

# AGENDA



For a meeting of the
<b>ENGAGEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP</b>
to be held on
<b>FRIDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 2013</b>
at
<b>10.30 AM</b>
In the
<b>WITHAM ROOM - COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM. NG31 6PZ</b>
Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

Group Members:	Councillor Ray Auger, Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing, Councillor Ibis Channell, Councillor Michael Cook (Chairman), Councillor Jock Kerr, Councillor Nick Robins and Councillor Rosemary H Woolley (Vice-Chairman)
Portfolio Holders:	Councillor Paul Carpenter, Deputy Leader & Portfolio: Governance & Communication Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal, Leader/Portfolio: Policy, Strategy and Strategic Partnerships
Support Officer:	Lucy Bonshor      Tel: 01476 40 61 20 E-mail: <a href="mailto:l.bonshor@southkesteven.gov.uk">l.bonshor@southkesteven.gov.uk</a>

## 🕒 Please note date and time of meeting 🕒

Members of the Group are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.

1. **COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

2. **MEMBERSHIP**

The Group to be notified of any substitute members.

3. **APOLOGIES**

*Your council working for you*

**4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Members are asked to disclose any interests in matters for consideration at the meeting.

**5. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 19TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**(Enclosure)**

**6. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**7. CUSTOMER ACCESS STRATEGY**

Presentation by the Interim Service Manager Customer Services

**(Copy presentation enclosed)**

**8. MEMBER TRAINING CHAMPIONS**

Service Manager HR & OD to discuss the introduction of Member Training Champions.

**9. ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

Report LDS113 from the Head of Legal & Democratic Services

**(Enclosure)**

**10. UPDATE FROM WORKING GROUP**

Working Group to update the PDG.

**11. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

Bulletins attached for information.

**(Enclosure)**

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASONS OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT**

## MEETING OF THE ENGAGEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

THURSDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 2013 2.30 PM



---

### GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Ray Auger  
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing  
Councillor Ibis Channell  
Councillor Michael Cook (Chairman)  
Councillor Vic Kerr  
Councillor Nick Robins  
Councillor Rosemary H Woolley (Vice-Chairman)

### OFFICERS

Community Engagement and Policy Development Officer (Carol Drury)  
Democratic Officer (Lucy Bonshor)

---

### 20. MEMBERSHIP

The Group were notified that Councillor Vic Kerr was substituting for Councillor Jock Kerr for this meeting only.

### 21. APOLOGIES

Councillor Channell apologised for being late.

### 22. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

None disclosed.

### 23. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 18TH JULY 2013

The action notes from the meeting held on 18th July were agreed as a correct record.

## **24. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

### **Training for Town and Parish Councillors**

The Community Engagement & Policy Development Officer, Carol Drury informed the group that she had spoken to the Development Management Service Manager, Pat Reid and the Planning Policy and Partnerships Service Manager; Karen Sinclair concerning the question of training for Town and Parish Councillors. Mr Reid and Ms Sinclair had already had a request for guidance from Bourne Town Council on the role of Parish and Town Councillors and a pilot session was to be held on the 1st October at Bourne Corn Exchange. This session was specifically for the south west cluster of parishes and depending upon the outcome of the session further sessions would be arranged for the Parish Clusters.

A short discussion then followed about other parishes attending from Stamford Town Council however, it was felt that Stamford and the relevant parishes within that cluster should have their own session depending upon the outcome of the Bourne session.

The majority of the Group felt that it would be a good idea that all cluster who were interested should be offered a session.

## **25. FIRST CONTACT**

The Chairman welcomed Jane Thomas from Age UK who gave a presentation to the Group about First Contact.

Ms Thomas gave a brief background to the Group.

- First Contact was first introduced in 2008.
- It gave over 60's access to services.
- It was a single gateway to free information and advice.
- The completion of one form did it all.
- Both public and voluntary services were involved.
- The form contained 13 checklist questions

She then gave examples of when First Contact could be used; the key was to get the leaflets out to people, the form could also be accessed online.

