

CORPORATE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

MONDAY, 20 DECEMBER 2021

PRESENT: Councillors Phil Haseler (Chairman), Gary Muir (Vice-Chairman), Julian Sharpe, Lynne Jones, Simon Werner, John Bowden, Chris Targowski, Leo Walters, Amy Tisi and Helen Price

Also in attendance: Councillor David Hilton, Councillor Christine Bateson, Councillor Carole Da Costa, Councillor David Cannon, Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra, Councillor John Baldwin and Councillor Mandy Brar

Officers: Mark Beeley, Emma Duncan, Karen Shepherd, David Cook, Andrew Durrant, Adele Taylor, Alysse Strachan, Andrew Vallance, Duncan Sharkey, Hilary Hall, Kevin McDaniel and Louise Freeth

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Price declared a personal interest as she was a member of Maidenhead Golf Club. There was a line in the capital budget on the golf club, Councillor Price said that she would be considering the proposals in the budget with an open mind.

DRAFT BUDGET 2022/23 - SCRUTINY CHALLENGE

Andrew Vallance, Head of Finance, set out the budget report to the Panel. The draft budget was published on 17th November and was considered by Cabinet on 25th November. The finance settlement for the budget had recently been announced, officers were still assessing the details along with financial advisors who would prepare some analysis on the figure. At this stage, there would not need to be any changes to the figures in the budget as a result, with most of the assumptions being correct. Considering the risks, the fair funding review would be back on the agenda and could potentially impact the budget for the next financial year, after this budget. There was a growing risk of inflation but this was being closely monitored. RBWM needed to build up its reserves and there was still a pension fund deficit. Work was being done to look at the transformation of services to try and fill budget gaps. There was £1 million earmarked in the budget to respond to Covid pressures. This was focused on two main areas, leisure centre income and car parks.

By Friday 17th December, RBWM had received 208 responses as part of the budget consultation. 40% felt that if there was more funding, place services should be prioritised for investment, while 30% believed that adults services should receive more investment. 50% said that the council was not good value for money, 25% agreed that it was and 25% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Andrew Hill had registered to speak on the budget as a member of the public. He asked if the business case for the Vicus Way car park held up. Draft assumptions had been correct according to officers, Andrew Hill asked if the key assumption on core spending power of 6.2% was correct. He asked how much RBWM was getting from the services grant this year and was RBWM planning to respond to the government consultation on the financial settlement. Andrew Hill commented on another local authority who had ring fenced reserves

and expressed concern that there were lines in the budget showing that revenue items could not be placed into the revenue accounts. He asked why capital expenditure was therefore not being placed into the capital budget and where Deloitte had approved this process. Andrew Hill asked what the maximum levels of revenue allowed were. Other risks to residents were if another major scheme was delayed, he asked why no schemes that were likely to be delayed were outlined in the budget. Andrew Hill concluded by asking if officers believed RBWM was not exposed to any market risks.

Andrew Vallance explained that the assumptions on grant funding were very close. On the services grant, no assumptions could be made as it had only recently been created by the government, RBWM had received £877,000 out of this grant. The local authority which had been mentioned by Andrew Hill had legally funded their budget from a housing revenue account, RBWM did not have a housing revenue account and therefore Andrew Vallance felt that the example was not relevant. Deloitte had approved the capitalisation in previous years and there was a risk with inflation rates increasing as there were a lot of short-term loans. More long-term loans had been used to lock in the low interest rates.

Adele Taylor, Executive Director of Resources, continued on the capitalisation point. There had been a significant amount of money that should have been in the revenue account in previous years, this had now been moved to the correct area. This was always kept under review.

The Chairman explained the process for the meeting, the Panel would consider the key lines of enquiry which had been discussed at a pre-briefing.

Waste contract

The Chairman said it was important to see if RBWM was getting good value for money on the contract and whether there was confidence that the contract would be able to deliver the level of service that was expected across the year.

Alysse Strachan, Head of Neighbourhood Services, said that the capital requirements were primarily because of the vehicles that were used to collect waste. Originally, different types of waste were collected on the same vehicle. However, moving to a system of general waste and garden recycling being collected every two weeks and general recycling and food waste being collected weekly meant that the vehicles needed to be set up in a different configuration. Garden waste and general waste needed to be collected on separate vehicles due to the volume. Additional staff were also required which was another pressure on the revenue budget, mitigations were being monitored for these changes.

