

**NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**



30 August 2019

Our Ref Council 12.09.19  
Your Ref.  
Contact. Hilary Dineen  
Direct Dial. (01462) 474353  
Email. hilary.dineen@north-herts.gov.uk

To: The Chairman and Members of North Hertfordshire District Council

You are invited to attend a

**MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

to be held in the

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, GERNON ROAD,  
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY**

on

**THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

at

**7.30 PM**

**\*\*MEMBERS PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU DOWNLOAD ALL  
AGENDAS AND REPORTS VIA THE MOD.GOV APPLICATION  
ON YOUR TABLET BEFORE ATTENDING THE MEETING\*\***

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Thompson', written in a cursive style.

Jeanette Thompson  
Service Director – Legal and Community

## **Agenda** **Part I**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
<b>2. MINUTES - 11 JULY 2019</b> To take as read and approve as a true record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on the 11 July 2019.	5 - 12
<b>3. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS</b> Members should notify the Chairman of other business which they wish to be discussed at the end of either Part I or Part II business set out in the agenda. They must state the circumstances which they consider justify the business being considered as a matter of urgency.  The Chairman will decide whether any item(s) raised will be considered.	
<b>4. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> Members are reminded that any declarations of interest in respect of any business set out in the agenda, should be declared as either a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or Declarable Interest and are required to notify the Chairman of the nature of any interest declared at the commencement of the relevant item on the agenda. Members declaring a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest must withdraw from the meeting for the duration of the item. Members declaring a Declarable Interest, wishing to exercise a 'Councillor Speaking Right', must declare this at the same time as the interest, move to the public area before speaking to the item and then must leave the room before the debate and vote.	
<b>5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b> To receive petitions, comments and questions from the public.	
<b>6. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OTHER COMMITTEES</b> Any Items referred from other committees will be circulated as soon as they are available.	13 - 58
<b>7. MINOR AMENDMENT STANDARDS COMMITTEE CO-OPTEE NUMBERS AND APPOINTMENT OF PARISH/ TOWN REPRESENTATIVES TO STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b> REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR – LEGAL AND COMMUNITY/MONITORING OFFICER  For Full Council to agree an amendment to the Standards Committee membership (7.2.2), increasing the maximum non-voting co-optee numbers to four and thereafter to confirm the appointment of two further co-optees to the Standards Committee (bringing the current numbers to three).	59 - 64
<b>8. QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC</b> To consider any questions submitted by Members of the public, in accordance with Standing Order 4.8.10 (c).	65 - 66

**9. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

To consider any questions submitted by Members of the Council, in accordance with Standing Order 4.8.11 (b).

**10. NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

To consider any motions, due notice of which have been given in accordance with Standing Order 4.8.12.

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MINUTES

Meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices,  
Gernon Road, Letchworth Garden City  
on Thursday, 11th July, 2019 at 7.30 pm

**PRESENT:** Councillors Jean Green (Chairman), Terry Tyler (Vice-Chairman), Ian Albert, Daniel Allen, Kate Aspinwall, Clare Billing, Judi Billing, John Bishop, Ruth Brown, Val Bryant, Paul Clark, Sam Collins, George Davies, Elizabeth Dennis-Harburg, Morgan Derbyshire, Gary Grindal, Simon Harwood, Terry Hone, Keith Hoskins, Mike Hughson, Tony Hunter, Steve Jarvis, David Levett, Ian Mantle, Jim McNally, Ian Moody, Gerald Morris, Michael Muir, Lisa Nash, Sue Ngwala, Sam North, Helen Oliver, Sean Prendergast, Mike Rice, Adem Ruggiero-Cakir, Deepak Sangha, Carol Stanier, Martin Stears-Handscomb, Claire Strong, Kay Tart, Richard Thake and Tom Tyson

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Anthony Roche (Deputy Chief Executive), Gavin Ramtohal (Legal Commercial Team Manager), Melanie Stimpson (Democratic Services Manager), Reuben Ayavoo (Policy and Community Engagement Manager) and Hilary Dineen (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager)

**ALSO PRESENT:** At the commencement of the meeting approximately 10 members of the public.

#### 22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

*Audio Recording – 39 seconds*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Barnard, Bill Davidson, Steve Deakin-Davies, Faye Frost, Ben Lewis, Val Shanley and Michael Weeks.

#### 23 MINUTES - 21 MAY 2019

*Audio recording – 1 minute 19 seconds*

It was proposed by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb, seconded by Councillor Paul Clark and

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 21 May 2019 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.

#### 24 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

*Audio recording – 1 minute 45 seconds*

There was no other business notified.

25 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Audio recording – 1 minute 51 seconds*

(1) **Audio Recording**

The Chairman advised that, in accordance with Council policy the meeting was being audio recorded. Members of the public and the press were able to use their devices to film/photograph, or do a sound recording of the meeting, but were requested to inform the Chairman to enable those present to be informed. The Chairman further requested that flash and sound notifications should be disabled.

(2) **Past Chairman Presentation**

The Chairman thanked Councillor John Bishop for his work as Chairman of the Council for 2018/19. She advised that he had represented the Council at many events throughout the year and supported his chosen charity Stand By Me Bereavement.

The Chairman made a presentation to Councillor Bishop as a token of appreciation, on behalf of both past and present Members and invited him to say a few words.

Councillor John Bishop thanked the Chairman and the Council for his gift. He stated that being Chairman was a magnificent job with the opportunity to meet so many people giving back to the community. He had enjoyed his year as Chairman of the Council and had raised £2,350 for his chosen charity Stand By Me Bereavement.

Councillor Bishop made a presentation of a cheque to Mr Wadsworth from Stand By Me Bereavement.

Mr Wadsworth thanked Councillor Bishop for supporting the charity. Stand By Me provided group sessions of support for children and young people who had been bereaved and they worked exclusively in North Herts and Stevenage. It was only with donations such as this that they could continue.

The Chairman proposed, Councillor Stears-Handscorn seconded and it was:

***RESOLVED:*** That the Council place on record its sincere thanks and appreciation to Councillor John Bishop for his services as Chairman of the Council during the past year.

(3) **Nicholas Moss OBE**

The Chairman advised that she had the pleasure of informing Council that Nicholas Moss, NHDC Independent Person for the Standards Committee, had been awarded an OBE in the Queens Honours List and offered congratulations.

Councillor Judi Billing, as Chairman of the Standards Committee, paid tribute to the work that Mr Moss had undertaken in the community, in his professional life as a member of the judiciary and for North Hertfordshire District Council as an Independent Person, guiding the Members and the Standards Committee. She thanked him for the work he had undertaken so far at the Council and congratulated him on his award.

Councillor Mike Rice, former Chairman of the Standards Committee, paid tribute to Mr Moss. He had enjoyed working with Mr Moss who guided, corrected and made sure the right path was taken and without that support it would have been a poorer place. He thanked him for the work he had undertaken so far for North Herts District Council and congratulated him on his award.

The Chairman presented Mr Moss with a token gift in recognition of his award.

Mr Moss thanked the Council for the gift and the kind words.

**(4) Chairman's Chosen Charity**

The Chairman announced that her chosen charity for this year was Parkinsons UK North Herts and Stevenage Branch

**(5) Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman reminded Members that any declarations of interest in respect of any business set out in the agenda, should be declared as either a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or Declarable Interest and the nature of any interest declared was required to be notified to the Chairman at the commencement of the relevant item on the agenda. Members who declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest had to withdraw from the meeting for the duration of the item. Members who declared a Declarable Interest, who wished to exercise a 'Councillor Speaking Right', had to declare this at the same time as the interest, move to the public area before speaking to the item and then leave the room before the debate and vote.

**(6) Register of Interests Forms**

The Chairman advised that a number of Members had yet to complete their online Register of Interests form.

Anyone having difficulty in doing so were requested to contact the Committee, Member and Scrutiny team for support .

**(7) Rules of Debate**

The Chairman reminded Members that, in accordance with the Constitution, no speech was to exceed five minutes without the consent of the Chairman.

**(8) Refreshments**

The Chairman invited all Councillors to refreshments after the meeting in Committee Rooms 2/3.

**(9) Additional Item of Business**

The Chairman advised that she had agreed to an additional Item of business, the Nomination of a Representative to Bedford and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board, which was as a result of a recommendation made at the Annual Council meeting.

**26 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

*Audio recording – 20 minutes 23 seconds*

There were no presentations or public participation.

27 ITEMS REFERRED FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

*Audio recording – 20 minutes 31 seconds*

**Item Referred from Cabinet: 27 June 2019 – Modern Day Slavery Transparency Statement & Charter Against Modern Slavery**

The Executive Member for Community Engagement presented the referral from Cabinet together with the report considered by Cabinet and the associated appendices. It was noted that one aspect discussed by the Cabinet related to the training aspect of the Charter and that all forms of training delivery should be considered so as not to be as restrictive. Council were supportive that all forms of training including that referred to in the Charter be considered.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Richard Thake

It was moved by Councillor Judi Billing, seconded by Councillor Sam North and

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That paragraph 1 of the Charter Against Modern Slavery be amended to read:  
“Train its corporate procurement team to understand modern slavery through appropriate training on Ethical Procurement and Supply.”;
- (2) That, subject to (1) above, the Council agrees to adopt the Charter Against Modern Slavery as attached as Appendix C to the report..

**REASON FOR DECISION:** To adopt the Charter Against Modern Slavery.

*Audio recording 27 minutes 41 seconds*

**Item Referred from Cabinet: 27 June 2019 – Co-Operative Councils Innovation Network**

The Leader of the Council presented the referral from Cabinet together with the report considered by Cabinet and the associated appendix.

The following Members took part in the debate and asked questions:

- Councillor Mike Rice;
- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor David Levett;

It was moved by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb, seconded by Councillor Paul Clark and

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That North Hertfordshire District Council become a full member of the Co-Operative Councils Innovation Network and adopt the networks co-operative values;
- (2) That North Hertfordshire District Council be a Co-operative Council.

**REASON FOR DECISIONS:** The Labour and Co-operative group of North Hertfordshire are currently associate members of the Co-operative Councils Innovation network. With the recent change in administration, the Leader of the Council seeks to make the Council a full member of the Network.



*Audio recording – 38 minutes 42 seconds*

**Item Referred from Finance, Audit and Risk Committee: 3 June 2019 – Finance, Audit & Risk Committee Annual Report**

Councillor Kate Aspinwall, Chairman of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee, presented the referral from that Committee together with the report that had been considered

The following Members took part in the debate and asked questions:

- Councillor Terry Hone.

It was moved by Councillor Kate Aspinwall, seconded by Councillor Terry Hone and

**RESOLVED:** That the Annual Report of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee 2018/2019 be noted.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** To comply with the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

*Audio recording – 41 minutes 23 seconds*

**Item Referred from Cabinet: 11 June 2019 – Revenue Budget Outturn 2018/19**

The Executive Member for Finance and IT presented the referral from Cabinet together with the report.

It was moved by Councillor Ian Albert, seconded by Councillor Sam North and

**RESOLVED:** That Council approves the net transfer to earmarked reserves, as identified in table 8 of the submitted report, of £1.504million.

**REASON FOR DECISIONS:**

- (1) Members are able to monitor, make adjustments within the overall budgetary framework and request appropriate action of Services who do not meet the budget targets set as part of the Corporate Business Planning process.
- (2) Changes to the Council's balances are monitored and approved.

*Audio recording – 49 minutes 14 seconds*

**Item Referred from Cabinet: 11 June 2019 – Annual Treasury Management Review 2018/19**

The Executive Member for Finance and IT, presented the referral from Cabinet together with the report and associated appendix.

