OPEN

FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)

13th January 2005

PRESENT:-

Labour Group
Councillor Wilkins (Chair), Councillor Pabla (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Carroll, Lauro, Mulgrew, Southerd, Southern and Whyman, M.B.E.

Conservative Group
Councillors Bladen (substitute for Councillor Mrs. Wheeler), Harrison, Lemmon, Nalty, and Mrs. Renwick.

In Attendance
Councillor Atkin (Conservative Group).

APOLOGY

An apology for absence from the Meeting was received from Councillor Mrs. Wheeler (Conservative Group).

MATTERS DELEGATED TO COMMITTEE

FM/84. **GENERAL FUND ESTIMATES AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2004/05 AND 2005/06**

The Committee was asked to consider the probable out-turn for 2004/05 and the cash limit estimate for 2005/06. It was proposed that these estimates would be included in the consolidated budget of the Council, subject to the Council's overall financial position. Details were also provided of proposed Revenue Service Developments and new capital investment for 2005/06, together with proposals for the level of fees and charges under the responsibility of this Committee, for the next financial year. A detailed budget booklet had been provided, together with appendices showing:-

- An analysis of the main variations between 2004/05 and 2005/06 base budgets;
- The value and cost of capital assets currently used in delivering the Committee's services;
- An analysis of a statutory pensions adjustment as it affected this Committee for 2004/05;
- A summary of employee costs for the main central and departmental accounts;
- A summary of the proposals for revenue service developments and new capital investment; and
- A schedule showing the proposed fees and charges for the Committee's services for 2005/06.

With regard to Capital Charges, all services were required to show the capital cost of using assets. These came in the form of internal recharges and consisted of three elements, namely an interest charge, depreciation and a deferred charge. Capital charges could vary each year as they depended on the level of capital grants and contributions. It was important to note that these were purely accounting adjustments. The report explained the pension adjustment for 2004/05. Due to a change in accounting standards the actual cash contributions to the pension fund were no longer charged to the Committee's services. The charge now made represented the amount required to make good the deficit on the pension fund in the longer term. This was known as the FRS17 adjustment. The adjustment was significant in 2004/05, as the original estimates were prepared on the cash basis and these costs were shown in an appendix to the report.

The budget for 2005/06 had initially been compiled at November 2004 prices. An allowance for inflation had been included where it was considered unavoidable, to calculate the cash limit estimate for 2005/06. Details were provided of the assumptions built into the estimates. Capital investment was considered and the report outlined the Committee's current schemes.

The Service and Financial Planning Working Group had met on 20th December 2004 to consider the overall financial position, the financial strategy and the initial budget proposals for 2005/06. The Group also met on 10th January 2005 to progress proposals. Appended to the report was list of proposals for new revenue spending and capital investment.

A final appendix provided a schedule of proposed fees and charges to operate from 1st April 2005, together with a comparison to the existing charge.

Following a question from the Leader of the Council, it was confirmed that the Committee was not approving all of the Service Development bids at this stage. These would be considered as part of the consolidated budget report later in the meeting.

RESOLVED:-

(1) That the estimates of Revenue Income and Expenditure for 2004/05 and 2005/06 for the Committee's services be approved.

(2) That the proposals for Revenue Service Developments and new capital investment for 2005/06 be approved in principle.

(3) That the Committee's proposed fees and charges for 2005/06 be approved.

FM/85. **FINANCING OF VEHICLES, PLANT, MACHINERY AND WHEELED BINS**

A report was submitted to assess the options available to the Council for the future financing of vehicles, plant, machinery and wheeled bins. Currently they were funded through "operational" leases, in that effectively the Council rented assets through a financing company. Repairs, maintenance and insurance were the responsibility of the Council but the asset remained in the ownership of the lessor. In addition, the Council arranged and undertook the procurement of assets. Typically, vehicles were leased for a seven year period, whilst plant, machinery and wheeled bins were leased over a ten year period. At the end of the primary lease period there were a number of options for the Council, but all involved additional costs, which were difficult to estimate. The report highlighted the benefits and drawbacks associated with leasing. It then explained the current leasing costs, which were approximately £286,000 each year. The Council was committed to increase this amount by approximately £15,000 in 2005/06, mainly to finance the purchase of wheeled bins, to extend the Composting Scheme.

