

CABINET

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

9 June 2008

The meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond) - In the Chair

Councillors: Pam Hargreaves (Deputy Mayor),
Gerard Hall (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder),
Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder),
Robbie Payne (Finance & Efficiency Portfolio Holder),
Peter Jackson (Neighbourhoods & Communities Portfolio Holder),
Victor Tumilty (Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder).

Also Present: -

Councillor S Cook, Chair of the Regeneration and Planning
Services Scrutiny Forum
Linda Edworthy, Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit

Officers: Paul Walker, Chief Executive
Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive
Mike Ward, Chief Financial Officer
John Mennear, Assistant Director (Community Services)
Graham Jarritt, Borough Librarian
Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services
Paul Briggs, Assistant Director (Resources & Support Services)
Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services
Graham Frankland, Head of Property, Procurement and Public
Protection
Joan Wilkins, Scrutiny Support Officer
Julian Heward, Assistant Public Relations Officer
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

14. Apologies for Absence

None.

15. Declarations of interest by members

None.

16. Inquorate Meeting

It was noted that at the commencement, the meeting was not quorate. The Mayor indicated that (as permitted under the Local Government Act 2000 and the Constitution) he would exercise his powers of decision and that he would do so in accordance with the wishes of the Members present, indicated in the usual way. Each of the decisions set out in the decision record were confirmed by the Mayor accordingly.

17. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2008

Confirmed.

18. Quorate Meeting

During consideration of the following item, the meeting became quorate.

19. Seaton Carew's Regeneration Needs and Opportunities – Final Report (*Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

The report set out the conclusions and recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

Councillor S Cook, Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, presented the final report of the Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into the regeneration needs and opportunities for Seaton Carew. Councillor S Cook indicated that one of the many items highlighted by residents as being a major concern was the Longscar Hall building. The Mayor stated that dealing with the owners of this building had been every difficult in the past and when requested to, the building had been brought up to an acceptable standard.

Cabinet discussed many of the recommendations of the Scrutiny Forum in detail and were particularly concerned with the future use of land for development purposes and how any capital receipts would be utilised by the Council. The Mayor indicated that he was concerned at the potential removal of the Coronation Drive site as one suitable for future development at this stage as it was included in the marketing study exercise being undertaken at the moment. To remove it would have an adverse affect on

this piece of work and the Mayor suggested that Coronation Drive should be left in as a potential site for development at this stage. It was acknowledged that there would be significant opposition from residents, as there was from within Cabinet, but the Mayor and other Members considered that such opposition should not deflect the Cabinet from considering this or any other site for development around the town.

In relation to recommendation (b) of the Scrutiny Forum, “That consideration be given to ‘ring fencing’ the reinvestment of any future capital receipts gained from disposal of land in Seaton Carew back into the resort” Cabinet considered that such a proposal would tie the hands of Cabinet when considering the best use of capital receipts. Cabinet agreed to an amended version of the proposal that allowed flexibility.

Decision

1. That the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, as set out below, be approved:-
 - (a) That further opportunities to continue to raise the profile of Seaton Carew on a region and sub regional basis be explored;
 - (b) That consideration be given to the reinvestment of any future capital receipts gained from disposal of land in Seaton Carew back into the resort where possible;
 - (c) That the feasibility of the suggested regeneration opportunities, identified during the course of this investigation (Section 13.8, 13.11 and 13.2 of this report refer), be explored as part the development of future regeneration activities in Seaton Carew;
 - (d) That a review of the current provision of organised activities and events be undertaken that identifies options to increase the variety and frequency of events to further attract visitors to the resort;
 - (e) That in recognition of the key role played by local businesses and groups, the benefits of re-establishing the former Seaton Carew Business Association together with a mechanism to encourage and support the involvement of the wider community (to include Seaton Carew’s young people) be explored;
 - (f) That the provision of integrated community facilities in Seaton Carew be supported, with the proviso that existing community facilities should not be removed until agreements are in place to deliver new / replacement facilities;
 - (g) That pending the outcome of Seaton Carew’s Coastal Strategy Study, consideration be given to delaying the establishment of interim arrangements for the marketing and planning activity for land susceptible to flooding in and around Seaton Carew;
 - (h) That opportunities to encourage community enterprise schemes in Seaton, be explored; and
 - (j) That the Council explore the Department for Culture Media and Sport ‘Sea Change’ funding programme to establish potential opportunities for submission of a bid for Seaton Carew under the remit of the programme.