The Chairman asked if RBWM owned all the waste vehicles or if some were owned by the contractors, Serco.

Alysse Strachan explained that some were currently hired by the council but the plan was for RBWM to eventually purchase the vehicles.

Councillor Werner said that the logic of reducing collections would mean that less vehicles and staff would be needed. However, it seemed that the number of vehicles and staff had actually increased, he asked for an explanation of why this was the case. Councillor Werner asked for the detail of how many vehicles and staff RBWM currently had in waste services.

Alysse Strachan said it was primarily around the change to fortnightly collections on waste and the configurations of the waste vehicles which needed to be changed as a result. She outlined the different configurations that each vehicle needed to provide and confirmed that RBWM had required an additional six vehicles to cover these new changes. Alysse Strachan did not have the detail on the staffing of the new vehicles, the new configuration was the optimum way of collecting the rounds for all waste streams.

Councillor Werner suggested that this was something that could be taken to the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel, who could consider this part of the budget in further detail.

Councillor L Jones said she was not aware of the increased costs in this service area before the budget was drafted. She agreed with the suggestion made by Councillor Werner that this could be scrutinised further by the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Borrowing, interest rates and inflation assumptions

Councillor L Jones said that she wanted to look at the assumptions across the budget in a number of different areas, she would look to take it through the paper over the course of the meeting.

S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy

Councillor L Jones said that there had been a number of items around S106 to provide savings. There was concern that RBWM could need to find more savings going forward and suggested that it could be a stop gap.

Adele Taylor said the three items had been identified as being from S106 funds. Councillor L Jones was correct that these were one off funds but there was no other appropriate alternative use for this money. This capital had been applied in the most relevant places, the Capital Review Board had ensured that this was the case.

Councillor Price commented on lines 23 and 24 in the budget, she believed that the figure on these lines should be 0.

Andrew Vallance confirmed that Councillor Price was correct, this would be amended in the final budget.

Councillor Werner said that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was zero-rated in Maidenhead town centre. He asked if officers had estimated how much income was being lost as a result, Councillor Werner had seen a report that suggested the figure could be around £45 million.

Duncan Sharkey, Chief Executive, said that no estimations had been made. CIL being zero-rated for Maidenhead was council policy therefore there was no loss, officers did not estimate figures where there was no way of knowing what they would be.

Children and adults

Councillor Tisi commented on the consultation document, some of the adults lines had been left out until today and therefore it was important that those residents who had already submitted their representations on the budget went back and considered these lines. On line 11, Councillor Tisi understood that this was around ongoing care packages and that some packages were delivered by the council rather than health. The assumption on this saving was that there would be a bigger health contribution than in the past, Councillor Tisi asked how confident officers were on this saving being delivered.

Kevin McDaniel, Executive Director of Children's Services, explained that the figure in the budget on this item was a net figure and the council was in some cases already receiving contributions from health. Following recent staffing changes in the CCG, the council was now working with a new team and there had been new thresholds. Kevin McDaniel was confident

that the new levels of contributions were not speculative, they were led by changes in staffing by health colleagues.

Councillor Tisi said that on line 38, home to school transport, she had noted a reduction in the tender process and she was not confident that this saving could be achieved. Councillor Tisi asked what factors were beyond officers control and could impact on this.

Kevin McDaniel said that there was no guarantee that the contract would run for five years. Officers were constantly looking for optimisation, routes could be changed and repurposed depending on circumstances which would impact the amount being spent. It was felt that this saving would happen, but it could not be guaranteed.

Councillor Tisi responded by asking about things that were outside the council's control, for example rising petrol costs.

Kevin McDaniel confirmed that a degree of inflation had been added in as part of the budget.

Councillor L Jones said that she was looking at demand but there was no evidence presented that demand was different to any other year. It would be useful to see the average number of cases for each area, she recommended that the detail would be considered by the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Councillor L Jones commented on savings from later entry into residential care and that this was supposed to be redistributed into the higher level of caring at home. She had not seen the evidence for this happening. On children's services, Councillor L Jones noted that an increased cost was coming from private facilities, she asked why the council had therefore not considered investing in house.

