

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title:	Agenda																							
Date:	Wednesday 13 January 2016																							
Time:	4.00 pm																							
Venue:	Conference Chamber West West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds																							
Full Members:	<p style="text-align: center;">Chairman Diane Hind</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vice Chairman Jeremy Farthing</p> <p><i>Conservative Members (13)</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Simon Brown</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Angela Rushen</td> <td style="width: 33%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Terry Buckle</td> <td>Andrew Speed</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Patrick Chung</td> <td>Clive Springett</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jeremy Farthing</td> <td>Jim Thorndyke</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Susan Glossop</td> <td>Frank Warby</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wayne Hailstone</td> <td>Vacancy</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Richard Rout</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Charter Member (1)</i> Diane Hind</p> <p><i>Independent Member (1)</i> Paul Hopfensperger</p> <p><i>UKIP Member (1)</i> John Burns</p>			Simon Brown	Angela Rushen		Terry Buckle	Andrew Speed		Patrick Chung	Clive Springett		Jeremy Farthing	Jim Thorndyke		Susan Glossop	Frank Warby		Wayne Hailstone	Vacancy		Richard Rout		
Simon Brown	Angela Rushen																							
Terry Buckle	Andrew Speed																							
Patrick Chung	Clive Springett																							
Jeremy Farthing	Jim Thorndyke																							
Susan Glossop	Frank Warby																							
Wayne Hailstone	Vacancy																							
Richard Rout																								
Substitutes:	<p><i>Conservative Members (6)</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Paula Fox</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Peter Thompson</td> <td style="width: 33%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sarah Stamp</td> <td>Patricia Warby</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Charter Member (1)</i> Julia Wakelam</p> <p><i>UKIP Member (1)</i> Tony Brown</p>			Paula Fox	Peter Thompson		Sarah Stamp	Patricia Warby																
Paula Fox	Peter Thompson																							
Sarah Stamp	Patricia Warby																							
Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.																							
Quorum:	Six Members																							
Committee administrator:	Christine Brain Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk																							

Public Information



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Venue:	West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 3YU	Tel: 01284 763233 Email: democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk Web: www.westsuffolk.gov.uk
Access to agenda and reports before the meeting:	Copies of the agenda and reports are open for public inspection at the above address at least five clear days before the meeting. They are also available to view on our website.	
Attendance at meetings:	The Borough Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public.	
Public speaking:	<p>Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question or statement of not more than three minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within three minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply.</p> <p>A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start.</p> <p>There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.</p>	
Disabled access:	<p>West Suffolk House has facilities for people with mobility impairments including a lift and wheelchair accessible WCs. However, in the event of an emergency use of the lifts is restricted for health and safety reasons.</p> <p>Visitor parking is at the car park at the front of the building and there are a number of accessible spaces.</p>	
Induction loop:	An Induction loop is available for meetings held in the Conference Chamber.	
Recording of meetings:	<p>The Council may record this meeting and permits members of the public and media to record or broadcast it as well (when the media and public are not lawfully excluded).</p> <p>Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Administrator who will instruct that they are not included in the filming.</p>	

Agenda
Procedural Matters
Part 1 - Public

1. Substitutes

Any Member who is substituting for another Member should so indicate, together with the name of the relevant absent Member.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Minutes

1 - 10

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2015 (copy attached).

4. Public Participation

Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question/statement of not more than 3 minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within 3 minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply.

A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start.

There is an overall limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.

5. Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture

11 - 14

Report No: **OAS/SE/16/001**

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture has been invited to the meeting to give a short presentation / account of her portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

6. Skyliner Way, Bury St Edmunds - Verbal Update

7. Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 3)

The Regulation of Investigatory Powers (Directed Surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Sources) Order 2010 requires that Members should scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.

The Monitoring Officer advised that in Quarter 3, no such surveillance has been authorised.

