

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 21 January 2013
5.00 - 7.10 pm

Present: Councillors Brown (Chair), Rosenstiel (Vice-Chair), Boyce, Ashton, Benstead, Herbert and Tucker

Executive Councillors:

Leader of the Council: Councillor Bick

Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources: Councillor Smith

Officers Present:

Chief Executive - Antoinette Jackson

Director of Customer and Community Services - Liz Bisset

Director of Environment - Simon Payne

Director of Resources - David Horspool

Head of Legal Services - Simon Pugh

Head of Corporate Strategy - Andrew Limb

Head of Human Resources – Deborah Simpson

Head of Revenues and Benefits – Alison Cole

Head of Property Services – Richard Egan

Committee Manager – Glenn Burgess

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/1/SR Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Birtles.

13/2/SR Declarations of interest

None

13/3/SR Minutes of the previous meeting

With minor grammatical amendments the minutes of the meetings of 3 October 2012 and 15 October were approved and signed as a correct record.

13/4/SR Public Questions

Ms Jannie Brightman addressed the committee regarding the CBbid Business Improvement District Project (BID) and raised the following points:

- i. From the moment that match funding had been agreed the BID was a 'done deal'.
- ii. Despite strong opposition to the BID, the committee had voted it through on the Chair's casting vote.
- iii. The figure of 24% in support of the BID could easily have been made up from the universities, the Grand Arcade and the owners of empty shops.
- iv. Since the vote, a number of independent shops in the City Centre had been forced to close.
- v. The tragic fate of the high street had been further emphasised by the number shops and businesses going into liquidation.
- vi. The cloning of the high street was of great concern.

Ms Jill Eastland addressed the committee regarding the BID and raised the following points:

- i. The BID would have an adverse impact on vulnerable members of the community.
- ii. The City Council had been undemocratic in the way that it had dealt with the BID.
- iii. The BID would result in a few wealthy businesses having control of the City Centre. Local residents would have less input into any decisions regarding the City Centre.
- iv. The City Council had invested £20,000 in the BID before it was even agreed.
- v. Asked for confirmation that no additional funding would be provided to Love Cambridge or the BID.
- vi. More information, in a clear and simple format, was needed on the City Council's budget and ongoing priorities.
- vii. The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for the BID had been inadequate, and suggested that EqIA's should be completed for the Council's overall budget.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded and made the following comments:

- i. No additional funding would be given to Love Cambridge as it had been disbanded. As part of the BID there was a liability as part of the levy of £42,660.
- ii. Agreed that budget information presented in a clear and simple format was beneficial.

The Director of Resources responded and made the following comments:

- i. Whilst the City Council did strive to make budget information as clear and simple as possible there was a requirement to present significant amounts of of the finer detail. However an easily understandable overview of the information was important, and he agreed to take the comments into account in reviewing report formats.
- ii. Whilst an EqlA was included as part of the Budget Setting Report (BSR) at appendix 5, it covered a large range of services and projects and each of these major areas would also produce individual detailed EqlAs as appropriate.

In response Ms Jill Eastland made the following comments:

- i. The City Council's budget was confusing due to its lack of detail and suggested EqlA's on the individual areas of the BSR.
- ii. Suggested a 'buddy' system whereby the budget is shared with a member of the public to ensure that it is clear and understandable.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources responded and made the following comments:

- i. Agreed to discuss options with the Director of Resources for presenting the budget information in a clearer format.

The Director of Resources responded and made the following comments:

- i. Whilst the EqlA at appendix S of the BSR covered individual areas of the budget, he would be happy to liaise with Ms Eastland outside of the meeting if she had any further queries

13/5/SR Record of Urgent Decisions taken by the Leader of the Council and the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and ResourcesCity Council Appointment to the Horizons Board

The decision was noted.

