

The Council's Vision:

To enable people to live, work and prosper in West Somerset

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held on Monday 17 March 2014 at 3.30 pm

Council Chamber, Williton

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Minutes

Minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 17 February 2014, to be approved and signed as a correct record – **SEE ATTACHED.**

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive and record any declarations of interest in respect of any matters included on the Agenda for consideration at this Meeting.

4. Public Participation

The Chairman to advise the Committee of any items on which members of the public have requested to speak and advise those members of the public present of the details of the Council's public participation scheme.

For those members of the public wishing to speak at this meeting there are a few points you might like to note.

A three-minute time limit applies to each speaker and you will be asked to speak before Councillors debate the issue. There will be no further opportunity for comment at a later stage. Your comments should be addressed to the Chairman and any ruling made by the Chair is not open to discussion. If a response is needed it will be given either orally at the meeting or a written reply made within five working days of the meeting.

5. Notes of Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points

To review the Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points from the Cabinet Meeting held on 5 March 2014 – **SEE ATTACHED.**

6. Cabinet Forward Plan

To review the latest Cabinet Forward Plan for the months of March, April and May, published on 26 February 2014 – **SEE ATTACHED.**

7. Scrutiny Committee Work Plan

To review and scope items for the Scrutiny Committee Workplan for 2013/2014 – **SEE ATTACHED.**

The Council's Vision:

To enable people to live, work and prosper in West Somerset

8. Community Safety Report

To receive a verbal report from Inspector, Shane Carey, and the Community Safety Officer, Peter Hughes, on local police issues.

9. Minehead Events Plan

To consider Report No. WSC 49/14, to be presented by Councillor K M Mills, Lead Member for Economic Regeneration and Tourism - **SEE ATTACHED.**

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with an update on the progress of delivering the Minehead Events Programme during 2013 looking forward to 2014.

10. Car Parking Services – Proposed Agency Agreement for Car Park

To consider Report No. WSC 48/14, to be presented by Chris Hall, Assistant Director Operational Delivery - **SEE ATTACHED.**

The purpose of this report is to seek authority to enter into an agency agreement whereby Somerset County council would provide enforcement and some of the management services for West Somerset Council (WSC) car parks.

11. Capital Strategy and Programme 2014-15

To consider Report No. WSC 46/14, to be presented by Councillor K V Kravis, Lead Member for Resources and Central Support - **SEE ATTACHED.**

The purpose of this report is to seek the views of Scrutiny Committee on the temporary interim strategy used to influence the drafting of the capital programme for 2014/15 and the subsequent results.

12. Section 106/Planning Obligations Review – Update on Recommendations

To consider Report No. WSC 50/14, to be presented by Sam Rawle, Scrutiny and Performance Officer - **SEE ATTACHED.**

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with an update on the progress made in responding to the recommendations arising from the Scrutiny review of the Section 106 & Planning Obligations review.

The Council's Vision:

To enable people to live, work and prosper in West Somerset

COUNCILLORS ARE REMINDED TO CHECK THEIR POST TRAYS

The Council's Corporate Priorities:

- Local Democracy:
Securing local democracy and accountability in West Somerset, based in West Somerset, elected by the people of West Somerset and responsible to the people of West Somerset.
- New Nuclear Development at Hinkley Point
Maximising opportunities for West Somerset communities and businesses to benefit from the development whilst protecting local communities and the environment.

The Council's Core Values:

- Integrity
- Respect
- Fairness
- Trust

RISK SCORING MATRIX

Report writers score risks in reports uses the scoring matrix below

Risk Scoring Matrix

Likelihood	5	Almost Certain	Low (5)	Medium (10)	High (15)	Very High (20)	Very High (25)
	4	Likely	Low (4)	Medium (8)	Medium (12)	High (16)	Very High (20)
	3	Possible	Low (3)	Low (6)	Medium (9)	Medium (12)	High (15)
	2	Unlikely	Low (2)	Low (4)	Low (6)	Medium (8)	Medium (10)
	1	Rare	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)	Low (5)
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Impact							

Likelihood of risk occurring	Indicator	Description (chance of occurrence)
1. Very Unlikely	May occur in exceptional circumstances	< 10%
2. Slight	Is unlikely to, but could occur at some time	10 – 25%
3. Feasible	Fairly likely to occur at same time	25 – 50%
4. Likely	Likely to occur within the next 1-2 years, or occurs occasionally	50 – 75%
5. Very Likely	Regular occurrence (daily / weekly / monthly)	> 75%

- Mitigating actions for high ('High' or above) scoring risks are to be reflected in Service Plans, managed by the Group Manager and implemented by Service Lead Officers;
- Lower scoring risks will either be accepted with no mitigating actions or included in work plans with appropriate mitigating actions that are managed by Service Lead Officers.

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 February 2014 at 3.30 pm

Present:

Councillor K J RossChairman

Councillor M O A Dewdney
Councillor B Heywood

Councillor P N Grierson

Members in Attendance:

Councillor K V Kravis
Councillor K M Mills
Councillor A H Trollope-Bellew
Councillor D J Westcott

Councillor E May
Councillor T Taylor
Councillor K H Turner

Officers in Attendance:

Executive Director (Interim) (A Dyer)
Monitoring Officer (B Lang)
Assistant Director Resources (P Fitzgerald)
Section 151 Officer (S Campbell)
Principal Accountant (S Plenty)
Scrutiny and Performance Officer (S Rawle)
Performance and Efficiencies Manager (K Batchelor)
Administrative Support (H Dobson)

Prior to the start of the meeting the Chairman welcomed the Assistant Director Resources to his first meeting of the Scrutiny Committee. Further, on behalf of the Committee he expressed his thanks to the Section 151 Officer for all her work at West Somerset Council and who would be returning to Somerset County Council full time.

SC101 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M J Chilcott, J Freeman, R P Lillis and PH Murphy.

SC102 Minutes

(Minutes of the Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 20 January 2014 – circulated with the Agenda).

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 20 January 2014, be confirmed as a correct record.

SC103 Declarations of Interest

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in their capacity as a Member of a County, Parish or Town Council:

WEST SOMERSET COUNCIL
Scrutiny Committee 17.02.14

Name	Minute No.	Description of Interest	Personal or Prejudicial or Disclosable Pecuniary	Action Taken
Cllr P N Grierson	All Items	Alcombe	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr K J Ross	All Items	Dulverton	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr K H Turner	All Items	Brompton Ralph	Personal	Spoke
Cllr D J Westcott	All Items	Watchet	Personal	Spoke

In addition the following declaration of interest was declared:

Cllr K H Turner declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 - SC108 Corporate Performance Report 2014/15, as he was a landlord.

SC104 Public Participation

No members of the public requested to speak on any items on the agenda.

SC105 Notes of Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points

(Copy of Notes of Cabinet Decisions/Action Points, circulated with the agenda).

RESOLVED that the Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points for 5 February 2014, be noted.

SC106 Cabinet Forward Plan

(Copy of the Cabinet Forward Plan published 6 February 2014, circulated with the agenda).

RESOLVED that the Cabinet Forward Plan published 6 February 2014, be noted.

SC107 Scrutiny Committee Work Plan

(Scrutiny Committee Work Plan, circulated with the Agenda).

On consideration of the Work Plan the following points were raised:

- The Performance and Scrutiny Officer advised of the request to include a report from Building Control regarding joint arrangements for going forward. Further, she requested whether the Committee wished to receive an update on the Family Focus Project, and suggested that the format of future Work Plans map out future meetings only.
- The scheduled Annual Report from Minehead Eye would not be necessary at this point.
- Cllr M O A Dewdney suggested that the Committee receive an update from the Minehead Visioning Manager on his activities as he was due to complete his secondment April/May 2014.
- The Executive Director (Interim) requested that a report of the draft Capital Programme be included for the meeting to be held in March 2014.

RESOLVED (1) that a report on the Shared Services Business Case for Building Control be added to the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee scheduled for 14 April 2014;

RESOLVED (2) that an update report on the Family Focus Project be added to a suitable future meeting of the Scrutiny Committee;

RESOLVED (3) that an update report be requested from the Minehead Visioning Manager be added to the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee scheduled for 14 April 2014;

RESOLVED (4) that a report of the draft Capital Programme be added to the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee scheduled for 17 March 2014;

RESOLVED (5) that the Annual Report from Minehead Eye scheduled for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 April 2014, be deleted from the Work Plan;

RESOLVED (6) that the format of the Work Plan be amended to show future meetings of the Scrutiny Committee only;

RESOLVED (7) that the Scrutiny Committee Work Plan, as amended, be noted.

