

SCRUTINY PANEL

10 December 2019

Present: -

Councillor Davies (Chairman), Councillor Bentley, Councillor Bourne, Councillor Dundas, Councillor Hayter, Councillor Hogg, Councillor McCarthy, Councillor Whitehead

Substitutions: -

None

Also present: -

Councillor Barlow, Councillor Fox, Councillor Higgins, Councillor King, Councillor J. Young

241. Minutes of Previous meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2019 be confirmed as a correct record.

242. Half Year 2019 - 2020 Performance Report including progress on 2018-2021 Strategic Plan Action Plan

Councillor Bentley (by reason of being Deputy Leader of Essex County Council) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7 (5).

Councillor Julie Young, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Culture and Performance, and Councillor David King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, joined Mandy Jones, Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate, to present the Performance Report. The Deputy Leader introduced the report.

There had been concerns in June regarding KPIs for void time for empty properties, sickness and for the Planning process, but very good performance had been recorded for customer services.

It was confirmed that the sickness rates for the past five years would be provided at this meeting, as requested and that measures had been put in place to reduce the incidence of sickness, including musculoskeletal injuries suffered by waste crews. These included scans of injuries, physio, improvements in the depot and an upgrade in the hygiene of Shrub End.

The KPI target for minimising missed rubbish collections (K1W3) had not been met, but the Deputy Leader pointed out that, even so, 99.91% of collections had been made and efforts had been put in place to improve and meet the target. A new route (Route 18, including Cowdray Crescent/Ipswich Road) had been instituted and a protocol established to avoid repetitions of missed collections, including where properties were hard to reach, or where waste was put out late.

The work done to reduce the average time to re-let Council homes (K1H5) was covered. This included a change to fit new interior fittings, such as kitchens, after

new tenants had moved in. This both allows a reduction in time to re-let, but also allows new tenants to make choices as to what interior fittings are used in their property.

Regarding the three Planning KPI targets (K1P1), a busy and high-profile year for Planning Officers had seen some concern as to whether targets would be met, but it could now be confirmed that the Planning Service was meeting targets and exceeding them.

A fall in rent collection was highlighted by the Deputy Leader, and the introduction of batch payments relating to Universal Credit was shown to be the cause of this. The Panel's attention was then drawn to the awards, accreditations and successes of the Council during the first six months of 2019/20, as shown in Appendix C. Mandy Jones provided additional detail on progress against the Strategic Plan Action Plan (SPAP) and KPI targets. 12 out of 16 KPI targets were currently rated Green (meeting or better-than target), one was Amber (at risk) and three were Red. Collection of Council Tax and Business Rates (K1R1 and K1R2) were on course to be rated Green by the end of 2019-20, whilst there had been positives from additional homes (K1H1) and Waste and Recycling (K1W1 and K1W2).

The target for sickness rates (K1R3) had changed since 2018-19. Long-term sickness remained the main issue to address, with measures being taken to reduce this over time. The annual overall average sickness rates were provided to the Panel for the period from 2013/14 to 2018/19:

2013/14 - 8.21 days
2014/15 - 8.84 days
2015/16 - 6.68 days
2016/17 - 8.94 days
2017/18 - 7.72 days
2018/19 - 9.65 days

The Red-rated targets were detailed. The target for K1H3 (Full Homelessness Duty Owed) was explained in the context of being based on the changes in legislation contained within the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017. Personal Housing Plans are drawn up with individual clients by staff at the Library Community Hub, and the percentage target for Full Homelessness Duty Owed related to the percentage of individuals who had been given a Personal Housing Plan for whom the Council owed full homelessness duty. A speculative target had been set as there were, as yet, no national targets or data recording in place for this performance area and so benchmarking was not yet possible. A full year of data relating to this performance area had now been collected by the Council and a new target would be proposed in January, based on the quantitative data now collected. In terms of performance figures in numbers, rather than percentages, 1,015 individuals had presented themselves for Personal Housing Plans, of which 111 had been owed a full homelessness duty by the Council.

The main factor behind the missing of the target for K1H5 (Average time to re-let Council Homes) was identified as the pulling out of the main contractor for Colchester Borough Homes (CBH) in March 2019, caused by its inability to deliver works in line with the costings agreed to in the procurement process for the contract.

