



# CHELTENHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

### Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 16 July 2012**  
**6.00 pm**  
**Pittville Room - Municipal Offices**

<b>Membership</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Duncan Smith (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Barbara Driver, Colin Hay, Helena McCloskey, Ian Bickerton, Andrew Wall, Jo Teakle and Diane Hibbert

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

### Agenda

<b>1.</b>		<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
<b>2.</b>		<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
<b>3.</b>		<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b> To approve the draft minutes of the last meeting held on 28 May 2012.	(Pages 1 - 6)
<b>4.</b>		<b>PUBLIC QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS</b> None received to date	
<b>5.</b>		<b>MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE</b> From - Council (see agenda item 9) - Cabinet	
<b>6.</b>		<b>WARDEN HILL ELECTIONS</b> A report to inform the committee of the results of the independent enquiry into the problems which occurred in the Warden Hill ward during the local elections on 3 May 2012. Marie Rosenthal, the author of the report, will be in attendance to answer any questions Members may have on the report.	(Pages 7 - 18)
<b>7.</b>		<b>APPOINTMENT OF A SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE</b> Report of the Chair of the O&S Committee, Councillor Duncan Smith	(Pages 19 - 24)

8.		<p><b>FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update from Councillor Penny Hall as the Council's representative at the Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group held on 8 June 2012.</li> <li>• An update from Councillor Klara Sudbury on her attendance at the following meetings: Glos Health, Community and Care O&amp;S committee on 10 July 2012 Glos Police and Crime Panel on 13 July 2012 Glos Community Safety O&amp;S committee</li> </ul>	(Pages 25 - 26)
9.		<p><b>UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS</b></p> <p>A review of progress across the scrutiny task groups and initiation of any new work.</p> <p>Review Draft Terms of Reference for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joint Planning Liaison working group</li> <li>- Sex trade (referred by Council)</li> </ul> <p>Review proposed scrutiny topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- from Cllr. Regan regarding Allotments</li> <li>- from Cllr. Hall regarding maintenance of grass verges</li> </ul>	(Pages 27 - 38)
10.		<p><b>REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN</b></p> <p>Review of workplan agreed at the last meeting</p>	(Pages 39 - 44)
11.		<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Date of next meeting: 13 September 2012</p>	

**Contact Officer:** Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937  
**Email:** [democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk)

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 28th May, 2012**

**6.00 - 7.40 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Duncan Smith (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Colin Hay, Penny Hall, Helena McCloskey, Ian Bickerton, Andrew Wall, Jo Teakle and Diane Hibbert
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Councillor Wendy Flynn, Councillor Jacky Fletcher, Councillor Anne Regan, Andrew North, Councillor Jon Walklett, Councillor Andrew Chard, Councillor Peter Jeffries, Councillor John Rawson and Councillor Roger Whyborn

## Minutes

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Driver and Councillor Penny Hall was attending as her substitute.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None received.

**3. REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The chair referred members to the functions of the overview and scrutiny committee which had been circulated with the agenda. As chair, he intended this to be a business meeting which would not undertake scrutiny itself but act as a commissioning body for scrutiny task groups to undertake further review work. This committee would review any suggested topics and if agreed set up high-level terms of reference for a scrutiny task group (STG) and set a timescale. The STG would have a free hand to carry out their work but the committee would request an update when the time set for the review had elapsed. When the STG reported back their recommendations, the committee would not go through their report in detail but would satisfy themselves that the terms of reference had been met. It was his intention that the majority of scrutiny reports would be sent to Council so as many members as possible could contribute to the debate and influence the outcomes.

He acknowledged that there would be exceptions to this such as call-in. The Chief Executive also reminded members that the chair had requested that the report on the Warden Hill elections should come to the July meeting of this committee. Some members did suggest that this topic would be better dealt with by a STG but the chair responded that an independent person had been set up to carry out the review and he didn't want to set up another group to scrutinise the work of the independent review.

Referring to the specific functions for the committee set out in the constitution, a member queried the wording of the function, "nominate members to Cabinet working groups when representatives of O&S are requested". He suggested that it should refer to "non-executive members" as "O&S" could be interpreted as being restricted to members of this committee. The Democratic Services Manager agreed to follow this up with One Legal.

#### **4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny meeting of the 27 February 2012 and the Environment meeting of the 29 February 2012 were approved as a correct record.

The chair requested that the minutes should be referred to the new Cabinet so that they could review the minutes for any outstanding actions for their consideration.

#### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

None received.

#### **6. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

None received.

#### **7. END OF YEAR DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

The Strategy and Engagement Manager introduced the report which set out the corporate performance of the organisation as at the end of the financial year 2011/12. The report was due to go to Cabinet in June and so this was an opportunity for this committee to make any comments and observations.

The Chief Executive advised members that the first milestone reported as red was now green as the government had agreed to provide funding to the county council for sustainable transport.

Members requested further information on the cost of local appeals which had been upheld and the trend over previous years. The officer agreed to request this information from the Director Built Environment and pass on to the committee.

The chair concluded that there were no issues arising where a scrutiny review had been identified. Regarding commissioning, he suggested that there was an important role for scrutiny in looking at services that had been taken through the commissioning route. Scrutiny could review the efficiency of this process as well as the delivery of the anticipated benefits.

#### **8. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

The Democratic Services Manager introduced the workplan which had been circulated with the agenda. She explained that each of the three previous

committees had maintained their own workplan and any issues which they wished to be carried forward were set out in the new plan.

Members were keen that the committee was consistent on its strategy to avoid carrying out detailed scrutiny themselves. On this basis it was queried why this committee should look at the draft Corporate Strategy in February and why this would not be done by a STG.

The chair responded that this document should come initially to this committee and they would then have the option to set up STGs to look in more detail at sections of the strategy. He added that the chair's briefings would also be important for reviewing potential items for the agenda. For example this would include looking at the Corporate Risk Register to see whether there were any issues that needed to be brought to committee. He intended that the chair's briefing should involve the vice-chair and the lead member from the other political group, Councillor Dianne Hibbert. Each of the attendees would have a responsibility for communicating to their respective groups, particularly with regard to potential nominations for STGs.