Members were reminded of the projected General Fund budget deficit in future years. Due to the magnitude of annual leasing charges and a potential requirement to make efficiency savings, a review had been undertaken. The scope of the review was reported and the other options available to finance acquisitions were to borrow, to purchase assets outright or to operate a renewals fund. Contract hire had not been considered as part of the options appraisal.

Before determining the best financing method a review was undertaken to look at the future requirements for vehicles and plant. The main basis for this was the date when the current lease expired. The replacement programme only covered those items that were currently leased and other smaller items of plant and equipment were not included, as these were usually funded from other revenue budgets. Known commitments had been included and further replacements would need to be the subject of Service Development Proposals. The total indicative rolling programme over the next eleven years was summarised in an appendix to the report. It was considered that this programme provided a good basis on which to undertake the financial appraisal.

The report then focused on the initial options appraisal, comparing leasing against borrowing. Members were reminded that the prudential code for capital finance provided a degree of flexibility to borrow outside Government allocations. The main requirement was to demonstrate the cost of any borrowing was prudent, affordable and sustainable. Current research indicated that prudential borrowing was an alternative to leasing. The appraisal was undertaken using the net present value (NPV) methodology and the report explained how the methodology operated. To test the best financing method, the estimated replacement values for 2004/05 were used. This was the capital value of assets for which new leases would need to be arranged and totalled around £290,000. The other main assumptions were shown in a table within the report and detailed workings were provided as an Annexe. A summary of estimated costs over the five and ten year periods were also provided.

The report highlighted the favourable options for the procurement of vehicles, plant, machinery and wheeled bins. It was questioned which was the best option and arguably, this part of the appraisal was inconclusive. The report highlighted a number of specific issues, such as leasing implications after the primary lease period and the future treatment of assets acquired through borrowing. This led to the option of purchasing assets outright using capital resources. Under this option, the Council would earmark the relevant financing in its Capital Programme to replace assets. An indicative replacement programme was appended to the report. It required an investment of £2.8 million over the next eleven year period, which equated to an average of £250,000 per year. However, the replacement programme was volatile, with high projected replacement costs in certain years.

A renewals fund was a common method of replacing vehicles and plant. Its main benefit was that it helped to smooth out the funding variances of the Replacement Programme. It could bring a degree of flexibility, provided that the overall balance of the fund was not compromised. However, a Renewals Fund needed to be established and resources set aside to achieve this. It would need to be supplemented on a regular basis and this was illustrated in a further appendix to the report. It showed that an amount of £550,000 would be required to establish the fund initially, with annual funding of between £225,000 and £255,000 for a ten year period. The annual "top up" would need to be financed from capital. A comparison was made to leasing over the eleven year period. In cash terms, the capital financing option saved approximately £½ million.

Consideration was given to financing the renewals fund and this would operate as an earmarked capital reserve. The initial £550,000 could be funded from next year's capital resources, but this would significantly reduce the resources available for other investment. Another option was to re-direct a proportion of the Commutation Reserve, which was no longer required for its original purpose. The ongoing amount, initially of £225,000 per year could be achieved by re-directing current repayments and covenant agreements. This would provide nearly half of the required amounts to 2009/10 and all of the annual contribution from 2010/11 onwards. The remaining £125,000 per year required would then be the "first call" on future capital investment programmes to 2009/10. Effectively, this would need to come from capital receipts. In recent years, the Council had generated capital receipts in excess of £100,000 per year. Current projections showed that this should continue to be the case, but it could not be guaranteed.

The report set out the potential drawbacks of using a renewals fund. Apart from ensuring that adequate capital receipts were earned and earmarked, other issues were the potential for some deposit interest to be lost, in particular on the initial £550,000, if part of the commutation reserve was used. The main cost was not readily measurable in that it was an "opportunity cost". This was a longer term investment and until around 2014, the Council would still be paying for existing leases, albeit at a reducing cost. Depending on actual replacement, the fund might need additional resources every ten years or so.

The main benefit of this option was a saving of approximately £286,000 per year from leasing charges. This was incremental and would be fairly significant on a cumulative basis over the longer term. An analysis was provided in table form. Compared to current projections, the Council could save approximately £322,000 by 2008/09. This would help considerably to reduce the overall projected deficit on the General Fund, but it would be prudent to earmark funds to meet any termination costs when current leases expired. The report set out other benefits compared to leasing and provided a risk analysis for the renewals fund.

