

Runnymede Borough CouncilCORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE21 April 2022 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillor T Gracey (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), A Alderson, M Adams, M Cressey, L Gillham, J Gracey, M Heath, C Howorth, J Hulley, D Whyte and J Wilson.

Members of the Committee absent: None.

Councillors R King and I Mullens also attended.

**Notification Of Changes To Committee Membership**

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be reappointed.

<b>Group</b>	<b>Remove From Membership</b>	<b>Appoint Instead</b>
Conservative	Councillor D Cotty	Councillor M Adams
Conservative	Councillor N Prescott (Chairman)	Councillor J Hulley
Conservative	Councillor M Willingale	Councillor J Wilson

The Chief Executive had given effect to this request in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

**Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Declaration Of Interest**

Councillor M Adams, who was a Director of RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd which was the company that would be receiving the loan, declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 13 on the agenda – Loan Agreement for RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd and left the room for the discussion and voting on this item.

**Runnymede Economic Development Strategy 2022 to 2026**

The Committee considered the Runnymede Economic Development Strategy for 2022 to 2026 which included a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis and provided an analysis of the local economy and identified the Council's priorities and deliverables for supporting economic growth over the next four years.

The Government approach to supporting economic recovery and growth post – pandemic was set out in the paper "Build Back Better: Our Plan for Growth March 2021". The Levelling Up White Paper published in February 2022 contained the Government's long-term economic and social plan to make opportunity more equal across the UK. The Shared Prosperity Fund would help resource the plan for levelling up and the Council would be allocated funding through this Fund from 2022 to 2025. It was noted that the Council had received £1 million from the Shared Prosperity Fund in common with all Surrey Councils.

Officers would report on proposals for the use of this £1 million as part of the Corporate Business Plan.

The Runnymede Economic Development Strategy 2022 to 2026 identified six strategic priorities and a number of deliverables for the Council to support economic growth. The Council had undertaken a Runnymede Economic Assessment which underlined that Runnymede had a highly competitive economy and was a dynamic location for business. It was noted that the Savill Court Hotel referred to in the last paragraph on page 41 of the Assessment had changed its name to Fairmont Windsor Park.

Runnymede was ranked as the most competitive borough in the UK outside London (UK Competitive Index 2021), was the largest economy in the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (5.8bn GVA) and was home to a significant number of national and international companies. There were a high proportion of jobs in tech and cyber security in Runnymede. The borough benefitted from foreign direct investment, e.g. Netflix at Longcross.

The Committee was pleased to note Runnymede's excellent performance against most of the economic indicators and commended the Economic Development Strategy. Runnymede was the 61<sup>st</sup> least deprived local authority but the borough received less favourable results for affordable accommodation, had pockets of deprivation and suffered from a high degree of traffic congestion and a high level of car use compared to other local authorities. One of the six strategic priorities (Number 6) in the Strategy was developing a low carbon economy. The aim of this priority was to support and encourage businesses to be more sustainable or greener.

A number of objectives and deliverables were identified in Appendix 1 of the Strategy. These included supporting inward investment, developing business awards and support for tech clusters, extending business engagement through Business Runnymede and the Town Teams, developing the tourism economy and strengthening pathways for residents to jobs in tech. The Committee noted an Equality Screening and an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Strategy. One of the key themes of the EIA was that the strategy would encourage skills and education providers and careers advisers to target residents from disadvantaged groups and provide stronger pathways to employment and skills by promoting opportunities and addressing barriers.

The Council agreed that the Council would need to show how it would encourage residents to reduce their car use to develop the low carbon economy. The Strategy would need to link to the Climate Change Strategy and encourage cycle, bus and train use. Tourism would need to be promoted as the Council had a number of environmental assets that would draw people to the borough who would then spend money and enhance the local economy.

Going forward the Committee indicated that it would like to see a specific Action Plan for the strategy. It was noted that the Corporate Business Plan would set out work plans for the various Council strategies which were being drawn up. These strategies formed the core elements for the Corporate Business Plan. It was agreed that the Council should make the connections between the strategies clear to the local public.

