

# Agenda



Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Jennifer Thompson, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 01491 823619

Fax: 01491 823605

E-mail: [jennifer.thompson@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:jennifer.thompson@southoxon.gov.uk)

Date: 26 August 2013

Website: <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk>

## A MEETING OF THE

# Scrutiny Committee

WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY 3 SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 6.00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER, SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES

This meeting will be broadcast live on the council's website and the record archived for future viewing. You can view this broadcast and access reports at [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk).

### Members of the Committee:

Mrs Celia Collett, MBE (Chairman)

Ms Joan Bland (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr Steve Connel  
Mr John Cotton  
Ms Kristina Crabbe

Mrs Pat Dawe  
Mr Will Hall  
Mrs Eleanor Hards  
Mr Paul Harrison

Ms Elizabeth Hodgkin  
Mr Alan Rooke  
Mr David Turner  
Mrs Margaret Turner

### Substitutes

*Mr Roger Bell  
Mr Felix Bloomfield  
Mr David Bretherton  
Mr Bernard Cooper  
Mr Philip Cross  
Mrs Margaret Davies  
Mr Leo Docherty*

*Mr Mark Gray  
Mr Tony Harbour  
Mr Marcus Harris  
Mr Marc Hiles  
Ms Lynn Lloyd  
Mrs Ann Midwinter  
Ms Anne Purse*

*Mr Robert Simister  
Miss Rachel Wallis  
Mr Michael Welply  
Mrs Jennifer Wood  
Mrs Denise Macdonald*

**Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.**

**1 Apologies**

**2 Declaration of disclosable pecuniary interest**

**3 Minutes**

**Purpose:** to approve the minutes of the meeting on 4 June 2013 (Minutes previously circulated.)

**4 2012/13 performance review of GLL (Pages 5 - 26)**

Report of the Head of Economy Leisure and Property (**attached**)  
The feedback from the contractor will be circulated separately.

**Purpose:** to consider the performance of GLL in providing the leisure management service in South Oxfordshire district for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013 and make any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure, grants and community safety to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

**5 Draft housing distribution numbers for the larger villages (Pages 27 - 34)**

Report of the Head of Planning (**attached**)

**Purpose:** to consider the draft housing distribution numbers for the larger villages prior to Cabinet's consideration of these. The numbers will inform the preparation of neighbourhood plans.

**6 Financial outturn: March 2013 (Pages 35 - 54)**

Report of the Head of Finance (**attached**)

**Purpose:** to report the final year end position for revenue and capital expenditure against budget for the financial year 2012/13.

The committee is recommended to:

1. note the overall outturn position of the council as well as the outturn of individual service areas.
2. take into account the impact of the outturn position in the integrated service and financial planning process when setting the 2014/15 original budget.
3. note the slippage in the capital programme to 2013/14.

**If committee members have questions about specific services to raise at the meeting, these must be sent to the committee clerk by the morning of 3 September.**

**If questions are not submitted in advance, it is very unlikely that**

**these can be answered at the meeting.**

**7 Council tax reduction scheme 2014/15** (Pages 55 - 58)

Report of the Head of Finance (**attached**)

**Purpose:** to allow the committee to review the proposed council tax reduction scheme that will be adopted for the financial years beginning 2014/15 onwards and make any recommendations to the Cabinet member for Finance.

**8 Review of the arts development strategy and action plan**  
(Pages 59 - 76)

Report of the Head of Economy Leisure and Property (**attached**)

**Purpose:** to update the committee on the delivery of the arts development strategy and action plan for South Oxfordshire and advise on any amendments to the strategy for 2013/14. The report reviews the delivery of year three of the action plan and seeks the committee's views on the draft year four action plan, to ensure that officers have identified the key issues correctly

MARGARET REED

Head of Legal and Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

# Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of: Head of Economy Leisure and Property

Author: Chris Webb

Tel: 01491 823431

E-mail: [chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:chris.webb@southandvale.gov.uk)

Cabinet Member responsible: Bill Service

Tel: 01235 510810

E-mail: [bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk)

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 September 2013

## 2012/13 performance review of GLL

### Recommendation

That the committee considers GLL's performance in delivering the leisure management contract for the period 2012/13 and makes any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure, grants and community safety to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

### Purpose of Report

1. The report considers the performance of GLL in providing the leisure management service in South Oxfordshire district for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.

### Strategic Objectives

2. The review of GLL helps ensure that the council is achieving its strategic objectives in the following areas:
  - excellent delivery of key services - deliver high performing services with particular emphasis on ensuring good quality sports and leisure provision
  - effective management of resources - reducing energy usage throughout the council's operations and continue to work in partnership with Vale of White Horse District Council to extend the sharing of services and all resources.

### Background

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced (approximately half the revenue budget is spent on seven main contractors), the council cannot deliver excellent service to its residents unless its contractors are

excellent. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.

4. The council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The council realises that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the council working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be:
  - a consistent way for the council to consistently measure contractor performance, to help highlight and resolve operational issues
  - flexible enough to suit each contract, including smaller contracts which may not require all elements of the framework
  - a step towards managing risk more effectively and improving performance through action planning.

### Overview of the Review Framework

6. The review process consists of three essential dimensions:
  1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPTs)
  2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
  3. council satisfaction as client.
7. Each dimension is assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. Contractor feedback and an assessment of strengths and areas for improvement are also included. Where some dimensions are not relevant or difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the heads of service.
8. The contract with GLL runs from 1 April 2009 until 31 August 2014. The value of the contract to the council has increased since its commencement, due to major facility improvements at Park Sports Centre and Thame Leisure Centre, and the transfer of the swimming pool at Thame Leisure Centre from Thame Town Council to South Oxfordshire District Council. As part of its tendered proposal, GLL sub-contracted the day to day operations of the centres to Nexus Community. However, Nexus Community merged into GLL in January 2011 and the report refers to the contractor as GLL. GLL provides a comprehensive programme of activities and opportunities for residents and visitors to South Oxfordshire to enjoy sporting and leisure facilities. It operates facilities in Wheatley, Didcot, Thame, Henley and Wallingford on behalf of the council through a management contract and service specification document. Within these documents are a series of key performance targets, which help to demonstrate the achievement of the contractor in delivering important parts of the service. These targets are summarised in paragraph 10 of this report and are detailed in annex A of this report.
9. The main deliverable within the contract, which provides a minimum income to the council of £217,566 each year, is to increase participation in the council's leisure facilities and seeks to provide a varied programme of activities to cater for different age groups and preferences. The contract expiry date of 31 August 2014 is in line with the contract expiry dates of the leisure management contracts in the Vale of White Horse

district and provides the potential for a more effective and efficient joint contract from 1 September 2014. The procurement of the joint contract is the subject of a separate procurement exercise and, therefore, does not form part of this report.

**DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

10. There are ten key performance targets (KPTs) measured on this contract. An analysis of performance against KPTs appears below (and in more detail in Annex A of this report).

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	Increase total visits	8%	-6%	Poor	1
KPT 2	Increase physical activity usage	8%	-7%	Poor	1
KPT 3	Increase U16 dry course visits	15%	-42%	Poor	1
KPT 4	Increase wet course visits	3%	7%	Excellent	5
KPT 5	Reduce energy usage: electricity gas	-3%	-9%	Excellent	5
		-3%	7%	Poor	1
KPT 6	Increase GP referral clients	2.5%	10%	Excellent	5
KPT 7	Decrease S/V (subsidy per visit)	-£3.87	-£4.21	Excellent	5
KPT 8	Increase in community leisure cards	25%	-28%	Poor	1
KPT 9	Decrease operating cost per visit	£ 2.97	£3.19	Fair	3
KPT 10	Total internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings	25%	23%	Fair	3
Overall “average” KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average)					2.81
Overall “average” KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Fair

11. These targets were agreed at the start of the year using the actual achievements from the previous year. The targets were set as testing but in line with anticipated trends at

the start of the year, and the early results were encouraging. However, as the year progressed, significant underachievement was forecast and this became more evident as the year went on. The achievement by GLL in last year's performance report resulted in scores that achieved an overall average KPT score of 4.7 and an overall average KPT performance of excellent.

12. As with last year, GLL needs to carry out some further work on the reports delivered by its Legend management reporting system. It appears that the numbers reported by Legend may not be fully representative of the actual numbers coming through the doors. This needs to be clarified for the current reporting year.
13. In addition, there is a discerning trend across the district that suggests our customers are being more selective with their disposable cash and may be choosing not to spend as much on using our facilities. This is also contributing to reduced attendances, which GLL needs to address and challenge.
14. GLL responded to this trend by offering a series of reduced price membership offers, such as at Didcot Wave where the change in price is showing a change in customer take up in a positive way. There is a considerable amount of work to be undertaken in attracting new, and retaining existing, customers apart from simply price-related initiatives, although price is a key factor.
15. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement 

Fair
------

Previous KPT judgement for comparison 

Excellent
-----------

**DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

16. GLL carried out and collated customer satisfaction surveys during 2012/13. A copy of the face to face survey is attached in annex B of this report.
17. The sample sizes for this reporting period were 620 face to face completed questionnaires, which is approximately 15 per cent less than in the previous reporting year. However, the questions do provide a more detailed picture of customer satisfaction and are more relevant to the services provided. In 2013/14 this sample size will be increased.
18. An analysis of customer satisfaction performance is also included in annex B of this report.
19. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent



20. The overall score achieved by GLL for customer satisfaction is 3.47. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement

Fair

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

Good

### **DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION**

21. The council has taken the opinions of seven officers who have interaction with members of the GLL team at many levels. These officers provided scores that they considered were appropriate to the performance of the contractor and these have provided the overall satisfaction score. An analysis of council satisfaction performance appears in annex C of this report.
22. As reported in the previous year's performance report, the formal merger of Nexus Community into GLL introduced significant initial change for the management teams within the leisure centres and the senior management team who control the overall direction of the contract. Officers hoped that the second year of this merger would show a reduced amount of change and certainly its effects on staff would have reduced. However, this is not yet evidenced by officers, as there are still a number of issues that continue to occur and require our attention.
23. As described in paragraph 22 above, the client team has a number of issues that relate primarily to the volume of work it identifies on each of the sites each month that require remedial work by the GLL team. This work varies from basic cleaning issues to maintenance and identification of operational controls that are not being applied to the required standard. Whilst the remedial works are then undertaken, it is the fact that the client team, rather than the contractor, is identifying this continual volume of work that is of concern.
24. The client team considers it had to do more following up on issues and projects during this period than is reasonable. Officers also have a concern over the culture within GLL and feel that this is distracting general managers and the partnership manager away from the service management of the centres towards the financial and business elements of the contract. When considering the KPI figures in dimension one of this report, the significant reductions in users and income may have been linked in some way to this culture change and the ensuing distraction of the facility management team. It is clear that there is a continued willingness and determination by GLL to achieve a much higher score in the final performance period for this contract.
25. Further to the issues identified in paragraph 22 above, the number of comments received by GLL and the council has increased. The issues are generally of an operational nature, but reflect the council's concerns about the level of on-site management supervision provided over the reporting year either because of staff changes or through the change of emphasis as previously described. Further details on the breakdown of these comments can be found in Annex B of this report.
26. Riverside outdoor pool continues to be a difficult facility to operate; officers are consistently finding a range of service-related issues that require attention. By its nature as a seasonal facility, the outdoor pool does not have a permanent team of staff

and so to prepare, operate and decommission such a facility is new each year to most of the team. However, that does not alter the known work that is needed to prepare the site in readiness for opening and to manage it during the season. This is an unnecessary and continual drain on the client team's resources during the summer and needs to be a major area of improvement in 2013/14.

