

## HYBRID COMMITTEE MEETINGS OPTIONS APPRAISAL

### Background

It was previously agreed that the meetings of full Council in May and June would take place in-person at a temporary chamber in Angus House.

It was also agreed that specialist IT (Information Technology) equipment be hired at an estimated cost of £7,000 to allow the May and June 2022 meetings to be live streamed on the Council's YouTube channel, and recorded, enabling the public to continue to view Council meetings.

Members asked at the 10 March 2022 Council meeting, for consideration to be given to the use of locations other than the Council Chambers to host meetings, including the possible use of both Town & County Hall and Angus House or both, as well as the possibility of 'roaming' meetings visiting different locations in the County. Proposals for the longer-term strategy on meeting arrangements were being drawn together by the Director of HR, OD, Digital Enablement, IT and Business Support for consideration at the June 2022 meeting of the Council. These proposals include options for holding hybrid meetings to accommodate elected members' competing demands and alternate venues to be determined by the new Council.

The annual number of meetings that need to be accommodated varies according to the business of the Council, with ten Council meetings and commonly eight or nine meetings of each of the six Committees, giving in the order of 60 to 70 meetings a year.

This report provides an appraisal of various options to enable the Council to determine the future of Council and Committee meetings. Four options have been appraised for Audio/Visual solutions (Options 1 to 4) combined with four options (Options A to D) for physical locations to site those Audio-Visual solutions and finally an additional option (E) to consider hosting Full Council meetings around various locations in Angus. The various Audio-Visual options and Physical Location options are then assessed for compatibility and a number of compatible options are then recommended.

The following Options Appraisal seeks to follow the principles set out in our Options Appraisal Guidance (November 2021). The appraisal is considered to be proportionate to the scale of the project, the public interest in the project and the financial consequences to the Council. For the avoidance of doubt the options appraisal is intended to guide, inform and support members in reaching a decision on this matter.

### Strategic Vision & Objectives

The objective for this appraisal is to assist members to determine the future of hybrid committee meetings. The various options for both Audio Visual solutions and physical locations to deliver this objective are set against the Council's priorities and Strategy on a Page (SOAP) as set out in the Council Plan 2022-2025 approved at the Special Angus Council meeting on 3 March 2022 as:

Priorities –

- 1. Economy: Angus to be a go-to place for business**
- 2. People: To maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities**
- 3. Place: Our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens**
- 4. Our Council: Angus Council to be efficient and effective**

**Strategy on a Page which focuses on the themes of Raise – Create – Reduce – Eliminate.**

It is considered that the options being assessed can contribute to all four priorities and our Strategy on a Page work as outlined below and are scored accordingly as part of the assessment:

**Priorities-**

**1: Economy:**

**We want Angus to be a 'go-to' area for businesses**

- support business and economic growth by improving the physical and digital infrastructure.

**2: People**

**We want to maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities**

- work collaboratively for and with our citizens to keep them safe in resilient communities.
- reduce social isolation and loneliness.
- offer our citizens a range of opportunities to help them achieve their potential and to reduce poverty.

### 3: Place

#### We want our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens

- continue to reduce the council's carbon footprint with the aim of reducing our net carbon emissions to zero by 2045.
- engage with citizens and communities to deliver the right services in the right place at the right time.

### 4: Our council

#### We want Angus Council to be efficient and effective

- listen to the needs of our customers and by working for and with them deliver better public value
- support and challenge our workforce for the future based on our values to help us to achieve our vision and deliver our priorities
- identify any further opportunities for efficiencies in revenue budget
- identify efficiencies in capital spend through end-to-end review of programme and projects
- continue the rationalisation of our property

#### Strategy on a Page (SOAP) –

- Reduce the impact of climate change by being a major contributor to achieving Scotland's national climate change goals, as leaders in clean growth, environmental stewardship and sustainability. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 3 Place.**
- Reduce unnecessary duplication and focus on areas of greatest need. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 4 Our Council**
- Reduce unnecessary bureaucracy wherever it is found, and it is legally permissible to do so. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 4 Our Council**
- Eliminate inefficiencies within activities, making the best use of resources and technologies, leading to a higher level of consistency and productivity. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 4 Our Council**
- Raise the quality of customer service through developing communication channels, underpinned by technology, which continue to provide opportunities for people to engage. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 3 Place.**
- Raise and promote the wellbeing and safety of communities and the workforce. **This will be considered in the appraisal as part of priority 2 People.**

#### Assessing the Options

The appraisal will assess each of the options against the following agreed objectives:

- Impact on Economy: Angus is a go to place for business.
- Impact on People: Maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities.
- Impact on Place: We want our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens
- Impact on our council: Angus Council is efficient and effective
- Risk

Each objective is scored on a scale between 0-10. A rating of '0' is a complete failure to deliver an objective, whilst '10' would indicate that an option delivers an objective in full.

For the objectives which are qualitative the scoring is compared across the options and graded according to the scale of the impact. For the quantitative data the impacts are graded by the scale of the revenue, capital and carbon impacts.

The score against the objectives are weighted on the following basis

Objective	Weighting
Impact on Economy: Angus is a go to place for business	10
Impact on People: Maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities.	20
Impact on Place: We want our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens	10
Impact on our council: Angus Council is efficient and effective	20
Carbon Implications	10
Financial Implications	20

Risk	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

Option	Summary
<b>Audio Visual Solutions</b>	
1	Continue with remote meetings only
2	Utilise existing audio and video capabilities currently available in meeting rooms in Council office buildings.
3	Procure audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources.
4	Procure a fully managed audio/video solution delivered and managed by a third party.
<b>Physical Location for Audio Visual solution</b>	
A	Have no physical location
B	Operate from Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall
C	Operate from Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)
D	Operate from Angus House for full Council Committee and Municipal Buildings/Town & County Hall for all other democratic functions.
<b>Additional Option</b>	
	Additional option of roaming Full Council only meeting at various locations across Angus.