The Committee agreed that the Council should aim to improve performance on provision of affordable housing. It was noted that affordable housing had a specific definition which might not make it really affordable to people on lower incomes and it was suggested that providing low cost accommodation should be a key aim of the Council. In promoting economic development in the borough, it was agreed that the Council should seek to act as a catalyst for growth and that it was appropriate for risk taking to be undertaken by the private sector.

A Member referred to one of the key findings in the workforce dynamics section of the strategy that was also referred to in the Runnymede Economic Assessment. This was that

in 2020, there were 4,200 people in Runnymede with no qualifications which represented 7.2% of 16 to 64 year olds in the borough which was higher than the rate for Surrey and for the United Kingdom. It was noted that the statistic of 7.2% was based on a low sample number. It was agreed that the Member would be advised of the origin of the statistic and that officers would investigate whether there was any other data available which substantiated this statistic.

**Recommend to the Full Council meeting which considers the Corporate Plan:**

**that the Runnymede Economic Development strategy for 2022 to 2026 be approved and in particular the assessment of the local economy and SWOT analysis be noted and the six priorities set out in the Strategy and the deliverables identified in Appendix 1 of the Strategy be approved.**

### **Climate Change Strategy**

The Committee considered a final draft Climate Change Strategy which had been subject to wide internal consultation amongst Members and Officers. The comments and input received had been incorporated into the Strategy and Members were pleased with the progress that had been made in developing the Strategy which was a living document which would continually be updated. Illustrations and graphics would be included in the desktop publishing of the document once the content had been finalised.

Achieving net zero carbon emissions from the Council's services and operations by 2030 would be a major challenge. It was agreed that the Council should encourage the Government and other local authorities to promote climate change and encourage the community to reduce its carbon footprint. It was suggested that Members should lead by example in reducing their carbon footprint. For example, they should seek to reduce their car use and only visit the Civic Centre by car when it was necessary to do so.

It was agreed that a delivery plan should be provided for the Strategy and that the need for achievable and measurable targets for the Strategy should be a particular priority. It was suggested that an Executive Summary should be included in the Strategy. It was noted that many of the Actions within the Strategy were outside the remit of the Council and that an essential part of the strategy concerned how the Council would work with other organisations and could seek to influence other organisations to operate green and sustainable policies.

A Member suggested that the Council should be completely paperless in producing Committee documents. It was noted that the Council Summons still had to be produced in hard copy by law and that Members could elect not to receive paper but could not be compelled not to receive paper. It was noted that if Members considered that the production of Committee documents should be entirely paperless then they should lobby their local MP for a change in the law.

It was suggested that the Southampton to London Pipeline/Esso Pipeline that was routed through Chertsey Meads should be included in the section of the Strategy entitled Partner and Stakeholder Engagement: External Projects. It was noted that the Council had obtained various environmental requirements from Esso in carrying out work on the Pipeline in Chertsey Meads including the need for sequential layers to be replaced in the same order and reseeded of trenched areas.

It was suggested that the section of the Strategy entitled Air Quality and Congestion might include mention of encouragement of vehicles to stop idling (i.e. running engines while stationary) and that the Parks and Green Spaces part of the Strategy might include a commitment for the Council to not use peat and that in particular subcontractors might be encouraged not to use peat.

Policy SD8 in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan expected development proposals of 1,000 square metres or more of additional floorspace to incorporate measures to supply a minimum of 10% of the development's energy needs from renewable and/or low carbon technologies unless it could be demonstrated with evidence that this was not feasible or viable. It was suggested that Action PP1.0 of the Strategy might be amended to include a statement that the Council would encourage developers to exceed this 10% expectation.

It was suggested that Action PPAT 1.0 might be amended to make a distinction between bicycle hire for leisure and for places of work, that food labelling might be included within Action CC 7.0 and that the Strategy might include reference to packaging standards and cup recycling. Where possible, electric charging points should be rolled out to encourage the use of electric vehicles and it was noted that all Council car parks were currently being reviewed for the potential to install charging point facilities.

The Committee supported the convening of a Citizens Panel so that the community was informed and could contribute to the climate change decision making process. It was noted that proposals for the Citizens Panel would be included in the Empowering Communities Strategy which would be submitted to the Committee's next meeting.

