

Agenda Item 5

Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Results of recommendations made between June and September 2012

Financial Out turn 2011/2012			
Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25th. June			
Full report at Appendix 1			
Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
All carry forward requests are supported noting the comments in paragraph 4 of the report.	Noted	City Executive Board	4 th . July
To request that the £0.5m surplus is placed in reserves and its use considered during the up and coming budgetary process rather than earmarking it at this stage for capital.	Agreed with amendment. This money will be placed in an earmarked capital reserve. All reserves are reviewed as part of the yearly budgeting process.	City Executive Board	4 th . July
To ask Board Members and Senior Officers to consider the effects of delays in recruitment on services and plans and allow for any “catch up” required within future planning.	Agreed with amendment All service pressures have been considered. The effects of delayed recruitment are being considered as part of workforce planning.	City Executive Board	4 th . July
Treasury Management Performance 2011/2012			
Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25th. June			

Full report at Appendix 2			
Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
<p>The Committee agree with the proposed changes to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2012/2013 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the limit invested in MMFs to £20m. • Add Police Authorities to the counterparty list. 	Noted	City Executive Board	4 th . July
<p>For the City Executive Board to keep under active review the effects of “Right to Buy” within the HRA Business Plan. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income streams. • Our ability to be flexible within the funding of the capital programme to allow us to use all capital receipts from sales. 	Agreed	City Executive Board	4 th . July
<p>Fusion Leisure Contract – 2011/2012 Performance against target</p> <p>Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25th. June</p> <p>Full report at Appendix 3</p>			
Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
To seek confirmation via the Partnership Board that the living wage is being paid to staff and confirmation when it will also be paid to any sub-contractors working in Fusions run sites in Oxford.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To see the subsidy position for each leisure centre including capital investments made.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To seek clarification of what	Not available	Board Member	

share of the £1.3m surplus made by Fusion would be re-invested in the Oxford City Contract and how this would be used within leisure centres and/or services.	To be reported at the meeting	for Leisure	
To see the ideas and proposals from the Partnership Board to further increase participation with a particular emphasis on outreach work within target groups.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To see Fusion's suggestions on encouraging better utilisation of our centres.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To request that for the future participation is also shown as a percentage of the population in each postcode area and if possible to include all visitors to allow for a more meaningful comparison of the figures.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To provide information on the various outreach projects across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost • Objectives • Targets • Outcomes 	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To request further information on the methodology used for measuring satisfaction and the process for auditing and checking the quality of the results.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
To raise the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board and for standards to be monitored. To report back on how monitoring is to happen.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	Board Member for Leisure	
Request that the Board Member respond to the local Ward	Not available To be	Board Member for Leisure	

Member for Marston on what the Council's leisure offer for residents in his ward.	reported at the meeting		
<p>Changes to Business Rates</p> <p>Recommendations from the Finance and Performance Panel – 28th. August</p> <p>Full report at Appendix 4</p>			
Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
The Finance and Performance Panel of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee felt that the levy being 82% was too high and noted that this would form part of the City Council's response to the current Government consultation.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
<p>April to June 2012/13 – Quarter 1 Corporate Plan Performance</p> <p>Recommendations from the Finance and Performance Panel – 28th. August</p> <p>Full report at Appendix 5</p>			
Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
To request that the indicators for a Vibrant and Sustainable economy be reviewed as the Panel felt that it was not clear if the Council's policies were sufficient enough to fully capture a vibrant and sustainable economy as it felt that only have 3 indicators were not sufficient.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
<p>Asset Management Plan</p> <p>Recommendations from the Asset Panel – 24th. August</p> <p>Full report at Appendix 6</p>			

Scrutiny Recommendation	Response	Considered by	Date
Welcomed the inclusion of most of the recommendations highlighted to the Deputy Leader in March 2012 and that the latest version was clearer due to improved formatting. However it was felt that some sections did not require the amount of detail included;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
That it was not necessary to detail all of the previous achievements going back to 2009;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
A list highlighting the changes made following the end of the consultation would be beneficial;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
The design of the document allowed for improved navigation and was presented in a professional way.	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Foreward – Page 5, final paragraph – Clarification is required on the delivery of the 112 affordable homes, how these homes will be funded and the numbers to be delivered for each of the next three years;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 1 – Review of 2009 Asset Management Plan, Pages 8, 9 and 10 – These are not necessary and should be removed as these relate to the previous plan;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 2 – Portfolio Objectives and Overview, Page 11 – Objective 2 – The wording is unclear and would read better as “We want all our property to be efficiently managed”;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 2, pages 11 and 12 – The tables showing Operational	Not available To be	City Executive Board	12 th . September