Within 24hrs of someone completing a form they would receive a letter confirming which services would be contacting them, the Service Level Agreements in place with those partners required them to contact people within 28 days, this may be sooner, it depended upon the resources available in the County at the time. Although the information and advice were free the use of some of the services was chargeable and outcomes would vary per person as would eligibility.

Since the launch over 8,000 people had used the service and over 24,000 referrals had been made to partner agencies.

Ms Thomas then spoke about getting the information out to people and informed the group about training that had been done, including training Boots Pharmacy staff to get the message about First Contact out to the relevant people. Any help that Members could give her in order for her to talk to groups of people would be welcome, whether it was a coffee morning or a Parish Council meeting. A meet in the street and street talking had been held in South Holland and this had been very successful and she was hoping to do the same in South Kesteven. She was also set to attend a GP surgery in the Deepings shortly and also hoped to attend flu clinics. She referred to the launches already carried out in South Kesteven and the future events planned, any help that Members could give or contacts would be greatly received in getting the message out to the community.

For Members information a breakdown had been done of the number of people who used the service within each of their wards and this was circulated.

Other partners would soon be coming on board such as the Environment Agency and more training and education would be undertaken.

A discussion followed with Members asking for copies of forms (circulated to all Members) and Ms Thomas's contact details and offering possible channels where she could get the message about First Contact out to the wider community, including adverts in some parish magazines.

One Member did ask how First Contact was different to the CVS and also how they were funded and whether they were paid by results to which Ms Thomas replied that they had targets as part of Age UK but Service Level Agreements were in place with partners and public health in order that the right level of checks were carried out and the partners achieved capacity. Public Health held the contract for First Contact which was funded by the NHS. Age UK hosted the front facing part of the service whilst Lincolnshire County Council hosted the back facing part of the service.

The Chairman thanked Ms Thomas for attending the meeting.

## **26. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

Two Members of the Working Group began the discussion by giving their personal view of what they thought should happen with regard to the Cabinet verses Committee systems. One Member felt that after speaking to various people there was not a problem with the current system perse it was just that Members had a feeling of non ownership, that they weren't making decisions, only seven people made those decisions. He felt that the Cabinet should have a shake up and be more transparent and fair. If a committee structure was

followed each should be quasi judicial, able to make their own decisions. The second Member felt that by changing to a Committee system Members would feel more involved in decision making and although this may be costly in the short term in the long run there would be savings, Members he felt would feel more involved in a committee system based on the old system. As the Cabinet was made up of one party he felt that other party's views were ignored.

The Chairman informed the group that any committee system would have to be a new system and could not be based on the old committee system. PDG's did not make decisions they were Policy Development Groups and made recommendations to Cabinet. He then spoke about information that he had received from the Local Government Association LGA concerning governance.

- Committees were autocratic
- A determination had to be made on the number of committees required
- The committees would have to be sub judicial in order to make their own decisions
- The councillors on each committee would all be accountable for the decisions made.
- If the Council was sued following a decision made, councillors maybe liable for the financial penalty
- All decisions would have to go to Council and therefore a meeting of all chairmen of committees would have to be held before a council meeting
- Chairmen of committees tended to be members of the ruling party

Using a version similar to the old committee system of governance:

- Committees were democratic
- All decisions had to go to Council to be ratified and could be amended by Council which would require the decision to go back to the original Committee to be re discussed and then back again to Council.
- A meeting would have to be held with all Chairmen before the Council meeting.
- Again all Chairman would in majority be in the ruling party (mini cabinet)

The Chairman made it clear to the Group that the LGA were not biased on either side. He then spoke of the findings to date of the Working Group and why he felt that the remit of the Working Group should be amended to look at how the current Cabinet system could be improved.

