors: E J Berry and T G Hughes

Apologies

Councillors: T W Snow and N A Way

Officers: A Jarrett (Head of Finance), J May (Head of Human

Resources, Training and Development) and J Stuckey

(Member Services Officer)

Notes of the previous meeting –29 September 2014

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.

2. Form Conclusions and Recommendations

The working group had held three meetings;

- At the first meeting the Head of Finance and the Procurement Manager explained the MDDC procurement process;
- At the second meeting a representative from Devon County Council attended and gave an overview on procurement at DCC and the Devon Procurement Partnership;
- The Head of Business Administration Systems attended the third meeting to give an overview on the cost of running the IT service.

Discussion took place regarding previous meetings. Members agreed that they had been very satisfied with the information given to the Group by the Procurement Manager at the first meeting. Members felt that the service was acting in a responsible manner.

It was also agreed that the representative from Devon County Council gave a good presentation and confirmed that Local Authorities and the County Council were working together well to get best buying power.

It was **AGREED** that joint working should continue to be pursued.

The Group discussed IT provision and the fact that the Council had a requirement for many licences due to the number of different services provided.

The Head of Finance outlined the current tender for recycling vehicles. Ten vehicles had been ordered and they would be arriving over the next few months. The vehicles would be more fuel efficient, operationally suitable and there would be a reduction in maintenance costs. The vehicles had been specified to accommodate future collection scheme options. The procurement of vehicles followed standard procurement rules and if the costs were over £50k they were subject to the tendering process.

It was **AGREED** that the positive work of the Procurement team should be promoted internally as there was an assumption that procurement just 'buy' things and there was currently little recognition of what procurement actually was and the work they carry out.

Members **AGREED** that the report should also explain that service managers are the experts in their field and are allowed to specify their requirements. The Procurement Service carry out the tender exercise and legal requirements but always work to the specification laid down by the service.

It was **AGREED** that in his report the Head of Finance would make reference to the accounts payable service and would explain the safe practices that had been put in place to reduce risks in this area.

3. Next Steps

The Head of Finance would draft a report which he would distribute to the Group, with the intention of reporting back to the Scrutiny Committee at the meeting being held on 8th December 2014.

The meeting closed at 10.45am

Briefing Note for Scrutiny Committee 19th January, 2015 Cabinet Member for Working Environment and Support Services

1. Gazetteer Services

- 1.1. The Local Land & Property Gazetteer that holds records of all properties (buildings and land) now has 53,820 records. This ensures that all council services and national organisations use a consistent address for Mid Devon properties.
- 1.2. This is achieved by matching all property information throughout the council and with the national hub. Our standard for matching is at GOLD standard, the highest standard. This information is also supplied to Fire and Rescue services.
- 1.3. There is a national initiative called INSPIRE requiring us to publish all Environmental information. This needs to be completed by March 2015. We are on target to meet this date.

2. Land Charges

- 2.1. Property searches are routinely turned around in one day. This generates an income of over £100k per year, this is an indication of a livelier property market
- 2.2. Street Naming and Numbering is maintained on a daily basis. The next large scale development expected is for the Farleigh Meadow proposals.

3. ICT Services

- 3.1. The web site is being replaced and is in draft form. Online forms in their simplest format will be available on the new web site. The complicated integration of these forms into the business systems (back office) will take some months of work to complete to make it properly digital.
- 3.2. The new ICT Service Desk system is LIVE. It will continue to be developed over the next six months. This system holds all requests for support and services for ICT. It records actions taken to resolve calls. It enables self-service for users with a Frequently Asked Questions section.
- 3.3. The Payment Kiosk has been installed in reception. The customers who have used it to pay bills are satisfied. As yet there has been no formal launch
- 3.4. The Council's intranet site called Phoenix Portal built using Sharepoint has successfully been upgraded. This has also been extensively restructured to be more reflective of ways of working rather than on an organisational basis.
- 3.5. ModernGov is a software system for Member Services that also integrates with Express (Elections) and will change and streamline the committee processes, handling of agendas and accompanying reports. It is anticipated that the next administration will have the ability to go paperless. Member services are now using the system. There will be a pilot for members sometime in January to April.
- 3.6. The Corporate system used for property related information called Uniform now has version 10 available. Version 10 will be put through the test system before releasing to the LIVE environment. No dates have been scheduled yet.
- 3.7. Total Land Charges (TLC) has been upgraded in preparation for the reporting on environmental information, known as Con29, changes next year. The Con29 forms are used as part of the land charge property searches.
- 3.8. Lalpac (Licencing) has now been upgraded. The work will start soon on implementing new forms over the next few months as there is a plan to make Licencing paperless.
- 3.9. The Time and Attendance system called Wintime needs to be upgraded in the New Year as the underlying system is no longer supported by the supplier.