Kevin McDaniel confirmed that the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the five-year sufficiency strategy earlier in the year. RBWM could control the cost and number of places but the volume was relatively small. A national survey had recently been completed where the average cost of inflation in placements was 9.1% of all costs. The average weekly cost had risen by £600 a week which was around a £1 million extra pressure. For those of the highest need, the increase had been another £1.3 million. Every placement was reviewed on a monthly basis to ensure that children were on the right placements.

Councillor L Jones said that she would like to see the trend over the past five years and it would be good to have it evidenced in the budget.

Adele Taylor added that trend information was being added to budget monitoring reports.

Hilary Hall, Executive Director of Adults, Health and Housing, confirmed that she was happy to take the detail to the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel. During the pandemic, there had been a move to more people living at home than in care homes but this trend had now been reversed. People were likely to be frailer when leaving hospital which therefore meant that more intensive support was needed.

Councillor Werner commented on school transport, it seemed there had been a significant amount of monitoring for the past few years. He was surprised that this amount of money had not resulted in a big change to the service that was provided.

Kevin McDaniel responded by explaining that the school transport budget was around £2.4 million a year, the figure of £160,000 was a relatively small amount. A minibus hired with 10 seats would cost significantly more than a single seat taxi and it was therefore important that the optimum mode of transport and route was considered. The home to school transport team had managed to keep costs down and ensured that the service was cost efficient.

Councillor Werner asked for confirmation that the saving in this area had already been delivered in-year.

Kevin McDaniel clarified that a £250,000 saving had been made this financial year which had been included in the budget.

Councillor Tisi said that there was a lot of transformation, she wanted to understand why the savings were proposed before the transformation was carried out.

Hilary Hall said that in adult social care a transformation plan had been put together. The service delivery had originally been traditional, the service was therefore modernised by officers which was key to improving the service for residents. Hilary Hall used the example of the day opportunities, where a saving had already been delivered whilst a modernised offer had been put forward for residents as a result.

Kevin McDaniel added that the key point was about modernising practise to see what could be done earlier in certain situations.

Councillor Tisi suggested that this item could be referred to the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Walters said that these services were an expensive cost for the council. He asked if there was any way for the costs to be monitored or regulated.

Kevin McDaniel said that monitoring took the form of an inspection of the quality of services that the council provided. From a financial point of view, the competition and markets authority were undertaking a review of the marketplace for children's care after the high levels of growth that had recently been seen.

Councillor Werner raised the point about transformation coming after savings had been identified, he commented that he had raised this issue at a previous Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting. He reiterated that this should go to the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Commercialisation and revenue generation opportunities

Councillor Price said that gaining new streams of revenue income was important, it had been mentioned in the budget report but she could not see any evidence on how this would be delivered. On the lottery, the money that came in would also come out but this was shown in the budget as an income. She suggested that this could go back to the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Emma Duncan, Deputy Director of Law & Strategy and Monitoring Officer, said that the lottery was designed to replace revenue grant funding and allowed residents to choose where their money was spent. The system could potentially also generate more income than grant funding and was usually run by an external provider, therefore it was an income proposal rather than commercialisation. Emma Duncan said that by joining up opportunities and creating new ones allowed authorities to optimise income generating opportunities. The council could then investigate where additional income could happen to relieve pressure on the savings that needed to be made. Officers could not give complete guarantees but proposals had been made in the budget which officers thought were achievable.

Councillor Price believed that this did not apply to line 14 of the budget which was around advertising and sponsorship, she had not seen any evidence of this being achievable.

Emma Duncan explained that RBWM did a lot of work with the councils advertising network which investigated space on the website which could be sold.

Councillor Price felt that rooms and facilities that were owned by RBWM could be let out as another source of income generation but this was not part of the budget.

Emma Duncan responded by pointing out that this required dedicated resources. Where RBWM was light on officer resource, focus needed to be on the bigger items. Budget monitoring reports allowed Members to keep up to date with this over the course of the financial year, recommendations could then be made if needed.

