

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 89

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** DRAFT BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY  
COUNCIL CORPORATE PLAN 2015-19

**AUTHOR:** MATTHEW WRAGG

#### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee:

- (i) Approve the draft Corporate Plan 2015-19 and draft Medium Term Financial Strategy; and
- (ii) Direct that the final version of the Corporate Plan 2015-19 and Medium Term Financial Strategy be referred back to Policy & Resources Committee after Budget Council in February 2015, for consideration.
- (iii) At its meeting on 19 March 2015 approve the final version of the Medium Term Financial Strategy; and refer the final version of the Corporate Plan 2015-19 to Council for approval.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

Policy & Resources Committee are recommended to approve the draft Corporate Plan 2015-19 and Medium Term Financial Strategy, which will be brought to Policy & Resources Committee and Full Council in March 2015, once the budget for 2015/16 is agreed.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The Corporate Plan is part of the council's policy framework. Based on previous plans the intention for 2015-19 is to provide a more concise plan with a clearer focus on the council's purpose & ambition and service modernisation and prioritisation to meet the challenges ahead.

This is directly aligned to city principles and priorities agreed in the Sustainable community strategy. Specific options for areas of investment identified in the plan will be developed, with partners and city partnerships, to ensure the best use of overall community, public and private sector resources in the city.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services  
**Signed:**



## **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (i) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (ii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 90

## RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

### POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION

**SUBJECT:** BUDGET UPDATE AND SAVINGS  
2015/16

**AUTHOR:** NIGEL MANVELL

#### THE DECISION

That the Committee: –

- (1) Notes the updated forecasts for resources and expenditure for 2015/16 and an estimated budget savings requirement for 2015/16 based on a range of council tax propositions.
- (2) Notes the approach taken to identifying savings in the context of the council's draft Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (3) Notes the detailed proposals for savings in 2015/16 based on a council tax increase of 5.9%, which would trigger a referendum in accordance with Chapter IVZA of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and associated regulations ("the Referendum Budget").
- (4) Notes options for further savings that could form part of the "Substitute Budget" that would be required in addition to the proposals at 2.3 or alternatively to support a budget based on a threshold rise in the council tax (the "Threshold Budget") or a council tax freeze (the "Freeze Budget").
- (5) Directs that all of the savings proposals be subject to further consultation, engagement and scrutiny alongside the draft Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (6) Notes the indicative allocations of one-off resources for 2015/16 set out in table 1 subject to the identification of sufficient further one-off resources to fund the proposed allocations.
- (7) Notes the update on the HRA budget set out in paragraphs **Error! Reference source not found.** to **Error! Reference source not found.**
- (8) Notes the Capital Investment Programme update set out in paragraphs 3.35 to 3.36.

#### ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The council is under a statutory duty to set its budget and council tax before 11<sup>th</sup> March each year. This report sets out the latest budget assumptions, process and timetable to meet the statutory duty.

#### CONCLUSION

The budget process allows all parties to engage in the scrutiny of budget proposals and put forward viable alternative budget and council tax proposals to Budget Council on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2015. Budget Council has the opportunity to debate the proposals put forward by the Committee at the same time as any viable alternative proposals.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Wall', written over a horizontal line.

### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (iii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (iv) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 91

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **COUNCIL DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW

**AUTHOR:** PETER FRANCIS

#### **THE DECISION**

- (1) Note that the council undertook informal and formal consultation as a part of this review and that as a part of the formal consultation a draft scheme was published and people were invited to give their views on that draft scheme.
- (2) Note the outcome of that consultation as set out in section 5
- (3) Note that an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken on the proposed changes in the draft scheme (appendix 1) which has been summarised in section 7
- (4) Notes that the Executive Director Finance & Resources will, prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015, exercise her delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme, to give effect to national changes.
- (5) That Policy & Resources Committee recommends to Council that:
  - (a) That the changes set out in section 3.17 are made to The Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Persons who are not Pensioners) (Brighton & Hove City Council) 2013 to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.
  - (b) Council note the consequence of the decision in 2.5.1 will mean the option to generate £1.7million through a more widely revised scheme included within the savings proposals elsewhere on this agenda cannot form part of the package for setting the 2015/16 budget and therefore alternative savings proposals will need to be identified. There is no further opportunity to revisit this scheme to support setting the 2015/16 budget.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The recommendations in the report are formed on the basis of:

- Information from the first full year's operation of the scheme which show that the amounts being charged to recipients of CTR are being collected in line with planning expectations and that the vast majority of customers are engaging with the council about their Council Tax issues
- The council has ensured CTR recipients are supported in a number of ways, including the provision of budgeting support; pre-emptive help from the debt prevention team within Revenues and Benefits and the availability of a discretionary fund for people in exceptional circumstances. The council is

continuing to provide finance and budgeting support through the recent commission of the community banking partnership – Moneyworks Brighton & Hove

- The informal consultation, which suggested that the majority of respondents felt it was reasonable that people in receipt of CTR make some contribution to their Council Tax.
- The formal consultation, which suggested that the majority of respondents felt the increase to 25% minimum contribution from 8.5% in one step was excessive.

The EIA and the formal consultation identified issues relating to inherent difficulties in the way the proposals for the treatment of Child Benefit included in the draft scheme would work.

The reduction in funding for CTR should not be seen in isolation. On the one hand for the council it is fundamentally related to broader budget decisions and priorities; and, on the other hand for recipients of CTR it is fundamentally related to the government's other welfare reforms, the cost of living, the performance of the economy and the availability of work.

Under the recommendations listed the council is meeting part of the cost of the reduction of CTR, which in practice means it is being supported by Council Tax and Business Rate payers in part, in addition to the remaining shortfall in funding being made up by working age recipients of CTR themselves.

## **CONCLUSION**

There are a series of requirements prescribed by legislation which must be undertaken in order for a council to make changes to its CTR scheme. These requirements are:

- To consult any major precepting authority which has the power to issue a precept to it.
- Publish a draft scheme in such a manner as it sees fit; and
- Consult such other persons as it considers are likely to have an interest in the operation of the scheme.

A council may not make changes to its scheme unless these measures have been undertaken. Therefore, following the July 2014 Policy & Resources Budget and Corporate Plan preparation report, a programme of work was commenced to meet these requirements in order to enable members to make a decision about whether to make changes to the scheme.

One of the requirements listed above is to publish a draft scheme. Further to the funding position, the analysis of other authorities' schemes (appendix 3) and the responses to the informal consultation held in July and September, the council published a draft scheme in September and ran formal consultation on the scheme, as per the last requirement in 4.1, until the end of October 2014.

A copy of the draft scheme is included in appendix 4

The key features of the draft scheme were:

- Changing the minimum contribution people of working age have to pay towards their Council Tax from 8.5% to 25% of their liability.
- Minimising the maximum detriment any household faces as a result of the first change to £5 per week for a year or until a change in circumstances.
- Changing the maximum amount of savings a person could hold from £16,000 to £6,000.
- Doubling the amount non-dependants are expected to contribute towards the Council Tax before CTR is paid.
- Removing Second Adult Rebate.
- Counting Child Benefit as an income when calculating CTR.
- To increase the earnings disregard for some Disabled people and carers by £10 per week.

Information received from the consultation and analysed as part of the EIA means the proposal to count Child Benefit as an income would no longer be recommended. This is because the proposal could only be implemented in such a way that a proportion of people who receive Child Benefit would be affected which would result in those people being more adversely affected by the changes when compared to people in similar circumstances.

A series of alternative options are set out in the table below which also sets out the level of savings each combination would result in and the remaining subsidy the council would have to supplement the scheme by after taking into account reductions in funding by government. These figures vary from those in the informal consultation because they exclude the fire and police precept elements of Council Tax and make allowances for collections rates. The figures also exclude the provision relating to Child Benefit for the reasons set out in 4.6.