### Option 1 Audio Visual Solutions - Continue with remote meetings

This option retains the current processes around meetings where all attendance is remote through individual Teams sessions. While this suggests remote access at home it could also include situations where a member can come into an individual quiet space within a council office and join the meetings through Teams there on their laptop. This could be advantageous where a members' network connectivity at home is poor or unreliable, or where disruption at home may impact their ability to fully concentrate on meeting proceedings.

#### Advantages

- Limited travel costs
- Reliable performance for members coming into an office where their home network connectivity is poor

#### Disadvantages

- Reduced opportunity for members to physically meet together in a dedicated space or have a dedicated chamber
- Remains dependant on YouTube with which we have no official contract for streaming and hosting
- Video and audio quality for attendees and the public watching will continue to be dependent on members network and home setup
- No change to the streaming method means that Business Support staff still need to be available for each meeting, and require additional software to perform the streaming
- No change to the recording method means that the meeting papers and recordings remain on different sites and are not linked, making navigation and viewing difficult for the public
- Public cannot attend council or committee meetings in person. The option to have remote meetings was never intended when introduced in statute to permanently replace in-person meetings.

#### Financial Implications

##### Capital Costs

There are no capital costs to deliver this option

##### Revenue Costs

This option would offer estimated savings of up to £20,000 per annum based on previous members travel expenses for committee meetings pre-COVID

#### Carbon Implications

This option could reduce emissions equivalent 12,390kgCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum compared to previous travel based on assumed average emissions relative to previous mileage. Actual emissions avoided would depend on individual member circumstances.

#### Risk

- Continued reliance on extra software to stream meetings could lead to disruption of meetings if the streamer's laptop or software fails during a meeting
- Disruption of members' network connectivity or device failure will impact their ability to contribute to meeting proceedings

**Option 2 Audio Visual Solutions - Use currently available audio and video capabilities for hybrid meetings within existing meetings rooms**

Work has progressed to design and pilot hybrid meeting options within offices for council officers. This allows multiple attendees to attend a physical meeting space without the need for each attendee to join the Teams meeting to be seen and heard. These systems have been successful for meetings in small and medium sized rooms but limited to up to 8 attendees only.

**Advantages**

- This equipment is already in place so there is no work to deliver this solution
- Any development or upgrades to equipment to facilitate other council hybrid meetings in future would naturally be available for committee meetings at no further cost
- This offers a temporary space for specific meetings allowing limited members to meet in person

**Disadvantages**

- This equipment is designed to manage up to 8 physical attendees which will not be sufficient if many members intend to come into Angus House for meetings
- Video and audio quality is not as good as other options which use separate cameras, audio and mics
- The committee services host, a council officer or member would have to connect to the equipment and act as the Teams output for the room. They would require software installed and configured
- Using a shared hybrid meeting space runs a risk that a previous meeting organiser or attendee could change the configuration in some way. This could disrupt participation for multiple members so would require testing prior to meetings and arrangements for IT and Facilities Management services to be available to resolve any issues
- Remains dependant on YouTube with which we have no official contract for streaming and hosting
- No change to the streaming method means that Business Support staff still need to be available for each meeting, and require additional software to perform the streaming
- No change to the recording method means that the meeting papers and recordings remain on different sites and are not linked, making navigation and viewing difficult for the public

**Financial Implications**

**Capital Cost**

There are no capital costs to deliver this option

**Revenue Cost**

This option could offer savings estimated between £10,000 and £15,000 per annum based on previous members travel expenses for Council/Committee meetings pre-COVID and based on the assumption that 25% of members will attend in person all council and committee meetings. Actual savings would be dependent on how many members decided to come into these meetings rooms and how often.

**Carbon Implications**

This option could reduce emissions equivalent to 8,170kgCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum compared to previous travel subject to the same assumptions and caveats as noted in option 1.

**Risk**

- Continued reliance on extra software to stream meetings could lead to disruption of meetings if the streamer's laptop or software fails during a meeting
- Any configuration issues or device failure with the meeting room equipment would impact all attendees in that room

**Option 3 Audio Visual Solutions - Procure audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources**

This option would procure the services of an external audio/video supplier to design a solution suitable to deliver Council/Committee meetings within a purposely fitted dedicated space. This solution would include strategically placed cameras, dedicated wireless microphones, an audio system and display screens to allow in-person attendance as well as remote attendees.

Attendees meeting in person could still use Teams with audio/mic/video turned off to use the raise hand functionality, allowing responses to questions and comments to be managed along with remote attendees.

Streaming of meetings would still be delivered through existing means to YouTube, but there may be an option to reduce resources by streaming direct from the dedicated location.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dedicated system would be pre-configured with correct settings which would not need to be changed, nor would they be changed to cater for any other type of meeting</li> <li>Separately mounted cameras would be strategically placed to offer the best coverage of the room, being able to focus and zoom on the active speaker very precisely and deliver excellent quality video. An audio system and individual push-to-talk microphones would also ensure excellent quality audio for remote attendees and livestream viewers</li> <li>Specialised hardware included with the solution would reduce the complexity of streaming which is currently performed by separate software and can be prone to issues when Teams updates. This also requires substantial resources from the Business Support team who need to be present for each meeting to perform the streaming to YouTube</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee Services host would have to be present in the chambers to operate the hardware device which manages the meeting livestream, regardless of whether any members or officers were physically present</li> <li>Remains dependant on YouTube with which we have no official contract for streaming and hosting</li> <li>No change to the streaming method means that Business Support staff still need to be available for each meeting, and require additional software to perform the streaming</li> <li>No change to the recording method means that the meeting papers and recordings remain on different sites and are not linked, making navigation and viewing difficult for the public</li> <li>Replacement / repair costs for equipment in future years</li> </ul>

**Financial Implications** - Exact costs for this option would be dependent on the chosen location

**Capital Cost**

Costs to purchase, install and configure equipment for this option would be an estimated £48,000. Actual costs would be dependent on a site survey of the chosen location.