27. Officers have communicated these concerns at the monthly client meetings and in quarterly progress meetings with senior GLL managers specifically arranged to discuss these concerns. These meetings will continue until the situation is rectified to the council's satisfaction.
28. Despite these issues, GLL has continued to support a range of charitable, community and special initiatives throughout the year. The most prominent being the Olympic Games and the on-going legacy. GLL as an organisation was heavily involved in direct provision of the games and has subsequently been awarded contracts to manage two of the Olympic venues. Prior to the games starting, GLL used the council's facilities to promote the games and raise the profile of sport and healthy lifestyles and in legacy terms to recruit volunteers to work during and after the games with clubs and organisations to increase participation in sport. GLL staff were heavily involved in the Olympic Torch relay, which travelled through the district, and have hosted Inspire Days at Henley and Thame leisure centres where free use has been provided to encourage residents to try a physical activity and increase use of our facilities. All other centres in this contract will host similar days.
29. In addition, GLL's Sports Foundation has continued to support 38 aspiring athletes who come from clubs or who reside in the district. This foundation provides grant aid to athletes at different levels of their development and for a wide range of sporting activities.
30. In July 2012 GLL supported the launch of the new Riverside Jubilee Interactive Water Feature, which proved a great success during the summer. The GLL team took over the operation of the feature and combined it with the existing operation of the outdoor pool and campsite.
31. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of contractors on customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

32. The overall score achieved by GLL for council satisfaction is 3.86 and using the scoring matrix in paragraph 31 above this provides a score of fair. This is the same mark that GLL achieved in 2011/12, which is disappointing as both the council and GLL were anticipating a significant improvement in 2013/14.
33. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on council satisfaction as follows:

Council satisfaction judgement

Fair

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

Fair

## Overall assessment

34. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPTs, customer satisfaction and council satisfaction, the head of service has made an overall judgement as follows. Recognising the high importance of customer satisfaction, this dimension is accorded greater weight in the judgement.
35. Officers consider that GLL did not perform well during the reporting year, primarily due to the continued significant change that occurred throughout the year, customer satisfaction has declined, KPT performance has declined significantly and council satisfaction has not improved, which leads the head of service to award an overall judgement of Fair for 2012/13.

Overall assessment

Fair

Previous overall assessment for comparison

Good

## Strengths and areas for improvement

36. Annex C of this report records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor over the last year. Where performance is below expectations, the contract monitoring officer will agree an improvement plan with the contractor.
37. Officers have developed an action plan based on the findings of the customer survey and council officers' comments to address areas for improvement. The plan is attached as annex F of this report and the outcomes of this plan will be reported in 2013/14. The updated 2011/12 action plan is attached as annex E of this report.

## Contractors feedback

38. A key feature of the process for reviewing the performance of contractors is that the council provides them with an opportunity to give their feedback on the assessment, including suggestions for improvements to council processes. This is included in annex D attached to this report.

## Financial implications

39. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

## Legal implications

40. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

## Conclusion

41. The head of economy, leisure and property has assessed GLL's performance as "Fair" for its delivery of the leisure management contract during 2012/13, which is a reduction in performance from "Good" in 2011/12. In the last year of such a contract, the council would not normally provide a performance report of this type; however, as GLL's

overall performance has reduced, the head of economy, leisure and property has delegated authority to vary this provision and require officers to report in 2014/15 on GLL's performance over 2013/14. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the cabinet member for leisure, grants and community safety, to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

### **Background Papers**

- none.

## Annex A – Key performance targets

### KPT 1 – increase in total number of visits to leisure centres by eight per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres and includes figures for non-sporting attendances, such as spectators. The number of visits during 2012/13 was 980,449, a decrease of six per cent on the previous year. The two worst performing centres were Park and Didcot leisure centres, which both lack a swimming pool and rely solely on dry side activities. Didcot Wave has performed strongly and Henley Leisure Centre has shown strong growth, although both underachieved on last year’s attendances.

### KPT 2 – increase physical activity visits by eight per cent - achieved

This target looks at the total number of visits to the leisure centres to participate in physical activities. In 2012/13 there were 790,728 such visits, which is a decrease on 2011/12 of seven per cent. Again, the two worst performing centres were Didcot and Park leisure centres, with the first three quarters of the year provided better results than the final quarter, which proved particularly challenging. This is not a unique situation in the industry or the county, with all operators evidencing a reduced attendance in many facilities. GLL has action plans in place to tackle these reductions for 2013/14.

### KPT 3 – increase under 16 dry course visits by 15 per cent – not achieved

This target looks at the number of under 16’s attending dry side courses organised by the leisure centres themselves. The target was set at increasing the attendances overall by 15 per cent based on growth in the previous year of 19.66 per cent. Unfortunately, the actual attendances fell short of the target by 42 per cent. One of the reasons being offered by GLL for this shortfall is the reporting obtained from the GLL servers, which have now been in place for two years. However, a more acceptable reason is that due to finances being more restricted, customers are making a choice between learn to swim courses and dry side ones, with the consequences being evident as to which gets priority.

Under 16 dry course	2011/12	2012/13	Variance
Abbey	13,738	9,082	-4,656
Henley	1,563	545	-1,018
Park	19,326	11,884	-7,442
Thame	18,809	8,855	-9,954
Didcot L C	2,921	2,329	-592
<b>Total</b>	<b>56,357</b>	<b>32,695</b>	<b>-23,662</b>

### KPT 4 – increase in wet course visits by three per cent – achieved

During 2012/13, 154,112 wet course visits were recorded, an increase of seven per cent over target on 2011/12 figures. All facilities with pools have shown growth in their attendances, with Henley and Thame showing the largest growth. This growth does in some way support GLL’s suggestion for the decline in dry sports courses, as customers would rather their children swim before having other sporting skills.

<b>Under 16 wet course</b>	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Abbey</b>	16,067	16,362	295
<b>Henley</b>	21,687	23,556	1,869
<b>Thame</b>	45,236	49,959	4,723
<b>Didcot Wave</b>	61,707	64,235	2,528
<b>Total</b>	144,697	154,112	9,415

**KPT 5 – reduce energy consumption by three percent - achieved**

GLL did not achieve its target reduction in gas consumption for the reporting year, in fact the facilities used seven per cent more, due primarily to the prolonged damp and cold weather over much of the year. The one exception was Riverside outdoor pool, which benefited from a period of hot and humid weather during its season.

GLL over achieved its target reduction in electricity consumption by almost six per cent showing an overall reduction by nine per cent. With the exception of Riverside outdoor pool and Thame Leisure Centre, all facilities contributed to the achievement of this target through improved housekeeping and investment in carbon reduction schemes by the council.

**KPT 6 – increase GP referral clients by 2.5 per cent - achieved**

This target measures the increase in the number of people using the facilities who are referred by GP's and other referring practitioners, such as practice nurses and physiotherapists. GLL is the leading leisure contractor in the area for promoting and working in this field and invests significant resources into profiling and enabling participation. In 2011/12 the contract saw a 2.76 per cent increase in referrals from the previous year, in 2012/13 the increase was ten per cent, which exceeded the target and is an excellent result. Abbey Sports Centre in Berinsfield was the only facility to lose clients, whilst Thame, Didcot Wave and especially Henley had significant increases in clients.

	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Abbey</b>	593	433	-160
<b>Henley</b>	281	443	162
<b>Park</b>	429	440	11
<b>Thame</b>	638	774	136
<b>Didcot Wave</b>	404	495	91
<b>Total</b>	2,345	2,585	240

**KPT 7 – decrease subsidy per visit (SV) to -£3.87 - achieved**

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was -£3.87 per visit. The end of year figure reported is down to -£4.21 per visit - an overachievement of -£0.34. Didcot Leisure Centre was the poorest performing centre, due to lost income from reduced attendances and additional energy costs through increased gas consumption. Overall, the contract has performed well for this KPT, despite the difficult economic conditions and extended bad weather.

Negative S/V figures are GOOD, positive figures are BAD ;  
 Negative Var £ figures are BAD

	2011/12	Target S/V £	S/V £	Variance £
<b>Abbey</b>	£0.26	£0.26	0.08	0.18
<b>Wave</b>	-£1.37	-£1.40	-£1.47	0.07
<b>Henley</b>	-£1.13	-£1.15	-£1.41	0.26
<b>Park</b>	-£1.25	-£1.28	-£1.68	0.40
<b>Thame</b>	-£1.58	-£1.62	-£1.63	0.01
<b>Didcot Leisure Centre</b>	£0.63	£0.62	£0.98	-0.37
<b>Riverside</b>	£0.72	£0.70	£0.92	-0.21
<b>Overall</b>		<b>-£3.87</b>	<b>-£4.21</b>	<b>0.34</b>

**KPT 8 – increase number of community leisure cards by 25 per cent – not achieved**

The number of community leisure cards issued failed to achieve the target by 28 per cent in the last year. The main reason for this shortfall was the cleansing of the GLL data base, which removed approximately 6,000 loyalty cards that were not being used by residents, thereby exaggerating the decline in cards in use. Also GLL transferred the hosting of these cards from the old Nexus server onto the GLL server, which reports differently and has further confused the figures. This KPT illustrates the difficulty that the facility teams are experiencing in growing gym numbers; however, GLL introduced lower cost gym membership options at Didcot Wave and Abbey Sports Centre and a re-launch campaign is planned for May 2013.

	March 2012	Target	March 2013
Loyalty	13,747	<b>17,184</b>	13,129
Pay as you go 30%	3,428	<b>4,285</b>	3,099
Pay as you go 60%	544	<b>680</b>	702
Prepaid	3,697	<b>4,621</b>	3,470
Swimming only	524	<b>655</b>	501
Under 14's	1,761	<b>2,201</b>	2,052
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,701</b>	<b>29,626</b>	<b>22,953</b>
<b>YTD % Variance</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>-3%</b>

**KPT 9 – decrease operational cost per visit to £2.97 – not achieved**

The target subsidy per visit for the centres was £2.97 per visit. The end of year figure reported is £3.19 per visit - an underachievement of -£0.22. The two worst performing centres were Didcot Leisure Centre and Park Sports Centre who had significantly lower customer numbers and, therefore, income through the doors. Expenditure was well controlled, but it was the shortfall in income that resulted in the non-achievement of this KPT.

	2011/12	Target OC/V £	O/C £	Var £
<b>Abbey</b>	3.59	£3.52	3.69	-0.17
<b>Wave</b>	2.61	£2.56	2.52	0.04
<b>Henley</b>	3.20	£3.13	3.06	0.08
<b>Park</b>	2.65	£2.60	3.16	-0.57
<b>Thame</b>	2.39	£2.34	2.49	-0.15
<b>Didcot Leisure Centre</b>	3.04	£2.98	3.46	-0.48
<b>Riverside</b>	3.71	£3.63	3.95	-0.31
	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>-0.22</b>

**KPT 10 – internet bookings as a percentage of casual bookings 25 per cent – not achieved**

Although this KPT was not achieved, there is evidence that the level of use of internet bookings is reaching the higher levels achieved three years ago and the final quarter of the reporting year actually achieved a higher percentage than the target set. This will hopefully continue in the next reporting year due to the continuing efforts of the facility teams and the improved profile of this booking facility.



## Annex B – Customer satisfaction

		Abbey	Didcot	Henley	Park	Thame	Partnership
<b>Access</b>							
1	Ease of getting through on telephone	2.1	3.8	3.2	4.3	3.3	3.3
2	Activity available at convenient times	2.9	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.8
3	Ease of booking	3.1	4.1	3.3	4.6	3.6	3.7
4	Ease of parking	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.2	4.1
5	Waiting time at reception	2.2	4.0	2.9	4.3	3.8	3.4
6	Activity charge	2.8	3.4	3.2	4.3	3.7	3.5
7	Range of activities available	2.0	3.1	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.3
8	Ease of contacting the centre with issues	1.7	3.7	3.6	4.2	3.3	3.3
9	If any issues, how well were they dealt with	1.8	4.0	4.0	4.5	2.9	3.4
<b>Quality of Facilities / Services</b>							
10	Quality of equipment	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.7
11	Water quality in the swimming pool	2.5	3.6	4.0		3.9	3.5
12	Water temperature in the swimming pool	3.9	3.2	2.9		3.6	3.4
13	Quality of food and drink	2.2	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.3
14	Quality of information / leaflets/websites	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.9	3.2	3.3
15	Availability of information	3.0	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.5
16	Quality of information on notice boards	2.3	3.4	3.4	4.0	3.2	3.3
17	Quality of flooring in sports hall/activity area	2.3	3.3	3.7	4.1	3.4	3.4
18	Quality of lighting in sports hall/activity area	2.8	3.3	3.3	4.3	3.5	3.4
19	Quality of artificial turf pitches	2.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.5
<b>Cleanliness</b>							
20	Cleanliness of changing rooms	2.4	3.2	3.2	0.3	3.4	2.5
21	Cleanliness of activity space	2.6	3.5	3.8	4.3	3.2	3.5
22	Cleanliness of cafeteria area	2.6	3.3	4.2	4.4	3.6	3.6
23	Quality of litter removal	2.6	3.7	3.9	4.5	3.5	3.6
24	Overall impression on cleanliness of centre	2.9	2.9	4.4	4.4	3.5	3.6
<b>Cafeteria / Food &amp; Drink / Vending</b>							
25	Range of food and drink	2.5	3.9	3.1	4.4	3.4	3.5
26	Quality of food and drink	2.6	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.0	3.4
27	Value for money of food and drink	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.9	3.2	3.2
28	Reliability of vending services	1.2	2.6	2.7	3.9	3.2	2.7

Staff							
29	Helpfulness of reception staff	3.2	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.1
30	Helpfulness of other staff	2.9	3.5	3.4	4.6	4.2	3.7
31	Standard of coaching / instruction	3.7	3.7	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.1
32	Availability of staff	2.1	3.6	3.6	4.5	3.5	3.4
33	Visibility of staff including uniform	2.6	3.4	4.2	4.5	3.7	3.7
Value for Money							
34	Value for money of activities	3.5	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.6	3.6
35	Overall satisfaction with your visit today	3.4	4.0	3.9	4.6	4.0	4.0

The survey results are detailed as follows and compared to the previous reporting year.