Councillor Lemmon asked about the eleven year planning period used within the cost assumptions and the projected life expectancy of plant and equipment. The Head of Finance and Property Services explained the assumptions made regarding the subsequent replacement of such equipment. The Member then asked about warranty periods for new equipment and the costs of future warranty schemes. It was confirmed that the proposal only looked at the means in which the purchase of new equipment was financed.

Councillor Southern questioned the implications if capital receipts were less than anticipated. The current projections were based on receipts from the sale of Council properties under the Right to Buy scheme and there could be no guarantees. The Chair added that if capital receipts diminished, the Council could revert to a leasing option. Councillor Southerd questioned the five year period proposed for the replacement of equipment. In response, Officers explained that the renewals fund would provide increased flexibility, where lease agreements tended to be more restrictive. This would enable the Council to meet service needs more easily. The Deputy Chief Executive explained the difficulty when vehicles reached the end of their useful life before the end of the lease period. In such cases, vehicles could not be returned without a penalty being imposed. There were also punitive fees for secondary leases on some occasions. In response to a question from the Leader of the Council, clarification was provided on the contributions that had been built into the budget proposals, following a meeting of the Service and Financial Planning Working Panel. In essence, there was a capital programme allocation of £1.1 million together with a £550,000 contribution from the Commutation Reserve. Officers explained the yield that would be received from this approach and it was confirmed that this was a longer term strategy resulting in a financial benefit to the Council. Councillor Whyman M.B.E. then questioned the risks and in the worst case scenario, the Council would be required to return to borrowing or leasing. The revenue savings from 2011 onwards would make the scheme self-financing.

Councillor Harrison considered there was a complex comparison between the different schemes and he sought to examine the principles. He questioned whether the Council was seeking to provide additional resources for other revenue expenditure. The Chair referred to the identified difference between income and expenditure and this measure would seek to bring them back into line. Councillor Harrison questioned the need for a depreciation reserve and an explanation was provided on local government finance. In essence, the Renewals Fund was a reserve designed to accumulate funds for future replacements. The Deputy Chief Executive explained how the costs of new acquisitions were effectively written off over a five year period. Councillor Lauro questioned whether protections would be put in place to ensure that the fund was not depleted in the future. Councillor Southern had some concerns regarding the use of Right to Buy Capital Receipts for this purpose when in the longer term there were concerns over the Housing Revenue Account. The Head of Finance and Property Services explained that the following Committee Report would look at utilising debt free resources from windfalls for certain housing projects.

***RESOLVED**:-*

(1) That the Council establishes a Renewals Fund for the future replacement of its vehicles, plant, machinery and wheeled bins.

(2) That the Council transfers £550,000 from the Commutation Reserve to establish the fund.

(3) That capital resources be used to finance the fund in the future and be identified in the Council's approved Capital Investment Programme.

FM/86. **CONSOLIDATED BUDGET PROPOSALS 2005/06 AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2005-2008**

The Committee was advised that the Council's Annual Financial Settlement 2005/06 provided local authorities with the level of Government funding for the next financial year. It was a crucial element for this Council as it formed the main income stream for General Fund services. The Council had received an increase on its 2004/05 level of 8% for 2005/06. This equated to just over £400,000 in cash terms. This partly represented additional funding for the District's rising population and covered additional duties regarding liquor licensing, civil contingency planning and recycling.

The Council had gained additional funding from lifting of the "floor and ceilings" mechanism. This had impacted on the Council's full grant entitlement over the last two years, but the Government was still protecting those authorities who would lose under the current grant formula. If the full funding formula was applied, the Council would receive an additional £400,000 in grant. The Council's Leader noted that the shortfall was £600,000 at this stage last year and therefore progress was being made.

The increase for 2005/06 had been treated as a "one off" and in subsequent years, the rolling forecast assumed an inflation increase of 2.5%. It was noted that the figures were still provisional as they were subject to consultation, but it was unlikely that the Council would see any material changes. Details were given of other specific grants. The Planning Delivery Grant was likely to total around £280,000 for 2005/06. This money was essentially ring-fenced for planning and the Council needed to demonstrate improvements in this area. A Waste Performance and Efficiency Grant of around £27,000 had also been received. This was to target developments in recycling and the composting of waste.