**Revenue Cost**

This option could offer savings estimated between £10,000 and £15,000 per annum based on previous members travel expenses for Council/Committee meetings pre-COVID and based on the assumption that 25% of members will attend in person all council and committee meetings. Actual savings would be dependent on how many members decided to come into meetings rooms rather than attend remotely

Annual costs to support this option would be £3,500; giving a net ongoing revenue saving of between £6,500 and £11,500. The net saving could be higher if the frequency of member attendance at committee meetings in person is lower than assumed.

**Carbon Implications**

This option could reduce emissions equivalent 4,088kgCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum compared to previous travel

<p><b>Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued reliance on extra software to stream meetings could lead to disruption of meetings if the streamer's laptop or software fails during a meeting</li> <li>Any configuration issues or device failure with the meeting room equipment would impact all attendees in that room</li> </ul>					
<p><b>Option 4 Audio Visual Solutions - Procure a fully managed audio/video solution delivered and managed by the third party</b></p> <p>Dedicated solutions for a fully managed service provided by external suppliers were described in a previous paper to the Angus Council in Report 211/21. These solutions would provide the same audio/video functionality as Option 3, with multiple cameras, dedicated microphones, audio capability and display screens to show remote attendees.</p> <p>Like Option 3, attendees could still join the Teams meeting with audio and video disabled to allow the use of the options to raise and lower hands when required.</p> <p>As well as providing a dedicated solution for the audio/video and streaming/recording, this solution also provides additional functionality for hosting Council/Committee papers on a web site that streams the meeting and stores recordings. This ties in with the recordings to allow public viewers to go directly to specific agenda items and view the relevant papers while accessing the recording of that specific item. For longer meetings this makes it much easier for the viewer to access items that may be of interest to them without viewing the full agenda or having to skip through a long video recording to find that item of interest.</p>					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="82 846 683 880"><b>Advantages</b></th> <th data-bbox="683 846 1474 880"><b>Disadvantages</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="82 880 683 2016"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated systems of this type are proven and in use across most councils in Scotland as well as many other councils in the UK</li> <li>The dedicated system would be pre-configured with correct settings which would not need to be changed, nor would they be changed to cater for any other type of meeting</li> <li>Separately mounted cameras would be strategically placed to offer the best coverage of the room, being able to focus and zoom on the active speaker very precisely and deliver excellent quality video. An audio system and individual push-to-talk microphones would also ensure excellent quality audio for remote attendees and livestream viewers</li> <li>Specialised hardware included with the solution would reduce the complexity of streaming which is currently performed by separate software and can be prone to issues when Teams updates.</li> <li>No resource required from the Business Support team because no need to perform the streaming to YouTube</li> <li>The managed solution integrates documents and videos through a custom web site application. This allows committee papers, recordings and any other related documents to be in one area for easy access. Members of the public who want to follow committee meeting proceedings would have a much easier method of seeing papers, related documents and recordings. These would be available on a per agenda item basis rather than per</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="683 880 1474 2016"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papers for previous committees would have to remain on the Angus web site, and previous recordings on the YouTube channel. This could make accessing these potentially confusing for the public in the first year or so, as new committee meetings are made available on the managed system whilst older meetings are accessed through the previous sites</li> <li>The Committee Services host would have to be present in the chambers to operate the hardware device which manages the meeting livestream, regardless of whether any members or officers were physically present</li> <li>Costs in future years will depend on contract prices and be subject to inflation. There may be additional costs to move to a different provider.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated systems of this type are proven and in use across most councils in Scotland as well as many other councils in the UK</li> <li>The dedicated system would be pre-configured with correct settings which would not need to be changed, nor would they be changed to cater for any other type of meeting</li> <li>Separately mounted cameras would be strategically placed to offer the best coverage of the room, being able to focus and zoom on the active speaker very precisely and deliver excellent quality video. An audio system and individual push-to-talk microphones would also ensure excellent quality audio for remote attendees and livestream viewers</li> <li>Specialised hardware included with the solution would reduce the complexity of streaming which is currently performed by separate software and can be prone to issues when Teams updates.</li> <li>No resource required from the Business Support team because no need to perform the streaming to YouTube</li> <li>The managed solution integrates documents and videos through a custom web site application. This allows committee papers, recordings and any other related documents to be in one area for easy access. Members of the public who want to follow committee meeting proceedings would have a much easier method of seeing papers, related documents and recordings. These would be available on a per agenda item basis rather than per</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papers for previous committees would have to remain on the Angus web site, and previous recordings on the YouTube channel. This could make accessing these potentially confusing for the public in the first year or so, as new committee meetings are made available on the managed system whilst older meetings are accessed through the previous sites</li> <li>The Committee Services host would have to be present in the chambers to operate the hardware device which manages the meeting livestream, regardless of whether any members or officers were physically present</li> <li>Costs in future years will depend on contract prices and be subject to inflation. There may be additional costs to move to a different provider.</li> </ul>
<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated systems of this type are proven and in use across most councils in Scotland as well as many other councils in the UK</li> <li>The dedicated system would be pre-configured with correct settings which would not need to be changed, nor would they be changed to cater for any other type of meeting</li> <li>Separately mounted cameras would be strategically placed to offer the best coverage of the room, being able to focus and zoom on the active speaker very precisely and deliver excellent quality video. An audio system and individual push-to-talk microphones would also ensure excellent quality audio for remote attendees and livestream viewers</li> <li>Specialised hardware included with the solution would reduce the complexity of streaming which is currently performed by separate software and can be prone to issues when Teams updates.</li> <li>No resource required from the Business Support team because no need to perform the streaming to YouTube</li> <li>The managed solution integrates documents and videos through a custom web site application. This allows committee papers, recordings and any other related documents to be in one area for easy access. Members of the public who want to follow committee meeting proceedings would have a much easier method of seeing papers, related documents and recordings. These would be available on a per agenda item basis rather than per</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papers for previous committees would have to remain on the Angus web site, and previous recordings on the YouTube channel. This could make accessing these potentially confusing for the public in the first year or so, as new committee meetings are made available on the managed system whilst older meetings are accessed through the previous sites</li> <li>The Committee Services host would have to be present in the chambers to operate the hardware device which manages the meeting livestream, regardless of whether any members or officers were physically present</li> <li>Costs in future years will depend on contract prices and be subject to inflation. There may be additional costs to move to a different provider.</li> </ul>				