To mitigate the risk of this occurring again in the future, a new procurement process had been put in place to focus on the importance of deliverability. A new contractor had been appointed and had worked hard to complete the backlog of works which had built up. The Council's Client Team, CBH officers and the Board of CBH were all monitoring ongoing performance and weekly voids management meetings had been held. An empty property action plan had also been produced and a performance dashboard had been drawn up to help identify other factors affecting performance in this area.

It was reiterated that more capital works were being carried out after properties are re-let, to decrease time spent un-let, and to increase the choice that new tenants had regarding internal fixtures such as kitchen units. It was noted that customer satisfaction levels after moving-in to Council-owned properties were high, at 90% satisfaction on average, and that the cost of the void service and works provided by CBH was very low in comparison to other providers.

The Panel discussed performance relating to time to re-let Council properties. Additional detail was requested regarding the procurement process which had been carried out and whether there had been any problems experienced, and one member asked whether a different outcome would have been likely had the contract been awarded to the next-highest-rated contractor which had bid.

The Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate, and Andrew Tyrell, Client and Business Manager, confirmed that the correct process had been followed. The problem which had arisen was that the successful bid had been based on a misreading of a cost schedule for works, from the National Housing Federation (NHF), which had been radically reviewed and amended prior to the bidding process. The bid which had been accepted had then been found to have significantly underestimated the costs for works. The next-best bid had been considered to be more expensive but had provided costings more closely-aligned to the costs given by the NHF cost schedule. It was noted that the successful bid had been received from the existing contractor, with no problems having been raised regarding their past performance. The Client and Business Manager gave assurance that the relatively low bid from this contractor had been questioned at the time, with the firm giving assurance that they could work to the rates given. Legal advice had been sought by officers as to whether the bid should be accepted, and the advice received confirmed that it could be accepted.

In light of the early termination of the contract by the contractor, the Council had amended its procurement process and officers were now prepared to refuse bids for contracts where the bidder was unable to provide evidence to show that they could carry out contract work for the rates given.

The Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate, provided context and detail regarding KPI K1W3 (Number of Weekly Missed Collections). Although 99.91% of collections had been made successfully, the target had still been missed. Contributory factors included vehicle breakdown, staff illness and residents placing refuse on the kerb after collections had been made in their street. An increase in households had led to pressure on collections, and to the instigation of a new collection round to help ease this pressure.

The Panel discussed and queried performance on missed collections, with a Panel member praising Council officers who had stepped in quickly to solve collection issues which had been reported in a new estate within their ward. Concern was raised by another member as to whether the statistics for this performance measure were accurate, given that there had been many reports to members of missed collections, and as to whether missed collections reported by elected members had been included within the overall statistics. The serious impact on those affected by missed collections was underlined. The Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate, informed the Panel that all emailed reports of missed collections had been recorded in the statistics given, and that this had been confirmed by Richard Block, Assistant Director (Environment) and by Rosa Tanfield, Group Manager – Neighbourhood Services. The Chair informed the Panel that she had been informed that missed collections were only recorded if called in by residents. The Group Manager explained that the statistics also included all emails and online forms submitted.

The Group Manager detailed the remedial action put in place to reduce the number of missed collections. This included increased investment in the fleet, route optimisation, better use of data to mitigate the increase in homes which are to be covered, introduction of Route 18, optimisation of routes and additional fleet and staff brought in. The sources of problems were being identified, with special attention being given to seek the causes for any repeated missed collections. Data relating to reported missed collections was relayed to cabs to help avoid repeated missed collections from the affected areas. The Panel asked for, and was given, assurance that the capacity to cover additional households was being built up.

The Panel asked whether a next-day collection would be possible where deliveries are missed and reported, especially when these occur on a Thursday or Friday. The Group Manager and Assistant Director (Environment) informed the Panel that this would depend upon the type of collection, as wheelie bins required specialist vehicles to collect their contents, but that it was possible for general waste to be collected quickly. Collections which were missed and reported on Fridays would be picked up on Monday at the latest, although a Panel member raised an example of when this had not occurred, and collection had occurred later in the week, and that there would be difficulties posed for the occupants of flats if collections could not be made quickly following a report of a missed collection. The Deputy Leader informed the Panel that any missed collections were a disappointment, but that Monday collection of waste missed on a Friday was a reasonable expectation.

