

## 2013/14 Budget Scrutiny Outstanding Actions, Recommendations and Conclusions

### Capital Bids 2013/14

The budget scrutiny process for 2013/14 has involved a review of the capital bids received as part of the 2013/14 process. The bids received were reviewed at an informal budget scrutiny meeting (24 September 2012) and scored using a standard score card taking into account:

- Drivers (compulsory/legal; highly recommended; or desirable)
- Strategic Objectives (direct and significant to a strategic objective; indirect; or, not applicable)
- Consultation Priority
- Impact on performance or service deliver
- Organisation risk
- Efficiency (positive revenue with figures provided)

At the second informal budget scrutiny meeting (2 October 2012) Lead Members and Heads of Service were present to provide scrutiny members with additional information on a number of bids.

At the 16 October 2012 meeting of the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board, Members reviewed the information from the informal meetings and agreed to submit the following recommendations for consideration by the Executive:

Recommendations	Reasons and Comments
<b>Capital Programme 2012/13</b>	
<p>1. That the following capital bids be included in the capital programme 2013/14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. D &amp; PS Access Audit 2012</li> <li>ii. Vehicle Replacement 2013/14</li> </ul>	<p>Bids i – xv: The Board was satisfied with the information and justification for each of these bids. All of these bids received a score of 24 or greater during the review process and the Board determined that all bids with a score greater than 24 should be recommended for inclusion in the capital programme 2013/14.</p>

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board  
2013/14 Budget Scrutiny

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Cherwell Community Centre – Roof Covering Replacement</li> <li>iv. Microsoft Licensing</li> <li>v. Recycling Bank Replacement 2013/14</li> <li>vi. Units 6 &amp; 7 Thorpe Way – Replacement Roof Covering</li> <li>vii. Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants</li> <li>viii. Vehicle lifting equipment</li> <li>ix. Desktop PC Replacement</li> <li>x. Visualfiles Upgrade</li> <li>xi. Server Replacement Package</li> <li>xii. 23 &amp; 24 Thorpe Place – Replacement Roof Lights</li> <li>xiii. Financial System Upgrade</li> <li>xiv. Bicester Sports Village Phase 2</li> <li>xv. Stratfield Brake Repair Works</li> <li>xvi. Wheeled Bin Replacement Scheme</li> <li>xvii. Works in Connection with Condition Survey</li> <li>xviii. Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre Astro Turn Replacement</li> <li>xix. North Oxfordshire Academy Track Refurbishment</li> <li>xx. Discretionary Housing Grants</li> </ul>	<p>Members noted however that there were a number of bids that related to the replacement of items which would have a limited life span and therefore require repair or replacing again as well as . Members commented that the capital pot is limited and would require building up again, therefore the Board suggested that consideration should be given to services building up funds to cover future replacements and ongoing costs.</p> <p>Bid xvi (Wheeled Bin Replacement Scheme): The Board commented that it was important for the Executive to be mindful of future wheeled bin replacement schemes and that the Executive be requested to build up funds from revenue accounts for future replacement schemes. Members noted that not all bins would require replacing at the same time and therefore bin replacement should be undertaken as a rolling scheme.</p> <p>Bid xvii (Works in Connection with Condition Survey): The Board agreed that this project be recommended for inclusion in the capital programme 2013/14 as the survey would review assets and identify areas requiring replacement to inform a rolling repair and maintenance programme.</p> <p>Bid xviii (Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre Astro Turf Replacement) and bid xix (North Oxfordshire Academy Track Refurbishment):The Board recommended that these bids be included in the capital programme 2013/14 as recreation was one of the council’s key services and third party funding could only be sought if CDC committed funds. Members requested that officers giver consideration with partners to general maintenance and future replacement.</p> <p>Bid xx (Discretionary Housing Grants): Members noted that the level of demand for these grants varied and agreed that the grants should be retained, in particular, in light of the welfare reforms.</p>
---	--

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board  
2013/14 Budget Scrutiny

<p>2. That the following capital bid be included in the capital programme 2013/14, subject to negotiation and agreement being reached with Kidlington Parish Council for the ongoing maintenance of the bollard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Kidlington Pedestrian Scheme – Phase 2</li> </ul>	<p>The Board recognised that this bid was the next phase of the Kidlington pedestrianisation scheme and would help enforce the new pedestrianised area in the centre of Kidlington. The Board agreed that this bid should be recommended for inclusion in the 2013/14 capital programme subject to subject to negotiation and agreement being reached with Kidlington Parish Council for the ongoing maintenance of the bollard.</p>
<p>3. That the following capital bid be included in the capital programme 2013/14, subject to an appropriate policy for the scheme being established, a requirement that any bids over £2000 must have, as a minimum, matched funding and that the Lead Member approve grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Community Facilities Grant Scheme</li> </ul>	<p>The Board noted that the Community Facilities Grant Scheme would support community groups and parishes and there were no projects earmarked for funding. The Board stressed the need for a process for the allocation of grants that would consider each application on its merits and that each grant be approved by the Lead Member. To Board also recommended a cap of £2000 per bid and that any bids over £2000 must have, as a minimum, matched funding.</p>
<p>4. That the following capital bids not be included in the capital programme 2013/14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Bartec expansion</li> <li>ii. Replacement CCTV and Intruder Systems District Wide</li> <li>iii. CDC and SNC Customer Services Desktop as a Service (DaaS)</li> <li>iv. Town Centre Visitor Information</li> <li>v. Lighting to Main Chamber, Bodicote</li> </ul>	<p>Bid i (Bartec Expansion): The Board recommended that this bid not be included in the capital programme 2013/14 as, whilst the benefits of the system were understood, Members felt that it was not a priority at the current time, additionally, the payback was longer that the asset life.</p> <p>Bid ii (Replacement CCTV and Intruder Systems District Wide): There was no insurance requirement to replace the system which was adequate.</p> <p>Bid iii (CDC and SNC Customer Services Desktop as a Service (DaaS)): The Board felt the time and resource efficiencies of the system presented in the bid did not warrant the capital expenditure, particular as there were no direct financial efficiencies.</p> <p>Bid iv (Town Centre Visitor Information) and Bid v (Lighting to Main Chamber, Bodicote): These were the two lowest scoring bids and Members agreed that they did not justify best use of the council's resources.</p>
<p>5. That the following capital bids not be included in the capital programme 2012/13:</p>	<p>The Board agreed that these bids did not met the capital requirements and requested that officers investigate other sources of funding,</p>