There was some discussion about the various types of working group and potential duplication if a STG was set up to look at an issue where a Cabinet working group was already in place. The chair responded that if one was already operational then it would be appropriate for that group to stay in place. However if members of the group felt unhappy about a particular aspect they could make a request to the O&S committee for a STG to do an additional piece of work. The commissioning working groups were a good example of Cabinet led working groups where non-Executive members had been invited to participate. The purpose of a Cabinet working group was to act as a sounding board for the Cabinet Member and not to carry out scrutiny. O&S could decide to scrutinise a commissioned service once it was up and running through a STG. O&S could also decide to set up a STG to review the commissioning process for that service and in that process the group would want input from members of the Cabinet working group as well as officers and the Cabinet Member.

The vice-chair expressed some concerns that the committee did not take on too much and she suggested there could be a maximum of two or three working groups at any one time. The committee must also give consideration to the capacity of officers and non-executive members to support all the STGs being suggested.

Regarding the list of information items in the workplan, members acknowledged that these were important for all members. It was suggested that such presentations could be held in external venues for example Gloucestershire Airport rather than hold it in the municipal offices. Generally the O&S committee would avoid reports from outside bodies unless there was a specific outcome which required scrutiny. The chair suggested that some of these presentations should form part of the Council meetings.

Members considered each item on the plan and the actions agreed are set out in the revised plan in an appendix to these minutes. Further work would be carried out on the plan before being brought back to the next meeting of this committee.

**Resolved that the draft work plan be revised to take account of the discussion at this meeting and brought back to be next meeting of the committee.**

**9. SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS**

The Democratic Services Manager referred members to the summary which had been circulated with the agenda. This listed all the potential scrutiny task groups as well as other bodies where O&S was required to make a nomination or have some input. It was emphasised that some of the scrutiny task groups were just ideas at this stage and terms of reference would need to be drafted and resources assessed before they were added to the scrutiny work plan. The list of potential topics had been circulated and a number of members had expressed an interest in being on one of the Scrutiny Tasks Groups should they be set up..

Regarding the Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group, Councillor Hall highlighted the value of the group and the benefit she had got from attending. After some discussion, Councillor Hall agreed to continue to represent the O&S committee and she would attend the chair's briefing of this committee to give feedback.

Regarding the Joint Planning Liaison Group, the Chief Executive explained that the member steering group for the Joint Core Strategy across the three councils had decided that they needed to liaise with a wider group of members. This had resulted in a request to each of the three councils to set up an ad hoc group of members to understand and give feedback on the specific issues for their area. Originally the Leader had sent a request to group leaders to set up this joint core strategy working group but the Chair of O&S had suggested that this should be a scrutiny task group and as Chief Executive he supported this view. The chair added that this particular working group could be in operation for as long as two years.

Regarding the Event Submission Working group, Councillor Hall, as a member of the group, reported that it had met several times and was due to meet again soon to review the final draft of an event submission form it had been developing. She highlighted that this STG was not looking at specific events but it was noted that there may be a need in the future to set up a scrutiny review to look at a particular event if there were concerns.

The vice-chair raised concerns about the proposed Expo event and suggested that it should be scrutinised as there was a general lack of information for members about it. The Chief Executive explained that specific applications for the Expo event would be dealt with by the Licensing and Planning Committees when appropriate and regarding the Bill in Parliament for road closures this would come back to the Cabinet for an Executive decision. He suggested that the vice-chair should liaise with the Cabinet Member to establish a timetable for these decisions.

Regarding climate change, members acknowledged that the working group had done some valuable work. However if this was to become a STG, it would need

to have specific terms of reference. This will be discussed with the officers responsible for the group.

Regarding the proposed ICT review, the Chief Executive indicated that a commissioning review of ICT was due to be set up later in the year. It may be appropriate for the committee to set up a STG which could give some direction to the commissioning review.

Regarding Gloucestershire Airport, the suggestion was that the Cheltenham members of the Joint Airport Working Group could pick up on any issues requiring further investigation. A member suggested that there had been a significant injection of finance for the airport safety project with the objective of increasing passenger numbers and it may be appropriate for this committee to set up a STG to review whether those benefits have been achieved.

The chair suggested that it may be appropriate for the September meeting of this committee to look at setting up a STG to review the success of money spent on flood alleviation schemes in Cheltenham.

It was noted that the times of meetings for scrutiny task groups needed to be set so that all members have the potential to attend. STGs should also consider relevant co-optees and if they were having a presentation as part of their work they should consider inviting other members.

Members welcomed the workplan and felt it was also important that at each meeting they had some information regarding the scrutiny task groups and the timescales they were working to.

The list circulated at the meeting would be updated.

**Resolved that actions set out in the summary attached to these minutes are progressed and interests in potential scrutiny task groups be noted.**

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  
Monday 16 July 2012.

Duncan Smith  
**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 6



## **INVESTIGATION INTO BALLOT PAPER ISSUE ERROR AT ST CHRISTOPHER'S CHURCH POLLING STATION, WARDEN HILL WARD, CHELTENHAM DURING THE MAY 2012 LOCAL ELECTIONS**

Report by Marie Rosenthal to Andrew North, Chief Executive and Returning Officer  
for Cheltenham Borough Council

June 2012

### **Contents**

1. Executive Summary
2. Background
3. Investigation and Findings
4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Annex A – Terms of Reference

Annex B – Declaration of Result of Poll for Warden Hill Ward

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Local Elections were held in the Borough of Cheltenham on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2012. A polling station was located at St Christopher's Church Hall in Lincoln Avenue, Warden Hill to allow voters in that area to vote in person.
2. The Representation of the People Act 1983 sets out the statutory rules which govern the conduct of local elections in the United Kingdom. Rule 47 requires:-

“Any ballot paper ... on which anything is written or marked by which the voter can be identified ... shall ... be void and not counted”
3. A complaint was made by an Elector who had noticed that the Poll Clerk at that polling station had written her unique voter number on the back of her ballot paper before handing it to her.
4. The investigation has found that a combination of human error and failures by the polling station staff at the St Christopher's Church Hall polling station caused the error.