assets ranked by condition do not make sense and so should be removed;	reported at the meeting		
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – A separate asset class is required to cover ‘countryside’ assets, including Port Meadow, the other SSSI’s and parks which should also be included. There is no mention of these assets in either class 4.1 or 4.10;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.2 Allotments – The first paragraph should be amended to include at the end ‘ <i>and further details will be found in the emerging Green Space Strategy</i> ’; the second paragraph should be deleted as the Green Space Strategy has not been agreed;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.5 Community Centres – Amend the fifth paragraph to read ‘ <i>The Council will establish occupational leases with community groups to formalise responsibilities. These leases will typically be between one and three years, noting that none size will not fit all and the Council will consider granting Community Association long-leasehold interests (or asset transfers) where the following criteria are met:</i> ’	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Section 6 – Capital Programme, Page 31 – further clarification is required with regard to the paragraph titled ‘Homes and Communities Agency Affordable Homes Programme’ and S106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing as this is in the process of being changed;	Not available To be reported at the meeting	City Executive Board	12 th . September
Appendix 3, point 17.2 – should	Not available	City Executive	12 th .

<p>be amended to read <i>'Where the Council implements rent reviews and lease renewals, it will seek to establish the highest market rental value supported by comparable evidence, to preserve the capital value and income flow of the portfolio subject to other relevant requirements of the Asset Management Strategy such as maintaining the agreed balance of uses of the Covered Market'</i>;</p>	<p>To be reported at the meeting</p>	<p>Board</p>	<p>September</p>
<p>Appendix 3, point 19, page 51 - Tenant Associations – This should be deleted in its entirety as the meaning of the section is unclear and appears to cut across the responsibilities of the Neighbourhoods and Communities Team;</p>	<p>Not available To be reported at the meeting</p>	<p>City Executive Board</p>	<p>12th. September</p>
<p>The following typographical errors require correcting:</p> <p>(i) Section 6, page 32 – last line of the second paragraph, delete 'a' and insert 'an' before the word amount and delete the full stop at the end of the final bullet point;</p> <p>(ii) Section 7, page 33, point 7.1 – In the final line the word 'city' needs correcting to 'City';</p> <p>(iii) Appendix 1, page 38 – too many m's in Emissions.</p>	<p>Not available To be reported at the meeting</p>	<p>City Executive Board</p>	<p>12th. September</p>



To: City Executive Board

Date: 4th. July 2012

Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Financial Out-turn for the year ending 31st. March 2012

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present comments from the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee on the budget out-turn for 2011/2012.

Key decision? No

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Mills

Executive lead member: Councillor Turner

Policy Framework:

Recommendation(s): For the City Executive Board to say if it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

All carry forward requests are supported noting the comments in paragraph 4 of the report.

Recommendation 2

To request that the £0.5m surplus is placed in reserves and its use considered during the up and coming budgetary process rather than earmarking it at this stage for capital.

Recommendation 3

To ask Board Members and Senior Officers to consider the effects of delays in recruitment on services and plans and allow for any “catch up” required within future planning.

Introduction

1. The Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee considered the delivery of the 2011/2012 budget and were supported in the debate by Nigel Kennedy. The committee would like to thank him for his time and advice.
2. This report was not received by members until the day of the meeting and many had not had time to read and consider its content. Recommendations are therefore made from a limited scrutiny perspective.

Comments and Recommendations

3. Performance overall is good and the committee would like to congratulate officers for delivering a challenging budget well.
4. The committee considered the carry forward requests and noted that in a couple of service areas had the money been spent as planned in year it would have placed them in a position of overspend. The most significant of these is the museum request from Policy Culture and Communications and brings into sharper relief the under achievement of income in the Town Hall.
5. A number of under spends are attributed to delays in recruitment to posts and members discussed the effects these delays sometimes had on the delivery of services or plans.

Recommendation 1

All carry forward requests are supported noting the comments in paragraph 4 of the report.

Recommendation 2

To request that the £0.5m surplus is placed in reserves and its use considered during the up and coming budgetary process rather than earmarking it at this stage for capital.