Action CC 1.0 related to the baseline by which performance on Climate Change would be measured. It was noted that there was no standard methodology for determining the baseline and the Council would have to create its own baseline which would be established during the course of 2022. The fact that the Council did not have a baseline at present did not hold up the other Actions in the Strategy. Many of the Key Performance Indicators (KPI)s referred to in Action CC 3.0 would be qualitative rather than quantitative so the production of a baseline would not prevent those KPIs being taken forward.

In the strategy, the Council had committed to continue to develop the 15 minute principle so that all essential services were within easy reach and accessible by public transport. It was noted that residents in Egham and Englefield Green did not live within 15 minutes travelling time if they wished to access services in Addlestone in person and noted that the Corporate Business Plan would set out proposals for community hubs to allow residents in different areas of the borough to access services more locally.

**Recommend to the Full Council meeting which considers the Corporate Plan-  
that the Draft Climate Change Strategy for Runnymede Borough Council be approved.**

### **Gender Pay Gap**

The Committee considered a report on the gender pay gap figures for Runnymede Borough Council. The purpose of the gender pay gap legislation was to encourage employers to close the pay gap between the genders. This gap arose as, in most organisations, male employees earned more than female employees and employers were required to make a series of calculations which showed the extent of the gap.

Data had been gathered, analysed and calculated for Runnymede Borough Council as at the snapshot date of 31 March 2021 as required by the Gender Pay Gap regulations. The mean gender pay gap for Runnymede was 8.44% which was a reduction on the result for the previous year which was 9.06% and represented an improvement when compared to the mean gender pay gap as at 31 March 2020. The median gender pay gap was 0.54% which had increased from the previous year when there had been no median gender pay gap. The number of women in the top pay quartile had reduced although there were a larger number of women on the Council's Senior Leadership Team. It was the impact of the number of low paid male manual workers which was helping to keep the gender pay gap relatively low for Runnymede Borough Council.

The Committee agreed that the production of a suitable action plan to encourage the gradual reduction of the gender pay gap would be considered by the HR Member Working Party.

**Resolved that –**

**the report be noted and a suitable action plan is subsequently devised to encourage the gradual reduction in the gender pay gap.**

### **Superannuation – Carers’ Policy**

The Committee considered whether it would be appropriate to amend the Carers’ Policy in respect of superannuation payments.

In May 2021, the Committee had approved a new Carers’ Policy to support employees who were Carers so that they could more easily combine this role with their employment role. It had also been agreed to consider an amendment to the policy proposed by Councillor Robert King in respect of superannuation payments based on an assessment of costs over a six month period. During this period no Carers had altered their hours and therefore instead an assessment of potential costs to the Council for employees at Grade 7, Grade 10 and SMA level for a 6 month and for a 12 month period had been considered by the Human Resources Member Working Party (HRMWP) at its meeting in March. It had been agreed at that Working Party meeting to propose an amendment to this policy to the Committee based on this exercise.

The purpose of the proposed amendment from the HRMWP was to ensure that an employee did not lose out on pension benefit as a result of reducing their hours on a temporary basis due to being a Carer. This protection was proposed for a 6 month period with any further extension being at the discretion of the employee’s line manager. The Committee noted the estimated costs to the Council that had been considered by the HRMWP. These costs would already be budgeted for on the assumption that the post was operating at full time so there would not be any additional budgetary consequences unless the Council employed a temporary member of staff to cover the reduced hours and they too wished to join the pension scheme.

Surrey Pensions who administered the pensions of staff at Runnymede Borough Council had advised that no other authorities had proposed to make this provision for their employees. They had also advised that although it was possible for an employer to pay additional contributions for an employee for a period of time, an Additional Pension contribution contract in respect of that employee would be required and that under the Pension Regulations an employee could only make additional contributions for themselves for a minimum of one year. Therefore if the Committee wished to change the Policy on the basis suggested by the HRMWP, where the employee made matching contributions, then Runnymede would need to support the difference for the employer’s side contribution for one year and not six months. Accordingly, officers had produced revised wording to reflect supporting the difference for one year.

