EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
NOTES OF A MEETING OF FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2013
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING
AT 7.00 - 9.30 PM

Members Present:	A Lion (Chairman), Mrs R Gadsby (Vice-Chairman), D Jacobs, J Knapman, H Mann, G Mohindra, Ms S Watson and J Wyatt
Other members present:	Mrs A Grigg, Ms S Stavrou, G Waller and C Whitbread
Apologies for Absence:	K Angold-Stephens
Officers Present	J Gilbert (Director of Environment and Street Scene), D Macnab (Deputy Chief Executive), P Maddock (Assistant Director (Accountancy)), P Maginnis (Assistant Director (Human Resources)), J Preston (Director of Planning and Economic Development), S Tautz (Performance Improvement Manager), R Wilson (Assistant Director (Operations)) and A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer)

23. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

The Panel noted that Councillor H Mann was substituting for Councillor Angold-Stephens.

24. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 September 2013 were agreed.

Matters Arising

Councillor Lion asked for an update of the members survey which was suggested by this Panel at the last meeting to be able to justify the additional expenditure on Microsoft licences. The need and the proposed cost of the additional licences was mentioned in the ICT report. Mr Macnab said that a report on this would be brought to the next Panel.

25. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were made.

26. TERMS OF REFERENCE / WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel noted their Terms of Reference and Work Programme.

27. BUDGET 2014/15 - FINANCIAL ISSUES PAPER

The Assistant Director of Finance, Peter Maddock, introduced the Financial Issues Paper. He noted that it had gone to the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee in September 2013. Their comments were recorded in the report. This report provided the framework for the Budget 2014/15 and updated members on a number of financial issues for the medium and short term.

In broad terms the following represent the greatest areas of current financial uncertainty and risk to the Authority:

- Central Government Funding
- Business Rates Retention
- Welfare Reform
- New Homes Bonus
- Development Opportunities
- Reducing Income Streams
- Waste and Leisure Contract Renewals
- Organisational Review

For the 2012/13 outturn it was noted that the CSB was £456,000 lower than the original estimate and £498,000 lower than the revised. The revised CSB estimate for 2012/13 increased from £14.735m to £14.777m with the actual being £14.279m.

Net DDF expenditure for 2012/13 was £594,000 lower than the revised estimate. However £836,000 of this resulted from slippage so both expenditure and financing for this amount has been carried forward to 2013/14, giving a net overspend of £242,000.

The current CSB saving against revised estimate was £0.498m, compared to £0.562m in 2011/12. A significant cause of this under spend was again salary savings, actual salary spending for the authority in total, including agency costs, was some £19.092m compared against an original estimate of £19.526m. There was currently an under spend on the salaries budget in 2013/14 and this was expected to continue, although at a reduced level as approximately £400,000 was removed from the salaries budget through the deletion of vacant posts in setting the 2013/14 budget.

It was noted that we had a vastly reduced Revenue Support Grant and Local Council Tax Support but were now able to retain a portion of local business rates. It could be shown that in three years under the new funding assessment system funding reduced by £1882m or by 25.8% and over a five year period it would have fallen by nearly 60%.

Taking this into consideration it was proposed to reduce the funding to parish councils by 13.6% for 2013/15 and 14.1% for 2015/16; though these amounts need to be seen in the light of the total parish receipts for 2013/14 being just short of £3m.

One other aspect of the new scheme on Business Rates Retention is the ability to pool with other authorities to share risk and possibly reduce levy payments. The DCLG were very late issuing guidance last year and so although most Essex authorities were keen on pooling in principle, no agreements was possible for 2013/14. The possibility of pooling is now being taken forward through the Essex Leaders Strategic Finance Group with the intention of having a pool in place for 2014/15.

It was noted that the collection of Council Tax has been difficult but better than expected.

The Government announced in June that it would continue to provide an incentive for authorities to freeze the Council Tax for both 2014/15 and 2015/16. Additional grant equivalent to a 1% increase in the Council Tax would be available and Councils seeking to raise Council Tax by more than 2% would have to conduct a referendum. From 2016/17 onwards it was assumed that future increases will not exceed 2.5%.

The Heseltine Review (No stone unturned in pursuit of growth) had made 89 recommendations to boost growth and recommended a Local Growth Fund of £80 billion over 4 years. The government claims to be fully supportive of the reports recommendations, although the funding that had been compiled was only £2 billion per year and none of the funding was new money.