13/6/SR Recommendation to extend the current Council Bank Contract**Matter for Decision:**

The Council's main bank contract is currently run by HSBC Bank plc. and the initial five-year contract period is due to expire on 31 March 2013. Whilst considering options for extension of this contract, HSBC, in discussions with the Council, has indicated its willingness to freeze the current tariffs for the duration of any extended period. Executive Councillor approval is required to extend this contract for more than one year.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Approve the extension of the current Money Transmission contract for a period of three years and to authorise the Director of Resources to conclude the necessary contractual arrangements.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

In response to a question from Councillor Herbert the Director of Resources confirmed that the Council had commissioned an independent review, by Focus on Banking, of the HSBC contract and the current market. The review had concluded that the contract rates were favourable and that the Council should seek to extend the contract for a longer period.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations unanimously.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/7/SR General Debts - Bad Debts to be written off

Matter for Decision:

Write off of debt deemed not to be collectable and require passing for write off. The amounts relate to general income.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Write off 1 debt as summarised in the exempt 'Appendix A' to officer's report.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from Head of Revenue and Benefits.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/8/SR Irrecoverable debts to be written off**Matter for Decision:**

Write off of debt deemed irrecoverable.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Agree the debt write off deemed irrecoverable as shown in the exempt Appendix 'A' of officer's report.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Director of Resources.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/9/SR Cowley Road Landholding**Matter for Decision:**

As part of the new Cambridge Science Park Station access is required over City Council land in several areas, key being a small strip of land at the end of Cowley Road without which the station will not proceed. There will be significant economic, social and environmental benefit from the station. Given these benefits and the uplift in value of the Council's neighbouring land from the station, it is considered that rights of access for the station should be granted at nominal value. Access for other development will be by negotiation at a later date.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Approve the grant of a right of way to Network Rail across Cowley Road on the terms as outlined in paragraph 3.9 of the officer's report.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Head of Property Services.

Councillor Rosenstiel confirmed that this was an important step by the City Council in helping to facilitate the new station.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and approved the recommendations unanimously.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/10/SR Living Wage

Matter for Decision:

Consideration of the Council's approach to the Living Wage for staff, agency workers and contractors engaged through the Council's procurement processes.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Endorse the proposal to pay the Living Wage for Cambridge City Council staff, by way of a supplement to current pay rates.

- ii. Endorse the proposal to pay the minimum of the Living Wage to agency workers after 4 weeks of their engagement with the City Council.
- iii. Agree to a review within 12 months of the proposal to pay the minimum of the Living Wage to agency workers after 4 weeks of their engagement and for any changes to be proposed for the 2014 Pay Policy Statement.
- iv. Encourage contractors to adopt the Living Wage through the Council's procurement processes.
- v. Include the recommendations of this committee, as they relate to staff and agency workers, in the Council's proposed Pay Policy Statement, to be considered by Civic Affairs on 30th January 2013.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Head of Human Resources.

In response to a question from Councillor Herbert the Executive Councillor confirmed that, whilst the Council were fully committed to encouraging all contractors to adopt the Living Wage, there might be certain legal restraints. Legal advice had been taken and each contract would have to be looked at on its own merits.

In response to a question from Councillor Rosenstiel the Head of Legal Services confirmed that he had seen the recent advice of the Local Government Information Unit and officers had been in discussion with Islington Council regarding their approach.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations unanimously.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/11/SR Customer Services & Resources Portfolio - Revenue and Capital Budgets 2012/13 (Revised), 2013/14 and 2014/15**Matter for Decision:**

The report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Customer Services & Resources Portfolio. The report compared the proposed 2012/13 Revised Budget to the budget as at September 2012 and detailed the budget proposals for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Decision of the Executive Councillor:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

Review of Charges:

a) Approve the proposed charges for this portfolio's services and facilities, as shown in Appendices B1 – B3 of the officer's report.

Revenue Budgets:

b) Approve, with any amendments, the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix A of the officer's report) and the resulting revised revenue budgets for 2012/13 (shown in Section 3, Table 1 of the officer's report) for submission to the Executive.

c) Agree proposals for revenue savings and unavoidable bids, as set out in Appendix C of the officer's report.

d) Agree proposals for bids from external or existing funding, as set out in Appendix D of the officer's report.

e) Agree proposals for Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as set out in Appendix E of the officer's report.

f) Approve the budget proposals for 2013/14 as shown in Section 3, Table 2, of the officer's report for submission to the Executive.

Capital:

g) Seek approval from the Executive to carry forward resources from 2012/13, as detailed in Appendix G of the officer's report, to fund re-phased capital spending.

- h) Approve capital bids, as identified in Appendix H of the officer's report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.
- i) Confirm that there are no items covered by this portfolio to add to the Council's Hold List, for submission to the Executive.
- j) Approve the current Capital & Revenue Projects Plan, as detailed in Appendix J of the officer's report, to be updated for any amendments detailed in (g), (h) and (i) above.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Director of Resources.