SC108 Corporate Performance Report April – December 2013/14

(Report No. WSC 28/14, circulated with the Agenda).

The purpose of the report was to provide Members with an update on progress in delivering the corporate priorities, performance of council services including customer satisfaction covering the period from 1 April 2013 to 31 December 2013.

During the course of the discussion the following points were raised:

- It was suggested that perhaps the milestones relating to the new nuclear development at Hinkley Point should be set aside/not included until the project had recommenced.
- In response to concern the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Health and Wellbeing reported on the background to the delivery of 20 additional affordable homes in Townsend Farm, Carhampton and advised that he was quite confident that the project would progress.
- Key Action 2.2.4 – Delivery of 19 additional affordable homes at Seaward Way, Minehead. It was confirmed that the Council's solicitors had been instructed to take legal action. The impact to the budget would be minimal as the sale of other sites would realise sufficient capital receipts to repay the loan.
- It was confirmed that the deadline for applications to the Coastal Communities fund had not yet passed.
- Concern was raised regarding issues relating to consulting on the future use of the Cuckoo Meadow Play Area. It was suggested that perhaps the Ward/Lead Members might wish to be more involved. Further, the Committee might consider that the play area was important enough to

recommend that it be included in the capital programme when the draft is reported to the Committee in the future.

- KPI 51 – the total number of properties made decent in the private sector through informal or formal action. Concern was raised regarding the delivery of the indicator and the Committee requested that the annual indicator be changed to a quarterly indicator.
- The Committee requested that the following information be provided after the meeting:
 - Revenues and Benefits: regarding overpayment recovery, why and how was there a record level of overpayments being created?
 - Environmental Health: clarification was requested regarding the criteria/procedure of how a star rating was awarded to a premises by the Council and whether it could be carried over to a new proprietor.
 - Key Actions 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 – Deliver 25/10 empty properties back into use within the Quantock/Exmoor panel areas. Confirmation would be provided as to the criteria for an empty home and more details as to the properties involved.
 - Key Action 5.3.2 – Delivering 40 disabled facility grants. Concern that there were 22 clients waiting on the register due to budgetary constraints. Confirmation would be sought as to whether there were any issues providing the grants.
 - Key Action 5.3.3 – Improving 50 privately rented properties to the minimum standard. Concern was raised that some tenants were not aware of the Council's scheme and might need protection. How could the scheme be better promoted and support to the tenant be provided?
 - To provide an update of ongoing work regarding CCTV in Minehead.

RESOLVED (1) that the progress in delivering the corporate priorities for 2013/14 be noted;

RESOLVED (2) that the performance against Group and Service Indicators be noted;

RESOLVED (3) that Cabinet be advised of the points raised by the Committee as set out above.

SC109 Financial Monitoring Report April – December 2013/14

(Report No. WSC 29/14, circulated with the Agenda).

The purpose of the report was to provide updated in year financial information on a range of issues including budgetary monitoring and business rate retention.

During the course of the debate the following points were raised:

- It was confirmed that the budget had been affected by the changes regarding joint working. The new Joint Management Structure would increase employment costs for West Somerset Council as set out in the approved business case. Savings for the council would be provided by the implementation of shared services. Confirmation was sought as to what the increased salary costs would be.

- It was confirmed that the Council's current legal working arrangements with Mendip District Council would continue to roll forward after they were due to expire at end of March until a decision regarding the possibility of a larger partnership was resolved.
- Details regarding the 'Elections – overspend on canvasser fees' would be provided after the meeting.

RESOLVED that the current financial standing of the Council together with the estimated position at the end of the financial year be noted.

The meeting closed at 17.01 pm.

DRAFT

CABINET ACTION PLAN

Date/Minute Number	Action Required	Action Taken
CAB89 – Tobacco Declaration	<p>RESOLVED that Cabinet wholeheartedly support the intentions of the Local Government Declaration on Tobacco Control and would continue working with the Health and Wellbeing Board to clarify detailed expectations and requirements to enable the document to be signed on behalf of the authority prior to it being recommended to Council for approval.</p>	
CAB97 – Annual Budget and Council Tax Setting 2014-15	<p>RESOLVED (1) that it be recommended to Council that the Council Tax Freeze Grant be accepted and thus does not increase Council Tax unless Government sets the capping referendum rate at 2%.or more</p> <p>RESOLVED (2) that the revenue budget for 2014/15 as presented in Appendix A to the report be recommended to Council.</p> <p>RESOLVED (3) that the schedule of savings as shown in Appendix B, Table 10 to the report (as recommended by Scrutiny) balancing the remainder of the budget using general reserves be recommended to Council.</p> <p>RESOLVED (4) that the revised Medium-Term Financial Plan in Appendix A, Table 2 to the report be recommended to Council.</p>	To be considered at the Council meeting to be held on 26 February 2014
CAB98 – Fees and Charges 2014/15	<p>RESOLVED that the levels of fees and charges be recommended to Council.</p>	<p>At the Council meeting held on 19 February 2014, it was RESOLVED (1) that the following fees be unchanged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Licences • Private Water Supplies • Acupuncture/Tattooing/Skin Piercing/Semi-Permanent Skin Colouring Licences • Land Search Fees • Animal Welfare Licences

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street Trading Licences • Environmental Health Charges • Housing Inspections for Immigration Purposes • Gambling Licences • Car Park Fees • Court Summons and Liability Orders for Council Tax and NNDR • Building Control Charges <p>RESOLVED (2) that the following changes to fees be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New charges implemented for Scrap Metal Dealers Licencing • Harbour Mooring Fees increase in line with inflation • Green Waste Charges increase from £45 per year to £46.50 per year • Pre-Planning Advice, VAT to be added to the fees <p>RESOLVED (3) that a full review of Fees and Charges Policy be completed by the end of October 2014.</p>
<p>CAB99 – 2015/16 Council Tax Rebate Scheme Consultation</p>	<p>RESOLVED (1) that it be recommended to Council that the Authority consult for the period 24 February 2014 to Friday 23 May 2014 on possible change to the 2015/16 Council Tax Rebate Scheme.</p> <p>RESOLVED (2) that it be recommended to Council to consult on Option 5 as an alternative to the existing scheme.</p>	<p>At the Council meeting held on 19 February 2014, it was RESOLVED (1) that the consultation for the period 24 February 2014 to 23 May 2014 on possible change to the 2015/16 Council Tax Rebate Scheme be approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED (2) that the residents of West Somerset should be consulted on Option 5 as an alternative to continuing with the existing scheme.</p>

Weekly version of Forward Plan published on 26 February 2014

Forward Plan Ref / Date proposed decision published in Forward Plan	Date when decision due to be taken and by whom	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring a resolution for it to be considered in private and what are the reasons for this?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/14/4/01 19/03/2013	2 April 2014 By Councillor K V Kravis – Lead Member Resources & Central Support	Title: Allocation of Section 106 funds held – Quarter 4 Decision: to make proposals for the allocation of monies secured through planning obligations to individual schemes, and to update members with the current funding position.		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Ian Timms, Assistant Director Business Development 01984 635271
FP/14/4/02 19/03/2013	2 April 2014 By Councillor D Westcott – Lead Member for Community and Customer	Title: Consideration of nomination/s received under the Community Right to Bid Legislation Decision: To approve community listing		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Bruce Lang, Assistant Chief Executive 01984 635200
FP/14/4/03 4/07/2013	2 April 2014 By Councillor C Morgan – Lead Member for Environment – Hinkley Point	Title: Hinkley Point Decision: to consider key issues relating to Hinkley Point		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Andrew Goodchild, Planning Manager 01984 635245
FP/14/4/04 6/02/2014	2 April 2014 By Councillor K Mills – Lead Member for Regeneration and Economic Growth	Title: Car park services proposed agency agreement Decision: to recommend to Council to approve the proposal		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Chris Hall, Assistant Director Operational Delivery 01823 356361