Recommendation 3

To ask Board Members and Senior Officers to consider the effects of delays in recruitment on services and plans and allow for any “catch up” required within future planning. Director and Board Member Comments

Director, Finance and Efficiency

6. The £0.5m surplus is being placed in an earmarked reserve for capital financing which is consistent with the current MTFP strategy aimed at minimising debt charges and maximising base revenue funding. All reserves will be reviewed as part of the annual refresh of the MTFP. Earmarked reserves can be reallocated as part of that process if required and the strategy changes.
7. Delays in filling posts are largely a consequence of not being able to attract suitable candidates, some posts having to be advertised several times. The current economic position has had an impact, with people choosing to ‘stay put’ if they are already in employment.

The Council is seeking to address this issue over the longer term as part of its workforce planning arrangements

Board Member, Councillor Turner

8. Decisions on the capital programme and its financing are taken by full council, so ultimately the decision commented on will be for elected members. However, I personally think it would be wiser to spend one-off windfalls such as this on capital or time-limited revenue schemes than ongoing revenue commitments.

Name and contact details of author:-

Pat Jones on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee
Principal Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252191 e-mail: phjones@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers:

Version number: 1

To: City Executive Board

Date: 4th. July 2012

Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Treasury Management Performance 2011/2012

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present comments from the scrutiny committee on Treasury Management Performance for 2011/2012.

Key decision? No

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Mills

Executive lead member: Councillor Turner

Policy Framework:

Recommendation(s): For the City Executive Board to say if it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

The committee agree with the proposed changes to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2012/2013 to:

- Increase the limit invested in MMFs to £20m.
- Add Police Authorities to the counterparty list.

Recommendation 2

For the City Executive Board to keep under active review the effects of “Right to Buy” within the HRA Business plan. In particular:

- Income streams.

- Our ability to be flexible within the funding of the capital programme to allow us to use all capital receipts from sales.

Introduction

1. The Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee considered performance within the Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/2012 and were supported in the debate by Nigel Kennedy and Anna Winship. The committee would like to thank them for their time and advice.
2. This committee is the “proper scrutiny body” within the CIPFA code and comments are made within that role. For the coming year a Finance and Performance Panel has been set made up of Councillors Fry, Mills, Simmons and Rowley. Future considerations in this area will take place at this Panel.

Comments and Recommendations

3. The committee is please to see improvements in returns on investments and overall good performance within the strategy. Loans required to finance debt repayments within housing self financing have bought a considerable new dimension to the Strategy and the Panel wish to monitor this alongside the Housing Business Plan in the future.
4. The effect of “Right to Buy” on income within the Housing Business Plan and the ability of the Council to keep all capital receipts from this source within Oxford was discussed by the committee. Members expressed concern that large discounts offered are likely to produce a high number of sales and this could affect income levels significantly. The ability to keep the remainder of the capital receipt to repay debt or invest in new social housing (or maybe both) was welcome but funding arrangements within the capital programme needed to be kept flexible to get best advantage from this.

Recommendation 1

The Committee agree with the proposed changes to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2012/2013 to:

- **Increase the limit invested in MMFs to £20m.**
- **Add Police Authorities to the counterparty list.**

Recommendation 2

For the City Executive Board to keep under active review the effects of “Right to Buy” within the HRA Business Plan. In particular:

- **Income streams.**
- **Our ability to be flexible within the funding of the capital programme to allow us to use all capital receipts from sales.**

Director and Board Member Comments

Comments will be made at the meeting.

Name and contact details of author:-

Pat Jones on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee
Principal Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252191 e-mail: phjones@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: 1

Version number:

Report of: The Value and Performance Committee - 25th June 2012
To: Councillor Van Coulter, Board Member for Leisure

Fusion Leisure Contract – 2011/2012 Performance against target

The Committee would like to thank Councillor Coulter for attending the meeting and presenting an informative and interesting report. The Committee had a full and constructive debate and would like to highlight the following comments and make the following recommendations. The committee requests that Councillor Coulter respond as soon as possible to the committee Chair – Councillor Mills.

Comments and Recommendations

Finance

- (1) Are all Fusion staff and contractors paid the living wage?

RECOMMENDATION: To seek confirmation via the Partnership Board that the living wage is being paid to staff and confirmation when it will also be paid to any sub-contractors working in Fusions run sites in Oxford.

- (2) Subsidy figures shown do not include capital costs. The committee were interested to know what the outcome for subsidy would be if they were. Views were expressed that the savings in revenue may be taken and replaced by increases in the capital expenditure as required as part of the contract.

RECOMMENDATION: To see the subsidy position for each leisure centre including capital investments made.

- (3) The issue of Fusion's charitable status and its profits were discussed at the meeting along with how any surpluses were ploughed back into the business.

