WITHAM FOURTH DISTRICT INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the **Board** at a Meeting held at 47 Norfolk Street on **Wednesday 22 March 2023**

Present: -

Messrs: T. Ashton A. Hall

Mrs. P Ashleigh-Morris C. Hardy R. Austin A. Harrison

P. Bedford P. Richardson (Chairman)

B. Bowles A. Saul
C. Crunkhorn K. Smith
(Vice-Chairman) J. Ward
J. Grant J. Woods

1 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies had been received from R Hall-Jones

2. DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON STRATEGIC OPTIONS PAPER

The Chairman made an opening statement about the paper that had been circulated to all Board Members outlining several possible options. He stressed that the meeting was arranged to discuss whether the Board should go down the shared services route with a neighbouring consortium, or to remain fully independent and make changes to the senior management team, when the current Chief Executive retires.

He explained that the shared services model would only be for office-based staff with accountancy, engineering, and technical services expertise and as such, this would only account for around 15% of the Board's current annual budget.

A question arose regarding the attendance of the Board's Officers at the meeting and after discussion it was agreed that both the Chief Executive and the Chief Engineer should remain in the meeting.

2.1 Board discussions

The Chief Executive went through the options paper with Board Members to ensure they were familiar with the paper and the appendices. The Chairman then asked Members for their comments:

A Saul - asked if the Chief Engineer would be interested in being considered for the Chief Executive role in the future and he confirmed that this was always his

ambition.

J. Woods - believed that with the challenging capital programme ahead of us and a new

Engineering Manager arriving soon, the Board were currently in the right

place to deliver this as an independent Board.

J. Grant - questioned the benefits that shared services would deliver as he was

concerned about the loss of focus in a shared services model. The Chief Engineer said it was about having better resilience through a larger pool of

staff, specialising in the tasks we need.

C. Hardy - asked if there would be any staff redundancies under shared services? The

Chief Executive said not, as there were a number of vacancies across the Boards currently in the shared services model, this would actually present

opportunities for our staff, rather than presenting a risk.

R. Austin - gave the comparison of the shared services model currently operated by the

three district councils in South Lincolnshire, which he said was working well

and a bigger team was proving invaluable.

T. Ashton

- shared his thoughts on the current shared services model from his perspective as a Board Member of one of the other Boards. Despite this, he felt that our strength was having people close to the ground, rather than being remote. He felt that, as we are one of the largest Boards, we have the resilience to stay fully independent. We have a huge amount of work ahead of us and we need our own team fully focused on this. As a result, he would struggle to support a move to shared services. The Chairman said the financial efficiencies of joining a shared services model were important as we also have a £3 to 5M dredging programme to fund.

A Saul

- agreed with Mr Ashton's comments and felt we should stay as we are.

P Bedford

 said he also had experience of the council's shared services model which he felt was not an improvement as it takes much longer to get an answer from officers. The CEO is isolated so he could not see the benefit of a shared services model.

K Smith

 also agreed with Mr Ashton's comments and felt that the Board is large enough to understand our area and deliver the large projects we have.
 Would shared services eventually lead to a full merger? He could not see the logic in officers travelling further to do their jobs, so he does not see shared services as the way forward.

A Harrison

- said this was not the first time working with other Boards had been discussed by the Board and we have always decided that staying independent was the way forward.

B Bowles

- Thought that shared services work better when you join with like-minded people and for him, the neighbouring Boston Board would be the best solution. But we have done OK staying independent, and we should remain so.

P Ashleigh Morris

- stated that if it isn't broke, don't fix it. She had experience of the local council model and some things worked well, and some didn't. She therefore felt that staying an independent Board was important and perhaps explore moving offices to save money,

C Crunkhorn

- said that resilience was the key thing for him and that shared services would give this as we currently rely on a very small team in the office. There is more and more work being pushed at the Board and the Chief Engineer needs to have a specialist team under them so that they do not spend time dealing with minutia. We are embarking on a £51m programme of work, so the risk of losing one key member of the team makes improving resilience even more important

A Hall

- felt the debate was good and we should stay independent and focussed

J Woods

 said a smaller team has more togetherness and savings on paper do not always materialise.

2.2 Board Decision

The Chairman felt that everyone had been given the opportunity to discuss the option of moving to a shared services model and therefore asked Members to vote. A show of hands was taken and 87% of the Members present, voted against pursuing a shared services model.

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman thanked Members for their time today and confirmed there was no other business and the meeting concluded at 3.40pm.

Chairman