The Council's General Fund Three Year Financial Projection was summarised as follows:-

	2004/05 Probable £'000	**2005/06 Base £'000**	**2006/07 Projection £'000**	**2007/08 Projection £'000**
Net Revenue Expenditure	8,912	9,912	10,259	10,488
Less Financing				
Government Grants	5,033	5,434	5,570	5,709
Council Tax	3,708	3,942	4,121	4,336
From Earmarked Reserves	347	70	70	70
Gross Deficit/Surplus (-)	-176	466	498	373
PROJECTED RESERVES	**2,804**	**2,338**	**1,840**	**1,467**

The table showed that reserves were projected to be around £1.5 million by March 2008. The projection accommodated some additional spending pressures in the form of higher pension contributions and waste disposal costs. These had been more than offset by the increase in Government grant, higher than anticipated income from planning fees and interest on "debt free" capital receipts. The projection assumed increases in Council Tax of 4.5% in each of the three years 2005-2008. The main assumptions regarding future pay and price changes underpinning the forecast were detailed in an appendix to the report.

Policy Committees had considered the probable out-turn for 2004/05 and the base budget for 2005/06. A further appendix provided a summary of the main changes to the projections from that approved in July 2004, together with further analysis of the change in net spending between the 2004/05 and 2005/06 base budgets. A financial risk analysis was summarised within the report and set out in detail in an appendix.

Consideration was given to the minimum level of reserves. The Council faced many financial risks and needed to be prudent in ensuring adequate general reserves to act as a contingency. Previously, the Council operated a policy of maintaining the minimum level of reserves at £½ million. The current financial strategy allowed for a minimum level of £¾ million at the end of the three year rolling period. These were historic figures and the prudential code now placed the emphasis on each local authority to determine its minimum level of reserves, based on advice from the Authority's Section 151 (Chief Finance) Officer. Good practice indicated that the minimum level should be set at 10% of net revenue expenditure and for South Derbyshire this equated to £1.050 million at March 2008.

The Leader asked whether the minimum level of reserves could be set below this level, for example at £900,000 with a move to the £1.050 million over the three-year planning period. He explained the reasoning behind this. It was understood that the Council could not plan to spend anticipated savings arising from Gershon. If these occurred, the resources could add to reserves or provide additional funds for revenue service developments. The Head of Finance and Property Services was uncomfortable at setting the level of reserves below that recommended. The Audit Commission might be critical of this approach. The Council's Leader accepted the point made, reiterated the potential to set a lower level of reserves initially and he commented that the Audit Commission would also be responsible for ensuring that authorities implemented Gershon, so that the required efficiency savings would be achieved.

The Deputy Chief Executive referred to the remaining balance on the Commutation Reserve. If this was maintained at a minimum level of £150,000, it could give additional resources to supplement the general reserve. Following a question from the Leader, the Head of Finance and Property Services confirmed that the Council could, if it wished, transfer the balance of the Commutation Reserve to the General Reserve. Councillor Harrison sought clarification about the use of the Commutation Reserve. He felt it would be imprudent for the Council to set a level of reserves below that recommended.

With regard to Council Tax levels, the projection built in increases of 4.5% per year for the next three years. There had been much publicity in recent months regarding Council Tax increases for next year. The Government had made it clear that it expected to see increases in low single figures and below last year's average increase across all authorities of 5.9%. The overall financial position on the General Fund was relatively healthy, but the Council continued to face many spending pressures and aspirations to develop services. The Service and Financial Planning Working Group had considered options for identifying additional revenue resources to meet these spending bids. Members were reminded of the "shifting resources" project established to review and make recommendations for identifying current resources that could be redeployed. Any proposals arising from this were likely to be for the longer term. Other areas currently being considered, that would impact on the budget were moving from the leasing of vehicles, plant and equipment to direct purchase, identifying "invest to save" schemes and a review of fees and charges.

Proposals for Revenue Service Developments were summarised in an appendix to the report and a separate booklet had been circulated detailing each bid. These were considered by the Service and Financial Planning Working Group at its Meeting on 12th January 2005.