RECOMMENDATION: To seek clarification of what share of the £1.3m surplus made by Fusion would be re-invested in the Oxford City Contract and how this would be used within leisure centres and/or services.

Participation, utilisation and satisfaction of facilities

- (4) Increases in visitor numbers seemed to have reached a plateau. What can be done to encourage more users into the leisure centres or have we gone as far as we can?

RECOMMENDATION: To see the ideas and proposals from the Partnership Board to further increase participation with a particular emphasis on outreach work within target groups.

- (5) Utilisation at our leisure centres is not evenly spread. Some centres are crowded whilst others are under used. What can Fusion do to encourage use of under-utilised centres?

RECOMMENDATION: To see Fusion's suggestions on encouraging better utilisation of our centres.

- (6) The pie charts demonstrating participation by area are a good start but don't give a complete picture on either the representation within the population or the total of visitor numbers.

RECOMMENDATION: To request that for the future participation is also shown as a percentage of the population in each postcode area and if possible to include all visitors to allow for a more meaningful comparison of the figures.

- (7) The effects and success of the various outreach work was not clear. Increases in participation were very obvious across target groups but the links between this increase and outreach schemes was not obvious.

RECOMMENDATION: To provide information on the various outreach projects across:

- Cost
- Objectives
- Targets
- Outcomes

- (8) Satisfaction levels are very high at 97%. Views were expressed that this seemed almost impossibly high. Information was requested on the methodology used to measure satisfaction and how results were audited by the Council.

RECOMMENDATION: To request further information on the methodology used for measuring satisfaction and the process for auditing and checking the quality of the results.

- (9) The majority of repairs and maintenance is delivered by Fusion within the contract. Views were expressed that these are not always done well or in a timely way.

RECOMMENDATION: To raise the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board and for standards to be monitored. To report back on how monitoring is to happen.

(10) The issue of leisure provision in the Marston area was raised.

RECOMMENDATION: Request that the Board Member respond to the local Ward Member for Marston on what the Council's leisure offer for residents in his ward.

Authors: Pat Jones and Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Email: phjones@oxford.gov.uk , mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

Tele: Pat – 01865 252191, Mathew – 01865 252214

To: City Executive Board

Date: 12th September 2012

Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Changes to Business Rates

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present comments from the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel on changes to Business Rates.

Key decision? No

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Mike Rowley

Executive lead member: Councillor Ed Turner

Policy Framework:

Recommendation(s): For the City Executive Board to say if it agrees or disagrees with the following comment:

Comment 1

The Finance and Performance Panel of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee felt that the levy being 82% was too high and noted that this would form part of the City Council's response to the current Government consultation.

Introduction

1. The Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel considered a briefing note on proposed changes to Business Rates and were supported in the Nigel Kennedy. The Panel would like to thank him for his time and advice.

Comment

2. The Finance and Performance Panel of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee felt that the levy being 82% was too high and noted that this would form part of the City Council's response to the current Government consultation.

Director and Board Member Comments

Director, Finance and Efficiency

3. Comments will be made at the meeting.

Board Member, Councillor Turner

4. I welcome Scrutiny's support.

Name and contact details of author:-

Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel Democratic and Electoral Services Officer Law and Governance Tel: 01865 252214 e-mail: mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers:

Version number: 1

To: City Executive Board

Date: 12th September 2012

Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel

Title of Report: April to June 2012/13 – Quarter 1 Corporate Plan Performance Report

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present comments from the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel on Corporate Plan Performance, Quarter 1 – April to June 2012

Key decision? No

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Mike Rowley

Executive lead member: Councillor Bob Price

Policy Framework:

Recommendation(s): For the City Executive Board to say if it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

To request that the indicators for a Vibrant and Sustainable economy be reviewed as the Panel felt that it was not clear if the Councils policies were sufficient enough to fully capture a vibrant and sustainable economy as it felt that only have 3 indicators were not sufficient.

Introduction

1. The Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Finance and Performance Panel considered the Corporate Plan Performance, Quarter 1 report and were supported in the debate by Neil Lawrence. The Panel would like to thank him for his time and advice.

Recommendations

- (1) To request that the indicators for a Vibrant and Sustainable economy be reviewed as the Panel felt that it was not clear if the Councils policies were sufficient enough to fully capture a vibrant and sustainable economy as it felt that only have 3 indicators were not sufficient.

Director and Board Member Comments

Director, Finance and Efficiency – Comments will be made at the meeting.

Board Member, Councillor Price - I welcome the observation which I am happy to accept.