The K1H4 performance measure for Rent Collected was covered. The Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate, reaffirmed that changes in payments received, caused by the transfer of benefits claimants on to Universal Credit, had led to a fall in rent collected. The Panel was given assurance that CBH provided ongoing support to tenants, which had resulted in only two evictions being carried out in the first half of 2019-20. With rent collection rates now having improved, officers were confident that the target collection rate of 98% would be reached by year end. Karen Loweman, Director of Operations for CBH, explained that around £80k per month was received in payment of rent from Universal Credit, and that payments had initially been erratic but had now become more regular. A further factor on performance was the re-setting of standing orders at the start of the financial year,

where there was no payment made in the first month, with this being paid in to the Council split between the remaining months of the year.

The Panel queried whether the suite of KPI targets was challenging enough, with specific reference to K1B1(a) and (b), Time to process Housing Benefit claims and Local Council Tax Scheme claims. The target for these had been set at seven days, although performance over the year for both was below this level, at four and six days respectively. The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources urged caution, as certain targets had already been tightened following 2018-19, and the offering of a low-cost, high-value service meant that there was a limit as to how much additional pressure could be put on to the performance of officers. The Council's performance was noted as comparing well to that of other local authorities and it was crucial that a balance was kept between performance and use of resources and the cost of services. Overall performance showed that excellent levels of service were being delivered, but the Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources gave assurance that the targets would be closely considered prior to new targets being proposed for 2020-21. A member of the Panel asked members to consider that, in certain performance areas, it could be difficult and costly to improve performance by even a fraction of a percent.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Panel had:

- (a) Considered the significance of the performance, described in the reports, for the organisation's ability to operate effectively and achieve its strategic goals.
- (b) Noted the Reporting Timetable covering 2019-2020, specifically the dates for setting KPI targets for 2020-2021.

243. 2020/21 Revenue Budget, New Strategic Priorities and the Medium-Term Financial Forecast

Councillor Bentley (by reason of being Deputy Leader of Essex County Council) declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7 (5).

The report was presented by Paul Cook, Head of Finance and Section 151 Officer, and Councillor David King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources. The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources explained the inclusive approach being used to draft the proposed budget for 2020/21 and explained that the offer to discuss the budget with group leaders and members of the shadow cabinet. Views and recommendations were being sought on priority setting and the budget, and the report produced had been drafted so as to be clearer, show the Strategic Priorities of the Council and show where recommendations and suggestions were taken on board.

The Head of Finance informed the Panel that officers had worked further on the Budget Strategy over the summer, following its consideration by Cabinet in July. Uncertainties had been highlighted, such as the uncertainty over the 2020-21 Local Government Financial Settlement. The expected loss in government funding had

been amended down to £200k per year. £500k had been allocated from reserves to identify, set and detail new strategic priorities, and it was confirmed that the Council is in a reasonable position, with regard to borrowing, in comparison to other local authorities. The technical details on assumption changes were highlighted, as listed in Appendix D of the report. This included assumptions on borrowing rates and noting that, even with a 1% increase to the base rate of interest, the Public Works Loan Board still provided a good rate and flexibility. There was, however, continuing uncertainty regarding possible changes to the New Homes Bonus. The Head of Finance informed the Panel that, as Colchester was at the higher end of the scale for expected growth, it was possible that a future review of the New Homes Bonus might be favourable for the Borough.

The Head of Finance outlined the expected surpluses and deficits out to 2023/24 and summarised the appendices to the report, including the forecast revenue overspend of £336k for 2019/20. It was explained that it was usual for this forecast figure to improve over the year as mitigations to overspends were carried out, and that it is expected that revenue overspend would be reduced so as to break even by year end.

The Panel welcomed Councillor King's engagement with Members over the Budget and requested information on what the likely effect was of the recent refusal of Full Council to approve a request for £350k funding for North Essex Garden Communities (NEGC) Ltd, especially with regard to the forecast net overspend which had been forecast prior to the aforementioned decision by Full Council. Clarification was also requested as to funding of NEGC Ltd, specifically as to whether medium term revenue investment, as mentioned in paragraph 13 of Appendix D, was in the form of a loan to NEGC Ltd, or whether it was a revenue expenditure, rather than capital expenditure, as seemed to be indicated in Table D2 of Appendix D. Details relating to interest charged and repayment terms agreed on the funding were requested, if the investment was in the form of a loan.