The report considered capital investment and financing. The Council's provisional programme to 2009/10 was appended to the report. The projections indicated a shortfall in overall resources of around £317,000 for the five year programme. This was based on projected capital receipts, mainly from Council house sales and a table within the report summarised the position. The provisional expenditure assumed the continuation of current levels of rolling programmes. No provision had been made for future commitments and the projected resources did not include general government allocations under the Single Capital Pot beyond 2005/06. The Government provided general resources for housing in 2005/06 of around £535,000. However, there was no indication that any resources would be available to the Council in future years. Apart from Partnership funding and specific Government grant, the Council's resources were dependent upon generating capital receipts. It was noted that the Council was committed until 2011/12 to the repayment of covenant financing at around £½ million each year. It was important that the Council used resources for new capital investment wisely and maintained a sufficient reserve against future commitments and/or a downturn in projected capital receipts. It was unlikely that any new spending could be approved unless it was financed within the current programme.

There was a need to identify additional capital resources and a further annexe to the report set out the number and total cost of bids for new investment. As the leasing of assets was replaced with a renewals fund, capital resources would need to be identified to fund the associated replacement programme. Similarly, any other "invest to save" schemes would require capital receipts to be set aside.

The SFPWG had considered options for identifying additional capital resources to meet new spending bids. The Council had considered a disposal strategy and other options included prudential borrowing, reprioritising existing programmes and recycling a proportion of "debt free" receipts. The Council was benefiting from transitional arrangements regarding the pooling of capital receipts. It would be able to keep a substantial proportion of capital receipts generated over the next three years. The total amount currently projected to be generated was around £3.85 million over this three year period. This would depend on the level of Council house sales in particular, but these receipts were ring fenced and could only be invested in housing. The Council currently funded a proportion of the Housing

Investment Programme and disability grants from general capital receipts. There was the option of transferring this proportion to the debt free receipts over the next three years. This would "free up" general receipts for investment in other schemes, but would reduce the amount available for housing. A further table showed the additional receipts available if this option was implemented fully. The report concluded with proposals for new capital investment and a request from the Environmental and Development Services Committee for a contribution in 2004/05 to the Hilton Cycleway. The total project cost was estimated at around £283,000 of which the Council's contribution would be £9,000.

The Chair commented on projected Council Tax increases and the potential for "capping". The Leader of the Council also commented on the projected level of Council Tax increase and there appeared little scope to vary from the 4.5% used within the projections.

The Head of Finance and Property Services had circulated an addendum to this item which Members considered. The document set out proposals for new revenue spending, identifying the total cost of proposals and the amount available, there being a difference of £140,250. Councillor Carroll referred to the Street Warden scheme and she questioned whether some of the costs could be capitalised. This was confirmed and it could reduce the revenue commitment by some £15,000-20,000, but with a corresponding impact on capital expenditure. Councillor Southern referred to the proposed quarterly newsletter and he questioned the value of this initiative. Councillor Harrison asked how the difference between the cost of proposals and amounts available would be addressed. The Chair and Leader of the Council responded and it was hoped to review options over the next week.

Consideration was given to the proposals for capital investment. Councillor Lemmon referred to improvements to the Etwall Leisure Centre and in response, the Deputy Chief Executive confirmed the legal agreements in place to ensure funding was received from the Council's partners.

Consideration was given to the report's recommendations. Officers explained the need to undertake consultation on the Council's budget plans. Members felt that some of the proposals could only be approved in principle at this stage and there was a discussion about the capital contribution towards the Hilton Cycleway project.

RESOLVED:-

(1) That the estimates of Revenue Income and Expenditure for 2004/05 and 2005/06 for the General Fund be approved, together with the level of Income and Expenditure, as submitted.

(2) That the updated three-year financial projection on the General Fund to 2008, including associated assumptions and risks be approved.

(3) That in principle, the Committee approves a minimum level of general fund reserves of 10% of net expenditure as at 31st March 2008.

(4) That it be noted that an assumption of a Council Tax increase of 4.5% has been built into the budget proposals.

(5) That in principle, the proposals for Revenue Service Developments for 2005/06 be approved.

(6) That in principle, the proposals for new capital investment for 2005/06 be approved.

(7) That further consideration be given to the decisions contained in resolutions (3)-(6) above at a future Meeting.

(8) That the information contained within resolutions (1)-(6) above be used as the basis for the budget information/consultation process.

(9) That the Committee commits a capital contribution of £9,000 in 2004/05 towards the Hilton Cycleway and that further consideration be given to the source from which this funding is allocated at a future Meeting.