The Committee noted that members of all the political groups on the HRMWP had supported the change to the Policy and the Committee approved the revised wording to reflect supporting the difference for one year subject to the addition of a sentence stating that any extension of this arrangement would be at the discretion of the Corporate Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development. The HRMWP had recommended that any extension of the arrangement would be at the discretion of the employee’s manager but the Committee agreed that it would be appropriate for any extension to be at the discretion of the Corporate Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development to provide a consistent approach across the organisation.

**Resolved that –**

**paragraph 7 of the Carers’ Policy be amended to read as follows:-**

**“Where an employee reduces their hours as a consequence of being a Carer on either a temporary or a permanent basis, the difference between the employers’ superannuation contribution on a full-time salary and on the reduced hours will be paid by the Council for the first year subject to the employee also bearing the difference in employee contribution cost for a minimum of one year (which is required under the provisions of the Local Government Pension Scheme). Any extension of this arrangement for a further year will be at the discretion of the Corporate Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development.”**

**Proposed Letting At Addlestone One**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report seeking approval for the proposed letting of a commercial unit in the Addlestone One development. The details of the proposed business operation and the proposed outline terms for the letting were noted. The Committee commended officers on bringing this proposal forward which would enhance the development and increase footfall and approved the outline terms for the unit. The Committee agreed that delegated authority be given to finalise and sign off the completed deal as set out in resolution i) below. The Committee approved the capital contribution required for the fit out of the unit and noted that the sum required was in line with the post Covid market. The arrangements for the financial vetting of the letting were noted by the Committee.

**Resolved that –**

- i) the outline terms in the report which are agreed for the letting of the commercial unit in the Addlestone One development as reported to the business as reported be approved and delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council to finalise and sign off the completed deal; and**
- ii) a capital contribution be approved for fit out works in the sum reported to be funded from the Addlestone One development budget held in the Capital Programme.**

**Proposed Management Agreement For Land**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report setting out the main terms proposed for a Management Agreement for land. A Highways improvements scheme to the local road network would remove grassland and woodland from a parcel of land in Runnymede and in return it was proposed that Runnymede would enter into a Management Agreement with an organisation as reported for that organisation to provide grassland and woodland in another parcel of land in the borough for the time period reported.

The parcel of land which had been identified on which the organisation would provide grassland and woodland was noted by the Committee. The ongoing working relationship which the organisation would have with the Council's Green Spaces Team and the ecological benefits which would result on this land were also noted by the Committee. It was noted that the Highways improvements scheme to the local road network was essential for Runnymede's Local Plan to be delivered and it was agreed that entering into the Management Agreement would represent the best option available to Runnymede associated with securing those improvements.

The organisation would carry out the works specified in their Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) on this land. As the LEMP had not yet been provided it was agreed that authority to finalise the terms particularly relating to the LEMP be delegated to officers as set out in resolution ii) below.

**Resolved that -**

- i) a Management Agreement be granted for the time period reported to the organisation reported to facilitate the Highways improvements reported; and**
- ii) the authority to finalise the terms particularly relating to the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan be delegated to the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive in consultation with the Corporate Head of Assets and Regeneration.**

**Financial Update On The Construction Of Magna Square**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee noted an update on the construction spend of the Magna Square development in Egham and noted progress on the delivery of the development. It was envisaged that the project would be completed within the budget sum allocated. The Committee commended officers on the scheme which represented a blueprint for other developments within the borough.

**Loan Agreement For RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report recommending the adjustment of the purchase price discount rate associated with Magna Square properties which were subject to the loan agreement to RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd (RBCI) approved by Full Council on 26 January 2022. This was necessary to reflect the market changes which had been verified by the Council's independent valuers.

At its meeting on 25 November 2021, the Committee had considered a report containing a proposal that the Council enter into an agreement to provide a further loan to RBCI which was a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) that had been set up to acquire and manage residential investment property for letting in the private rented sector.

The Magna Square (formerly known as Egham Gateway) development report presented to

the Committee in February 2020 had set out the agreement for RBCI to take on private residential units in the new development. This was required in order for the residential units to be let as Private Rented Sector units with Assured Shorthold Tenancies. In order to achieve this, a new loan agreement was required to enable the company to buy the units from the Council.