These included:

- a. A failure to understand the role and responsibility of the Presiding officer
  - b. A failure to instruct and supervise the work of the Poll Clerks and to have a sound knowledge of voting procedure
  - c. Failure by the Poll Clerk staff to know all the procedures for voting and how to deal with any problems
5. No malicious intent was identified as regards the error that has been found. This was a rare event; although it is noted that a similar incident involving staff employed by another authority using this same polling station took place several years ago. Nevertheless, the investigation at Warden Hill Ward has identified a small number of shortcomings in the arrangements for appointing Presiding Officers, training election staff and carrying out polling station inspections.
  6. This report makes a number of recommendations for staff training arrangements and more effective use of Polling station inspectors intended to prevent a reoccurrence of such an error in the future.

## 2. BACKGROUND

1. Local Elections were held in the Borough of Cheltenham on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2012. Warden Hill Ward was one of the Wards being contested to return a Borough Councillor to serve on the Cheltenham Borough Council. There were three candidates standing in that Election.
2. The Returning Officer had arranged for two polling stations to be set up to allow Electors to vote in that Ward. One of the Polling Stations was located at St Christopher's Church Hall in Lincoln Avenue, Warden Hill, and Cheltenham. A Presiding Officer and three Poll Clerks were appointed by the Returning Officer to staff this Polling Station.
3. A complaint was made to the Election Office at approximately 4.30 pm. on polling day by an Elector who had noticed that the Poll Clerk had written her unique voter number on the back of her ballot paper before handing it to her. This voter had questioned the process but had been told by the Presiding Officer that this was correct. The voter telephoned the Elections Office because she continued to believe that this process was flawed.
4. The Returning Officer took immediate steps to contact the Polling Station and instruct the Staff to refrain from putting voter numbers on ballot papers. The Presiding Officer was replaced as a matter of urgency.
5. At the count, on the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the Returning Officer had to disallow 412 votes which had been cast at St Christopher's Church Hall Polling Station as there was writing or a mark by which the Voter could be identified contrary to the statutory rules set out in Schedule 1 to the Representation of the People Act 1983. Fortunately the number of disallowed votes did not affect the outcome of the election as the winning candidate had a majority of 460 votes.
6. On the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2012 the Returning Officer announced that he would commission an independent investigation into the circumstances surrounding the marking of the ballot papers at this Polling Station and that the Report would be published.
7. The investigation commenced on Tuesday the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2012 and was completed on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2012.

### 3. THE INVESTIGATION AND FINDINGS

The investigation was carried out by Marie Rosenthal, Returning Officer and Monitoring Officer at the Forest of Dean District Council, assisted by Geraldine Randall-Wilce, Electoral Services Manager at Forest of Dean District Council. Its terms of reference are attached at Annex A.

The investigators reviewed statements made by all the staff employed at the St Christopher's Church Polling Station and the Polling Station Inspector responsible for that station on polling day; met with staff of the Electoral Registration Office and the Returning Officer; interviewed the Presiding Officer; examined file notes and telephone records relating to the handling of the complaint and training material and other documents used for the appointment and training of election staff

The Investigation has made the following findings:

1. The Presiding Officer had been employed previously by the Returning Officer at that Station with no complaints. One of the Poll Clerks was an experienced Poll Clerk who had worked previously at St Christopher's Church Hall Polling Station on a number of occasions. The other two Poll Clerks were inexperienced. All of the Polling Station Staff had attended the mandatory training provided by the Returning Officer for election staff and been supplied with a personal copy of the Handbook for polling station staff issued by the Electoral Commission.
2. The Handbook is clear and comprehensive and designed to assist polling station staff working at a local government election in England and Wales. It clearly describes the procedures to be followed and how to deal with any issues that may arise. The Handbook makes it clear that whilst polling station staff will receive training, they should read the Handbook very carefully in advance of polling day to ensure they were familiar with all the processes that are described in it. Section 5 of the Handbook sets out the process for conducting the poll on polling day in clear language. **It emphasises that polling staff must not write anything on the ballot paper itself.**
3. The Handbook which is a lengthy document comprising 42 pages is supplemented with a Quick Guide for Polling Station Staff which gives page references to show where the detailed information can be found in the Handbook
4. The presentation slides and training material used by the Returning Officer's staff to deliver the mandatory training to all polling station staff is based on material provided by the Electoral Commission. It deals with the issuing of ballot papers at the polling station. There is a presentation slide which sets out in clear unambiguous language:

**Do NOT write the elector number on the ballot paper!!**

**Write nothing on the ballot paper!!**

Copies of the presentation slides are not given to Presiding officers.

5. The statements made by the poll clerks working at St Christopher's Church Polling Station in the Warden Hill Ward of Cheltenham Borough Council reveal that they did not receive any instructions from the Presiding Officer on the issuing of ballot papers when they set up the polling station on the day. The Presiding Officer organised the layout of the station and the location of the issue table and ballot box but then turned her attention to sorting and organising the polling station paperwork at the sundries table elsewhere in the station. The polling station staff were left to organise the issue of ballot papers and the marking of the corresponding number list themselves.
6. Not all the staff brought their Handbooks with them although a copy of the Quick Guide and the Handbook were available at all times at the polling station for them to refer to it. Polling station staff did not check the Handbook at this time or seek advice from the Elections Office. From an early stage all ballot papers were marked with the elector number on the back.
7. It appears from the statements that the polling station staff were challenged by at least one other voter during the day who noticed that the unique elector number was being written on the back of the ballot paper. The polling station staff say that they did consult the handbook during the day on this issue and were satisfied from reading the Frequently Asked Questions section that they were issuing the ballot papers correctly. This question asks *"Why do you need to write my elector number beside my ballot paper number? Does this mean my vote is not secret?"* *The answer relates to the marking of the corresponding number list, not the marking of the ballot paper. However it is acknowledged that the section is ambiguous. However if the other sections specifically on the issue of the ballot paper are consulted the position is crystal clear.*
8. During the afternoon one voter questioned the process and was advised by the Presiding Officer that this was correct. This voter remained dissatisfied with this answer and at approximately 4.30 p.m. telephoned the Elections office at the Municipal Offices to make a complaint as she believed the process was flawed
9. As soon as the Returning Officer had been notified of this matter, arrangements were put in hand to direct the staff to immediately stop putting voter numbers on ballot papers and for the Presiding Officer at that Station to be replaced as a matter of urgency.
10. A Polling Station Inspector had been appointed for this Polling Station. Their role is to check the layout of the polling station and that things are running smoothly and to be a point of contact for the polling station staff with the Returning Officer and his core staff. The Inspector visited the station at approximately 10.45 a.m. and found everything to be in good order. He has commented in his statement that the Presiding Officer commented to him that