<p>meeting, reducing the need to find specific papers and skip through long recordings to find the item of interest being discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supplier would run pre-meeting tests and annual maintenance as part of the contract to ensure that the equipment was fully functional, reducing the risk that meetings are disrupted</li> <li>• In the event of network failure, the recording/streaming device would continue recording the meeting without disruption, uploading the recording when connectivity is resumed</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Financial Implications</b></p> <p><b>Capital Cost</b> Costs to install and configure equipment for this option would be an estimated £79,000. Actual costs would be dependent on a site survey of the chosen location.</p> <p><b>Revenue Cost</b> This option could offer savings estimated between £10,000 and £15,000 per annum based on previous members travel expenses for Council/Committee meetings pre-COVID. Actual savings would be dependent on how many members decided to come into meetings rooms rather than attend remotely</p> <p>Annual costs to support this option would be £10,420 Reduced demand on Business support staff (normally requires 1 resource and 1 available as backup). If members chose this option compensating staff cost savings within Business Support would be made to offset the annual running costs.</p> <p>A net saving in ongoing running costs from this option is estimated at £4,580 but actual savings will depend on member in-person attendance patterns.</p>	
<p><b>Carbon Implications</b> This option could reduce emissions equivalent 4,088kgCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum compared to previous travel</p>	
<p><b>Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any configuration issues or device failure with the meeting room equipment would impact all attendees in that room</li> </ul>	

## PROPERTY CONSIDERATIONS

In considering the property options there are a number of common factors relating to the buildings that will be relevant particularly to the costs and carbon footprint.

### Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall

Town & County Hall is a Forfar Common Good building. The general fund pays rent at an annual cost of £18,649 to the Forfar Common Good fund and meets the revenue costs for operating the building (rates, energy, servicing, insurance and security etc). The combined revenue costs of Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall is circa £78,000 and for this appraisal 25% of these costs have been attributed to Town & County Hall (£19,500). Thus, annual costs for Town & County Hall are rounded to £38.2k, and this is the current financial provision in the council's budget and is taken as the base (would score 5 on the 1-10 scale) with lower costs scoring greater than 5, higher costs scoring less than 5.

Prior to the pandemic an alternative layout for the Council Chamber had been drafted and a potential arrangement is set out in [Appendix 2](#), and an estimate of £26k for new furniture, adjustments to power outlets etc would allow the existing Chamber to be modernised.



In addition, the Municipal buildings provide a work/meeting/breakout space, Provost's office, Depute Provost's office and the Canmore function room. These spaces could continue to be utilised as currently or alternative accommodation provided at Angus House. The focus of this report is on the Chamber/Town & County Hall. The implications for the Municipal buildings require a future assessment and options for use.

Overall, the property costs are £38.2k pa and a capital cost of £26k to use the Town & County Hall as a Council Chamber.

An estimation of the carbon footprint of Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall is 38,930kg/CO2e per annum. An estimate of the amount for Town & County Hall only assumes 13,000kg/CO2e per annum and is taken as the base (would score 5 on the 1-10 scale) with lower emission scoring greater than 5, higher emissions scoring less than 5.

**Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)**

Prior to the pandemic Angus House was fully occupied as the Council's main back-office worker building. Post pandemic it is anticipated that two wings of office space in Angus House will become available as the organisation takes advantage of the more digital approach to working developed during the pandemic with more hybrid working and flexible workstyles which reduce our office space requirements and costs as well as reducing our carbon footprint.

Officers have been exploring the opportunity that part of Angus House could be re-purposed and/or let in a similar approach to that taken for St. Margaret's House and William Wallace House. A business case was prepared that was shared with Members of the respective Budget Groups during the budget preparation.

The building is owned by the Council and the overall operational cost (rates, energy, services etc) is £373k per annum. The ground floor north wing is one of six wings in the building and therefore its proportion of operational costs is approximately £62k per annum. With a proposal to use the area for Council and Committee meetings on Tuesdays and Thursdays, the costs directly attributable to that use is circa £25k per annum. If only Council meetings were hosted in Angus House the operating costs would be £2.5k pa. It is important to point out that these cost estimates are to enable comparison with other options – some of the running costs such as non-domestic rates and insurance would be incurred regardless of how that part of Angus House was used and would in practice only be avoided if the area were let to another party.

However, utilising the ground floor, north wing for a Council Chamber would mean one of the available two wings could not be let and is estimated to reduce the potential rental income opportunity by £18,000 per annum (excluding operational recharges). Thus, for options appraisal purposes a lost income of £18k is attributed to the use of Angus House North Wing as a Chamber.

The equivalent cost of the Chamber being in Angus House for all Council/Committee meetings is therefore £43k or for just Council (not Committees) is £2.5k pa.