The Committee had recommended to Full Council the approval of the execution of a loan facility agreement between the Council and RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd for the purchase of residential units in the Magna Square development at up to the sum reported to be repaid over a time period as reported. This recommendation had been agreed by Full Council on 26 January 2022.

When it had considered this matter on 25 November 2021, the Committee had noted that the valuations and anticipated market rents were being reviewed to ensure that the original assumptions were still viable for RBCI to take on the loan and that should there be a need to review any of these details a further report would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

The Committee was advised that the Council's independent external valuers had informed officers that market factors had changed significantly since the original purchase price discount rate had been agreed and that reduced rental income was now predicted. As a result of these reductions, RBCI were now seeking an increase in the purchase price discount rate to ensure that the company remained viable once the residential accommodation was purchased. This increase would be in line with the current market practice. The financial and legal implications of this adjustment were noted. This increase would make the scheme affordable to RBCI but would have the effect of reducing the loan value, reducing the interest payments and reducing the investment income to the Council.

The Committee agreed to recommend that this adjustment be made and to recommend that a supplementary revenue estimate be approved to account for the reduced investment income to the Council which would result from the adjustment.

**Recommend to Full Council on 28 April 2022 that –**

- i) the purchase price discount rate that forms part of the loan facility agreement between the Council and RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd for the purchase of residential units in the Magna Square development be adjusted from the percentage reported to the percentage reported thereby reducing the loan facility agreement from the sum reported to the sum reported; and**
- ii) a supplementary revenue estimate be agreed in the sum reported to account for the reduced investment income to the Council resulting from the lower amount loaned to RBC Investments (Surrey) Ltd.**

**Investment Property – Rent Arrears**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report relating to irrecoverable rent arrears requiring write off approval, Covid period rent concessions and peaceable re-entry to obtain possession of an asset when all other avenues had been exhausted.



The Committee approved the write off of bad debts in the sum reported set out in paragraph 2.4 of the report and noted the reasons for the write off of these bad debts. The Committee also noted and agreed the Covid period rent concessions under the Commercial Rent (Coronavirus) Act 2022 set out in paragraph 3.7 of the report, the other sums which were likely to be irrecoverable to some extent as set out in paragraph 5.2 of the report and the total potential loss of income set out in paragraph 5.3 of the report.

The total potential loss of income equated to a small proportion of the Council's overall income from its investment property portfolio and spanned several years. The Committee was pleased to note that the Council was collecting a higher proportion of its rental income than the national average and commended officers on the collection performance.

The Council as landlord had the legal right to re-enter a commercial property where a tenant was in breach by non-payment of rent and to take possession of that property by a process known as peaceable re-entry. The Committee noted the circumstances under which peaceable re-entry was allowed and where it might be beneficial to a landlord. In view of the sensitivity associated with this course of action, the Committee approved the approach to be taken if peaceable re-entry was proposed by officers as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report.

It was agreed that officers would assess the commercial feasibility of the Council entering into a scheme for Council employees with one of the organisations that had received a Covid period rent concession and that Members would be advised of the findings of the assessment.

#### **Resolved that –**

- i) the write off of the bad debts as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the report be approved;**
- ii) the Covid period rent concessions, as set out in paragraph 3.7 of the report, that are in accordance with the principles of the Commercial Rent (Coronavirus) Act 2022, be noted and agreed; and**
- iii) the principle of peaceable re-entry for obtaining possession of the Council's commercial property be approved and delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council to ensure appropriate due process is followed with part of the process involving officers liaising confidentially with Ward Members where the property in question is located in their Ward to ensure complete transparency.**

#### **Community Services Structure**

The Committee considered proposed changes to the Council's Community Services structure.

A restructuring of Community Services had been completed earlier in the year under which Community Development functions had been absorbed into the unit. The services provided by Community Services had expanded and the unit was looking to evolve further to provide services which had a high social value as well as generating income for the Council.