Centre	Partnership Results	
	2011/12	2012/13
Abbey Sports Centre	3.80	2.68
Didcot Centres	3.85	3.56
Henley Leisure Centre	3.40	3.60
Thame Leisure Centre	3.40	3.53
Park Sports Centre	3.85	4.15
<b>Contract average score</b>	3.70	3.47

The average score reached in 2011/12 was 3.7 across the contract, and the 2012/13 score has fallen, which reflects the trends identified elsewhere within this report. The centre teams at Thame and Park should be commended for their efforts in improving their scores, which in the case of Henley in particular reverses very negative trends that had existed for some time.

In 2011/12 GLL / Nexus introduced a new externally scored monitoring regime called Leisure Client, which concentrates heavily on cleaning and other customer facing areas. These inspections, which mirror the council's own monthly inspection criteria, also show increases in the scores, which support the rise in customer satisfaction evidenced below.

In addition to the surveys, customer comments are monitored throughout the year. This feedback has reported 255 complaints and 137 compliments during 2012/13 across the

contract as a whole. The two main areas of complaint revolved around cleaning and the equipment or environment provided in the centres. Both of these areas of concern are again highlighted in the action plan for 2013/14. The compliments received focus on staff and the equipment and environment provided. These results mirror exactly the outcomes from last year and again demonstrate the levels of diversity and individual tastes that the service has to try and accommodate. The summary of the comments is as follows:

<b>Type of complaint</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Type of compliment</b>	<b>Year Total</b>	<b>Year Total</b>
	<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>		<b>2011/12</b>	<b>2012/13</b>
Cleaning	68	60	Cleaning	11	14
Equipment/environment	67	67	Equipment/environment	30	32
Staff	19	30	Staff	60	62
Other	66	98	Other	22	29
Parking	13	0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>137</b>

Separate monitoring of equality and diversity related comments was also undertaken. Throughout the year there were four such comments received across the contract, a reduction from 29 in the previous year. The breakdown of these comments is as follows:

<b>Group comment received from</b>	<b>Year total</b>
Low Income	0
Disability	4
Ethnicity	0
Age	0
Sexuality	0
Religion or Belief	0
Gender	0
Gender Reassignment	0
Pregnant Women/New mothers	0
Others	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>

The four complaints all referred to main entrance access difficulties at the Abbey Sports Centre and Didcot Leisure Centre. Both centres will have new self opening doors in 2013/14 provided by the leisure client team in liaison with the council's equalities officer.

# Annex C - Council satisfaction

This assessment allows the council (as a client) to record its own satisfaction with aspects of a contractor's performance which lie outside Key Performance Targets and customer satisfaction. Each officer with direct knowledge and who frequently interacts with the contractor should complete this form. Questions can be left blank if not relevant to a contract or contractor.

Contractor / supplier / partner name | GLL

From (date) | 1 April 2012 | To | 31 March 2013

## Service delivery

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
1 Understanding of the client's needs		4			
2 Response time		4			
3 Delivers to time		4			
4 Delivers to budget		4			
5 Efficiency of invoicing			3		
6 Approach to health & safety		4			
7 Easy to deal with		4			
8 Communications / keeping the client informed		4			

## Communications and relations

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
9 Quality of written documentation		4			
10 Compliance with council's corporate identity		4			
11 Listening		4			
12 Quality of relationship		4			
13 Notifies Council of organisational or operational change			3		
14 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of works		4			

## Improvement and innovation

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatsfd
15 Degree of innovation			3		
16 Goes the extra mile		4			
17 Supports the council's sustainability objectives		4			
18 Supports the council's equality objectives		4			
19 Degree of partnership working		4			

## Key documents

If required, has the contractor provided the council with annual updates of the following documents?

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Updated risk register (Yes / No)            | Yes |
| 2. Updated business continuity plan (Yes / No) | Yes |

## Strengths and areas for improvement

Strengths	Partnership manager is always available, is accommodating and responds as requested
	The on-site teams work hard to deliver
	General managers and partnership manager are easy to approach and discuss/resolve issues.
	Desire from the majority of general managers to deliver the best service
	The team are friendly and approachable
	Supportive of projects such as GO Active and Active Women

Areas for improvement	Understanding and taking pro active actions for maintenance
	The use of the BETTER branding within the facilities
	Reducing the volume of items that the client team identify in the facilities, which are easily visible to both staff and customers.
	Improved technical and management support, plus appropriate resources for the operation of the outdoor pool at Riverside Park
	Management priorities re-balanced to service delivery rather than corporate or business areas.

## **Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback**

### **CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT**

From GLL's perspective it is disappointing that the partnership has not matched the growth that was experienced in 2011/12. 2012/13 GLL has recognised and adapted to changes in market demand and this has seen the introduction of new memberships and initiatives, the impact of which will be seen in 2013/14. Staff turnover in 2012/13 has been an issue across the partnership. This has been addressed by GLL with a full permanent staff pay review and casual pay rate review. This review has resulted in competitive pay rates for GLL staff compared to the rates inherited and will help Managers in recruitment and retention of their teams. A significant change in 2012/13 was the responsibility for OCC maintenance being taken on by GLL. The issues identified by SODC concerning maintenance reflect the period of transfer. As the year has progressed an improved understanding at a Centre level has improved the resolution of issues and GLL has applied a specific managerial resource to manage OCC maintenance.

2012/13 has seen further alignment in procedures following the full merger between GLL and Nexus and this will provide consistency, stability and an improvement in facility operations and management that will be evident in the next financial year.

GLL is committed to providing an excellent service in South Oxfordshire and has already made significant improvements in areas such as swimming lessons and sports courses. This included the introduction of a new online software system that enables the parent to track the progress of their child and make enrolment payments without the need to queue at Reception. GLL has invested in Centre and online booking systems to improve its front of house service and increase the number of bookings made on the internet. These investments have seen improvements in 2013.

### **ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT**

None – GLL recognise the Council's comments, concerns and compliments and are keen to work together to ensure an improved score in the next committee report.

**WHAT COULD / SHOULD THE COUNCIL DO DIFFERENTLY TO ENABLE THE CONTRACTOR TO DELIVER THE SERVICE MORE EFFICIENTLY / EFFECTIVELY / ECONOMICALLY?**

Feedback provided by Carey James – Partnership Manager

Date 27.08.13

## Annex E – progress of previous year’s action plan

Action	Owner	Due date	Client officer’s comments
Consideration to have dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres to improve cleaning standards	GLL	Review in Q1. Agree outcome in Q2	This initiative has been brought forward by GLL; however, the changes are not reflected in a reduction of customer complaints in this area compared to 2011/12. Also the number of monthly client inspections identifying cleaning as an issue remains consistently high.
More attention paid to cleaning during the day and especially at weekends.	GLL	Review in Q1.	There has been some improvement to this but it is inconsistent due to the difficulty in recruiting staff, which has a subsequent impact on service delivery. It is also dependent on staff being available from other duties to undertake the work.
General maintenance works need to be carried out in a more timely fashion without a negative effect on customers.	GLL	Continual improvement	This is still an area of concern, which will hopefully improve due to GLL being solely responsible for maintenance now after the removal of Mouchel through an agreement with Oxfordshire County Council. However, better identification of works by site teams is needed, as well as the GLL in-house staff responding quicker to work orders. However, as the new arrangements settle in, the situation is improving consistently.
Payment of contract variation invoices needs to be speeded up	GLL SODC client team	Q1	This area now seems to have improved satisfactorily
Maintain a closer eye on the market in terms of pricing	GLL	Ongoing review	There has been some movement on this aspect but it is limited and slow to be introduced.



Develop an insert into the disability guide to promote attendance at casual wet and dry sessions	GLL	Q2	Information has been updated and improved on the GLL website. A specific membership for people with disabilities has been introduced, which until this reporting year had not been available.
Place appropriate signage in all facilities asking customers not to use disabled parking bays without proper authority	GLL	Q2	It is felt that existing signage is satisfactory in all centre car parks; however, staff are making concerted efforts to monitor inappropriate use wherever possible.
Ensure all legislative documentation is retained in a uniformed style	GLL	Q1	Over the course of this reporting year GLL has introduced a full IMS system, which is in use at all SODC facilities and constantly updated.
Improve flooring at Didcot Leisure Centre reception	GLL/SODC client team/ OCC	Q4	This work is yet to be undertaken although cleaning frequencies have improved.
Review the quantity and condition of equipment provided in all centres	GLL	Q1	Some work on this has been completed at centres where shortfalls have been identified but there is a continual need to monitor the condition of equipment which will be maintained until the end of the contract.

## Appendix F – proposed action plan to improve performance

Action	Owner	Due date
Understanding and taking pro active actions for maintenance	GLL	
Explaining the use of the BETTER branding within the facilities	GLL	
Reducing the volume of items that the client team identify in the facilities, which are easily visible to both staff and customers	GLL	
Improved technical and management support plus appropriate resources for the operation of the outdoor pool at Riverside Park	GLL	
Management priorities re-balanced to service delivery rather than corporate or business areas.	GLL	
Consideration to have dedicated cleaning staff for all sites during the full opening hours of the centres to improve cleaning standards	GLL	
Reduce the number of complaints received with particular focus on staff related issues	GLL	
Improve customer satisfaction sample size to a minimum equivalent of 300 completed questionnaires per facility	GLL	

# Scrutiny Committee Report



Report of Head of Planning

Author: Beryl Guiver

Telephone: 01491 823723

Textphone: 18001 01491 823723

E-mail: Beryl.Guiver@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet member responsible: Rev'd Angie Paterson

Tel: 01491 614033

E-mail: angie.paterson@btinternet.com

To: SCRUTINY

DATE: 3 September 2013

## Draft housing distribution numbers for the larger villages

### Recommendation

Scrutiny Committee is asked to comment on the recommendation to Cabinet that the draft housing distribution numbers for the larger villages, as set out in Appendix A, is supported as a basis for taking forward neighbourhood plans in advance of the Local Plan: Sites and General Policies Development Plan Document.

### Purpose of Report

1. To seek comments on the recommendation to Cabinet that supports the draft housing distribution numbers for the larger villages, which will inform the preparation of neighbourhood plans.

### Corporate Objectives

1. Meeting housing need: bringing forward land at the larger villages to accommodate 1,154 new homes, to help meet our housing growth ambition to 2027, as set out in the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy.
2. Support for communities: supporting local communities who are preparing neighbourhood plans.

3. Building the local economy: supporting suitable proposals for economic growth in neighbourhood plans.

## Background

4. The South Oxfordshire Core Strategy sets out in Policy CSH1, together with the accompanying table 7.3, that 1,154 new homes should be built in the larger villages of Benson, Berinsfield, Chalgrove, Cholsey, Chinnor, Crowmarsh Gifford, Goring, Nettlebed, Wheatley, Woodcote and a site at Bayswater Farm. Bayswater Farm is a single site lying outside the Green Belt in a sustainable location on the edge of Oxford. (For the purposes of this report, the term 'villages' includes these larger villages and Bayswater Farm)
5. In our next planning policy document, the [Local Plan: Sites and General Policies](#), we will set out how these 1,154 new homes should be divided between the twelve Larger Villages and Bayswater Farm. Specific sites will be identified in the plan to accommodate this allocation or in a neighbourhood plan where appropriate.
6. We have been working with the parish councils for the larger villages since last September to identify how best to distribute the housing number between the villages. We have sought to take account of local views when making an initial judgement on the capacity of each village to accommodate growth.
7. Our starting point, as required by the core strategy paragraph 7.20, was to split the 1,154 homes across the villages based on each settlement's current size. The village size is based on the number of dwellings shown in the 2011 Census. This proportional split was amended to include at least 500 homes in the Central Oxfordshire area of the district, as required in the core strategy in Table 7.3.
8. Working with the parish councils, we have assessed whether the proportional split needs to be modified to take account of factors such as the individual vision for a village, the Green Belt, the AONB and sustainability factors.
9. In one case at Wheatley the proposed allocation is less than its proportional allocation. This is because the village is entirely within the Green Belt and this limits the amount of land available. Our core strategy Inspector ruled out a localised Green Belt review for Wheatley.
10. We have reached agreement with all the parish councils concerned on a draft distribution of housing numbers. This draft distribution is included at Appendix A.
11. Subsequently we undertook a public consultation on the scope of the Local Plan and this included the draft distribution of housing numbers. This consultation initially closed on 5 August. However, as we were holding exhibitions in the villages to start the village housing site selection process after this deadline we agreed to extend the consultation deadline until 6 September. A summary of comments received to date is attached at Appendix B.
12. The distribution of housing numbers will be finalised and agreed by this council when the Local Plan: Sites and General Policies DPD is presented for approval

as our submission version to the planning inspectorate for independent examination in 2014.