Whilst the ground floor of Angus House is being used on a temporary basis to host the May and June Council meetings, if agreed to use on a permanent basis an estimate for the furniture, power outlet changes, plinth for the top table etc is £44k of capital costs. A potential design is shown in Appendix 3.

Overall, the property costs are £43k pa for running costs and a capital cost of £44k to use Angus House as a Council Chamber for all Committees, reducing to £2.5k pa if only used for Council meetings with the same capital cost.

An estimation of the carbon footprint of Angus House ground floor north wing is circa 23,500kg /CO2e per annum, attributed to the use as a Council Chamber is 10,000kg /CO2e per annum

<b>Option A Have no physical location, matched with Option 1 Audio Visual solution</b>	
This option would see members have no formal Council Chamber. All meetings would be carried out remotely. Existing spaces in Council buildings could be booked if home network connectivity is poor or for informal business.	
<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial savings can be made from not occupying any building or providing furniture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future uses for Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall to be investigated</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council's carbon footprint can be reduced from not occupying a building.</li> <li>• Ability to have all meetings and breakouts remotely.</li> <li>• Avoids all building related issues such as level access etc.</li> <li>• Avoids need to make Town &amp; County Hall energy efficiency improvements to meet net zero carbon emissions 2045 target if buildings are not used.</li> <li>• Available space in Angus House can be let/re-purposed.</li> <li>• No transport or parking issues, with members reducing their carbon footprint.</li> <li>• The Council/Committee meetings are part of the Council's digital approach</li> </ul>	<p>and options brought to future committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of rental income to Forfar Common Good until future use is determined.</li> <li>• Building running costs fall to Forfar Common Good until future use is determined.</li> <li>• Potential dilapidation costs for General Fund to meet if Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall no longer required for Council use.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Financial Implications**  
Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall - The property costs of £38.2k pa would be saved by the General Fund with the opposite effect on the Forfar Common Good Fund. The Forfar Common Good Fund would lose rental income and bear the running costs until such time as a new use could be found.  
Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The area can generate a potential rental income opportunity of £18k per annum, and reduce the revenue cost by £62k

Total Property Savings = £102.2k pa and with rental income total saving is £120.2k pa

**Carbon Implications**  
Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall – The reduction in carbon emissions of 13 t /CO2e pa.  
Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The carbon emissions reductions would potentially be circa 23.5 t/CO2e pa.

Total carbon reduction would be circa 36.5t /CO2e pa

**Risk**

- Unable to find alternative solution for Town & County Hall, with the burden falling to Forfar Common Good for revenue and repairs costs
- Unable to lease the space in Angus House
- Reliance on broadband/IT resilience

**Option B Operate from Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall, with Option 3 or 4 Audio Visual solution**

This option would see members retain use of the existing Town & County Hall location for all functions. The buildings provide a chamber, public attendance space, four work/meeting/breakout spaces, Provost's office, Depute Provost's office and the Canmore function room. The chamber furniture would be renewed with mobile/flexible furniture to allow alternative layouts for different meetings and use of the space (Layout shown in Appendix 2). The buildings would be available five days per week.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
-------------------	----------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing facility in good condition.</li> <li>Associated breakout rooms and meeting spaces.</li> <li>Accessible with lift access to 1st floor.</li> <li>Members private workspace availability.</li> <li>Provides office for Provost and Depute Provost.</li> <li>Provides facility for corporate events.</li> <li>Provides venue for Registrars to conduct civil ceremonies.</li> <li>Historic nature of the building and Chamber.</li> <li>Central location in town for public, including good public transport links from most burghs.</li> <li>Central location in County for Members and public to travel to.</li> <li>Ample town centre parking.</li> <li>Access for public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited space in Chamber for members, officers, public and press which is highlighted during full Council.</li> <li>Furniture and layout in chamber are no longer suitable and requires new furniture and layout reconfiguration.</li> <li>Older building with associated maintenance requirements and difficulty in improving energy efficiency to meet net zero carbon emissions 2045 target.</li> <li>Not suitable for dual purpose - officer meeting and desk space out with member needs.</li> <li>Not a modern efficient space.</li> <li>Workspaces and other rooms are separate reducing the flexibility a single space would give.</li> <li>Only one level access entrance/exit which is a difficult route to the chamber with a need for personal evacuation plan for visitors with mobility issues due to first floor location of chamber.</li> <li>Reliance on mechanical air extraction to comply with ventilation requirements</li> <li>Car parking is remote with limited public disabled parking adjacent to building.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Financial Implications</b></p> <p><u>Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall</u> - The property costs of £38.2k pa would be incurred (cost as budgeted). The Forfar Common Good Fund would avoid additional costs and a loss of income. There would be a capital cost of £26k</p> <p><u>Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)</u> - The area can generate a potential rental income opportunity of £18k per annum, and reduce the revenue cost by £62k</p> <p>Total Property Savings = £62k pa and with rental income total benefits are £80k pa. Capital cost of £26k.</p>	
<p><b>Carbon Implications</b></p> <p><u>Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall</u> – There is no change in carbon emissions.</p> <p><u>Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)</u> - The carbon emissions reductions would potentially be circa 23.5 t/CO2e pa.</p>	
<p><b>Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unable to lease the space in Angus House</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Option C Operate from Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing), with Option 3 or 4 Audio Visual solution</b></p> <p>This option would see members move all functions from Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall to the ground floor North wing at Angus House. The building would provide a flexible chamber space, public attendance space, an open plan work/meeting space and the use of meeting rooms A, B and C for breakout space. New mobile/flexible chamber furniture would be purchased to allow alternative layouts for different meetings and use of the space (Layout shown in Appendix 3). The buildings would be available on committee days only (Tuesdays and Thursdays) each week. The wing would be dual purpose with council officers using the space out with committee days.</p>	
<p><b>Advantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing building in good condition with available space.</li> <li>Bookable breakout rooms and meeting spaces</li> <li>Large open, flexible space on ground floor modern ground floor accessible building.</li> <li>Suitably sized space for members, officers, public and press.</li> <li>Members joint workspace, promoting collaboration available adjacent to chamber.</li> <li>Central location in County for Members and public to travel to.</li> <li>Approximately hourly bus service for central Forfar.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disadvantages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires new furniture to create chamber.</li> <li>Out of town location and potential for reduction in use of town businesses.</li> <li>Utilising meeting spaces for breakout would reduce availability to council office staff.</li> <li>Limited parking.</li> <li>Does not provide dedicated office for Provost and Depute Provost.</li> <li>Access to the space for members would be limited to Tuesdays and Thursdays to allow space to be dual purposed.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disabled parking in close vicinity shared with office staff and visiting public.</li> <li>• Accessible for public.</li> <li>• Space could be dual purposed, being used as officer meeting and desk space out with member needs.</li> <li>• Naturally ventilated space.</li> <li>• Reception facility.</li> <li>• Sprinkler system for fire safety.</li> <li>• Modern building with lower maintenance requirements and easier to make energy efficiency improvements to meet net zero carbon emissions 2045 target.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of available space in Angus House to lease and subsequent reduction in potential income.</li> <li>• Loss of rental income and maintenance costs for Town &amp; County Hall impact on Forfar Common Good until future use is determined.</li> <li>• Potential dilapidation costs for General Fund to meet if Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall no longer required for Council use.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Financial Implications**  
Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall - The property costs of £38.2k pa would be saved by the General Fund with the opposite effect on the Forfar Common Good Fund. The Forfar Common Good Fund would lose rental income and bear the running costs until such time as a new use could be found.  
Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The cost of the Chamber being in Angus House for all Council/Committee meetings is £43k in ongoing running costs with £44k of one-off capital costs.