Forward Plan Ref / Date proposed decision published in Forward Plan	Date when decision due to be taken and by whom	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring a resolution for it to be considered in private and what are the reasons for this?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/14/4/05 18/01/2013	2 April 2014 By Councillor T Taylor – Leader of Council	Title: Draft Corporate Plan for 2014-15 Decision: to introduce the draft West Somerset Council Corporate Plan 2014/15 for recommendation to Council.		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Penny James, Chief Executive 01984 635246
FP/14/4/05 18/01/2013	2 April 2014 By Councillor K V Kravis – Lead Member Resources & Central Support	Title: Draft Capital Programme 2013-14 and Capital Strategy Decision: to present the draft Capital Programme 2013/14 and draft Capital Strategy for recommendation to Council.		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Shirlene Adam, Section 151 Officer 01984 635259
FP/14/4/06 26/02/2014	2 April 2014 By Councillor K V Kravis – Lead Member Resources & Central Support	Title: Volunteer Policy Decision: to recommend to Council to approve the Volunteer Policy		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Simon Lewis, Assistant Director Housing and Community Benefit 01823 356397
FP/14/5/01 23/05/2013	7 May 2014 By Councillor D Westcott – Lead Member for Community and Customer	Title: Consideration of nomination/s received under the Community Right to Bid Legislation Decision: To approve listing		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Bruce Lang, Assistant Chief Executive 01984 635200
FP/14/5/02 4/07/2013	7 May 2014 By Councillor C Morgan – Lead Member for Environment – Hinkley Point	Title: Hinkley Point Decision: to consider key issues relating to Hinkley Point		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Andrew Goodchild, Planning Manager 01984 635245

Forward Plan Ref / Date proposed decision published in Forward Plan	Date when decision due to be taken and by whom	Details of the proposed decision	Documents and background papers to be available to decision maker	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring a resolution for it to be considered in private and what are the reasons for this?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/14/6/01 23/05/2013	4 June 2014	<p>Title: Cabinet Appointments on Outside Bodies</p> <p>Decision: to appoint representatives to serve on outside bodies for the period to the Annual Meeting in 2014 (except where specific periods are stated).</p>		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Bruce Lang, Assistant Chief Executive 01984 635200
FP/14/6/02 23/05/2013 Page 9	4 June 2014 By Councillor D Westcott – Lead Member for Community and Customer	<p>Title: Consideration of nomination/s received under the Community Right to Bid Legislation</p> <p>Decision: To approve community listing</p>		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Bruce Lang, Assistant Chief Executive 01984 635200 Page 9
FP/14/6/03 4/07/2013	4 June 2014 By Councillor C Morgan – Lead Member for Environment – Hinkley Point	<p>Title: Hinkley Point</p> <p>Decision: to consider key issues relating to Hinkley Point</p>		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Andrew Goodchild, Planning Manager 01984 635245
FP/14/7/01 23/05/2013	2 July 2014 By Councillor K V Kravis – Lead Member Resources & Central Support	<p>Title: Allocation of Section 106 funds held – Quarter 1</p> <p>Decision: to make proposals for the allocation of monies secured through planning obligations to individual schemes, and to update members with the current funding position.</p>		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Ian Timms, Assistant Director Business Development 01984 635271
FP/14/7/02 23/05/2013	2 July 2014 By Councillor T Taylor –	<p>Title: Corporate Performance & Budget Monitoring Report 2013-14 – Quarter 4</p>		No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Bruce Lang, Assistant Chief Executive 01984 635200

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – WORKPLAN – 2013/14 – 2014/15

	2014 17 March	14 April	16 June	21 July	18 August	15 September	20 October	17 November	15 December	2015 19 January	16 February
	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review	Notes of key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points Cabinet Forward Plan Scrutiny Committee Workplan Review
Community Safety – Report from the Local Inspector and Community Safety Officer on Local Police Issues	Update from Minehead Visioning Manager	Shared Services Business Case – Building Control Report	Update on Family Focus Project					Corporate Performance – Quarter 2 2014/15		Financial Standing and MTFP 2015/16 – 2017/18	Corporate Performance – Quarter 3 2014/15
Update Report Minehead Events Group				Financial Monitoring – Quarter 4 2013/14	Financial Monitoring – Quarter 1 2014/15			Financial Monitoring – Quarter 2 2014/15		Service Plans – 2015-2016	Financial Monitoring – Quarter 3 2014/15
Car Park Services Proposed Agency Agreement											
Capital Programme 2014-15											
Section 106 & Planning Obs Review – Report on progress to implement recommendations											

Future items not yet scheduled:

Report Number: WSC 49/14
Presented by: Cllr Karen Mills – Lead Member for Economic Regeneration & Tourism
Author of the Report: Corinne Matthews – Economic Regeneration and Tourism Manager
Contact Details:
Tel. No. Direct Line 01984 635287
Email: cmatthews@westsomerset.gov.uk
Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny
To be Held on: Monday 17th March 2014
Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: Not applicable

MINEHEAD EVENTS PLAN

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with an update on the progress of delivering the Minehead Events Programme during 2013 looking forward to 2014.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 2.1 The events programme does not fit with a specific corporate priority, but it is widely acknowledged that Minehead is a key economic centre for the District, therefore activity that promotes its vitality and vibrancy is a priority for the Economic Regeneration Service.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Scrutiny notes the process and progress made in delivering the programme and recommends any improvements for future delivery where they feel this is appropriate.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
Events funding dries up and potentially events cease to run	3	3	9
<i>Pump prime events on a declining scale for a finite time until break-even point / surplus is achieved.</i>	2	3	6

The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the scoring matrix. Each risk has been assessed and scored both before the mitigation measures have been actioned and after they have.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5.1 Portas Town Team Funding

Members will recall that the Cabinet Meeting of 3 October 2012 considered a report titled 'Our Town First – Town Team Partners (Minehead) that sought funding of £20,000 to establish an events programme for Minehead.

5.1.2 The funding was derived from an allocation of £10,000 from a Government Initiative instigated by the Retail expert Mary Portas, and provided £10,000 for every town that had unsuccessfully bid for the larger £100,000 programme. The other £10,000 came from the Minehead Seaside Strategy fund.

5.1.3 The initial proposal for utilising this funding for an events programme had been put forward by the Minehead Vision Group (who had also submitted the Portas application) and it was aligned to the MVG Action Plan priority of improving the vitality and vibrancy of the Town as well as further promoting the area to visitors. Minehead Town Council was also supportive of instigating high impact events, especially for those run in out of season months where foot fall to the Town needed boosting.

5.1.4 The aim was to pump-prime new events and support existing events to ensure that to the 'outsider' there was a seamless programme of all year around activity taking place in Minehead.

5.2 Event Programme Business Plan

The Cabinet Report was accompanied by an outline business plan (attached as Appendix A) that stated the following objectives, in respect of investing in an events programme to deliver economic development outcomes.

- Increase footfall to town centre businesses in economically challenging times (outside of main tourism season)
- Actively promote Minehead as a vibrant destination that has events taking place all the year around
- Grow the number of 'quality' high volume and high 'earning' events.
- Add value to existing events, and extend events over more than one day to encourage over-night stays.
- Grow the capacity of a Minehead Events Group to share the workload, and strategically plan and oversee activity.
- Enable the Events Group to become a constituted body with financial accountability.
- Work towards an events programme reaching financial breakeven point within three years.

5.3 Review of the 2013 Programme

The first full calendar year for the new events programme was 2013, and many positive outcomes can be reported, these included

- High profile event held in February 2013 (Winter Festival) that increased footfall to Town Centre traders and other activities (i.e. 1610, Regal Theatre, Minehead Eye, WS College Catering)
- New harbour festival event held that received a positive response from the traders in Quay Street and the local community.

- Summer Festival was affected by poor weather, but attracted a large crowd.
- Grant funding was applied for and won for the Blenheim Gardens Band Concerts.
- Income and expenditure in-line with business plan projections.

Planned	Delivered
4 new major events	2
4 Current events supported	4
Co-ordinated marketing plan to support all events	0

- 5.3.1 There were also some challenges associated with delivering the programme, which can be summarised as follows
- 5.3.2 Whilst a draft project plan was established, its successful implementation relied on the Minehead Events Group taking ownership and responsibility for key elements. The Group which had previously come together as a loose / informal gathering of organisations, businesses and voluntary / charitable groups were reluctant to become constituted and take overall control of the strategic plan. It became apparent that their strength was in meeting to share ideas, volunteers and potentially add value to specific events, but they had no desire to collectively run an annual programme.
- 5.3.3 There was also an identified need for the Group to take responsibility for all the ‘back office’ functions that are associated with running events which includes insurances, road closures, licences, marketing and promotion etc. However, the Group resisted taking on this wider role, and thus the responsibilities fell to one or two individuals. This lack of a cohesive plan did lead at times to some short-comings in relation to overall communications, which in turn, at times, resulted in some disenfranchisement of key stakeholder groups.
- 5.3.4 That the back office function was also undertaken ‘behind the scenes’ led to some event organisers remaining ignorant of the true costs of event management, and not recognising that the back office function should be proportionally spread across the entire programme. It is estimated that the organisation of the 2013 programme resulted in some 40 days of work for one or two key individuals, as well as infrastructure costs of £6.6K
- 5.3.5 The lack of a constituted group also led to some difficulties in respect of payments and receipts. Because there was no separate bank account for an Events Group, the District Council paid many invoices directly, and the income was paid in locally to the Minehead Information Centre, who also paid some invoices. The expenditure and income accounts have been successfully reconciled, but it is not ideal to have a Local Authority paying a large number of invoices ranging from large (in the case of the hire of the ice-rink) to the very small. It should also be noted that if the Local Authority collects income, there is a VAT charge of 20%, therefore the income is decreased by that amount. Though it can be argued that large items of expenditure paid for by the Local Authority can result in the VAT element being absorbed within the round, but there are many other event related costs that are not inclusive of VAT, leading to complications when the profit and loss accounts are being accounted for against individual events. It should also be noted that guidance from the Association of Town centre Management (who oversee the Town team Portas projects) advise that Local Authorities in being the holder of the funding, should make the financial accounting as easy as possible for Community led Groups who are delivering the activity.