8. Work Programme Update
Report No: **OAS/SE/16/002**

15 - 24

Part 2 – Exempt

NONE

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Wednesday 11 November 2015** at **4.00 pm** at the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU**

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Diane Hind
Vice Chairman Jeremy Farthing

Terry Buckle
Susan Glossop
Paul Hopfensperger
Tim Marks
Richard Rout
Angela Rushen

Andrew Speed
Clive Springett
Jim Thorndyke
Frank Warby
John Burns

Substitutes attending:
Patricia Warby

By Invitation:
Tony Brown, Peter Stevens, Robert Everitt, Ian Houlder and
Clive Pollington
Peter Stevens, Cabinet Member for Operations

43. **Substitutes**

The following substitution was declared:

Councillor Patricia Warby for Councillor Wayne Hailstone.

44. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wayne Hailstone.

45. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 July 2015 and 15 October 2015 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

46. **Public Participation**

There were no questions/statements from members of the public.

47. **Presentation by Streetkleen Bio Limited**

The Chairman welcomed Gary Downie (Managing Director) from Streetkleen Bio Limited who had been invited to the meeting to give a short presentation outlining the PooPrints Dog DNA programme and to answer questions from the Committee.

The presentation covered the following areas:

- What is PooPrint
- Rationale for Dog DNA Registration
- A Blueprint of overall service
- Communication of the proposition
- Engaging with key stakeholders (RSPCA/Local authorities)
- Timeline and recommended next steps.

Mr Downie explained that the PooPrints DNA programme was available world wide. The United States and other countries had experienced reductions in dog fouling by as much as 90% after introducing the programme, which was now available in the United Kingdom (UK) and worked within the framework of existing UK legislation.

Barking and Dagenham Borough Council was set to become the first UK local authority to introduce PooPrints to help achieve their corporate priorities of civic pride and social responsibility. It was estimated that there were 18,000 dogs in the borough Barking and Dagenham and that 50% of dogs would be registered in the first year.

DNA analysis was an affordable solution in tackling anti-social dog ownership. The cost involved a £30 registration fee to register the dog, and £70 for carrying out a DNA matching, which could be recouped from the irresponsible dog owner with a Fixed Penalty Notice.

Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) could also be created and enforced to require owners to have their dogs registered to use any protected areas. Registered owners could then walk their dogs in protected spaces as normal and provide evidence of dog DNA registration to wardens, if required.

PooPrints UK was asking local authorities to consider creating a benefit led message approach and DNA testing. DNA registration was a permanent, long term solution to eradicate dog waste for aspirational communities. Enforcement was the driver, but there needed to be effective measures in place to challenge irresponsible behaviour dog owners.

Members discussed the presentation in detail and asked a number of questions of Gary Downie, to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the DNA registration process and costs.

Members agreed that DNA registration was a good idea, but it needed to be made compulsory as it was felt that irresponsible dog owners would not register their dog(s).

Members also discussed the cost solution and sampling versus prosecutions.

The Chairman on behalf of the Committee thanked Gary Downie for an informative presentation, and summarised that until Central Government helped by making it law for owners to DNA register their dogs, there were limitations with the scheme.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the presentation.

48. **Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Operations**

As set out in the Council's Constitution, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member would be invited to attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and answer questions from the Committee. Therefore, to carry out this constitutional requirement, members were asked to consider the responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Operations, who had been invited to the meeting.

Report No: OAS/SE/15/015, set out the overall responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Operations, which were:

- Car parking
- CCTV
- Cemeteries
- Fleet management
- Ground maintenance
- Land drainage
- Markets (delivery)
- Operations
- Property services and estate management
- Public conveniences
- Refuse/recycling
- Street scene
- Tourism (operations)

Councillor Peter Stevens, Cabinet Member for Operations opened his presentation by thanking the Committee for the invitation. He then set out the areas of responsibility; structure; key facts; and current major projects. There were three broad services areas with split Portfolio responsibility for the West Suffolk service with Forest Heath District Council:

- Waste and street scene (Cllr Stevens and Cllr David Bowman)
- Property services (Cllr Stevens and Cllr David Bowman)
- Leisure, cultural services (Cllr Jo Rayner and Cllr Andy Drummond)

A breakdown of operational costs was provided for waste and property only, and total operations including leisure for St Edmundsbury; Forest Heath and West Suffolk.