13. In the meantime we need to use the draft distribution number for each larger village in order to carry out more detailed site investigation work. If this reveals that not enough suitable land to accommodate the proposed number of homes can be found at a particular village, then the distribution will need to be modified in consultation with the other villages.
14. At the same time, some communities will wish to press ahead with the preparation of their neighbourhood plans, ahead of this council agreeing the final distribution. They need to have some confidence that they are planning for broadly the right number of new homes.
15. Woodcote Parish Council, for example, is preparing its neighbourhood plan based on the draft distribution. They are likely to submit their plan to us for examination by the beginning of September 2013 and their examination is therefore likely to take place this autumn. Other neighbourhood plans may also be submitted for examination before the Local Plan: Sites and General Policies DPD is submitted or adopted.
16. When a neighbourhood plan goes before an independent Examiner, we will be asked to confirm that the neighbourhood plan proposals are in general conformity with our local strategic policy. In particular, we would expect to be asked whether we have a proposal to ensure that all of the 1,154 homes allocated to the larger villages will be built and that the distribution of the homes between the villages follows the guidance given in the core strategy. If we cannot do this then the neighbourhood plan may not be allowed to progress to the referendum stage.

## **Options**

17. We have considered the following options;
  - a) Cabinet confirm its support now for the proposed distribution for the larger villages
  - b) Cabinet does not take a view on the distribution until it takes a decision to submit the Local Plan: Sites and General Policies DPD with the associated impact on the delivery of neighbourhood plans.
18. Endorsement now will provide communities with greater confidence in using the draft housing distribution numbers for the preparation of neighbourhood plans. To minimise the risk of neighbourhood plans failing the 'general conformity' test, because the distribution may have to be changed before it is finalised, we will encourage parishes to include contingency sites.
19. Conversely, withholding endorsement of the draft distribution may affect the confidence and willingness of communities to progress with the preparation of neighbourhood plans, for example, to expend effort and resources on community consultation or preparatory technical work. This may significantly delay their progress, and the delivery of housing through their plans.

20. Withholding endorsement also increases the risk that any neighbourhood plan that does proceed to examination may fail, if the Examiner is not confident that the neighbourhood plan will enable local strategic policy for housing delivery to be achieved.
21. We need to assure any Examiner that the neighbourhood planning groups and the council are working together on this issue and have an agreed approach as set out in Appendix A.

### **Financial Implications**

22. There are no significant financial implications with this decision that cannot be accommodated within budget.

### **Legal Implications**

23. There are no significant legal implications with this decision.

### **Risks**

24. A decision now could raise expectations that the draft distribution is more certain than we can in fact guarantee at this stage. Later changes could lead to dissatisfaction with the process and create tensions with parish councils, local communities and landowners. We can manage this risk by providing clear information to district councillors and parishes about the weight and status of the draft distribution.

### **Other implications**

25. There are no other significant implications with this decision.

### **Conclusion**

26. The draft distribution follows the guidance given by the Inspector in the core strategy and has the support of the parish councils for each of the larger villages. Endorsement now by Cabinet of the draft housing distribution numbers will provide a formal position that can be reported to an Examiner scrutinising a neighbourhood plan. This should satisfy the Examiner that the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with our local strategic policy.
27. As Scrutiny committee is likely to meet just before the new consultation closing date, the summary of consultation responses will be updated at the meeting. It should also be noted that the final report to Cabinet may change.

### **Background Papers**

- South Oxfordshire Core Strategy adopted December 2012

## Appendix A

### Draft housing distribution for the larger villages

Location	Proposed number of homes
<b>Central Oxfordshire area</b>	
Benson	125
Berinsfield	109
Cholsey	128
Crowmarsh Gifford	48
Wheatley	50
Bayswater Farm	40
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>500</b>
<b>Rest of District area</b>	
Chalgrove	80
Chinnor	159
Goring	105
Nettlebed	20
Sonning Common	138
Watlington	79
Woodcote	73
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>654</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>1154</b>

## Appendix B

### Summary of consultation responses on the proposed distribution of the 1154 homes to the larger villages.

This summary includes consultation responses received up to 13 August 2013. We are accepting responses up and until 6 September 2013 as a number of the larger village consultation events held, fell close to or after the initial closing date of 5 August.

The summary uses information from two sources; that taken directly from formal responses to the consultation and that from exercises held at consultation events to gain views on housing sites in the larger villages.

#### Headline information from formal consultation responses

Total number of responses received to two questions (13.08.13):	<b>202</b>
Total number of respondents (13.08.13):	<b>178</b>

Breakdown of responses to the following question:

<b>Do you agree with the proposed housing numbers for each of the 12 larger villages? Please note that each village must accommodate a share of 1,154 new homes</b>		
	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	27	25.23
No	80	74.77
Total responding	107	100

#### Points raised by those agreeing with the proposed housing distribution

- Numbers seem reasonable in terms of the size of the settlements
- Will help with sustainability of the communities of those settlement, particularly if affordable housing is allowed
- Agree with the number but need to tackle traffic and infrastructure concerns

#### Points raised by those disagreeing with the proposed housing distribution

1. Allocations should be based on space available at settlements and proximity to existing services and facilities.
2. Some settlements have a much better range of facilities and development should be focussed there and their allocation increased.
3. Some settlements have fewer constraints and development should be focussed there and their allocation increased.
4. Some settlements have already seen large scale development and this should be reflected in their allocation.
5. Windfall sites should be taken into account to reduce the allocations.
6. The allocations should factor in proximity to places of work.
7. If the allocation has been adjusted for some villages due to green belt considerations, the same approach should be used for AONB villages.
8. Should be focussing on bringing into use houses that have long been empty and other brownfield sites.
9. Traffic issues in various settlements that the new housing will exacerbate.



10. The allocations will result in the loss of good agricultural farmland.
11. No logic presented on the reasons for the split. It seems to have been done only on a simplistic mathematical basis. The data and methodology need to be clearly presented and explained and sustainability factors justified.
12. Will the houses in the different settlements actually be for local people in those settlements?
13. Strong concern regarding the lack of infrastructure (schools, healthcare provision etc.) in villages and how they will cope with more housing.
14. Car parking provision for new housing allocations is a concern
15. The Strategic Housing Market Availability Assessment may give a higher objectively assessed need, which will need to be accommodated in the plan and trigger an early review of the core strategy. Agreement on any housing figures is premature.
16. The figure of 500 homes in the Central Oxfordshire region was not intended by the Inspector as a ceiling, which the council has used it as. Therefore the split is incorrect.
17. The housing numbers should be considered as a minimum not a maximum
18. Too many houses in the larger villages already. Additional allocations are not protecting their rural character. Villages are turning into towns.
19. The 1154 housing figure is incorrect and should be challenged.
20. The council's population data shows no need to build within the rest of the district area.
21. Villages cannot cope with this level of development. It should be focussed in the larger towns or have a primary focus on Didcot.
22. Some smaller villages should accommodate some of the housing.
23. The network of settlements should be changed.

### **Points raised on the housing distribution in the consultation exercises**

#### **Crowmarsh** (36 attending event), **Cholsey** (105 attending event)

No specific comments on the numbers

#### **Chinnor** (183 attending event)

- Too many homes will make Chinnor like a town
- The community size and feel is right as it is, more housing will ruin this

#### **Nettlebed** (47 attending event)

- Leave Nettlebed as it is

#### **Goring** (175 attending event)

- Do not believe 100+ homes is appropriate for an AONB village

#### **Watlington** (125 attending event)

- Keep Watlington as a village not a town

#### **Wheatley** (147 attending event)

- Questions around the scale of the allocation changing the village feel of Wheatley or changing Wheatley into a small town
- Wheatley is big enough already.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Scrutiny Committee Report



Report of Head of Finance

Author: Simon Hewings

Telephone: 01491 823583

Textphone: 18001 01491 823583

E-mail: [simon.hewings@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:simon.hewings@southandvale.gov.uk)

Cabinet member responsible: David Dodds

Tel: 01844 297714

E-mail: [david.dodds@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:david.dodds@southoxon.gov.uk)

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 September 2013

## Financial outturn 2012/13

### Recommendation(s)

- (a) Note the overall outturn position of the council as well as the outturn of individual service areas.
- (b) Take into account the impact of the outturn position in the integrated service and financial planning process when setting the 2014/15 original budget.
- (c) Note the slippage in the capital programme to 2013/14.

Note: If committee members wish to raise specific questions please send these in advance if possible to either the committee clerk or the accountancy manager. Please be aware that if questions are not submitted in advance, it may not be possible to answer these in detail at the meeting.

### Purpose of Report

1. To report the final year end position for revenue and capital expenditure against budget for the financial year 2012/13.

### Strategic Objectives

2. Monitoring actual performance against budget ensures that expenditure continues to be in accordance with the delegated powers within the constitution, and that changes in circumstances which have affected spending requirements are recognised and can be considered in the preparation of future years' budgets.

## Background

3. The attached papers contain summarised detail revenue and capital expenditure for 2012/13; they also present an explanation of the significant variances against budget. This is presented by service, and follows the format of the budget monitoring reports presented to cabinet briefings throughout the year.
4. A detailed report was presented to Cabinet briefing on 24 July and provided the opportunity for cabinet to discuss the outturn with senior management, and also for individual portfolio holders to further discuss with their heads of service.

## Revenue Outturn 2012/13

5. The council's budget requirement for 2012/13 was £14.704 million. Net expenditure for services at year end was £11.715 million – this equates to a variation of £2.989 million, which has been transferred to the council's reserves. This will therefore improve the council's financial position going into what is likely to be yet another very challenging budget setting period when the budgets are set for 2014/15.
6. The council has continued to deliver on its various savings initiatives started in previous years to further reduce the council's expenditure in support of central government's austerity programme of public sector funding cuts.
7. Table 1 below summarises the outturn position by service. More detail of variances is shown at Appendix 1.

**Table 1: summary of revenue budgets and variances**

<b>Summary of revenue budgets and variances</b>	<b>Budget £000</b>	<b>Actual £000</b>	<b>Variance £000</b>
Corporate management team	595	103	<b>(492)</b>
Corporate strategy	5,364	4,711	<b>(653)</b>
Economy leisure and property	(16)	(405)	<b>(389)</b>
Finance	2,591	2,262	<b>(329)</b>
Housing and health	1,671	1,276	<b>(395)</b>
HR, IT and customer services	1,654	1,536	<b>(118)</b>
Legal and democratic services	833	571	<b>(262)</b>
Planning	1,690	1,661	<b>(29)</b>
Contingency	322	0	<b>(322)</b>
<b>Net cost of services</b>	<b>14,704</b>	<b>11,715</b>	<b>(2,989)</b>

## Capital

8. Including new growth bids, the original capital budget for 2012/13, as agreed by council in February 2012, was £4.614 million. Of this, £2.801 million was included in the approved capital programme and £1.813 million was budgeted in the provisional programme.

### Approved capital programme

9. Details of the changes of the approved capital programme in year are summarised in table 2, below:

**Table 2: movement on approved capital programme**

	<b>2012/13 £000</b>
Original budget 2012/13	2,801
Roll forward from 2011/12	2,757
Schemes deleted from approved programme in year	(36)
Schemes added to approved programme in year:	
Land acquisition at Didcot	2,935
Flood alleviation	23
Transfer from provisional programme	1,338
Slippage into 2013/14	(3,236)
<b>Approved programme 31 March 2013</b>	<b>6,582</b>

10. Capital expenditure for 2012/13 was £5.913 million. £2.626 million of this spend was funded from government grants and other contributions with the balance drawn from capital receipts and earmarked revenue reserves. Detail of the variance of spend against budget is shown in appendix 2 to this report.