5.3.6 Regular reports of the progress of the 2013 Events Programme were made to MVG. Though because of the situation, where one event concludes, and planning for the next must start, it proved difficult to obtain a strategic overview of the programme as a whole until the autumn. At the end of November 2013 a Review Meeting was held comprised of Cllr Karen Mills, Cllr Paul Grierson (the West Somerset Council nominee to the Minehead Events Group) and Michael Downes the Treasurer for Minehead Development Trust (who also oversees the accounts for Minehead Information Centre). At this meeting the events programme for 2013 was examined and its strengths and some of the perceived weaknesses reviewed. It was broadly felt that whilst the Events Programme was pleasingly largely performing to the predictions of the initial business plan, there were some specific elements that required further thought and rationalisation. The Group made the following recommendations to MVG:-

- That a Sub-Group of MVG was formed that took responsibility for the ‘back office’ function of the events programme, and established a strategic framework with the function of
 - Developing the 2014 Events Programme
 - Approved the budget for the year
 - Invited ideas from external event organisers
 - Established a marketing and promotional strategy.

This approach was endorsed by MVG with Cllr Mills, Lillis & Grierson (WSC), a MTC Member (subsequently agreed as Cllr Thomas), Graham Sizer (MDT / Chamber of Trade), Jill Homewood (MIC) and supported by Officers from the WSC Economic Development Team.

5.4 **Winter Festival 2014**

The Group embarked on the organisation of the 2014 Winter Festival, which was held during the February Half Term. The Group met to plan the event, and thereafter to review and to start planning for the next two major functions, namely the Harbour and Summer Festivals.

5.4.1 Each Member of the Group took on specific responsibility for managing key elements of the Winter Festival, and roles and responsibilities were divided up, so that no one person felt too over whelmed or was left with most of the work. It was also recognised that some members of the Group had more knowledge of event management and logistics than others, and that this expertise needed to be learnt and specific knowledge disseminated amongst the wider membership.

5.4.2 In respect of lessons learnt from comparing the 2013 Winter festival to the 2014 event. The following was noted:-

- Devolving the responsibilities meant that several took on a variety of roles, rather than just one or two individuals, and decision making was collective, thus far more joined-up and collaborative.
- The Chamber of Trade was successful in bringing in £1,000 of private business sponsorship.
- The Event was successful, and whilst not breaking even, the gap funding was a £1,000 for 2014 as opposed to £2,500 for 2013. Although interestingly whilst costs had been reduced, and some welcome sponsorship achieved, the numbers using the ice-rink were similar to last year.

- In 2014 the weather had been better during the Half Term break, so it would have been expected that participant numbers would have increased, but that was not the case.
- In 2013 the marketing expenditure had been higher, and a campaign that ensured that all school children across the District had received publicity, as well as proactive localised publicity (bus shelter adverts) might have given the event a higher profile.
- From both events 2013 and 2014 it was evident that businesses located close to the Ice Rink (held in Wellington Square) and the Regal Theatre had reaped the benefits of the event all having seen a demonstrable increase in foot fall within local cafes and pubs and sell out performances at the Regal for their Puppet Theatre (where prior to 2013 the uptake had been far less than that). Therefore from a wider economic development perspective these are very much the value added impacts we would wish to see.

5.4.3 The conclusions that the Events Group drew from this analysis were two fold.

(1) That the Winter Festival could well be an event that the Chamber of Trade would want to organise in its entirety for 2015 and continue to encourage business sponsorship.

(2) That Organisations such as the Regal Theatre, Minehead Eye, local businesses would see a benefit in collaborating with the Strategic Minehead Events Programme to add value to their respective activities and support the far wider marketing and promotion of a varied tourism / community offer for Minehead.

(3) That the Winter Festival required a far lower subsidy than it had in 2013, that the Chamber of Trade were considering on taking on the event in its entirety next year, feeling that it could become break even in its third year.

Conclusions

5.5 The Sub-group of MVG very much see their role as a caretaking one for 2014. They recognise that as a group they have a relatively steep learning curve to encompass in relation to all the intricacies of event management, and are ensuring that they use the Minehead Information Centre event management role to learn from. They are also looking towards up-coming events such as the Harbour Festival (which was very successful for those Quay Street businesses during 2013) to see how they can move those events to a totally sustainable / independent business led footing in future years.

In addition to this they are exploring the potential for new income raising events that will both add value to the overall tourism offer in Minehead, and will generate income to continue to inject funds into the overall Events Plan. This will enable a pot of on-going events funding to gap fund worthy events that can demonstrate an economic impact, but still require some on-going support. These are most likely to be events that happen outside of the main tourism season, but are very important for the vitality and vibrancy for the town centre of Minehead, during the difficult months of the year. Clearly this means that there remains a role for a public / private sector supported events group with some on-going subsidised support, but that the over- arching responsibility for a Minehead Events Group in the future could be to simply support new events until they are able to demonstrate their economic worth and become fully sustainable.

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The table below provides an account of the expenditure to date, as well as the original business plan predictions.

Expenses		
Difference		
Actual Expenditure 2013	£ 15,248	-£ 5,252
Predicted Expenditure (in business plan) 2013	£ 20,500	
Income		
Actual Income 2013	£ 7,095	-£ 2,905
Predicted Income (in business plan) 2013	£ 10,000	
Budget Left		
Budget left held by WSC	£ 11,275	£ 12,347
Budget left held by MIC	£ 1,072	
Total Budget Left		
Actual Total Budget Left for 2014	£ 12,347	£ 2,347
Predicted budget left (in business plan) for 2014	£ 10,000	

7. COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 The Authority has previously agreed a sum of £20,000 to be earmarked for the delivery of projects through the Minehead Events Group.
- 7.2 Having looked at the figures in detail referred to above, it can be confirmed that a balance of £12,347 remains unspent as at the end of 2013.

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

Members need to demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.

The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

8.1 There are no specific implications for this report.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no specific implications for this report.

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Regular reports in relation to the Events activities are submitted to Minehead Vision Group. The new Group has a representative of both Minehead Town Council and the Minehead Chamber of Trade.

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no specific implications for this report.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no specific implications for this report.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are no specific implications for this report.

Report Number: WSC 48/14
Presented by: Chris Hall, Assistant Director Operational Delivery
Author of the Report: Chris Hall, Assistant Director Operational Delivery
Contact Details:

Tel. No. Direct Line

Email: c.hall@tauntondeane.gov.uk

Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny Committee
To be Held on: 17 March 2014
Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: Not applicable