- 3.10. The Projector has been replaced in the Exe Room
- 3.11. **HR System**
 - 3.11.1. eRecruitment is being built in the HR system and due for testing shortly. This is used for applying for council jobs online.
 - 3.11.2. Similarly the Learning and Development module is being built. This will save time and improve management and reporting as at the moment HR maintain Learning and Development records and requests with many spreadsheets.
 - 3.11.3. The electronic payslip element will become available via email for office based staff ie those with email addresses.

3.12. **Digital Transformation**

- 3.12.1. There is extensive work being scheduled to enable the move to using digital or online channels. Some this work includes existing ICT planned work such as the review and replacement of the telephone system and the replacement web site.
- 3.12.2. New work is the implementation of enabling the council to send text messages to customers' mobiles (SMS). There will be a corporate pilot for this as well as the Housing trials for SMS. This is the beginning of unified communications work where channels such as voice (telephone/mobile) text, email can all be merged.

4. Future ICT Work

- 4.1. There is a programme of new work that extends to 2016. This includes further Digital Transformation work as well as planned upgrades and replacements that are necessarily forced upon us by suppliers updating their own technology and systems.
- 4.2. Document Management needs to be implemented more widely into additional services. Electronic documents are necessary for digital transformation and to enable mobile working.
- 4.3. Printer replacements are to be scheduled for Planning and Print room

4.4. Infrastructure –

- 4.4.1. There are about twelve servers still running old operating systems (2003) which need to be upgraded before April 2015. There is likely to be some impact as the business systems are migrated.
- 4.4.2. Some switches (connecting floors and locations to the main server room) need to be replaced due to age and obsolescence.
- 4.4.3. Citrix needs to either be replaced or upgraded. This software is used for delivering systems to the desktop and for remote access in a secure manner.
- 4.4.4. Outlook email needs to be migrated to the new Exchange 2013 email server.
- 4.4.5. The council's connections to the Public Service Network (PSN) (Government Secure Network) will have to start the annual round of IT Health Checks. This is to ensure that all appropriate security measures are in place and being used to keep not just our but also government systems safe and secure. The Code of Compliance submission has to be completed mid May. This is not just a technical exercise but includes staff and members adhering to government requirements and physical security measures.

5. Performance

- Total number of ICT Service Desk Calls this year 5997
- % Calls Resolved within Agreed Timescale (SLA) averaging 82%
- Customer Satisfaction averaging 9.7 out of 10
- System up-time averaging at 100%
- ICT Services budget has some internal variations but nothing untoward. The only exception will be the additional recruitment of a Web Developer Analyst to meet the increasing demand for web service delivery.
- We have now reached a total of 682 FOI requests for the year, of these requests, about 97% were answered within the 20 day time limit.

Christina Cross Head of Business Information Services



Agenda Item 13



Phoenix House Phoenix Lane Tiverton

Devon EX16 6PP

www.middevon.gov.uk

Contact: Mrs J Roach Telephone: 01392 861042

Date 22 October 2014 Email: jroach@middevon.gov.uk

Closure of Care Homes and the Effect on other Services

Your Ref: Our Ref:

At Mid Devon District Council we recently held a Special Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee in order to look at the issues surrounding the closure of the Devon County Council care homes.