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board  
2013/14 Budget Scrutiny

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Bradley Arcade – Promenade Deck Repairs to Shops</li> <li>ii. Stable Restaurant Alterations</li> <li>iii. Repairs to Lighting Protection at Bodicote House and Banbury Bus Station</li> <li>iv. External / Internal Painting</li> <li>v. Retained Land Backlog Maintenance</li> <li>vi. Street Furniture</li> <li>vii. Unit 18 Thorpe Way - clearance of unit</li> <li>viii. Unit 6 &amp; 20 Thorpe Place – Improvements</li> <li>ix. CDC Community Development Strategy</li> <li>x. Cherwell Allocations Review and Implementation</li> <li>xi. Work-in-default</li> </ul>	
<p>6. That recommendations on the following capital bids be deferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Replacement Air Conditioning Plant to Main Chamber, Bodicote House</li> <li>ii. Highfield Depot – Proposed Redevelopment of Office and Welfare Facilities</li> <li>iii. Planning and Building Control replacement of ICLIPSE (Northgate)</li> </ul>	<p>Bid i (Replacement Air Conditioning Plan to Main Chamber, Bodicote House): The Board queried if this would fall under the Condition Survey that they had recommended for inclusion in the Capital Programme 2013/14. If it were not, the Board queried if it should be included. Members agreed that a decision on this bid be deferred to allow for further information to be presented to Members in due course.</p> <p>Bid ii (Highfield Depot – Proposed Redevelopment of Office and welfare Facilities): The Board agreed to defer consideration of this item and requested that a business case be developed as part of the proposal which would include detail on the immediate works required and a long term objective for the site. Members stressed that the working conditions and health and safety of the staff working on the site was a priority and the business case would ensure that their</p>

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board  
2013/14 Budget Scrutiny

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. Corporate – Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS)</li> <li>v. Joint Intranet (CDC and SNC)</li> <li>vi. Thorpe Lane Hard Standing Depot</li> </ul>	<p>needs were addressed in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>Bids iii – v. The Board had received supplementary information on bid iv at their second informal meeting from the Lead Member for Performance and Customers, the Head of Transformation and the ICT Services Manager. The Board agreed that bids iii and v should be incorporated into the business case for EDRMS</p> <p>Bid vi (Thorpe Lane Hard Standing Depot): The Board requested that further information be provided to the Board in due course detailing the work that needed to be undertaken and the implications if it were not undertaken.</p>
---	---

**Environmental Services Budget**

The budget scrutiny process for 2013/14 has involved a review of the council's environmental services budget. The Board received an extensive briefing from the Head of Environmental Services during which Members were advised that Environmental Services delivered many of the front line services of the Council, including Waste Collection, Street Cleansing, Public Conveniences and Landscape Management. These services were the services that the Council was most well known for amongst residents and accounted for a significant percentage of overall Council expenditure. The overall revenue budget for Environmental Services was £5.86 million.

The Board agreed to submit the following recommendations for consideration by the Executive:

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Reasons and Comments</b>
1. That consideration be given to requesting officers to develop a business case for commercial waste collection.	The Board noted that waste collection from residents in the district was the primary function of the waste service but considered that the collection of commercial waste could generate an income for the Council. It was acknowledged that the cost of such a service could outweigh any benefits and agreed that giving consideration to the feasibility of offering such a service through a cost/benefit analysis would be the most appropriate course of action in the first instance.
2. That the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board maintain a watching brief on the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (OWP)	<p>The Board had undertaken a detailed review of the Council's partnership with OWP in 2010/11 and retained the item on their work programme to monitor in light of uncertainty about the financial arrangements.</p> <p>The Board had noted that there was still considerable uncertainty about the financial arrangements and, in particular, the payments to collection authorities from the county council.</p>

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board  
2013/14 Budget Scrutiny

	<p>The issue was under discussion by Leaders and Chief Executives across the county and would also be considered by the OWP at their next meeting.</p> <p>Members agreed that this should remain on their work programme and requested that the Head of Environmental Services provide updates to the Board as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Homelessness Budget</b></p> <p>The budget scrutiny process for 2013/14 has involved a review of the council's homelessness budget. The Head of Finance and Procurement advised the Board that the Council's homelessness budget had remained relatively stable for the previous two years and the Government had confirmed that the Council's homelessness grant would remain the same for the next two years, but this was not ring fenced.</p> <p>It was anticipated that the need for homelessness support would increase as a result of the Government's Local Government Resources Review and Welfare Reforms Resources Review and Welfare Reforms which could cause budget pressures for the Council. As a consequence, the Board agreed that they should retain a watching brief through the Finance Scrutiny Working Group.</p>	