

**MINUTES OF THE PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SELECT COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2007 at 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Dunn (Chair), Councillor Detre (Vice Chair) and Councillors Butt, Mendoza and J Moher (part).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pagnamenta.

**1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

None declared.

**2. Deputations**

None.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 24<sup>th</sup> January 2007**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2007 be received and approved as an accurate record.

**4. Matters Arising**

None.

**5. Revenue and Benefits Performance**

Margaret Read (Head, Revenue and Benefits Service) introduced the report and updated Members on the end of year figures, confirming that the 94% gross target set for 2006-2007 in-year Council Tax collection had been exceeded, with 94.16% gross and 93.24% net collection achieved, representing a 0.5% improvement in net collection from the previous year. She stated that as other London boroughs were yet to announce their end of year revenue collection figures, a comparison with other authorities was not yet available, although based on last year's figures the Council would improve from 31<sup>st</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> out of the 33 London boroughs. The Select Committee heard that improvements were still required for arrears collection, where the end of year figures were 95.27% compared to a target of 96% for 2005/2006, 95.73% compared to a target of 96.5% for 2004/2005 and 94.96% compared to a target of 96.5% for 2003/2004. For pre-contract arrears, £569,000 had been collected this year and a total of over £5.5 million had been collected since Capita's appointment as contractor in 2003.

Turning to National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) collection rates, Margaret Read confirmed that this year's collection had exceeded the target by 0.36% and improved by 0.37% from the previous year with a

collection rate of 98.66%. Margaret Read commented that NNDR collection performance continued to be strong and to improve year on year.

Margaret Read informed the Select Committee that a robust policy towards 'won't payers' had been adopted throughout the year and would continue in 2007/2008. For those who had difficulty in making payments, greater flexibility had been afforded by allowing greater discretion in consolidating arrears payments and repayment timescales. In addition, pensioners were being targeted in a Council Tax Benefit campaign which had resulted in £140,000 Council Tax Benefit being awarded. For 2007/2008, improvement in promptness of despatch for notice of payments was being sought and it was also hoped that magistrates' courts would allow the Council more flexibility in obtaining recovery payments. The movement of tenants in private sector housing would also be focused upon. Members noted that as of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007, Direct Debit payers would pay in 10 as opposed to the previous 12 instalments throughout the financial year and that annual bills had all been posted out on time.

Margaret Read then drew Members' to the performance in Council Tax complaints which continued to show improvement in this area, and Revenue and Benefits' Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Performance Measures (PMs) for February 2007. It was noted that the overall CPA score of 3 for this year was safely maintained, whilst Housing Benefits Performance continued to be stable, with 88% of outstanding working items being less than 2 months old.

Members then discussed the issues that had been raised in the report. Councillor Detre enquired whether Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) records were accessible to the Council. He queried the Council's lowly Council Tax collection performance league position with other London boroughs, seeking an explanation as to the reasons for this, and he also sought confirmation of the length of Capita's contract.

In reply, Margaret Read explained that the Council had improved significantly from a low starting point in 2003, when Capita's contract had commenced and collection rates were only 89.7%. The Select Committee heard that there were a number of London boroughs in the league table with collection rates very similar to Brent's and Margaret Read advised Members that a large improvement in the league position would only be realistically achievable in the long term. Margaret Read confirmed that Capita's contract had recently been extended by a further 3 years. Capita representatives explained that they had expressed their concern to the Audit Commission and Revenue and Benefits at the methods used by other London boroughs to record collection rates and had asked that the Audit Commission investigate this issue.

Councillor Mendoza further queried the Council Tax collection performance, and sought details as to why this year's performance could be considered relatively successful. He asked whether there had been any change in the priorities of Revenue and Benefits since the change in the Administration in May 2006. He also sought confirmation regarding the significance of the gross and net figure collection rates.

In response, Margaret Read stressed the importance in recognising the significance improvements in collection rates since the new contract had been in effect in 2003 and stated that the Council held strong ambitions to ultimately be one of the high performers in Council Tax collection. Members were advised that 94.16% gross collection rate was the 2006/2007 target, however the 93.24% net figure would be used to compare performance with other London boroughs. Margaret Read confirmed that Revenue and Benefit's priorities had remained unchanged from recent years, with particular attention being made on achieving high CPA scores.