Note: At 7.05 p.m. Councillor Lemmon left the Meeting.

FM/87. **DRAFT SERVICE PLANS 2005/08**

The Committee gave consideration to Draft Service Plans for the Human Resources, IT and Customer Services, Legal and Democratic Services and Revenue Services Divisions. The Finance and Property Services and Policy and Economic Regeneration Service Plans were not presently available and would be reported to a future Meeting of the Committee.

Service Plans provided an important part of the Council's performance management framework and details were given of those other elements within this framework. The Service Plans followed the same format as last year, with the addition of a new section on "workforce planning" and changes to the section on managing risks. Plans covered a three year period, although in practice they would be reviewed and rolled forward annually. Progress reports would continue to be made every six months.

Details were provided of the sections contained within each service plan. All plans had been developed on the basis that there would be no change in the level resources devoted to that service area. Proposals for service developments or reductions, along with New Capital Projects would be considered through a separate mechanism and incorporated into the Service Plans at a later date. Proposals resulting from the new Corporate Plan would also need to be included later. It was proposed therefore, that the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, be authorised to agree final versions of the plans when the budget and Corporate Plan had been approved.

Members were invited to highlight issues stemming from the Service Plans that they would wish to be included in the budget process. With regard to the Service Plan for Legal and Democratic Services, Councillor Harrison questioned the insurance arrangements for the laptop computers being supplied to Members and details were confirmed.

***RESOLVED*:-**

(1) That the Draft Service Plans for Human Resources, IT and Customer Services, Legal and Democratic Services and Revenue Services be approved as a basis for service delivery over the period April 2005 to March 2008.

(2) That the Draft Service Plans for the Finance and Property Services and Policy and Economic Regeneration Divisions be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee.

(3) That the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee to agree the final versions of these plans, when the new Corporate Plan and the 2005/06 budget have been approved.

FM/88. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT [ACCESS TO INFORMATION] ACT 1985)**

***RESOLVED*:-**

That, in accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the Meeting as it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that there would be disclosed exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Act indicated in brackets after each item.

HATTON FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME (Paragraph 8)

The Committee accepted a tender for the Hatton Flood Alleviation Scheme.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS – PLANNING SERVICES (Paragraph 1)

Following negotiations with the postholder, the Committee approved terms for the early retirement of the Head of Planning and the appointment of a replacement Officer.

DISPOSAL OF FORMER SHELTERED HOUSING AT BASS'S CRESCENT, CASTLE GRESLEY (Paragraphs 8 and 9)

The Committee accepted an offer for the disposal of the former sheltered housing accommodation at Bass's Crescent, Castle Gresley.

P.J. WILKINS

CHAIR

	EXEMPT REPORTS	
12.	**AGENDA ITEM** HATTON FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME	
	DECISION: That the Council accepts the tender submitted by Greenway Construction Limited to undertake the Hatton Flood Alleviation Scheme.	
13.	**AGENDA ITEM** HEAD OF PLANNING	
	DECISION: (1) That the Committee approves the early retirement of the current Head of Planning and that he be awarded added years service for pension purposes, in accordance with the Council's scheme and in the interests of the efficiency of the service. (2) That the Chief Executive be authorised as follows:- ▪ That the Head of Planning be given three months notice of his retirement; ▪ That the Notice be provided on a rolling basis in order to ensure continuity of service; ▪ That the Notice period be extended by agreement until the new appointment is confirmed (3) THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SENIOR OFFICER APPOINTMENTS PROCEDURE, THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION WORKING PANEL BE RECONVENED AND THAT THE PANEL COMPRISES THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS:- Labour Group – Councillors Whyman MBE, Carroll and Southerd. Conservative Group Two Members (to be confirmed)	
14.	**AGENDA ITEM** DISPOSAL OF FORMER SHELTERED HOUSING AT BASS'S CRESCENT, CASTLE GRESLEY	
	DECISION: That the Council accepts the offer of £265,000 for the sale of the former Sheltered Housing accommodation at Bass's Crescent, Castle Gresley.	

DATED: 17th January 2005
Chief Executive

[1] Although it is not necessary to use a prescribed form, copies are available from the Chief Executive.
[2] NOTE – this gives an outline of the committee decision for call-in purposes but it does not necessarily reflect the final wording for minute purposes.
[3] Insert both the agenda item number and its heading.