Councillor Werner felt that there was a lot of speculative income projections which was a concern. He said that the income should be established before it could be put into the budget, rather than including the income before it had been established.

Emma Duncan said that RBWM had difficulty in closing the gap between income and expenditure and Councillor Werner's suggestion could be possible if the council was in a better financial position.

Adele Taylor added that all budgets were estimates based on assumptions and best estimates. Business cases should be able to generate a return on the salary. It was important to consider the consequences of actions arising out of budget decisions, it was about providing assurance where assumptions had been made.

Councillor Sharpe commented on the revenue items contained within the budget and that it was good to be making good use of resources. He proposed that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel received a quarterly progress report and asked to what extent were the projections calculated correctly.

Adele Taylor confirmed that the Panel would be able to see reports on budget monitoring over the course of the financial year. Emma Duncan said that more detail could be provided on the financial assumptions and projections which had been made in the budget.

Councillor Price said that she was not sure on the estimates and assumptions and how optimistic they were, it was therefore not clear what the risks were and she was unable to decide whether the budget was financially realistic.

Emma Duncan added that Members could be given a breakdown of the areas that officers had considered to provide further assurance to the Panel. Decisions would be made on the numbers by the officers who had authority over certain areas of the budget.

ACTION – More detail to be provided to the Panel on the assumptions in the budget and the evidence that officers had considered which showed that targets were achievable.

Councillor Walters said that the assumptions were guess estimates, officers were experimenting and provided figures which through their expertise they felt were achievable.

Corporate plan alignment

Councillor Price said the aims and objectives from the corporate plan needed to be considered as the budget was the financial driver behind the plan. She could not see where the support was in the budget for the poorest residents in the borough.

Adele Taylor said that the council had a responsibility to ensure that there was an efficient service provided for all residents, for example by providing a council tax support scheme. There was a line in the budget under welfare benefits which was focused on maximising income.

Louise Freeth, Head of Revenue, Benefits, Library and Resident Services, explained that there were a number of different schemes. Despite the end of the furlough scheme, officers had seen a decrease in the number of residents coming to the council for additional support. The council tax support scheme would allow up to a maximum of 100% support for certain

residents. The council tax reduction scheme allowed working age residents to get up to £150 off their council tax bill in the current financial year. Louise Freeth said that officers were looking at a potential underspend, which could potentially be rolled forward into the new financial year but could mean that customers received less than the current £150 in 2022/23. There were various forms of assistance available to residents in respect of housing costs.

Duncan Sharkey said that the council supported people in need and there were huge amounts of support in place. There was no specific line in the budget as it came across in a number of different service areas.

Councillor Price said that she was concerned about next year, a number of support schemes were funded by the government and distributed by the council. It would be good to have a list of support schemes available to residents so that they could see what was available.

Adele Taylor confirmed that the schemes discussed in the budget were for the next financial year.

Councillor Baldwin raised a point of order, he claimed that Councillor Walters was a non-Panel Member but the Chairman had given him permission to speak at the meeting.

Mark Beeley, Democratic Services Officer, explained that there were ten Members on the Panel for the meeting. The five standard Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel Members had been joined by three additional Conservative Members, one additional Liberal Democrat Member and one additional Local Independent Member, as detailed in the scoping document and agreed by the Panel. Councillor Walters was one of the three additional Conservative Members on the Panel.

Councillor Baldwin left the meeting.

Longer term view on financial picture

Councillor L Jones said it would be helpful to have an explanation of the effect this budget had on the reserves and how the reserves would be strengthened. On borrowing, it was stated that the council would continue to borrow but the cash flow figures were fairly static. Councillor L Jones was not sure if there would be increased levels of borrowing over the next few years. There was no evidence behind the cash flows coming in on the development partnership receipts. Councillor L Jones was concerned that without flexibility to increase council tax the council could be looking at another £2 million of savings each year. She asked how much of these proposed savings had already been identified.