Name and contact details of author:-

Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny
Committee, Finance and Performance Panel
Democratic and Electoral Services Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252214 e-mail: mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers:

Version number: 1

To: City Executive Board

Date: 12th September 2012

Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Asset Management Plan

Title of Report: Report of the Asset Management Plan Panel following consideration of the Asset Management Plan 2011-2014

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To submit comments and recommendations from the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, Asset Management Panel to the City Executive Board.

Executive lead member: Councillor Turner

Recommendation(s): For the City Executive Board to say if it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

- (1) A list highlighting the changes made following the end of the consultation would be beneficial;
- (2) Foreward – Page 5, final paragraph – Clarification is required on the delivery of the 112 affordable homes, how these homes will be funded and the numbers to be delivered for each of the next three years;
- (3) Section 1 – Review of 2009 Asset Management Plan, Pages 8, 9 and 10 – These are not necessary and should be removed as these relate to the previous plan;
- (4) Section 2 – Portfolio Objectives and Overview, Page 11 – Objective 2 – The wording is unclear and would read better as “We want all our property to be efficiently managed”;
- (5) Section 2, pages 11 and 12 – The tables showing Operational assets ranked by condition do not make sense and so should be removed;
- (6) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – A separate asset class is required to cover ‘countryside’ assets, including Port Meadow, the other SSSI’s and parks which should also be included. There is no mention of these assets in either class 4.1 or 4.10;

- (7) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.2 Allotments – The first paragraph should be amended to include at the end '*and further details will be found in the emerging Green Space Strategy*'; the second paragraph should be deleted as the Green Space Strategy has not been agreed;
- (8) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.5 Community Centres – Amend the fifth paragraph to read '*The Council will establish occupational leases with community groups to formalise responsibilities. These leases will typically be between one and three years, noting that none size will not fit all and the Council will consider granting Community Association long-leasehold interests (or asset transfers) where the following criteria are met:*'
- (9) Section 6 – Capital Programme, Page 31 – further clarification is required with regard to the paragraph titled 'Homes and Communities Agency Affordable Homes Programme' and S106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing as this is in the process of being changed;
- (10) Appendix 3, point 17.2 – should be amended to read '*Where the Council implements rent reviews and lease renewals, it will seek to establish the highest market rental value supported by comparable evidence, to preserve the capital value and income flow of the portfolio subject to other relevant requirements of the Asset Management Strategy such as maintaining the agreed balance of uses of the Covered Market*';
- (11) Appendix 3, point 19, page 51 - Tenant Associations – This should be deleted in its entirety as the meaning of the section is unclear and appears to cut across the responsibilities of the Neighbourhoods and Communities Team;
- (12) The following typographical errors require correcting:
 - (i) Section 6, page 32 – last line of the second paragraph, delete 'a' and insert 'an' before the word amount and delete the full stop at the end of the final bullet point;
 - (ii) Section 7, page 33, point 7.1 – In the final line the word 'city' needs correcting to 'City';
 - (iii) Appendix 1, page 38 – too many m's in Emissions.

Introduction:

Councillors Jean Fooks and Oscar Van Nooijen met on 24th August 2012 to further consider the content of the Asset Management Plan 2011-2014

following further drafting by Officers at the end of the consultation process, prior to the Plan being submitted to the City Executive Board.

The following comments and recommendations are presented by Councillors Fooks and Van Nooijen on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee. Please note that the final recommendation (12) simply consists of a number of typographical points and all page references relate to the version submitted to the City Executive Board.

Comments:

The Panel in considering the latest draft:

- (1) Welcomed the inclusion of most of the recommendations highlighted to the Deputy Leader in March 2012 and that the latest version was clearer due to improved formatting. However it was felt that some sections did not require the amount of detail included;
- (2) Felt that it was not necessary to detail all of the previous achievements going back to 2009;
- (3) The design of the document allowed for improved navigation and was presented in a professional way.