A discussion followed with views being put forward about increasing the number of Members on PDG's and the Working Group inviting Members from other parties to make presentations. A remark was made about the Chairmanship of committees and it was stated that in reality whoever the majority party was had the right to choose the chairmanships. One Member felt disenfranchised about being a Councillor and felt that she was not involved in the decision making process and would like a return to a committee structure. She felt that Councillor Wood should have attended the meeting to put his case, however it was stated that he had been to a previous meeting and documentation that he had collected had been circulated to Members. Ms Drury

confirmed that he had been invited to attend the Working Group but due to commitments had been unable to attend.

It was commented that a Members level of involvement was a personal choice, Members could attend all meetings and with the permission of the Chairman in most cases could present their view on an issue.

The Chairman again put the proposal forward that the remit of the Working Group be changed to look at how the current Cabinet system could be improved. The proposal was seconded and on being put to the vote carried.

Councillor Woolley asked if she could be included on the Working Group and it was agreed that the Working Group going forward would comprise of Councillors Bisnauthsing, Robins and Woolley, Councillor Cook would step down.

*(4.15pm Councillor Bisnauthsing left the meeting)*

It was agreed that a letter be drafted to those who had originally signed the letter requesting that a return to the Committee system be looked at informing them that the remit of the Working Group had been changed.

**>Action Note**

***A letter to be sent to those Members who had signed the letter requesting a return to the Committee system informing them of the change of remit of the Working Group***

## **27. FURTHER TRAINING FOR MEMBERS**

The Chairman discussed with the Group training for Members. The emphasis of the training was on the rights and obligations of councillors, where they could find information, what they could and couldn't do, what meetings they could attend. It was felt that an easy understandable form was required and he asked if an e-mail/or form could be sent to all Members to complete (anonymously) asking what information they would like on rights and privileges, does and don'ts that they had as councillors to see if there was a genuine need or problem.

**>Action Note**

***Ms Drury to look at circulating a form to all Members.***

On the topic of IT the Chairman felt that further training was needed especially as technology was being used more and more and it was becoming more important. It was suggested that because each Member had different needs generic training would not be useful, more specific training was necessary. A

suggestion was made about having a regular drop-in session or an IT clinic fortnightly so that Members could attend if they had a problem. This could be anything from a 10 minute session to a longer session if the Member's issue required more time.

**>Action Note**

***Ms Drury to speak to Andy Nix about drop-in sessions or IT clinics for Members.***

Following the discussion Ms Drury said that there seemed to be two issues relating to IT one was troubleshooting a laptop, the other where to find information on the laptop. With regard to help to find information within the Modern.gov system she informed the Group that she, together with Jo Toomey and Lucy Bonshor could advise/help Councillors on where information could be found, they were there to support Members.

One Member then referred to having a buddy system which had been spoken about when Members were first elected two years ago, this would help in locating people within the building especially when they move office or department or if they had any issues. Reference was also made to having the direct dial number of officers. The Chairman referred to a telephone directory that he had asked for and he found very helpful, even though it was a fairly large document.

**28. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Community Engagement & Policy Development Officer, Carol Drury circulated to Members information bulletins which listed the recommendations made by PDG's and the subsequent decisions made by Cabinet. Each PDG had a bulletin and both the bulletins for Communities PDG and Resources PDG were circulated. The bulletins were for Members information in order that they could see how their recommendations fitted in with the Cabinet decisions. In future the bulletin for the relevant PDG would be sent with the agenda, other PDG bulletins would be circulated at the meeting for Members information. Feedback from the Executive would also be included on the agenda and this would enable Portfolio Holders to attend meetings and speak to the Group about decisions made by Cabinet where a decision was different to that recommended by the PDG.

The work programme layout had also been streamlined with some columns being taken out. It was hoped that the changes to the work programme and the introduction of the bulletins would help Members be better informed of decisions taken by the Cabinet.

The Chairman thanked Ms Drury and commended her for her work on the bulletins.