In conclusion, the Council was in a stronger financial position than had been anticipated. This was due to the greater level of savings in 2012/13 and reductions through underspent budgets. However, the scale of the challenges ahead was greater now than at any time in the past. Future funding had been hit by reductions in government grant, top slicing of the NHB and a drop in local income streams. There was also the substantial risk that retained business rates could fall either through continued shrinkage in the rating list or through successful appeals.

It was highlighted that the MTFS approved in February 2013 was looking for net CSB savings of £1.3m but the updated version now required an additional £1m to provide £2.3m of savings across the forecast period. If this level of savings was to be achieved, tough decisions would be necessary on fees and charges and the future level of service provision, particularly in discretionary areas.

Councillor Mohindra noted that this report had been to the Finance Cabinet Committee in September. He was concerned that the recommendations of the report were for the Cabinet Committee and not for this Panel. He suggested that we just noted the Cabinet's decision. Mr Maddock said that this was really here for comments or observations.

Councillor Watson noted that the revenue balances shown on page 37 of the agenda, showed a reduction from £9.466m to £6.793m, was that right? Mr Maddock said that it was and that the reserves would go down by an equivalent amount.

Councillor Jacobs noted that as this report had been to the Cabinet, he did not see where we fitted into this. He assumed that we would make a number of savings and noted that there had been suggestions for savings on extra wheeled bins for recyclables. Mr Macnab replied that the intention was to bring forward options to the Council to achieve savings. As for this report he thought that it was right that this Standing Panel receive it at this time.

Councillor Mohindra asked if the potential for pooling with other authorities would be coming back to this panel. Mr Maddock said a more detailed report would go to the December Cabinet. Officers were under the understanding that there may be a savings of about £40 to £60k. Not a large amount. The LGA were appealing to Central Government about improving this scheme.

RESOLVED:

That the Financial Issues Paper be noted.

28. FEES AND CHARGES 2014/15

The Assistant Director of Finance, Peter Maddock, introduced the annual report on the fees and charges that the Council levies and what scope if any there was to increase particular charges.

It was noted that one of the key areas to be revisited was the pay and display charges in the Council's off street car parks. These charges had not been increased for five years. A recent study in 2011/12 predicted that modest changes in the fee structure could boost income by more than £300,000. Pay and Display car parking fees form the largest discretionary income stream to the General Fund. The current income estimate was set at £747,000.

He noted that the medium Term Financial Strategy highlighted the need to identify £2.3m savings as a result of the significant reductions expected in funding from central government.

In recent years the scope to increase fees has become somewhat more limited as government has introduced cost recovery only for some fees or set a maximum level for others. There are also some fees that the government sets that the Council has no control over.

Although Hackney Carriage Operators and Vehicle Licences fees were set, local authorities do have discretion over some licensing fees could therefore be increased where appropriate.

It was noted that although the Council did not provide a trade waste service itself it did need to ensure that a service was available should traders require it. Currently all traders go directly to service providers and deal with them. If a trader was to come to the Council for such a service the Council would arrange for SITA to carry out the trade waste collection at a charge currently of £13.50 per collection; it was proposed that this be increase to £14.00. Similarly the fee charged to schools etc. be increased from £8.50 to £9.00

Councillor Mohindra noted that there was a proposal for a big jump in fees for hardstandings on housing estates. Mr Wilson, Assistant Director Housing, replied that they were proposing a large increase as usually garages placed on these areas were old and in a dilapidated state. This led to complaints and resulted in a disproportionate amount of time spent in seeking to resolve the complaints. Moreover, it was generally felt that the current fee of £29.10 per annum (56p per week) was too low for the benefit that lessees receive, compared to the annual rent for a Council garage of £410.80. For these reasons, it was recommended that the hardstanding fee for next year be increased from £29.10 per annum to £82.00 per annum, representing around 20% of the Council garage rent.

Councillor Jacobs said he did not know how much we needed to increase our charges by as yet as the Panel could not come to a sensible answer without more information. He noted that the table showing the current and proposed costs for bulky household waste (4 to 7 items) had the wrong proposed price listed in that it should be higher than the current price, although it was showing as lower. Mr Maddock agreed and said it should be £34.00 and not £29.