It was moved by Councillor Ian Albert, seconded by Councillor Sam North and

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Treasury Report for 2018/19 be noted;
- (2) That the actual 2018/19 prudential and treasury indicators be approved.

**REASON FOR DECISIONS:** To ensure the Council's continued compliance with both the CIPFA code of Practice on Treasury Management and the Local Government Act 2003, and that the Council manages its exposure to interest and capital risk.

## 28 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

*Audio recording – 53 minutes 5 seconds*

The Legal Commercial Team Manager presented the report.

The following Members entered into the debate and asked questions:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Jim McNally;
- Councillor Judi Billing.

It was proposed by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb, seconded by Councillor Paul Clark and

**RESOLVED:** That Full Council approves the amendments to the Constitution set out in paragraphs 8.1-8.3 and notes Executive delegations as per 8.5-8.6 of the submitted report.

**REASONS FOR DECISION:** To meet the requests of the new administration.

## 29 MEMBERS ALLOWANCES SCHEME AMENDMENT 2019-20

*Audio recording – 59 minutes 8 seconds*

The Leader of the Council presented the report together with associated appendices.

The Legal Commercial Team Manager advised of a further amendment that Paragraph 2 of Section 9 of the proposed Scheme be deleted as follows:

*'A claim in respect of annual registration as Data Controller will be paid when accompanied by a receipt for payment of the fee.'*

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that Council should decide whether the proposed amendments to the Special Responsibility Allowances should be made retrospectively

It was proposed by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb, seconded by Councillor Paul Clark that the proposed scheme with the advised amendments be adopted and

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council agrees the amendments to the Scheme of Allowances as set out in Appendix B of the submitted report, subject to the deletion of the following paragraph:

*'A claim in respect of annual registration as Data Controller will be paid when accompanied by a receipt for payment of the fee.'*

- (2) The amendment in respect of allowances for the Leader of the Council and Executive Members be applied retrospectively from 22 May 2019.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** To meet the requests of the new administration.

**30 NOMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS AND OTHER BODIES FOR 2019/20 - BEDFORD AND RIVER IVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD**

*Audio Recording – 1 hour 4 minutes 1 second*

The Democratic Services Manager called for nominations for a representative on the Bedford and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board.

It was proposed by Councillor Paul Clark and seconded by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb that Councillor Steve Jarvis be the nominated representative.

There being no further nominations Councillor Steve Jarvis was nominated as the NHDC representative to the Bedford and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board.

**31 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

*Audio recording – 1 hour 5 minutes 40 seconds*

There were no questions from Members

**32 NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

*Audio recording – 1 hour 5 minutes 44 seconds*

In accordance with Standing Order 4.8.12 the following motion was submitted:

It was moved by Councillor Sam Collins and seconded by Councillor Tom Tyson that:

“The Council undertakes to only lease or purchase Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (including Electric Vehicles and Plug in Hybrids PHEVs) when the replacement of any council owned or leased vehicle is due. This also includes any company cars used by officers.

The Council also undertakes to encourage all of its contractors to adopt similar measures.”

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Steve Jarvis;
- Councillor Richard Thake;

Councillor Steve Jarvis proposed an amendment to the motion that:

“That the implementation of these undertakings shall be subject to agreement by the Cabinet.”

Councillor Sam Collins, the proposer of the motion accepted the proposed amendment.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) The Council undertakes to only lease or purchase Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (including Electric Vehicles and Plug in Hybrids PHEVs) when the replacement of any council owned or leased vehicle is due. This also includes any company cars used by officers;
- (2) The Council also undertakes to encourage all of its contractors to adopt similar measures;
- (3) That the implementation of these undertakings shall be subject to agreement by the Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 8.47 pm

Chairman

# Agenda Item 6

## **Referrals from Other Committees**

6a Risk Management Update

6b Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-2025

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET  
26 MARCH 2019**

**PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**ITEM 6A**

**TITLE OF REPORT: ITEM REFERRED FROM CABINET: 30 JULY 2019 – RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

*Extract from the draft Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 30 July 2019*

**ITEMS REFERRED FROM OTHER COMMITTEES**

**c - Item Referred from Finance, Audit and Risk Committee: 29 July 2019 - Risk Management Update**

The Chairman of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee presented the referral from the meeting held on 29 July 2019 which included the following recommendations to Cabinet:

- (1) That the risk entitled Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Properties be adopted as a Corporate Risk;
- (2) That the Annual Report on Risk and Opportunities be noted and referred to Full Council for consideration.

Cabinet considered the report entitled Risk Management Update together with the following associated appendices:

- Appendix A - New Risk Anti Social Behaviour
- Appendix B - Annual Report on Risk Management

No alternative options were considered.

It was moved by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb, seconded by Councillor Keith Hoskins and

**RESOLVED:** That the risk entitled Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Properties be adopted as a Corporate Risk.

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:** That the Annual Report on Risk and Opportunities be considered and noted.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** The responsibility for ensuring the management of risks is that of Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Referral from Finance, Audit and Risk Committee considered by Cabinet on 30 July 2019**

### **TITLE OF REPORT: ITEM REFERRED FROM FINANCE, AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE: 29 JULY 2019 – RISK AND OPPORTUNITIES MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

The Service Director-Resources presented the report entitled Risk and Opportunities Management Update together with the following appendices:

- Appendix A - New Risk Anti Social Behaviour;
- Appendix B - Annual Report on Risk Management 2018-19.

The Risk Management Group would hold its next meeting on 8 August 2019 and Members of this Committee were welcome to attend. This Group discussed a number of issues and reviewed at least one corporate risk per meeting.

He explained that it was for the Committee to consider suggested changes to the risks

A new risk was being brought to the attention of the Committee, being the Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Facilities. This was being presented as a Service Risk, although the Committee could change this.

This did not relate to Anti Social Behaviour in general, but to the effect on Council properties.

Appendix B of the report was the Annual Report on Risk Management that would be considered by Cabinet and Council.

The following Members asked question and entered in the debate:

- Councillor Sam North;
- Councillor Kate Aspinwall
- Councillor Steve Jarvis;
- Councillor Michael Weeks.

Members felt that the Anti-Social Behaviour risk should be a Corporate Risk. The Council needed to consider the likelihood of the impact and threats associated with this risk. This had already had an effect on the ability to keep car parks open and public toilets had been vandalised and had to be closed resulting in a cost to the Council.

Members noted that, in Letchworth, although the rates of crime had dropped, anti-social behaviour had dramatically increased in the Town Centre. This may result in the Council having to provide more services such as CCTV and lighting.

Members also noted that this was not only regarding financial risk, but also reputational risk and the ability to provide services.

The Service Director-Resources advised that CCTV had been discussed in relation to the multi store car parks, however it would be difficult to place cameras in a place that they would not also be damaged.

The Chairman asked the Committee to consider a new risk regarding Climate Emergency and the impact that mitigation would have on the Council. Placing this item on the Risk Matrix would ensure more scrutiny. It was suggested that this risk should be related to the Council's implementation of the Climate Change Strategy.

The Service Director- Resources advised that this would be referred to the Risk

Management Group and, following consideration by that Group, would be referred back to this Committee.

Members asked for the link to the Council's Risk Management System, Pertana, be circulated to all Members and substitutes of the Committee.

***RESOLVED:***

- (1) That the Service Director – Resources be requested to refer an update to the existing Climate Change risk to the Risk Management Group;
- (2) That the Workforce Planning Risk retain its current Risk score of 5.
- (3) That the Service Director – Resources be requested to circulate the link to the Council's Risk Management System, Pertana, to all Members and Substitutes of this Committee.

***RECOMMENDED TO CABINET:***

- (1) That the risk entitled Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Properties be adopted as a Corporate Risk;
- (2) That the Annual Report on Risk and Opportunities be noted and referred to Full Council for consideration.

***REASON FOR DECISIONS:***

- (1) The responsibility for ensuring the management of risks is that of Cabinet;
- (2) This Committee has responsibility to monitor the effective development and operation of risk and opportunities management.

**REPORT CONSIDERED BY FINANCE , AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE ON 29 JULY 2019  
AND CABINET ON 30 JULY 2019**

**TITLE OF REPORT: RISK AND OPPORTUNITIES MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

REPORT OF: THE SERVICE DIRECTOR – RESOURCES

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: FINANCE AND IT

COUNCIL PRIORITY: / PROSPER AND PROTECT / RESPONSIVE AND EFFICIENT

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 To provide the Committee with an update on the Corporate risks and the proposed changes to these risks.
- 1.2 To present the Annual Report on Risk and Opportunities Management.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the review /changes to the Corporate risks for the quarter, namely
  - New Risk for the impact of Anti Social Behaviour on Council facilities proposed as a Service Risk
  - Workforce Planning to retain its current Risk score of 5.
- 2.2 That the Committee notes and refers the Annual report on Risk & Opportunities Management to Cabinet and then Full Council.

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 The responsibility for ensuring the management of risks is that of Cabinet.
- 3.2 This Committee has responsibility to monitor the effective development and operation of risk and opportunities management.

**4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 There are no alternative options that are applicable.

**5. CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT MEMBERS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS**

- 5.1 Consultation has been undertaken with the Senior Management Team (SMT) and the Risk Management Group (this includes the Executive Member for Finance and IT as Risk Management Member 'champion') and these recommendations were supported. Lead Officers discuss these risks with the relevant Executive Member

## **6. FORWARD PLAN**

- 6.1 This report does not contain a recommendation on a key decision and has not been referred to in the Forward Plan.

## **7. BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 At the March meeting of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee, the Committee noted the reduction in Risk score for North Hertfordshire Museum and Hitchin Town Hall from a 9 to a 3, and the introduction of a new Brexit risk with a risk score of 9. The report was approved and referred on to Cabinet. The report was subsequently approved by Cabinet

## **8. RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS**

### **8.1 Corporate Risks**

- 8.1.1 The Corporate risks summarised in Table 1 have been reviewed and agreed by SMT. Members are able to view the current risk descriptions on Pentana, the Council's performance and risk management software. Table 1 shows the last date that each Corporate risk was reviewed by the risk owner
- 8.1.2 At the Risk Management Group meeting on 29 May, a new risk for the impact of Anti Social Behaviour on Council facilities was discussed. The introduction of the risk was to reflect the rise of Anti Social behaviour at various locations in the District and the impact this has had on service provision and property maintenance. Although introduced as a Service Risk, a proposed high score of 7 on the Risk Matrix promoted some discussion within the Group as to whether this should be a Corporate Risk. After some debate, it was decided that this would be presented as a Service risk to this Committee, with the opportunity to discuss whether it should be increased to a Corporate Risk (subject to referral and approval by Cabinet). The detail of this risk is included in Appendix A.
- 8.1.3 The Workforce Planning Risk was discussed in detail. It was agreed that the current risk score of 5 remained appropriate.
- 8.1.4 The Annual report on Risk and Opportunities Management was reviewed and agreed by the Group. The report summarises all the changes to the Corporate Risks approved by Cabinet (and monitored by Finance, Audit and Risk Committee) throughout 2018/19. The report is included as Appendix B. Recommendation 2.2 is that this report is referred to Cabinet and Full Council.

**Table 1: Risk and Opportunities Matrix**

The dates specified relate to the date that officers last reviewed the risk. Risks that officers have reviewed since the last FARC meeting have been given a direction of travel arrow.