Recommendations:

- (1) A list highlighting the changes made following the end of the consultation would be beneficial;
- (2) Foreward – Page 5, final paragraph – Clarification is required on the delivery of the 112 affordable homes, how these homes will be funded and the numbers to be delivered for each of the next three years;
- (3) Section 1 – Review of 2009 Asset Management Plan, Pages 8, 9 and 10 – These are not necessary and should be removed as these relate to the previous plan;
- (4) Section 2 – Portfolio Objectives and Overview, Page 11 – Objective 2 – The wording is unclear and would read better as “We want all our property to be efficiently managed”;
- (5) Section 2, pages 11 and 12 – The tables showing Operational assets ranked by condition do not make sense and so should be removed;
- (6) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – A separate asset class is required to cover ‘countryside’ assets, including Port Meadow, the other SSSI’s and parks which should also be included. There is no mention of these assets in either class 4.1 or 4.10;

- (7) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.2 Allotments – The first paragraph should be amended to include at the end *‘and further details will be found in the emerging Green Space Strategy’*; the second paragraph should be deleted as the Green Space Strategy has not been agreed;
- (8) Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.5 Community Centres – Amend the fifth paragraph to read *‘The Council will establish occupational leases with community groups to formalise responsibilities. These leases will typically be between one and three years, noting that none size will not fit all and the Council will consider granting Community Association long-leasehold interests (or asset transfers) where the following criteria are met.’*
- (9) Section 6 – Capital Programme, Page 31 – further clarification is required with regard to the paragraph titled ‘Homes and Communities Agency Affordable Homes Programme’ and S106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing as this is in the process of being changed;
- (10) Appendix 3, point 17.2 – should be amended to read *‘Where the Council implements rent reviews and lease renewals, it will seek to establish the highest market rental value supported by comparable evidence, to preserve the capital value and income flow of the portfolio subject to other relevant requirements of the Asset Management Strategy such as maintaining the agreed balance of uses of the Covered Market’*;
- (11) Appendix 3, point 19, page 51 - Tenant Associations – This should be deleted in its entirety as the meaning of the section is unclear and appears to cut across the responsibilities of the Neighbourhoods and Communities Team;
- (12) The following typographical errors require correcting:
 - (i) Section 6, page 32 – last line of the second paragraph, delete ‘a’ and insert ‘an’ before the word amount and delete the full stop at the end of the final bullet point;
 - (ii) Section 7, page 33, point 7.1 – In the final line the word ‘city’ needs correcting to ‘City’;
 - (ii) Appendix 1, page 38 – too many m’s in Emissions.

Director and Board Member Comments

Joint Board Member and Officer response attached at appendix A.

Name and contact details of author:-

Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny
Committee, Asset Management Panel
Democratic and Electoral Services Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252214 e-mail: mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers:

Version number: 1

Appendix A

Response to Scrutiny Comments for CEB 12th September 2012

- (1) List of changes following consultation is attached below pages 3-7 (Post Consultation changes). This includes any changes proposed here in response to Scrutiny's further comments.
- (2) The forward is not the place to cover such matters as funding and programme.

Programme is covered by a target on page 16 although does not specify a year by year programme due to the uncertainties of timing arising from in-scope sites not yet having been finalised and potential impacts of planning and other issues. No change recommended or proposed.

Funding is covered by Capital Programme on pages 31/32 but for clarity we would recommend the addition of the words 'and as allocated in the 30 year HRA Business Plan after the words 'Housing Revenue Account' on page 32

- (3) The introduction of the review of the previous plan was in response to earlier Scrutiny comments and we do believe they are of merit and assist in putting the plan into context and show the journey. Recommend retention.
- (4) We agree with the principle of simplification raised by Scrutiny but this measure was not solely about management but was a broader objective focused on the efficiency of the portfolio. Recommend change to We want all our property (General Fund and Housing Revenue Account) to be well managed and efficient.
- (5) Ranking of condition is a key CIPFA benchmark and format is clear and aligned with CIPFA guidance. Future performance is measured against these. No change recommended.
- (6) Following earlier Scrutiny comments we added additional wording paragraphs 2 and 7 under the Agricultural Asset Class (Section 4.1) to cover the Countryside Assets. We are currently undertaking a review of this whole asset class and will consider appropriateness of introducing a separate asset class as part of this review and if proposed this will form part of the further review of this plan. No further change recommended at this time.
- (7) It is acknowledged that the Green Spaces Strategy is not yet ratified and therefore propose that the second paragraph be amended as follows : 'However, subject to the agreement of the emerging Green Spaces Strategy 2012-26, vacant plots on current sites will be cleared

to reduce this waiting list, rather than investing further in allotment space, other than urgent improvement and repair works.'