CAR PARKING SERVICES – PROPOSED AGENCY AGREEMENT FOR CAR PARK

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek authority to enter into an agency agreement whereby Somerset County Council would provide enforcement and some of the management services for West Somerset Council (WSC) car parks.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 2.1 The report proposes sustainable, economic and resilient arrangements for the enforcement and management of West Somerset Council car parks whilst maintaining local democracy and accountability in West Somerset.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:
- (a) Note the business case for entering an agency agreement with Somerset County Council.
 - (b) Note that some functions carried out by West Somerset Council staff would transfer and that the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations would apply to the relevant staff.
 - (c) Recommend that Cabinet authorise the Chief Executive to enter into an agency agreement for parking enforcement and management services with Somerset County Council.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
West Somerset Council may lose income and service levels may be compromised if car parks are not effectively enforced and managed.	Unlikely 2	Moderate 3	Low 6
<i>The proposed agency agreement would use the countywide service to provide flexible capacity when required for effective enforcement and management.</i>	Unlikely 2	Minor 2	Low 4
That an agency agreement might tie West Somerset Council in to car park enforcement and management service that is not appropriate or affordable in future.	Unlikely 2	Moderate 3	Low 6
<i>The proposed agency agreement allows flexibility in enforcement deployment levels and allows changes to the guidelines at any time. To protect the service there is a minimum deployment condition set at an agreed level at the outset.</i>	Unlikely 2	Minor 2	Low 4
That West Somerset Council might lose control of enforcement and management decisions with a negative effect on accountability.	Unlikely 2	Moderate 3	Low 6
<i>Under the proposed terms of the agency agreement, the car park enforcement and management services would be carried out in accordance with West Somerset Council's own guidelines. Branding on correspondence and signs would show West Somerset Council and a protocol would be agreed whereby appropriate issues are referred to WSC officers for decision.</i>	Unlikely 2	Minor 2	Low 4
That the TUPE and HR processes may be challenged during or after the consultation which may could in turn lead to legal action.	Unlikely 2	Moderate 3	Low 6
<i>Consultation with staff and UNISON is taking place on the Business Case and potential TUPE situation.</i>	Unlikely 2	Minor 2	Low 4

The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the scoring matrix. Each risk has been assessed and scored both before the mitigation measures have been actioned and after they have.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 5.1 West Somerset Council has made a shared service delivery agreement with Taunton Deane Borough Council. However Taunton Deane's car park enforcement service is provided through an agency agreement with the County Council. Somerset County Council has made this agency agreement available for West Somerset Council to join.
- 5.2 In June 2012 Somerset County Council established a parking service to provide civil parking enforcement and related services. Taunton Deane Borough, Sedgemoor District and Mendip District Councils all entered into agency agreements with the County Council to provide parking enforcement in their car parks. At the time West Somerset Council for financial reasons, chose to continue the existing in-house arrangements for management and enforcement of the car parks (Cabinet report WSC 3/11 refers).
- 5.3 Since June 2012 it has been a challenge for West Somerset Council's in-house team to provide an appropriate level of service with the limited number of officers available. During the weekends of August and September 2013 the County Council has assisted by providing additional cover at weekends.
- 5.4 A number of service delivery options have been considered and are shown at Appendix A. The preferred recommendation is for West Somerset Council buying in to the County Council's parking service, retaining a minimum in-house client function to manage the car park infrastructure and to advise on parking charges and policy.
- 5.5 At the Corporate PAG held on 18 February 2014, an overview of the report was given which received a good response.

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The business case shows a potential annual saving of circa £39k per annum (to include any potential redundancy costs identified). This saving is possible because enforcement officers are already deployed on street by Somerset County Council and those same officers can enforce the car parks. Officer time is only charged when they are deployed in a car park, penalty charge notice (PCN) processing costs are only incurred once a PCN is issued. A copy of the business case is included as Appendix B.
- 6.2 There are a small number of tasks that are carried out by the WSC Parking Services Team that are not included in the agency agreement with Somerset County Council. It would be necessary to resource those tasks within the Joint Management and Shared Services Project.
- 6.3 The current and proposed patrol routines are shown at Appendix C.
- 6.4 As this proposal is unrelated to the joint management and shared services project with Taunton Deane Borough Council, any one off costs will be funded by WSC with all cost reductions being a benefit to WSC.
- 6.5 It should be noted that the final negotiations relating to the transfer of employees have not yet been carried out, should these negotiations result in the transfer of fewer numbers of employees there would be a need for this Authority to seek a redeployment or redundancy option for those member of staff.
- 6.6 If this were to be the case then the in year savings would be reduced, but there would still be a financial benefit in year one and achievement of the full saving from 15/16 onward.

SERVICE DELIVERY OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 6.7 A table showing the service delivery options considered together with their advantages and disadvantages is included as Appendix AER.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED SERVICE

- 6.8 Details of the service are set out in Appendix A and Appendix B.

TRANSFER OF UNDERTAKINGS (PROTECTION OF EMPLOYMENT) REGULATIONS (TUPE)

- 6.9 Existing staff in the West Somerset Council parking service would qualify for TUPE protection should the principle part of their job transfer under the agency agreement. Somerset County Council delivers the enforcement service through a contract with NSL Ltd, a national enforcement service provider. A small SCC client group oversees the contract. They also deal with the more contentious decisions on representations and appeals and advise on policy.
- 6.10 An initial assessment of their activities suggests that the three staff currently employed by West Somerset Council would qualify for transfer to NSL Ltd under the TUPE regulations.
- 6.11 A consultation procedure has been carried out with the staff involved and Unison, the results of that consultation will be reported at the Scrutiny meeting on 16th December 2013. Initial discussions have also taken place between Somerset County Council and NSL Ltd. If the decision is made to enter into an agency agreement with the County Council, individual interviews to discuss the options will take place with the staff involved.

7. COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 The business case shows significant ongoing savings which, if achieved, will help the Council towards its MTFP target.
- 7.2 If authority is granted to enter into this agreement the financial impact will be closely monitored to ensure that savings are maximised.
- 7.3 Any one off costs of the project would have to be met from the savings generated.

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

Members need to demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.

The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

- 8.1 None in the context of this report.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None in the context of this report.

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Consultation has been carried out with potentially affected staff and Unison.

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 This change could potentially provide rental space within the Mart Road depot for either NSL or an alternative organisation.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 None in the context of this report.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 A formal agency agreement would be required to give authority for Somerset County Council to act on behalf of West Somerset Council in the processing of Penalty Charge Notices. This would not affect West Somerset Council's powers to make traffic regulation orders to regulate parking in council car parks and to set parking charges.

Appendix A – Service Delivery Options

Appendix B – Business Case

Appendix C – Patrol Routines

Appendix A – Service Delivery Options Considered

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Recommendation
Retain an in-house capability for car park enforcement.	In house expertise is retained. Existing equipment, procedures and supply contracts would continue.	Existing capacity and cost issues are not resolved. This option would not fit well with shared service provision, as the equivalent Taunton Deane service is provided through the County Council's countywide service provision. It would not resolve the inefficiency of two parking enforcement agencies working alongside each other in West Somerset.	Not recommended.
Outsource with an independent tender for an enforcement service for WSC car parks.	Would test the market. Would allow WSC to choose the form of contract.	Initial assessments suggest that existing staff would qualify for transfer under TUPE regulations. Other functions currently carried out by these staff would have to be absorbed through the shared service provision changes. There would be significant additional costs of preparing tender documents and subsequent ongoing costs for contract management. This arrangement would not resolve the inefficiency of two parking enforcement agencies working alongside each other in West Somerset.	Not recommended.
Buy in to the County Council's parking enforcement service provision.	Financial models show a saving of circa £39,000 per year for the same level of deployment of enforcement officers. Taunton Deane has demonstrated cost savings through adoption of the countywide service. The proposal provides flexible resources from the service provider and access to expertise from County Council staff.	Initial assessments suggest that existing staff would qualify for transfer under TUPE regulations. Other functions currently carried out by these staff would have to be absorbed through the shared service provision changes.	Preferred option.



Parking Services Review

West Somerset Council

BUSINESS CASE

Document Details

Project name	Parking Services Review
Document name	Business Case
Status	Draft
Security	Internal
Date	1 Oct 2013
Version	V 0.1
Author	P Yeomans
Owner	S Watts

Document Revision History

Previous Version Number	Previous Issue dates	Summary of Changes	Changes made by

1. Background

West Somerset Council is undergoing significant re-structuring to reduce costs and protect services.

In June 2012 Somerset County Council established a parking service to provide civil parking enforcement and related services. Taunton Deane Borough, Sedgemoor District and Mendip District Councils have entered into agency agreements with the County Council to provide parking enforcement in their car parks. At the time West Somerset Council chose to continue the existing in-house arrangements for management and enforcement of the car parks.

Since June 2012 it has been a challenge for the in-house team to provide an appropriate level of service with the limited number of officers available. Since August 2013 the County Council has been assisting with additional cover at weekends.

This proposal looks at the option of West Somerset Council buying in to the County Council's parking service, retaining a minimum client function to manage the car park infrastructure and to advise on parking charges and policy.

2. Why the project is needed

Revenue from the Council's car park assets provides an important income stream that supports Council services. Failure to properly manage the car parks and their enforcement would put that income stream at risk.

Reduction of cost is the key driver for a change to West Somerset Council's parking service. The County Council's on-street parking management and enforcement service operates throughout West Somerset. This business case shows how savings can be made; by using the same enforcement officers and management arrangements for both on street parking places and car parks.