At that meeting Members resolved to open a conversation with other agencies to investigate whether it would be possible for all of the organisations involved in providing care to look at ways of working together to try and alleviate pressures. We are aware that we are not the lead authority but we do feel that we would like to raise issues of concern, for example, we frequently hear of bed blocking because hospitals are unable to discharge patients. We consider that it is a matter of concern that a valuable resource such as a DCC care home is being closed when it might be a more cost effective way of providing rehabilitation, respite care or convalescence. If people are discharged home too early then it is more than likely that there will be re-admissions and the cost of a second admission might outweigh the costs of a rehab bed. Once the resource has gone then an opportunity could be lost forever.

We are also concerned that there does not appear to be an overall strategy for looking holistically at how we as a society are going to address long term health and social care needs.

It appears to us that each agency has severe pressure in terms of funding their services and are all having to make difficult decisions. As local Councillors we are aware of the significant support that is available by tapping in to voluntary service in communities. We are also aware that sometimes it is the little things that enable folks to feel supported and enable them to cope in difficult situations. Community hubs and schemes such as the Blackdown Support Group have an important role to play. It is important that people who are willing to invest time and effort in such schemes are not overly burdened with having total responsibility for fundraising.

Local Parish and District Councils could have a very important role in providing back up support and help to lonely and vulnerable people.

District Councils are heavily involved in Local Plan's; could community hubs be integrated in to new communities?

Available in other languages and formats on request Please telephone 01884 255255 or eagle 4. Stomerfirst middlevon.gov.uk

The Committee agreed that I should write to all who have responsibility in relation to policy and funding in health and social care, with the aim of asking if you would be willing to meet as a group to discuss the above points.

I would be very grateful if you could contact me to confirm that you would be interested in meeting to discuss these matters.

Yours sincerely

Jenny Roach (Councillor)
Mid Devon District Council

Your Ref: Our Ref:



Phoenix House Phoenix Lane Tiverton Devon EX16 6PP

www.middevon.gov.uk

Contact: Jenny Roach Telephone: 01884 234209

Date Email: jroach@middevon.gov.uk

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO DCC, CCG AND LOCAL MP'S

Dear

I am writing with reference to my letter of 30 September 2014 regarding reductions to care services and the possibility of working together to produce a joined up approach. I have attached a copy of the letter for your information.

At the last meeting of the Scrutiny Committee I had to report that I had not received a response to that letter from you. The committee asked me to write to you to say how disappointed they were that the letter had not been responded to or at least acknowledged.

Whilst we are aware that we do not have much influence in this area we remain concerned that there does not appear to be a holistic approach. This concern is shared by members of the public who have difficulty comprehending why they see on the local news that discharges from hospital are being delayed because there are no care beds. Then at the same time they hear that residential beds for the elderly are being cut by Devon County Council. There are also frequent reports of ambulances are stacking in A and E for the same reason.

As a committee we can see benefits to each of the agencies getting together to look at a more joined up approach to this situation. It may well be that you have already adopted this approach in which case it would be reassuring to be made aware of any progress.

Regards

Jenny Roach Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee MDDC Email from Councillor Stuart Barker of Devon County Council, Received on 22 December 2014, in response to an email requesting an answer to the enquiry about working with other agencies.

Thank you for the email however I do not have a letter sent directly to me dated 30th September. I did have a letter dated 2nd October and I responded to that letter. Jennie Roach subsequently wrote a response to that letter on 25th November with more questions which has been with officers and a response should be with you this week. Responses are normally made within 28 days unless there are unforeseen circumstances. The copy of an open letter you attached was sent to Parishes and others was dated 30th September but wasn't addressed specifically to me - your letter dated 2nd October did cover the questions raised at your scrutiny meeting so that was the one requiring an answer.

I think there is a misunderstanding about the position of hospital discharges. This is subject to national reporting and government regularly publish the relevant figures. If you look at the reports you will see that on average the responsibility rest significantly more with NHS services – typically in Devon they would be responsible for around 75% of delayed discharge issues. There have been few DCC social care delay issues in your area so the question of availability of residential beds is not an issue. The vast majority of discharges are to home where it is necessary to have nursing and reablement services available. Continuing Healthcare Care and Nursing Care are not DCC responsibilities.