2. That recommendation (i) of the Scrutiny Forum be reconsidered following the completion and consideration of the report into the potential marketing of development sites in Seaton Carew.

20. Seaton Carew's Regeneration Needs and Opportunities – Action Plan (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings and subsequent recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into Seaton Carew's regeneration needs and opportunities.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

To assist the Cabinet in its determination of either approving or rejecting the proposed recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, attached as Appendix A to the report was the proposed Action Plan for the implementation of those recommendations which had been prepared in consultation with the appropriate Portfolio Holder(s).

Implementation of the action plan would be subject to the amendments to the proposals agreed by Cabinet in the previous item.

Decision

That the Action Plan prepared in response to the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into 'Seaton Carew's Regeneration Needs and Opportunities' be approved, subject to the amendments to the proposals agreed by Cabinet.

21. Tees Valley Multi-Area Agreement (*Chief Executive and Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

Type of decision

Key Decision, test (ii) applies.

Purpose of report

The purpose of the report is to recommend Cabinet to endorse the draft Tees Valley MAA, as presented, as the basis for submission to government. A similar report together with the draft MAA is being considered by the Cabinets of all five Tees Valley local authorities.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Mayor reported that since early 2007, the Council, together with the other Tees Valley Authorities, One NorthEast (ONE) and Government

Office for the North East (GONE), has been working with Central Government to develop what we believe can be included in a Multi-Area Agreement (MAA). MAAs were first highlighted in the Local Government White Paper in October 2006, and the Tees Valley MAA will be one of the first of its kind in the country, representing a trailblazing form of city regional devolution for areas outside of the core cities.

The proposed MAA is intended to work within the existing funding arrangements and envelopes for the three main capital funding streams relating to regeneration (place), housing and transport. In terms of regeneration, agreement has already been reached with ONE for an ongoing programme of investment in the Tees Valley worth around £20 million per year, secured through the MAA process.

The latest version of the MAA was submitted as Appendix A to the report. This latest version, and the supporting technical notes, was the subject of a discussion panel attended by senior Government Officials in London on 24 April 2008. The feedback from the meeting was very positive in relation to the strong partnership that the Council has with the other Authorities and its Partners, and a recognition that the draft MAA was a well-evidenced, well-argued document that had clear principles and objectives.

Particular concern was expressed by a Cabinet Member at the number of issues relating to the MAA. These concerned the Board and the local authority representation and the potential cost to Hartlepool and how the town could be assured of receiving its fair share of any funding. The potential Tees Valley Light Rail System was highlighted as a particular concern as it was not proposed to extend as far as Hartlepool.

The Mayor indicated that the governance of the Tees Valley MAA had been discussed and approved by Cabinet last year. There were five local authority seats on the Board, one for each of the five Tees Valley Councils and six for other 'private sector' groups/bodies. Government guidance required private sector involvement at Board level and it was considered that any other proposal with a local authority majority was likely not to have received support. ONE for example only had a quarter of the Board seats allocated to local authorities. It was also highlighted that some of the other bodies represented included public bodies such as Teesside University.

There was local authority representation on the sub-groups and it was suggested that this could be one area where additional representation could be included. The Mayor did state that in many positions, the representative did need to be an executive member due to the need for decision making powers to be exercised. Cabinet did feel that the issue of additional representation on these sub-groups should be explored further and opened up to back-bench Councillors where appropriate.

The level of delegation to the MAA Board was also questioned particularly in what that actually meant in terms of decision making taken away from local council control. Linda Edworthy from Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit

commented that at present there was no local delegation of decision making as ONE had removed any delegation. Through the MAA the Tees Valley was looking to get that delegation back so decisions were made here for the Tees Valley's own approved work programme, rather than in Newcastle. Local authorities would not be required to put any funding into the MAA up front. Councils may have to contribute to schemes in terms of matched funding but it was anticipated that there would be funding drawn from quite a number of sources for any project.