A number of statistics and major projects covering waste and property services were included, such as for West Suffolk:

- 5.7 million bins emptied each year containing 64,000 tonnes of material;
- Maintaining a fleet of 200 vehicles covering 1 million miles each year;
- West Suffolk Operational Hub
- Bartec (back office system and in-cab technology)
- Owning 410 varied property assets;
- CCTV control room dealt with over 1,600 incidents each year (mostly unreported) and new CCTV control room
- Car parking reviews

Members discussed the presentation in detail and asked a number of questions of the Cabinet Member and officers to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the following:

- (1) Street lighting – the Council was looking to reduce the operational cost of street lights by upgrading the Borough owned street lights so that the majority of them could be transferred to Suffolk County Council Highways and those remaining with the Borough would be cheaper to run.
- (2) Waste transfer stations - The Council currently used three waste transfer stations (Thetford; Red Lodge and Haverhill). As and when the West Suffolk Operational Hub was operational, one transfer station would be located in the Bury area with the intention of retaining the Haverhill site.
- (3) A14 cleansing – It was acknowledged this was an issue. The service continued to maintain a full team clearing the A14 and A11, and continues to seek to work more closely with the Highways Agency in co-ordinating cleansing when road closures were in place.
- (4) CCTV - A member tour was being organised to enable members to look at the new CCTV set-up at West Suffolk House.
- (5) Tree ownership - Officers confirmed there was a definitive map available showing who owned what trees. The Council also had a tree maintenance programme.
- (6) Late grass cutting - The Council had a policy on late grass cutting and officers agreed to provide a written response on further grass cutting scheduled in 2015.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for Operations for his informative presentation.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the presentation by the Cabinet Member for Operations.

49. **Christmas Fayre Review**

(Councillor Paul Hopfensperger declared a non-pecuniary interest as owning a business in Bury St Edmunds town centre, and remained in the meeting).

Councillor Andrew Speed declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Our Bury St Edmunds and owning a business in Bury St Edmunds town centre, and remained in the meeting).

On 10 June 2015, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to establish a Task and Finish Group to complete a review of the Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre and to adopt a five-year operational plan for the event. The prompt for the review came from the Council's acknowledgement that the Christmas Fayre had grown to be a nationally recognised event and that a review of the current principles and arrangements was therefore opportune.

Report No: OAS/SE/15/016, summarised the review of the Bury St Edmunds Christmas Fayre and presented a draft five-year operational plan for taking forward the recommendations from the Christmas Fayre Task and Finish Group.

The report included the background to the review; the current position of the Christmas Fayre, statistics; venues and stalls; timings; health and safety; marketing; entertainment; employment; finance; Christmas Fayre Working Group; traffic management and car parks. Also attached to the report were a number of appendices, namely:

- Appendix A: analysis of Christmas Fayre stalls;
- Appendix B: Christmas Fayre stakeholders review and reporting structure;
- Appendix C: Christmas Fayre impact survey.
- Appendix D: five-year operational plan.

The Christmas Fayre review covered a wide range of areas of the planning and management of the Fayre. The recommendations in the report were based on findings from discussions with Fayre stakeholders; desk research and an online survey. All the recommendations that the Task and Finish Group had agreed on in response to the findings of the review were brought together into a five-year operational plan, attached as Appendix D.

The Committee was asked to consider the Christmas Fayre Review Report and supporting five-year operational plan prior to being presented to Cabinet on 8 December 2015.