**29. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 4.45pm.

# Engagement PDG Customer Access Strategy November 2013

Lee Sirdifield  
Interim Service Manager – Customer  
Services



Your council working for you

## ***Broad Principles***

### **How we will behave with customers**

- Deliver what we promise consistently
- Put ourselves in our customers' shoes
- Improve by listening to our customers
- Resolve customer queries in quickest way possible
- Put things right when we get it wrong

### **How we will manage customer access**

- Provide clear information about our services to all
- Ensure consistent quality for all access methods
- Have a single view of the customer
- Support vulnerable customers or complex queries
- Enable "digital by preference" access to key services



Your council working for you

### ***Key outcomes***

- Customers influencing more the way that our services are delivered
- The customer seeing us as one organisation and the council seeing them as one customer.
- Clear and consistent customer standards whatever the access channel.
- Resolution at first point of contact wherever possible.
- An effective website with end to end functionality for service requests.
- Interaction between council and customers to be “digital by preference”
- Consistently improved performance against an agreed relevant suite of measures.
- Support for vulnerable customers/complex issues
- Ability to predict future demand of customer need
- Better handling of customer feedback and real learning from our mistakes.
- Focus on reducing the cost of customers interactions



*Your council working for you*

### ***What's happening generally***

- 83% households have internet with 73% accessing every day
- Many organisations digital by default
- Growth of more automated telephony e.g. Voice recognition
- Use of Smart phones has rocketed
- Use of mobile devices to schedule home calls e.g. delivery, utilities



*Your council working for you*

### ***Other councils***

- Use of apps
- 28 transactions online saved £170,000
- Another 5% reduction in calls year on year
- Some “aggressive” channel shift strategies
- Many partner with IT firms
- Accelerating due to budget reductions



*Your council working for you*

### ***Our customers***

- CSC over 85,000 calls in 2012/13
- Over 100,000 in our other call centres
- Face to face 20,000 in Grantham and 10,000 in area offices
- New Bourne service on track to double previous numbers
- Emails – 6726 in CSC and 14,593 in R&B – elsewhere?
- Web - 408,648 visitors in 2012/13 (most popular = planning, building control & WaR) 36,000 payments
- Web – 5000 service requests



*Your council working for you*

### ***Our residents***

- Citizen's Panel – 60% had contacted council in last year
- Phone 61.7% and face to face 16%
- Preferred phone 55% and face to face 10%
- 13% - depends on reason
- Only 58% knew could report a problem
- Only 45% knew they could request a service
- 90% access to internet, 40% smart phones
- So, capability & aptitude for channel shift



Your council working for you

### ***Our technology***

- Review of our core systems and there were concerns about CRM plus 5 others
- Different telephony across the organisation and we may not be maximising deployment
- Had a number of presentations & proposals but needed an "honest broker"
- Foresight Consulting are doing short piece of work to help scope an action plan



Your council working for you

## ***Our model***



Your council working for you

### ***How we will measure success?***

- Continuing high level of satisfaction from customers
- Face to face important for vulnerable customers but seek to improve efficiency
- Telephony more consistent offer and reduce costs using “friendly” technology
- Improve online functionality to cover 75% services



Your council working for you

***Next steps***

- PDG for consultation in November and Cabinet for formal approval in December.
- Need to communicate to staff
- Need to market existing offer to residents
- Need to identify supporting IT and resources
- Develop detailed action plan to support including communication of approach to our customers once approved



## REPORT TO ENGAGEMENT P.D.G.

**REPORT OF:** Head of Legal and Democratic Services

**REPORT NO:** LDS113

**DATE:** 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2013

<b>TITLE:</b>	Corporate Enforcement Policy	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Key decision	
<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Councillor Paul Carpenter – Portfolio Holder for Governance and Communication	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Lucy Youles/John Armstrong l.youles@southkesteven.gov.uk; 01476406105 <a href="mailto:j.armstrong@southkesteven.gov.uk">j.armstrong@southkesteven.gov.uk</a> ; 01476406103	
<b>INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS:</b>  Equality and Diversity	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below Not applicable at this stage	Full impact assessment Required:
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	Current Enforcement Policy  <a href="http://moderngovsvr/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2975">http://moderngovsvr/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=2975</a>	