The Chief Executive commented that the Tees Valley authorities had been working on this kind of joint arrangement since 2000 and this had been helped by the foresight of the four authorities in maintaining the Joint Strategy Unit since 1996. As an example of how these joint arrangements had made a difference Seaton Carew was cited as an example. On its own, Seaton Carew would never have qualified for any funding from ONE but as part of the Coastal Arc, Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland Councils had been able to draw down funding to assist Seaton Carew, The Headland, Redcar and Saltburn in developing their tourism. Without that joint approach that funding would not have been available.

The Chief Executive stated that the MAA would draw down £24m into the Tees Valley, with delegated approval for any scheme up to £5m being made here and not in Newcastle. That would save time and money and get schemes in place significantly quicker. That was the basis of the delegation under the agreement.

Cabinet members commented that bringing these funds under more local control was key and while the MAA was not perfect, it did achieve that aim. It was proposed that quarterly reports on the work of the MAA Board be submitted to Cabinet and that the development of future MAA's should be extended beyond Cabinet members. The issue of wider member involvement in the Board sub groups should also be investigated.

Decision

1. That the contents of the draft Multi-Area Agreement (MAA) be endorsed
2. That the Mayor and Chief Executive be authorised to negotiate the final version of the MAA, in line with this endorsement, with Central Government by the end of June 2008 or as soon as practicable thereafter.
3. That Cabinet receive quarterly reports of the work of the MAA Board.
4. That the development of future MAA's includes the involvement of a wider group of Council members.
5. That the issue of the wider involvement of Councillors in the Board sub-groups be investigated.

22. 2008/2009 Financial Position Update and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2009/2010 to 2011/2012 (*Chief Financial Officer*)

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework.

Purpose of report

To provide an update of the 2008/2009 Financial Position and to roll forward the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Finance and Efficiency Portfolio Holder reported on the first review of the Council's financial position in preparation for rolling forward the medium term financial strategy (MTFS). The general fund balances were sufficient to allow for the minimum prudent level of 3% and there was also some headroom to allow for unforeseen items of some £0.885m as reported to the previous meeting of Cabinet.

In the current year there were a number of factors developing that were not previously apparent and these were detailed in Section 4 of the report. The receipt of income from Housing Hartlepool in relation to right to buy had slowed at a much faster rate than expected even in light of the current economic situation and this could lead to a potential deficit of £1.039m in the strategy. However, the Council was likely to benefit from the LABGI scheme once more by around £2.1m which would more than offset the deficit. In total, the Council was facing the next budget round with £1m of the LABGI resources and a potential £0.9m of uncommitted general fund balances. Job Evaluation had now been agreed and back pay was now being processed. The report set out the latest position on the on-going costs and the funding. The existing position was funded, though there may be some small issues in later years.

Sections 5 and 6 of the report set out the strategy assumptions that had been made in rolling the MTFS forward. These included provisions for inflation of 2.5%, Council Tax increases of 3.9%, efficiencies of 3% and government grant increases of 2%. Also submitted as appendix A to the report was the timetable for the budget process.

Decision

That the report be noted and the proposed budget timetable as set out at Appendix A to the report be approved.

23. Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan 2008/09 (*Head of Community Safety and Prevention*)

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework.

Purpose of report

To set out proposals for the development of the new Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan 2008/09 and to consider issues for the Youth Offending Service (YOS) during 2008/09.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Mayor reported that each year the Youth Justice Board (YJB) requests the Youth Offending Service to set out how they are going to respond to the Youth Justice Performance Management Framework, to address areas of under performance and deliver continuous improvement.

The Government have agreed to a standard Youth Justice Performance Framework on the basis that it must be aligned to the new local performance framework. There were six Youth Justice System specific indicators in the National Indicator Set and these were detailed within the report.

The YJB have produced a Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan template and Guidance to serve as a format for the plan. The Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan will be Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) compliant and will feed the CAA process, it will be crucial to Her Majesties Inspectorate of Probation as pre-inspection evidence for Youth Offending Service inspections from April 2009.