The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources explained that the ramifications of that decision were still being assessed by officers, liaising and working with NEGC Ltd and the other shareholding local authorities. For NEGC Ltd to remain viable and continue, the Portfolio Holder stressed that it would need the funding and confidence of each partner local authority involved, and further stressed that the Budget would need to allow for the progress of Garden Communities, should the planning inspector approve of the Emerging Local Plan, but also for changes to the Plan, should the current version not be signed off by the inspector.

The Portfolio Holder noted that the Council continued to provide back office support to NEGC Ltd. The effect of postponing the £350k payment to NEGC Ltd from the Council was dependent on the development delivery vehicle which would be chosen for the company to proceed with, assuming that the Emerging Local Plan is approved by the planning inspector in 2020 and that the Garden Communities Project and partnership would continue. This would be an element of discussion of the Budget in February 2020, prior to the inspector issuing their report on the Emerging Local Plan. The Head of Finance confirmed that there was an aim for more detail to be made available to Members in January 2020, with any

amendments to underlying assumptions being reflected in an amended Medium-Term Financial Forecast.

An update was requested on any elements in the Council's draft budget for 2020/21 to improve the organisation's environmental sustainability, following the declaration of a Climate Emergency by Full Council earlier in the year and in addition to the aspirational goals laid out in the reports received by Scrutiny Panel at this meeting. The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources explained that work was ongoing to identify ways to convert the Council's intent into specific measures to reflect the Climate Emergency which had been declared. Meetings to this aim had recently been held with the Carbon Trust and an example of ongoing work was an investigation as to how to potentially lower the carbon emissions and improve the sustainability of the Council's Rowan House headquarters. Such improvements and retrofitting were likely to be costly. The Portfolio Holder reminded the Panel that progress updates on the work of the Conservation and Environmental Sustainability Task and Finish Group would be received by Cabinet, Full Council and the Scrutiny Panel in early 2020. This would include costed mitigations of environmental impacts, which could then be reflected in the finalised budget proposed for 2020/21.

The Panel asked whether there was sufficient flexibility in the Council to make the changes which would be necessary to meet the Council's set target of carbon neutrality by 2030. The Portfolio Holder gave assurance that the beginnings of the necessary work were underway and noted that whilst Government action and technological advances could reduce the challenge of meeting this target, it remained an ambitious target to achieve. A key task highlighted was the need to define and address the main obstacles which would need to be surmounted. A Panel member noted that the farming of shellfish was a very effective way to capture carbon, and that this was worthy of support.

A member of the Panel requested an update on the recent discussions and funding decisions taken by the Revolving Investment Fund Committee. The Portfolio Holder agreed to provide a written answer to the Panel following this meeting, to allow for an appropriate level of detail to be given, and to include an update on work relating to the Northern and Southern Gateway projects.

In answer to questions on the Cabinet's priority setting for the draft budget, The Portfolio Holder informed the Panel that feasibility studies and priority setting was still ongoing, including on the balancing of different priorities with that of achieving improvements in environmental impact and sustainability, maximising positive environmental effects and minimising any negative impacts. Ways in which to increase financial headroom were being discussed in order to fund work on strategic priorities.

Regarding promotion of cycling in the Borough, the Portfolio Holder informed the Panel that meetings had been held with cycling groups in Colchester to discuss the issues, and with Essex County Council. It had been accepted that patience was required, and that focused action was needed to provide better road engineering and better strategic routes. The Panel were informed that there was a commitment to shared action by the Council and by Essex County Council.

A Panel member enquired as to whether the addition of new strategic priorities for the Council had caused any consideration as to whether to remove or change any of the existing priorities, in light of the terms of the new local authority settlement and to avoid the risk of over-promising. The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources agreed that over-promising should be avoided, especially in areas which depended upon external partners, including central government. Judgements as to the ability to achieve progress on priorities would need to be made throughout the financial year, but there were no plans to scale back long-term processes which had already commenced. Plans were needed for at least three to five years into the future, with clear work programmes, timescales and project management. The Chair of the Panel stated that the Scrutiny Panel would maintain a watching brief on the Council's future plans.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Panel had considered the report on the 2020/21 Revenue Budget, New Strategic Priorities and the Medium-Term Financial Forecast.

