

# **Council Meeting**

22nd February, 2005

## **Booklet 4**

Recommendations

### **INDEX TO MINUTES**

	Page Nos.
Cabinet	
11th January, 2005	

#### **CABINET**

#### 11th January 2005

**Cabinet Members** 

Present:- Councillor Blundell

Councillor Foster
Councillor Matchet
Councillor H Noonan
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Ridley

Councillor Ahmed

Councillor Taylor (Chair)

Non-Voting Opposition

Representatives present:- Councillor Benefield

Councillor Duggins Councillor Mutton Councillor Nellist

Employees Present:-

J. Bolton (Director of Social Services and Housing)

M. Bonathan (Education and Libraries Directorate)

N. Clews (City Development Directorate)

F. Collingham (Chief Executive's Directorate)
M. Collins (Chief Executive's Directorate)

H. Drummond (Chief Executive's Directorate)

R. Edwardson (Director of Education and Libraries)

C. Hinde (Director of Legal and Democratic Services)

R. Hughes (Head of Corporate Policy)

S. Iannantuoni (Chief Executive's Directorate)

L. Knight (Legal and Democratic Services Directorate)

S. Manzie (Chief Executive)

J. McGuigan (Director of City Development)

J. Parry (Education and Libraries Directorate)

A. Ridgwell (Director of Finance and ICT)

S. Rudge (Social Services and Housing Directorate)

S. Sampson (Education and Libraries Directorate)

R. Snow (Education and Libraries Directorate)

#### **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Arrowsmith.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### 132. Asset Management Plan

The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of City Development, which sought approval to the 2004 Asset Management Plan, prior to its submission to the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM).

Until 2002, all authorities were required to prepare and submit an annual Asset Management Plan (AMP) to their Government Office. In 2003, only those authorities which had failed to achieve a 'good' score for their AMP were required to submit documents. Coventry was in that position, having achieved a 'satisfactory' score for its 2002 document, and duly submitted an AMP in July 2003. The 2003 AMP was also scored as 'satisfactory', although the Cabinet noted that the Council were only one point away from achieving a 'good' score.

Government Offices use a strict scoring criteria to assess whether AMP's are poor, satisfactory or good. Those making the assessment are not surveyors and simply check the AMP against their scoring criteria. It is therefore vital that the plan clearly identifies how each of the criteria has been met.

The Council is now one of a small number of authorities who have yet to achieve a 'good' score for its AMP and has been asked to submit a revised document to GOWM by January 2005. Following discussion with GOWM over the criteria which the Council had failed to meet in its 2003 AMP, the document has been reviewed and updated. A draft document has been sent to GOWM for comment, and further changes were made following comments received. Based on GOWM's initial response, the document should now receive a 'good' score.

Given the approach by GOWM to the assessment of the AMP, certain changes have been made to the content of the document. In particular, specific references to the Council's processes and properties have been removed, as these are not relevant to the limited purpose for which the document is required, i.e., as a statement of how the Council has or has not met the strict scoring criteria laid down by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and enforced by GOWM. The changes and improvements that the Council is making in its approach to strategic asset management have been highlighted, which give GOWM confidence that the Council is becoming a 'good' authority in respect of asset management. A scoring matrix was attached as an appendix to the report submitted, and clearly shows where each of the scoring criteria have been evidenced.

The document is not intended to be a hands on strategy to set out how the Council manages its property, although it does do this in part. The Council needs to go beyond the limited scope of an AMP and develop a Corporate Property Strategy, which will achieve this aim. A copy of the Asset Management Plan was attached as an appendix to the report.

The Cabinet Member (Health and Housing) indicated that paragraph 6.22 of the report submitted did not accurately reflect the current position and should therefore be amended prior to consideration by the Council.

RESOLVED that the Council be recommended to approve the 2004 Asset Management Plan.