she had found the training to be inadequate and cited the time it had taken her to check the box the previous day and suggested a basic run through of the exercise would have been helpful. When he revisited the station at 4.30pm he was told about the voter complaint and the instruction from the Elections office to cease writing voter numbers on the ballot papers. He observed that this was put into effect immediately.

11. The Election Agents for the Candidates taking part in the Election for Warden Hill Ward were contacted by the Returning Officer. Two out of the three agents were notified after 6.00 p.m. The remaining agent was briefed at around 10.00 p.m. at the count venue.
12. The results for the Warden Hill Ward are shown in Annex B. The Conservative Party Candidate achieved a majority of 460 votes. The 412 votes which had been marked at St Christopher's Church Hall Polling Station were disallowed and not counted.
13. The training provided by the Returning Officer is very comprehensive and meets the best practice advice and guidance of the Electoral Commission. The training focuses on the roles of the Presiding Officer and the Poll Clerk and involves some limited practical examples. Feedback from the training session is generally very positive.
14. However there is no separate planned session for inexperienced staff new to election work or for Poll Clerks being promoted to Presiding Officer. This is available on request on an individual basis. The feedback forms from two of the poll clerks working at the St Christopher's Church Hall polling station were critical, with one of the staff arriving late for the training due to alleged poor identification of training venue and the other asking for a more "thorough, i.e. "mock up " of what needs to be done".
15. A clear impression has been gained that Election staff employed by the Returning Officer at the Elections Office regard their responsibilities for running local elections with rigour and diligence.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The investigation has found that a combination of human error and failures by the polling station staff at the St Christopher's Church Hall polling station caused the error. It has also identified a very small number of shortcomings in the arrangements for training election staff and carrying out polling station inspections.

These included:

- Failure to understand the role and responsibility of the Presiding Officer
- Failure by the Presiding Officer to instruct and supervise the work of the Poll Clerks and to have a sound knowledge of the voting procedure
- Failure by the Poll Clerk staff to know all the procedures for voting and how to deal with any problems
- Failure by the Polling Station Inspector to spot the incorrect issue of the ballot papers
- A need to review the learning and teaching techniques used for training election staff

All the polling staff had attended the mandatory training session arranged by the Returning Officer for staff working on the May Elections. This training uses Electoral Commission training material. It involves the trainer working through a lengthy power point presentation to a large group of individuals, many of whom are already experienced election staff. It has few practical demonstrations or hands on activity.

It is generally recognised that each person prefers different learning styles and techniques. Learning styles group common ways that people learn. Everyone has a mix of learning styles. Because of this it is recommended that the Returning Officer reviews the current training and encourages trainers to use a range of learning and teaching techniques when training election staff. It is suggested that this include a “mock up” of a polling station and a physical demonstration of how to issue a ballot paper and mark the corresponding number list.

No malicious intent was identified as regards the error that has been found. Indeed the polling station staff believed their actions would improve vote security.

The Polling Station Inspector has an important role to play in providing an independent check that everything is running smoothly at the polling station. It is recommended that the Returning Officer consider making it an explicit part of the Polling Station Inspector’s role to ask the polling station staff to explain the ballot paper issue process to them during their visits to the polling station.

This was a rare event; although it is noted that a similar incident involving staff employed by another authority using this same polling station took place several years ago.

### **Recommendations**

- 1. That the Returning Officer:**
  - a. Requires trainers to use a range of learning and teaching techniques when training election staff. It is suggested that this include a “mock up” of a polling station and a physical demonstration of how to issue a ballot paper and mark the corresponding number list.**
  - b. Supplies Presiding Officers on request with a hard copy set of the training presentation as a further aide memoire to their role.**





## **Annex A - Terms of Reference**

Independent Investigation into the marking of Ballot Papers at the St Christopher's Church Polling Station, Walden Hill Ward, Borough of Cheltenham

### **Aim**

To conduct an independent investigation to provide a report to Cheltenham Borough Council Returning Officer and Chief Executive into the marking of ballot papers by Election Staff during the 2012 local elections, to establish the facts surrounding the error and to make any recommendations for the improvement of systems in the future.

### **Background**

The Returning Officer is responsible under the provisions of the Representation of the People Act 1983 to conduct properly run Elections.

### **Scope of Investigation**

The investigation should include:-

- A review of training, core processes and controls in relation to the issue of ballot papers at a Polling Station
- A review of the Management supervision and inspection arrangement at the St. Christopher's Church polling station

### **Conduct of the Investigation**

The Independent Investigator will:-

- Have access to all relevant legislation, guidance and documentation
- Be supported by the Senior Electoral Registrations Manager from the Borough Council and
- Have access to all staff for personal interview

### **Outputs**

The final report will be presented to the Returning Officer who will publish the report to Cheltenham Borough Council's Scrutiny Committee. It should at a minimum, cover the following:-

- Reasons for the error, identifying as far as possible whether the error was attributable to human error, breakdown in systems or processes or malicious action
- Any recommendations for improvements to current electoral systems and processes.