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>3</b> High	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Income Generation (14.03.19) ↔</li> <li>• Sustainable Development (24.04.19) ↔</li> </ul>	<b>9</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brexit (29.04.19) ↔</li> <li>• Local Plan (24.04.19) ↔</li> <li>• Managing the Council's Finances (21.12.18)</li> <li>• Waste Management, Recycling and Street Cleansing (20.03.19) ↔</li> </ul>
	<b>2</b> Medium	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Homelessness (16.04.19) ↔</li> <li>• Workforce Planning (05.04.19) ↔</li> </ul>	<b>8</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cyber Risks (25.03.19) ↔</li> </ul>
	<b>1</b> Low	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Hertfordshire Museum and Hitchin Town Hall Project (07.02.19)</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>
		<b>1</b> Low	<b>2</b> Medium	<b>3</b> High
		<b>Impact</b>		

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The Committee's Terms of Reference include monitoring the effective development and operation of risk management and corporate governance, agreeing actions (where appropriate) and making recommendations to Cabinet. This report gives the Committee the opportunity to review and comment on the high level risks and how they are proposed to be managed.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

## **11. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The Risk and Opportunities Management Strategy requires the Finance Audit and Risk Committee to consider regular reports on the Council's Corporate risks. Failure to provide the Committee with regular updates would be in conflict with the agreed Strategy and would mean that this Committee could not provide assurances to Cabinet that the Council's identified Corporate Risks are being managed.

## **12. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of their functions, give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 12.2 Reporting on the management of risk provides a means to monitor whether the council are meeting the stated outcomes of the district priorities, its targets or delivering accessible and appropriate services to the community to meet different peoples needs. The risks of NHDC failing in its Public Sector Equality Duty are recorded on the Risk Register. The Council's risk management approach is holistic, taking account of commercial and physical risks. It should also consider the risk of not delivering a service in an equitable, accessible manner, and especially to its most vulnerable residents, such as those who are homeless.

## **13. SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1 The Social Value Act and "go local" policy do not apply to this report.

## **14. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 There are no direct human resource implications relating to this report, but it should be noted that there is a separate Corporate risk relating to Workforce Planning.

## **15. APPENDICES**

- 15.1 Appendix A – New Service Risk – Anti Social Behaviour  
Appendix B – Annual Report on Risk Management 2018-2019

**16. CONTACT OFFICERS**

16.1 Rachel Cooper, Controls, Risk & Performance Manager  
[rachel.cooper@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.cooper@north-herts.gov.uk); ext. 4606

Ian Couper, Service Director – Resources  
[ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk), ext. 4243

**17. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

17.1 The risks held on Pentana, the Councils Performance and Risk Management IT system.


This page is intentionally left blank



New Risks - RMG

<b>Risk Code</b>	RR564	<b>Risk Title</b>	Impact of Anti-Social Behaviour on Council Facilities
<b>Risk Owner</b>	Ian Couper	<b>Updated By</b>	Ian Couper
<b>Year Identified</b>	2019	<b>Corporate Priority</b>	Attractive and Thriving
<b>Risk Description</b>	<p>As a result of anti-social behaviour in or around Council facilities, there is a risk that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council facilities suffer from criminal damage</li> <li>- Customer use of facilities reduces, e.g. multi-storey car parks, toilets at Howard Park</li> <li>- Users of facilities experience verbal abuse and intimidation</li> <li>- Members of the public suffer personal injury</li> <li>- Staff, service users and local residents suffer distress</li> </ul> <p>This could lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of income</li> <li>- Additional expense to rectify resulting damage</li> <li>- An increase in the number of insurance claims</li> <li>- An increased number of complaints</li> <li>- Damage to the Council's reputation</li> </ul>		
<b>Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council optimises the use of its facilities</li> <li>- Council facilities provide an attractive and safe environment for service users</li> <li>- Achievement of relevant budgeted income</li> </ul>		
<b>Consequences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of income</li> <li>- Additional costs</li> <li>- Poor publicity</li> <li>- Detrimental effect on staff, service users and local residents</li> </ul>		
<b>Work Completed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multi-storey car parks and Howard Park added to police patrol plans</li> <li>- Community Protection Manager sent a letter to all head teachers of secondary schools in Baldock, Hitchin and Letchworth regarding anti-social behaviour in multi-storey car parks (February 2019)</li> <li>- Decided to implement a temporary measure to close both multi-storey car parks early each day, with effect from 25 March 2019</li> <li>- Updated plan for Careline staff who need to park out of hours</li> <li>- Introduced additional patrols by Arena Security at multi-storey car parks</li> <li>- 2019 North Hertfordshire Community Safety Partnership Survey highlighted that in general, people were satisfied that the district was a safe place to live</li> <li>- NHDC officers (Grounds Maintenance and Community Safety) attended Howard Park key stakeholders meetings, which included the police, to discuss issues and links with other incidents in Letchworth and to agree related actions</li> <li>- Ensured that all current lighting at Howard Park is operating effectively</li> <li>- Use of mobile camera at Howard Park to ensure effective coverage of area</li> </ul>		
<b>Ongoing Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central logging of incidents to track the scale of any issues</li> <li>- Encouraging any criminal incidents to be reported to the police</li> <li>- Officer working group investigating longer term options for both multi-storey car parks</li> <li>- Officer working group implementing agreed actions to help address identified issues</li> <li>- Monitoring the impact of the temporary measure to close both multi-storey car parks early</li> <li>- Arranging to link the Park Ranger into the Letchworth town centre radio system to enable communication with shop owners and others if there are issues in the town (the system is also linked to the CCTV control room)</li> <li>- Review permanent cameras (with Heritage Foundation) and lighting at Howard Park to balance effectiveness and cost</li> </ul>		
<b>Current Impact Score</b>	2	<b>Current Likelihood Score</b>	3

New Risks - RMG

<b>Overall Risk Score</b>	<p>7</p>	<b>Current Risk Matrix</b>	 <p>Likelihood</p> <p>Impact</p>
<b>Date Reviewed</b>	<p>13-Mar-2019</p>	<b>Next Review Date</b>	<p>13-Sep-2019</p>
<b>Notes</b>	<p>15-May-2019 Since the creation of the Risk Register entry and the implementation of various mitigating measures, anti-social behaviour issues have reduced at both Howard Park and the multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>16-Apr-2019 Since Christmas 2018, the toilets in Howard Park have been closed on and off for a period of over six weeks. Currently, they are open.</p> <p>12-Apr-2019 Following further comments from Becky, Ian and Andrew Mills, the risk entry was updated and subsequently published on the Risk Register.</p> <p>18-Mar-2019 Draft new risk entry created following a recommendation by the Risk Management Group on 20 February 2019 and subsequent discussions with Becky Coates, Community Safety Manager and Ian Couper. Draft risk entry circulated to Becky and Ian for further comment.</p>		

**NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**Annual Report on Risk Management**

**April 2018 to March 2019**

**A progress report on Risk and Opportunity Management at  
North Hertfordshire District Council**

# **Annual Report on Risk Management** **2018/19**

1. Summary
2. Background
3. Significant Changes to the Corporate Risks
4. Risk Appetite
5. Insurance Review
6. Business Continuity
7. Health and Safety
8. Review of the Risk Management Framework at NHDC
9. Achieving the Significant Actions for 2018/19
10. Significant Actions for 2019/20
11. Conclusion
12. Recommendations
13. Definitions
14. Risk Matrix for Corporate Risks as at 31 March 2019

# Annual Report on Risk Management

April 2018 to March 2019

## 1 Summary

- 1.1 To provide Full Council with an annual report on risk and opportunities management at NHDC during the financial year 2018/19, as outlined in the Risk and Opportunities Management Strategy.
- 1.2 This report aims to:
  - Confirm the Council's ongoing commitment to the management of risks and opportunities to enable the achievement of its objectives, projects, service delivery and performance management.
  - Summarise the significant changes to the Corporate Risks during the year.
  - Summarise the achievements against the significant actions for 2018/19 identified in last year's Annual Report.
  - Propose further significant actions for 2019/20, in order to maintain the Council's strong and effective risk and opportunities management processes.

## 2 Background

- 2.1 Throughout 2018/19, the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee (FARC) received reports on the management of the Council's Corporate Risks and where necessary, referred these reports to Cabinet.
- 2.2 In November 2018, the Risk Management Group approved minor revisions to the Risk and Opportunities Management Strategy. These amendments consisted of changing job titles to reflect the 2018 senior management restructure. The strategy is available on the Risk Management intranet page. Officers will undertake a detailed review of the strategy in 2019/20, which will include ensuring that it reflects the new Commercial Strategy and the approach to managing risks associated with major contracts.
- 2.3 Throughout the year, the Performance and Risk Officer provided ongoing training and support to officers and Members.
- 2.4 On request, the Performance and Risk Officer is able to provide 1:1 sessions to members of the FARC, covering topics such as accessing Risk Register entries on Pentana Risk, the Council's performance and risk management system.
- 2.5 The Executive Member for Finance and IT, in his role as the Member "Risk Management Champion", was a regular attendee at Risk Management Group meetings.
- 2.6 The risk management function at both a strategic and operational level is delivered and supported by the Service Director - Resources, the Controls, Risk and Performance Manager and the Performance and Risk Officer.

2.7 Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) continues to deliver the Council's insurance services and HCC's Risk and Insurance Manager continues to attend Risk Management Group meetings. This enables the Council to obtain an insight into emerging risks and related issues at HCC and other local authorities in Hertfordshire. The Performance and Risk Officer is a member of ALARM, the national organisation dedicated to supporting risk professionals in the public sector. Membership of ALARM provides training opportunities and enables the sharing of best practice and benchmarking data with other public sector organisations.

### **3 Significant Changes to the Corporate Risks**

3.1 There is a single set of Corporate Risks, which Cabinet owns and monitors. These risks (such as key projects and risks directly related to the Council's objectives) require a high level of resources to manage and mitigate and need to be managed at a strategic level within the Council.

3.2 At each meeting, officers provided the FARC with updates on the assessment and management of the Council's Corporate Risks. Section 14 of this report presents a summary risk matrix, which shows the position of each Corporate Risk as at 31 March 2019 (the last meeting of the FARC for 2018/19 was on 21 March 2019). The following paragraphs summarise the changes that were reported in the past year.

#### **3.3 Deleted Corporate Risks**

The following Corporate Risks were deleted in 2018/19.

#### **3.4 Office Accommodation**

Practical completion of the District Council Offices took place on 31 May 2018 and the whole building had been handed over to NHDC. A closure report, including lessons learned, had been reported at the last Project Board meeting on 11 June 2018.