The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions to which responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the following:

- (1) Stall holders – 76% of stall holders came from East Anglia. The plan going forward was to look at a pricing structure to future benefit local businesses.

- (2) Neutral cost – Members wished to see the event make a small profit margin. Officers confirmed that the aspiration was to make a small profit.
- (3) Format of the market – Members discussed the format of Christmas Markets abroad, which lasted for a whole month. Officers advised that changing the current format and dates of the Christmas Fayre could be looked at as a longer term aspiration and would be a major review.
- (4) Transport – The Council was working closely with transport providers to advertise the availability and frequency of bus and train services to the fayre and had started to promote a campaign to encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport.

The Market Development Officer informed the Committee that there would be stalls in the Cathedral court year which was new for this year, and that the Christmas Market evolved around what people wanted.

The Cabinet Member for Families and Communities thanked the Task and Finish Group for a well considered review of the current Christmas Fayre.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

RECOMMENDED

That the Christmas Fayre Review, Report No: OAS/SE/15/16 and the five-year operational plan, attached as Appendix D, be approved.

50. Car Parking Task and Finish Review Group - Final Report

(Councillor Paul Hopfensperger declared a non-pecuniary interest as owning a business in Bury St Edmunds town centre, and remained in the meeting).

(Councillors Terry Buckle, Frank Warby and Patricia Warby left the meeting at 6.20pm during the consideration of this item, and prior to voting).

Councillor Jeremy Farthing left the meeting at 6.25pm during the consideration of this item, and prior to voting.

Councillor Clive Springett left the meeting at 6.27pm during the consideration of this item, and prior to voting

Councillor Angela Rushen left the meeting at 6.35pm during the consideration of this item, and prior to voting).

In 2012, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertook an extensive review of car parking provision and charging in St Edmundsbury. A significant number of recommendations were endorsed by Cabinet on 12 December 2012. This included the need for a full periodic review of car parking across the Borough every 3-4 years.

A Task and Finish Review Group was therefore established by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 22 July 2015 to undertake this review, including the setting of tariffs and the consideration of pay on exist/Automated Number Plate Recognition operating systems.

In commencing the review, the Task and Finish Group undertook extensive consultation with car park users; key stakeholders and local businesses. In addition, specialist advice was sought from an independent consultant, Alpha Parking on existing and future capacity of car parks across Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill.

Councillor Jim Thorndyke, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group presented Report No: OAS/SE/15/017, which included the Task and Finish Groups conclusions and fifteen recommendations, which addressed the issue of capacity; service delivery and proposed investment in the delivery of the car parking service, as follows:

Recommendation 1	That the Council promotes: (i) That all tariffs remain highly competitive in comparison to similar towns. (ii) The location of the car parks through directional signage (iii) The flexible cashless, pay by phone option – RingGo (iv) Online permits/season tickets.
Recommendation 2	The purchase and installation of two further Electric Car Charging Points in Bury St Edmunds and two new Electric Car Charging Points in Haverhill.
Recommendation 3	The Council reviews all signage in the car parks with a view to making information easy to understand and more visible, including tariff boards and disability parking bays.
Recommendation 4	Charges to car parking and season ticket charges across the Borough are detailed in Appendix E.
Bury St Edmunds	
Recommendation 5	To transfer long stay car parking at weekends from Parkway MSCP to Ram Meadow by: (i) Improve signage to Ram Meadow Car Park from the highway. (ii) Investigate improvements to the pedestrian route into the town centre from Ram Meadow and quality of infrastructure/signage in the car