### **Provisional capital programme**

11. When funding for schemes is approved by council they are added to the provisional capital programme. Transfers to the approved capital programme are made after submission of a detailed capital scheme appraisal report to cabinet or by individual cabinet member's decision, at which point the scheme can commence. The movement on the provisional capital programme for 2012/13 is shown in table 3, below:

**Table 3: movement on provisional capital programme**

	<b>2012/13 £000</b>
Original budget 2012/13	1,813
Rolled forward from 2011/12	1,617
Additions to programme	433
Transferred to approved programme	(1,338)
Slippage identified in year	(135)
<b>Balance at 31 March 2013 to be carried forward to 2013/14</b>	<b>2,390</b>

12. The £2.390 million remaining in the provisional programme relates to schemes that have not been progressed for a number of reasons, including the emergence of higher priorities or scheme delays. These will now be rolled forward to 2013/14.

### **Analysis of Revenue Underspend**

13. The variations between budgeted and actual revenue income and expenditure are summarised in table 4 below:

**Table 4: variations between budgeted and actual revenue income and expenditure**

	Total variance	Income variance		Expenditure variance				Notes	Under-spends c/fwd to 2013/14
		Grants and contributions	Fees and Charges	Employee costs	Supplies and services	Third party payments	Other gross expenditure		
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	
Corporate management team	(492)	(400)	(130)	(25)	62	0	1	34	
Corporate strategy	(653)	(13)	(95)	19	(159)	(382)	(23)	7	
Economy leisure and property	(389)	(31)	(73)	17	(202)	25	(125)	4	
Finance	(329)	(1,073)	(376)	(16)	(502)	129	1,509	45	
Housing and health	(395)	(240)	(30)	(55)	(111)	0	41	0	
HR, IT and customer services	(118)	0	18	(45)	(111)	26	(6)	20	
Legal and democratic services	(262)	36	(111)	(46)	(121)	3	(23)	24	
Planning	(29)	(32)	111	(187)	68	50	(39)	0	
Contingency	(322)								
<b>Total</b>	<b>(2,989)</b>	<b>(1,753)</b>	<b>(686)</b>	<b>(338)</b>	<b>(1,076)</b>	<b>(149)</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>134</b>	

14. We have analysed the outturn position to identify cross-council explanations for the significant variation from budget, excluding a number of budgets that have a net zero impact on the council's bottom line. The following key reasons for variances have been identified.

**Over achievement of income budgets**

15. We have overachieved against a number of income budgets for three main reasons.

16. Firstly, the government awarded us a number of grants during the year which we had no knowledge of when setting the budget in January 2012. These include £400,000 in corporate management team from the Homes and Communities Agency towards Didcot town centre redevelopment, and £116,000 in health and housing for air quality and contaminated land initiatives. Also in health and housing, and in finance, additional benefit subsidy was received as a result of the increased benefits paid out.

17. Second, in a number of services we have raised significantly more in fees and charges that we budgeted for. The main examples are as follows:

- In legal services income from taxi licences and land charges exceeded budgets by £57,000 and £48,000 respectively;
- In economy, leisure and property income from the council's car parking operations was £128,000 above budget.

The large under-achievement of income in planning was in both building control and development management, where employee and running costs were below budget by comparable amounts.

18. Finally we have identified more housing benefit overpayment income than estimated of which we believe we will recover £290,000.

#### **Underspend against employee budgets**

19. The underspend on employee costs (£338,000) accounts for about 11 per cent of the council's total underspend. This reflects the in-year savings delivered by the on-going Fit for the Future programme throughout the council and also the natural vacancy factor around the recruitment process (i.e. there is a time-lag between staff replacing those who have left due to the recruitment process and the new employee serving out notice at their previous employment). It also reflects the underspends in planning referred to in the previous paragraph 16.

#### **Underspends in supplies and services budgets**

20. Included within the £1.076 million underspend on supplies and services is £450,000 adjustment to the bad debt provision which has been made now that the more effective debt management by the council and its contractor has proved to be sustainable. There was also a significant underspend on consultancy costs across services, equating to £248,000 reflecting lower than anticipated demand for external support in a numbers of services including economy, leisure and property, and in legal and democratic services. In addition to these two items a significant cumulative underspend was realised across many supplies and services budgets across the council. This suggests that a number of these budgets are set at a level that caters for the worst case scenario, and that the level of these budgets could be reviewed.

#### **Underspends in third party payments budgets**

21. Within third party payments there was a £0.346 million underspend on payments to the council's waste and street cleansing contractor, Biffa. The budget for payments to Biffa was set assuming that the highest costs to the council across the services provided would be incurred. This proved to be too pessimistic and has been addressed in the budgets set for 2013/14. There was also an overspend on payments to the financial services contractor, Capita, of £0.129 million. This is shown within finance and reflects increased payments to Capita as a result of improved performance a part of which relates to the vastly improved debt collection performance that has allowed us to substantially reduce our bad debt provisions (see above).

### **Measures to aid more accurate budget setting**

22. Officers propose a number of measures designed to aid more accurate budget setting. The paragraphs below list some of these proposed measures.

#### **Employee costs**

23. In the 2013/14 budget setting process, a two per cent managed vacancy factor (net across the council) has been introduced, taking £182,000 from employee budgets. The level of this will be reviewed for the 2014/15 budget setting parameters in the

light of historic staff cost savings. Excluding planning, where staff costs were below budget commensurate with lower than expected income, the two per cent was broadly in line with the employee cost underspend.

### **Challenge process during budget setting**

24. The fit for the future reviews of services have resulted in significant reductions in staffing numbers as the employee establishment has been adjusted in accordance with service requirements. This replicates the process of zero based budgeting that builds budgets from scratch based on need. The major contracts of the council are uplifted by contractually set inflation, and therefore straightforward to estimate. However, where there are variable elements in the contracts the budgets for these should be understood and challenged.
25. In terms of other costs, these can be challenged to identify if they are being set at a level to satisfy the worst case scenario in terms of demand. Another area for challenge meanwhile is around the growth bids (unavoidable and service growth). In future years, growth bids will be reviewed along side any prior year underspend in the bidding service. Challenge should be made by portfolio holders and , strategic management board.

### **Closer review of quarter 3 outturn forecasts**

26. This was focussed on last year, and the variance between quarter 3 forecasts and actual outturn are shown at appendix 1. This will be focussed on again at quarter 3 this year with high importance being accorded to accurate forecasts to improve the budget monitoring and also to provide some assurance on the level of balances when setting the 2014/15 budgets.

### **Optimistic budget setting**

27. A tendency will exist for HoS and service managers to be optimistic about what could be delivered in year by their teams, and therefore budgets are requested accordingly. This is to be encouraged as it sets stretching objectives, however should be considered when reviewing underspent budgets.

### **Pessimistic identification of budget pressures**

28. By nature, services will take a pessimistic view of pressures, both when setting budgets and also monitoring them in year. During setting, consideration could be given to best, worst and median case scenarios, with an agreement to fund at either best case (i.e.: for removal of doubt the best case is the lowest cost pressure) or median case, with acknowledgement that if the worst case did materialise, then contingency could be called upon – this might mean increasing the amount in contingency, but it is better to underspend on use of contingency at year end than in the services due to over cautious budgeting and funding of pressures.

### **Financial, legal and any other implications**

29. The financial implications are as set out in the body of the report. There are no other implications of this report.



## **Conclusion**

30. Despite the backdrop of the economic downturn and austerity, the council has underspent on both revenue and capital for 2012/13, and as a result the council's financial position continues to be healthy.

## **Appendices**

1. Revenue outturn 2012/13 and commentary on major variances
2. Capital outturn 2012/13 – summary and commentary

## **Background Papers**

- Annual statement of accounts 2012/13 (currently being audited)
- Annual budget papers for 2012/13

This page is intentionally left blank

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Summary</b>							
Corporate management	595,073	103,289	(491,784)		96,787	6,502	
Corporate strategy	5,363,546	4,710,627	(652,919)		4,764,501	(53,874)	
Economy, leisure & property	(16,103)	(405,109)	(389,007)		(232,001)	(173,108)	
Finance	2,590,598	2,261,221	(329,378)		2,374,835	(113,614)	
Housing & health	1,671,108	1,276,040	(395,068)		1,614,625	(338,585)	
HR, IT & customer	1,654,487	1,535,548	(118,939)		1,524,338	11,210	
Legal & democratic services	832,961	571,501	(261,460)		644,160	(72,659)	
Planning	1,689,409	1,661,058	(28,351)		1,571,718	89,340	
Contingency	322,500	0	(322,500)		0	0	
	<b>14,703,580</b>	<b>11,714,175</b>	<b>(2,989,405)</b>		<b>12,358,962</b>	<b>(644,788)</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Corporate Management Team</b>							
Corporate Management Team - Jeanette Cox	390,617	355,904	(34,713)		373,617	(17,713)	
Didcot Growth Point - Toby Warren	64,000	(359,291)	(423,291)	400k unbudgeted Homes and Communities Agency grant funding for 2013/14 was received in respect of Didcot redevelopment. This will be taken to the grants reserve.	(383,500)	24,209	
Fit for the Future - Anna Robinson	140,456	106,676	(33,780)		106,670	6	
<b>Corporate Management Team</b>	<b>595,073</b>	<b>103,289</b>	<b>(491,784)</b>		<b>96,787</b>	<b>6,502</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Corporate Strategy</b>							
Support costs - Clare Kingston	98,253	71,105	(27,148)		73,627	(2,522)	
Communications and grants - Shona Ware	670,354	630,237	(40,117)		643,668	(13,431)	
Open Spaces - Ian Matten	140,767	96,927	(43,840)		126,931	(30,004)	
Policy - Sally Truman	275,319	215,920	(59,399)	Under spent on consultations costs. This is due to only one citizens panel survey being carried out because of work required to implement the new Econsultation system. Also no residents survey was done as this is now biennial and held back to align with the Vale survey	227,882	(11,962)	
Waste - Ian Matten	4,178,853	3,696,438	(482,415)	The majority of the under spend relates to contract inflation, volume of non routine works, administration of brown bins and bad debt provision which was lower than expected. This is partly offset by lower than predicted income from brown bin customers.	3,692,393	4,045	
<b>Corporate Strategy</b>	<b>5,363,546</b>	<b>4,710,627</b>	<b>(652,919)</b>		<b>4,764,501</b>	<b>(53,874)</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Economy Leisure &amp; Property</b>							
Cornerstone - Emma Dolman	418,389	418,896	507		425,024	(6,128)	
Arts Development - Emma Dolman	32,126	27,358	(4,768)		28,729	(1,371)	
Commercial Services - John Backley	36,779	50,565	13,786		30,998	19,567	
Car Parking - John Backley	(380,909)	(536,192)	(155,283)	Income from ECNs and income from car parks not operated by the council were higher than expected.	(471,166)	(65,026)	Income from one of the car parks not operated by the council was greater than expected.
Economic Development - Suzanne Malcolm	(821,124)	(918,518)	(97,394)	Improved rental income as per Q3 estimate. Insurance cost much reduced due to realignment of contract. No strategic property advice required.	(874,345)	(44,173)	
Facilities - John Backley	438,565	313,094	(125,471)	Savings in NNDR, electricity and insurance. Additional hiring and commission income.	367,914	(54,820)	Staffing costs and insurance lower than forecast.
Leisure - Kate Arnold	110,529	122,356	11,827		118,403	3,953	
Leisure management contact - Gemma Thynne	8,500	4,533	(3,967)		8,500	(3,967)	
ELP Support Costs - Chris Tyson	147,947	106,890	(41,057)		123,605	(16,715)	
Sports Development - Cath Dale	77,411	66,353	(11,058)		68,636	(2,283)	
Leisure - Chris Webb	(253,786)	(217,782)	36,004		(229,970)	12,188	
Toilets - John Backley	169,471	157,338	(12,133)		171,671	(14,333)	
<b>Economy Leisure &amp; Property</b>	<b>(16,103)</b>	<b>(405,109)</b>	<b>(389,007)</b>		<b>(232,001)</b>	<b>(173,108)</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Finance</b>							
Accountancy & Treasury - Simon Hewings	644,548	523,758	(120,791)	£45k of the variance shown because budget for accountancy restructure costs approved for carry forward. Other main variances include saving of £15k on external treasury mgmt (as funds now mgd in house) and a £44k reduction in audit costs as a result of the change in auditors.	590,852	(67,094)	Difference from Q3 forecast mainly due to c/fwd request and because of greater than anticipated saving on external audit fees, reflecting the new E&Y fee structure
Internal Audit - Adrianna Partridge	82,560	79,622	(2,938)		80,132	(510)	
Payroll & Pension - William Jacobs	656,033	639,538	(16,495)		645,123	(5,585)	
Exchequer, Revenues & Benefits - Paul Howden :-	1,148,763	959,407	(189,356)	Majority of the under spend relates reduction in bad debts and lower than expected implementation cost of the council tax reduction scheme.	999,207	(39,800)	
Shared Services Finance - William Jacobs	58,694	58,896	202		59,521	(625)	
<b>Finance</b>	<b>2,590,598</b>	<b>2,261,221</b>	<b>(329,378)</b>		<b>2,374,835</b>	<b>(113,614)</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Health &amp; Housing</b>							
Environmental Health - Paul Staines	37,150	14,480	(22,670)	0	20,532	(6,052)	
Environmental Services - Paul Holland	562,446	369,100	(193,346)	The underspend relates mainly to unbudgeted grant income of 60k for air quality and 56k for contaminated land. This income will be taken to the grants reserve.	539,738	(170,638)	The underspend relates mainly to unbudgeted grant income of 60k for air quality and 56k for contaminated land. This income will be taken to the grants reserve.
Housing Services Homelessness - Lyn Scaplehorn	508,019	423,638	(84,381)	The debt outstanding for homelessness has reduced resulting in a 42k saving on the contribution to the bad debt provision. Housing benefit subsidy was higher than estimated producing a net saving of £48k.	537,683	(114,045)	The debt outstanding for homelessness has reduced resulting in a 42k saving on the contribution to the bad debt provision. Housing benefit payments were lower than projected and subsidy slightly higher producing a net saving of £83k.
Housing Development - Helen Novelle	100,760	70,950	(29,810)	0	79,660	(8,710)	
Private Sector Housing - Paul Holland	94,057	74,363	(19,694)	0	77,356	(2,993)	
Food Safety - Diane Moore	368,676	323,508	(45,168)	0	359,656	(36,148)	
<b>Health &amp; Housing</b>	<b>1,671,108</b>	<b>1,276,040</b>	<b>(395,068)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,614,625</b>	<b>(338,585)</b>	



## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>HR IT and Customer Services</b>							
IT Operations - Simon Turner	632,231	559,915	(72,316)	The Icon project is under spent and a budget cfwd request for £20k has been submitted to implement phase 2 of the project. Staff costs are below budget partly due to vacancies.	582,980	(23,065)	
IT Applications - Lee Brown	167,116	149,356	(17,761)		152,858	(3,503)	
Land & Property Data - Lee Brown	118,588	78,046	(40,541)		100,750	(22,703)	
Customer Contact - Andrew Down	79,692	77,570	(2,122)		77,232	338	
Human Resources - Mark Gibbons	388,674	385,764	(2,910)		325,713	60,051	Year end accruals for hidden pensions were not known when the Q3 projection was made.
Training - Mark Gibbons	114,549	148,003	33,454		148,449	(446)	
Performance & Projects - Geoff Bushell	131,731	132,038	307		128,831	3,207	
Recruitment - Mark Gibbons	21,906	4,857	(17,049)		7,525	(2,668)	
<b>HR IT and Customer Services</b>	<b>1,654,487</b>	<b>1,535,548</b>	<b>(118,939)</b>		<b>1,524,338</b>	<b>11,210</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Legal &amp; Democratic</b>							
Community Safety/CCTV - Katharine Doherty	252,485	277,720	25,235		231,813	45,907	
Democratic and Electoral Services - Steven Corrigan	386,336	325,924	(60,412)	30k underspend on members expenses including travel. 30k underspend on democratic services including printing.	336,677	(10,753)	
Electoral Services - Steven Corrigan	182,840	145,796	(37,044)		176,762	(30,966)	
Land Charges - Liz Hayden	(185,132)	(225,569)	(40,437)		(212,582)	(12,987)	
Licensing - Liz Hayden	(193,761)	(262,870)	(69,109)	Higher taxi income than anticipated	(227,772)	(35,098)	
Legal - Ian Price	390,193	310,500	(79,693)	Underspend mainly due to lower demand for external legal support.	339,262	(28,762)	
<b>Legal &amp; Democratic</b>	<b>832,961</b>	<b>571,501</b>	<b>(261,460)</b>		<b>644,160</b>	<b>(72,659)</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Planning</b>							
Building Control - Richard Beel	(83,991)	(88,390)	(4,398)		(114,041)	25,652	
Policy, Conservation and Design - Miles Thompson	969,684	915,936	(53,748)	Due to vacancies in team and pending FFTF savings	952,434	(36,498)	
Development Services	803,716	833,512	29,796		733,325	100,187	Mainly reduced income of 60k resulting from the number of planning applications received between 1st Jan & 31 Mar being less than projected.
<b>Planning</b>	<b>1,689,409</b>	<b>1,661,058</b>	<b>(28,351)</b>		<b>1,571,718</b>	<b>89,340</b>	

## SOUTH - revenue outturn

South monthly revenue budget monitoring report as at 31 March 2013

	Working budget full year	Outturn	Variance	Explanation of variances >£50,000	Outturn forecast last quarter	Outturn variance against last forecast	Explanation of variances >£50,000
	£	£	£		£	£	
<b>Contingency</b>							
Contingency - William Jacobs	322,500	0	(322,500)		0	0	
<b>Contingency</b>	<b>322,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(322,500)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Direct Service Expenditure</b>	<b>14,703,580</b>	<b>11,714,175</b>	<b>(2,989,405)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,358,962</b>	<b>(644,788)</b>	

## South 2012/13 quarter four capital budget monitoring – approved programme

	Working Budget full yr	Outturn	Variance	Variance as % of budget	Q3 outturn est	Variance between Q3 est and actual outturn	Variance as % of budget	Budget approved for slippage to 2013/14	Variance after slippage
CMT	3,382,310	3,143,250	(239,060)	-7.1%	3,247,000	(103,750)	-3.1%	238,000	(1,060)
CORP	767,500	436,274	(331,226)	-43.2%	756,331	(320,057)	-41.7%	305,000	(26,226)
ELP	883,000	740,297	(142,703)	-16.2%	785,443	(45,146)	-5.1%	136,000	(6,703)
FIN	16,000	4,591	(11,409)	-71.3%	3,989	602	3.8%	12,000	591
HIC	75,000	62,236	(12,764)	-17.0%	50,188	12,048	16.1%	5,000	(7,764)
HSH	1,445,000	1,517,687	72,687	5.0%	1,445,000	72,687	5.0%	(136,000)	(63,313) A
LDS	0	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0
PLAN	13,175	9,557	(3,618)	-27.5%	14,175	(4,618)	-35.1%	8,000	4,382
	<u>6,581,985</u>	<u>5,913,892</u>	<u>(668,093)</u>		<u>6,302,126</u>	<u>(388,234)</u>		<u>568,000</u>	<u>(100,093)</u>

### Notes

- A Overspends against 2012/13 profiled budget will be adjusted for against 2013/14 original budget allocations

## Summary

The 2012/13 final working budget for capital schemes was £6.6 million. Actual spend for the year was £5.9 million, compared to the quarter three forecast of £6.3 million (adjusted to include the costs of 'Didcot Land Acquisition').

There was an underspend of £44,000 on schemes which have now completed and an underspend of £841,000 in respect of incomplete non-rolling capital schemes. A net overspend of £217,000 on rolling capital schemes reduces the overall underspend on capital schemes against budget for the year as profiled to £668,000.

The services reporting the largest year end variances from budget and from quarter three outturn are Corporate Management (CMT), Corporate Strategy (CORP), Economy, Leisure and Property (ELP) and Housing and Health (HSH):

**CMT** - Main underspends are on 'Didcot Station Forecourt' (£93,000, understood to relate to delays caused by technical issues) and on the 'Didcot Land Acquisition' (£135,000, due to timing of stamp duty costs). These budgets will be slipped to 2013/14.

**CORP** - Due to legal issues there was a £82,000 underspend against budget in year on grant to Tetsworth Memorial Hall, and a £125,000 underspend on NHB grants as grant claims not received from awardees. There was also an underspend of £53,000 on the 'Ladygrove Loop' scheme due to delay in receipt of charges from supplier, as well as a number of smaller scheme underspends. These budgets are being slipped to 2013/14. In addition underspends on completed schemes amounted to £23,000.

**ELP** - Underspends have arisen across a number of schemes, none of which individually exceed £50,000. Larger variances include 'Didcot Arts Centre' (£40,000 due to delay in completion of outstanding works), 'Orchard Centre Public Art' (£21,000 as dependant on progress of artist) and a £17,000 underspend against budgets as profiled for the 'Carbon Management Programme' which was a consequence of staff shortages and contractor delays. In addition, there was a £28,000 underspend on 'Car Park Resurfacing' works due to delays in commissioning works and adverse weather. These unspent budgets will all be reprofiled out to 2013/14.

**HSH** - The single main underspend (£132,000) was on Social Housing Initiatives as grants not required in year. This underspend will be slipped to 2013/14. Expenditure in year on mandatory 'Disabled Facilities Grants', which is a demand led function, was £268,000 greater than budget. The overspend on this rolling capital scheme will be adjusted for partly by absorbing the £43,000 underspend on 'Home Repair Assistance' and the balance through reduction in 2013/14 budget allocation.

# Scrutiny Committee Report



Listening Learning Leading

Report of Head of Finance

Author: Ben Watson

Telephone: 01491 823834

Textphone: 18001 01491 823834

E-mail: ben.watson@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet member responsible: David Dodds

Tel: 01844 212891

E-mail: david.dodds@southoxon.gov.uk

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 September 2013

## Council tax reduction scheme 2014/15 onwards

### Recommendation

That the committee reviews the proposed council tax reduction scheme for 2014/15 onwards and makes any recommendations to the Cabinet member for Finance

### Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to allow the committee to review the proposed council tax reduction scheme that will be adopted for the financial years beginning 2014/15 onwards and make any recommendations to the Cabinet member for Finance.

### Strategic Objectives

2. The councils are required by statute to adopt a scheme to help those on low incomes to meet their council tax liability. In accordance with the strategic objective "effective management of resources", by having a scheme, we will achieve the corporate priorities of providing value for money services that meet the need of our residents and service users and, provide equality of access to our services.

## Background

3. Prior to April 2013 there was a national scheme of financial assistance called “council tax benefit” which was available to taxpayers on low incomes to help them meet their council tax liability. This scheme had been in operation since 1993.
4. Following changes introduced by the Local Government Finance Act 2012, this council adopted its own local “council tax reduction scheme” to take effect from 1 April 2013. This was against a backdrop of reduced Government funding of approximately ten per cent compared to the funding given for the previous council tax benefit scheme.
5. In common with the other district councils in Oxfordshire, the local scheme more or less mirrored the previous council tax benefit scheme which meant that no residents saw a reduction in their entitlement.
6. The ten per cent reduction in Government funding was counteracted by our implementation of technical reforms to the council tax system whereby more council tax was charged on empty properties and second homes.
7. The final scheme that was adopted was for one year only therefore the council is required to formally adopt a scheme for 2014/15. This formal adoption must be undertaken by full Council before 31 January 2014.

## Proposal for 2014/15 onwards

8. It is proposed that the scheme adopted for 2014/15 shall be the same as the scheme that was adopted for 2013/14. The reasons for this are it:
  - provides minimal disruption for the council and residents
  - is predictable (in that it is based on the previous national scheme) and involves no additional new risk
  - protects income for vulnerable families at a time when other welfare reforms are taking place e.g. spare room subsidy, benefit cap, personal independence payments, universal credit
  - does not create any new administrative costs
  - should not affect council tax collection rates and bad debt provisions or, revision of contractual (Capita’s) collection targets
  - does not disproportionately affect any particular group – disabled persons, single parents, etc
  - allows more time for the council to monitor the effects of other benefit-cutting schemes around the country
  - presents a very low risk of legal challenge



9. It is further proposed that the scheme be adopted open ended so that it will continue to apply for future financial years until such time as the council formally changes it. This avoids annual administration.
10. One proposed change to be made to the scheme for 2014/15 onwards will be to introduce a clause for “uprating”. This is the process whereby the “personal allowances” and “non-dependent deductions” used for calculating levels of entitlement are increased each year, normally in line with inflation, but sometimes by other amounts (such as the current one per cent increase introduced by the Chancellor in his December 2012 autumn statement).
11. Whilst most councils will have adopted their own council tax reductions schemes, there is the Government’s “default scheme” for those who have not. It is anticipated that the personal allowances and non-dependent deductions in the default scheme will be uprated by Regulations later this year. The proposal is therefore to link the personal allowances and non-dependent deductions in this council’s scheme, to those in the default scheme i.e. if those allowances are uprated by one per cent, for example, then the allowances in this council’s scheme will also rise by one per cent.
12. If the council chose not to uprate these allowances, residents would effectively have a cut in their entitlement each year as the cost of living increases. In the case of non-dependent deductions, the general taxpayers would pick up the cost of living increase rather than other adults in individual households who could contribute to these costs. Additionally, uprating these allowances will not significantly increase the costs falling on this council and its taxpayers.