## **1. RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 That the Engagement PDG note the proposals for a revised Corporate Enforcement Policy Members are asked to consider the content of the Report and provide their views on the possible content of the proposed policy.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

2.1 The purpose of this report is to make Members aware of the forthcoming revised draft Corporate Enforcement Policy and to seek their views at this early stage so as to assist in the formulation of the draft document.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

3.1 The Council has a key role to play in establishing an environment that assists in supporting and facilitating the growth of business and supporting local economic prosperity. At the same time there is the equally important role in protecting public health and safety and promoting community health and well being and protecting the environment. Fair and effective enforcement underpins this and ensures that we protect health, safety and quality of life for all those who live, visit and work in the District and, ensures that those businesses and individuals who undertake regulated activities do so lawfully.

3.2 The Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006, requires that the Council has regard to the Principles of Good Regulation when exercising certain specified regulatory functions. The specified functions relevant to this Council are those carried out by our environmental health and licensing services.

3.3 Other guidance exists that recommends that we have a documented enforcement policy in place, for example the National Planning Policy framework, Health and Safety Executive Section 18 Guidance, and Food Standards Agency Framework Agreement.

3.4 The purpose of the Corporate Enforcement Policy is to establish a single overarching policy that encompasses the key factors and principles common to all aspects of enforcement undertaken by the Council. The intention is to commit the Council to good enforcement practice and establish a framework by which we will ensure a fair and consistent approach to the way that enforcement activities are undertaken.

3.5 It will be an important document that should give recognition to the fact that fair and effective enforcement is essential to protect economic interests, public health and safety and the environment.

3.6 Whilst the Corporate Enforcement Policy covers all regulatory activities undertaken by the Council it will remain necessary to support it with a suite of service-specific policy documents that set out in greater detail the enforcement practice in relation to particular service areas.

3.7 It is important that the Council reviews and updates its Corporate Enforcement Policy so it can demonstrate compliance with obligations imposed on it by the Regulatory Reform Act 2006, and the statutory guidance including the Regulators Compliance Code. Both of these documents post date the previous revision of the Council's Corporate Enforcement Policy in early 2006.

3.8 The intention is to produce a revised Corporate Enforcement Policy that is more directive and instructive on how to apply, for example, the assessment of when enforcement action may be necessary and proportionate. Consideration could, for example, be given to:

- The seriousness of the compliance failure;
- The businesses past performance and its current practices;
- The risks being controlled; and
- Legal, official or professional guidance received from third parties.

3.9 In addition the revised policy would inform when a particular enforcement option may be appropriate, for example:

- **To take no action** – This may be appropriate where the cost of compliance to the offender outweighs the detrimental impact of the contravention, or the cost of the required enforcement action to the Council outweighs the detrimental impact of the contravention to the community.
- **Informal action and advice** - We may for example take informal action when:
  - The act or omission is not serious enough to warrant formal action;
  - From the individual's or businesses past history we can reasonably expect that informal action can achieve compliance;
  - We have high confidence in an individual or business proprietor;
  - The consequences of non-compliance will not pose a significant risk to public health, public safety or the environment.
- **Forfeiture Proceedings** – used perhaps where there is a need to dispose of goods in order to prevent them re-entering the market place;
- **Administrative Penalties** – may be appropriate where an allegation of housing/council tax benefit fraud has been investigated and officers are satisfied from the evidence before them that an offence has been committed. When considering whether this is an appropriate course of action (as opposed to prosecution) the officer may take into account the severity of the offence and any aggravating features.
- **Injunctive Actions** – this may be appropriate in dealing with dangerous circumstances or significant consumer detriment.
- **Seizure** – Certain legislation enables authorised officers to seize goods, equipment or documents for example unsafe food. This would be appropriate where the goods are required as evidence for possible court proceedings.
- **Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN)** – where an offence permits a FPN we may choose to administer a FPN on a first occasion without a warning.
- **Formal Notice** – These may be served on offenders requiring them to take specific actions or cease certain activities. The Notice may require activities to cease immediately if they relate to health, safety, environmental damage or nuisance. In other cases it may be appropriate, taking into account the seriousness of the offence and implications to allow a 'reasonable' period of time to remedy the defect.
- **Simple Caution** – this is a potential alternative to prosecution and may be appropriate to:

- Deal quickly and simply with a less serious offence;
- Divert less serious offences away from the Courts
- Reduce the chance of repeat offences

Ideally a number of criteria would be identified and require satisfying before a simple caution is thought to be appropriate, for example:

- Sufficient evidence must be available to prove the case;
- The offender must admit the offence;
- It must be in the public interest to use a simple caution;
- The offender must be over 18 years of age;
- The offender should not have received a simple caution for a similar offence within the previous two years.

- **Prosecution** – the decision to prosecute is significant and could have far reaching consequences. It may be appropriate that the final decision on whether or not to prosecute should rest with the Head of Legal and Democratic after consultation with the relevant Head of Service/strategic Director. In any event sound criteria should be adopted before a decision to prosecute is made and may include circumstances where:

- The alleged offence involves a flagrant breach of the law putting public health and safety at risk;
- There is a reckless disregard for the environment
- The offence includes an element of deception
- A serious risk has been identified which the suspected offender has not rectified despite having been given reasonable opportunity to comply with the law;
- There is a history of similar offences
- The alleged offence is considered to be anti-social behaviour or causes public alarm;
- Prosecution is in the public interest, there is reasonable prospect of conviction and sufficient evidence to support proceedings.

- **Prohibition/stop notices and injunctions** – these are most probably appropriate where immediate action is necessary and may be issued in the following circumstances:

- There is imminent risk of injury to health or safety or environmental pollution;
- There is a serious hazard to residential premise;
- The consequences of not taking immediate action to protect the public would be unacceptable;
- Where unauthorised development is unacceptable and continuing work is or may cause irreversible damage;
- A proprietor is unwilling to confirm in writing his/her unprompted offer of a voluntary prohibition;

3.9.1 Before adopting a Corporate Enforcement Policy a draft version will be subject to consultation.

#### 4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 A failure to have in place an up-to-date Corporate Enforcement Policy could result in some inconsistency of approach across the Council resulting in a greater likelihood of challenge to enforcement decisions.

**5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

The provision of the policy will be met from existing resource.

**6. RISK AND MITIGATION**

Risk has been considered as part of this report and any specific high risks are included in the table below:

<b>Category Risk</b>	<b>Action / Controls</b>
No high risks are considered at this stage of the policy formation	

**7. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The Corporate Enforcement Policy should include a clear Equality Statement to ensure all enforcement activity is undertaken fairly and without discrimination on any grounds.

**8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

The provision of a robust policy will ensure that enforcement prevents the continuation of potential criminal activity

**9. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES**

**10. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

Set out in the document

**11. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICES**

## ENGAGEMENT PDG – DECISIONS BULLETIN

22<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2013

---

### DECISION

#### 7.10.13 SAFEGUARDING ADULTS MULTI AGENCY POLICY & PROCEDURE

- 1) Cabinet approves the adoption of the Safeguarding Adults Policy and Procedure as attached to report TSE0059; and**
- 2) notes the intended arrangements for briefing staff and volunteers and agrees that Members should be briefed by e-mail.**

### CONSIDERATIONS/REASONS FOR DECISION:

- 1) Report TSE0059 from the Service Manager, Housing Management.
- 2) Lincolnshire County Council had adopted a new Safeguarding Adults Multi Agency Policy and Procedure manual on 1st August 2013.
- 3) As a partner agency with a social and moral responsibility to provide a duty of care to adults at risk within South Kesteven, the Council was required to sign up to the Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) Policy and Procedures or produce its own.
- 4) In light of the extensive content of the LCC Policy it was agreed that the District Council should produce its own policy.
- 5) Comments from the Management Team, Communities PDG and the Portfolio Holder had been incorporated into the document.
- 6) A copy of the document had been sent to Lincolnshire County Council's Adult Safeguarding Board.
- 7) Comments made by the Portfolio Holder Good Housing thanking the Service Manager Housing Management for the concise policy.
- 8) Comments made by the Service Manager Housing Management on the proposed training and roll out of the policy.
- 9) Comments made by the Portfolio Holder Governance and Communication that the document, in order to be effective had to be reacted to.