	<p>park</p> <p>(iii) Rebranding of Ram Meadow Car Park as the Visitor and Long Stay Car Park</p> <p>(iv) No change to Ram Meadow Charges</p> <p>(v) Parking at Parkway Multi Storey should be limited to a 4 hour maximum at the weekend, with the exemption of weekly and season ticket holders.</p>
Recommendation 6	The Car Parking Task and Finish Review Group feel that it is imperative that Cabinet set up a formal review to identify additional car parking provision across Bury St Edmunds. This review should consider future growth proposals and opportunities and urge that this process is completed no later than 2017.
Recommendation 7	As a matter of priority, the Borough Council seeks discussions with businesses and developers in the south of Bury St Edmunds with a view to finding additional public car parking in the area.
Recommendation 8	It is recommended that additional capacity of 30 spaces can be found in Hardwick Heath Car Park.
Recommendation 9	The Council promotes the availability of free parking at weekends at Olding Road.
Recommendation 10	To investigate a phased upgrade of car parking machines with a view to replacing all machines with car readers and contactless payments features over the next two to three years.
Recommendation 11	<p>It is recommended that occupancy levels across the town centre car parks must decrease to below 95% occupancy before Pay on Exit can:</p> <p>(i) Accommodate users extending the length of the car parking stay; and</p> <p>(ii) Avoid significant congestion on the highway.</p>
Recommendation 12	That the Borough Council works with Suffolk County Council and key stakeholders in the development of a Transport Strategy for Bury St Edmunds which promotes sustainable transport and help addresses the capacity challenges for off street car parks.
Haverhill	
Recommendation 13	It is recommended that Haverhill Leisure Centre

	car park be limited to a maximum stay of 3 hours.
Recommendation 14	To implement up to 4 hours and All Day parking restrictions on the Rose and Crown Car Park in Haverhill.
Recommendation 15	To provide an additional 15 hours off-street car parks enforcement each week by the parking services team in Haverhill.

Also attached to the report were the following appendices:

- Appendix A – Car Parking Capacity and Management Study 2015
- Appendix B - Tariff Comparison and other Towns
- Appendix C - Consultation responses from User Questionnaires
- Appendix D – Summary of business survey respondents in Haverhill
- Appendix E – Proposed changes to car parking and season ticket charges across the Borough from 1 April 2016.

The Committee was asked to comment on the report and the fifteen recommendations, as set out in Section 9 of Appendix 1, prior to being presented to Cabinet on 8 December 2015.

The Committee considered the report and the recommendations in detail and asked a number of questions to which officers provided comprehensive responses. In particular discussions were held on the following:

- (1) Parkway multi-storey – It was noted this was a popular car park because it was cheap and was prime retail parking.
- (2) Car park tariffs – Some members felt that the Council should not be afraid to put costs up. Prices would not deter people parking in the centre of town even though cheaper or even free options were available just a little further away.
- (3) Ram Meadow – It was agreed that the Council needed to encourage more people to use the Ram Meadow Car Park, but felt more lighting was needed.
- (4) Pay-on-exit – The Task and Finish Group had considered a trial. However, the trial would have cost an estimated £200k to install the barriers, the back office operation and a 24-7 service to respond to malfunctions; damage or driver error causing the blocking of exit routes. Pay-on-exit had not been ruled out, and it was envisaged that pay-on-exit would be installed when establishing new car parks particularly.
- (5) West Suffolk College – The College had not responded to the Task and Finish Group’s review on car parking. The Committee felt the College should take some further ownership of their own parking issues.

The Cabinet Member for Operations informed the Committee that the Alpha Report was good and the Task and Finish Group's recommendations were excellent. What needed to be addressed were future car parking problems, and the Master Plans would help with the issue.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

RECOMMENDED

That the fifteen recommendations of the Car Parking Task and Finish Review Group, as set out in Section 9, of Appendix 1 to Report No: OAS/SE/15/17, be approved.

51. Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 2)

The Regulation of Investigatory Powers (Directed Surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Sources) Order 2010 required that Members should scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis. The Monitoring Officer had advised that in Quarter 2, no such surveillance had been authorised. There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, Quarter 2 update.

52. Decisions Plan: November 2015 to May 2016

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE/15/018, which requested that Members peruse the Cabinet Decisions Plan for the period November 2015 to May 2016, for which it would like further information on or which might benefit from the Committee's involvement. The Committee considered the Decisions Plan, and there being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the contents of the Decisions Plan.

