

Redesign Board Workshop 15.5.18 3-5pm
Committee rooms 1 and 2, HQ
Action Note

1. Welcome and apologies

Board Members present: Cllr Lobban (Chair), Cllr Reiss (Vice Chair), Cllr Bremner (by VC), Cllr Caddick, Cllr I Cockburn, Cllr Christie, Cllr Davidson, Cllr Fraser, Cllr Jarvie, Cllr Loudon, Cllr G MacKenzie, Cllr MacKinnon, Cllr C Smith, Cllr M Smith, Cllr Wilson, Paul MacPherson, John Gibson.

Apologies: Cllr A Sinclair. Non-Board Members: Cllr Boyd and Cllr Campbell.

Other Members present: Cllr Adam, Cllr Finlayson, Cllr Henderson; Cllr Knox, Cllr Laird, Cllr MacDonald, Cllr Munro, Cllr Rixon (by VC)

Staff present: Steve Barron; Carron McDiarmid; Derek Yule; Evelyn Johnston; Pablo Mascarenhas; William Gilfillan, David Haas, Robbie Bain and Alasdair Bruce (item 5); Caroline Campbell and Tony Usher (item 8).

- 2. Action note from meeting on 24th April 2018** was confirmed as accurate.
- 3. Matter arising: Communications Plan** – Board Members confirmed the themes arising, with one small correction (less risk averse under the theme of innovation). To develop the final draft of the communications plan for the June workshop three Board Members – Cllr C Smith, Cllr Jarvie and John Gibson will work with Ruth Cleland and her team.
- 4. Feedback from the Staff Partnership Forum on 4th May 2018** – Board Members were advised of the positive feedback generally from the Trade Unions on their involvement in redesign and of the learning benefits for staff involved in redesign. They requested support from managers for representatives to have time to undertake redesign activity. They also reminded the Board of the need to treat staff respectfully at Board meetings, even where ideas presented may not be favoured. This was noted.
- 5. Car Parking review** – the review team leader, David Haas presented three reports.
- a. The list of the review recommendations agreed at the Board Meeting on 1st May was circulated for information. This will be presented differently in the final report for the Board taking into account the need to streamline them and to separate those which need Member approval and those that can be taken forward operationally.
 - b. Proposals on financial and governance arrangements. There was a general view that the proposals were going in the right direction but with more work needed on targets and surplus levels. Discussion points included:
 - The importance of including all relevant costs attached to individual car parks.

- The need for enforcement to ensure people pay where required.
- There is scope for some areas to benefit from the approach proposed given opportunity to re-invest income locally and if there is local flexibility and impacts are considered (e.g. Caithness and Mallaig).
- On setting the income target, questions were raised about who sets that and whether it is one rate for the Council or if there is scope for local income targets to be set. Should we accept the current income target and work on the basis of the surplus being retained locally or could all income raised locally be kept locally?
- Income targets set need to be reviewed annually. The Depute Chief Executive/Director of Finance confirmed that income targets will carry risk where you can't control demand and people's choices can be fickle. While surplus can be retained locally a deficit would call on reserves and we need a range of options to deal with a deficit occurring. The Director of Community Services reminded the Board of the position in Fort William recently where assumptions needed to be re-visited. The Convenor said choices in Aviemore were surprising with the Council car park often full where charges are made and nearby non-paying car parks were not.
- Concerns about whether the income targets set for 2018/19 are achievable. Some feel they are not achievable because assumptions about capacity and use are inaccurate and that there had been errors on the budget backing sheet presented to Council.

Although it was acknowledged that the budget decision was separate to the redesign review, the Leader explained the position that the budget decision for 2018/19 had 3 elements: increasing current charges, new permit arrangements and new charges in some other car parks. On the latter there did appear to be errors in the detail but the Leader was seeking clarity from the Head of Corporate Governance on whether the Council decision was about the savings/income target overall to be met or whether it was also for the detail on how it would be met and from specific locations listed in the budget backing sheet. If it was for the savings/income target overall then there would be scope to look at new places and to change it. It was also noted that the Redesign Board cannot over turn a Council decision that would need a Council decision. If savings/income was not achieved it would need to be found from somewhere else.

The Board noted that the redesign of car parking would not proceed until it is ready and Members have deliberated it sufficiently.

It was agreed that an extra workshop was needed prior to the June workshop for further discussion on the options for a devolved car parking management budget

which would look at the figures for the income target and amount to retain locally. It should be mindful of all factors across the disaggregated budgets so that charges can be considered more holistically as part of local decisions on the Community Services budget. This way Members can have choices on what charges can be used for or to off-set costs on other services.

c. Draft approach for considering local changes to car parking. Discussion points included:

- Communities want to be involved so the new approach should apply to the areas proposed for this year and not wait until next year. Local petitions showed public opinion on introducing new charges in 2018/19.
- The engagement approach was welcomed but had not been used for the areas identified to have charges this year.
- Engagement is important because communities don't want to be presented with a fait accompli. Also the approach proposed would allow for very local circumstances to be considered that could influence our approach to charging e.g. in Mallaig cars have to be parked because you can't take vehicles to some islands so we might want a different charging regime for those cars than for others.

