

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Committee: Cabinet **Date:** 14 June 2018

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping **Time:** 7.30 - 8.45 pm

Members Present: C Whitbread (Chairman), S Stavrou (Vice-Chairman), N Avey, A Grigg, H Kane, A Lion, J Philip and S Kane

Other Councillors: N Bedford, L Burrows, G Chambers, S Heather, L Hughes, J Share-Bernia, D Stocker, B Vaz, J H Whitehouse, R Bassett, D Dorrell, M Sartin, H Whitbread and J M Whitehouse

Apologies: G Mohindra

Officers Present: D Macnab (Acting Chief Executive), D Bailey (Head of Transformation), Q Durrani (Assistant Director (Technical Services)), P Maddock (Assistant Director (Accountancy)), T Carne (Public Relations and Marketing Officer), G Woodhall (Senior Democratic Services Officer), S Mitchell (PR Website Editor)

1. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Leader of Council made a short address to remind everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the internet, and would be capable of repeated viewing, which could infringe their human and data protection rights.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Pursuant to the Council's Member Code of Conduct, Cllr J H Whitehouse declared an interest in item 12, Receipt of Petition – Future of Epping Sports Centre, by virtue of being a member of Epping Sports Centre. The Councillor had determined that her interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the issue.

(b) Pursuant to the Council's Member Code of Conduct, Cllr N Avey declared an interest in item 13, Corporate Plan Key Action Plan – Outturn 2017/18, by virtue of being the Chairman of Epping Town Council. The Councillor had determined that his interest was not pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration for the issue.

3. MINUTES

Decision:

(1) That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet, held on 10 April 2018, be taken as read and signed by the Leader as a correct record.

4. REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

There were no verbal reports made by Members of the Cabinet on current issues affecting their areas of responsibility.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE CABINET

The Cabinet noted that no public questions or requests to address the Cabinet had been received for consideration at the meeting.

6. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee reported that the following items of business had been considered at its meeting held on 17 April 2018:

- (a) a short presentation, followed by a question-and-answer session with A Whitehead for the East of England Ambulance Service;
- (b) a review of the Youth Council's request for £8,000 to fund their current projects; and
- (c) an update on progress with the Transformation Programme.

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported that the following items of business had been considered at its meeting held on 4 June 2018:

- (a) written answers from County Cllr Gooding on Passenger Transport issues as he had withdrawn from attending a few days before the meeting;
- (b) a presentation on the West Essex and Eastern Hertfordshire Digital Innovation Zone; and
- (c) resolved to invite Epping Forest College, Essex County Highways, Essex County Mental Health Services and representatives from Stansted Airport to future meetings of the Committee.

The Cabinet's agenda was reviewed but there were no specific issues identified on any of the items being considered.

7. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 22 MARCH 2018

In the absence of the Finance Portfolio Holder, who had tendered his apologies for the meeting, the Leader of Council presented the minutes from the meeting of the Finance & Performance Management Cabinet Committee, held on 22 March 2018.

The Cabinet Committee had made recommendations to the Cabinet concerning the update of the Corporate Risk Register. Other issues considered by the Cabinet Committee included: the Quarter 3 performance of the Key Performance Indicators during 2017/18; and the Quarterly Financial Monitoring reports.

Decision:

Risk Management – Corporate Risk Register

- (1) That the Risk Owners for Risk 4, Finance Income, Risk 6, Data/Information, Risk 8, Partnerships, and Risk 11, Transformation Programme, be updated;
- (2) That the Key Date and Required Further Management Action for Risk 3, Welfare Reform, be updated;
- (3) That the Required Further Management Action for Risk 11, Transformation Programme, be updated;
- (4) That Risk 1, Local Plan, be reviewed by the Acting Chief Executive and Planning Portfolio Holder; and
- (5) That, including the amendments above, the revised Corporate Risk Register be approved.

Reasons for Decision:

The Cabinet was satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all of the relevant issues.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

The Cabinet was content that the Cabinet Committee had considered all of the relevant options and that there were no further options to consider.

8. ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 19 APRIL 2018

The Portfolio Holder for Asset Management & Economic Development presented the minutes from the meeting of the Asset Management & Economic Development Cabinet Committee, held on 19 April 2018.

The Cabinet Committee had not made any recommendations to the Cabinet on this occasion. Other issues considered by the Cabinet Committee included: a progress report from the Economic Development Team; a progress report on the Asset Management Development projects; and a progress report on current developments at North Weald Airfield.

Decision:

- (1) That the minutes of the meeting of the Asset Management & Economic Development Cabinet Committee, held on 19 April 2018, be noted.

Reasons for Decision:

The Cabinet was satisfied that the Cabinet Committee had fully addressed all of the relevant issues.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

The Cabinet was content that the Cabinet Committee had considered all of the relevant options and that there were no further options for consideration.

9. TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT - APRIL 2018

The Leader of Council presented a report outlining the progress made by the Transformation Programme during April 2018, along with the planned actions for May 2018.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that regular monitoring reports on the progress of the Transformation Programme were presented to the Cabinet. This was the monitoring report for April 2018 and covered the progress made for all chartered projects of Medium and High Risk Potential, as well as key aspects of the Transformation Programme. The Cabinet noted that, overall, progress indicators for 'cost' and 'benefits' were Green for the period, The status indicator for 'time' was reported as Amber to highlight that 18 actions (from a total of 110) were overdue on its deadline, when compared with planned timelines. Project and Programme Managers had actions in place to deal with any potential negative effects. Progress would be kept under review and it was anticipated that the status of the majority of these items would return to Green in the next report.

In response to questions from the Cabinet, the Leader acknowledged that 19% of the actions were still outstanding for the current chartered projects, and there would be some extra Officers joining the Transformation Team shortly, but there were a variety of reasons for projects not being on target, not necessarily just resources. In relation to the Pay and Benefits Review project, the Head of Transformation stated that the Council's Management Board had recently discussed the initiation of this project, and it was their view that – given the current capacity of the People Team - it was sensible to defer this project until September when the new Strategic Directors should be in situ.

Decision:

(1) That the progress of the Projects and Programmes within the Transformation Programme for April 2018 be noted, alongside the planned actions for May 2018.

Reasons for Decision:

To inform the Cabinet of the progress with the Transformation Programme, including work streams, programmes and projects.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

No other options were available as failure to monitor and review the progress of the Transformation Programme and to consider corrective action where necessary, could have negative implications for the Council's reputation, and might mean that opportunities for improvement were lost.

10. SERVICE ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

The Leader of Council presented a report on the Service Accommodation Review.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that the Civic Offices had been awarded Grade II Listed Building status in December 2017, which had resulted in the need to undertake further work to complete the Stage 2 Outline Business Case for the Service Accommodation Review project. A Portfolio Holder Delegated Decision had been signed on 8 May 2018 to vary the contract with Pricewaterhouse Coopers to achieve this, at a cost of £72,000 funded from the Transformation budget (formerly the 'Invest to Save' fund). It would take 2 to 3 months to complete the Stage 2 Outline Business Case, which would provide an initial design for preliminary discussions with Historic England. Further work would then need to be undertaken to

gain Listed Building consent from Historic England, alongside the development of plans to be used in the planning application and procurement processes. A further report would be considered by the Cabinet in September 2018, which would make recommendations for the Council's Service Accommodation, based on the Outline Business Case.

When questioned by the Members present, the Leader explained that extra work was required as it was not just the Council Chamber which had been highlighted as part of the listing but also the main Reception and Planning Reception areas as well. Therefore, the Council had to work very closely with Historic England to gain approval for its plans and this was what the extra funding would achieve. If there were any grants available to fund this additional work then the Council would apply, but the Council's approach was considered the most appropriate for what the Council wanted to achieve from the Accommodation Review. It was vital to progress this project as quickly as possible, and if it proved impossible to house all of the Council's staff in the newer Civic Offices building then the Cabinet would have to consider the feasibility of the alternative approaches in September.

Decision:

(1) That the progress with, and the next steps for, the Service Accommodation Review project be noted; and

(2) That £72,000 be allocated from the Transformation Budget (formally the 'Invest to Save' fund) to complete the update of the Stage 2 Outline Business Case.