53. Work Programme Update

The Committee received Report No OAS/SE/15/019, which updated Members on the current status of its rolling work programme of items for scrutiny during 2015-2016 (Appendix 1). Members were reminded to complete the Work Programme Suggestion Form when submitting future items for potential scrutiny (Appendix 2). This enabled suggestions received to be considered by the Committee at each meeting.

The Committee considered its rolling work programme, and there being no decision required, **noted** the items expected to be presented to the Committee during 2016.

The Meeting concluded at 6.46pm

Signed by:

Chairman

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture	
Report No:	OAS/SE/16/001	
Report to and date/s:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	13 January 2016
Portfolio Holder:	Jo Rayner Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture Tel: 07872 456836 Email: joanna.rayner@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead Officer:	Christine Brain Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	As part of the "Challenge" role, Overview and Scrutiny are asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members. It is part of the Scrutiny role to challenge in the form of questions. Therefore, to carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.	
Recommendation:	Members of the Committee are asked to question the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture on her portfolio responsibilities.	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Consultation:	• N/A		
Alternative option(s):	• N/A		
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
Ward(s) affected:	All		
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	None		
Documents attached:	None		

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation

1.1 Background

1.1.1 As part of its "Challenge" role, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members.

1.1.2 To carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall be invited to give an account of his or per portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

1.1.3 At this meeting, members of the Committee are asked to consider the responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture, Councillor Jo Rayner.

1.1.4 The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture has overall responsibility for the following:

- Heritage and culture
- Parks and open spaces (including trees)
- Sport

1.2 Proposals

1.2.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee ask questions of the Cabinet Member for Operations, following his verbal presentation, based on the functions as outlined in paragraph 1.1.4 of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny of Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Work Programme Update	
Report No:	OAS/SE/16/002	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	13 January 2016
Chairman of the Committee:	Diane Hind Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tel: 07890 198957 Email: diane.hind@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Brain Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	<p>1) To update the Committee on the current status of its rolling work programme of annual items for scrutiny during 2016 and current Task and Finish Groups running (Appendix 1);</p> <p>2) To remind Members to complete the Work Programme Suggestion Form when submitting future items for potential scrutiny (Appendix 2).</p>	
Recommendation:	<p>Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</p> <p>That, Members <u>note</u> the current status of the work programme and the annual items expected during 2016;</p>	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
Documents attached:	<p>Appendix 1 – Current Work Programme and Task and Finish Group</p> <p>Appendix 2 - Work Programme Suggestion Form</p>	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations

1.1 Rolling Work Programme

1.1.1 The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting.

1.1.2 The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action. The current position of the work programme for the next few months is attached at **Appendix 1** for information.

1.2 Member Work Programme Suggestion Form

1.2.1 Attached at **Appendix 2** is the Member Work Programme Suggestion Form, which Members are reminded to complete when submitting future items for potential scrutiny.

1.2.2 This enables suggestions received to be considered by the Committee at each meeting.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rolling Work Programme (St Edmundsbury Borough Council)

The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting. The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action.

Description	Lead Officer	Details
9 March 2016		
Portfolio Holder Presentation	Resources and Performance	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to give a short presentation / account of their portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.
New Housing Development Sites Joint Task and Finish Group	Service Manager (Planning-Development)	Final Report - To jointly review with Forest Heath District Council the unacceptable length of time taken by housing developers to bring highways, footpaths, landscaping and open space up to adoption standards on new developments.
Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership	Community Safety Co-ordinator	To review the work of the Partnership on an annual basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Scrutiny Officer	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Scrutiny Officer	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
20 April 2016		
Portfolio Holder Presentation	Families and Communities (TBC)	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to give a short presentation / account of their portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.
Dog Fouling in West Suffolk	Head of Operations	Update on initiatives following report presented to the Committee on 22 July 2015.
Skyliner Way, Bury St Edmunds	Head of Planning and Growth	Quarterly progress report in relation to the recommendations made by the Committee at its meeting held on 3 September 2014
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 4)	Monitoring Officer	To scrutinise the Council's use of its surveillance powers.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Scrutiny Officer	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Scrutiny Officer	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Futures items to be programmed at a later date