Parking enforcement and management of the parking service require specialist knowledge and qualifications. Enforcement officers must be qualified to ensure that enforcement is carried in accordance with the Council's guidelines and complies with the regulations. Cash collection and banking staff must be qualified to meet audit requirements. Challenges and representations must be dealt with properly so that they can be justified if necessary in adjudication. This is not a service that can be temporarily covered by unqualified staff.

Three members of staff currently provide all aspects of West Somerset Council's parking service. The public use the service seven days a week and the need for enforcement or attention to pay and display machines may come at any time. The challenge of providing cover, particularly during times of annual leave or sickness, has proved problematic during the past year.

3 Project Description

The proposal requires that West Somerset Council enters into a similar agency agreement to that currently in place between Somerset County Council and Taunton Deane Borough, Sedgemoor District and Mendip District Councils.

Elements of the service, the proposed management arrangement and the proposed charging mechanisms are summarised below.

Service elements to be provided by Somerset County Council

Service	Provision	Charges
Enforcement officers	SCC through the contract with NSL	Hourly rate, only payable when deployed in a car park
Penalty notice processing	SCC through the contract with NSL	Price per PCN correctly issued
All enquiries about penalty notices	SCC through the contract with NSL	Included
Penalty notice appeals and day to day policy interpretation	SCC through the Parking Services Manager	Annual fee
Bailiff service and debt recovery	SCC through the Parking Services Manager	Included
Cash collection and banking	SCC through the contract with NSL	Price per collection
Pay and Display machine maintenance	SCC through the contract with NSL	Annual price per machine. Replacement parts and vandal damage extra at cost

Service elements to be delivered by West Somerset Council

Service	Provision	Charges
Season ticket and permit issue	West Somerset Council Customer Services	
Setting car park prices	West Somerset Council, with advice from SCC Parking Manager	In house, advice included in annual fee
Setting enforcement, challenges and representations policy and guidelines	West Somerset Council, with advice from SCC Parking Manager	In house, advice included in annual fee
Provision of car park	West Somerset Council,	In house, advice

infrastructure, car park surface, signs, lines, boundaries, replacement machines.	with advice from SCC Parking Manager	included in annual fee
Response to politically sensitive challenges (communication protocol to be agreed)	West Somerset Council, with advice from SCC Parking Manager	In house, advice included in annual fee

Dulverton

West Somerset Council's car parks in Dulverton are subject to a lease agreement and are managed by Dulverton Town Council. It is assumed that this arrangement will continue so the Dulverton car parks have not been included in the financial assessment.

Existing staff and TUPE

If it is decided that this proposal is worthy of further development, detailed consultation will be carried out with staff and union representatives for the staff in the parking service.

As this proposal involves exiting functions moving to a different service provider, West Somerset staff in the parking service would qualify for transfer under the TUPE regulations if most of the work they are currently doing transfers. This would be subject to detailed analysis during a transfer process.

4. Benefits

The proposal would bring the following benefits

- Cost savings compared to current arrangements
- A sustainable service operating to specified quality standards, drawing on resources of the County Council and a national service provider
- Detailed service monitoring and reporting facilities
- Availability of the Parking Service Manager's expert advice
- Shared processes and procedures, simple for the public to understand

5. Benefits realisation

Some of the cost benefits would be realised as soon as the service transfers, through the reduction of directly employed staff. Other benefits would come on stream as the service develops, through alignment with other services in the County and opportunities to use new developments such as cashless parking.

Detailed monitoring arrangements have been established within the County Council's existing agency agreements, including direct on-line access for each Council at any time to the management systems. The County Council

provides monthly reports on all aspects of the service and progress is discussed at monthly joint meetings. West Somerset Council would receive reports tailored to specific needs, or could generate its own reports from the system for audit purposes.

The agency agreements include facilities for regular service reviews. The intention is to take advantage of the latest service and technological developments to provide service improvements and to continue to reduce costs.

6. Costs/ resources/ timescales

The following table sets out a detailed comparison of annual costs.

	Draft Budget 2014/15	1 st April-30 June 2014	1 st July-31 st March 2015	Possible Budget 2015/16
Salaries	£81,000	£20,250	£0.00	
NDR	£66,000	£66,000		£66,000
Maintenance	£15,000	£1,000	£14,000	£15,000
Equipment	£4,000	0.00		
Signs	£3,800	£500	£3,300	£3,800
Uniform	£500	0.00		
Ticket Machines	£16,000	£1,000	£10,000	£10,000
Rent	£500	0.00		
Coin Counting machine	£1,000	0.00		
Ticket Machine sim cards	£3,500	£875	£875	£3,500
DVLA Enquiry SERVICE	£100	£15		
Meter Tickets	£6,500	£1,000	£5,500	£6,500
Secure cash collection	£3,000	£800		
Vehicle expenses	£4,500	£1,350		
Electricity	£800	£200	£600	£800
Chipside (This is IT budget)	£1,6000	£381		
SUB TOTAL	£207,800	£93,371	£34,275	£105,600
Patrol time			£29,192	£39,956
Cash collections			£4,958	£7,600
Meter Maintenance			£8,789	£8,789
Penalty processing		*	£4,875	£6,500
Total	£207,800	93,371	£82,089	168,445
			£32,340	£39,355

- * This figure will vary on the amount of fines issued
- This exclude Dulverton and Kilve Beach car parks

Project Costs

6. Investment appraisal

The proposal shows significant ongoing cost savings and a positive return within the first year. This proposal is unrelated to the joint management and shared services project with Taunton Deane Borough Council, as such any one off costs will be funded by this Authority. All cost reductions will also be to the benefit of West Somerset Council.

It should be noted that the final negotiations relating to the transfer of employees have not yet been carried out, should these negotiations result in the transfer of fewer numbers of employees there would be a need for this Authority to seek a redeployment or redundancy option for those members of staff.

If this were to be the case then the in year savings would be reduced, but there would still be a financial benefit in year one and achievement of the full saving from 15/16 onward.

Appendix C

1st April - 31st October

CURRENT PATROL TIME							
1st April - 31st October							
Week 1	M	T	W	TH	F	SA	SU
Minehead	60	60	60	60	60		
Porlock	45	45	45	45	45		
Dunster	45	45	45	45	45		
Watchet	45	45	45	45	45		
Williton	45	45	45	45	45		
Kilve							
Beach	30	30	30	30			
Depot/driving	180	180	180	180	180		
Total Minutes	450	450	450	450	420	0	0
	37 Hours per week						

1st April - 31st October							
Week 2	M	T	W	TH	F	SA	SU
Minehead	60		60		60	60	60
Porlock	45		45		45	45	45
Dunster	45		45		45	45	45
Watchet	45		45		45	45	45
Williton	45		45		45	45	45
Kilve							
Beach	30				30	30	30
Depot/Driving	180		180		180	180	180
Total Minutes	450	0	420	0	450	450	450
	37 Hours per week						

	PATROL TIME UNDER SCC						
	M	T	W	TH	F	SA	SU
Minehead	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Porlock	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Dunster	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Watchet	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Williton	30	30	30	30	30	30	
Total Minutes	300	300	300	300	300	300	270
	341/2 Hours per week						

1st November -31st March

		PATROL TIME UNDER SCC						
		1st November - 31st March						
Week 1		M	T	W	TH	F	SA	
Minehead	120	60	60	60	60	60	60	
Porlock	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
Dunster	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
Watchet	30	45	45	45	45	45	45	
Williton	120	30	30	30	30	30	30	
Depot /Driving	120							
Total Minutes	360	195	195	195	195	195	195	
		22.25 Hrs per Week						

		CURRENT PATROL TIME						
		1st November - 31st March						
Week 1		M	T	W	TH	F	SA	SU
Minehead	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	
Porlock	30	30	30	30	30	30		
Dunster	30	30	30	30	30	30		
Watchet	30	30	30	30	30	30		
Williton	120	30	30	30	30	30		
Depot /Driving	120	120	120	120	120	120		
Total Minutes	360	360	360	360	360	360	0	0
		30 hours per week						

		CURRENT PATROL TIME						
		1st November - 31st March						
Week 2		M	T	W	TH	F	SA	SU
Minehead	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Porlock	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Dunster	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Watchet	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Williton	120	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Depot /Driving	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Total Minutes	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	360
		30 hours per week						

Report Number: WSC 46/14

Presented by: Councillor Kate Kravis, Lead Member for Resources & Central Support

Author of the Report: Paul Fitzgerald, Assistant Director Resources

Contact Details: Steve Plenty

Tel. No. Direct Line: 01984 635217

Email: sjplenty@westsomerset.gov.uk

Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny Committee

To be Held on: 17th March 2014

Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: Not Applicable

CAPITAL STRATEGY AND PROGRAMME 2014/15

1. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek the views of Scrutiny Committee on the temporary interim strategy used to influence the drafting of the capital programme for 2014/15 and the subsequent results.