*Recommended by the FARC on 24 September 2018*

*Approved by Cabinet on 25 September 2018*

#### **3.5 Waste**

Officers had undertaken a comprehensive review of the Waste risks following the award and commencement of the new contract, which had resulted in the creation of a new parent risk and a new sub-risk, the redrafting of four existing sub-risks and the deletion of the original parent risk and five sub-risks:

- Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal (Parent Risk)
- Trade Waste (Sub-Risk)
- Waste and Recycling Services for Flats (Sub-Risk)
- Commingled Waste (Sub-Risk)
- Street Cleansing (Sub-Risk)
- Shared Procurement Opportunity (Sub-Risk)

*Recommended by the FARC on 24 September 2018*

*Approved by Cabinet on 25 September 2018*

- 3.6 **New Corporate Risks**  
The following Corporate Risks were introduced in 2018/19.
- 3.7 **Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal - Food and Garden Waste**  
Officers had created the new “Food and Garden Waste” sub-risk with an overall risk score of “5” to reflect the introduction of charging for Garden Waste, which commenced in May 2018. The overarching “Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal” Corporate Risk remained at the same assessment level of “8”.  
*Recommended by the FARC on 18 June 2018*  
*Approved by Cabinet on 19 June 2018*
- 3.8 **Waste**  
Officers had created a new parent risk, “Waste Management, Recycling and Street Cleansing” with an overall risk score of “9” and a new sub-risk, “Route Optimisation of Collection Rounds”, with an overall risk score of “7”. The creation of these new risk entries was one of the outcomes from the comprehensive review of the Waste risks that followed the award and commencement of the new contract (previously referred to in paragraph 3.5).  
*Recommended by the FARC on 24 September 2018*  
*Approved by Cabinet on 25 September 2018*
- 3.9 **Brexit**  
Officers had created a new risk entry with an overall risk score of “9”, which reflected the current high level of uncertainty surrounding the Brexit process and the possible implications for the Council.  
*Recommended by the FARC on 21 March 2019*  
*Approved by Cabinet on 26 March 2019*
- 3.10 **Corporate Risks with Amended Assessments**  
The regular review of the Council’s Corporate Risks includes an assessment of the impact and likelihood scores. Section 13 of this report details the definitions used for assessing scores at NHDC, which ensure a consistent approach to risk scoring.
- 3.11 **Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal – Depot/Transfer Station**  
Officers had increased the likelihood risk score from “Medium” to “High” and subsequently, increased the overall sub-risk score from “8” to “9”. This was to reflect the emerging issues relating to the installation of a fire suppression system and the Environment Agency permit/licence at the Buntingford Depot. Despite the change to the sub-risk score, the overarching “Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal” Corporate Risk remained at the same assessment level of “8”.  
*Recommended by the FARC on 18 June 2018*  
*Approved by Cabinet on 19 June 2018*
- 3.12 **Waste and Street Cleansing Contract Renewal - Sale of Recyclable Materials**  
Officers had increased the likelihood risk score from “Medium” to “High” and subsequently, increased the overall sub-risk score from “8” to “9”. Officers had updated the sub-risk as part of the comprehensive review of the Waste risks that followed the award and commencement of the new contract (previously referred to in paragraph 3.5) and it now incorporated commingled waste.  
*Recommended by the FARC on 24 September 2018*  
*Approved by Cabinet on 25 September 2018*

### 3.13 **North Hertfordshire Museum and Hitchin Town Hall Project**

Officers had reduced the likelihood risk score from “High” to “Low” and the impact risk score from “High” to “Medium” and subsequently, reduced the overall risk score from “9” to “3”. This reflected the completion of the purchase of 14 and 15 Brand Street and the fact that the remainder of the project was now under NHDC’s full control.

*Recommended by the FARC on 21 March 2019*

*Approved by Cabinet on 26 March 2019*

## **4 Risk Appetite**

4.1 The Council’s “risk appetite” is its willingness to accept risks in order to realise opportunities and achieve its strategic objectives. The Council has to take risks in order to evolve and deliver its services effectively. The Council’s risk management framework ensures that it recognises the risks that accompany new objectives and opportunities, and that it manages them appropriately. The Council has to decide what risks it wants to take and what risks it wants to avoid, although it cannot or should not avoid all risks.

4.2 The Council will have a range of different appetites for different risks depending on the circumstances, and these can vary over time. The reporting of the Council’s Corporate Risks to Cabinet via the FARC, allows the significant risks the Council is prepared to take to be approved and monitored accordingly. Generally, risks with a score of “7” or above will exceed the Council’s risk tolerance and will require further controls and mitigation. As at 31 March 2019, the following Corporate Risks, which have clear links to the Council’s objectives, had a score of “7” or above:

- Brexit (9)
- Local Plan (9)
- Managing the Council’s Finances (9)
- Waste Management, Recycling and Street Cleansing (9)
- Cyber Risks (8)
- Income Generation (7)
- Sustainable Development (7)

## **5 Insurance Review**

5.1 Hertfordshire County Council handles the Council’s insurance arrangements under a shared service arrangement.

5.2 The Council transfers some financial risks to its insurers. Public liability insurance provides the Council with insurance cover for claims made by the public for personal injury and/or property damage. These are each subject to a £10,000 excess that is charged to the responsible service area. Areas that have been subject to a claim are identified and wherever possible, action is taken to prevent future damage to property or personal injury.

5.3 Fifteen claims were received from the public relating to the policy year 2018/19. Although claims are made, these are not always successful for the claimant, as payments of compensation are made only when there is a proven legal liability. As at the end of March 2019, five of the fourteen claims relating to minor property damage had been settled. One personal injury claim was made and this was declined.



- 5.4 The Municipal Mutual Insurance (MMI) Scheme of Arrangement was triggered in 2013 and the Council now pays 25% of any new claims dating back to the period that MMI was the Council's insurers (1974 to 1993). The Council's Financial Risks make provision for any new claims and any further levy demands relating to the period that MMI were the Council's insurers.

## **6 Business Continuity**

### **6.1 Business Impact Analysis**

As part of the process, the core critical functions were identified and the risks mitigated (SMT - June 2018). SMT monitor these critical functions, whilst individual Service Directors retain responsibility for lower scale risks in their areas. The revised Business Continuity Plan structure is:

#### Corporate Level Plans

- Main Resilience Plan
- Mass Staff Absence Plan
- Recovery Plan
- Pandemic Plan
- IT Recovery Plan
- Property Services; Loss of Building (currently work in progress)
- Waste Contract (Lot 1)

#### Ten Core Critical Functions

- Burials
- Careline
- Emergency Planning
- Housing – Dealing With Homelessness Approaches
- Customer Service
- Communications
- IT
- Safeguarding – Managing Alerts/Concerns
- Revenues and Benefits - Payments
- Waste Management (Waste Contract/Loss of Buntingford Depot)

- 6.2 A major change to Business Continuity Planning arrangements during 2018/19 was the move back to the refurbished DCO. A storage facility is now available at Works Road, Letchworth, which houses the emergency planning equipment, IT disaster recovery and has suitable facilities to be converted to a secondary Incident Control Centre.

### **6.3 Business Continuity Training**

The 2018/19 Resilience training programme was completed. Training focused on key response roles including Incident Manager and Reception Centre Management and staff training. With the return to the refurbished DCO complete and senior management changes in place following the restructure, training for 2019/20 will include Business Continuity sessions.

### **6.4 Working in Partnership**

The Hertfordshire Local Resilience Forum takes a lead role in Business Continuity Planning and therefore promotes a broader understanding of issues. NHDC officers have secured good relationships with local organisations such as Churches Together, Urbaser, Pearce, Johnson Matthey and Garden Square retail. NHDC works closely with its peer authorities on topics such as cybercrime, reception centres, managing equipment, mutual aid and Brexit.

## 6.5 **Business Continuity Preparedness**

NHDC has a robust Business Continuity Planning framework. Despite uncertainty, work is ongoing to prepare NHDC for Brexit, with waste and food being the key areas impacted. Work with Environmental Health assisted in the promotion of a countywide Food Officer Group to examine the significant risks and work with Urbaser is taking place around waste. Brexit concerns have been raised at SMT level and recorded on the Risk Register as a Corporate Risk.

## 6.6 **Business Continuity Promotion**

Awareness work was carried out for Business Continuity Awareness Week in May 2018 (14 to 18 May). The theme was Organisational Resilience and NHDC published a series of key messages for businesses via Twitter. Internally, an article in the Insight magazine promoted key information for staff. The NHDC Resilience Planning booklet containing advice on Business Continuity is available on the NHDC website along with additional information and direction to Hertfordshire County Council for further guidance.

## 6.7 Business Continuity actions planned for 2019/20 include:

- Continue to monitor and assess potential impacts of Brexit
- Business Impact Assessments and key activities to be reviewed by SMT
- Business Continuity Plans for critical functions to be reviewed and updated as required
- Business Continuity training to be provided
- Resilience Direct will be used as a secure online external repository for NHDC's Resilience Plan documents
- Further promotion of Business Continuity Planning to the business community

# 7 **Health and Safety**

## 7.1 **DCO Heating**

The heating/cooling in the DCO continues to be a problem. Property Services are working closely with the installation company to find the optimum settings for the system. There is a trial of a retro fitted air deflector on the fifth floor and this is designed to redirect the air from the units away from desktops and disperse it across the ceiling.

## 7.2 **Display Screen Equipment (DSE) Risk Assessment Software**

The contract for the DSE risk assessment software provided by Cardinus has been renewed and is due for roll out at the end of May 2019. The updated programme now includes modules on working with hot desks, dual screens, rising desks, use of tablets and home working.

## 7.3 **Letchworth Multi-Storey Car Park**

The latest fire risk assessment highlighted a potential emergency egress issue from the town centre side of the car park after 1900 hours. The town centre gates are closed for security reasons at this time each evening and therefore the exit route from the car park through the town centre becomes unavailable.

7.4 Due to the loss of this exit, the re-routing of pedestrians across the vehicle decks to the DCO side stairs and a safe exit route increases the travel distances. The distances needed to travel will be increased further by the planned decoration works to the DCO side stairs, which will require the stairs to be closed off for approximately two weeks. The proposed routes for pedestrian exit to the DCO side of the car park after 1900 hours will be via the town centre stairs and vehicle ramps with exit from the Level 1 vehicle entrance. It is proposed to close the left side vehicle entrance to vehicles to accommodate this. The increased travel distances have been assessed by the Herts Fire and Rescue Service Fire Officer and have been deemed acceptable and within the guidelines for normal use of the car park. The Fire Officer also agreed with the proposals for management of pedestrian egress during the stairwell refurbishments.

7.5 Alternative arrangements for completion of the works have been considered. However, there would be increased costs for the Council for out of hours working and potential risks to staff and members of the public if the stairs were to remain open for the duration of the works.

7.6 **Bury Mead Road Museum Store**

The latest fire risk assessment review for the building highlighted several concerns around fire safety within the building. Discussions have taken place with the Service Director and both the Museum Manager and the Operations and Facilities Manager for Hitchin Town Hall and temporary measures have been implemented to reduce the level of risk. These include a reduction of unwanted combustible materials from the site, restricted access controlled by the Museum Manager and the relocation of all items used or loaned out on a regular basis to North Hertfordshire Museum. The regular volunteer worker engaged to catalogue items has also been relocated to the main museum in Hitchin. More works are planned to reduce the fire loading on the building further. However, due to priority being placed on the opening of the North Hertfordshire Museum, no timescales have been set for the completion of this work.

**8 Review of the Risk Management Framework at NHDC**

8.1 The latest risk management audit, reported by the Shared Internal Audit Service (SIAS) in March 2017, provided a substantial level of assurance and highlighted the Council’s commitment to ensuring that effective risk management underpinned all activities and supported the Council in achieving its stated objectives. The subsequent implementation of the two “Merits Attention” recommendations enhanced the risk management processes further.

**9 Achieving the Significant Actions for 2018/19**

9.1 Last year’s Annual Report detailed the following key action for 2018/19, to enhance implementation and development of the risk management framework:

Action	Due Date
To review the structure of the Risk Management Group following publication of the details of the corporate restructure and to make any required changes to the group’s Terms of Reference	31/08/18

- 9.2 On 22 November 2018, the Risk Management Group reviewed its structure and agreed two options for future membership. The Service Director – Resources subsequently presented these options to the Senior Management Team and it agreed that the Service Director – Commercial would join the Risk Management Group to represent the commercial side of the organisation and that the Strategic Infrastructure and Projects Manager would no longer be required to regularly attend meetings. These were the only changes required to the current membership.
- 9.3 The Risk Management Group will review its Terms of Reference during 2019/20 and agree the changes required.