It was agreed that the additional workshop would also give time to consider a flow chart version of the approach presented.

6. **Commissioned Preventative Services for Children** – Members on the review team advised further work would be brought back to a future workshop – that would provide more information on the in-house hub model and on the experience of an ALEO with that role in England.
7. **Building Trades Services** - Members on the review team advised work was continuing including discussions with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). Discussion at the June workshop was planned.
8. **Up-date of the reviews taken forward in Community Services** which the Board provided earlier views on. Caroline Campbell, Head of Performance and Resources and Tony Usher, Harbours Manager, presented an up-date. Caroline and Tony highlighted that harbours formed a significant internal trading operation which had generated a surplus of over £2.5m in at least each of the last 3 years (£2.9m last year). It covered almost 100 facilities (harbours, marinas and piers) in 3 categories:
 - Commercially viable (with surplus generated) and sharing overheads as a group (e.g. Lochinver, Kinlochbervie, Uig, Sconsor, Kyle and Nairn);

- Providing community benefit but not commercially viable, often popular for small boats (e.g. Helmsdale, Inverie and Balintore);
- Smaller marine facilities with little community benefit (e.g. Ardelvie, Stein, Strath at Gairloch, Auckengill). This is the largest in number.

Customers using the Council's facilities included the fishing industry, ferries, general cargo, timber industry, aquaculture, leisure and super yachts.

Five options for service delivery had been considered along with the pros and cons of each. They were:

1. Retain the status quo
2. Retain strategic sites with an accelerated closure/asset transfer or sale of smaller marine facilities which are not commercially viable or providing community benefit
3. Community ownership
4. Transfer to an ALEO
5. Transfer to a newly established Trust.

The Harbours Board (as an advisory Member group) had agreed with option 2, noting the legal impediment to option 4 (based on opinion of Counsel) and financial impediments to options 1 and 5.

The Board welcomed the presentation and asked that all commercial ideas of any scale go to the Commercial Board for consideration, including proposals for a harbour extension at Portree given the potential income opportunities. There was a view that investment in the leisure industry would have pay back. The potential impact on harbours from NW Sutherland being chosen as a place for satellite launches was highlighted.

The presentation on the review into fleet maintenance was deferred.

9. **Redesign Board Reviews** – a paper setting out proposals to extend the types of redesign reviews in use and for new ideas for reviews was circulated in advance and presented. The Board agreed:

- To look at peer reviews for: wrap around child care and early years provision (seen by the Leader as the most important to prioritise); the in-house catering service (with scope to do more external catering raised in the Board); reviewing our current approach to recruiting agency staff; reviewing all casual labour; and the cleaning service.
- To take forward a review of all processes which involve income to the Council as a Lean review rather than a peer review.
- To develop a new type of review as a peer spending review to focus on non-staffing expenditure as set out in the paper. This would focus on review by team/function and review by type (through subjective codes). This would proceed as soon as

possible and inform the budget setting process being taken forward by the Depute Chief Executive/Director of Finance.

- To develop a new type of review as a community review, focusing initially on public transport in Caithness and Easter Ross (with a current issue flagged in Kiltalirty), place-based choices in South Lochaber (initially on grounds maintenance) and supporting the management of schools programme. Proposals would come back to the Board. Local Members in areas affected would be involved.

Other suggestions/ questions raised were:

- A review of housing voids to get comparable void periods with Housing Associations (from 6 weeks to 2 weeks was mentioned) to reduce rent loss and maximise Council Tax – it was noted this is being picked up in the Building Trades Review.
- Querying what was in scope for the maternity leave Lean review and confirmed as the administration of it and not about terms and conditions.
- Adaptations for home owners which are funded by the Council and delivered by RSLs. This arrangement was queried. Other concerns were the potential for over specifying works and poor customer satisfaction. Further information is to be sought on this as a potential review area.
- Staff flexibility around shift working and over time use was raised. It was noted that staffing issues and any changes to terms and conditions were discussed in partnership with the Trade Unions rather than as a redesign review.

10. **Community Empowerment Act: briefing on Community Asset Transfers and Participation Requests.** A briefing was circulated in advance and presented by Pablo Mascarenhas (Community and Democratic Engagement Manager). It was highlighted that on community asset transfers (CAT) that each case would be individual although our processes can improve to streamline them and look at opportunity costs of CAT (e.g. developing the asset in-house for affordable housing) to support Members' decisions. A query was raised about the effects on the Council workforce of CAT, around staff protection and that will be considered. On participation requests it was noted that to date only one had been made but that it had been refused as ineligible.

11. **AOB**

- The Board agreed we needed more than 2 hours for workshops, especially if they are to include a Lean showcase, so future meetings to be for up to 3 hours. Carron will re-issue invites.
- The Chair asked Members only to remain for a final item of AOB.