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 16

Page 17

**ELECTION OF A COUNCILLOR**  
**for the WARDEN HILL WARD of the**  
**BOROUGH OF CHELTENHAM**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> MAY 2012**

## DECLARATION OF RESULT OF POLL

I, ANDREW NORTH, being the Returning Officer at the Election of a Councillor for the WARDEN HILL Ward of the Borough of Cheltenham held on the 3rd day of May 2012, do hereby give notice that the number of Votes recorded for each Candidate at the said Election is as follows:-

NAMES OF CANDIDATES		DESCRIPTION	Number of Votes Recorded;	If elected write the word "Elected" against the number of Votes
SURNAME	OTHER NAMES			
Bexfield	Cindy April	Liberal Democrat	249	
Regan	Anne	The Conservative Party Candidate	709	ELECTED
Van Coevorden	Adam Paul	Green Party candidate	208	
The number of ballot papers rejected was as follows:-				
(a)	want of official mark:			
(b)	voting for more candidates than voter was entitled to:			
(c)	writing or mark by which voter could be identified:		412	
(d)	unmarked or wholly void for uncertainty:		5	
Total No. of Votes:			1583	

The total number of votes recorded represented 36 % of the registered electors.

And I do hereby declare that the said ..... ANNE REGAN ..... is duly elected as a Councillor for the said Ward.

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2012.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Returning Officer

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 18

## Cheltenham Borough Council

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 16 July 2012

#### Appointment of an O&S sub-committee

#### Report of the chair of O&S

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, Councillor Duncan Smith</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Director of Commissioning, Jane Griffiths</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Key Decision</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	The new arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny which were considered by Council in December 2011 and March 2012 made provision for the O&S committee to set up one or more sub-committees in support of its functions. As the committee meets bi-monthly it is anticipated that sometimes there might be a need to set up a scrutiny task group (STG), consider a call-in request or receive recommendations from a STG as an urgent matter. A sub-committee could be set up for this purpose as it would facilitate the arrangement of an urgent meeting at short notice and ensure the item of business was dealt with expeditiously.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>It is recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&amp;S)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Establish and appoint members to the Overview and Scrutiny sub-committee in accordance with political proportionality (2 Lib Dem, 1 Conservative and 1 PAB) including substitutes.</b></li> <li><b>2. Agree that the functions of the sub-committee are as set out in Appendix 2.</b></li> <li><b>3. Consider whether they wish to appoint the chairman and vice chairman of the sub-committee.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>The sub-committee will be supported by Democratic Services from existing budgets and there are no financial implications.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Paul Jones, Head of Financial Services (Go Shared Services), paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 77 5154</b></p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p>Section 21 LGA2000 permits O&amp;S committees to appoint and arrange for discharge of functions by one or more sub-committees.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Peter.Lewis, Head of Legal Services peter.lewis@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012</b></p>

<p><b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b></p>	<p>The sub-committee will be supported by Democratic Services using existing resources and there are no HR implications.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, <a href="mailto:julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk">julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>, 01242 264355</b></p>
<p><b>Key risks</b></p>	<p><b>None</b></p>
<p><b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b></p>	<p>The sub-committee will ensure that the business of overview and scrutiny is carried out expeditiously.</p>
<p><b>Environmental and climate change implications</b></p>	<p><b>None</b></p>

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The new arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny considered and approved by Council in December 2011 and March 2012 made provision for the main committee to set up one of more sub-committees in support of its functions. This is referred to section 2.7 of Part 4D – Overview and Scrutiny rules in the Council’s constitution.

**“O&S Committee may, for the purposes of carrying out or advising it on any of its functions, appoint one or more sub-committees, and may, but need not, appoint the chairman and vice-chairman of the sub-committee(s).”**

- 1.2 An indicative terms of reference for such a sub-committee were included in the report on the Review of the Constitution which was approved by Council in March 2012. An updated version of these terms of reference is attached as Appendix 2.
- 1.3 The rules of political proportionality apply to the sub-committee and the committee has the power of appointment of substitute members to the sub-committee.
- 1.4 As the committee meets bi-monthly it is anticipated that sometimes there might be a need to set up a STG, consider a call-in request or receive recommendations from a STG as an urgent matter. It was considered that a sub-committee could be set up for this purpose as it would facilitate the arrangement of an urgent meeting at short notice and allow any business to be dealt with expeditiously.

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 See above

## 3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 Any business would need to wait until the next scheduled meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or set up an additional meeting of the committee. It was envisaged that this would be more difficult given the number of members involved and a smaller sub-committee would facilitate the process.

## 4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1 Discussed by the Constitution Working Group during their review of the constitutional changes required to support the new O&S arrangements

## 5. Performance management –monitoring and review

- 5.1 By the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Rosalind.Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, Rosalind.reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk,  01242 774937</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	1. Risk Assessment
<b>Background information</b>	1. Constitution Section 4 D: Overview and Scrutiny Rules

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If a sub-committee is not appointed, then an urgent item of business could not be dealt with in the required timescales or all members of the main committee would need to attend a special meeting for a single item of business.	O&S chair	01/07/2012	3	3	9	Reduce	Set up a sub-committee	16/07	Dem Services Mgt	
<p><b>Explanatory notes</b></p> <p><b>Impact</b> – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p><b>Likelihood</b> – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p><b>Control</b> - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											



<b>OVERVIEW &amp; SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE</b>
<b>Functions</b>
<b>General</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>undertake the functions set out below together with such specific functions or tasks as are allocated from time to time by O&amp;S Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Scrutiny Task Groups (STGs) and Call-in</b>
<p><i>Where an urgent decision<sup>1</sup> is required and (1) the O&amp;S Committee chairman (or, in their absence, the vice-chairman or in their absence the Group Leaders acting collectively) agrees that the decision is urgent, and (2) it is not, in the view of the Proper Officer, practical to convene a quorate meeting of O&amp;S Committee -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish time limited STGs to carry out in-depth reviews of a particular issue, set the size and high level terms of reference and agree reporting lines (to the Sub-Committee, O&amp;S Committee or other appropriate body) for recommendations</li> <li>consider call-ins<sup>2</sup> and decide appropriate action (including the establishment of STGs)</li> <li>receive reports from STGs and make recommendations to Cabinet, Council, committee (including O&amp;S Committee) or other appropriate body (including commissioning boards)</li> </ul>
<b>Scrutiny processes</b>
<p><i>When considering call-ins and considering reports from STGs -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>question Cabinet Members, committees, the Chief Executive, Executive Directors, Directors or representatives under joint arrangements regarding decisions taken, service delivery, initiatives or projects</li> <li>question, call for and gather evidence from any external person or organisation (with their consent) in order to carry out the scrutiny process</li> <li>make reports and recommendations to Cabinet, Council, a committee or other appropriate body arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process</li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined in Article 13

<sup>2</sup> Rule 14 Overview & Scrutiny Rules (see Part 4D)

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 24

# Information Note

This note is intended to inform members of any matters covered at the Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group which may be of interest and prompt discussion at the O&S meeting.

