

Title of Report:	Response to the Overview & Scrutiny Commission Review into the utilisation of Shaw House
Report to be considered by:	Executive
Date of Meeting:	04 September 2014
Forward Plan Ref:	EX2874

Purpose of Report: To provide a response to the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Task Group in respect of the utilisation of the Shaw House.

Recommended Action: To agree the Officer's recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission's recommendations.

Reason for decision to be taken: To provide a response to the OSMC recommendations.

Other options considered: As set out in the report

Key background documentation:

- Report presented to Overview & Scrutiny Commission on 20 May 2014
- Draft Shaw House Business Plan 2014-2017

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Strategy principle:
 CSP8 - Doing what's important well

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Hilary Cole - Tel (01635) 248542
E-mail Address:	hcole@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	1 July 2014

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Amanda Loaring
Job Title:	Heritage & Tourism Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519075
E-mail Address:	aloaring@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

- Policy:** None
- Financial:** The OSMC recommendations include proposals to increase the expenditure at Shaw House, these would need to be funded through investment or increased income. Recommendation 1 proposes the achievement of an operating surplus or cost neutrality (as appropriate) should be brought forward to no later than 2016/17. Officer's response is in the appendix of the report.
- Personnel:** None
- Legal/Procurement:** None
- Property:** The OSMC recommendations include a proposal to relocate the Registration Service by 31 March 2015. Officer's response is in the appendix of the report.
- Risk Management:**

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes		Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:				
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)				
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at www.westberks.gov.uk/eia				<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality				<input type="checkbox"/>

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting of 21 May 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) agreed to conduct a review into the utilisation of Shaw House.
- 1.2 The Terms of Reference for the task group were to conduct a review into Shaw House and in particular:
 - (i) Understand its current utilisation and costs
 - (ii) Assess the viability of future options for its use
 - (iii) Report to the OSMC thence the Executive with recommendations as appropriate.
- 1.3 The final report of the working group was presented to the OSMC on 20th May 2014.
- 1.4 This report provides a response to the working group recommendations.

2. Proposals

- 2.1 At their meeting on 7 March 2014 the OSMC working group members considered the draft business plan for Shaw House being written by the Heritage & Tourism Manager and other officers. This document was still at the development stage with work in progress on the budget figures, projected targets and timescales.
- 2.2 The OSMC report takes a view that "The overall thrust of the proposed Business Plan appears to the Task Group to be sound and should, if the individual business cases within it are driven through to completion, go some way to significantly increasing the House's potential and utility."
- 2.3 The OSMC report goes on to comment that the targets in the draft plan are "insufficiently ambitious". From officers knowledge of the markets operated within and having sought external advice it is not believed possible to reach a cost neutral position within the term of the current business plan.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 This item is not relevant to equality.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The OSMC report makes 11 recommendations and the officers responses to these are set out in the attached document. Overall they are positive and are either already in the draft business plan, will be included in the plan or will be actions to be undertaken as the plan evolves. There are two recommendations which propose increases to expenditure and whilst it is accepted that budgets are tight, any increase in expenditure requires a commensurate increase in income to achieve the same outturn, as the draft business plan develops these will be considered.

Appendices

Appendix A - Response to the OSMC Review of Shaw House

Consultees

Local Stakeholders: OSMC, OSMC Task Group

Officers Consulted: Steve Broughton, Sean Anderson, Julie Young and Corporate Board

Trade Union: Not consulted