Councillor Watson commented that with such a minimal increases would the administration cost more?

Councillor Jacobs noted that if the council did not increase their charges for some years, then any percentage increase would be all the greater.

Councillor Knapman noted that our only options were to increase our expenditure or drop our income. We should ask how our residents would be better off if we did not increase Council Tax. We are very near the bone in the services we provide, as it was as we have been making savings year on year but not cutting services. We need to get the right balance.

Councillor Lion asked the meeting if there was any fees or charges that the Council did not want to raise. Councillor Jacobs said that we could make some savings on waste but were essentially talking about car parking charges.

John Gilbert, Director of Environment and Street Scene, noted that a small percentage rise would not raise that much income. To catch up on the missing five years missing income we would need to collect another £150k in car parking charges, but we needed to be careful here and look how we generate income. We also have two car parks owned by Sainsbury's and would need their permission to raise charges. There are also some car parks in Loughton that came under the Housing Fund. We need to model savings made or charges increased and to discuss options available.

Councillor Lion asked if there were any views against the raising of car parking charges in the longer term. Councillor Knapman said he would like to keep our free bays. But, if we if we charge 20p instead of 10p then the motorist would not really notice. Unlike other local authorities we seem to be at about a 50/50 split between income and expenditure.

Councillor Gadsby noted that if we increased the car parking charges then we would drive the users to park on the roads; we would then have to pay Highways to put in double yellow lines. It was a no win situation.

Councillor Jacobs commented that we should look at the merits and the parking needs of different areas and we should not compare our area with other places that have big shopping facilities.

Councillor Waller said that parking fees were discretionary. Fees had been frozen for 5 years and it was inevitable that there would be increases but not in all areas. We do have problems meeting current demands for Car Parking with different needs for various parts of the district. We should have variable tariffs according to the location. As we cannot increase the supply of spaces at present we should consider increasing the charges. Demand will go on increasing. He would welcome input from Members – at this stage they had not made up their minds and would welcome view from different areas of the district.

Councillor Mohindra wanted to know about penalty charges and where they went. Mr Gilbert replied that some of it went to NEPP, but we could not amend the charges as they were set.

Councillor Mann spoke as a Loughton resident and said that he was concerned about the increase in charges as Loughton High Street was suffering quite badly and he put a lot of this down to parking charges. Empty shops did not bring in business rates and he would like the increase in car parking charges to be as low as possible.

Councillor Watson said they had to be careful about this as the general trend was to say that the South of the District had the most demand and so would get the higher increase. She was concerned about the local residents who may wish to use local parking and we need to be aware that we cannot keep hitting the same people with rises.

Councillor Knapman was not sure he agreed with that as the council had provided minimal transport for the rural areas. They have to drive into the stations. The problem was undersupply of car parking and road transport. It was a tough call and we needed to get a reasonable return on this. Other things we should look at could be such things as charges for collecting of bulky item. It was not for this Panel to come up with solutions – we can ask officers to look at the problems raised and come back with solutions.

Mr Macnab asked that apart from bulk waste and car parking charges there did not seem to be much in dispute. It seemed that the Panel would like to go for a 50/50 split between increases in fees and cost savings.

Councillor Knapman added that it was better to say we wanted an appropriate balance between increases and cost savings. Once there was a better financial budget view, fees and charges could be reviewed.

RESOLVED:

1) That an appropriate balance be struck in increasing fees and charges and this be reviewed in January 2014.
2) That the Panel were generally supportive of the increases as set out in the report.

29. QUARTERLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT

The Assistant Director of Finance, Peter Maddock, introduced the quarterly financial monitoring report for the second quarter of 2013/14. The report provided a comparison between the original estimate for the period that ended 30 September 2013 and the actual expenditure or income as applicable.

The Panel noted that:

- The salaries schedule showed an underspend of £44,000 or 0.4%. This compared to 2.7% at this time last year.
- Once Housing Services, which is primarily charged to the Housing Revenue Account, and Building Control are removed from the Schedule there is a General Fund overspend of £45,000. This is because the level of vacancies has now fallen below the 2.5% vacancy allowance for the first time in a number of years. This was not surprising given the deletion of approximately £400,000 of vacant posts from the budget for 2013/14.
- Investment interest levels in 2013/14 were slightly below expectations at quarter 2.
- The Council had received £2.360m of the original investment placed with Heritable Bank; this was a recovery of 94.02%.
- Development Control income at Month 6 has recovered well since the first quarter.
- Building Control income was down by £71,000.
- The account was expected to return a deficit of over £30,000 unless there was a drastic improvement in income and soon.