## Update from Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group 8 July 2012

Attended by Cllr Penny Hall and Rosalind Reeves from Cheltenham Borough Council

### 1. Changes to O&S structures across Gloucestershire

- Forest have just reviewed the success of their new structure introduced in May 2011 – a single committee and a number of scrutiny panels. Felt it was working well.
- Interest in CBC's new structure
- At the county, scrutiny resource now integrated into Democratic Services but still officer support for O&S
- county reviewing O&S structure

### 2. Reviews shared that may be of interest

- GO Shared service review beginning in July (Forest)
- Process for groups seeking voluntary and community sector funding starting in July (Forest)
- Private sector housing renewal loans reporting in July (Forest)
- Budget scrutiny underway at the county and aiming to report to Cabinet in November to influence the MTFs – may be worth CBC looking at how they do it
- looking at ICT provision for new members at the county in 2013 – may be worth looking at the outcomes
- Member communication in the development of the Joint Core Strategy (Tewkesbury) – review completed and recommendations made
- Housing and Homelessness strategy review underway (Tewkesbury)
- Public participation (Stroud)
- UBICO review planned at Cheltenham – Tewkesbury expressed an interest in this

### 3. Learning points

The value of holding a one day enquiry to deal with a scrutiny topic. Eg County did a one day enquiry on Severn Estuary and produced a short video for the Centre for Public Scrutiny conference. Forest did a similar one-day enquiry on Leisure centres and parking. Takes a lot of time to organise but can be very effective for generating interest and outcomes and dealing with an issue in a short space of time

For scrutiny to be effective the importance of members attending meetings and being prepared by reading papers and preparing questions beforehand.

### 4. Update on Police and Crime Panel.

Group received an update and a briefing has now been sent to all councillors

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager

Tel No: 01242 774937

Email: [Rosalind.reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:Rosalind.reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 26

List of all scrutiny task groups and other appointments related to Overview and Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny	Purpose	Agreed nominations/membership	Lead Officer	Update
Budget scrutiny working group	The working group's role is to develop the budget process, support the development of Members' scrutiny role and to consider ideas from Members for reducing the budget gap.	Cllrs Coleman, Harman, Wall, Hibbert, Massey, Sudbury Cllr Prince (sub). Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation.	Mark Sheldon	First meeting scheduled for 10 July 2012
Community Governance review (STG)	Council in December 2011 agreed to set up a cross party working group to review the Parish Council boundaries ahead of the PC elections in 2014. Terms of Reference tba by Council in July.	Cllrs Barbara Driver, Anne Regan, David Prince, Andrew Chard and Klara Sudbury. Parish Council members will also be appointed so that all five parishes are represented on the group.	Helen Down	The first meeting took place on 21 June 2012. Unfortunately despite availability being canvassed before the meeting, no borough councillors were able to attend. The Parish Councillors present discussed the draft terms of reference. These will be circulated to all members of the working group for agreement.
Joint Planning Liason Group (originally called Joint Core Strategy but brief has now been extended to other aspects) (STG)	To provide a vehicle with which to engage with elected members on strategic development management issues in light of the changes to the planning framework.	Cllrs Harman, Wall, Godwin, Chard, Mcloskey, Teakle, Sudbury and Bickerton.	Strategic Land Use Team	First meeting on 28 June when the group will review Tof R and agree what areas they want to look at. 2nd meeting planned for 9 July. TOR to be reported to O&S on 16 July.
Event Submissions task group (STG)	Review and make recommendations for the process for organisers of events to submit proposals	Current membership: Cllrs Regan, Hall, Britter, Hibbert and Seacome to continue and Councillor Sudbury expressed an interest in joining the group.	Trevor Gladding with support from Saira Malin, Democratic Services	Officers are meeting on 26 June to review the draft event form and this is being reviewed with the Chair, Cllr Penny Hall on 28 June. Final meeting(s) with the working group will agree the form and final report before it goes to O&S in September.

## List of all scrutiny task groups and other appointments related to Overview and Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny	Purpose	Agreed nominations/membership	Lead Officer	Update
Youth provision (STG)	A potential STG to review CBC investment in CCP to develop resilience in VCS Youth provision and assess the impact of the GCC grant	Cllr Anne Regan, Chris Coleman, Suzanne Williams, Rob Reid, Jo Teakle and possibly Barbara Driver (tbc).	Richard Gibson	Meeting being planned for mid July when the draft terms of reference will be agreed. These can then be reported back to the next meeting of O&S in September.
ICT review (STG)	A potential to review ICT services and resilience. Is the infrastructure sufficiently robust, is a shared ICT the right approach and do we have the right delivery model in place.	Cllrs Andrew Chard, Andrew Wall, Simon Wheeler and Colin Hay.	Mark Sheldon	A first meeting is being planned where Terms of Reference will be discussed and review results of a recent meeting with Services Manager to capture needs analysis and outcomes from ICT. Members can add their views and comments.
UBICO (STG)	To review the service post implementation of UBICO and benefits realisation	Cllrs Jacky Fletcher, Suzanne Williams, Tim Harman, Andrew Chard, Charlie Stewart and Pat Thornton	Jane Griffiths	DSM to ask all members for any issues they wish to raise and draft terms of reference will be brought back to O&S in September.
Airport scrutiny working group (possible STG)	To scrutinise issues relating to Gloucestershire Airport from a Cheltenham perspective.	Cllrs Suzanne Williams, Tim Harman, Andrew Chard and Nigel Britter expressed an interest if a STG is set up	Pat Pratley	Agreed that the CBC members of the Joint Airport Working Group is the most appropriate starting point for further reviews relating to the airport (current membership is Cllr Godwin, Williams, Harman, Jordan(observer)
Sex trade in Cheltenham (STG)	Council at its meeting on 25 June referred this matter to O&S with a view to bringing back a report to Council in December See one page strategy attached	Nominations to be requested if O&S agrees it should go ahead as a STG. Cllrs Chard, Driver, Regan, Seacome and Massey expressed an interest.	Louis Krog	Discuss at O&S on 19 July. Officers recommend that the first stage of any review should be to talk to the Police and find out what they are doing. Possible one day inquiry.