## 10 Significant Actions for 2019/20

- 10.1 The implementation of the following key actions in 2019/20 will ensure the continued development of the risk management framework at NHDC:

Action	Due Date
To review the Risk Management Group's Terms of Reference and agree the changes required.	30/09/19
To review the Risk and Opportunities Management Strategy, including the need for changes to reflect the Council's adopted approach to commercialisation.	31/12/19

## 11 Conclusion

- 11.1 The Council continued to maintain robust risk management practices throughout 2018/19, including the regular review of the Corporate Risks. Section 3 of this report summarises the changes made to the Corporate Risks during the year. The outcome from the risk management framework is to ensure a better understanding of the risks and opportunities the Council faces and to determine the most effective way to manage and exploit them. As a result, the Council is more risk aware.

## 12 Recommendations

- 12.1 Full Council notes the continuing strong processes of the risk management framework at NHDC that supports the Council's governance framework.
- 12.2 Full Council notes the changes to the Council's Corporate Risks during 2018/19.

## 13 Definitions

13.1 The following are the definitions of likelihood and impact used in NHDC's Risk Management Framework.

### Likelihood

<b>1. Low</b>	Unlikely in the next 12 months.
<b>2. Medium</b>	Possible in the next 12 months.
<b>3. High</b>	Likely in the next 12 months.

### Impact

Severity of Impact Guide							
Score	General	Personal Safety	Service Disruption	Financial Loss £	Project Delay	Impact on Stakeholders /Environment	Reputation
<b>1. Low</b>	Consequences will not be severe and associated losses will be small	Minor injury (first aid)	Negligible affect on service provision but may have a more significant cumulative affect if action is not taken	Up to £10,000	Delivery of project delayed by weeks	No impact on stakeholders Minor damage to local environment	Minimal reputation damage (local press article)
<b>2. Medium</b>	Will have a noticeable affect on services	Injury (external medical treatment required)	Will cause a degree of disruption to service provision and impinge on budgets	Medium financial loss £10,000 to £100,000	Delivery of project may be delayed by months	Some impact to stakeholders Moderate damage to local environment	Coverage in national tabloid press
<b>3. High</b>	Can have a catastrophic affect	Serious injury or loss of life	May result in significant financial loss or major service disruption	Major financial loss exceeding £100,000	Delivery of project no longer attainable	Significant impact on stakeholders Major damage to local environment	Extensive coverage in national press/national TV item

## 14 Risk Matrix for Corporate Risks as at 31 March 2019

14.1 As reported to the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee on 21 March 2019 and Cabinet on 26 March 2019.

### Summary Matrix

<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>3 High</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b> • Income Generation • Sustainable Development	<b>9</b> • Local Plan • Managing the Council's Finances • Waste Management, Recycling and Street Cleansing • Brexit
	<b>2 Medium</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b> • Increased Homelessness • Workforce Planning	<b>8</b> • Cyber Risks
	<b>1 Low</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b> • North Hertfordshire Museum and Hitchin Town Hall Project	<b>6</b>
		<b>1 Low</b>	<b>2 Medium</b>	<b>3 High</b>
		<b>Impact</b>		

**CABINET  
26 MARCH 2019**

**PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**ITEM 6B**

**TITLE OF REPORT: ITEM REFERRED FROM CABINET: 30 JULY 2019 – MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2020 -2025**

*Extract from the draft Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 30 July 2019*

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2020 - 2025**

The Executive Members for Finance and IT presented the report entitled Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020 – 2025 together with the following appendix:

- Appendix A - Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The following alternative option was considered:

The Council needed to have a strategy for setting its budget to ensure that it meets its statutory duty to set a balanced budget over the medium term, and ensure that spend was prioritised towards delivering statutory services and its strategic aims, (as set out in the Council Plan). It was considered whether to delay the MTFS to follow the same timeline as the Council Plan. However, the development of savings ideas would take time, and it was felt necessary to commence this as early as possible. Having a MTFS provided a structure for formulating, discussing and agreeing savings ideas. To avoid conflict with the Council Plan, the MTFS is focused on headline information and referred to a net savings target, to allow opportunities for investments.

The Chairman of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee presented the referral from the meeting held on 29 July 2019 which contained the following recommendations to Cabinet:

- (1) That Cabinet ask the Service Director – Resources to update the MTFS to show that it did not take account of any potential impacts of Brexit;
- (2) That Cabinet recommended to Full Council the adoption of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25, as attached at Appendix A.

It was moved by Councillor Ian Albert, Seconded by Councillor Martin Stears-Handscorn and:

**RESOLVED:** That the Service Director – Resources be requested to update the MTFS to show that it did not take account of any potential impacts of Brexit;

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:** That the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25 as attached at Appendix A be adopted.

**REASON FOR DECISIONS:** Adoption of a MTFS and communication of its contents would assist in the process of forward planning the use of Council resources and in budget setting for 2020/2021 to 2024/2025, culminating in the setting of the Council Tax precept for 2020/21 in February 2020.



## **Referral from Finance, Audit and Risk Committee considered by Cabinet on 30 July 2019**

### **TITLE OF REPORT: ITEM REFERRED FROM FINANCE, AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE: 29 JULY 2019 – MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2020-2025**

The Service Director – Resources presented the report entitled Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25 together with the following appendix:

- Appendix A- Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25.

The following Members asked questions and took part in the debate:

- Councillor Kate Aspinwall;
- Councillor Steve Jarvis;
- Councillor Sam North;

Members queried how the Commercialisation Strategy interacted with the Medium Term Financial Strategy and asked what estimates had been made regarding growth.

The Service Director- Resources advised that he expected these would form part of detailed budget setting.

Members suggested that the MTFS should contain a comment that it did not take account of any potential impacts of Brexit.

In response to a question about how the MTFS reflected housing growth, the Service Director – Resources advised that currently there was an assumption of one percent growth in Council Tax Base.

#### ***RECOMMENDED TO CABINET:***

- (1) That Cabinet ask the Service Director – Resources to update the MTFS to show that it did not take account of any potential impacts of Brexit;
- (2) That Cabinet recommends to Full Council the adoption of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25 as attached at Appendix A.

***REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:*** To enable the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee to consider the report entitled Medium Term Financial Strategy prior to consideration by Cabinet.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report considered by cabinet on 30 July 2019**

**TITLE OF REPORT: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY**

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR - RESOURCES

EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND IT

COUNCIL PRIORITY : ATTRACTIVE AND THRIVING / PROSPER AND PROTECT / RESPONSIVE AND EFFICIENT

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 This report recommends the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2020/21 to 2024/25 to guide and inform the Corporate Business Planning Process. The strategy highlights the significant uncertainties faced by the Council in forecasting its funding, expenditure and income in 2020/21 and beyond. It recommends a budget strategy based on estimates of a number of factors, but that amendments to that strategy may be required as further information becomes available.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 That Cabinet recommends to Full Council the adoption of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25 as attached at Appendix A.

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 Adoption of a MTFS and communication of its contents will assist in the process of forward planning the use of Council resources and in budget setting for 2020/2021 to 2024/2025, culminating in the setting of the Council Tax precept for 2020/21 in February 2020.

**4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 The Council needs to have a strategy for setting its budget to ensure that it meets its statutory duty to set a balanced budget over the medium term, and ensure that spend is prioritised towards delivering statutory services and its strategic aims (as set out in the Council Plan). It was considered whether to delay this MTFS to follow the same timeline as the Council Plan. However, the development of savings ideas takes time and it was felt necessary to commence this as early as possible. Having a MTFS provides a structure for formulating, discussing and agreeing savings ideas. To avoid conflict with the Council Plan, the MTFS is focused on headline information and refers to a net savings target, to allow opportunities for investments.

**5. CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT MEMBERS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS**

- 5.1 The Executive Member for Finance and IT, the Deputy Executive Member for Finance and IT and the Leader of the Council have been consulted in developing this Strategy.
- 5.2 No external consultation has been undertaken in the preparation of this report.
- 5.3 Members will be aware that consultation is an integral part of the Corporate Business Planning process, and consultation on the individual actions and projects planned to support the Objectives will be carried out in accordance with the Corporate Business Planning Timetable and the Council's Consultation Strategy.
- 5.4 As in previous years, Member workshops will be held in regard to corporate business planning proposals.

## **6. FORWARD PLAN**

- 6.1 This does not include a key executive decision (as the approval of the MTFS is a matter for Full Council) however it was notified to the public in the Forward Plan on the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

## **7. BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 The Council is required to set a balanced budget each year. This can include using reserves if this is affordable over the medium term. The Council therefore sets a 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy each year to help determine the approach that it will take to setting the detailed budget for the following year.
- 7.2 As the Council's budget and its objectives are inextricably linked, it is also important to align the MTFS with the Council Plan. There is no point in having a service or key project that cannot be funded and no point in spending limited resources (including staff resources) if they are not achieving the objectives that have been set. Therefore the MTFS and Council Plan would normally be considered in the same committee cycle. As detailed in section 4.1 it is considered necessary to agree the final MTFS ahead of the final Council Plan. Setting the budget for 2020/21 (and beyond) is an iterative process and this can reflect changes to the Council Plan, as well as the other uncertainties reference in Appendix A and 8.1 below. The draft Council Plan is being considered by Cabinet at the same time as the MTFS.

## **8. RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy attached as Appendix A details the forecast impact of reducing resources, and quantifies what the Council will need to do to balance its budget in the medium term. It also reflects the significant uncertainty over funding, expenditure and income and therefore highlights the need to be able to react to any changes.
- 8.2 Subject to Cabinet's consideration, the MTFS at appendix A will be referred to Council for adoption on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2019.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 Cabinet's terms of reference include at 5.6.37 the power, by recommendation "to advise the Council in the formulation of those policies within the Council's terms of reference". Council's terms of reference include at 4.4.1(b) "approving or adopting the budget". The MTFS is part of the budget setting process.
- 9.2 Councillors are reminded of the requirement, under section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, to set a balanced budget prior to the commencement of the financial year in question; and also that the Local Government Act 2003 requires the Chief Finance Officer to report on the robustness of estimates and the adequacy of reserves allowed for in the budget.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Revenue financial implications are covered in Appendix A.
- 10.2 The main purpose of the Medium Term Financial Strategy is to consider the revenue funding, income and expenditure for the Council. This includes considering the revenue implications of capital expenditure which are linked to the reduced income from treasury investments (as capital reserves are spent) and the costs of borrowing (which may be required when reserves are used up. The Strategy does also consider discretionary capital spend (i.e. not directly linked to continuing service delivery) and the need to deliver value for money. This would include using capital expenditure to reduce revenue costs or generate income.

## **11. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The key risks within the budget assumptions are referred to in Appendix A.
- 11.2 There are financial and reputational risks involved in arriving at a balanced budget against the uncertainty surrounding levels of government funding. We seek to mitigate the risks by scenario planning, use of the established corporate business planning process and early involvement of members and key stakeholders. The Council has a Corporate Risk of "Managing the Council's Finances". This is monitored by the Finance Audit and Risk Committee. Having an MTFS is a key mitigation to this risk.

## **12. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of their functions, give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 12.2 The MTFS attempts to align resources to the delivery of the Council Plan, which sets the corporate objectives. Through its corporate objectives the Council is seeking to address equality implications in the services it provides and through the remainder of the Corporate Business Planning Process will carry out Equalities Impact Assessments for relevant Efficiency or Investment options.

## **13. SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1 The Social Value Act and "go local" policy do not apply to this report.