- Hackney Carriage and other licensing income are both below expectations by £7,000 and £6,000 respectively.
- Income from MOT's carried out by Fleet Operations was £18,000 below expectations.
- Local Land Charge income was broadly in line with the prior year and above the original estimate which suggests, as last year, income will exceed budget for the year.
- The Housing Repairs Fund showed an underspend of £364,000. However a larger than average proportion of the expenditure was due to a seasonal fall in the winter months.
- From 1 April 2013 the Council was entitled to a share of business rates collected so monitoring the amount collectable was now more important than ever.

Councillor Knapman noted that he was not a fan of the Council's MOT service. We needed to consider if we needed to keep this, especially if they were moving buildings. Mr Macnab noted that we are now keeping Grounds Maintenance in house and are looking at its continuation towards fleet management. Councillor Wyatt noted that if we had no MOT testing it would cost to MOT our vehicles.

Councillor Gadsby asked if we were trying to cut down our expenditure on B&Bs. Mr Wilson said that we had low numbers of single people in B&B accommodation. These have high management problems and there was nowhere else suitable to put them.

RESOLVED:

That the revenue and capital financial monitoring report for the second quarter of 2013/14 be noted.

30. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2013/14 - QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Performance Improvement Manager, Mr S Tautz, introduced the report on the performance of the Council's Key Performance Indicators for the first six months of 2013/14.

The meeting noted that the KPIs provided an opportunity for the Council to focus attention on how specific areas for improvement would be addressed, and how opportunities would be exploited and better outcomes delivered.

It was noted that:

- 26 (74.3%) of the indicators had achieved the performance target for the first two quarters of the year; and
- 9 (25.7%) of the indicators had not achieved the six-month performance target, although 5 (55.5%) of these KPIs had performed within the agreed tolerance for the indicator.

KPI 11 – *what % of the rent we were able to be paid for our commercial premises was not paid?* – Councillor Knapman noted that this was a reflection on the state of the economy. More comments were needed on what was going to be done about this. Mr Macnab noted that an action plan had been developed and we have now some extra capacity to chase debtors. A further detailed report giving an action plan and commentary on the figures could be arranged.

Action: to receive an updating report.

KPI 12 – *what % of our commercial premises was let to tenants?* – noted that the comments had been reviewed by Management Board. The meeting noted that it was only just missing the target.

KPI 20 – *How much non-recycled waste was collected for every household in the district?* – Councillor Knapman noted that we may miss this by some margin. Councillor Jacobs suggested that the 3rd quarter target was incorrect as it was only 59 above the second quarter but 131 below the 4th quarter. He suggested the figure be adjusted to something like 275. Mr Gilbert noted that there seemed to be recycling fatigue building up in the community. Also our overall waste stream was increasing so our recycling looked less. Once we have a new waste contract in place we can look afresh at this. However, we are still about 11th or 12th in the UK and are looking for improvement.

KPI 32 – *what % of the district's annual business rates was collected?* – The Panel asked for the percentages of those on Direct Debit.

Action: to provide the percentage of those on Direct Debit.

KPI 40 – *what % of the rent due from our council home tenants was paid?* – The Panel noted that this was the first time this indicator had been considered on a quarterly basis as it used to be an annual indicator. This was because it was the only time when a true picture would emerge. The figure provided does not include two direct debit payment dates or tenants who may have paid by cheque or cash at the desk in that period. Officers were presently looking at ways to set up quarterly targets. Also noted that the figure for quarter two should be 95.7% and not 94.56% when taking into account amounts credited in the two direct debit periods referred to.

KPI 41 – *on average, how many days did it take us to re-let a Council property*? – The Panel noted that the Housing Options workload had substantially increased in recent months, the work load should reduce in the next quarter. The online registering facility has also new been introduced. Both of these factors have caused this KPI to suffer.
We have had some home seekers refusing properties offered and one house had been refused six times; others had been refused three or four times. Officers were looking at options to toughen up penalties for refusal and also looking to move from a two week choice based lettings cycle to a one week cycle, with hopefully, a higher turnover. It was confirmed that officers asked applicants to declare their reasons as to why they had refused offers made.