In response to questions from Councillor Herbert the Director of Resources and the Executive Councillor confirmed the following:

- i. The original decision to retain a vacancy within internal audit was due to a shared service agreement with Peterborough City Council. As the identified employee cost savings for 2013/14 (reference S3025) were relatively small it was deemed important to retain the flexibility of the service.
- ii. Net retail income for commercial property for 2012/13 has been increased by £50,000 reflecting rent reviews, renewals and new lettings. In some instances this includes retrospective amounts, which is why the ongoing effect (shown in S3012) is for a lesser amount.
- iii. Interest rates (RB3244) relates to an update to the projection in respect of 2012/13 reflecting latest information, including the effects of additional sums for investment due to slippage. Future year projections will not include one-time effects in 2012/13.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/12/SR Cambridge Community Safety Plan 2011-14 Update for 2013-14**Matter for Decision:**

In order to keep the Cambridge Community Safety Plan current it is updated on an annual basis following production of a Strategic Assessment. The Leader is asked to consider the plan and endorse the chosen priorities.

Decision of the Leader:

The Leader resolved to:

- i. Endorse the proposed priorities and amendments to the Community Safety Plan agreed by the Community Safety Partnership and set out in section 3.1 of the officer's report.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Director of Customer and Community Services.

In response to the report Councillor Herbert made the following comments:

- i. Highlighted the importance of ongoing informal dialogue between the City Council and the new Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC).
- ii. Raised concern that the valuable dialogue taking place at Area Committees regarding neighbourhood policing may be at risk, and highlighted the importance of ongoing resident engagement in police priorities.
- iii. The lack of accountability of the Community Safety Partnership highlighted the need for it to be reviewed.

In response to some of the points raised the Leader confirmed the following:

- i. Whilst the Community Safety Partnership was made up of many different partners (not just the City Council), it was important that the views of Councillors be taken on board.
- ii. The Leader had met with the new PCC and emphasised the importance of ongoing dialogue with the City Council. The PCC had attended recent Area Committees and an all member briefing had been suggested.
- iii. Agreed with the need to maintain resident engagement with neighbourhood policing, and highlighted the importance of this being done in partnership with the Area Committees. Confirmed that there had been no indication from the PCC that this neighbourhood approach was under threat.

In response to member's questions the Director of Customer and Community confirmed the following

- i. The PCC had no powers to review or alter how the Community Safety Partnership operated.
- ii. There was no indication that the role of the Probation Service within the Community Safety Partnership would change.
- iii. Due to variations in the way that the police record anti-social behaviour there was a need to look at baseline figures, which would form part of the final Partnership Plan. Some further work was also required on the figures for victim based acquisitive crime.
- iv. Emphasised that, whilst there may be an understandable overlap between neighbourhood and citywide priorities, the police would tackle these issues at different levels.
- v. Funding was available through the Community Safety Partnership to look at joined up projects.

The Leader confirmed that issues raised at Area Committees had formed part of the Strategic Assessment and, as overlaps were expected, work had been done to align neighbourhood and citywide priorities.

Councillor Herbert made the following additional comments:

- i. Welcomed the Leader's comments and highlighted the importance of ongoing dialogue between the Community Safety Partnership and the City Council.
- ii. Highlighted the need for a better means of engaging the wider community on the citywide police priorities.

- iii. Highlighted the need for citywide and area priorities to be brought closer together.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/13/SR Update on Strategic Partnerships and our involvement

Matter for Decision:

The Leader of the Council attends the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (LEP), the residual Board of Cambridgeshire Horizons and the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership. It is part of a commitment given in the Council's "Principles of Partnership Working" that the Council's lead member in each partnership provide his or her scrutiny committee with an annual account of their work.

Decision of the Leader:

The Leader resolved to:

- i. Continue to work with the partnerships (LEP and Cambridge Community Safety Partnership) to ensure that the strategic issues affecting Cambridge and matters of concern to Cambridge citizens are responded to. This includes maintaining the economic success of our area, whilst respecting its unique character, and continuing to address and prevent incidents of anti-social behaviour and crime.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from Head of Corporate Strategy.

In response to a question from Councillor Ashton the Director of Environment confirmed the following:

- i. Horizons had a number of loans and investments totalling over £20m. Whilst none had to date, this should return to the partnership over the next 13 years. Further detail was available to members on request.