The Chair acknowledged the progress that had been made in Council Tax collection since 2003 and the efforts being made to continue improvements in performance. Whilst noting that in-year collection performance was strong, the Chair enquired why shortfalls in arrears collections remained. The Chair sought views on the possibility of changes to legislation that would require letting agents to provide information to local authorities about their tenants, or even make landlords legally responsible for collecting Council Tax. With regard to Benefits performance, the Chair enquired whether the CPA placed undue emphasis on speed of dealing with cases at the expense of accuracy. He also enquired about staff turnover levels within the Benefits section.

In reply to the issues raised by the Chair, Capita representatives stated that good performance figures were important both in terms of the Council's reputation and Capita's, who relied on the Council for references. With regard to Council Tax arrears collection, Capita representatives explained that collection for a previous year became harder the longer as time went on, although performance was good in terms of pre-contract arrears collection. In addition, Members heard that a number of problems were encountered regarding incorrect information on the records database that Capita had inherited when their contract had commenced. However, a number of initiatives were being undertaken to improve arrears collection, such as bankruptcy charges which would continue to be publicised. Furthermore, the Anti-Poverty Policy placed a priority on debtors paying in-year Council Tax before arrears collection. Members noted that improved data mapping would help make it easier to trace pockets of debts and identify categories more likely to owe payments.

Capita representatives explained that as a large proportion of those in arrears were also on benefits, that some revenue could be gained from these through small from deductions in benefits. Additional resources in tracing tenant movements in transient properties would also see improvements in performance. The Select Committee were advised that actual arrears figures would increase with Council Tax rises, although it was hoped the percentage of arrears would continue to decrease. Capita representatives also advised Members that there was no enforceable legislation to force letting agents or landlords to provide details of tenants, and that the only real solution to this issue would require legislation that made the landlord liable for Council Tax. Duncan McLeod (Director of Finance & Corporate Resources) added that it would be difficult to make significant changes in Council Tax legislation, particularly as it would be likely to have a major impact on the housing market and that any revisions would require serious consideration.

With regard to the Chair's queries concerning Benefits performance, Margaret Read stressed the need for both speed and accuracy in processing claims, stating that lack of accuracy would ultimately lead to an increase in costs. Members heard that the Benefits payment system had a verification compliant system in place to ensure the correct entitlements were being given and also data matching with the Department for Work and Pensions was undertaken to increase accuracy. Margaret Read continued that new Performance Measures (PM) of reducing benefits payments placed more emphasis on seeking information in change of circumstances cases (CICs). Staff turnover was a comparatively low 7%, although it was higher for Assessment staff due to the nature of the employment market in this sector. Margaret Read stated that Benefits staff averaged approximately 2 ½ years and staff often left to join agencies because of the possibility of greater earnings. Simon Hardwick (Service Development Manager, Revenue and Benefits) added that 2 training groups of 8 employees were to be taken on this year, with the next one commencing in September. Members heard that employees were expected to repay a proportion of their training costs if they left within 2 years of completing the training course, as staff leaving soon after completion of the course had been a problem in the past.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that Capita's Council Tax and NNDR collection performance against contractual targets for 2006/02007 be noted;
- (ii) that Capita's performance in relation to Council Tax collection arrears for 2003/2004, 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 be noted;
- (iii) that Capita's performance in providing IT support for the Revenue and Benefits service be noted;

- (iv) that the further reduction of outstanding work in the Benefits Section since the previous report to the Committee in January 2007 be noted; and
- (v) that the Benefit Service's current and projected "3" score for the 2007 CPA, and preparations being made towards the 2007/2008 CPA, be noted.

**6. Local Government Ombudsman Reports on Two Complaints about the Revenue and Benefits Service**

Margaret Read (Head, Revenue and Benefits Service) introduced the report concerning the Local Government Ombudsman's (LGO) reports concerning 2 complaints that had been made about the Revenue and Benefits Service. She advised Members that this was the first occasion in 6 years that the LGO had issued a report against the Council, which had otherwise enjoyed positive assessments from the LGO.

Drawing Members' attention to the first report, Margaret Read stated that it involved a case concerning Mr Holding, who had wrongly been awarded a 50% empty property discount in February 2002. Following the discovery and correction of this error in April 2004, the Council issued a new bill including previous arrears now owed, but following Mr Holding being unable to repay under the Council's proposed arrangements, recovery action was taken. The original arrears was around £4,500, although £1,479.34 was written off by the Council, leaving just over £3,000 outstanding.