(table 4.8)

alternative proposals			additional resources generated for BHCC			total additional resources generated for BHCC	remaining subsidy required
minimum contribution	transitional protection minimising increases inclusive of CT rises to:	recommendation level of discretionary fund	from minimum contribution	max cost of transitional protection (dependent on CT rise)	cost of increase to discretionary fund		
8.5%			£0	£0	£0	£0	£3,864,000 *
15.0%	£2.50 pw	£150,000	£727,000	-£2,530	-£50,000	£674,470	£3,189,530
25.0%	£5 pw	£200,000	£1,847,000	-£23,250	-£100,000	£1,723,750	£2,140,250 #

\* current position

# draft scheme

The draft scheme also proposed changes which would have meant that some people in work would have been entitled to a greater amount of CTR than they would otherwise. When the CTR scheme was initially introduced the council increased the amount ignored from single people's earnings before it is counted for CTR. The proposals in section 4.5 proposed to extend these measures to disabled people and carers to provide some support from the change in minimum contribution. As such they have not now been included in the main recommendations but would be recommended should the minimum contribution have been increased. The cost of this provision would be approximately £17,000.

In changing a CTR scheme the council must consider whether transitional protection should be applied to people affected by the changes. Should a change to the minimum contribution have been recommended then transitional protection at the rates set out in table 4.8 would also have been recommended. It is not considered that this level of transitional protection is required for people affected by the changes set out in paragraph 3.17 because of the smaller number of people affected. This means that those individuals can be referred to and supported by the discretionary fund where they meet the criteria and as such transitional protection will be provided via this fund. Everyone affected by the changes will be written to and invited to apply so individual circumstances can be taken into account.

The informal consultation asked for opinions on whether the proposals which mean people in work would be better off should be extended to all groups including single people, couples and parents but there was not strong support for this. Other proposed measures to extend run on periods for people moving from benefits to work were not strongly supported and did not form a part of the proposals.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



**CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (v) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (vi) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.



04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 92

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **COUNCIL DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** COUNCIL TAX EMPTY PROPERTY  
DISCOUNTS 2015/16

**AUTHOR:** PAUL ROSS-DALE

#### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee recommends that Council -

- (1) Approves the reduction of the Class C (empty and unfurnished) Council Tax discount to zero (i.e. full withdrawal) with effect from 1 April 2015.
- (2) Approves the reduction of the Class D (uninhabitable) Council Tax discount to zero (i.e. full withdrawal) with effect 1 from April 2015.
- (3) Approves a discretionary Council Tax 4-week discount to cover exceptional circumstances.
- (4) Agree appendix 1 which sets out the formal determinations and decisions for the financial year commencing 1 April 2015 and in subsequent financial years.
- (5) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Finance & Resources to take all appropriate steps to implement and administer the recommendations in 2.1 - 2.3, including the publishing of any related data or information in accordance with statutory requirements.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The grounds for these decisions are outlined in the report.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The budget gap next year is very substantial and therefore all options must be considered carefully. The budget gap leaves no option but to review the money that we do not collect due to discounts being awarded.

The uninhabitable discount could be reduced, rather than removed. A selection of local authorities in our sample check allowed a 50% or 25% discount. However, to keep the discount at any level would cost money that will mean a spending cut elsewhere and an associated impact on council services.

Withdrawal of the discounts could have a potential impact on resourcing the customer service and collection activities of the Council Tax teams, because a large number of new bills, some of them for small amounts, will have a knock on effect on the numbers of people contacting the service. The potential for this to impact on our collection rate has been factored into the savings estimate.

Awarding a nominal 7 day discount for the empty and unfurnished properties was also considered. This would rule out billing for some very small debts and would give only a very modest amount of support. The value to each property would therefore be negligible but would still cost in the region of £0.075m overall. Furthermore, due to the number of empty periods that exceed 7 days, there would still be a large number of bills for small amounts (e.g. if a property is empty for 10 days, it would be necessary to bill for 3 days once the 7 day discount had expired).

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Wall', written over a horizontal line.

### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (vii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (viii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 93

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT  
(TBM) 2014/15 MONTH 7

**AUTHOR:** JEFF COATES

### **THE DECISION**

- (1) That the Committee note the forecast outturn position for the General Fund, which is an overspend of £4.368m. This consists of £4.052m on council controlled budgets and £0.316m on the council's share of the NHS managed Section 75 services.
- (2) That the Committee note that there is a further £1.890m of as yet unallocated risk provision that could be used to mitigate against this overspend.
- (3) That the Committee note the forecast outturn for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which is an underspend of £0.156m.
- (4) That the Committee note the forecast outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Grant which is an underspend of £1.115m
- (5) That the Committee note the forecast outturn position on the capital programme.
- (6) That the Committee approve the capital programme variations and reprofiles in Appendix 3 and new capital schemes in Appendix 4.

### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The Month 7 position, although improved, still shows a significant level of forecast financial risk that must be urgently attended to, particularly in relation to Adult Social Care and Children's Services. The trends on the corporate critical budgets for Community Care and for Looked After Children continue to give cause for concern. While there are some mitigating actions and recovery plans in place it is not clear that these will make sufficient impact on the forecast risk to ensure a break even position at year end

The Executive Leadership Team (ELT) will keep the position under close scrutiny and will take appropriate action to reduce spending, manage vacancies and develop financial recovery plans where necessary.

### **CONCLUSION**

The provisional outturn position on council controlled budgets is an overspend of £4.052m. In addition, the council's share of the forecast overspend on NHS managed Section 75 services is £0.316m. Any overspend at the year end will need to be funded from general reserves which would then need to be replenished to

ensure that the working balance did not remain below £9.000m. Any underspend would release one off resources that can be used to aid budget planning for 2014/15.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



**CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (ix) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (x) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 94

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT 2014/15 (MID YEAR REPORT)

**AUTHOR:** JAMES HENGEVELD

#### **THE DECISION**

- (1) That Policy & Resources Committee endorses the key actions taken during the first half of 2014/15 to meet the treasury management policy statement and practices (including the investment strategy) as set out in this report.
- (2) That Policy & Resources Committee notes that the approved maximum indicator for investment risk of 0.05% has been adhered to and the authorised limit and operational boundary have not been exceeded in the first half of the year.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

Treasury management is governed by a code that is recognised as “best and proper practice” under the Local Government Act 2003. The Code requires a minimum of two reports per year, one of which is required to review the previous year’s performance. This report fulfils this requirement.

#### **CONCLUSION**

This report sets out action taken in the six months to September 2014. Treasury management actions have been carried out within the parameters of the AIS, TMPS and Prudential Indicators. Therefore no alternative options have been considered.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



#### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xi) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 95

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** CORPORATE PROPERTY STRATEGY &  
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2014-2018

**AUTHOR:** ANGELA DYMOTT

### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee approve the Corporate Property Strategy & Asset Management Plan (AMP) 2014-2018 as set out in Appendix 1 of this report.

### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

It is best practice for councils to have an overarching property strategy and asset management plan to ensure the council is making best use of its asset base and achieving value for money. This needs to demonstrate the rationale for continuing to hold certain property assets and show how the property objectives link to the council's corporate priorities, contribute to the budget, improve performance, service delivery, modernisation of the council and provide diverse facilities for the city and enable regeneration.

The decision is required to endorse the adoption of the refreshed AMP 2014-2018 and enables the council to fulfil its commitment to deliver the outcomes for the City and the targets in the action plan.

### **CONCLUSION**

The document is a best practice recommended requirement for all local authorities. It is structured to a format and content aligned to the RICS (Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors) guidelines and to CIPFA (Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy) guidance.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xiii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xiv) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 96

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** 2014-15 - 6 MONTH PERFORMANCE UPDATE

**AUTHOR:** ANDY EDWARDS

#### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee:

- (1) Note areas of highlighted performance and endorse the improvement actions detailed in Appendix 2.
- (2) Support and challenge lead officers across the council to continually improve performance and tackle issues of concern highlighted in the report.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The council must ensure that it uses a robust performance and risk management framework to meets the challenges of delivering services in the financial context that local authorities are now working in.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Through consultation with The Chief Executive, Directors and Heads of Service the proposed Performance and Risk Management Framework was deemed to be the most suitable model.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



#### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xv) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xvi) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 97

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **HOUSING COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** NEW HOMES FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS  
- DEVELOPING NEW HOMES ON  
GENERAL FUND SITES

**AUTHOR:** SAM SMITH

#### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee:

- (1) Note the initial design and viability modelling and agree in principle that each of the following sites is appropriated to the Housing Revenue Account for the development of new housing, subject to Housing and Policy & Resources Committees agreeing a further report detailing the final feasibility and design and associated financial implications:
  - (i) Former library site, Whitehawk Road, Whitehawk, Brighton and,
  - (ii) Wellsbourne site, Whitehawk Road, Whitehawk, Brighton.
- (2) Agree that the Estate Regeneration team, in conjunction with the council's Sustainable Futures strategic construction partnership, undertake final feasibility studies, design and development of new housing on sites (i) and (ii).
- (3) Agree to initial feasibility/viability studies, consultation, analysis and research to identify potential wider regeneration opportunities in the vicinity of site (i).
- (4) Approve the transfer of a sum of £1.3M from the HRA to the General Fund for sites (i) and (ii) for best consideration for the land value (as detailed in paragraph 3.8-3.9) as and when the final scheme is approved by Policy & Resources and the land appropriated to the Housing Revenue Account.
- (5) Agree that the Estate Regeneration team explore opportunities and options for the delivery of new housing on the car parking site at 7-9 Frederick Street with a view to seeking agreement to appropriate the land for housing purposes if suitable housing development is su

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The Estate Regeneration team has continued to explore opportunities to build much needed new homes on council land and to commission initial feasibility and design studies for sites which have potential for council development.

#### **CONCLUSION**

There are none.

**Proper Officer:**



Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Wall', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.

**CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xvii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xviii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 98

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** HOSTELS AND HOMELESS PROVISION

**AUTHOR:** RICHARD DENYER-BEWICK

### **THE DECISION**

- (1) That the Committee note the contents of the report and agree to continue to operate in-house hostels, while the whole system review of the supported housing Integrated Support Pathway is undertaken and future service delivery options are developed.
- (2) That the Committee agree in principle to entering into leases for Glenwood Lodge Project and West Pier Project from April / May 2015, with break clauses not exceeding five years.
- (3) That the Committee agrees to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Adult Services to negotiate and enter into new leases with premises' landlords following consultation with the Executive Directors of Environment, Development & Housing and Finance & Resources and the Monitoring Officer.

### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

There is no other reasonable option but to enter into leases for WPP and GLP while the wider review of homelessness services is undertaken. This plan is felt to be feasible and practically achievable before the end of the financial year. Operating outside of long term leases would be a significant cost pressure for 2015/16. A full review of in house hostel services will take a significant amount of time and resource and is unlikely to be complete before the leases expire. It is proposed that the focus be on reviewing the ISP model during 2015 to ensure this is fit for purpose and to commission services after this review is completed.

### **CONCLUSION**

**Do Nothing:** As an alternative to renegotiating longer term leases at WPP and GLP, the Council could choose to do nothing. The landlords may allow the Council to continue using the buildings, which would allow further time for consideration of future delivery options for services and exploration of any opportunities to use a different range of cheaper or better quality premises. While this option maintains flexibility, the current leases set out the rate to be paid if the properties are not handed back; after a certain time the rates escalate and this is likely to be costly and place a significant budget pressure across the hostel services. There is additional risk that landlords may not wish to allow the council's continued use of the buildings. This could lead to the requirement for the Council to give landlords vacant possession of the buildings, close services and / or re-provide them from alternative locations – the options for sourcing alternative accommodation within these timescales are limited.

**Transfer Services:** There is no requirement for the council to operate its own hostel provision and it might be considered an option to investigate the possibility to transfer provision of all or some of these services to the independent sector through a tender process, as is the case with other hostels commissioned by the local authority. There are no current plans to do this but the option may provide future savings for the authority and could present opportunities to operate the services in different locations or buildings. A full business case would need to be developed in consultation with staff and unions and in accordance with the Councils agreed Change Management procedures. Key stakeholders such as the CCG, SPFT and Public Health would need to be consulted. The better option is to undertake the full review of homelessness services provision in the ISP before making decisions on the future delivery options for in house services.