## **14. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 Section 2.5 of Appendix A details the assumptions in relation to inflation over the period of the MTF5. As the actual rate of inflation will be subject to national pay bargaining, the actual costs will depend on the results of those negotiations. The budget also makes assumptions around funding for increments. The budget does not make any allowance for pay increases above inflation. This means that there will be no improvement to the Council's ability to attract staff in relation to pay, which will particularly impact on difficult to fill posts. The Human Resources Team and the Senior Management Team continually try to identify staff benefits that are not related to pay, and therefore more affordable.
- 14.2 The delivery of projects to deliver council objectives depends on having adequate people resources with the requisite skills as set out in paragraph 7.2.
- 14.3 The development of budget proposals will take up staff time. As they are developed these budget proposals will identify the ongoing impact on staff.

## **15. APPENDICES**

- 15.1 Appendix A- Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-25

## **16. CONTACT OFFICERS**

- 16.1 Ian Couper, Service Director: Resources  
[ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk) ; ext 4243
- 16.2 Antonio Ciampa, Accountancy Manager  
[antonio.ciampa@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:antonio.ciampa@north-herts.gov.uk); ext 4566
- 16.3 Jeanette Thompson, Service Director: Legal and Community  
[Jeanette.thompson@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Jeanette.thompson@north-herts.gov.uk); ext 4370
- 16.4 Kerry Shorrocks, Corporate HR Manager  
[Kerry.shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Kerry.shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk), ext 4224
- 16.5 Reuben Ayavoo, Policy and Community Engagement Manager  
[Reuben.ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Reuben.ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk), ext 4212
- 16.6 Tim Everitt, Performance and Risk Officer  
[Tim.everitt@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Tim.everitt@north-herts.gov.uk), ext 4646

## **17. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 17.1 None.

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY**

**2020-2025**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1	Introduction
2	The current picture
3	Next Steps- Bridging the Gap
Annex 1	Budget Assumptions
Annex 2	Roles and Responsibilities



## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), the Council's key financial planning document, is an integral part of the Council's Corporate Business Planning process. The Council operates a system of priority led budgeting, with those district priorities set out in the "Council Plan" policy document. The MTFS then sets out how the financial management process will contribute to delivering those priorities and sets out a clear framework for our financial decision making. The strategy is updated annually. We fully expect that it will change over time to reflect new opportunities and policy decisions.
- 1.2 The MTFS includes a forward look over the next five years to assess the spending pressures the Council is likely to face and the level of cost reductions or income generation that will need to be made to allow us to achieve our legal duty to set a balanced budget each year. Over the last few years, the Council has taken the opportunity to increase the level of its general fund reserves. The intention is that they can be used to soften the impact of expected (although currently unknown) future funding reductions. There will still be a need for the Council to review what services it delivers and how, but this approach does give more time to plan the impact of these changes.
- 1.3 The current national political climate means that there is significant uncertainty within the MTFS and therefore it will be kept under review until the budget for 2020/21 is agreed at Council in February. Even once the MTFS is agreed by Council, it is still just a plan, and therefore it will be monitored throughout the year and amended to reflect updated information. The budget monitoring reports (revenue and capital) that are provided to Finance, Audit and Risk Committee and Cabinet are a key component of this.

## 2.0 The current picture

- 2.1 The budget agreed by Full Council in February 2019, set the 2019/20 budget and indicative budgets for the years up to 2022/23 as follows:

£000	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Net revenue expenditure	15,136	14,808	14,911	15,021
Estimated Funding	15,136	14,417	14,655	15,082
Use of General Fund reserves	0	391	256	(61)
General Fund brought forward	7,055	7,055	6,664	6,408
General Fund carried forward	7,055	6,664	6,408	6,469
<b>Assumed savings and income efficiencies still to be identified and delivered (cumulative)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>1,200</b>

- 2.2 Whilst the MTFS is for a five year period, detailed forecasts were only provided for a four year period. This reflected the substantial uncertainty over future funding levels and that the Council should aim to balance its funding within the four year period.
- 2.3 The final position at the end of 2018/19 (subject to audit) was a General Fund Balance that was higher (£7.862 million) than estimated above. This was primarily due to underspends against budget. Some of the underspends have been carried forward, which increases the forecast spend in 2019/20 by £474k compared to budget. This means that the net position is an improved General Fund position by £333k. As at the end of 2019/20 the earmarked reserves also included £368k of gains from Business Rate pooling. It is forecast that this could be released to the General Fund.
- 2.4 To refresh the MTFS for the period 2020-25 it is necessary to consider any changes that need to be made to funding expectations and expenditure forecasts. Annex 1 provides further details of some of these assumptions. The following paragraphs detail the relevant changes and areas of uncertainty.

## Expenditure

- 2.5 The current budget includes an allowance for pay inflation of 2% each year. Pay awards for lower earners tend to be greater than for higher earners, which means an average 2% pay award would actually be less than this for a proportion of the workforce. The Council is part of national pay bargaining. The initial request from UNISON is significantly higher than 2%, and is the greater of £10 per hour or a 10% increase. In essence the percentage allowance in the MTFS is an estimate of where the negotiations will end up. The cost of an average pay award of 2.7% (which was the end result for 2019/20) would be an additional £94k per year (£376k cumulative over 4 years). A separate allowance is budgeted for the payment of increments, which is based on the grade profile of current staff. As the allowances above reflect national pay bargaining, they do not affect the differentials between what North Herts pays compared with other Councils. This means that where the Council has posts that are difficult to recruit to, this position is unlikely to improve in terms of pure pay rewards. However the Council does implement and promote the other advantages of working for us. A more fundamental review of our pay scales could be carried out, but is likely to be a very significant cost pressure and the impact on being able to recruit is very uncertain. This will need to be kept under review in the context of our ability to recruit to vacant posts.
- 2.6 Employees of the Council are eligible to join the Local Government Pension (LGPS), indeed new employees are now auto-enrolled in to the pension scheme. The LGPS provides a pension that is based on average career earnings. For service up to the year 2014, the pension is based on final salary. The Council pays employer contributions in to the fund. Due to various factors, including pensioners living longer, the contributions that the Council has made in the past have not been sufficient to cover future liabilities. As a result the Council now pays a lump sum towards past service costs and a percentage of payroll costs to cover the estimated cost of the pensions being accrued by current employees. Every 3 years, an actuary undertakes a valuation of the pension fund to determine future contribution rates. This valuation is being carried out at the moment, using data as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019. The results will be published in the Autumn and any change in contribution rates/ amounts will be applicable from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020. The current estimate included in the MTFS is that the lump sum and percentage rates will be unchanged. The likelihood is that any change will result in an increased cost.
- 2.7 Hertfordshire County Council as Waste Disposal Authority have the power to direct where the Council sends its residual and green waste. At the moment, the Council delivers this waste to transfer locations in Hitchin and Cumberlow Green. Whilst this is not expected to change over the medium term period, there could be significant impacts over the long term.
- 2.8 The budget for 2019/20 included additional one-off investments for Citizens Advice North Herts (£50k), Age UK (£20k), Minority Ethnic Forum (£25k) and Health and Wellbeing activities (£50k). The assumption is that these will remain as one-off (as budgeted) and there will be no ongoing costs in 2020/21 onwards. The Memorandum of Understanding arrangements where there is ongoing funding will be renegotiated in advance of the end of existing agreement periods.
- 2.9 It is assumed that any other revenue growth will be fully funded by additional off-setting savings.

## Income

- 2.10 The Council currently receives payments from HCC under an arrangement known as the Alternative Financial Model (AFM). These payments are intended to provide an incentive for the Council to introduce measures that reduce residual waste. HCC are consulting on making changes to the AFM that would see a reduction in the total amount that was allocated. This would have an impact on the income that the Council would receive. The Council currently receives funding above what is budgeted (and this is put in to an earmarked reserve) and also funds some discretionary waste reduction activities. Over the medium term the impact of the income reduction can be managed, but it is expected to have an impact in the longer term (see 2.12 below).

- 2.11 The take-up of the chargeable garden waste service has exceeded the original forecasts of 26%. The budget for 2019/20 is based on an estimated take-up of 52% and an annual charge of £40, although the three month extension to the 2018/19 charging period means that only 9/12ths of the income will be accounted for in 2019/20. In 2020/21 (with a full year of income) the Council would be estimated to generate an overall net surplus (after accounting for capital charges and overheads) at this level of take-up. Given that the £40 was set based on benchmarking against other Authorities to assess its reasonableness and was also subject to feedback through a consultation process, it is proposed to retain it at this level. But to take reasonable measures to reduce the surplus, no inflationary increases will be added and concessionary discounts will be reviewed. However this review will need to be mindful of the administrative practicalities of introducing concessionary charging and that budget will need to be identified. The surplus will initially provide protection against the risks associated with providing the service, if required, and where appropriate be used against wider waste and environmental service costs. For any increases in take-up above the current budgeted level, the creation of an environmental investment budget will be proposed as part of the 2020/21 budget process (subject to Full Council approval). The net income (after reflecting the amounts paid to Urbaser for collection and other direct costs) from households above the 52% take-up level will be allocated to this budget. This can be used alongside AFM funding (see paragraph 2.10), and in the longer term may provide an alternative funding source for AFM related activities (although see 2.12 below).
- 2.12 In February 2019, Central Government released a consultation on their emerging Waste Strategy. Various elements of this could have cost implications for the Council if they were introduced. The most significant of these proposed changes are:
- Introduce consistent waste collection across all areas of the Country (e.g. same materials in the same types of bins) and being stopped from charging for garden waste collections. The Council would expect significant 'new burdens' funding if this was introduced, particularly in relation to garden waste charging.
  - Introduction of a Deposit Return Scheme, which would have an impact on what the Council would collect at the kerbside. It is likely to mean that the higher value recycling materials would be taken to deposit return locations, leaving the Council to collect the remainder. This would affect the net costs of disposal for recycling materials.
  - Extended Producer Responsibility- places the financial burden for waste on those that are producing it at source. This in turn would affect how waste collection and disposal are funded. It would need to be determined how this affects the funding that the Council receives. It is likely to have an impact on the future of the AFM.
- 2.13 The Council is estimating that it might make a surplus (after accounting for capital charges and overheads) on off-street car parking in 2019/20, and therefore would expect that this would also be the case for 2020/21. This surplus can be significantly affected by capital charges, particularly in relation to property revaluations. Whilst there has been provision in the budget for capital works associated with parking, these have been delayed pending the implementation of the parking strategy. This has also had an impact on the total cost of off-street parking provision. In general, parking charge levels are set to manage demand and reflective of the cost of alternative parking locations. It is proposed that the budgeted assumption that parking charges increase by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) + 2% is changed to increase by 2% only, as this better matches the expected increases in costs of parking provision and the level of increase required to manage parking demand. This is for modelling purposes and actual increases will be considered each year as part of the more detailed budget setting process. The budget setting process for 2020/21 onwards will need to consider the current review being undertaken and recruitment of parking posts to deliver the 2019-2031 adopted Parking Strategy. In addition the Parking Strategy has an associated Action Plan which has some significant investment proposals such as pay-on-foot that will need to be factored in (subject to a business case) to any future budgets. Furthermore that the implementation of evening and Sunday charging will be aligned to the needs to manage parking within the overall parking strategy, and any budgetary change relating to this will need to be reflected in detailed budget setting.