Action: The Panel asked that a report be submitted to the next meeting on the reasons for the refusals for these houses and why some properties were difficult to let.

KPI 50 – *What was the net increase or decrease in the number of homes in the district?* – Councillor Knapman was not sure about the targets set. He was told that this indicator had been around since the beginning. The Council could not count on affordable housing being built and this was what we were reliant on. This indicator was of its time and maybe a new, more meaningful indicator should be developed.

KPI 54 – *What % of planning applications recommended by planning officers for refusal were overturned and granted permission following an appeal?* – The Panel noted just how volatile these figures were when you have a relatively small sample size.

KPI 55 – *What % of planning applications, refused by Council Members against the planning officer's recommendation were granted permission on appeal?* – Again, the Panel noted that this was only about 15 cases and the number of appeals allowed was 10 out of the 15. In previous years members had been close to the 50% target but the last two quarters were higher. Officers would provide training where they could. It should also be noted that these were historical figures as people had up to six months to appeal.

RESOLVED:

(1) That the six month performance for the Key Performance Indicators adopted for 2013/14 be noted;

(2) That the Director of Corporate Support Services make a comprehensive report to the next meeting of the Panel with regard to current performance in respect of KPI 11 (Commercial Premises – Rent), including the identification of appropriate actions to improve performance and achieve the year-end target position;

(3) That the Director of Housing make a comprehensive report to the next meeting of the Panel with regard to current performance in respect of KPI 41 (Housing re-let times), including the identification of appropriate actions to improve performance and achieve the year-end target position.

31. EQUALITY OBJECTIVES 2012-2016 - 2ND QUARTER PROGRESS

The Performance Improvement Manager, Mr S Tautz, introduced the report on progress towards the achievement of he Council's Equality Objectives for 2012 to 2016, for the first six months of 2013/14. The Panel noted that in March 2012, the Cabinet agreed a range of equality objectives for the four years from 2012 to 2016, designed to help the Council meet the aims of the general duty and bring about positive improvements to service design and delivery.

It was noted that in April 2012 the Council adopted four equality objectives for the four years until March 2016 to advance equality for service users and employees. The objectives were based in evidence, proportionate to the organization, and were subject to public consultation. The equality objectives were focused on the following key areas where improvement in relation to equality had been identified as a priority:

Equality Objective 1:	The use of equality intelligence
Equality Objective 2:	Ownership of equality
Equality Objective 3:	Engagement
Equality Objective 4:	The workforce equality profile

The achievement of the equality objectives was supported by an action plan spread across the four year time-frame. Many of the identified actions could only be achieved incrementally or were dependent upon other actions.

It was also noted that a three-year programme of equality analysis concluded in March 2013. The method of reporting relevant equality information to decision-making bodies had been replaced with a 'Due Regard Record', and this was currently the subject of a pilot exercise that was to run until February 2014. A screening process to identify functions relevant to equality and which should be subject to equality analysis would be carried out in November/December 2013, with a view to a new programme commencing in April 2014.

Councillor Knapman thanked the officers for the report and noted that it was a much clearer report this time around. They could now see the direction of travel.

Councillor Mohindra asked if there was a difference between 'under control' and 'on track' as designated against individual actions. He was told that the officers would look again at their definitions.

RESOLVED:

That the progress against the Council's Equality Objectives (2012-2016) for the first six months of 2013/14 be noted.

32. COUNCIL TAX FREEZE GRANT

The Assistant Director of Finance, Peter Maddock, introduced the report showing the contrast in the Council's financial position if it was to increase Council Tax instead of accepting the Freeze Grant.

In considering the Financial Issues Paper at the last meeting of the Finance Cabinet Committee, it was decided to recommend a further freeze in the Council Tax to Cabinet. The Financial Issues Paper had assumed Members would not want to increase the Council Tax and so no alternative scenario involving an increase was provided.

The last time the Council Tax was increased was for the 2010/11 financial year. Since then the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) had made grants available to support authorities choosing to freeze the Council Tax. These grants had been the equivalent of a 1% increase in Council Tax, approximately £75,000, and have been accepted for the three financial years from 2011/12 to 2013/14.