### **Alternative option**

13. For the 2013/14 schemes the Government offered additional “transitional funding” to councils who did not reduce entitlement by more than 8.5 per cent. Therefore, it could be argued that a reduction of this amount in 2014/15 would be deemed to be acceptable to the Government.
14. Initial modelling work undertaken has shown that reducing entitlement by 8.5 per cent would be likely to save the council approximately £20,000. However, officers believe that the costs of recovering the additional bills raised by reducing entitlement are likely to also be in the region of £20,000. Because of this, and the reasons listed in paragraph eight above, it has been decided not to pursue this option.

### **Financial Implications**

15. As stated above, the costs of the council tax reduction scheme are broadly neutral following changes made to the amounts of council tax charged for empty properties and second homes. By retaining the existing council tax reduction scheme no new financial implications will arise, but neither are we taking the opportunity to generate additional council tax by reducing recipients' discount.
16. The Government has also awarded further “new burdens” grant for 2013/14 to recognise the work required to adopt a local council tax reduction scheme. This totals £46,052. By not changing the scheme it is unlikely that the council will spend this grant and it will be transferred to reserves.

## Legal Implications

17. The current council tax reduction scheme was adopted for 2013/14 only. There is a statutory duty to adopt a 2014/15 scheme by 31 January 2014. If this is not adhered to the Government's default scheme will be imposed on the council.

## Risks

18. By maintaining existing levels of support it is not anticipated that there will be any legal challenge to the council's scheme. Therefore, the only risk is that a scheme is not adopted for 2014/15 and the Government's default scheme is imposed. This would leave the council in the position of not being able to determine its own rules and take into account local circumstances and needs.

19. The council continues to face the financial risk of receiving less council tax income than budgeted due to a significant increase in eligible recipients of the discount. This risk is not increased by the recommendation to maintain the current scheme. The risk could be reduced if the scheme were changed to make fewer residents eligible for the discount, although this would be dependent on the council collecting the new/increased liabilities and considering the impact on vulnerable groups that would result from the change in eligibility.

## Equality Implications

20. The scheme takes account of the public sector equality duties through ensuring it does not disproportionately affect any particular group. It protects income for vulnerable families through adopting the 2013/14 scheme and introducing the clause to 'uprate' their allowance.

## Conclusion

21. As stated above, and for the reasons given, the council must adopt a local council tax reduction scheme for 2014/15 by 31 January 2014 and it is proposed that this be based on the current 2013/14 scheme, with the addition of a clause for uprating of allowances.

## Background Papers

- Local Government Finance Act 2012
- 2013/14 council tax reduction scheme

# Scrutiny Committee Report



Report of: Head of Economy Leisure and Property

Author: Miranda Laurence

Telephone: 01235 515134

E-mail: [miranda.laurence@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:miranda.laurence@southoxon.gov.uk)

Cabinet member responsible: Bill Service

Tel: 01235 510 810

E-mail: [bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:bill.service@southoxon.gov.uk)

To: Scrutiny committee

DATE: 3 September 2013

## Review of arts development strategy and action plan

### Recommendation

The scrutiny committee is requested to provide its comments on the draft year four action plan so that the head of economy, leisure and property can take these into account before finalising the action plan.

### Purpose of report

1. The purpose of this report is to update the committee on the review of the delivery of the arts development strategy and action plan for South Oxfordshire, which was approved in July 2010, and advise on any amendments to the strategy for 2013/14. In addition, the report reviews the delivery of year three of the action plan and seeks the committee's views on the draft year four action plan, to ensure that officers have identified the key issues correctly

### Strategic objectives

2. The arts development strategy and action plan contributes towards the council's strategic objectives in the corporate plan 2012-16, particularly:
  - effective management of resources
  - support for communities.

## Background

3. In July 2010, the cabinet approved the arts development strategy and action plan 2010-13, with annual review and amendment of the strategy and approval of the annual action plan delegated to the head of economy, leisure and property, in consultation with the relevant strategic director and cabinet member for leisure
4. The arts development vision for South Oxfordshire is 'to make the arts and cultural activity an effective means of achieving a better quality of life, encouraging personal development, social interaction and active participation in the arts and community as a whole, as well as contributing to economic development. The creative economy brings spend into the area, giving employment to residents and enabling residents to generate income
5. In August 2012 the arts development officer went on maternity leave and a new officer (maternity cover) started in post. The head of economy, leisure and property, in consultation with the relevant strategic director and cabinet member for leisure, agreed that the arts development strategy 2010-13 could roll on for one year so that there was effectively a year four action plan for 2013/14
6. The arts development officer decided not to return to work and the person carrying out maternity cover was offered and accepted the post as of August 2013. The new arts development officer intends to write a new strategy for 2014-17, to reflect updated external circumstances, and anticipates completing this by the end of 2013/14.
7. Officers, in consultation with the relevant strategic director and cabinet member for leisure, have reviewed the strategy and action plan for year three and produced a draft action plan for year four

## Review of arts development strategy and action plan – year three

8. Officers reviewed the strategy and determined that, with a few minor amendments and updates, it remained fit for purpose and should roll on to year four, as above, as its objectives were still in line with current priorities
9. The arts development officer worked with a wide range of arts and non arts organisations to help develop accessible, high quality and arts activity in South Oxfordshire district. Officers will give a short visual presentation of the work carried out in year three of the action plan.
10. Some of the key successes arising from the year three action plan, which took on board scrutiny's comments from the years one and two review, include:
  - activities for protected characteristic groups in the east of the district – animation workshops in three Henley primary schools, professional intergenerational dance company working with 30 older adults in Nettlebed hospice;
  - five consultation sessions with over seventy young people (aged 13-19) in order to build up a picture of their preferences (arts and communication) so we can build up increased contact with the arts by this age group - this fed into a youth engagement action plan;

- development of opportunities for adults with learning disabilities - 'Drop-in Art' sessions, festival of activities for people with learning disabilities over five days, staff training led by people with learning disabilities;
  - working with groups across the district on the Tree of Light project - seven schools and groups from South Oxfordshire including Wallingford, Henley and Woodcote, worked with over 1,000 people to create a massive piece of theatre that was seen in Oxford and at Stonor Park, in addition to being seen at Reading's Madejski Stadium as part of the Olympic Torch's relay around the country;
  - significantly moving on the Orchard Centre public art project, to the point where the planning application is in and the first press stories are being delivered about the forthcoming installation.
11. Whilst the council took the lead on implementing the action plan, it worked in partnership with district and regional organisations to deliver several of the projects to avoid duplication and to promote South Oxfordshire's arts service. Examples of this are:
- continued work with Oxfordshire Arts Partnership to attend county and regional arts events
  - leading and hosting the Area Action Activities Group, Oxfordshire Play Association, Oxford Options, Oxfordshire County Council Adult Safeguarding conference.
  - the arts development officer convened the hosting of one of two regional Arts Award Conferences run by Artsworld at Cornerstone, which drew delegates from across the region
  - the development of arts and science programme in collaboration with Royal Microscopical Society who ran a family day in conjunction with the 'Seeing is Believing' exhibition – three sessions attended by 50 children
  - holding of a public art and planners day drawing arts and planning officers from the Oxfordshire district and city councils to discuss best practice and future developments (including CIL).
12. Changes to the delivery of the arts development strategy occurred naturally due to the change of postholder. Some time had to be spent researching and developing partnerships in order to scope and plan meaningful activity. This resulted in a necessary slight change of priorities in the year three action plan. The main examples of this are:
- whilst the arts development officer has worked with the comms buddy to put out stories in WIS, press releases, filming of exhibition launch and other communications, it has not been the right time to pay for additional communication support to publicise arts development
  - developing new partnerships in the north and east of the district to launch the 'Taking pArt' programme of participatory arts workshops available to community groups whose communities may struggle to access high quality arts - whilst, as above, it can be seen that the arts development officer did good work in the east of the district, the extended work will take place with the roll out of the Taking pArt programme in year four and beyond - the arts development officer

completed a comprehensive review of the Taking pArt programme with the Vale arts development officer during year three to prepare the ground for this.

### **Arts development strategy and action plan – year four**

13. Officers reviewed the year three action plan targets, and drafted the year four action plan targets taking into consideration new projects and developments not in existence when creating the three year action plan in 2010. The action plan continues to address the following objectives, identified in the extended three year strategy:

- participation and inclusion in the arts by all including key protected characteristic groups
- support youth arts, and encourage youth ambassadors
- support to professional and community arts groups and organisations
- support arts centres, venues and spaces
- support for public art

and to penetrate into the north and east of the district

14. A copy of the draft year four action plan is attached as appendix one to this report.

### **Financial implications**

15. The action plan for year four will be delivered within the existing arts development budget.

### **Legal implications**

16. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

### **Risks**

17. Changing priorities, timetables and diminishing resources for partners can impact and delay on the proposed plans.

18. The action plan for year four relies on the arts development officer's time to input and oversee delivery and activity.

### **Conclusion**

19. The arts development strategy sets out an action plan that provides a clear vision for arts development in the district and the new priorities for year four. It provides an opportunity to develop partnerships with arts organisations and other agencies to ensure our actions achieve the maximum impact on the ground. The views of the scrutiny committee on the draft year four action plan are welcomed, and will be taken into account by the head of economy, leisure and property when finalising the plan.

### **Background papers**

- Arts Development Strategy 2010-2014

## ACTION PLAN – 2013-2014

The action plan will attempt to focus resources by setting a number of specific achievable objectives and actions. The action plan will run for the duration of the strategy, but will be reviewed and amended yearly in line with changes in funding and influencing priorities. The below action plan shows actions for the final year of this strategy (2013-14) based on development since 2010. The objectives and actions will be designed to improve the range and quality of arts provision and access to that provision. It will take a practical, grass roots approach but not at the expense of aspiration and innovation. The arts development officer will be a key driver in these actions and the person responsible for their delivery.

In 2013-14 an additional action which overlies all objectives is the research and production of a new arts development strategy. The current extended strategy was researched and written before 2010 and given the major changes to government, funding contexts and the changing arts environment, the strategy needs to be renewed rather than updated from 2014/15 onwards. The new three-year strategy will have annual action plans renewed each year rather than a three-year action plan.