- (8) Propose addition of word 'typically' before 'be between one and three years' in paragraph 4 giving some flexibility and which we think adequately captures the one size will not fit all approach. We do not recommend further wording is necessary to amplify and may be counter productive in arriving at agreements in this area.
- (9) This plan is effectively a 'snapshot' at 2011 and reflects policies, standards and strategies at that point in time and hence references to S106 policy on Affordable Housing at that time. However the reference is not necessary within the definition here and for clarity and to avoid future need to update we recommend deletion of 'which would otherwise be sold and are beneath the Section 106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing (fewer than ten homes)'
- (10) We acknowledge the point scrutiny are making here but believe there is a need to have a clear commercial position stated so as not to in any way undermine or weaken our negotiating position. Believe much of what is referred to by Scrutiny is covered by Sections 3.0 and 8.0 of the protocols and so for clarity would recommend the addition of a further paragraph as follows:
- '17.5 The Council will in agreeing rents and renewal terms have regard to all other relevant protocols and policies'
- (11) This relates to the commercial property portfolio and is a best practice approach in this area and covers such as the Covered Market Tenant Association. As commercially orientated it does not cut across the activities of the Neighbourhoods and Communities teams. For clarity we recommend the addition of the words 'in relation to its commercial property portfolio.'
- (12) Typographical errors agreed.

Post Consultation Changes – Prior to CEB 12th September

Contents Page 3

Word 'Foreward' changed to Forward

Forward – page 5

Heading changed from 'Foreward' to 'Forward'

Final paragraph deleted and replaced with the following:

Our new Asset Management Plan is for the period 2011-2014 and outlines the detail of a strategy which underpins the Councils corporate objectives and our aims to

- deliver better and more efficient use of our property and improvements in its condition
- bring forward major regeneration and housing schemes
- deliver improvements to our capital values, income stream and levels of return

Key measures of success will include commencement of delivery of the Barton housing scheme, promotion of the Westgate retail redevelopment and delivery of 112 affordable homes.

Page 10 Clause 1.2 Column 2 Bullet Point 2

Words ‘,Rose Hill’ removed

Page 11 Objective 2

Replaced with the following wording: ‘ We want all our property (General Fund and Housing Revenue Account) to be well managed and efficient.’

Page 11 Objective 4

Replaced with the following wording: ‘Within the next three years we only want to own and/or occupy the minimum amount of operational property that is needed to fulfil the objectives of the services we provide and the corporate plan’

Page 11 Objective 6

Replaced with the following wording: ‘We shall work in partnership with other service providers/landowners where appropriate’

Page 13 Paragraph below first table

Second sentence replaced with the following: ‘The Council’s target is to achieve 50% in category A & B by December 2013’

Page 15 Target Column Objective 2 Measure 2

Word ‘Assets’ changed to ‘Property’

Page 16 Target Column Objective 2 Measure 2

Word ‘Assets’ changed to ‘Property’

Page 16 Clause 3.2 Column 2 Bullet Point 1

Change of 3% to 5%

Page 17 Property Subsidisation final sentence

Words added to end: 'through its executive board'

Page 20 4.1 Agricultural Properties

Words added 'of agricultural land' after word 'acres' in line 1

Additional paragraph added after paragraph 1 as follows: 'In addition the Council holds circa 1000 acres of countryside property comprising meadow land, nature parks and reserves, woodland, country parks and other countryside amenity land.'

Existing paragraph two changed from 'Agricultural property' to 'Agricultural land'

Additional paragraph added to end of section before Actions

'Countryside properties are held by the Council largely as public assets for the benefit of the community alongside the protection of sites of scientific interest, conservation/ preservation of wildlife, natural habitat and flora and fauna of the area. The Council will seek to manage such sites effectively and efficiently.'

Page 20 4.2 Allotments

Final sentence amended to following: 'However, subject to the agreement of the emerging Green Spaces Strategy 2012-26,....'

Page 21 Community Centres Column 1

Change from 'Localism Bill' to 'Localism Act 2011'

Page 21 Community Centres Column 2

Addition of word 'typically' before 'be between one and three years'

Page 22 4.7 The Covered Market

First part of paragraph 2 down to 'The Council has adopted...' replaced with the following:

'The Covered Market is one of the most important assets within the Council's investment property portfolio. Despite its notional high value in property investment terms, the Council is committed to maintaining ownership of this asset in perpetuity because of its historic and future significance to the wider city community and its contribution to the offering for tourists and other visitors.'

Page 22 Column 2 Paragraph 2

March 2013 changed to March 2012

Words 'in 2012/13' deleted and replaced with 'close to the review date'

Page 23 Column 1 Paragraph 3

Reworded as follows:

'The Depot Review will be progressed further through 2012/13 with business case and options appraisal for consolidation of main depots of Cowley Marsh and Horspath Road together with further due diligence and feasibility work as necessary as matters progress.'