[Councillor Kevin Bentley left the meeting at this point]

244. Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd's Performance

The report was presented by Councillor Theresa Higgins, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, Councillor Nick Barlow, Chair of the Board of Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd (CCHL), Ian Vipond, Strategic Director of Policy and Place, and Andrew Tyrrell, Client and Business Manager.

An introduction was given by the Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, who explained that the CCHL group of companies had been set up in line with the Localism Act 2011 and was still in its early phases of operation. Headline points were given, including a planned 400-plus new homes as part of phase one housing projects, provision of an innovative £6.7m heating network supply for properties, a £30m capital programme delivered last year and the sourcing of £18m of external funding. The Chair of the CCHL Board explained that the Chairmanship of CCHL had been previously held by the Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, but that these roles had been split in order to ensure there would be no conflict of interests.

A discussion was held as to what information on CCHL should be brought before the Scrutiny Panel, with members of the Panel requesting a full presentation and for the Group Commercial Director and Managing Director to attend. The Portfolio Holder and the Chair of the CCHL Board explained that the Council's Governance and Audit Committee were in place as the Council's shareholder committee to oversee the operations of CCHL and its commercial bodies, that the Committee had received two full presentations from CCHL already in 2019/20, with a third scheduled for early 2020, and that work was being carried out to identify how best to reflect the differing roles of the Committee and the Scrutiny Panel in the materials and information which were brought to the two respective bodies. Apologies were given for the absence of Paul Smith, the Group Commercial Director, and Adrian Pritchard, Managing Director, who had unavoidably not been able to attend this meeting, alongside assurance that the officers in attendance could take Members' questions.

The Strategic Director of Policy and Place explained the need to clearly distinguish between the differing roles of the Scrutiny Panel and of the Governance and Audit Committee, as the shareholder committee for the Council, which was the sole shareholder in CCHL. The Governance and Audit Committee held a duty to ensure that company law is adhered to in the operation and oversight of CCHL. The Scrutiny Panel held a different role and, should the Panel require a full presentation, then this would be possible. As a better understanding of the differing roles of the Committee and Panel was gained, the information provided to the two bodies would be more attuned to their roles, so as to avoid duplication where possible and ensure the correct functions are carried out by the correct bodies.

A member of the Panel highlighted the work which had been carried out by the Chair and the Panel to provide effective scrutiny, and to minimize the reports considered by the Panel so as to allow full and effective scrutiny of those items which are considered. The Panel member further questioned what value was added by scrutiny of CCHL, if the Governance and Audit Committee were already providing oversight as the official shareholder committee. Members further questioned whether it would be possible for a joint meeting to be held by the Committee and Panel, to allow the members of both bodies to scrutinise CCHL whilst avoiding the duplication of presentations and work by officers. The Chair confirmed that she would seek advice as to whether this was possible, and that a planned conversation with the Chair of Governance and Audit Committee, Councillor Pearson, on ways to avoid duplication of items considered by the Panel and Committee had yet to take place.

A request was made by a Panel member for the financial performance information and accounts relating to each of the commercial bodies controlled by CCHL. The Chair of the CCHL Board confirmed that this information had already been provided at a past meeting of the Governance and Audit Committee.

The Client and Business Manager thanked the Panel for their input and direction as to the information members wished to scrutinise and stated that, as this was the first time that the Panel had received a report on CCHL, the steer given would be very useful in the future. Owing to the way in which financial information is compiled, the Client and Business Manager explained that it would be best to wait until after the end of the financial year to report accounting information. The focus of the report at this meeting had been the business plan of CCHL, which was usually presented to Governance & Audit Committee in January and then to Cabinet in March, where any recommendations for changes or refocussing could be considered.

The Chair gave a brief summary as to why scrutiny of CCHL fell within the remit of the Scrutiny Panel and stated that it was difficult to commence this scrutiny by only reviewing the Business Plan. It was confirmed that the Chair would contact Councillor Pearson, Chair of Governance and Audit Committee, to arrange a meeting, and that Richard Block, Assistant Director (Environment) would consult the Monitoring Officer as to whether it would be possible for a joint session of the Scrutiny Panel and Governance and Audit Committee to be convened for scrutiny of CCHL.