In response to a question from Councillor Herbert the Leader confirmed the following:

- i. Whilst, when he first joined the LEP it was in a state of flux and lacked direction, a new Chair was now in post.
- ii. The funds generated by the Enterprise Zone were not likely to be returned to the LEP in the short to medium term.
- iii. The LEP One-Year Operational Plan (2010/13) was in the process of being replaced.
- iv. Consultation on a business prospectus had been completed, and the Leader felt that the success of the LEP was dependent on how realistic and achievable this prospectus was.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/14/SR Mid-Year Treasury Management Report 2012/13**Matter for Decision:**

To update the Council on treasury management activity and performance in the first half of 2012/13 in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Treasury Management Code of Practice. Also to advise the Council on its treasury management practices as required by the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice.

Decision of the Leader:

The Leader resolved to:

- i. Recommend to Council the revised Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators as set out in Appendix 4 of the officer's report, incorporating changes as detailed in section 11 of the officer's report.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from Director of Resources.

In response to a question from Councillor Herbert the Director of Resources confirmed the following:

- i. Following market sector advice the City Council were currently only lending over short-term periods. If the market picked up it was important that the Council be in a position to respond quickly to this, and shorter-term placements allowed flexibility for this.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/15/SR Strategy Portfolio - Revenue and Capital Budgets 2012/13 (Revised), 2013/14 and 2014/15 (Forecast)**Matter for Decision:**

The report set out the overall base revenue and capital budget position for the Strategy Portfolio. The report compares the proposed 2012/13 Revised Budget to the budget as at September 2012 and details the budget proposals for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Decision of the Leader:

The Leader resolved to:

Review of Charges:

a) Note that there is no proposed review of charges requiring approval for Strategy & Climate Change Portfolio services.

Revenue Budgets:

b) Approve, with any amendments, the current year funding requests and savings, (shown in Appendix A of the officer's report) and the resulting revised revenue budgets for 2012/13 (shown in section 3, Table 1 of the officer's report) for submission to the Executive.

c) Agree proposals for revenue savings and unavoidable bids, as set out in Appendix C of the officer's report.

d) Agree proposals for bids from external or existing funding, as set out in Appendix D of the officer's report, if applicable.

e) Agree proposals for Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as set out in the amended Appendix E as circulated.

f) Approve the budget proposals for 2013/14 as shown in Table 2 of the officer's report, for submission to the Executive.

Capital:

g) Approve capital bids, as identified in Appendix H of the officer's report, for submission to the Executive for inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan or addition to the Hold List, as indicated.

h) Confirm that there are no items covered by this portfolio to add to the Council's Hold List, for submission to the Executive.

i) Approve the current Capital & Revenue Projects Plan, as detailed in Appendix J of the officer's report, to be updated for any amendments detailed in (g) and (h) above.

j) Note that there are no project appraisals requiring approval for Strategy Portfolio services.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from Director of Resources, which included the amended Appendix E (Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids) as circulated.

In response to member's questions the Chief Executive confirmed the following:

- i. £80,000 had been allocated in the budget for maternity costs (RB3157) and this was based on staff currently on maternity leave. However spending against this provision, by its nature, was very difficult to estimate.
- ii. The Project Facilitation Fund (RB3236) was originally set up to help facilitate the delivery of capital schemes. After speaking further with departments it has now become clear that the full allocation of funding would not be required and a reduction had therefore been identified.
- iii. The costs associated with the Living Wage (PPF3208) did not include contract-related costs, as these would have to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

In response to member's questions the Leader and the Chief Executive confirmed the following:

- i. Business Improvement Districts (BID's) had not been set up to allow local authorities to reduce their own services and therefore save money. Whilst the City Council may benefit from additional improvements in things such as the street cleaning, the Council's core level of service could not be reduced, as this would be unlawful.

- ii. As part of the BID the City Council had committed to a core level of funding for street cleaning and would bid to undertake additional work for the BID. Whilst this may allow the service to be managed differently and free up efficiencies elsewhere, this level of funding could not be reduced.

To emphasise this point the Director of Environment read out the relevant part of the BID regulations.

In response members made the following points:

- i. Emphasised that by improving the city centre the City Council would then potentially benefit from improved business rates.
- ii. A successful BID could result in there be less irrecoverable debt to write off.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

13/16/SR Budget Setting Report 2013/14

Matter for Decision:

To consider the draft revenue and capital budgets.