As part of a consultation exercise carried out by DCLG it was stated that freeze grants would also be available for both 2014/15 and 2015/16.

As indicated in the report, increasing the Council Tax by 2% for 2014/15 and 2015/16 would provide additional funds above the freeze grant of £75,000 in 2014/15 and £152,000 in 2015/16. As this would be a continuing source of income it would ease some of the financial pressure on the Council and the net savings requirement could be adjusted down.

Having not increased the Council Tax for three years, it could be argued that to increase now by only 2% for two years was not unreasonable.

However, increasing the Council Tax would go against both the medium term aims in the Corporate Plan and the Cabinet's current Key Objectives. The Corporate Plan 2011/15 includes five medium term aims, one of which was to "Have the lowest district Council Tax in Essex and maintain that position".

Councillor Knapman commented that he had asked for a report to come to this Panel, but not this one. He wanted the worst case scenario on what would happen if we took the grants and they were then withdrawn, how would we cope. However, he agreed that we should have a 0% increase.

Councillor Jacobs agreed that the council should freeze council tax, as it would be hard to justify at this time.

Councillor Mohindra commented that we needed to carry out an analysis on how much it would need to be increased by.

Councillor Knapman agreed saying that was exactly the point he was making. They needed the right data and risk analysis to be carried out. Could he still have the original report that he asked for, especially as we may have to increase the tax after a number of years of not doing so. This would come as a large shock.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report on the Council Tax freeze Grant be noted; and
2. That a report be provided to this meeting giving the worst case scenario on what would happen if we took the grants and they were then withdrawn further down the line, how would the council react?

33. SICKNESS ABSENCE

The Assistant Director (Human Resources), Paula Maginnis, introduced the sickness absence report for quarters 1 and 2 for 2013/14.

It was noted that the Council's target for sickness absence under KPI10 for 2013/2014 was an average of 7.25 days per employee. The Council's outturn figures for Q1 was 1.69 days against a target of 1.66 days and Q2 (2013/14) was 1.36 days against a target of 1.85. Figures were still on track to meet the target for the end of the year.

During Q1, 4.5 % of staff met the trigger levels or above, 20.9 % had sickness absence but did not meet the triggers and 74.6% had no absence. During Q2, 3.9 % of staff met the trigger levels or above, 22.8% had sickness absence but did not meet the triggers and 73.3% had no absence.

The Panel noted the top reasons for absences and that staff had recently been offered the flu vaccination, as they are every year. The Council used Lloyds Chemist to provide the service. As always there was a very good take up by the staff.

RESOLVED:

That the report on Q1 and Q2 sickness absences figures were noted.

34. ALLOCATIONS OF COSTS - SUB COMMITTEE REPORT

Councillor Watson introduced the report of this Panel's sub-committee that was set up to look at levels of recharging that made it difficult to determine if the service was providing Value for Money. This Panel was asked by the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee to investigate recharges as members found them confusing.

The members of the sub-group comprised of Councillors Lion, Mohindra and Watson. The Sub-group worked with Peter Maddock, Assistant Director, Finance, investigating and looking below the surface of the high level budget and accounts presented to members. They noted the figures for the statutory accounts; the costs that the council did not have control of; and that budgets should be a proactive planning exercise. Was there a need to compare this with the private sector? They identified issues for the future by identifying who was responsible and the cost allocation for management purposes. However, given that we are looking at a restructure of the council this would provide an opportunity to rebuild the budgetary process to be more helpful to members and officers.

Councillor Watson gave her thanks to Mr Maddock for his help and the work he did for the sub group.

Mr Maddock noted that his companion report aimed to answer some of the questions posed by the sub-groups report.

Councillor Knapman noted the he would like to see what the financial implications of the report were and not just the perceived value.

It was noted that as this report was asked for by the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee, it should go back there.

RESOLVED:

(1) That the report of the cross charging sub group be noted; and

(2) That the report be referred to the next Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee and the Management Board for their information and consideration.

35. REPORTS TO BE MADE TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chairman would report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that they had received the report of the sub-committee looking at cross charging in the Council and that it had been referred to the Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee.

36. FUTURE MEETINGS

The dates for the future meetings of this Panel were noted.