This report formed the first part of a process to develop the 2008/09 Plan by providing an issues paper, which would be used as the basis for consultation with users and partners of the service and for consideration by scrutiny.

The final draft plan would be available for consideration by Cabinet on 21st July, Council on 31st July 2008 and needed to be submitted to the regional Youth Justice Board office by 13th August 2008.

Decision

That the issues paper be approved for consultation with stakeholders and young people and for referral to Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 17th July 2008.

24. Corporate Plan 2008/09 (*Assistant Chief Executive*)

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework.

Purpose of report

To enable Cabinet to consider and comment on the proposed Corporate Plan for 2008/09.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report was withdrawn at the meeting to allow for further amendments to be made in light of the comments of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee at its meeting on Friday 30 May 2008.

Decision

That the report be resubmitted to a future meeting of Cabinet.

25. Libraries Transformational Programme (*Director of Adult and Community Services*)

Type of decision

Key decision – test (ii) applies.

Purpose of report

To request that Cabinet consider, approve and adopt the Libraries Transformational Programme.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder reported that considerable progress has been made within the library service in adapting services and the introduction of new technology. The library remains one of the most popular services in Hartlepool and has consistently performed well in terms of national standards.

Efficiency savings had been achieved in the 2007/8 and 2008/9 budgets through redesigning vehicle delivery services and staff timetabling across all branches. The library service has also improved internal back office functions through business process re-engineering. However, this incremental approach was reaching its effective limits and a more transformational approach to how services are re-designed was now required.

A programme to tackle these issues was being developed and would focus on key areas of the service: -

- The branch service point network
- Central Library
- Technology
- Workforce Development
- Public and Community Engagement
- Partnership working.

The programme proposed actions within each of these areas in the period up to 2013 to provide high quality, efficient and sustainable public library services in Hartlepool. Detailed actions were set out within the report and also provided as an Action Plan.

Some Cabinet Members expressed concern that this process was one that would lead to library closures when they wished to see the service enhanced rather than diminished. The Assistant Director (Community

Services) indicated that this was not the case but that in a rapidly changing society, the use and client base of libraries had changed and was continuing to do so. The service needed to respond to the needs of these new users and if that required enhancing and extending the current service, this programme would reveal that. Cabinet Members commented that libraries were seen as a community hub that provided much more than a book lending service and they would wish to see the current branch libraries extended rather than reduced.

Cabinet members commented that they had anticipated seeing a greater link between this process and the Building Schools for the Future and Primary capital programmes. It was highlighted at the meeting that while the use of secondary schools had to some extent been discounted, the potential of the enhancement and/or use of primary school facilities was to be examined though it was accepted that this was not explicitly stated in the report.

Decision

That the Public Library Transformational Programme be adopted and approved subject to the acknowledgement of Cabinet's comments within the process.

26. Primary Capital Programme – Primary Strategy for Change (*Director of Children's Services*)

Type of decision

Key decision – Test (ii) applies.

Purpose of report

To inform members of the requirement to prepare and submit a Primary Strategy for Change document in preparation for Primary Capital Programme investment and to seek approval to submit a Primary Strategy for Change to the Department for Children Schools and Families.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

On 26th November 2007 Cabinet authorised a first stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme. The aims of the first round of consultation were to share information on the Primary Capital Programme with as wide an audience as possible and to collect views on possible ways forward. The Authority did not formulate any options or proposals as part of the Stage One process and agreed that this would happen as part of further rounds of consultation, depending on the outcomes of Stage One.

Stage One consultation took place between 11th February 2008 and 21st March 2008 and the outcomes were reported to Cabinet on 27th May 2008, when Cabinet also authorised a second stage of consultation that will provide opportunities for discussion about how the Authority and its partners will ensure that primary education in Hartlepool is transformed through

Primary Capital Programme investment.

Cabinet was updated on the comments made by the Project Board at its meeting on 2 June 2008 which would be included within the document. Cabinet Members questioned some of the potential future pupil numbers for some schools and asked if the figures for Burbank Primary School in particular could be reassessed by the Joint Strategy Unit in light of the potential for the growth in the number of families with children in the area as the family houses for rent became available again.