The Panel noted that CCHL and its subsidiaries were set up to generate profit for re-investment, and that there was a focus in the Business Plan on acting in a

commercial manner. Clarity was requested concerning what occurred where commercial priorities conflicted with social and environmental priorities. The Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services gave assurance that commercial activities were not desired where these would harm residents' interests or priorities. Equality Impact Assessments are carried out on all major decisions, with an example being the incentivisation of developing eco-friendly homes. The Chair of the CCHL Board elaborated on this, confirming that those involved with CCHL had duties under UK company law, but also had a duty to further, and to provide funding for, the strategic priorities of the Council and to the public-sector ethos of the local authority. Officers explained that there were always decisions to make as to which priorities take precedence over others, and that cost/benefit analyses were carried out before any major decision was taken, alongside work to ensure the commercial actions within CCHL and its subsidiaries harmonised with the priorities of the Council.

A commitment to subsidising those services which provided a public good, but which ran at a financial loss, was requested. It was further requested that information on such services and subsidies be provided in future reports on CCHL. It was highlighted that CCHL run or administer services, but that the Council sets the budgets and makes decisions on service commissioning. An example of a service which was a social good, but run at a loss, was given as being the CCTV network operated within central Colchester. The Strategic Director of Policy and Place clarified that the commercial companies were run to provide income from profit-making activities which could be used to subsidise the provision of services, including those services which did not generate income. A Panel member stressed that it would be beneficial to ensure that residents were informed as to why the subsidiary companies of CCHL had been set up, and of the benefits that they provided to the Borough. An example was given regarding the additional options for providing new housing, which were open to CCHL but would not have been possible for the Council itself to use directly. Likewise, the Council would have been unable to deliver the heat network which had been planned. It had been necessary to found Colchester Amphora Energy Limited in order for both the Company and Council to capture sets of funding and make the project commercially viable. Members confirmed that this was the type of information that the Panel wanted, to give more detail on the operation of CCHL.

The Strategic Director of Policy and Place summarised part of the problem faced by CCHL and its subsidiaries as being that, whilst some of the companies could show the benefits they are already providing, other were involved in longer-term works which had yet to show tangible progress.

The Panel discussed the wider relationship between the Council and its commercial bodies and strategic priorities. Assurance was given that having a range of ways to provide or build new housing (either directly by the Council, or through Colchester Amphora Homes Ltd or Colchester Borough Homes) meant that the most cost-effective approach could be taken to each individual development, whether large or small. The Client and Business Manager noted that approaches had changed somewhat at the Council, with the government's lifting of the cap on HRA borrowing giving the Council greater flexibility in its approach to housing provision; however, despite this change, the companies still had an important role to play in delivering affordable housing. The Chair of the Board gave assurance that Colchester Amphora

Homes Ltd did not operate in competition to Colchester Borough Homes, and that certain developments required a commercial developer. It was confirmed that the first four development sites had been agreed by Cabinet in October 2018, to provide around 400 new units, with 30% to be affordable units. It was then agreed that the Council would retain ownership of the affordable units and that any future development agreements would likewise require Cabinet approval. The purchase of these units by the Council would be at a reduced rate, similar to the price that would be charged of a registered provider of housing, such as a housing association.

The Panel was informed that all development works by Colchester Amphora Homes Ltd were required to be in line with the requirements of the company's performance and commercial viability targets, which were compared to those of other providers of residential development. Value for money can then be evidenced and demonstrated in comparison to other developers and the cost of purchasing property on the open market.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) The Scrutiny Panel had reviewed the achievements and performance of CCHL (and its subsidiaries) during 2019/20.
- (b) The Chair of the Scrutiny Panel would arrange to meet with the Chair of the Governance and Audit Committee, Councillor Pearson, to discuss future ways to co-ordinate overview and scrutiny of CCHL and its subsidiaries.
- (c) The Assistant Director (Environment) would approach the Monitoring Officer to seek clarification as to potential ways for joint scrutiny of CCHL to be carried out by the Scrutiny Panel and Governance and Audit Committee.

245. Scrutiny Work Programme 2019-20

Mindful of the likelihood that the Panel's meeting in January 2020 would be a lengthy one, the Chair requested that Owen Howell, Democratic Services Officer, ascertain whether there was a budget for providing of light refreshment prior to the meeting, and report back on whether such refreshment could be provided.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) It be ascertained as to whether light refreshments could be provided to the Panel prior to its meeting on 28 January.
- (b) The Programme for 2019-20 be noted.