Net running costs under this option would therefore be £5k extra pa in comparison to the current costs of using Town & County Hall.  
Capital cost of £44k assuming no dilapidation repair costs are required to Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall.

**Carbon Implications**  
Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall – The reduction in carbon emissions of 13 t /CO2e pa.  
Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The carbon attributed to the use as a Council Chamber is 10 t /CO2e pa

Total impact would be a reduction in carbon emissions of 3 t /CO2e pa

**Risk**

- Unable to find alternative solution for Town & County Hall, with the burden falling to Forfar Common Good for revenue and repairs costs.

**Option D Operate from Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) for Council meetings and Municipal Buildings/Town & County Hall for all other democratic functions, with 2 Sets of Option 3 or 4 Audio Visual solution.**

This option would see members retain use of the existing location for all functions except for the 10 full Council committee meeting in the year. Town & County Hall would provide a chamber etc as per Option B

The 10 full Council meetings would be held in the ground floor North wing at Angus House and would provide a chamber etc as per Option C.

Audio Visual solutions would be needed in both Chambers

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<u>Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall.</u> As set out in Option B plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing furniture with potentially revised layout to make more suitable for Committee meeting that overcomes the current negative aspects of the Chamber.</li> </ul> <u>Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)</u> As set out in Option C	<u>Municipal Buildings and Town &amp; County Hall.</u> As set out in Option B  <u>Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)</u> As set out in Option C  Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases the building costs significantly as uses two spaces rather than one</li> <li>• Increases the carbon footprint significantly as uses two spaces rather than one</li> </ul>

- Requires two sets of Audio-Visual solution

**Financial Implications**

Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall - The property costs would be £38.2k pa.

Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The cost of the Chamber being in Angus House for only Council meetings is £2.5k with £44k of capital costs.

Total running costs of £40.7k and a capital cost of £44k

**Carbon Implications**

Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall – There is no change in carbon emissions of 13 t /CO2e pa.

Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing) - The carbon attributed to the use as a Council Chamber is 10 t /CO2e pa

Total impact would be an increase in carbon emissions of 10 t /CO2e pa

**Risk**

- None

**Additional option of Roaming Full Council only meeting at various locations across Angus.**

This option is to provide members with an appraisal of hosting full Council meetings across various locations in Angus. It would be in addition to Options A , B or C which provide space for all other democratic functions. It would be by having a roaming Council meeting and therefore not compatible with Option D. The assumption is that the meeting would tour over electoral wards during the year. Suitable venues would be sought to provide a chamber space, public attendance space and breakout space. An Audio-Visual system would be transported, set up and dismantled for each meeting.

**Advantages**

- Accessible building(s).
- Some car parking including disabled parking frequently in close vicinity.
- Potential for public attendance
- Potential to generate local interest for each location when visited.
- Opportunity for moving meetings to various locations across Angus.

**Disadvantages**

- Audio, visual and streaming systems would be provided by an external supplier for each roaming meeting, requiring a site survey and internal resources to support the setup and delivery
- Furniture must be set up and dismantled for each meeting with associated costs and staff time demands
- Limited/no ability to have breakout space during recess in meetings.
- Council bookings would have no priority over other commercial bookings.
- Significant ongoing administrative burden with associated staff costs and demand
- Building may be used simultaneously for other purposes
- Wi-Fi capability would need to be assessed to accommodate access to digital papers and broadcasting
- Acoustics and lighting would need to be assessed for equipment use and broadcasting at each venue.
- Locations would be set in advance and may not align with Council agenda, resulting in potential to make public attendance on specific issues less accessible than a central location.

**Financial Implications**

Estimated cost for hire of facility and setting up of desk layout and chairs is £500 per meeting/£5000 pa. in addition to the costs in Option A, B or C. Costs to deliver the audio, video and streaming of a single roaming meeting are estimated at £2,500 per meeting/£25,000 pa. Exact costs would be dependent on a site survey of each specific location by the supplier to determine the exact costs.