I am afraid that the assumptions in the letter do not seem to have an evidence base but are personal views. Where we have been discharging directly to home and not using care homes for some time. In East Devon we have seen a significant reduction in readmissions within 3 months and 6 months and a reduction in the number of people needing a longer term social care support. People who access the reablement teams on discharge to home attain the facility to continue living independently much earlier than those discharged to either residential homes or cottage hospitals. The east Devon service is overseen by the Consultant Geriatrician based in the RD&E hospital and it achieves to support a higher number of people than was the case when a residential home was used. That residential home ceased providing the service over three years ago and has not been missed.

Devon has had an integrated approach to services with our CCG colleagues for over three years and has been jointly using section 256 funds from the NHS during that time. From April 2015 this will be replaced by the Better Care Fund which has been jointly agreed between DCC and both CCGs, we were recently notified that our joint plan has been approved by Government. Integrated plans have to work across the whole of Devon and not just in one local area.

I have noted the invitation to scrutiny meetings next year and am considering the position with officers before responding.

Regards

Stuart



Jan Ingram
Assistant Director
Social Care Provision
The Annexe
County Hall
Topsham Road
EXETER
EX2 4QR

Tel: 01392 382197

Email: jan.ingram@devon.gov.uk Fax: 01392 382363

Your ref: Date: 23 December 2014
Our ref: JI/TH Please ask for: Tara Hooper

Dear Mrs Roach,

Thank you for your letter to Councillor Barker of 25th November, which has been passed to me for response. Councillor Barker is currently taking advice regarding the appropriateness at this stage of attending your meeting. I have responded to the comments and further questions you set out in your letter as below.

One of the main concerns is the lack of clear information in all our correspondence in relation to options available under the Localism Act. It appears that expressions of interest have to be made in March, as the decision to close was taken after March 2014, does this mean that expressions of interest could be made in March 2015?

The Localism Act right to challenge is not applicable to these services as decisions have been made to end services as described under Grounds for rejection – see below

Grounds for rejection are contained in the Schedule to the Community Right to Challenge (England) Regulations 2012 (2012 No 1647) (Fire and Rescue Authorities and Rejection of Expressions of Interest) (read with Regulation 4). The grounds are:

- "1. The expression of interest does not comply with one or more of the requirements specified in section 81(1) or in regulations made by the Secretary of State under section 81(1)(b) (duty to consider expression of interest).
- 2. The relevant body provides information in the expression of interest which, in the opinion of the relevant authority, is in a material particular inadequate or inaccurate.
- 3. The relevant authority considers, based on the information in the expression of interest, that the relevant body or, where applicable:
 - (a) any member of the consortium of which it is a part, or
 - (b) any sub-contractor referred to in the expression of interest, is not suitable to provide or assist in providing the relevant service.

4. The expression of interest relates to a relevant service where a decision, evidenced in writing, has been taken by the relevant authority to stop providing that service.

Did any staff members show an intention to set up a social enterprise? Were staff informed at any time of this option and the Government's commitment to encouraging staff to take over and run services?

Staff in other areas of the county have taken this route. There is no requirement for Devon County Council to specifically communicate this opportunity to staff, however Trade Unions and staff are aware of this alternative; indeed this is not the first time services have been under review and Devon County Council staff have decided to take this route in the past.

Mid Devon District Council supported a bid for a 50 bed care home in the grounds of Alexandra Lodge. At the point this decision was made Councillors were unaware that Charlton Lodge would be closing. In the report to Council regarding the provision of this extra care facility Devon County Council committed £1 million and MDDC committed £300k to the scheme. Given the change in circumstances, could that finance be used to refurbish Charlton Lodge to provide the extra care housing which is predicted will be the way to meet future needs?

The funds are committed to Extra Care Housing at Alexandra Lodge.

The question relating to risk assessments has still not be answered, the risk assessment as printed in DCC reports assesses risk, following mitigation, as a 'possible minor' – all available information indicates that the risk of an enforced move is higher than has been assessed.