Decision of the Leader:

Please note:

All page references relate to the BSR, which can be found at:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/documents/s16428/BSR%20Doc.pdf>

The Leader resolved to:

General Fund Revenue Budgets: [Section 4, page 45 of the BSR refers]

Budget 2012/13:

- a) Approve, with any amendments, the revised budget items shown in Appendix D of the BSR.
- b) Approve, with any amendments, the Non Cash-Limit budget items for 2012/13 as shown in Appendix E of the BSR.
- c) Approve, with any amendments, the overall revised budget for 2012/13 for the General Fund, as shown in Section 4 [page 45 of the BSR refers] and Appendix G(a) of the BSR, with net spending at £22,536,390.

Budget 2013/14:

- d) Agree any recommendations for submission to the Executive in respect of:
 - Bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds as shown in Appendix H of the BSR.
 - Non Cash Limit items as shown in Appendix E of the BSR.
 - Revenue Savings and Bids as shown in Appendix F of the BSR.
 - Priority Policy Fund (PPF) Bids as shown in Appendix I(b) of the BSR – based on the position as outlined in Section 4 [page 45 of the BSR refers].
- e) Note the Council Tax taxbase, as set out in Appendix C (a) of the BSR, as calculated and determined by the Director of Resources under delegated authority.
- f) Recommend to Council the level of Council Tax for 2013/14 as set out in Section 3, page 44 of the BSR refers.

Note that the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel will meet on 7 February 2013 to consider the precept proposed by the Police and Crime Commissioner, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority will meet on 11 February 2013 and Cambridgeshire County Council will meet on 19 February 2013 to consider the amounts in precepts to be issued to the City Council for the year 2013/14.

Treasury Management:

g) Recommend to Council to approve:

(i) the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix P(a) of the BSR and to confirm that the Authorised Limit for external borrowing determined for 2013/14 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003,

(ii) to delegate to the Director of Resources, within the borrowing totals for any financial year within (i) above, to effect movement between the separately agreed figures for 'borrowing' and 'other long term liabilities',

(iii) the Treasury Management Annual Borrowing and Investment Strategies set out in Appendices P(b) and P(c) of the BSR , and

(iv) the Council's Counterparty List shown in Appendix P(c), Annex 3 of the BSR.

Other Revenue:

h) Delegate to the Director of Resources authority to finalise changes relating to any corporate and/or departmental restructuring and any reallocation of support service and central costs, in accordance with the CIPFA Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP).

Capital: [Section 5, page 53 of the BSR refers]

Capital & Revenue Projects Plan: [section 5, page 50 of the BSR]

i) Approve project appraisals that have been referred by Executive Councillors:

Other:

To agree inclusion in the Capital & Revenue Projects Plan of any new items and to note any additional funding for revised schemes approved by Executive Councillors:

- j) Agree any recommendations to the Executive in respect of the bids outlined in Appendix L of the BSR for approval to include in the Capital Plan, or put on the Hold List, including any additional use of reserves required.
- k) Agree the revised Capital & Revenue Projects Plan as set out in Appendix J of the BSR, the Hold list set out in Appendix M of the BSR, and the Funding as set out in Appendix N of the BSR for the General Fund.

Note that the Appendices will be updated in subsequent versions to incorporate approved rephrasing, new bids and the above recommendations.

General Fund Reserves:

- l) Note the impact of revenue and capital budget approvals and approve the resulting level of reserves to be used to:

(i) support the 2012/13 budget

(ii) support the 2013/14 and future years budgets.

as set out in Appendix G(c) of the BSR.

Reasons for the Decision: As set out in the officer's report

Any alternative options considered and rejected: As set out in the officer's report

Scrutiny Considerations:

The committee received a report from the Director of Resources.

In response to member's questions the Director of Resources confirmed the following:

- i. The £2.26m highlighted in the table on page 71 of BSR is part of the overall position for 2012/13. Due to the delay in the production of the BSR it was possible for managers to more accurately identify savings within their service in the current year, having more timely information available.
- ii. Successful delivery of the Capital Programme would result in lower deposit levels for future investments.

Councillor Herbert raised concern that the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee no longer had an opportunity to scrutinise the Medium Term Strategy, and suggested that a more clearly defined financial scrutiny role would be beneficial. It was noted that the Labour Group would welcome input into any future scrutiny or constitutional review in this area.

The Scrutiny Committee considered and endorsed the recommendations by 4 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 7.10 pm

CHAIR