Reasons for Decision:

To inform the Cabinet of the current progress with, and next steps for, the Service Accommodation Review project, and to agree to allocate £72,000 from the Transformation budget to complete the update of the Stage 2 Outline Business Case.

Completion of the Stage 2 Outline Business Case was required in order to present the Cabinet with sufficient evidence with which to decide whether to continue with proposals to refurbish the Civic Offices.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To halt work on the Review. However, this would impact adversely on both the draft Local Plan and the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

11. RECEIPT OF PETITION - FUTURE OF EPPING SPORTS CENTRE

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Community Services presented a report on the receipt of a petition regarding the future of Epping Sports Centre.

The Portfolio Holder informed the Cabinet that a petition seeking the retention of a Sports Centre in Epping, and containing 1790 signatories, had been received by the Council. The full description of the petition was as follows:

"We petition the Council to keep a sports centre within Epping Town. Not necessarily in the existing location but within the boundary of Epping Town. The reason is to ensure that people who are unable to drive have access to a sports centre (as is currently the case) and to avoid the additional traffic fumes and congestion in Epping Town that an out of town sports centre would generate."

The Portfolio Holder assured the Cabinet that the Council had yet to take any formal decision on the future of Epping Sports Centre, and was currently exploring options to meet the leisure needs of residents. However, the Council's preferred approach would be to ensure that the existing Sports Centre in Epping remained open until any new facilities were provided. The petitioners would be advised of the Council's position.

Cllr J H Whitehouse pointed out that the contract for Epping Sports Centre was only for 5 years, not 20 as was the case for the other three Sports Centres, and the current site had been earmarked for development in the Local Plan. The Acting Chief Executive stated that the contract to manage all four Sports Centres in the District was for 20 years, but the procurement process had included a hypothetical bid for the replacement of Epping Sports Centre. It had been agreed in the contract for the Council to accept the risk for the major structural elements at the Epping Sports Centre, and work had already started on the options appraisal for Epping Sports Centre to be considered at the September meeting of the Leisure Contract Partnership Board. Each option would have an indicative timeline against it when they were considered in the autumn.

Cllr Avey inquired whether the potential increased traffic flows had been considered if the Epping Sports Centre was re-located to North Weald Airfield. The Planning Portfolio stated that such analysis would be undertaken, but also pointed out that the current Sports Centres were not just for the residents of those settlements as other users would drive to use them currently. The Planning Portfolio Holder also reiterated that the decision taken at the special Council meeting in December regarding the draft Local Plan was to not commit to having a Sports Centre in Epping, rather than to not have a Sports Centre in Epping.

The Cabinet welcomed the news that Epping Sports Centre would not close in the immediate future. Cllr Bedford inquired whether the contract would be re-negotiated if it became clear that Places for People would need to make a substantial investment into a new Sports Centre? The Acting Chief Executive stated that this was correct, and the Council also had the option to seek an alternative provider if necessary.

The Leader of Council felt that the discussion had been useful for dispelling myths in the public arena. The District was really lucky to have so many Sports Centres, where many Districts had little or no Sports Centre provision. The Leader also reminded the Cabinet that Waltham Sports Centre had remained open whilst the new Centre was being built.

Decision:

- (1) That the Petition received in support of retaining a Sports Centre within Epping Town be noted;
- (2) That the Petitioners be advised:
 - (a) the Council had yet to take any formal decision on the future of Epping Sports Centre; and
 - (b) at this point, the Council was exploring options to meet the leisure needs of existing and future residents of the local area; and

(3) That the Council's preferred approach would be to ensure that the existing Sports Centre in Epping remained open until any new alternative facilities were provided.

Reasons for Decision:

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, any Petition containing at least 1200 signatories required the relevant Portfolio Holder to submit a report for consideration to the next available meeting of the Cabinet.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

There were no other options available as the petition was simply reported to the Cabinet for noting.

