



## **ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**MEETING** : Monday, 24th November 2014

**PRESENT** : Cllrs. James (Chair), Haigh and Norman

**Others in Attendance**

Anthony Hodge, Head of Regeneration and Economic Development

Sadie Neal, Head of Business Improvement

Helen Chard, Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager

Tanya Davies, Democratic and Electoral Services Manager

Ashley Gough, HR Advisor

**APOLOGIES** : Cllrs. Dallimore and Hilton

### **18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

18.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### **19. MINUTES**

19.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **20. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)**

20.1 There were no public questions.

### **21. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS (15 MINUTES)**

21.1 There were no petitions or deputations.

### **22. HOUSING STRATEGY & ENABLING SERVICE REVIEW**

22.1 The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Services and Neighbourhoods concerning the proposed new structure for the Housing Strategy and Enabling Service.

22.2 The Housing Strategy and Enabling Service Manager introduced the report and summarised key features of the service review, which aimed establish a more generic team to ensure that resources were appropriately placed to deliver the functions of the service. She noted that staff had raised some points of clarification, including the option for a career graded post and the capacity in respect of

**ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**24.11.14**

administrative tasks and that the responses to these queries were contained within the appendix to the report. In respect of the over-arching approach to a generic style of working, the affected staff were broadly supportive of the proposals.

- 22.3 In response to questions from Members, the Housing Strategy and Enabling Service Manager explained that proposals to move away from specialisms towards a more generic approach to the work of the team would ensure more team members would be able to respond to uneven demands placed on the service, including homelessness, and also provide a level of resilience.
- 22.4 **RESOLVED** - that the proposals for the restructure of the Housing Strategy and Enabling Team be approved and implemented.

**23. BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT REALIGNMENT**

- 23.1 The Committee considered a report of the Head of Business Improvement concerning the proposed new structure for the Business Improvement Service.
- 23.2 The Head of Business Improvement acknowledged that the service review had previously been considered by the Committee on 25 September 2014 and that Members had requested more detail about the general approach to contract management and how this was reflected in the proposed new structure for the Business Improvement Service. She noted the additional information provided in the report and advised that a meeting had taken place with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources to discuss the internal processes around contract management. She advised that the structure proposed reflected the level of resource required to manage the functions retained by the Council in respect of the contracts let.
- 23.3 Councillor Haigh commented that the IT Client Officer post was essential to ensuring the success of the contract with Civica for the management of IT services and raised concerns about whether the grading of the post would attract the required level of knowledge and expertise; she questioned whether the role had been independently evaluated by a Hay Panel and suggested that the Council consider drawing on expertise from Gloucestershire County Council. She sought clarity on the role of the proposed Business Analyst.
- 23.4 Councillor Norman stated that he was supportive of the need for a Senior Client Officer to take on a supervisory role and establish a layer between the Head of Service and the Client Officers to ensure the effective day to day functioning of the service. He echoed concerns about the grade of the of the IT Client Officer and emphasised the importance of recruiting an individual with the appropriate skills.
- 23.5 The Head of Business Improvement advised that the Hay Panel had raised some queries about the grading of the IT Client Officer post and stated that she recognised the importance of recruiting a appropriate individual. She explained that the nature of contract management meant that the role required some day to day contract management administration along with the required IT expertise; it was recognised that there would be a need to buy in more specialised IT expertise for specific projects. She acknowledged the helpful relationship with IT officers at the County Council, but noted that the City Council shared very few systems with the

**ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**24.11.14**

County Council She explained that the Business Analyst would consider business needs and resources available and advise services how best their needs could be met in the most cost effective manner.

- 23.6 Members agreed that they would await the outcome of the recruitment process for the IT Client Officer with interest.
- 23.7 **RESOLVED** - that the proposed structure for the Business Improvement Service is agreed and implementation be progressed.

**24. REVIEW OF PARKING SERVICES**

- 24.1 The Committee considered a report of the Corporate Director of Services and Neighbourhoods concerning the proposed structure for the retained Parking Services.
- 24.2 The Head of Regeneration and Economic Development explained that proposals to outsource Parking Services had been presented to staff in May 2013 and were deferred for contractual reasons. An independent review was commissioned in March 2014 and subsequently the management of on-street parking transferred to Gloucestershire County Council, with the City Council retaining the management of its own car parks and APCOA undertaking the enforcement. As a result of the changes to the functions retained by the City Council it is proposed that two staff transfer to APCOA and 1.6 staff are retained by the Council to monitor the contract with APCOA and safeguard the Council's interests.
- 24.3 Members agreed that the principle of outsourcing Parking Services was likely to result in a saving to the Council and that it was clear that there was a need to retain a level of staffing to monitor the contract with APCOA. Members sought confirmation that TUPE arrangements applied following the deferral of the outsourcing in 2013 and subsequent transfer of functions to the County Council, and also that any adjustment to APCOAs management fee as a result of the transfer of staff would not outweigh the proposed saving to the Council.
- 24.4 **RESOLVED** - that the proposed structure for the Parking Services, set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed subject to:
- (1) Confirmation that the TUPE arrangements had been deferred following the previous review of Parking Services and that TUPE criteria continue to apply at the present time.
  - (2) Confirmation that any adjustment to APCOAs management fee as a result of the transfer of staff does not outweigh the saving to the Council.

**25. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Monday 9 February 2015 at 6.00pm.

**Time of commencement: 18:00 hours**

**Time of conclusion: 19:00 hours**

**Chair**