

SUBJECT:	Creation of an Assets Officer, Estates
MEETING:	Individual Cabinet Member
DATE:	23rd May 2018
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:	All

1. PURPOSE:

To seek approval to the deletion of the Assets Graduate Surveyor Role and the creation of a new Assets Officer.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 To agree to the deletion of the Assets Graduate Officer
- 2.2 To agree to the creation of a new Assets Officer role within the Estates Team.
- 2.3 Development Graduate Surveyor role to be established as a full time post.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1 A restructure of the Estates team was implemented in April 2017 to accommodate budget mandate savings and as a result the team was split into Assets and Development. The Assets team retaining responsibility for the day to day management of the Council's operational and investment portfolio. The team consists of the Principal Valuer, Assets Officer and Graduate Assets Officer.
- 3.2 The Graduate role has not been filled and workload levels continue to escalate as annual income targets increase. As a result it has been concluded that the team needs additional expertise from a qualified chartered surveyor and not that of a trainee.
- 3.3 The Development Graduate Surveyor is currently a part time role and vacant. It is proposed that this be varied to a full time role to assist in the delivery of the council's development sites and aspirations.
- 3.4 The proposals will result in an increase of £10,592, which will be funded through additional income generation and will not require an uplift to the core revenue budget.

4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Option	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workloads will have to be prioritised, with non urgent or revenue generating work being 	This is not a feasible option given the increased requirement to generate revenue

Option	Benefits	Risks	Comments
		<p>push backed or stopped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unacceptable workload resulting in stress or sickness absences. • Complaints from Services and Public, resulting in reputational damage. 	and capital to support the Council's priorities
Commission external consultants to assist with workload	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects would be completed allowing us to maximise revenue and capital generation. • Can provide additional skill sets and capacity not present within existing team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased costs as cost of consultants likely to be higher than that of in-house provision. • No legacy involvement and will not be aware of political and community constraints / concerns. • Will create a workload for Estates team commissioning and managing consultants 	Where consultants can provide additional skill sets, this would be an appropriate solution, e.g. the expert advice being provided around the possible acquisition of investment properties. This however is not a suitable long term solution for managing workload issues and not the preferred option.
Create additional capacity within the Estates team through creation of an Additional Asset Officer and re-designation of Graduate role from 0.60 to 100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will create additional capacity enabling the team to manage growing workloads and manage services that have transferred to Estates with no resources, e.g. management of the allotments. • Provides flexibility within the team to manage peak demands, sickness, holiday absences etc. • Mitigates existing pressures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will result in an additional income target of £10,592 to be generated from the existing portfolio. 	The preferred option as it builds internal capacity and resilience.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA

See Appendix 1

6. REASONS:

6.1 The Estates Service undertakes the strategic management of the Councils land and property, markets and cemeteries. In 18/19 the Service has a net revenue income target of £1,300,257 and a capital receipts target of £10,415,000.

6.2 The table below highlights the present and proposed costs.

Present	scp	Salary	On costs	Total
Assets Officer x 1	37 - 41	37,107	12,184	49,291
Graduate Assets Officer	29 - 33	29,909	9,589	39,498
Development Graduate Surveyor	29 - 33	17,945	5,753	23,698
Agency Staff				15,000
				127,487
Proposed				
Assets Officer *2	37 - 41	74,214	24,367	98,581
Development Graduate Surveyor	29 - 33	29,909	9,589	39,498
				138,079
			Difference	-10,592

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

7.1 The proposal will result in a net cost of £10,592. This will be met through increased income and will be cost neutral to the authority.

8. WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS IMPLICATIONS (INCORPORATING EQUALITIES, SUSTAINABILITY, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING):

This report seeks approval for a re-structure and will not impact negatively on the services provided and as such a Future Generations Evaluation is not considered necessary for this report. The proposal does not have any safeguarding or corporate parenting implications.

9. CONSULTEES:

SLT
Cabinet
Head of Legal Services
S151 Monitoring Officer

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Appendix 1 Evaluation Criteria

11. AUTHOR:

Debra Hill-Howells Head of Commercial and Integrated Landlord Services

12. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01633 644281
E-mail: debrahill-howells@monmouthshire.gov.uk

**Appendix 1
Cabinet Member Decisions & Council**

Evaluation Criteria – Cabinet, Individual

Title of Report:	Creation of an Assets Officer Post, Estate
Date decision was made:	23rd May 2018
Report Author:	Debra Hill-Howells

What will happen as a result of this decision being approved by Cabinet or Council?
Amendments to the Estates structure
12 month appraisal
Improved service delivery

What benchmarks and/or criteria will you use to determine whether the decision has been successfully implemented?
Successful appointment of Assets Officer and Graduate Development Surveyor
12 month appraisal
<i>Paint a picture of what has happened since the decision was implemented. Give an overview of how you fared against the criteria. What worked well, what didn't work well. The reasons why you might not have achieved the desired level of outcome. Detail the positive outcomes as a direct result of the decision. If something didn't work, why didn't it work and how has that effected implementation.</i>

What is the estimate cost of implementing this decision or, if the decision is designed to save money, what is the proposed saving that the decision will achieve?
The additional salary costs £10,592
12 month appraisal
<i>Give an overview of whether the decision was implemented within the budget set out in the report or whether the desired amount of savings was realised. If not, give a brief overview of the reasons why and what the actual costs/savings were.</i>

Any other comments