12. CORPORATE PLAN KEY ACTION PLAN - OUTTURN 2017/18

The Leader of Council presented a report on the 2017/18 outturn for the Council's Key Action Plan.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that the Corporate Plan was the Council's key strategic planning document, setting out its priorities over the five-year period from 2015/16 to 2019/20. The priorities or Corporate Aims were supported by Key Objectives and the annual identification of Key Objectives provided an opportunity for the Council to focus attention on how areas for improvement would be addressed, opportunities exploited and better outcomes delivered during the year. The Key Objectives were intended to provide a clear statement of the Council's overall intentions for each year, and were supported by a range of actions and deliverables designed to achieve specific outcomes.

The Leader reported that a range of Key Objectives for 2017/18 was adopted by the Council, at its meeting on 27 September 2016, and at the end of the fourth quarter: 28 Key Actions (56%) had been achieved; 15 Key Actions (30%) were under control; 6 Key Actions (12%) were behind schedule; and 1 Key Action (2%) was pending. Progress in relation to individual actions was reviewed by the Cabinet and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly and outturn basis.

Decision:

(1) That, as part of the Council's Corporate Plan for the period 2015/16 to 2019/20, the progress made with the achievement of the Council's Key Action Plan for 2017/18 at the end of Quarter 4 be noted.

Reasons for Decision:

It was important that relevant performance management processes were in place to review progress against the key objectives, to ensure their continued achievability and relevance, and to identify proposals for appropriate corrective action in areas of slippage or under-performance. This report presented the year-end progress for 2017/18 against the key objectives.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

No other options were appropriate in this respect. Failure to monitor and review performance against the key objectives and to consider corrective action where necessary, could have negative implications for the Council's reputation and

judgements made about its progress, and might mean that opportunities for improvement were lost. The Council had previously agreed arrangements for the review of progress against the key objectives.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Cabinet noted that there was no other urgent business for consideration at the meeting.

14. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

Decision:

(1) That, in accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below as they would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act indicated, and the exemption was considered to outweigh the potential public interest in disclosing the information:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Paragraph Number</u>
16	The Financial Impact of the Inability to Sell Recycling Materials in the Chinese Market	3
17	Implementation of the People Strategy	1

15. THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE INABILITY TO SELL RECYCLING MATERIALS IN THE CHINESE MARKET

The Environment Portfolio Holder presented a report on the financial impact of the inability to sell recycling materials in the Chinese market.

The Portfolio Holder reminded the Cabinet that, at its meeting on 10 April 2018, it had considered a report setting out the difficulties arising from the Chinese Government's decision to ban the import of paper produced by Material Recycling Facilities (MRF) in the United Kingdom. This had resulted in excess paper in the reprocessing market, which in turn had led to a major drop in its resale value, and, as it was a buyer's market, there was an increased focus on quality. Biffa had made significant capital investment in improving their Edmonton MRF, approximately £4.6million, where the recycling materials from the District were processed. Biffa had claimed that the capital and ongoing operational costs amount to £133,680 per annum attributable to the processing costs of the Council's recyclate. In addition, Biffa had asked for an additional £39,000 in relation to historical errors in the way Recycling Unit Index Rate (RIUR) was calculated.

The Portfolio Holder explained that the Council could reject all of Biffa's requests for making a contribution towards these costs. However, there were two risks with this approach:

- (i) Biffa might elect to cease processing materials and recycling materials could end up in landfill; and
- (ii) this would put further significant financial pressure on the Waste Management contract.

The Portfolio Holder explained that specialist advice was obtained by the Council from WYG Environmental Limited, who had considered the options and provided market intelligence to enable Officers to recommend a settlement offer to Biffa. Although the capital investment would benefit the MRF for longer, it was not reasonable for the Council to pay for more than the first ten years of contract. Some of the costs were related to contamination found in the recycling materials, as inadvertently some non-recycling materials had found their way into recycling, and in arriving at the settlement figure the Council had factored in contamination levels.

The Portfolio Holder stated that a settlement of £500,000 split into a one off capital contribution of £200,000 and six yearly payments of £50,000 was considered a fair and reasonable commercial offer; particularly if it was linked to the mitigation of risks on the future market for commodity prices. It was felt that these steps were necessary to guarantee the future stability of the current contract.