**Close Services:** Hostel provision itself is a non-statutory function of the local authority so the council could choose to stop delivering these services. However hostels do provide accommodation for some people to whom the council may owe a statutory housing duty; therefore hostels support the effective delivery of a separate statutory function. They also provide an essential accommodation route for rough sleepers and other vulnerable people; hostel provision for the city is an essential part of the current Integrated Support Pathway model, supported by the city's Homelessness Strategy 2014-19. There would be significant crime and disorder implications arising from any decision to reduce hostel provision in the city, including an increase in rough sleeping and associated Anti Social Behaviour. There are implications for members of the public, for tourism and local business with any increase in numbers of people sleeping rough in the city, which would have parallel increases in crime and disorder and antisocial behaviour.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xix) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xx) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 99

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** TRAFFIC SIGNAL & CONTROL  
EQUIPMENT CONTRACT

**AUTHOR:** SEAN POWER

### **THE DECISION**

That the Committee:

- (1) Approves the procurement of a framework agreement for the maintenance, installation and supply of traffic signal and associated control equipment for a term of 4 years.
- (2) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Environment Development and Housing -
  - (i) to carry out the procurement of the framework agreement referred to in 2.1 above including the award and letting of the framework agreement; and
  - (ii) to enter into any subsequent call-off contracts to the framework agreement referred to in 2.1 above should he/she consider it appropriate at the relevant time.

### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

The procurement and award of this framework contract will help the council deliver its priorities to achieve value for money and to provide high quality service in road safety, traffic management and real time traffic information. In approving the procurement and award of this framework contract, the council will enable the means not only to fulfil its statutory duties but also help deliver corporate priorities.

### **CONCLUSION**

Various procurement options have been discussed with Strategic Finance and Procurement and this form of framework, procured through the EU process is considered most suitable.

The option to bring the whole service in-house was considered with the council taking responsibility for all maintenance, installation and emergency response. This option was discounted in part due to the large capital investment that would be required for equipment and facilities. The council also currently has no experience in this very specialised field that consists of electronics, computing, communications and traffic control. It was deemed that the large reorganisation that would be needed to bring the service in-house, including the TUPE of staff from the existing contractor, the establishment of a new management team and the training of staff, did not make this a viable option.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Wall', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.

**CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xxi) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xxii) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

04 December 2014

This record relates to Agenda Item 100

## **RECORD OF POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

### **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DECISION**

**SUBJECT:** ANNUAL SURVEILLANCE REPORT  
2014

**AUTHOR:** JO PLAYER

#### **THE DECISION**

- (1) That the continued use of covert surveillance be approved as an enforcement tool to prevent and detect crime and disorder investigated by its officers, providing the activity is in line with the Council's Policy and Guidance and the necessity and proportionality rules are stringently applied.
- (2) That the surveillance activity undertaken by the authority since the report to Committee in December 2013 as set out in Appendix 2 be noted.
- (3) That the continued use of the Policy and Guidance document as set out in Appendix 3 be approved.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

It is essential that officers are able to use the RIPA powers where necessary and within the threshold set out in the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, but only after excluding all other methods of enforcement. An authorisation will only be given by the relevant 'Authorising Officer' following vetting by the 'Gatekeeper', therefore it is unlikely that the powers will be abused. There is now the additional safeguard of judicial sign off.

The implementation of the Annual review has made the whole process transparent and demonstrates to the public that the correct procedures are followed.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The only alternative is to curtail the use of RIPA, but this is not considered an appropriate step.

**Proper Officer:**

Date: 5 December 2014

Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

**Signed:**



#### **CALL-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come into force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of the meeting at which the decision was taken subject to:

- (xxiii) any requirement for earlier implementation of the decision or,
- (xxiv) the decision being called in for review by 5 Members from two or more Groups represented on the Council.