Adele Taylor responded by explaining that she had to put together a personal report on the robustness of estimates and position on reserves, this would happen at the final budget stage. The budget was neutral on the reserve position, there was a reserve strategy in place where a contingency sum had been set aside in the budget. This was to cover any legislation changes or other circumstances that had not been predicted. If the contingency sum was not used, Adele Taylor had recommended that this was either put back into the general reserves or used as reserves for specific areas. She had to make a judgement call on what level the general fund reserves should be at, considering things like the strategic risk register to decide what this should be. RBWM was above the minimum level of reserves required. In the Medium Term Financial Plan, a 2% increase in council tax had been added in. Officers were looking at a five year resourcing plan which would help to understand what could change and the impact that this could have on the council.

Andrew Vallance said that the text in the budget report which Councillor L Jones had referred to would be reviewed. The cash flow was regularly updated after discussions were held with capital project managers which was at least once a quarter. This process was overseen by the Capital Review Board.

Councillor L Jones understood that a number of the answers to the questions that she had would be answered by the report that Adele Taylor had mentioned. On capital cash flows, there was no detail on how assumptions had been made. Councillor L Jones said that she would like to see how assumptions had come about, this could take the form of a Member briefing if information was commercially sensitive. Considering borrowing, there was a lot of borrowing to cover the capital spend. Councillor L Jones wanted to see borrowing reduced.

Adele Taylor said that she was happy to provide a confidential Member briefing. Borrowing was for capital expenditure and this was kept under review by officers.

ACTION – Adele Taylor to explore whether a Member briefing was required to provide evidence on how assumptions had been made by officers in the budget.

Andrew Vallance confirmed that the number of bids financed by borrowing had been reduced through meetings of the Capital Review Board.

Councillor Sharpe asked if the RBWM budget was different to other local authorities and was the budget robust and achievable over the next couple of years.

Adele Taylor said that it was similar to most other local authorities. On robustness, there were a number of significant risks but using network groups like a meeting of the Berkshire S151 officers had proved to be useful. The draft budget was the best that could be put forward at that point in time.

Councillor Sharpe suggested that if interest rates were to rise over the next twelve months, what would that do to the finances at RBWM. He asked what level of inflation had been predicted.

Adele Taylor said that interest rate rises and inflation had been included within the budget. It was assumed that there would be an inflation rise but officers would need to consider the figures. The assumptions on inflation had been made on each contract rather than being a flat, general figure.

Parking fees and charges

Alysse Strachan explained that the assumptions on parking had been based on the advantage card data from 2020/21. The model was based on the number of transactions and usage of each car park. It was anticipated that the inflation rate increase for fees and charges would cover the cost of implementing a resident discount scheme.

Councillor L Jones said it was hard to provide further comment on this as the Panel had not yet seen the full fees and charges. She suggested that it would need to come back to the Panel in the New Year.

Adele Taylor confirmed that the fees and charges would be considered by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel at the next meeting in January 2022. The document would be circulated at the start of January so that Members had time to consider it.

Councillor Tisi asked why the 2021 advantage card figures had been used when this was an inconsistent period of car parking usage which would not reflect normal patterns. She was informed that data from previous years had also been considered.

Councillor Price felt that it would be better to split the scrutiny of the fees and charges amongst the four scrutiny Panels.

Adele Taylor said that scrutiny of the budget was following a different process to last year and officers had recommended that it should be considered by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny.

Councillor Werner argued that the fees and charges could still be delegated to relevant scrutiny Panels if the Panel decided to.

RBWM Property Company and the impact on the budget

Councillor Price asked if the property company was contributing to the revenue budget.

Adele Taylor confirmed that there was a line in the budget on income from trading companies.

Referring back to the discussion on CIL, the Chairman mentioned that it was on the work programme for the Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Price said that she had read through all the Equality Impact Assessments which had been submitted as part of the budget. There were varying levels of quality and completeness. She asked if there should be more guidance provided to officers on a standard template of how to complete the Equality Impact Assessment.

Emma Duncan commented that each Equality Impact Assessment had been completed by the relevant officer. Each assessment would therefore vary slightly, Emma Duncan asked if there were any issues that Councillor Price could discuss these with her outside the meeting.

Councillor Price said that once the Borough Local Plan had been approved, there would be a significant amount of work on the Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). After the current Borough Local Plan was approved, work would start on the next one and Councillor Price wanted to know if there was the budget and resource available to complete these tasks.

The Chairman commented that the SPDs would be a requirement for the council.