It was highlighted that the government had set a requirement that the raising of educational standards and the reduction of spare school places had to be the primary drivers of the proposals submitted. While Cabinet and the Council would wish to see other factors involved in the development of proposals, the strategy needed to show the Council's intent to tackle those issues the government saw as key. The Mayor commented that innovative solutions may have to be developed to reflect the needs of communities as well as addressing the educational needs of children. The Mayor stated that he was concerned at raising expectations early in the process as the funding for the Primary Capital Programme was spread over a number of years. A change of government could radically affect, or even cancel, any proposed programme and raising parents and the wider community's hopes of a new primary school in ten years needed to be avoided.

Decision

That the draft Primary Strategy for Change be approved for submission to the Department for Children Schools and Families before 16 June 2008.

27. ICT Provision – Future Arrangements *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

The Performance Portfolio Holder reported on the detailed plans and processes for Phase 2 of the work leading up to the end of the current contract for ICT provision for the authority. The report also provides information on progress to date, including the high level Statement of Requirements (SOR) and 1st stage evaluation of delivery options.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

In October 2007, a report was agreed by Cabinet which approved the process leading up to the end of the current provision of ICT support to the Council. It was agreed that the process would involve 3 phases. Phase 1 was completed, and a report agreed by Cabinet in March 2008.

This report outlined the following approach to be taken in undertaking Phase 2 of this programme of work:-

- Clarify the broad principles to underpin any future arrangements
- Consider the scope/type of support required under any future arrangements
- Define the outcomes required from any future arrangements
- Identify the various options for future delivery
- Clarify evaluation criteria (at 3 levels) to match delivery options to the authorities requirements
- Evaluate the various options for delivery in 3 stages:
 - 1st stage to reduce options to only include those which are capable of delivering to the Councils requirements
 - 2nd stage to reduce options for detailed evaluation at the 3rd stage
 - 3rd stage to carry out detailed evaluation of shortlisted options
- Identify most appropriate delivery method for development during Phase 3

The project would consider the whole ICT support requirements of the authority and evaluate all options initially, then focus on a short list of options identified as most suitable and appropriate for HBC.

Phase 2 deliverables would be:-

- Statement of Requirements – high level (May 08)
- Statement of Requirements – 2nd stage (June 08)
- Statement of Requirements – Final (Nov 08)

At each stage of the Statement of Requirements, detail would be added in and the Council's requirements would be further refined to allow for more focused evaluation of the options for delivery.

- Options appraisal Part 1 – high level evaluation (May 08)
- Options appraisal Part 2 – to produce shortlist (June 08)
- Options appraisal Part 3 – leading to recommendation (Dec 08)
- Formal decision (March 09)

It was important to reiterate that at this stage, the evaluation was of the models for delivery, not the providers.

The overall organisation structure for the project was outlined in the report which included responsibilities and reporting arrangements. In relation to resource requirements, staffing resources were being allocated from existing HBC officers and a budget of £150,000 had been identified (for phases 1 and 2) from Departmental Managed Underspend to allow for some backfilling, additional expertise which may be required, benchmarking, fact-finding, site visits etc.

Workstream lead officers would identify resource requirements early in the process to allow budget commitments to be identified. Phase 3 budget requirements would be identified during the course of Phase 2.

Progress to date had provided a full picture of the current ICT support and in order to progress successfully to the next stage, consideration needed to be given to future requirements.

The high level requirements of any future ICT support arrangements had been identified as:-

- Proven delivery model
- Outcome based service
- Professional delivery
- Forward thinking / innovation
- Appropriate governance arrangements
- Flexibility to allow for unknown changes in requirements / legislation etc.
- Ability to take stakeholder requirements into account
- Ability to ensure efficient and effective use of resources

Research had been carried out to identify the range of options open to the authority for the future provision of ICT support. The research highlighted the complexity of the project, identifying 51 possible models that could potentially be adopted to provide ICT support to the Council.