Margaret Read stated that the LGO's report had concluded that in addition to initially wrongly awarding Mr Holding the 50% empty property discount, the Council had failed to consider its own policy concerning recovery arrangements and to enquire into Mr Holding's financial means after he had accepted responsibility for repayments. In addition, the Council had erroneously treated a letter from Mr Holding's solicitor as a Stage 1 follow-up complaint rather than a Stage 2 complaint. The LGO acknowledged the amount the Council had already written off and did not feel further financial compensation was appropriate, but felt it was in the public interest to report on the Council's approach to debt recovery as the case related to a vulnerable person.

Margaret Read advised the Select Committee that an agreement with Mr Holding for him to pay £20 a month had since been reached, adding that it had not been initially clear that he qualified as a vulnerable person as there were a number of personal circumstances not originally known to the Council. In addition, the contractor who had made the original error in handling the case in February 2002 was no longer contracted by the Council. Members noted that the Revenue and Benefits Service had revised and strengthened its policy since Mr Holding's case, including the rewriting of the Council Tax Recovery

Policy, whilst arrangements were now in place so that correspondence would not be considered as a Stage 1 follow-up complaint where it should be classified as a Stage 2 complaint.

Margaret Read then drew Members' attention to the second complaint, which involved a Ms Benn who had undergone a number of CICs as a recipient of Housing and Council Tax Benefits. The LGO had concluded that the Council had failed to assess Ms Benn's underlying entitlement to benefit between 4<sup>th</sup> August 2003 to 1<sup>st</sup> February 2004, resulting in Ms Benn being erroneously classified as being in Council Tax arrears and her account being referred to the bailiffs. The claim was finally correctly handled in October 2005, although the LGO had accepted the complaint for investigation before the case had been investigated at all stages of the Council's internal complaints procedure.

Margaret Read advised the Select Committee that the LGO had concluded that there had been maladministration by the Council because it had failed to assess her underlying entitlement to benefit. The LGO recommended that the Council pay Ms Benn £500 and inform the Ombudsman of the review of its Anti-Poverty Strategy.

Margaret Read confirmed that the Council paid Ms Benn the £500 on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2007, whilst the LGO had noted several improvements to the Council's procedures since the initial error had been made, including changes for the procedure for suppression of summons for an account where there is a Council Tax Benefit enquiry. In addition, an impact and needs requirement assessment of the Anti-Poverty Strategy had been undertaken in the latter part of 2005. Amongst the initiatives recommended, Members were informed that it had been identified that there was a need to consult with stakeholders to identify ways of improving the Anti-Poverty Strategy to best meet the needs of Revenue and Benefits customers. Meanwhile, a fundamental rewrite of the Anti-Poverty strategy, which had begun in August 2006, was at an advanced stage.

During discussion, the Chair, whilst acknowledging the Council's robust stance taken in terms of revenue collection, enquired on the likelihood of further complaints of this type being upheld in the future in view of the complexities involved in risk assessments. In reply, Margaret Read stated that it was difficult to identify all those who were at risk or vulnerable, and that there were a number of contradictions in Mr Holding's case which had confused the issue. However, Margaret Read acknowledged that the Council should have taken steps to determine Mr Holding's case at an earlier stage.

Councillor Detre enquired whether bailiffs visited customers prior to the complaint being fully investigated. Susan Riddle responded that a case is suspended when a complaint is made. In the case of Ms Benn, holds on bailiff's actions were placed following interventions from the

Citizens' Advice Bureau and the Law Centre, although the holds were removed following reassessments. The LGO had intervened on the grounds that Ms Benn could be considered as vulnerable following receipt of a letter from the Law Centre.

Councillor J Moher referred to the LGO's findings with regard to Mr Holding's case and expressed concern that it had concluded that the Council had failed to consider its own policy when proposing the recovery arrangements and had failed to adequately enquire into Mr Holding's financial means after he had accepted responsibility for making repayments. Although he acknowledged that the case was complex, he felt that Mr Holding's difficult personal circumstances should have been ascertained and acted upon at an earlier stage and felt that the LGO was correct to criticise this weakness in dealing with the case.