### OBJECTIVE: Research and write a new arts development strategy for 2014-2017

**Purpose:** to ensure that the ongoing arts development activity remains relevant to external changes to the district, regional and national contexts; to ensure that ongoing arts development activity remains effective and able to deliver on the council's corporate priorities

#### OBJECTIVE 1: PARTICIPATION AND INCLUSION IN THE ARTS

OBJ	REF	Action	Purpose	Key Partners	Resources	Measure	Activity and Spend	Budget
1	A	develop partnerships with key agencies to further engage all members of the community in the arts, (initial focus on people with learning disabilities)	to ensure there is an equalities approach to arts delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· race</li> <li>· gender</li> <li>· age</li> <li>· disability</li> </ul>	SODC corporate project officer (EIA), Styleacre, Anjali, Area Activities Action Group (South), equalities panel, disabilities panel, Oxfordshire Health & Wellbeing Board, Age UK	Officer time	EIA indicators, EO4 and EO8  Provide at least 50 opportunities for people with learning disabilities to participate in arts activity	Ongoing officer support for Curious Arts, theatre workshops for adults with learning difficulties [£350 showcase subsidy] Q1-Q4  Deliver and evaluate LD festival to promote	£1,950

							<p>organisations working with PWLD and celebrate Cornerstone's accessibility [£1000] Q1-2</p> <p>Develop Cornerstone-based taster sessions for specific partner groups, including drop-in art for PWLD [600]</p>	
1	B	work with partners to develop a diverse range of arts activities and projects in rural areas and market towns	to create vibrant and thriving economies in villages and towns	ACE, OAP, Good Night Out Leisure centres, market towns initiative, The Cultural (Arts) Group of The Henley Partnership, parish and town councils, community organisations	Officer time, arts development budget, SODC economic development,	See 4C (GNO)  Taking Part: help to deliver at least 5 Taking Part Workshops	<p>Work with Good Night Out, to host a development event to encourage new promoters in rural venues [OAP budget] Q1-Q4</p> <p>Develop Taking pArt programme focussing on East of District [£1200]</p> <p>Identify capacity for arts market to be held in market town (e.g. Wallingford, Thame) [OAP budget]</p>	£1,200



1	C	develop partnerships that will create new opportunities for the arts to contribute to the health and well being of local people	to improve quality of life using the arts	Age Concern, Styleacre, PCT, Care Homes, Crossover, professional performers and companies	Officer time Arts Development budget	Deliver at least 20 hours participatory activity through projects for local residents not easily able to access the arts	Work with and fund Age UK to deliver intergenerational project with the MOD and local barracks, schools and Health and Wellbeing Centres across the district [£1500] Q3-4  Fund Crossover to deliver an intergenerational and international arts workshop at educational/care home institutions in Henley area [£200] Q1	£1,700
1	D	network within own council and with other local authorities and arts providers over long term strategic development of arts activity for the benefit of local people	to ensure projects are developed to their maximum and funding is fully exploited	OAP, neighbouring authorities, OYAN, ADUK, Oxfordshire Gallery Network  SODC/VOWH Economic Development, Leisure, Planning, Community Safety	Officer time	Network with at least four arts providers and facilitators  Attend team meetings of at least three other Council departments to assess potential for link-up	Ongoing networking  Advocate for the arts amongst colleagues at SODC/VOWH and ensure good partnerships are maintained across departments to allow effective joint working	

1	E	network with other disciplines to develop partners and projects (initially arts and science)	to increase engagement and communication and to strengthen relationships between local organisations and ensure funding sources are utilised	Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Harwell Science and Innovation Campus, Culham Science Park, Diamond Light Source, Science Oxford, RMS,		Facilitate at least eight contact sessions with non arts providers Initiate and facilitate (and fund) at least one cross-disciplinary project at Cornerstone	<p>Ongoing networking Complete delivery of Npower / Didcot Power Station artist in residence project Q1</p> <p>Initiate Cornerstone project with RAL Space Centre and other RAL institutes for National Science &amp; Engineering week Q2-4</p> <p>Continue partnership with Cafe Sci to link into relevant Cornerstone programme and provide science-based opportunities for Cornerstone participants – ongoing</p> <p>Link with Oxfordshire Science Festival, working with RMS outreach and other relevant organisations Q4</p>	
---	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

**OBJECTIVE 2: Youth Arts**

2	A	recruit contacts and advocates across the district	to promote partnerships and to maximise the potential for youth arts	TRAIN, OCC youth service, schools/ consortiums, OYAN, OYAP, Artswork, Young Person's Coordinator, EIHs,	Officer time	Attend at least 6 network sessions or meetings for youth activity and youth arts	Attend and host networking meetings and attend Oxfordshire Playdays  Facilitate the promotion of the Arts Award across the district, including holding a briefing session with Artswork and hosting the Arts Award regional conference Q1	
2	B	ensure young people are consulted and involved in decision making of arts programmes and policies	to meet the needs of young people	Shared young person co-ordinator, Cornerstone gallery panel, Cornerstone programmer, schools	Arts development budget, officer time	Facilitate at least three separate initiatives to involve YP at Cornerstone  Host at least three work experience placements at Cornerstone	Deliver YP engagement action plan at Cornerstone [£800] Q1-4  Implement schools liaison strategy and establish teacher contacts Q2-4	£800

**OBJECTIVE 3: Support to professional and voluntary arts groups and organisations**

3	A	support local artists through advice, referrals and sign-posting opportunities to perform, sell, educate and exhibit work, and source funding	to support innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship		Officer time	Hold at least 3 Artist Information evenings across district	Plan and deliver artist information evenings across district to get to know individual artists and promote the Taking pArt scheme [£500]	£500
3	A	support local artists through advice, referrals and sign-posting opportunities to perform, sell, educate and exhibit work, and source funding	to support innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship	Other authorities, South & Vale colleagues	Officer time	deliver one funding advice session for artists  Four SODC artists display at Oxfordshire Art Markets	plan and deliver funding advice session aimed at artists  Encourage SODC based artists to sell work at OAP arts markets and make use of Oxfordshire subsidy [OAP budget]	
3	B	develop and maintain the OxonArts website with current jobs, opportunities and projects and drive awareness of it.	to ensure there is an effective one-stop shop for artists and people wanting to use the arts	OAP	Officer time, OAP budget	Continued increase in members and website hits	In partnership with OAP [OAP budget] ongoing	

3	C	act as an information and advisory service in relation to the development of the arts in the district	to ensure people have a point of contact		Officer time	Receive, act on and answer at least 50 enquiries	ongoing	
3	D	encourage collaboration and partnerships between and with arts organisations and arts groups.	to ensure artistic development for social, economic and environmental benefit	Oxford Inspires, OAP, arts organisations, arts groups	Officer time	Make links between at least four organisations	Ongoing auditing and proactive research of local organisations and projects  Facilitating collaborations between organisations	

**OBJECTIVE 4: Arts centres, venues and spaces**

4	A	provide support to existing arts facilities and encourage the development of participation and outreach programmes	to increase the range of activities available	Theatres, arts centres, village halls and community centres, Children's centres, schools, existing youth groups, professional companies. Library services	Venues budgets, external, arts budget	Deliver at least <b>50</b> hours of participatory activity  Engage at least six organisations in outreach activity, including at least three new to Cornerstone outreach	Work with libraries in SODC to host performances and workshops [500]  Host or facilitate and fund schools workshops linked to Cornerstone programmed shows [400]  Link to Didcot and other local children's	£1,000
---	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------	--	---	--------

							centres engagement with Cornerstone's performance and participation programme  YP engagement outreach project – linked with 5 <sup>th</sup> Birthday [100]	
4	B	work with colleagues to maintain a vibrant creative vision for Cornerstone	to increase visitors and income for the venue	Cornerstone, professional artists, Style Acre & Options group	Officer time	Facilitate at least three new initiatives	Continue Artweeks partnership  Programme extra Visual Arts events alongside gallery and window wall exhibitions  Coordinate 5th Birthday events - show case local professional artists	
4	C	ensure the effective delivery of the rural touring (RT) scheme	to ensure there is a vibrant cultural offer in rural areas	Village/ community halls, OAP, Theatre Chipping Norton	Arts development budget, OAP budget	Recruit at least three new promoters in rural locations with booked shows	Assist Good Night Out to maintain a vibrant programme and deliver an awareness raising event [OAP budget and £2,000 district subsidy] Q1-4	£2,000

**OBJECTIVE 5: Support for public art**

5	A	encourage active collaboration between, artists, architects, planners, engineers and arts development to deliver best practice in public art.	to ensure public art is considered and delivered appropriately for each site	SODC planning, developers, Vale arts development officer	Officer time, s106, Percent for Art	Install Orchard Centre public art project	Manage the installation of the Orchard Centre artwork [officer time] Q1-3  Support delivery of public art at Chinnor and Fairmile, Cholsey	
5	A	encourage active collaboration between, artists, architects, planners, engineers and arts development to deliver best practice in public art.	to ensure public art is considered and delivered appropriately for each site	SODC planning, developers, Vale arts development officer	Officer time, s106, Percent for Art	Deliver at least phase one temporary artwork project	Manage delivery with Vale ADO of the public art strategy for Didcot Great Western Park [S106 budget and officer time] Phase one temporary artwork project – Q1-2, all other artwork Q3 ongoing	

**OBJECTIVE 6: Advocating for the arts**

6	A	take an active role in existing strategic cultural networks and ensure a high profile for South Oxfordshire	to ensure South Oxfordshire is a vibrant and exciting place to visit	Oxford Inspires, Artswork, OAP, ADUK, ACE	Officer time	Attend at least 12 networking events  Host at least three meetings/ events	Ongoing • Arts Council Curators days • SEYDN • ADuk [£170 membership – spent in 12/13] Foundation for Community Dance (membership – spent in 12/13) Arts Industry (£38 membership) Arts Professional (membership spent in 12/13) Touring Exhibitions Group (membership £60) OYAN Artswork South East Dance regional networking OI Cultural Forum  Host meetings and events to raise the profile of Cornerstone and SODC across the county and region	£200
---	---	---	--	---	--------------	--	---	------



6	B	improve and update arts development information on the council's website and ensure the site links to other arts organisations	to ensure clarity and accurate information is provided	SODC IT team, SODC communications, VOWH Arts Development Officer	Officer time	Record web hits for Arts Dev web-pages	Work with Comms Buddy and Vale ADO to update Arts Development pages and develop and implement new ideas	
6	C	raise the profile of the arts by increasing marketing  celebrate achievements and successes with networks and partners through the media	to champion the benefits of the arts and the associated projects to ensure comprehensive understanding of the benefits	SODC communications, WIS, Cornerstone marketing officers	Officer time, arts development budget	Publish at least • 4 messages in WIS • 4 parish magazine/ website articles • 12 social networking messages through SODC mechanisms	Deliver marketing campaign with shared comms buddy and colleagues to communicate and raise awareness of projects, promote accessibility, and communicate successes following projects.  Training around marketing and advocating to communities [£500]	£500
								£9,850

## Abbreviations

AAAG	Area Activities Action Group (led by Oxfordshire County Council Youth Services)
ACE	Arts Council England
ADO	Arts Development Officer
ADUK	Arts Development UK
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
EIA	Equality Impact Assessment
EIH	Early Intervention Hubs (merging Youth Services and Young Offending Teams)
GNO	Good Night Out (Rural Touring Scheme)
IT	Information Technology
LGA	Local Government Association
OAP	Oxfordshire Arts Partnership
OCC	Oxfordshire County Council
OYAN	Oxfordshire Youth Arts Network
OYAP	OYAP Trust, formerly The Oxfordshire Youth Arts Partnership
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PWLD	People with learning disabilities
RMS	Royal Microscopical Society
RT	Rural Touring
SEYDN	South East Youth Dance Network
SODC	South Oxfordshire District Council
VOWHDC	Vale of the White Horse District Council
WIS	Weekly Information Sheet – internal council publication
YP	Young People

## Glossary

Anjali	a contemporary dance company where all the dancers have learning disabilities. The company produces and tours performances and undertakes educational and outreach work. Anjali aims to show that disability is no barrier to creativity ( <a href="http://www.anjali.co.uk">www.anjali.co.uk</a> )
arts award	a national qualification, which supports young people from 11-25 in their development as artists and arts leaders.
Artswork	a national youth arts charity, with a strategic role as Bridge Organisation for the South East (supported by ACE) ( <a href="http://www.artswork.org.uk">www.artswork.org.uk</a> )

Artweeks	an annual festival of visual arts with open studios and exhibitions held across Oxfordshire
Arts Council England South East (ACE, SE)	the national development agency for the Arts covering the nine regions of England, including the South East.
Arts Development UK	a professional association, with a membership drawn from local authorities and those working in the creative industries sector in England and Wales. ( <a href="http://www.artsdevelopmentuk.org">www.artsdevelopmentuk.org</a> )
OYAP	Oxfordshire based youth arts charity which specialises in working with young people at risk. ( <a href="http://www.oyap.org.uk">www.oyap.org.uk</a> )
s106	section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a local planning authority (LPA) to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission. The obligation is termed a Section 106 Agreement. These agreements are a way of delivering or addressing matters that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms. They are increasingly used to support the provision of services and infrastructure, such as highways, education, health, affordable housing and recreational facilities (including public art and street furniture).
Style Acre	Style Acre's sole purpose is to support people with a wide range of learning disabilities, including autistic spectrum disorders, mental health problems and physical or sensory needs - in addition to learning disabilities. We specifically support people in Oxfordshire and the connecting counties of Berkshire and Buckinghamshire ( <a href="http://www.styleacre.org.uk">www.styleacre.org.uk</a> )
TRAIN	Didcot TRAIN Youth Project was formed by Churches Together in Didcot & District and now employs a full time Detached Youth Worker ( <a href="http://www.didcottrain.org.uk">www.didcottrain.org.uk</a> )
Vale	Vale of the White Horse District Council

This page is intentionally left blank