It is not considered that a roaming option would increase the overall total members mileage. Ward members would see either an increase or decrease on their mileage claim depending on the electoral ward location the meeting was taking place in. Council officer mileage would increase if the meetings were moved from a Forfar location because their office base for mileage claims is most commonly Forfar. If on average eight officers were in attendance and averaged a round trip of 30 miles, the additional cost would be £108 per meeting/£1080 pa.

Additional costs are therefore estimated at circa £31.1k pa in addition to Option A, B or C to deliver this option for meetings of Full Council. This additional cost would be less if some Council meetings were held in the Chamber and only some meeting held on a roaming basis

**Carbon Implications**

There would be an increase in carbon emissions for the Council due to increased officer car travel. It is estimated that this equates 662kgCO<sub>2</sub>e per annum

**Risk**

- Availability of venues with suitable digital connectivity
- Availability of venues with suitable acoustics and lighting
- Availability of venues with suitable power sockets for all members to power laptops
- Potential for broadcasting system to fail due to unfamiliar location
- Meetings could over-run booking slot.

### Summary of Scores and Weighting

Option	Summary
<b>Audio Visual Solutions</b>	
1	Continue with remote meetings only
2	Utilise existing audio and video capabilities currently available in meeting rooms in Council office buildings.
3	Procure audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources.
4	Procure a fully managed audio/video solution delivered and managed by a third party.
<b>Physical Location for Audio Visual solution</b>	
A	Have no physical location
B	Operate from Municipal Buildings and Town & County Hall
C	Operate from Angus House (Ground Floor, North Wing)
D	Operate from Angus House for full Council Committee and Municipal Buildings/Town & County Hall for all other democratic functions.
<b>Additional Option</b>	
	Additional option of roaming Full Council only meeting at various locations across Angus.

Objective	Audio/Video Technical				Physical Locations			
Objective	1	2	3	4	A	B	C	D
Impact on Economy: Angus is a go to place for business	6	6	7	7.5	3	5	4	4.5
Impact on People: Maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities.	11.8	12.3	17	18	14	10	12	11
Impact on Place: We want our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens	5.8	5.8	7	8	8	5	6	5.5
Impact on our council: Angus Council is efficient and effective	12.3	9.5	15.3	18.5	18	10	14	4
Carbon Implications	9.3	6.5	5	5	10	5	2	0
Financial Implications	16	13.6	9.9	8.1	14	10	4	0
Risk	6	5.8	7	8	1	5	2	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>73.1</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>35</b>

### Summary of Technical and Physical Compatibility

The matrix below shows where the technical audio/video options 1 – 4 are compatible with the location options A – D. A coloured square indicates that the options are compatible and can be considered as a recommendation, red squares are not recommended for reasons listed below.

	A No Chamber	B T & C Hall	C Angus House	D Angus House & T & C Hall	E Roaming
1 Remote	Option A1				

<b>2 Existing Rooms</b>	<b>Option A2 Not recommended</b>				
<b>3 Internal Chamber</b>		<b>Option B3 Not recommended</b>	<b>Option C3 Not recommended</b>	<b>Option D3 Not recommended</b>	
<b>4 Managed Chamber</b>		<b>Option B4</b>	<b>Option C4</b>	<b>Option D4 Not recommended</b>	
<b>5 Roaming</b>					<b>Option E5 Not recommended</b>

**Summary of Costs and Savings to the General Fund (based on assumptions made)**

	Technical		Physical		Total		Payback
	Capital (One-off)	Revenue (Ongoing)	Capital (One-Off)	Revenue (Ongoing)	Capital (One-Off)	Revenue* (Ongoing)	Period Years#
<b>A1</b>	£0	(£20,000)	£0	(£120,200)	£0	(£140,200)	0
<b>A2</b>	£0	(£15,000)	£0	(£120,200)	£0	(£135,200)	0
<b>B3</b>	£48,000	(£11,500)	£26,000	(£80,000)	£74,000	(£91,500)	0.8
<b>C3</b>	£48,000	(£11,500)	£44,000	(£5,000)	£92,000	(£16,500)	5.6
<b>D3</b>	£96,000	(£4,500)	£44,000	£44,700	£140,000	£40,200	n/a
<b>B4</b>	£79,000	(£4,580)	£26,000	(£80,000)	£105,000	(£84,580)	1.2
<b>C4</b>	£79,000	(£4,580)	£44,000	(£5,000)	£123,000	(£9,580)	12.8
<b>D4</b>	£158,000	(£4,500)	£44,000	£44,700	£202,000	£40,200	n/a
<b>E5</b>	£0	£25,000	£0	£6,100	£0	£31,100	n/a

\* - the actual impact on revenue costs will depend on member in person attendance patterns and whether spare space in Angus House can be successfully let.

# - this column shows the number of years it would take for the revenue savings to cover the one-off capital costs

**Summary of Compatible Options:**

**Option A1 – Fully remote meetings with no Council Chamber:**

This option is in place and requires no costs to continue but does not allow any group attendance or dedicated meeting space for members. It continues to require internal resources to deliver the livestreams for each meeting. However, it offers the greatest reduction in carbon and travel expenses.

**Recommended.**



**Option A2 - Remote meetings with hybrid capability from existing bookable council office space using existing hybrid equipment with no Council Chamber:**

While this option is low cost and allows for physical attendance to meeting for limited numbers, audio/video quality is inferior to the dedicated options and would offer a poor experience for public viewers. More setup and testing may also be necessary prior to meetings to ensure best configuration and output quality. This option also needs internal resources to deliver the livestreams for each meeting. Carbon and travel expense reductions would be substantial given the limited numbers that could physically attend.