This increased spread of operational and strategic delivery had led to the requirement for the appointment of a Deputy Head of Community Services, a regrading of the Parks and Open Space Manager post to a Community and Open Space Development Manager post in view of the larger parks and open spaces service and a Policy and Projects Officer. Minor

savings had been identified in the unit which resulted in the requirement for a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum reported to facilitate these changes.

The Committee approved these proposals noting that increased income would be generated for the Council in the future by ensuring that the business unit could function to full capacity by making these changes.

**Resolved that –**

**the changes/additions to the structure of Community Services be approved and an ongoing supplementary revenue estimate be agreed in the sum reported.**

**Law and Governance Service Review 2021-22**

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered the final revised proposals for the Council's Legal Services business unit, further to consultation with staff and UNISON and updates on the recruitment of staff in Democratic Services and Election Services.

At its meeting on 20 January 2022, the Committee had considered a report on a service review of the Council's Law and Governance Business Centre. The review contained proposals in respect of three of the Teams within Law and Governance – Democratic Services, Elections Services and Legal Services. Further to the voluntary early retirement of two existing officers, the Committee had agreed to create two new posts of Head of Democratic Services and Deputy Head of Democratic Services. The Committee noted the progress which had been made in recruiting to both of these posts. The Committee had also agreed the funding required for a new Elections Assistant post to be added to the Elections Team. The Committee was advised that recruitment to this post had been put on hold until after the forthcoming local election.

At its meeting on 20 January 2022, the Committee had also approved a series of proposed new Legal posts which were required to support the Council's property management and procurement activities which were core Legal services fundamental to the delivery of the Council's functions and financial well-being. The Committee had agreed that a staff consultation be commenced regarding the proposed changes and that UNISON be consulted on the changes. As a result of the staff consultation, there were some changes to the proposals for the Legal Services business unit.

The proposed changes arising from the consultation in respect of Legal Services included not proceeding with two Legal Support Officer posts on the basis that the tasks that those officers would have carried out could be undertaken by existing staff. This resulted in the retention of a post that had been proposed to be deleted in the report to the Committee on 20 January 2022 and the regradings, additional hours and revised Job Descriptions as set out in resolutions vi) and vii) below. The savings created by these changes could be repurposed to increasing the hours of two of the newly created posts without requiring any additional budget. The Committee noted a revised structure for the Legal Services Team. One existing post was now proposed to be deleted. It was also proposed to enter into a Service Level Agreement with an external legal service provider as set out in resolution viii) below. The Committee noted the legal and environmental/sustainability/biodiversity implications of these proposals and an Equality Screening Assessment for the proposed changes in the Legal Services business unit.

The Committee gave detailed consideration to UNISON comments on the Legal Services Review and officers advised Members on the reasoning for the revised proposals which were now being put forward and on the consultation process which had been followed. Having considered the responses of officers, the Committee approved the final revised proposals for the Council's Legal Services business unit.

- i) the revised changes to the establishment list as set out in paragraph 2.10 of the report be approved;**
- ii) commencement of the external recruitment exercise be authorised to appoint to the following newly created and regraded existing posts:**
  - a. Posts D0046 and D0047 Principal Solicitors (Property) (2 posts) (at grade SMA plus MFS);**
  - b. New Principal Solicitor (Contracts) (at grade SMA);**
  - c. Post D0048 Senior Solicitor (Contracts) (at grade MMB);**
- iii) the post as reported be deleted from the current establishment list;**
- iv) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved in the sum reported for redundancy payments and pension strain costs payable further to the deletion of the post referred to at resolution iii) above;**
- v) the post as reported be retained and the proposed posts of Legal Support Officer (Property) and Legal Support Officer not be proceeded with;**
- vi) the revised salary grading of the two existing posts as reported to the grades reported be approved and the additional hours per week of one of those posts be agreed as reported;**
- vii) it be noted that the Corporate Head of Law and Governance in consultation with the Corporate Head of Human Resources will approve the revised Job Descriptions for the officers mentioned in recommendation vi) above; and**
- viii) delegated authority be given to the Corporate Head of Law and Governance further to consulting the Chief Executive to enter into a Service Level Agreement with the legal service provider as reported to take on the legal work as reported from the date as reported.**

(The meeting ended at 10.12.p.m.)

Chairman