In reply, Susan Riddle referred to the LGO's report on the Mr Holding case where the LGO had acknowledged that the Council's Chief Executive had identified the problem at the third stage of the complaints process and had written to Revenue and Benefits expressing concern about this. The Chair commented that the Chief Executive had already partly upheld the complaint at Stage 3 level prior to Mr Holding complaining to the LGO.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the LGO's findings in respect of Mr Holding and the actions taken to address these be noted; and
- (ii) that the LGO's findings in respect of Ms Benn and the actions taken to address these be noted.

## **7. 2006/2007 Best Value Performance Indicator General Survey**

Cathy Tyson (Assistant Director, Policy and Regeneration) introduced the report on 2006/2007 Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) General Survey which the Council were required to undertake to obtain local residents' perceptions of the Council's services. Cathy Tyson informed Members that the final response rate was 7% higher than the last survey, at 31%, and that this had been partly achieved through follow-up visits to the randomly sampled residents who had not initially responded to the questionnaires. She confirmed that headline results had shown an increase in satisfaction levels, particularly in service areas, and overall satisfaction with the Council had increased by 4% to 52%, 1% higher than the national average and representing the 9<sup>th</sup> most improved London borough. Members heard that nationally the trend was for Council's to experience decreasing satisfaction levels.

Cathy Tyson highlighted some of the positive aspects of the survey, notably that 59% of residents were satisfied with Brent as a place to

live, and 79% felt that people from different backgrounds got on well with each other. The top 5 areas residents felt needed improving included the level of crime, level of congestion, clean streets, roads and pavement repairs and activities for teenagers, although with the exception of the latter, all had experienced decreases in the proportion of respondents who thought these areas required improvement. Members heard that 32% of residents were satisfied with opportunities for participation in local decision-making provided by the Council, compared with 24% who were dissatisfied and 45% who took a neutral view, whilst 35% of residents wished to be more involved in decision-making, and for half of residents it would be dependent on the issue.

Cathy Tyson advised the Select Committee that the BVPI survey results were included in the Service Block assessments for the CPA scores. Members heard that some BVPI scores, such as those for museums/galleries and theatres/concert halls were outside the Council's influence as such facilities were more commonly located in central London. Although service satisfaction had improved in a number of areas, many local authorities had not experienced corresponding improvements in their overall BVPI scores. In Brent, the number of residents who felt that they were well informed by the Council had dropped from 55% to 42%, whilst an Ipsos MORI analysis of results had shown a positive correlation between the degree to which residents felt well informed by their Council and overall satisfaction with the Council. Cathy Tyson stated that it was therefore important that the Council kept residents well informed in order help improve the overall satisfaction score. Members noted the table in the report showing the 9 London boroughs with the largest improvement in general satisfaction scores and Cathy Tyson commented that in some instances authorities had previously had especially low scores and had improved through benefiting from high investment and in focusing on communication campaigns to improve residents' perceptions of their council.

During discussion, the Chair welcomed the increase in response to the BVPI General Survey and enquired whether there were plans to create a new strap line to promote Brent. Referring to Brent's and many other London boroughs' problems concerning Culture Block scores, the Chair enquired whether there had been discussions with the Audit Commission about this issue and he questioned the measurements used to assess the Culture Block.

Councillor Mendoza suggested that some areas within the Culture Block may be lacking the necessary resources. In noting the improvement in Tower Hamlet's BVPI scores that had been partly attributable to redevelopment in the area, he expressed the wish that the redevelopment of the area around Wembley Stadium would have a similar impact for Brent.



In reply to the issues raised by Members, Cathy Tyson advised the Select Committee that Brent was one of only a small number of London boroughs who had undertaken follow-up visits to residents who had not responded to the questionnaire. With regard to Culture Block scores, Cathy Tyson advised Members that the Council was in discussion with the Audit Commission's Relationship Manager about concerns that there was disproportionate emphasis in certain areas of this block. She added that detailed observations were frequently submitted about the Audit Commission's assessment methodology to the Local Government Association and it was widely acknowledged that Culture Block scores were an issue for a number of London boroughs. Members heard that there had been some small changes to Performance Indicators (PIs) in the Culture Block area following representations from local authorities to the Audit Commission on this matter, however it was not likely there would be any further changes in this area in 2007. Cathy Tyson stated that there was a rationale to the assessment for each block, however there were specific aspects to the Culture Block's criteria that were not apparent in other blocks. She acknowledged that there were resource issues within the Culture Block for the Council, such as the availability of quality of stock in libraries.