## Funding

- 2.14 2019/20 is the final year of the current settlement period in relation to Central Government funding. This covers Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and retained Business Rates. The Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is due to introduce a new Fairer Funding Formula and 75% Business Rates Retention in 2020/21. These are both currently being delayed by other Central Government priorities. The Central Government spending review has also been delayed. This means that there is no certainty over the amount of funding that Local Government will receive in total, how this will be distributed across Authorities, and how risks and rewards for changes in Business Rates will work. Furthermore it is not known when there will be greater clarity. It would be hoped that the longer the delay, the greater the transitional protection and therefore the closer the funding will be to current levels. The current assumption is that funding from Business Rates will be subject to a £1m reduction in 2020/21 (in line with the previously expected negative RSG), and then increase with inflation thereafter.
- 2.15 Central Government also determine the extent to which Local Authorities can raise Council Tax, without the need for a Local Referendum. Over the last two years this has allowed increases of up to 3% (or £5 for a band D if that is greater). This was a temporary increase to reflect inflation. It is currently expected that the limits for 2020/21 onwards will revert back to the greater of 2% or £5 (for a band D property). It is expected that amount of Business Rate funding that Local Authorities can retain will be based on an assumption that Councils increase Council Tax by as much as they are able. The MTFs therefore makes this assumption in forecasting future Council Tax funding.
- 2.16 The future of New Homes Bonus funding is very uncertain. The level of incentive has been reduced substantially over recent years, from 6 years down to 4, and the introduction of a baseline. It has also been proposed that the current system will be replaced in an attempt to better incentivise the building of new homes.
- 2.17 The Council gained from Business Rate pooling in 2018/19 by £368k. This has been retained in the earmarked reserve, but based on forecasts of collection fund positions it is assumed that it can be released to support general fund expenditure in 2020/21. The Council is part of a Business Rate Pilot in 2019/20. It is forecast that the gains from this could be in excess of £800k, but this will not be known until after the end of the year, and therefore after the 2020/21 budget has been set. At this stage it can not be assumed for 2021/22 either. The Council should not assume that these gains will continue in the new funding systems.

## Reserves and Resilience

- 2.18 The Council is required to retain a certain level of reserves. This is to provide protection against both known and unknown risks. This includes being able to react to changes in demand and any emergencies that may arise. The allowance of known risks is based on estimating the monetary impact of an event happening and applying a percentage to this based on the likelihood of it happening (high, medium or low). The allowance for unknown risks has been based on 5% of net expenditure. As the Council has become more reliant on generating income to set a balanced budget, an additional 3% of budgeted income (excluding Housing Benefit) will also be included in determining the minimum level.
- 2.19 In response to the issues faced by Northamptonshire County Council, and concerns over the financial health of other Local Authorities, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) are in the process of developing a financial resilience tool. This uses historic publicly available data to compare indicators of financial stress across similar Local Authorities. This is currently at a draft stage, but it is expected to be finalised in time for the setting of budgets for 2020/21. Chief Finance Officers will be expected to consider it when commenting on the robustness of estimates within the budget.

2.20 The overall message is that having reserves at the minimum level would make the Council very unresilient. Therefore in setting a medium term budget, the Council should plan to have sufficient breathing space above the minimum level, particularly when the uncertainties described above are considered.

2.21 The forecasts over a four year period are shown in the table below. These totals could be affected by the significant uncertainties highlighted above, and realistic alternative forecasts show that the net funding position in 2020/21 could be improved by £1m (if negative RSG was not implemented) or could be £2m worse (if rough estimates of the uncertainties all went the wrong way).

£000	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Cumulative
Net expenditure brought forward	14,597	14,638	14,739	15,087	14,597
Ongoing base budget adjustments, including previously identified savings	(63)	(103)	87	0	(79)
Net additional savings, service changes or income generation to be identified	(300)	(300)	(250)	(50)	(900)
Pay inflation and increments	328	319	319	319	1,285
Contractual inflation	282	430	430	430	1,572
Income inflation	(205)	(245)	(238)	(254)	(1,142)
Pension scheme contribution increases	0	0	0	0	0
Other adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Net Expenditure- to be funded from taxation and general grants</b>	<b>14,638</b>	<b>14,739</b>	<b>15,087</b>	<b>15,532</b>	<b>15,532</b>
Council Tax	(11,755)	(12,125)	(12,501)	(12,884)	
Revenue Support Grant	0	0	0	0	
Business Rates- including tariff adjustment	(1,660)	(1,710)	(1,761)	(1,814)	
New Homes Bonus	(844)	(844)	(844)	(844)	
Other	24	24	24	24	
Pooling gain funding	(368)	0	0	0	
<b>Net funding position (use of reserves)</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	
Reserve balance b/f	7,862	7,827	7,743	7,738	
Reserve balance c/f	7,827	7,743	7,738	7,723	

2.22 The Council currently has capital reserves that it can use to fund its capital programme. This means that the revenue impact of capital investment is minimal as it is just the lost interest from treasury investments. Over the life of the MTFs the available capital resources are likely to be diminished. After this the cost of capital investment will be substantially higher as it will incorporate borrowing charges and Minimum Revenue Provision. The capital programme (for all projects that are not committed to start) should be reviewed on the following basis:

- Is it necessary for continued service provision?
- If it is for investment, what return does it provide? Does it still provide a positive return if it was necessary to borrow money to fund the project?

### 3.0 Next Steps- Bridging the Gap

3.1 As highlighted in paragraph 2.21 there is currently high uncertainty in relation to funding, cost and income pressures in 2020/21. It would be impractical to wait for these to be resolved before starting budget work for 2020/21. Therefore the strategy to be adopted is a target of £300k net

savings (including service changes, efficiencies , income generation and any investments) for 2020/21, alongside consideration of options for further savings in future years (noting a current target of at least £900k by the end of 2023/24) . If a worse position transpires then it will be necessary to use reserves to balance the budget in 2020/21, bring forward identified savings options as quickly as possible and start to develop additional ideas for later years. If a better position transpires then the medium term impact of this will need to be considered in determining the potential for additional investments (on top of any that are funded from achieving net savings of £300k).

3.2 Corporate Business planning will need to be undertaken to identify how the required savings and income efficiencies will be delivered.

3.3 The roles and responsibilities of Councillors, Officers and the Senior Management Team are detailed in Annex 2. In summary the actions that will be required are:

- Officers (including the Senior Management Team) will continue to review current models of service delivery, and put forward proposals as to potential changes and the savings that could be achieved. Options may include:
  - Up-front (capital) investment to enable change
  - Working with others e.g. joint provision, joint procurement
  - Challenging the extent to which they deliver Corporate Priorities
  - Determine what non-statutory services are being provided (including services that exceed the statutory level of provision) and ensure that there is a case for continued delivery
  - Review of the capital programme
- There will be an increased focus on Commercialisation. This could include generating revenue income from capital investment, selling existing services on a more commercial basis or developing new services that are income generating. These options are likely to involve a lag between investment and savings generation.
- Councillors will be required decide on whether to take forward the options presented.
- The Service Director- Resources will monitor the assumptions made in funding and expenditure levels. When there is information that these will change, the MTFS will be updated and the implications presented back to Cabinet.

## ANNEX 1 Budget Assumptions and Policies

### Key Budget Assumptions

Inflation indices are reviewed on an annual basis and the forward budget projections amended accordingly. At this stage in the budget planning process, it is prudent to take a cautious approach and, in identifying the likely Council Tax requirement, the strategy focuses on the pressures on expenditure and assumes that income will rise in accordance with the determined policy. The figures presented in the MTFS financial projections appendices include the following assumptions in line with the current financial strategy

- Investment income is based on cashflow projections and a 1% return. This is significantly affected by the timing of expenditure in the capital programme.
- New Homes Bonus (NHB) will be awarded for 4 years from 2018/19. A 0.4% baseline (dead-weight) has been assumed. The split between District and County is assumed to remain at 80:20. The number of new homes per year is based on prudent estimates and could be higher. However, Central Government could also make changes to the baseline which would reduce the funding that the Council gets.
- New Homes Bonus is used to continue the delivery of services in the face of other government funding reductions and is built into the base budget. Given the high uncertainty over this funding, it would be better if it was not used for core budgets, but it is appreciated that this is not currently feasible.
- Contract inflation in accordance with the individual contract terms.
- Pay inflation at an average of 2 % per year.
- No allowance is made for general inflation on remaining expenditure. Although after allowing for salary and contractual inflation, the remaining amount is insignificant.
- Discretionary fees and charges income will be increased by CPI at November, plus 2%. This will be where it is legally possible and subject to a market impact assessment.
- The overall Council tax base figure will rise by 1% per annum.
- Council tax precept will be increased by the maximum amount allowed without the need for a local referendum.
- An assumed 99% collection rate for the purposes of calculating the Council tax base.
- An assumed 97% collection rate for Business Rates
- Any future changes to the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme will aim to have a cost neutral impact.
- A vacancy factor set at approximately 2.5% of salary budget to yield in the region of £300k is included in the base budget in each year.
- The Council will not subsidise areas which are the responsibility of another precepting body other than through a one-off match-funding arrangement where this is in the interests of the local Council tax payers.
- The potential impacts of Brexit are not reflected.
- All assumptions are subject to further refinement during the budget process as more certain information becomes available.

**Reviewing service provision**

As part of further developing the Medium Term Financial Strategy, we continue to investigate the appropriateness of service subsidies and also the funding of functions which are the responsibility of other bodies. We recognise that we should give careful consideration to each individual case before reaching a decision and should apply the test: "should the Council Tax payer pay for all or part of a service or should it be the service user?" Many of the services we provide are subsidised and during the budget setting process, service managers are now asked to review the extent of the subsidies and are asked the following questions:

- Does the service support the Council's high level objectives and priorities?
- Is the service statutory or discretionary and, in either case, do we have discretion over the level at which it is provided?
- What proportion or sections of the population use the service?
- What is the level of subsidy?
- What is the reason for the service subsidy?
- Is there a strategy in place which determines the level of subsidy going forward?
- Is there the opportunity to make greater use of or secure external grants to reduce the subsidy?
- What impact would a reduction in the level of subsidy have on the service?
- How much income could be generated by a removal of the subsidy?
- Should any removal be subject to a phasing in process and if so over how many years?

Changes made to service delivery are required to include an equality analysis.

The Council will seek to manage all its assets cost-effectively, including opportunities to optimise income from the use of these assets, offering concessions (as appropriate and affordable) to encourage use by all members of our community in pursuit of our priorities. We will also continue to explore opportunities in regard to our assets, including long term leases which effectively constitute a transfer, whereby community groups take on responsibility for the operation and overall facility management.

The Local Government Act 2003 permits local authorities to trade with both public and private sector bodies. In broad terms authorities may not trade for profit unless that activity is performed through a company. The Localism Act 2012, while vesting a general power of competence, retains this requirement. Section 4 of the Localism Act restricts the ability of a local authority to carry out activities for a commercial purpose using the general power. Section 4 (2) provides that if a local authority undertakes a commercial activity in exercise of its general power it must only do so through a company (for this purpose this covers limited or "registered society" i.e. formerly co-operative, community benefit society or industrial provident society). Consequently, these provisions will be considered when exploring alternative service delivery models.

**Risks and General Fund Level**

Best Practice guidance issued by CIPFA states that the general fund balance may be between 5% and 100% of net expenditure. With an original estimate of net revenue expenditure of around £15 million, the minimum 5% balance is in the region of £750k.

The Bellwin scheme may be activated where an emergency or disaster involving destruction of or danger to life or property occurs and, as a result, a local authority incurs expenditure on, or in connection with, the taking of immediate action to safeguard life or property, or to prevent suffering or severe inconvenience, in their area or among its inhabitants. The scheme makes provision to reimburse the cost of local authority actions taken in the immediate phase of an emergency, not those taken as part of the recovery phase. Any claim is subject to a threshold (i.e. costs have to exceed this amount before a claim can be made) and for North Hertfordshire this is around £27k. So the need to potentially fund £27k should be borne in mind when setting a General Fund balance.