1. Future Developments for Regional Transport in West Suffolk (A1307) – Progress Report.
2. Update on North West and North East Haverhill including Haverhill Town Centre Master Plan.
3. Decisions Plan: West Suffolk Operational Hub

Current position of Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups

	Title	Purpose	Start date	Members appointed	Estimated End date
1.	New Housing Development Sites (Joint Scrutiny Review)	To jointly review with Forest Heath District Council the unacceptable length of time taken by housing developers to bring highways, footpaths, landscaping and open space up to adoption standards on new developments.	August 2013	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> Diane Hind Angela Rushen Jim Thorndyke	9 March 2016
			Progress updates	<u>Forest Heath</u> David Bimson Ruth Bowman Bill Sadler	
			23 January 2014		



**Suggestion for Scrutiny Work Programme Form
(To be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee)**

Suggestion from:

What would you like to suggest for investigation / review?
Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

What are the main issues / concerns to be considered?
Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Would this review benefit from a "West Suffolk" approach (i.e. joint scrutiny by both Councils), or is it relevant only to your council?

Who is responsible for providing this service, or tackling the issue in question?
Have you spoken to them, and if so, what was the response?
What is the Portfolio Holders view on this issue?
What would be the likely benefits and outcomes of carrying out this investigation / review?
Estimated Committee and officer resource implications (eg research group, one-off report, dedicated meeting etc)
Suggested witnesses, documentation and consultation

Will this investigation / review contribute to one or more of the Council's Strategic Priorities? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active	
Homes for our communities	

Will this investigation / review contribute to the achievement of one or more of the commitments within the Council's Strategic Plan 2014-2016? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth:	
1. Benefit growth that enhances prosperity and quality of life.	
2. Existing businesses that are thriving and new businesses brought to the area.	
3. People with the educational attainment and skills needed in our local economy.	
4. Vibrant, attractive and clean high streets, village centres and markets.	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active:	
1. A thriving voluntary sector and active communities who take the initiative to help the most vulnerable.	
2. People playing a greater role in determining the future of their communities.	
3. Improved wellbeing, physical and mental health.	
4. Accessible countryside and green spaces.	
Homes for our communities:	
1. Sufficient housing for current and future generations, including more affordable homes; improvements to existing housing.	
2. New developments that are fit for the future, properly supported by infrastructure, and that build communities, not just housing.	
3. Homes that are flexible for people's changing needs.	

Will this investigation hit one of the essential elements of a scrutiny review when analysing potential scrutiny reviews? If so, which (please tick)	
Public Interest: The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen by overview and scrutiny.	
Impact (Value): Priority should be given to issues that make the biggest difference to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area, and which have the potential to make recommendations which could lead to real improvements. The outcome must also be proportionate to the cost of carrying out the review in terms of staff and councillor time.	
Relevance: Overview and scrutiny must be satisfied that an issue identified for review is relevant and does not duplicate existing work being undertaken elsewhere by various Working Groups, Cabinet, partners etc.	
Partnership working or external scrutiny: The focus of scrutiny is moving towards joint action and community leadership, so anything which offers this opportunity should be given serious consideration.	

Would you like to be involved in the investigation / review?	
Yes	No
Date of request:	Signed

Please return this form to the:

Scrutiny Officer, Forest Heath District Council, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY

Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Updated: July 2013

Updated: June 2014 (Revised West Suffolk Strategic Priorities)

Updated: March 2015 (Amended as a Joint Form)

This page is intentionally left blank