Phil Newby (Director, Policy and Regeneration) advised Members that in addition to benefiting from regeneration schemes, Tower Hamlet Council's large improvement in General Satisfaction levels was also due to large changes within the Council to improve in all service areas combined with a concerted communication campaign. Phil Newby suggested that a new strap line and re-branding of the Council could be considered in future, adding that Councils who had recently re-branded had seen improvements in residents' perception of their performance.

RESOLVED:-

that the report on the 2006/2007 Best Value Performance Indicator General Survey be noted.

#### **8. Comprehensive Performance Assessment Refresh 2006**

Jo Mercer (Policy and Regeneration Officer) presented the report on the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Refresh 2006, advising Members that overall a 3 stars rating had been maintained, and that the Council was only 1 block point away from an overall 4 stars rating. With the agreement of the Chair, Jo Mercer circulated an additional paper containing the CPA 2006 refresh scorecard. She advised Members that a rigorous focus on continuous improvement in all areas and specific attention to the Culture Block were required for progress to continue. The Select Committee noted that the Culture Block scores had declined nationally since 2005, with 56% of councils achieving the top 2 grades in this block in 2006 as opposed to 68% in 2005. In addition, the Audit Commission had acknowledged that there

was a 'London issue' for the Culture Block, with all councils that had scored below the minimum requirements located in the Capital.

Jo Mercer advised the Select Committee that the Council had raised concerns about the Culture Block with the Audit Commissions' Relationship Manager, at public events about the Culture Block, and in formal letters to the Audit Commission in July 2005 and again in May 2006 and December 2006. Members heard that there had been changes to 2 PIs and that consultation guidance for 2007 was awaited where any further changes would be made known.

Members enquired about the advantages of the Council achieving CPA 4 stars rating status and the possibility of there being a distinction made between higher and lower performing 3 stars councils. In reply, Jo Mercer advised the Select Committee that a 4 stars rating would bring numerous advantages to the Council, such as providing a better service to residents, possible funding opportunities, increased prestige of the Council's status and image and increased motivation amongst Council staff. Cathy Tyson stated that the Council's performance had continued to improve and that this year represented a strong 3 stars rating, with a notable improvement in the use of resources.

Members noted that there was currently insufficient differentiation between stronger and weaker performing 3 stars rating councils, and it was suggested that a league table would be a motivational force for councils. Cathy Tyson advised the Select Committee that future assessment was likely to be based on local agreements and local strategic partners. Assessments had been revised with a shift in focus from being mainly determined by inspection of services, which had proved to be good motivation for staff, to scoring against a number of PIs. It was anticipated that any future performance framework was likely to include at least 200 PIs in determining ratings.

RESOLVED:-

that the report on the Comprehensive Performance Assessment Refresh 2006 be noted.

**9. Vital Signs Performance Digest Quarter 3, October to December 2006**

Cathy Tyson updated Members on the Vital Signs performance for Quarter 3, stating that complaints was still an issue for the 3 main service areas of Children & Families, Environment and Culture and Housing & Community Care. However, a new system had been put in place to flag stage 1 complaints more promptly. Cathy Tyson then highlighted other areas of concern. Members heard that the adoptions of children looked after and children in care 3+ placements continued to fall short of targets, although it was hoped the numbers would increase by March 2007, especially as Special Guardianship Orders

could now be used. Cleanliness in respect of litter continued to be of some concern, however improvements were expected once the new Waste Management commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2007. Cathy Tyson advised the Select Committee that since the method of collecting visitor data for libraries had been made uniform across the service, performance figures had appeared to have dropped and efforts would be made to modernise libraries and increase stocks.

Turning to areas that had improved, Cathy Tyson reported that recycling and household waste had both experienced an upturn in performance. Members also heard that the percentage of cases involving CICs benefits claims and the length of stay in hostel accommodation had reduced.

Cathy Tyson advised the Select Committee that the number of areas categorised as medium or high risk had never been greater and was a cause for concern. In particular, there were a number of medium and high risk areas in Children & Families and an increasing number of areas were requiring high level monitoring.

The Chair commented on the financial considerations that could affect the number of people prepared to adopt children and he felt that the Special Guardianship Orders would improve performance for number of children adopted.