As the Council becomes more dependent on income, its net budget does not fully reflect the financial risks that it faces. So an additional 3% of budgeted income (excluding Housing Benefit) will also be included as a component in determining the minimum General Fund level. This would provide an additional allocation of around £390k (based on income of around £13m).

In addition to the allowances above for non-specific unknown risks, an additional allowance is made for specific known risks. Specific risks are identified and classified as high, medium or low risk and allowance is made for a proportion of the risk value. For high risk items, 50% of the risk value, for medium risk, 25% of the risk value and for low risk items, 0%. This is regarded as an appropriate risk management approach to risk likelihood and value.

### **Use of Capital**

The Council still has had fairly significant capital balances, but it is expected that they will be diminished during the life of the MTFS. This will mean that future capital expenditure will need to be funded from new capital receipts (generated from sales of land and buildings) or from borrowing. It needs to be recognised that the supply of surplus land with development potential is reducing and therefore the opportunity for future capital receipts is limited. When the Council needs to borrow then it needs to ensure that it is affordable, prudent and sustainable (Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, 2017). The affordable criteria relates to the revenue impact of borrowing, which is made up of interest charges and a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). These costs can be significant.

Local Authority capital spending improves services, protects the value of the Council's portfolio of assets and replaces existing assets as they reach the end of their useful lives. Capital investment is not a luxury since without it, local authorities would become unable to deliver even their existing services let alone respond to new demands. For all capital schemes there needs to be a consideration of the benefits that are generated, which will include:

- Is it necessary for continued service provision? What would the impact on the service be? Is the service statutory or does it deliver the Council's vision or high level objectives?
- If it is for investment, what return does it provide? Does it still provide a positive return if it was necessary to borrow money to fund the project (including MRP)? What is the level of risk in the expected returns?

These reviews should be carried out on an annual basis, and before any scheme commences. Inclusion on the capital programme is for the purposes of future planning, and does not guarantee that a scheme will go ahead.

### **ANNEX 2 Roles and Responsibilities**

The role of Councillors in this process is to:

- set vision and strategic direction
- agree the Council's high level objectives and priorities
- agree the specific projects to achieve the priorities
- agree the rolling MTFS including decisions on the time-frame to be covered, external influences to be considered and included, strategy for use of balances, assumptions regarding government support and the implications of doing so, income policy, capital strategy and setting indicative council tax levels for future years
- scrutinise proposals for funding prioritisation and de-prioritisation as set out by managers
- decide between options presented
- decide on options for increasing fees & charges where a proposed approach varies from that outlined in the income policy

- give due consideration to both the risks and opportunities of options as the council necessarily explores new avenues
- discuss savings suggestions and income generation proposals with relevant Officers.
- take a corporate overview of the budget position once decisions on individual prioritisation have been taken.
- set the level of Council Tax each year
- scrutinise and monitor the budget throughout the year

The role of all Officers is to:

- put forward suggestions for actions to deliver the objectives and new opportunities
- ensure that existing spend and new projects link to and deliver one (or more) of the Council's objectives
- manage services to deliver the actions in the plan within budget allocations
- explore alternative ways of delivering services, including assessment of risks and opportunities
- propose income generation and service transformation opportunities
- report on value for money and continuous improvement
- monitor the budget throughout the year and ensure spending is in line with policy requirements

The Senior Management Team is led by the Chief Executive. The group:

- facilitates a critical review of existing expenditure. This involves reviewing the base position, challenging existing budget allocations and creating the ability to reallocate money to strategic priorities.
- reviews service areas in comparison to other authorities to determine opportunities for improvements and cost reductions, or to explain reasons for any differences.
- reviews bids for additional resources/ investments. All bids will be subject to detailed scrutiny before inclusion in the draft budget. The strategic priorities fund can be allocated by SMT for short-term investments.

**COUNCIL  
12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**\*PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**TITLE OF REPORT: MINOR AMENDMENT STANDARDS COMMITTEE CO-OPTEE NUMBERS AND APPOINTMENT OF PARISH/ TOWN REPRESENTATIVES TO STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR: LEGAL AND COMMUNITY/ MONITORING OFFICER

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: LEADER/ COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (CLLR JUDI BILLING AS CHAIRMAN OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE)

COUNCIL PRIORITY: RESPONSIVE AND EFFICIENT

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1. For Full Council to agree an amendment to the Standards Committee membership (7.2.2), increasing the maximum non-voting co-optee numbers to four and thereafter to confirm the appointment of two further co-optees to the Standards Committee (bringing the current numbers to three).

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Full Council:

- 2.1. agrees the amendment of 7.2.2 of the Constitution, to a maximum of four Parish Council co-optees as non-voting members of Standards Committee;

*And, subject to that:*

- 2.2. confirms the co-optee appointments of Cllr Dr Julie Magill MBE (Barkway Parish Council) and Cllr Amy Bourke-Waite (Royston Town Council) to the Standards Committee.

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1. The increase in co-optee numbers will widen the engagement and further promote the ethical standards message in the District. This also ensures that there is Parish/ Town or Community Council in-put into the Standards Committee and Sub-Committees (as may be required).

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1. The applicants were considered appropriate co-optees for the role, and whilst there was only one (of two) vacancies at the time, the Panel considered that expanding the numbers and appointing additional co-optees would be an advantage, for the reasons outlined in the report.

#### **5. CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT MEMBERS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS**

- 5.1. The Independent and Reserve Independent Person (IPs) and Chairman of the Standards Committee were on the Interview Panel with the Monitoring Officer and agree with the recommended increase in co-optee numbers and appointments.
- 5.2. The Leader of Council and Opposition Leader were notified of the recommendations and principle of potential increase in co-optee numbers in their July briefings and no concerns expressed regarding this approach.

#### **6. FORWARD PLAN**

- 6.1 This report does not contain a recommendation on a key Executive decision and has therefore not been referred to in the Forward Plan.

#### **7. BACKGROUND**

- 7.1. The current Standards Committee membership includes two non-voting co-opted Parish Councillors to ensure that a Parish Council perspective is available to the Standards Committee and Sub-Committee (for any potential Standards Sub-Committee hearings that involve a Parish Councillor).
- 7.2. The Council has a vacancy due to the resignation of the previous post-holder from Great Ashby. It is desirable to have more than one co-optee, to prevent any potential conflict that may arise, in the event that there is a Parish complaint and that having to be dealt with by a co-optee from the same Council. Therefore, each time one co-optee resigns or loses office, under the exiting arrangements there is a requirement to undertake a recruitment exercise.
- 7.3. All Parish Councils within the District were therefore contacted on 12 June in order to promote the opportunity to be co-opted to the Standards Committee. Two applications were received and candidates interviewed on 16 July 2019 by a Panel, consisting of the IPs, Chairman of Standards Committee and the Monitoring Officer.

#### **8. RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS**

##### **Change in membership (section 7.2.2):**

- 8.1. The Standards Committee's terms of reference include, amongst other things, the promotion and maintenance of high standards of conduct and advice to Parish Councils. Increasing the co-option numbers will:
- assist with those objectives,
  - provide greater resilience in the event of relevant standards complaints,

- increase District-wide participation in ethical standards discussions and debates; and
- provide some flexibility/ resilience in the event that co-optees resign or lose office.

The potential increase to four (as opposed to three) provides more flexibility when having to recruit, and being able to take advantage of additional appointments should that be appropriate.

- 8.2. The proposed amendment (shown as tracked change below) would be:  
*"7.2.2: A maximum of ~~two~~ four Parish<sup>1</sup> Councillors co-opted as non-voting members".*

**Recommended appointments:**

- 8.3. The applicants were considered against the criteria for the post (Appendix A) and deemed suitable for the role on the Standards Committee. Offer letters were sent (conditional on suitable character references and Full Council approval of changes to the co-optee numbers and appointments). As both received suitable character references, this was confirmed to the Panel and the proposals were set out to the Leader and Opposition leader in their July briefings.
- 8.4. The co-optees proposed are Cllr Dr Julie Magill MBE of Barkway Parish Council and Cllr Amy Bourke-Waite of Royston Town Council. The Panel considered that Councillors would provide a fresh and effective perspective for the Standards Committee. If appointed, these shall continue so long as they remain a Parish and Town Councillor respectively, or the co-optees resign from the Standards Committee – whichever is the earlier date.

**9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1. Section 28(6) of the Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to have in place arrangements under which decisions on allegations against Councillors can be made. Section 102(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that Council may appoint such persons to a Committee or Sub-Committee for such term as may be determined by the appointing authority.

**10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no basic or special allowances paid to Standards Committee co-optees and other than the potential for travel to and from a Standards Committee meeting (two scheduled per year), no significant capital or revenue implications for increasing the co-optee numbers.

**11. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1. Appropriate policy frameworks help to ensure that the authority has good governance arrangements in place. The adopted arrangements currently include two Parish Council co-optees on the Standards Committee. Increasing the numbers reduces the risk of conflict of interest and therefore ensures more effective safeguards to those arrangements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Parish also includes Town and Community Councillors

## **12. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1. In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of their functions, give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 12.2. There are no direct implications from the appointment of Parish Councillor co-optees to the Standards Committee, other than providing a local community perspective.

## **13. SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1. The Social Value Act and “go local” requirements do not apply to this report.

## **14. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1. There are no direct human resource implications relating to this matter.

## **15. APPENDICES**

- 15.1. Appendix A – Selection criteria.

## **16. CONTACT OFFICERS**

- 16.1. Jeanette Thompson  
Service Director - Legal and Community & Monitoring Officer  
[Jeanette.thompson@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Jeanette.thompson@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 16.2. Ian Couper  
Service Director – Resources  
[ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:ian.couper@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 16.3. Reuben Ayavoo  
Policy & Community Engagement Manager  
[Reuben.Ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Reuben.Ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk)
- 16.4. Kerry Shorrocks  
Corporate Human Resources Manager  
[Kerry.Shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:Kerry.Shorrocks@north-herts.gov.uk)

## **17. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 17.1. Email and documents sent to Parish Councils on 12 June.

## **CO-OPTED PARISH MEMBER TO THE NHDC STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

### **SELECTION CRITERIA**

#### **SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES**

The Co-Opted Parish Member will have:

- a keen interest in standards in public life.
- a wish to serve the local community and uphold local democracy.
- the ability to be objective, independent and impartial.
- leadership qualities, particularly in respect of exercising sound judgement.

The Co-opted Parish Member will:

#### **Essential criteria**

- be a person in whose impartiality and integrity the public can have confidence.
- understand and comply with confidentiality requirements.
- have a demonstrable interest in local issues.
- have an awareness of the importance of ethical behaviours.

#### **Desirable additional criteria are:**

- working knowledge and/or experience of local government or other public service and/or of large complex organisations
- experience or knowledge of public sector governance.
- having an understanding of the pressures and constraints of elected or co-opted Members operating in a democratically accountable public body.

You should demonstrate in your application how you meet the above criteria as this will assist the short-listing process.

Means of assessment will be by application form and interview.

#### **Eligibility for Appointment**

Must be a serving Parish Councillor within the North Hertfordshire District.

This page is intentionally left blank



**COUNCIL  
12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**TITLE OF REPORT: QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

In accordance with Standing Order 4.8.10(c), one question was submitted by a Member of the Public by the deadline date for questions set out in the Council's Constitution.

**(A) Climate Emergency**

Mr Philip Devonald to Councillor Martin Stears-Handscomb (Leader of the Council):

"What progress has the Council made in addressing the climate emergency declared at the Annual Meeting in May?"

This page is intentionally left blank