2. **CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

- 2.1 The draft capital programme contains proposed capital expenditure on the transition costs in relation to sharing services with Taunton Deane Borough Council.

3. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That the Committee refer their comments on the temporary interim strategy used to draft the capital programme for 2014/15 and the programme itself to Council for their consideration on 26th March 2014.

4. **RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)**

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
There are no key risks associated to the recommendations in this report	N/A	N/A	N/A

5. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 5.1 The current capital strategy and programme was approved by Council on 20th February 2013 as part of the budget setting process. A key part of this strategy concerns the approach to funding the capital programme and states that it will be through **(a)** the disposal of land and buildings, **(b)** by maximising third party contributions from grant funding or private sector investment and **(c)** the use of borrowing, as a last resort, in accordance with the Prudential Code and with full regard of the impact on the revenue budget.

- 5.2 In addition the strategy makes it clear that the Council will not assume the use of any ongoing revenue funding to support the capital programme during 2013-16, other than one-off use of earmarked reserves that have been historically set aside from revenue sources.
- 5.3 Members will be aware that a £3.5m loan from the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) was repayable last month (February '14), the original intention being to use capital receipts received from the sale of assets to fund the repayment. Unfortunately, the disposals of the assets in question have, for various known reasons, been delayed and as a consequence a six month temporary loan of £3.5m was sourced to finance the repayment. This approach is thought to be crucial in that it provides time to establish a medium to long term strategy where the management of debt complements the capital financing strategy. The intention is for members of the finance team to work with Cabinet to produce a 'joined up' strategy that can then be widely considered through the democratic process, including Corporate PAG, Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet and Council.
- 5.4 With this in mind and until a refreshed strategy emerges it is thought prudent that the initial capital programme for 2014/15 is minimal and only contains schemes that are either **(a)** externally funded, **(b)** a legal requirement, **(c)** a statutory duty / assisting the delivery of a statutory service, **(d)** resolving a health and safety issue or **(e)** be a commitment previously approved by Cabinet or Council. **Table 1** below contains details of those 'bids' that meet this criteria, whilst those bids that are at this stage considered to be an aspiration are detailed in **Table 2** and will receive further consideration once a refreshed strategy has been approved.

Table 1 – Essential Capital Bids

Capital Scheme	Detail of Scheme	Proposed Funding Source		
		Capital Expenditure (£)	Capital Receipts (£)	Grants (£)
Dulverton Mill Leat / Weir Structure	Contribution to the reconstruction of Dulverton Weir	Exact amount will depend on the accepted tender.		
Microsoft Licence	Final payment of 'Enterprise Agreement'	13,636	(13,636)	
Watchet Harbour	Impounding Wall – Pile Bracket Fixings	19,100	(19,100)	
Watchet Harbour	Impounding Wall – Precast Concrete Column Units	27,000	(27,000)	
Watchet Harbour	Replacement Ladder	3,000	(3,000)	
Street Cleaning Vehicle	Purchase of small sweeper P316	48,000	(48,000)	
Street Cleaning Vehicle	Purchase of medium 7.5T vehicle	90,000	(90,000)	
CCTV	Installation of CCTV system (Watchet)	65,000	(10,000)	(55,000)
Disabled Facilities Grants	Provision of Grants	183,782		(183,782)
Shared Service Costs With TDBC	ICT Transformation Costs	135,000	(135,000)	
IT Hardware Replacement Programme	Desktop and Server Replacement Program	31,000	(31,000)	

Seaward Way (Housing Land)	Disposal costs (excludes potential overage costs)	20,000	(20,000)	
Seaward Way (Leisure Land)	Disposal costs (excludes potential overage costs)	16,000	(16,000)	
Former Aquasplash Site	Disposal Costs	13,900	(13,900)	
Former Visitor Information Centre	Disposal Costs	4,200	(4,200)	
Townsend Farm	Disposal Costs	3,000	(3,000)	
	Total	672,618	(433,836)	(238,782)

Table 2 – Aspirational Capital Bids

Capital Scheme	Detail of Scheme	Potential Funding Source		
		Capital Expenditure (£)	Capital Receipts (£)	Grants (£)
Disabled Facilities Grants	Provision of Grants	80,000	(80,000)	
Decent Homes Grants	Provision of Grants	40,000	(40,000)	
Tourist / Community Bookshop	Replacement Doors / Windows	3,000	(3,000)	
Blue Anchor Hotel	Coast Protection Scheme	25,000	(25,000)	
Car Parks	Upgrade Solar Machines	2,000	(2,000)	
Public Conveniences	Invest to Save	40,000	(40,000)	
Coast Protection	Environment Agency Bid Writing	3,000	(3,000)	
Purchase of Dog / Litter Bins	Purchase of 25 Litter Bins	2,000	(2,000)	
	Total	195,000	(195,000)	

- 5.5 Table 3 below provides information regarding the availability of capital resources to support the essential bids, and the potential balance available if all projected capital receipts and capital grants are realised before the end of 2014/15 financial year. This is explained further in the Financial/Resource Implications section of the report below.

Table 3 – Estimated Capital Resources Available

	Useable Capital Receipts (£)	Capital Grants Unapplied (£)	Capital Grants Receipts In Advance (£)
Balance Brought Forward 1 April 2013	1,295,534	214,335	213,112
Capital Receipts/Grants Income Received in 2013/14	153,906	468,167	350
Capital Receipts/Grants used to fund capital costs in 2013/14	(645,028)	(418,144)	(60,849)
Balance Carried Forward 31 March 2014	804,412	264,358	152,613
Capital Receipts/Grants confirmed to be received in 2014/15		183,782	
Estimated Capital Receipts/Grants used to fund proposed Essential capital costs in 2014/15	(433,836)	(287,982)	
Balance after financing of Essential capital costs	370,576	160,158	152,613
Estimated Net Capital Receipts from to be completed sale of assets during 2014/15 (net of best estimate of overage costs)	3,916,300		
Potential Balance Carried Forward 31 March 2015	4,286,876	160,158	152,613

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 As shown in Table 3 above, there is a projected unallocated capital receipts balance of £804,412 available at the start of 2014/15. The draft programme assumes that £433,836 of this sum is needed to support the essential schemes next year, leaving an **unallocated balance of £370,576**.
- 6.2 Table 3 also provides an estimate of predicted future capital receipts in respect of the Aquasplash site, Seaward Way and Townsend Farm. The amount shown is net of a best estimate of potential overage payments where applicable. The projected balance of capital receipts after essential schemes have been funded is therefore in the region of £4.3m. However this balance will not be known with certainty until the value of final sale proceeds and disposal costs are confirmed. Members have previously agreed a strategy to set aside income from future capital receipts to repay the current external loan funding of £3.5m. If all assumptions and estimates are accurate, including the timing of future asset disposals, there will potentially be sufficient funds to support some or all of the aspirational schemes if these meet Members' priorities.
- 6.3 There is also a projected balance Capital Grants available at the start of the year of £264,358. The known grant income for next year of £183,782 relates to funding from Government in respect of Disabled Facilities Grants. After funding the recommended essential schemes next year there is a projected balance of capital grant funding of £312,771, based on information held in the Council's finance system. This mainly represents uncommitted balances from developer contributions (e.g. Section 106

Agreements). The split in Table 3 identifies a projected 'Unapplied' grants balance of £160,158 which relates to contributions without restricted conditions on use, and a projected balance of £152,613 which relates to contributions with restricted conditions on use. The Planning Obligations Group (POG) would consider schemes to be funded from these balances, for consultation and recommendation with Members through to Full Council for approval.

7. COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

7.1 As highlighted in the 'Background Information' section of this report, it is proposed at this stage that Members consider approval of essential schemes for the initial Capital Programme for 2014/15, and consider that they are satisfied with the allocation of schemes between essential and aspirational. The proposals have recently been considered and supported by the Asset Management Group. Further consideration and consultation with Members on the prioritisation and affordability of future schemes, including those identified as aspirational schemes earlier in this report, would then follow with a view to providing a further update during 2014.

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

Members need to demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.

The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

8.1 There are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Although there are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report the scheme to install CCTV in Watchet will, if ultimately approved for inclusion in the programme, have a positive impact on crime prevention and possibly crime detection.