Page 23 Column 2 Bullet Point 1 Barton

Changed from '2013 and 2015' to '2013 and 2020'

Page 24 Clause 4.10 Paragraph 3

Replaced with the following:

'The Council intends to review the future of the existing swimming pools at Blackbird Leys and Temple Cowley which have reached the end of their useful life alongside proposals to construct a new competition standard pool adjoining Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre a project for which funding is in situ.'

Page 26 4.16 Investment properties

Rental income changed to '£6.2M' in paragraph 1

Page 28 Paragraph 1

Replaced with the following:

'The Council has recognised the need to manage its property asset base corporately and has therefore established a structured approach with clear roles and responsibilities and clarity of accountability and control.'

Page 29 Senior Manager for Asset Management

Change from 'Executive Director of City Regeneration' to Executive Director of Organisational Development and Corporate Services

Page 29 The Head of Housing

Replaced with the following:

‘Acts as the Housing Client with responsibility for housing strategy, housing capital programme, housing landlord function, neighbourhood renewal commissioning, HRA Business Plan development and implementation, commissioning housing maintenance programmes, tenant involvement and housing needs and homelessness.’

Page 29/30 Head of Corporate Property

Whole replaced with the following:

‘Responsible for large scale housing estate regeneration projects and development of affordable housing and will support the development of HRA Business Plan in conjunction with the Head of Housing and Head of Oxford Direct Services.’

Page 30 Financial Planning

Words ‘Executive Director of Organisational Development and Corporate Services’ replaced with ‘Head of Finance’

Page 30 Budget Holders for Property Work

Word ‘primary’ added before ‘budget holder’ in line 1

Words ‘and will budget for reactive maintenance’ added to the end of paragraph.

Page 31 Homes and Communities Agency Affordable Homes Programme

Deletion of ‘which would otherwise be sold and are beneath the Section 106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing (fewer than ten homes)’

Page 32 Affordable Homes Programme

Addition of the words ‘and as allocated in the 30 year HRA Business Plan after the words ‘Housing Revenue Account’

Page 32 Barton Development

Words ‘to 15’ removed from line 3

Page 32 Section 6

Last line of the second paragraph, ‘a’ deleted and ‘an’ inserted before the word amount and the full stop at the end of the final bullet point deleted;

Page 33 7.1 General Fund

Paragraph 1 replaced with the following:

'Following completion of the current works within the 'Office for the Future' and leisure programmes a programme has been prepared which will address an outstanding backlog of maintenance over the coming six years alongside normal cyclical maintenance. Funding for this work is now included in the capital programme, which was approved by city Executive Board on 9th February 2011.'

Page 33 7.1 General Fund

In the final line the word 'city' amended to 'City';

Page 34 Table

Numbers changed as follows:

2012/13 - £8,395,000

2013/14 - £8,375,000

2014/15 - £8,029,000

2015/16 - £7,763,600

Page 36 Appendix 1 Heading

2010/2011 changed to 2010

Page 36 General Fund Performance 1.1

2008/09 changed to 2009

Page 38 Appendix 1

Additional 'm' removed from 'Emmissions' to read 'Emissions'.

Page 43 Appendix 2

Regeneration & development

Added to column 2011/12 - 'Commercial agreement for Barton completed'

Removed from column 2012/13 - 'Barton and'

Removed from column 2013/14 - 'Westgate commercial agreement completed'

Moved from column 2013/14 to column 2012/13 - 'Blackbird Leys regeneration strategy commissioned'

Moved from column 2013/14 to column 2012/13 - 'Oxpens supplementary planning guidance commissioned'

Investment portfolio

All three bullet points moved to 2012/13

Affordable Homes Programme

Bullet point in column 2011/12 moved to column 2012/13 as bullet point 2

Housing Revenue Account business planning

Bullet point 1 in column 2011/12 moved to column 2012/13 as bullet point 3

Appendix 3 Page 49 Clause 11.2

Paragraph replaced with the following:

‘In relation to covenants the Council has imposed, it will seek to enforce such covenants where it is rational, sensible and proportional to do so, or, where no longer required, seek reasonable payment for its release or partial release where lawful to do so.’

Appendix 3 Page 51 Section 17.0

Addition of a further paragraph as follows: ‘17.5 The Council will in agreeing rents and renewal terms have regard to all other relevant protocols and policies’

Note: Items in italics not yet updated in ‘Published Version’ Includes recommended changes in response to Scrutiny comments at CEB

This page is intentionally left blank