Please could you provide the information to which you refer.

In your response to Question 9 you state 'Well UK is not overseeing the process. Transitions are managed by very experienced DCC staff. Well UK is evaluating how the process was received by sampling residents, day service users who have moved to new homes or services and their families.' Please would you explain how Well UK are going to sample the people involved in the moves, what is the sample percentage/number? When will Well UK be reporting back and who will be receiving their report. Will this report go directly to DCC Scrutiny?

In your response, you state 'it is expected that an interim report will be presented to Scrutiny when there are sufficient numbers sampled' surely, as this is an ongoing process, the Scrutiny committee will want to be aware of the effect of these moves on those who have already moved? It might be that information on the progress of the planned closures may require a re-evaluation of the process?

Well UK is meeting the specification which set out:

"The bidding organisation will be required to start work 28th July 2014 to initially and in partnership with DCC managers, familiarise themselves with the DCC transitions process and practice guidance issued to the transitional teams and with national guidance and best evidence where that exists and to refine and develop a schedule/programme of work to be agreed with the Residential and Day Projects board on 5th August 2014 that will:

a) Following an initial discussion with the transitional managers to provide any initial risk based assessment of, and any recommendations for, improvement in relation to the

- DCC principles, standards, processes and practical arrangements being proposed, to ensure they are fully compatible with national guidance and best evidence.
- b) Provide a project plan to implement from 5th August to review a sample of at least 60 care home residents (subject to service users' agreement) and at least 120 day centre users who will have already been supported into alternative service provision. These reviews will be a robust and a detailed analysis of how the processes of transition was experienced / delivered for each of the people within the sample. If appropriate the carer for the individual will also be able to express their views.
 - This plan should describe in detail the work to be undertaken in phase 1 involving approximately 15 residential placements and 30 day care placements. (Phases 2-4 will be a development from this starting position taking into account any lessons learnt from the previous phase)
- c) Devise a method of gaining the views and experience of at least 60% of the service users who have not participated in the sample"

This is an iterative process that enables learning gained from working with and supporting one group of residents and their families/ representatives to the next.

Reporting to Devon County Councils People's Scrutiny will, as described by Councillor Barker, be at points where there are sufficient numbers of reviews completed. This does not replace the interim reporting, and opportunity day by day, for Well UK to raise any concerns directly to the senior management involved in the transitions work.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny (What Rotherham and Mid Staffordshire tell us about Scrutiny, and where it's lacking. September2014) make several relevant points, in particular; 'In both Stafford and Rotherham, scrutiny appears to have placed too much store on the assurances of people in authority that everything was fine. Even if they had wanted to ask challenging questions, it appears they did not have access to the information to do so.' In view of these comments it would be helpful if the question in relation to Well UK and the evaluation to date could be made available before the next round of closures takes place.

Do all residents and service users involved in the planned moves have access to independent advocates?

DCC continues to work within the Mental Capacity Act Code of Practice which states, 'The Act's starting point is to confirm in legislation that it should be assumed that an adult (aged 16 or over) has full legal capacity to make decisions for themselves (the right to autonomy) unless it can be shown that they lack capacity to make a decision for themselves at the time the decision needs to be made. This is known as the presumption of capacity. The Act also states that people must be given all appropriate help and support to enable them to make their own decisions or to maximise their participation in any decision-making process.'

As homes move into closure phase, an experienced team of staff is working closely with individual residents and their families to facilitate moves. The members of this team work closely with the Manager and staff of the home who have supported residents before, during and after their moves. All residents are helped and supported to fully participate in and make choices and decisions about their future.

Independent advocates have been and will continue to support those residents with no family, carer or appointed representative. For residents without the capacity to understand the decisions relating to the changes and who do not have the support of family or a Power of Attorney, they will be fully supported by an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) within the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act to support them with decisions required in selecting and moving to a suitable alternative home.

I trust this provides a response to the issues and further questions you have raised. Please let me know if you need any further clarification.

Yours sincerely

Migram

Jan Ingram

Assistant Director, Social Care Provision