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report.

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Although there are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report the draft programme includes financial provision for the maintenance of assets thus prolonging their life and well as for costs associated with the disposal of assets.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Although there are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report there are schemes in the draft programme such as Dulverton Weir and the replacement street sweeping vehicles that, if ultimately approved for inclusion in the programme, will have an environmental impact.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are no implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report.

Report Number: WSC 50/14

Presented by: Sam Rawle, Scrutiny & Performance Officer

Author of the Report: Sam Rawle, Scrutiny & Performance Officer

Contact Details:

Tel. No. Direct Line 01984 635223

Email: sjrawle@westsomerset.gov.uk

Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny

To be Held on: 17th March 2014

Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: Not applicable

SECTION 106/PLANNING OBLIGATIONS REVIEW – UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATIONS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with an update on the progress made in responding to the recommendations arising from the Scrutiny review of the Section 106 & Planning Obligations review.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 2.1 There are no direct links to the Council's existing corporate priorities.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Members note progress made on implementation of the recommendations.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
Risk – The key risk is that adopted recommendations are not implemented and therefore weakening the key role of Scrutiny to drive improvement in services	(3)	(2)	(6)
<i>Mitigation</i> – The Scrutiny review process includes the monitoring of the implementation of recommendations and regular reporting back to the Scrutiny Committee.	(1)	(1)	(1)

The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the scoring matrix. Each risk has been assessed and scored both before and after the mitigation has been actioned.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 5.1 This report sets out the progress made in responding to the recommendations arising from the Scrutiny review of the section 106 and planning obligations process.
- 5.2 Appendix A of this report sets out the scrutiny recommendation, Cabinet response and progress with regards to implementation of those recommendations adopted by Cabinet.

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Details of any significant resource and financial implications linked to the Scrutiny recommendations will be referenced against the relevant recommendation within the table at Appendix 1.

7. SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTS

- 7.1 No comments received.

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

Members need to demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.

*The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for:*

- *Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation*
- *Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it*
- *Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it*

- 8.1 There are no direct implications associated with the recommendations in this report

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None directly in this report

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 None directly in this report

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 None directly in this report

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 None directly in this report

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 None directly in this report

Cabinet Response to Scrutiny Recommendations & Action Plan

Review of Section 106 Agreements and Planning Obligations

Submitted to Cabinet: 5th June, 2013

Scrutiny Recommendation	Cabinet Decision	Action arising from decision	Lead Officer(s)	Progress/Status
<p>That relevant Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils be notified as soon as an application that is likely to require a Section 106 agreement is received to enable a review of priorities to be undertaken to inform negotiations accordingly.</p>	<p><i>That relevant Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils be notified as soon as an application that is likely to require a Section 106 agreement is received to enable them to comment as part of their response to the planning application.</i></p>	<p>All Ward Members are automatically notified via email with a link to the application documentation once it is registered. Heads of Terms or a draft S106 agreement are required before an application is registered and so Ward Members can access this information via the link alongside all of the other planning documents. The relevant Parish and Town Councils are formally consulted on the same information and can comment as part of their consultation response to the application. Planning Officers will take account of any comments and a refreshed list of priorities when they negotiate with developers and set out their position as part of their report to the Planning Committee.</p>	<p>Planning Officers</p>	<p>The automatic emails and consultations to Town and Parish Councils are in place therefore this recommendation has been completed.</p>

That relevant Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils are notified on receipt of Section 106 monies as soon as is reasonably practicable.	Recommendation adopted	Parish/Town Clerks are emailed and Ward members copied in when we received an Expression of Interest or Full Application.	Angela Lamplough	The process has been implemented therefore this recommendation has been completed.
That officers ensure that the previous recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee relating to Ward Member consultation requiring that Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils, as key consultees, are involved in discussions, as appropriate to establish need prior to negotiations commencing, and be kept informed of progress, are followed.	<i>That officers ensure that the previous recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee relating to Ward member consultation requiring that Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils, as key consultees, are involved in discussions, as appropriate to establish need, and be kept informed of progress, are followed.</i>	As above, consultation with Ward Members and Town / Parish Councils are in place. Where further clarity and discussions are needed to match priorities with the development this will take place on a case by case basis.	Planning Officers	Ongoing
That a community profile be developed to ensure that priorities are justifiable and evidence based, with focus on those areas most likely to be affected by development.	Recommendation adopted	Profile for Minehead is in draft format and is with Andrew Goodchild at present. The plan is to further develop community profiles for other areas.	?	On hold until new structures are in place and this work can be passed to and completed by the appropriate officers.
That the current application process be amended to the effect that Expression of Interest forms are withdrawn from the Council's website and provided on demand to ensure applicants are encouraged to discuss proposals with relevant	<i>That the current application process does include the Expression of Interest form to be published on the Council's website, with the wording and process to be determined by officers.</i>	Additional wording has been added to the Expression of Interest Form to stress the need for applicants to discuss project proposals with the relevant parish/town council. The guidance notes also reiterate	Angela Lamplough	Completed.

Town and Parish Councils at an early stage.		the need to discuss projects with the relevant parish/town council. The Expression of Interest Form is accessible on the Councils website.			
That a robust and closely monitored process to collect Section 106 monies is followed to ensure that any outstanding monies are actively pursued.	Recommendation adopted	That Planning Officers, Building Control Officers and the Planning Enforcement Officer monitor developments (primarily 'starts' on site) and that any overdue payments are pursued	Planning Officers	Ongoing	
That consideration be given to including supplementary information relating to Section 106 monies that are included in agreed planning applications before receipt of funds, as part of the regular financial information made available to Members.	That consideration be given to including available supplementary information relating to Section 106 monies that are included in agreed planning applications before receipt of funds, as part of the regular financial information made available to Members.	The Planning Obligations Group are considering a caveat to be used with the publication of any available supplementary information so that it is clear that Section 106 monies included in agreed planning applications will only materialise should the development come to fruition.	Angela Lamplough	In progress	
That consideration is given to undertaking a review of the Supplementary Planning Document as soon as it is practically possible to ensure that it remains up to date and reflects current circumstances.	Recommendation adopted	Given the background context of the shared service arrangements it will be advisable to consider the West Somerset and Taunton Deane current approaches and decide whether there is a benefit from producing a single document.	Tim Burton	On hold until a new structure and responsibilities are established and in place.	
That the current guidance notes relating to Section 106 funding are	Recommendation adopted	Guidance notes and relevant forms have been updated.	Angela Lamplough	Completed	

<p>updated to reflect the changes in procedure following the agreed recommendations of this review.</p>				
<p>That consideration be given to any observations reported to Scrutiny Committee by members of the Task & Finish Group following their attendance at the June meeting of Planning Obligations Group.</p>	<p><i>That Scrutiny Committee are invited to submit any observations following the one-off attendance by members of the task and Finish Group at the June meeting of the Planning Obligations Group.</i></p>	<p>Task & Finish Group Members attended the September meeting of the Planning Obligations Group. Following this meeting recommendations were submitted to the December meeting of Scrutiny Committee.</p>		<p>Completed</p>
<p>That the possibility of parish/town councils using Section 106 monies in neighbouring towns/parishes where its use could provide a benefit to the said parish/town, be investigated.</p>	<p>Recommendation adopted</p>	<p>As above, consultation with Ward Members and Town / Parish Councils is in place. Where further clarity and discussions are needed to match priorities with the development this will take place on a case by case basis. Where it is appropriate to consider a neighbouring Town / Parish Councils priorities where those priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • Directly related to the development; and • Fairly and reasonably 	<p>Planning Officers</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

			related in scale and kind to the development		
		This will be done on a case by case basis.			
Recommendations following attendance at Planning Obligations Group (POG) Submitted to Informal Cabinet 8th January, 2014					
That when considering project applications and the allocation of funding, consideration be given to as wide a range of project applications as is appropriate within the scope of the Section 106 agreement and that the process be reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee, in approximately, 6 months' time.	Recommendation adopted	Additional checks are in place to ensure that this happens. All applications are assessed against a check list of required information.	Angela Lamplough	On-going	
It is noted that the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Central Support attends the meeting as any subsequent reports are in their name. That consideration be given to the Shadow Portfolio Holder also attending on a similar basis to ensure political balance and obviate the potential for the perception of any undue influence on the process by any individual Member.	Recommendation adopted on the basis that substitutes would not be allowed should the Shadow Portfolio Holder not be available to attend.	Shadow Portfolio Holder has been invited to the next POG meeting.	Angela Lamplough	Ongoing quarterly meetings.	