The Assistant Director of Neighbourhoods reiterated that one of the reasons for appointing WYG Environmental was to gain access to data from other Councils and judge whether the Council was being treated in a fair and equitable manner. The Acting Chief Executive added that the contract had been procured through a competitive dialogue process which had produced a risk sharing arrangement for recyclable materials between the Council and Biffa. Not many Councils had this sort of arrangement so this Council was achieving good value for money from this aspect of the contract, generating an income of £2.5million for the Council over the first four years of the contract.

The Acting Chief Executive counselled the Cabinet that there was still an underlying question concerning the stability of the contract, and it was necessary to resolve a number of these outstanding issues to provide a fair commercial deal and avoid such requests in the future. It was possible that a further test of the market would be recommended after the first ten years of the contract.

The Acting Chief Executive stated that the risk-reward mechanism aspect of the contract was still in place, so market changes could yet work in the Council's favour. The changes made by the Chinese Government were trying to encourage their population to increase their recycling rate. The Assistant Director of Neighbourhoods added that the Council would benefit when the price of recycling materials rose. However, the price of recycled paper had dropped from £100 to £5 per tonne in the last twelve months, for which Biffa had taken 20% of the loss.

Decision:

- (1) That the background into difficulties in exporting recycling materials to China resulting in significant capital and ongoing investments made by Biffa in their Material Recycling Facility (MRF) to improve and enhance the quality of output materials be noted;
- (2) That the making of a financial contribution be agreed in recognition of the investment made by Biffa which would improve the quality of output materials from their MRF ensuring all of the Council's recycling materials were reprocessed and recycled and nothing was sent to landfill;
- (3) That the following be agreed for payment to Biffa in the total sum of £500,000 over the remaining six years of the contract:
 - (a) a supplementary capital estimate in the sum of £200,000 for 2018/19 be recommended to the Council for approval for the one off capital payment;

- (b) a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum of £50,000 for 2018/19 be recommended to the Council for approval for the first of the revenue payments; and
 - (c) revenue growth bids in the sum of £50,000 per annum for five years starting in 2019/20 be approved for the remaining revenue payments;
- (4) That the Recycling Index Unit Rate (RIUR) of £44.66 for the period from November 2017 to November 2018 be agreed and that the consequential loss of income to the Council of £8,650 in 2018/19 be found from within the budget of the Neighbourhoods Directorate;
- (5) That the Procurement Rules be waived for the appointment of WYG Environmental Limited to assist with the contractual variation to the Waste Management contract with Biffa agreed above; and
- (6) That any opportunities for increasing income across all Council services to mitigate the risk of increased costs to the Council as a result of market fluctuation in income from recycling materials be considered by the Acting Chief Executive.

Reasons for Decision:

To consider options for dealing with Biffa's request for financial support to ensure the stability of the Waste Management contract and guarantee end use of the recycling materials collected in the District.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To refuse to consider the request made by Biffa and enforce the contract. However, the risk with this approach was that if Biffa were unable to recycle all the materials collected then these would have to be sent to landfill or Biffa could, if the losses mounted, decide that they wanted to pull out of the contract and issue a termination notice.

In respect of the Recycling Index Unit Rate (RIUR) the Council had no choice as this was part of the contractual arrangement with Biffa.

16. FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION OF PEOPLE STRATEGY - SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE

The Leader of Council presented a report on the proposed Service delivery structure as part of the further implementation of the People Strategy.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that, in April 2018, it had considered a report which proposed change to the Council's Management Board, as part of the implementation of a new Common Operating Model which would alter the way Council Services were delivered. The recommendations of Cabinet were subsequently endorsed by the Council and the recruitment of the two new Strategic Director roles had commenced.

The Leader stated that the current establishment of 15 Assistant Directors, plus the posts of Head of Transformation and Head of Customer Services would be reduced. In the new structure, it was proposed that each of the eight new service groups should be led by a new Service Director, and to reflect the additional levels of delegated authority and enhanced spans of control it was recommended that the roles were remunerated in the range of £70,000 to £75,000. In the first instance, it

was the intention that a ring-fenced internal recruitment process was undertaken with the current Assistant Directors and Heads of Service, who comprised the Council's Leadership Team. Two requests for voluntary severance from the Assistant Director of Legal Services and the Assistant Director of Housing Operations were received and it was recommended that these requests be granted.