**Not recommended**

**Option B3 – Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources with Council Chamber in Town & County Hall:**

This option would establish a dedicated meeting area in the existing chamber, with fixed audio/video equipment which would be used solely for council meetings. This would satisfy members wishes to attend physically in large numbers if necessary and provide a good quality viewing experience for the public. However, this requires capital and revenue costs to deliver and also requires internal resources to manage the equipment and continue livestreaming meetings. IT support are also less readily available at Town & County Hall.

**Not recommended**

**Option B4 - Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution fully managed by the third party with Council Chamber in Town & County Hall:**

This option would establish a dedicated meeting area in the existing chamber, with fixed audio/video equipment which would be used solely for council meetings. This would satisfy members wishes to attend physically in large numbers if necessary and provide a good quality viewing experience for the public. Implications around internal resource would be much less for this option due to this being fully managed by a supplier. This would reduce configuration, testing and maintenance from IT resources and would also not require Business Support staff to deliver the livestreams. The public viewer experience for this option is excellent as, as well as good quality audio/video output, meeting recordings would be easier to track and papers would be available alongside the recordings.

**Recommended**

**Option C3 - Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources with Council Chamber in Angus House:**

This option would establish a dedicated meeting area in Angus House, with fixed audio/video equipment which would be used solely for council meetings. This would satisfy members wishes to attend physically in large numbers if necessary and provide a good quality viewing experience for the public. However, this requires capital and revenue costs to deliver and also requires internal resources to manage the equipment and continue livestreaming meetings. Compared to B3 which considers the existing chamber, IT support staff are more readily available in Angus House.

**Not recommended**

**Option C4 - Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution fully managed by the third party with Council Chamber in Angus House:**

This option would establish a dedicated meeting area in Angus House, with fixed audio/video equipment which would be used solely for council meetings. This would satisfy members wishes to attend physically in large numbers if necessary and provide a good quality viewing experience for the public. Implications around internal resource would be much less for this option due to this being fully managed by a supplier. This would reduce configuration, testing and maintenance from IT resources and would also not require Business Support staff to deliver the livestreams. The public viewer experience for this option is excellent as, as well as good quality audio/video output, meeting recordings would be easier to track and papers would be available alongside the recordings.

**Recommended**

**Option D3 – Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution delivered by a third party and managed by internal resources. Two sets of audio/video solutions required, one for chamber in Angus House for full Council meetings and another for chamber in Town & County Hall for all other meetings:**

This option would require two sets of audio/video equipment described in option C3 and would also require additional maintenance, doubling both capital and revenue costs.

**Not recommended**

**Option D4 – Hybrid meetings from new audio/video solution fully managed and managed by the third party. Two sets of audio/video solutions required, one for chamber in Angus House for full Council meetings and another for chamber in Town & County Hall for all other meetings:**

This option would require two sets of audio/video equipment described in option C4 and would also require additional maintenance, doubling both capital and revenue costs.

**Not recommended**

**Option E5 - Additional option of Roaming Full Council only meeting at various locations across Angus:**

This option requires no costs to purchase audio/video equipment. However, this may require considerable internal resources to plan meetings in different locations, ensuring there is suitable power, connectivity and conducting testing to make sure that the meeting is hosted and streamed well. Additional carbon and travel expense would be incurred.

**Not recommended.**

**Final Recommended Options for Consideration:**

**Option 1** - (A1 above) Continue with fully remote meetings.

**Option 2** – (B4 above) Chamber in Town & County Hall, use new technology fully managed by third party provider (this would include new slimline chairs and tables to accommodate better design & layout as shown in Appendix 2).

**Option 3** – (C4 above) Chamber in Angus House, use new technology fully managed by third party provider (Layout as shown in Appendix 3).

**Final Summary of Costs and Savings to the General Fund (based on assumptions made)**

Option	Total		Payback Period Years#
	Capital (One-Off)	Revenue* (Ongoing)	
Option 1 - Continue with fully remote meetings	£0	(£140,200)	0
Option 2 - Chamber in Town & County Hall, use new technology fully managed by third party provider	£105,000	(£84,580)	1.2
Option 3 - Chamber in Angus House, use new technology fully managed by third party provider	£123,000	(£9,580)	12.8

\* - the actual impact on revenue costs will depend on member in person attendance patterns and whether spare space in Angus House can be successfully let.

# - this column shows the number of years it would take for the revenue savings to cover the one-off capital costs

**Final Summary Scoring of Recommended Options**

Objective	Option
-----------	--------

<b>Objective</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Impact on Economy: Angus is a go to place for business	4.5	6.3	5.8
Impact on People: Maximise inclusion and reduce inequalities.	12.9	14	15
Impact on Place: We want our communities to be strong, resilient and led by citizens	6.9	6.5	7
Impact on our council: Angus Council is efficient and effective	15.2	14.3	16.3
Carbon Implications	9.7	5	3.5
Financial Implications	15	9.1	6.1
Risk	3.5	6.5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>61.6</b>	<b>58.6</b>

**Item for Further Consideration:**

Should either technical/location options 2 or 3 be agreed then time is required to procure and install the new technology and furniture allowing these hybrid meetings to take place. Agreement is therefore required on how committee meetings should be delivered between August 2022 and February 2023.

Recommended options for delivery for council meetings between August 2022 and February 2023:

Option 1 - Continue with fully remote meetings for council and committee meetings

Option 2 - Full Council meetings to be in-person in Angus House with all other committee meetings held remotely. The cost for the 3 Full Council meetings would be circa £7.5K

<b>Recommendation</b>	<i>Members are asked to consider the details and the assessed scores above for the final recommended options and determine which options should be adopted. Further consideration is required for delivery for council meetings between August 2022 and February 2023.</i>
<b>Committee Reporting</b>	<i>This Option Appraisal forms Appendix 1 in the report</i>