Duncan Sharkey said that a number of the SPDs would be funded by CIL and S106 money, developers would also contribute to some SPDs.

Councillor Price said that there was a 'review of costs' in the budget to the total of £170,000. These reviews had not taken place and Councillor Price wanted to know how the savings could be made before the review.

Adele Taylor explained that some of the reviews had staffing implications, Councillor Price was welcome to contact her if there was anything specific she would like to know and she would co-ordinate responses from the appropriate teams.

Recommendations

Councillor Werner said that waste collection, income generation, evidence to achieve the transformation savings, level of need for children's services, exploration of new edge of care service, health contributions and parking charges had all been mentioned during the course of the meeting as potential topics for the other scrutiny panels to consider.

Councillor L Jones recommended that the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the evidence of growth demand over the past five years and the number of cases against the average cost per case. This would allow the Panel to explore the evidence around that growth demand assumption.

Emma Duncan said that the Panel needed to be precise in the referrals that were being made. This allowed officers to understand what was being looked at and would encourage effective scrutiny.

Councillor L Jones said that the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel had knowledge in this area and she wanted the Panel to be reassured that growth in the budget was evidenced for demographic demand and that they believed it was a robust growth bid.

Kevin McDaniel said that he would be happy for a paper to be brought forward on the growth bid to the relevant scrutiny panel, this could be taken to the meeting in January 2022. He suggested that the work would involve the Panel satisfying themselves that the evidence existed for the growth items in the adult's and children's budget.

The motion was proposed by Councillor L Jones and seconded by Councillor Tisi.

A named vote was taken.

That the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel satisfied themselves that evidence existed around the growth items in the adult's and children's budget. (Motion)	
Councillor Phil Haseler	For
Councillor Gary Muir	For
Councillor Julian Sharpe	For
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Councillor John Bowden	For
Councillor Chris Targowski	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Helen Price	For
Carried	

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel satisfied themselves that evidence existed around the growth items in the adult's and children's budget.

Councillor Werner suggested that the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the evidence and mechanisms that led to the increased cost of the waste contract.

Duncan Sharkey said that this could be something looked at by scrutiny in due course, rather than as part of the budget scrutiny in January 2022.

Councillor Price said that it was important to consider that the budget would deliver what the council wanted out of the waste contract.

Emma Duncan said that Members needed to consider whether items were adding to the budget scrutiny process. Considering the waste contract was a separate piece of work that the Panel could look at should they choose to.

Councillor Werner commented that officers did not have the relevant detail at this meeting and therefore the item should go to Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel for further detail and information.

Councillor Walters said that he was satisfied with the explanation by officers about the new configuration of the waste vehicles.

Councillor L Jones said this was the first time Members had been aware of any increase in the waste contract and that Members had not been informed before the decision was made.

The Chairman said that the Panel could do a scoping document if they felt the waste contract needed to be scrutinised.

Duncan Sharkey said that the additional cost was for changes that had already been approved.

Councillor Targowski said it was important that the other scrutiny panels were aware of this discussion so that they could decide what they wanted to do.

Councillor Sharpe felt that the budget position had been solidified, Members were discussing the process which was not relevant to the budget.

Councillor Price commented that the council should be looking at the lessons learned from this process.

Councillor Werner said it was important that the Panel satisfied themselves. He proposed a motion that the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the evidence and mechanisms which had led to an increased cost in the waste contract and that the Panel were satisfied these increased costs would not be repeated for the length of the contract.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Werner and seconded by Councillor Price.

A named vote was taken.

That the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the evidence and mechanisms which had led to an increased cost in the waste contract and that the Panel were satisfied these increased costs would not be repeated for the length of the contract. (Motion)	
Councillor Phil Haseler	Against
Councillor Gary Muir	Against
Councillor Julian Sharpe	Against
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Councillor John Bowden	Against
Councillor Chris Targowski	Against
Councillor Leo Walters	Against
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Helen Price	For
Rejected	

The motion fell, this was recorded as a minority comment.

Councillor Werner recommended that the proposed income proposals satisfied the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel and showed that they were achievable. He wanted more depth and evidence to be provided.

Councillor Sharpe said that he was not sure that bringing this item back to the Panel would be beneficial, he was not sure if there was anything that the Panel could add.