The Leader reported that the implementation of a new Common Operating Model and Management Structure was central to the Council's Transformation Programme in order to ensure that the authority was fit for purpose to meet future challenges. The appointment process previously agreed by the Council of the two new Strategic Director roles was an important initial step towards this objective, and in order to maintain progress, agreement was sought for the next phase of the implementation of the People Strategy, namely the new service delivery structure.

It was pointed out that Finance and ICT were generally mutually exclusive skills, and there was an argument that the specialist skills required for ICT should form its own Service. The Acting Chief Executive acknowledged that the Council would need to retain sufficient Finance and ICT skills to deal with the usual peaks and troughs of the workload demands. However, historically, ICT had always sat within a wider Directorate at the Council. The ICT department would have the necessary resource to deliver the ICT Strategy.

The Cabinet debated whether the Building Control section should remain within the Regulatory & Commercial Services sector, or be moved to the Planning Services Directorate. Arguments were heard for and against the proposal, but the Cabinet eventually voted for the Section to remain within the Regulatory & Commercial Services sector.

It was highlighted that the Service Director for Strategy & Member Services could get confused with the two Strategic Director roles, and the Acting Chief Executive agreed to review this Service Directorate title. The Acting Chief Executive also explained that, as the core activity of the Public Relations team was internal and external communications, it was felt that it would be better served sitting within the Customer Services Directorate. It was also felt that perhaps the name of the Public Relations team could be revised to reflect its core activities.

The Leader stated that the Council had made substantial progress with the Transformation Programme, particularly since February 2018, and it would retain its importance in the new structure. The Acting Chief Executive added that one of the key skills in the shortlisting process for the Strategic Director roles was good change management and a proven track record in managing major projects.

Overall, the Cabinet felt that the proposals was an improvement on the previous structure.

Decision:

- (1) That the proposed new structure in accordance with the Common Operating Model for the delivery of the Council's Services, comprising of the eight new groups as detailed in Appendix 3, be agreed.
- (2)
 - (a) That eight new Service Director posts be created at a salary range from £70,000 to £75,000 to lead each new service group;
 - (b) That the Job Description and Person Specification for the new Service Director roles, contained at Appendix 1 of the report, be agreed;

- (c) That recruitment to the new Service Director posts be commenced on the basis of an internal ring-fence process, comprising the Council's current Leadership Team;
 - (d) That voluntary severance on the terms contained within the report be agreed for the Assistant Director (Housing Operations) and Assistant Director (Legal Services) posts, the costs to be met from the existing District Development Fund budget agreed for the implementation of the People Strategy;
 - (e) That the leaving date for the two post holders be mutually agreed with the Acting Chief Executive, to ensure sufficient management capacity was maintained until the revised arrangements were in place;
 - (f) That, in accordance with the new structure, the vacant Assistant Director (Planning Policy and Economic Development) post be deleted from the establishment, once the current temporary cover arrangements were no longer required to support the development of the Local Plan through the Examination in Public process;
 - (g) That the proposed title for the Service Director of Strategy & Member Services be reviewed to avoid possible confusion with the Strategic Director posts; and
 - (h) That clarification be sought concerning the exact role of the Public Relations Team in delivering internal and external communications, with a potential change of name for the Team to better reflect their role; and
- (3) That a further report be submitted to the Cabinet on proposals for the structure of each individual service group, further to the appointment of the Service Directors and a review of the most efficient delivery model within their new areas of responsibility.

Reasons for Decision:

The Cabinet had previously requested that further reports be submitted, setting out proposals for the future structure of the Council.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To not implement a new Common Operating Model for the management of the Council; however, it would not be possible to achieve the benefits sought through the new Corporate Plan nor the requirements of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

To develop alternative structure proposals; however, this would inevitably lead to delay in delivering service improvements, fail to address current capacity issues at senior management level, and cause uncertainty amongst the Council's workforce.

CHAIRMAN