In reply, Cathy Tyson stated that the number of children available for adoption had peaked at a time when supply of adopters was low and alternative placements had needed to be sort. Members were advised that the situation was being closely monitored and there were regular meetings with Children & Families to discuss this issue and consider strategies. Duncan McLeod added that this issue had also been looked at by other committees such as the Health Select Committee.

RESOLVED:-

that the report on the Vital Signs Digest Quarter 3 October to December 2006 be noted.

**10. Local Area Agreement Performance Review, 2006/2007 Quarter 3**

Cathy Tyson introduced the report updating Members on the Local Area Agreement Performance Review. She advised the Select Committee that participation of young people in sport, incidences of domestic violence, incidences of residential fires and crime indicators as a whole had all improved. However, there was concern about some of the health indicators, particularly the reducing smoking stretch target which was a Brent teaching Primary Care Trust (tPCT) scheme and Cathy Tyson added that the tPCT financial crisis was putting a number of health indicators at risk. Members also heard that the teenage

pregnancy target was another concern and that the Health Select Committee had been considering this issue.

RESOLVED:-

that the report on the Council's performance against key performance indicators be noted

11. **Best Value Performance Indicators: A Comparison of Brent's Performance 2005/2006**

Cathy Tyson introduced the report, stating that there had been an overall improvement in Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI) in Brent for 2005/2006 in comparison to 2003/2004. She drew Members' attention to page 5 of the appendix to the report, informing Members that 50 indicators had improved, 20 had not changed, and 19 had experienced a decline in performance from the previous year. Cathy Tyson highlighted the main areas of concern, which included Council Tax collection, street cleanliness, domestic burglaries and robberies and the number of people visiting libraries. The Select Committee was advised that there had been a large improvement in recycling performance, although Brent's performance was still low compared to other London boroughs as its performance had started at a lower base and other local authorities had also improved. Members heard that some areas had been performing comparatively poorly on a long-term basis and focusing resources on these areas would be required to obtain significant improvements.

Councillor Mendoza sought clarification as to whether Brent was only 1 of 2 London boroughs which built new homes on brown field sites. In reply, Cathy Tyson advised Members that there were other London boroughs where new homes were built on such sites, however these were not included in the Performance Comparison report as it contained only a sample selection of London boroughs.

Duncan McLeod advised the Select Committee that some London borough's Council Tax Collection performance seemed to rise and drop in approximately equal amount from year to year, however Brent's method of measurement of performance remained consistent. He added that NNDR collection performance was within the top 10 of the other London boroughs included in the comparison.

RESOLVED:-

that the Council's performance against the national Best Value set of performance indicators be noted.

**12. Performance & Finance Select Committee Work Programme**

With the agreement of the Chair, Jo Mercer circulated a draft Work Programme for the 2007/2008 municipal year and she asked Members to consider possible subjects for Task Group activity.

Councillor Mendoza suggested that a review of the overall Culture Block strategy could be considered. Councillor Detre suggested that a consideration of the possible impact of the tPCT's financial situation on Brent's BVPI could be looked at. The Chair suggested that a residents' survey of the Waste Management Contract could be undertaken for inclusion in the Waste Management Contract Performance report in order to assist the Select Committee's consideration of the improvements that had been made.

Phil Newby advised Members that a task group of the Health Select Committee's Task Group had considered the tPCT's Turnaround Plans and its impact on the Council and had requested that this issue be considered by other committees within the Overview and Scrutiny structure. Members agreed to Phil Newby's suggestion that this issue be considered at the Select Committee's first meeting of 2007/2008. In order to give necessary time to consider the tPCT issue, Members agreed to Duncan McLeod's suggestion that the Revenue and Benefits Performance update for the first meeting in the draft be moved for inclusion in the update for the second meeting. Members noted that the Revenue Budget Monitoring and Capital Programme Monitoring Reports were considered on a quarterly basis and Duncan McLeod suggested that the first 2 reports be considered for the meetings provisionally scheduled for 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007 and 28<sup>th</sup> November 2007.

The Chair asked that the Select Committee consider the draft Work Programme and the suggestions made by Members and to discuss amongst Members before the next meeting.

**13. Items Requested onto the Overview and Scrutiny Agenda**

None

**14. Recommendations from the Executive to be considered by the Performance & Finance Select Committee**

None

**15. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting would be confirmed at the Annual Council meeting in May 2007.

16. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

A DUNN  
Chair