Details of the first stage evaluation of options were provided, as detailed in the report. The 2011 Strategy/Progress Group, having agreed the high level requirements, then converted them into specific questions/criteria (both mandatory and desirable) against which each of the models could be evaluated.

By evaluating the options in Section 6 against the criteria, it had been possible to reduce the number of options. It was recommended that the following options be carried forward for further investigation and evaluation:-

- In-house provision by HBC
- Single provider – Private Company
- Single provider – another local authority
- Dual providers – HBC plus another local authority
- Dual providers – HBC plus a private company
- Dual providers – a private company and another local authority
- Cluster of providers – 3 or more private companies
- Cluster of providers – HBC plus 2 or more other local authorities
- Cluster of providers – HBC plus 2 or more private companies
- Cluster of providers – HBC plus a mixture of private

- companies and other local authorities
- Cluster of providers – mixture of private companies and other local authorities

The links to other programmes and policies were included in the report. In relation to risks, as with any major project there were a number of risks that needed to be recognised and addressed to reduce the likelihood of their impacting on the success of the project. A risk register had been developed, highlighting the risks and their likely impact and identifying action already taken to mitigate against them, together with any further actions to be undertaken during the project. The register would be subject to regular reviews of the 2011 Strategy/Progress Group to ensure appropriate action was taken.

The key decision points of the process were:-

- June 2008 – agreement on Phase 2 process, governance arrangements and timescales, identification of any additional resource requirements, the high level Statement of Requirements (SOR) and reduction of options based on initial evaluation against Statement of Requirements.
- July 2008 – agreement on more detailed SOR, reduction of options based on further evaluation and evaluation criteria for final stage evaluation
- December 2008 – agreement on final SOR, final stage evaluation, initial recommendation and identification of any other information required to enable final decision to be made on the delivery model to be followed. This is not a decision on a provider.
- March 2009 – final decision on option to pursue and agreement on process and funding for Phase 3

Decision

1. That the progress to date on Phase 2 of the project be noted.
2. That the project governance arrangements and timescales identified in section 3 of the report be approved.
3. That the framework Statement of Requirements (Appendix A) be approved as a strategic statement of what the authority requires from ICT support and as the basis for further more detailed evaluation.
4. That Cabinet received the following further reports: -
 - (i) Detailed SOR, further evaluation of options and detailed criteria for final stage evaluation.
 - (ii) Final SOR, final stage evaluation, initial recommendation and identification of any other information required to enable final decision to be made on the delivery model to be followed. This was not a decision on a provider.
 - (iii) Decision on option to pursue and agreement on process and funding for Phase 3.
 - (iv) October 2011 – completion of Phase 3. Further detail and

financial implications for Phase 3 would be the subject of a future Cabinet report once the outcomes of Phase 2 were known.

5. That the further evaluation of those options identified in Appendix C and section 7 of the report be approved.

28. Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) – Rear of St Patrick's Shops (*The Mayor*)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To seek approval from Cabinet for additional funding towards work being undertaken regarding the proposed MUGA development at the rear of St Patrick's Shops.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Mayor reported that in November 2007 Cabinet agreed funding of £2,450 towards the costs of engaging a consultant to undertake a feasibility study. As part of this study it is found that detailed drawings and site surveys are required to be undertaken by the Council's Property Services Section. They will also be liaising with other Council Departments. Property Services have advised the consultant, Mr Dacre Dunlop that the cost of supplying the above information/service will be £2,312, and until this amount is received by them the work could not be commenced. This would impact on the completion of the feasibility study.

Decision

That the extra funding of £2,312 be approved so that the consultant can complete the works involved.

29. Quarter 4 – Corporate Plan 2007/2008 Monitoring Report (*Corporate Management Team*)

Type of decision

No decision required – the report is for Cabinet's information only.

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet of the progress made towards achieving the Corporate Plan Actions.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Performance Portfolio Holder indicated that the report described progress towards achieving the actions within the Corporate Plan using the traffic light system of Green, Amber and Red. The report provided an overview of Council performance, with separate sections providing more detailed information for each Portfolio Holder to consider.

Decision

That the report be noted.

P DEVLIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 16.6.08