List of all scrutiny task groups and other appointments related to Overview and Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny	Purpose	Agreed nominations/membership	Lead Officer	Update
Allotments (STG)	See one page strategy attached	Proposed by Cllr Regan Cllr Smith expressed an interest		To be considered as a potential O&S topic at the next meeting on 16 July
Grass verge cutting (STG)	See one page strategy attached	Proposed by Cllr Hall		To be considered as a potential O&S topic at the next meeting on 16 July
<b>OTHER GROUPS WHERE O&amp;S ARE REPRESENTED</b>				
Glos Health, Community and Care O&S Committee	The committee focuses on health issues from a public perspective and works in partnership with other agencies to improve local health services. It also scrutinises council services relating to adult social care, libraries and information, equalities, customer services and lifelong learning.	Council appointed Cllr Klara Sudbury on 14/05/2012 as CBC's representative with Councillor Colin Hay as substitute	County	Cllr Sudbury due to attend next meeting on 10 July 2012.
Police and Crime Panel	A joint committee with the county and other district councils in Gloucestershire to scrutinise the Police and Crime Commissioner who in turn holds the Chief Constable to account.	Council appointed Cllr Helena McCloskey on 14/05/2012 as CBC's representative with Councillor Klara Sudbury as substitute	County	Cllr McCloskey cannot attend the first meeting but Cllr Sudbury will be attending as her deputy and can report back to the next meeting of O&S.
Glos Community Safety O&S committee	The committee is responsible for overview and scrutiny of crime and disorder related issues and the county council's community safety activities.	Council appointed Cllr Helena McCloskey on 14/05/2012 as CBC's representative with Councillor Klara Sudbury as substitute	County	Cllr McCloskey cannot attend the next meeting on 13 July 2012 but Cllr Sudbury should attend as her deputy and can report back to the next meeting of O&S.
Gloucestershire Scrutiny Group	To exchange ideas and share learning and help develop scrutiny across Gloucestershire	Cllr Penny Hall to continue attending.	Rosalind Reeves attends as well	Councillor Hall and Rosalind Reeves attended last meeting on 8 June 2012 and can provide an update at the next O&S meeting.

List of all scrutiny task groups and other appointments related to Overview and Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny	Purpose	Agreed nominations/membership	Lead Officer	Update
Environmental Improvements Fund (Cabinet Advisory Group)	To review the applications for the Environmental Improvements Fund as part of panel advising the Cabinet Member Built Environment and Sustainability	Cllr Suzanne Williams, Cllr Penny Hall	Mike Redman	The deadline for formal submission of application forms is extended to Friday 27 July 2012 and a meeting of the group will be scheduled to review the bids.
Air quality management order working group (Cabinet Member Working Group)	To raise awareness and work with the county to develop an air quality action plan including seeking funding sources.	Cllrs McCloskey, Hall and Bickerton are currently on it so continuity would be welcomed.	Paul Scott	O&S nominations have been advised and meeting on 11 July.
Climate change working group (Cabinet Member Working Group)	Consider and support carbon reduction plans and potential effect of climate change on council operations, liaising with and influencing other relevant groups. Looking for a decision from O&S on whether there are any specific issues they would like a STG to look at.	Cllr. Hall, Bickerton, Thornton and Cllr Williams expressed an interest.	Gill Morris/Jane Griffiths	Discussions have taken place and agreed that it will be a Cabinet Member's working group and first meeting took place on 26 June. Agreed that O&S may want to set up a STG if there were any specific issues it wanted to review otherwise this working group would review climate change issues on an ongoing basis.



# Joint Core Strategy and Planning Liaison Scrutiny Working Group

## Terms of Reference

### Chair

Cllr Bickerton

### Members

Cllrs Sudbury, Teakle, Harman, Chard, Godwin, Wall, McCloskey

**Other Attendees:** Cllr Steve Jordan (Leader), John Rawson (Deputy Leader) and/or Andrew McKinlay (Cabinet Member Built Environment) may wish to attend dependent on agenda

Statutory stakeholders will be asked to participate at relevant times if required to help inform debate.

**Officer support:** Mike Redman and relevant officers of Development Management Team (determined by work programme of working group)

**Purpose:** To provide a vehicle with which to engage with elected members on strategic development management issues in light of the changes to the planning framework

### Specific remit:

To provide co-ordination of development plan activities

1. To consider the emerging Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy and provide guidance and feedback to be reported formally through the Joint Core Strategy Programme Management arrangements via the Joint Core Strategy Members Steering Group
2. To consider the work programme and associated issues relating to review of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and provide guidance and feedback to Planning Committee, Cabinet and Council as appropriate
3. To consider any development management issues raised via Planning Committee, Cabinet or Council – e.g. review of supplementary planning documents, current planning issues and forthcoming major schemes
4. To listen to feedback on the development management service from relevant forums and help guide future improvements to the service, including making the most efficient use of resources
5. To advise on how best to engage with other elected Members and stakeholders on issues of development management, including engagement with identified hard to reach groups
6. To act as champions for the development management service