#### Other Options Considered:

That the Lincolnshire County Council Policy and Procedures be adopted however, it was felt more appropriate to develop policy and procedures specifically tailored to South Kesteven District Council's own arrangements.

# ENGAGEMENT PDG – DECISIONS BULLETIN

22<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2013

---

## DECISION

### **11.11.13 HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

**Cabinet approves the Housing Asset Management Strategy 2013-2018**

## CONSIDERATIONS/REASONS FOR DECISION:

- 1) Report RIM0321 from the Service Manager Property Services.
- 2) The Housing Management Strategy 2013-2018 had been developed to inform both the strategic medium and long term approach to maintaining, improving and developing SKDC's housing assets.
- 3) Consultation had been undertaken with the Portfolio Holder, Cabinet, the Resources PDG and the Tenant Review Group.
- 4) The strategy had been based around two key areas, Property and Service Standards and Stock Portfolio Management and contained seven priorities: Our Standard, Energy Efficiency, Repair and Maintenance, Meeting Particular Needs, Business Resilience, Development Potential and Managing Opportunities and Liabilities.
- 5) As a provider of housing accommodation the Council had a duty under the Housing Act 1985, the reform agenda proposed by the Localism Act 2011 and other relevant legislation. The proposed strategy and standards reflected and assisted the delivery of those duties.
- 6) Comments made by the Portfolio Holder and reiterated by the Leader on the amount of work that had gone into the document.
- 7) Comments made by the Portfolio Holder, Governance and Communication on the "common sense" approach within the document.
- 8) The document was part of a series of documents with the next document coming forward being the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan.

# ENGAGEMENT PDG – DECISIONS BULLETIN

22<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2013

---

## DECISION

### 7.10.13 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2013/14 - 2017/18

**Cabinet recommends to Council the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the period 2013/14 – 2017/18.**

## CONSIDERATIONS/REASONS FOR DECISION:

- 1) Report HOF253 from the Strategic Director Corporate Focus and the Head of Finance.
- 2) The MTFS sets out the Council's strategic approach to the management of its finances in order to deliver its stated priorities as laid out in the Councils Corporate Plan.
- 3) The MTFS presented indicative budget levels which included assumptions around Council Tax and Government grant over the medium term together with a cyclical review of Fees and Charges.
- 4) It highlighted significant financial risks facing the Council in forthcoming years and what the Council was doing to reduce those risks to ensure the plans were robust, realistic, achievable, deliverable and fully funded.
- 5) Work on the MTFS had been carried out with Cabinet Members and the Resources PDG.
- 6) Two main principles were incorporated into the MTFS, the delivery of efficiencies and the transformation plan and the delivery of treasury management, capital framework and the asset review.
- 7) The Capital Framework was outlined within the MTFS showing the spending proposals for the five year period and how the Council's resources would fund the programme.
- 8) The pooling of business rates was still under discussion, although a decision had to be made by 31st October. It had been agreed that a decision on whether or not to join the Lincolnshire organisation (Lincolnshire County Council, South Holland District Council and North Kesteven District Council) would be made by way of an urgent key decision by the Portfolio Holder Strategic Resources.
- 9) Comments made at the meeting from the Portfolio Holder Strategic Resources thanking the Officers and their teams for their hard work in compiling the MTFS.
- 10) Comments made by the Leader on the current situation with the Pooling of business rates.
- 11) Comments made by the Strategic Director and the Leader about the New Homes Bonus and where the actual funding came from.
- 12) Comments made by the Head of Finance on grants that were no longer funded by the Government (Better Homes and Empty Homes).