Emma Duncan said that the Members would be monitoring this as part of the budget monitoring reports during the year.

Councillor Walters commented that they were guess estimates and they were the best that officers could do at this stage.

Councillor Bowden said that there were lots of matters to be resolved over the coming months, he was not in favour of the item coming back for further scrutiny.

Councillor L Jones said that the Panel needed to feel satisfied that they had seen the evidence behind the income proposals. The item did not necessarily need to be brought back to the Panel but Members needed to at least be briefed on the evidence.

Councillor Werner said that he did not want estimations going into the budget that were not achievable.

Councillor Sharpe said that officers had used their professional judgement to make estimations on income, he was not in favour of this motion.

Councillor Price supported Councillor L Jones proposal on evidence being supplied to Members separately, outside of the meeting.

Councillor Werner proposed the motion that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel satisfied themselves that the income proposals were achievable. It was agreed that instead of the item being brought to the Panel, a briefing document would be provided by officers to Members which outlined the evidence that the income proposals were achievable.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That officers would provide a briefing document to Members on the evidence behind the income proposals so that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel could satisfy themselves that they were achievable.

Councillor Werner proposed that the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the details of the increase in parking income once the fees and charges were revealed to satisfy themselves that the income targets could be reached.

Councillor Bowden felt that Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel was at the delivery end of this topic rather than the financial side. He would rather the topic was considered by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor L Jones said that she was happy to second the motion put forward by Councillor Werner, she argued that it would be a good topic for the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel to consider.

Emma Duncan said that it was a significant issue and amount of income, the topic was more suitable for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Sharpe believed that the item would need to be considered at the scheduled meeting of the Panel on 26th January 2022, he asked if there was space on the agenda.

Emma Duncan said that the performance management framework would be considered at that meeting and this was a key item for Corporate going forward. Officers felt that scrutiny could do some good work on the income generation for parking and other areas, it could be rolled into an item to be considered by the Panel later in the year.

Councillor Werner said it was essential to the budget, an extra meeting of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel could be arranged if required.

Adele Taylor said that assumptions in the budget could increase due to things like inflation. It was important to consider the fees and charges document too once it was available.

A named vote was taken.

That the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the details of the increase in parking income to satisfy themselves that income targets could be reached. (Motion)	
Councillor Phil Haseler	For
Councillor Gary Muir	Against
Councillor Julian Sharpe	For
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Councillor John Bowden	Against
Councillor Chris Targowski	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Helen Price	For
Carried	

RESOLVED: That the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel analysed the details of the increase in parking income to satisfy themselves that income targets could be reached.

Councillor Tisi commented on the amount of transformation which was proposed to happen in adult and children's services. She felt it was important that this was reviewed in six months' time to understand how effectively the transformation had been delivered. An example was the commissioning of services, Councillor Tisi was concerned about whether the timeframes meant that the savings were still deliverable.

Kevin McDaniel said that the performance framework and the budget monitoring reports would allow Members to review and monitor certain elements of the budget.

Hilary Hall suggested that the assumptions could be taken to the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel so that the Panel could satisfy itself around the assumptions made on savings in adult social care.

Adele Taylor said that the Cabinet Transformation Sub Committee would be a better place for a review. This could be discussed with Councillor Tisi, there could be assurances given by officers over the ability to deliver the savings and the transformation that had been outlined in the budget.

Councillor Tisi wanted to see how the council would hit the targets in the budget.

Emma Duncan said that the suggestion could be recorded as a minority comment and then Councillor Tisi could discuss with officers outside of the meeting whether the item should be added to the work programme of the scrutiny panel or whether it should be considered by the Cabinet Transformation Sub Committee.

The Chairman said a scoping document could be completed to add any items to the work programme.

Councillor Tisi said that on health contributions, officers had been confident that savings could be delivered. She asked if Kevin McDaniel could report back to scrutiny that things were progressing as planned.

Kevin McDaniel said that he would be happy for this to be picked up through the budget monitoring reports.

Councillor Price asked if edge of care services were also considered as part of the proposal that Councillor Tisi had suggested. Councillor Tisi clarified that it was part of the transformation savings.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 10.15 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....