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 32



<b>SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY</b>	
Proposed by	Council following a motion at Council on 25/6/2012 proposed by Councillor Barbara Driver
Members (any co-optees?)	Councillors Chard, Driver, Seacome, Regan and Massey have expressed an interest Others to be advised
Lead Officer	Louis Krog
Broad topic area	<b>Sex Trade in Cheltenham</b>
Specific topic area	Sex trade and exploitation of young women and vulnerable people arising from people smuggling and the sex trade in Cheltenham.
Ambitions for the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gain an understanding of the work currently being done by partnerships and the police to address this issue and to establish the extent of the issue in Cheltenham</li> <li>• Examine how CBC contributes to this work and review whether this is the most effective way that CBC can assist in tackling the issue.</li> <li>• Examine whether there is anything that needs to be done within Licensing regime to combat this issue</li> <li>• Examine whether there is anything that needs to be done in respect of the night time economy to combat the sex trade</li> <li>• Establish a council strategy to identify current working and responsibilities and to guide the council in it's future role in working with partners to address this issue (not extensive could be a 2 page summary)</li> </ul>
How do we perform at the moment?	There has been some recent publicity in the media highlighting the issue in Cheltenham. No current monitoring or reporting undertaken by CBC
Who should we consult?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gloucestershire Police</li> <li>• Gloucestershire Safeguarding Childrens Board, Gloucestershire Safeguarding Adults Board and Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre</li> <li>• Night time economy partners</li> <li>• Voluntary sector</li> <li>• Housing providers</li> <li>• CBC internal officers in Licensing, Public Protection and Community Safety</li> </ul>
Background information	Minutes of Council 25 June 2012
How will we involve public/media? Or at what stages	There is likely to be media interest. Consider a 1 day inquiry to which the public would be invited to attend

Support	tba
How long will it take?	Report to Council in December
Outcomes	A safer environment in Cheltenham
Recs will be reported to:	Council via O&S committee



<b>(DRAFT) SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY</b>	
Proposed by	Councillor Anne Regan
Members (any co-optees?)	tba
Lead Officer	Adam Reynolds, Green Space Development Manager
Broad topic area	Allotments
Specific topic area	<p>(i) To review the legal position in relation to the provision of allotments and clarify the position in relation to areas covered by Parish Councils.</p> <p>(ii) To review the process for identifying the need for allotment sites in Cheltenham and establish how this is allocated to parished and non parished areas.</p> <p>(iii) To review the Allotments strategy and ensure it is fit for purpose.</p> <p>(iv) To review the need for developments of allotments against the available capital receipts</p> <p>(v) To review the proposals for allotments at Weavers Field in light of the evidence in (i) - (iv)</p>
Ambitions for the review	•
How do we perform at the moment?	
Who should we consult?	•
Background information	<p>The allotment strategy was the subject for a scrutiny review in 2010 so that could be the starting point for the review.</p> <p>Following the debate on the Weaver's Field petition at Council on 25 June it was agreed that the Cabinet Member and officers would seek a discussion with representatives of the petitioners and with ward councillor with a view to improving amenity value of the scheme. This will be reported to Cabinet on 25 September 2012.</p>
How will we involve public/media? Or at what stages	
Support	
How long will it take?	
Outcomes	
Recs will be reported to:	Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 36



<b>(DRAFT) SCRUTINY REVIEW – ONE PAGE STRATEGY</b>	
Members (any co-optees?)	Those who volunteer for the task group following acceptance by the Scrutiny Cttee on July 16 <sup>th</sup> 2012
Lead Officer	
Broad topic area	The maintenance by CBC {Ubico Ltd] of grass verges throughout the borough
Specific topic area	Quality of the service, customer care issues, training and supervision of the workforce.
Ambitions for the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To understand how standards of service are set in particular each "Cut/maintenance of the verges as specified .in the agreements between CBC and GCC and to consider if improvements to the specification could be made</li> <li>• To understand the training programme for new operatives, the supervision given during their work and the assessment process of quality after each cut/ maintenance.</li> <li>• To make recommendations to improve systems where required</li> <li>• To understand customer care issues; how the relevant department respond to issues on the service raised by the general public and members and how they consider and act on the issues, again to make recommendations on improvements</li> </ul>
How do we perform at the moment?	This scrutiny request follows adverse comments on the service provided from members of the public, myself from direct observation and responding to the adverse comments and from other members
Who should we consult?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC officers and Ubico Ltd</li> </ul>
Background information	
How will we involve public/media? Or at what stages	With the results of the scrutiny review
Support	Officer resources to support the review will need to be identified
How long will it take?	
Outcomes	An improvement in the standards of service as demonstrated by appearance and effect on Cheltenham's roads A reduction in adverse comments/ publicity
Recs will be reported to:	Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank  
Page 38



Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
------	---------	---------	-------------------	--

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORPLAN 2012/13

#### PROPOSED ACTION FOR REGULAR ITEMS PREVIOUSLY GOING TO O&S UNDER NEW SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS

(brackets indicates which O&S committee this previously went to)

Corporate Risk Register (EBI)	Standard Item	Regular review before going to Cabinet	Quarterly Report Sep/Nov/Feb and May	Review the Cabinet report outside the meeting and identify any exceptions for potential scrutiny. (Bryan Parsons, Governance Officer)
Quarterly budget report (EBI)	Standard item	Quarterly review requested by the EBI committee before Cabinet	Report prior to Cabinet in October/ Feb/April/June and October	Refer to Budget scrutiny working group. (Paul Jones, Head of Finance (GO Shared Services))
Commissioning programme – a general update (EBI)	Scrutiny	A six monthly update requested by members for an overview of the programme with a focus on costs and future savings	Report in November and May	Would recommend that this is reported to Council twice a year. On an exception basis, the budget scrutiny working group may want to scrutinise benefit realisation or O&S may want to commission a STG to look at specific aspects of service delivery. Council also agreed on 25/6 that O&S would be responsible for monitoring and review of the commissioning protocol. (Jane Griffiths, Director of Commissioning)
RIPA update report. (EBI)	Scrutiny	Reports on usage of the powers	Ad hoc notification to O&S when used	Continue to receive a report at O&S when the powers are triggered as set out in current policy. ( Bryan Parsons, Governance Officer)

O&S Committee 2012/13 work plan

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
Interim Budget consultation Budget working group then O&S committee	Scrutiny	Review interim budget proposals and comment	Report in November	Initially considered by the budget scrutiny working group and a meeting of O&S would be scheduled to review their conclusions. (Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources)
Corporate Performance Report (EBI)	Standard item	Regular review of quarterly performance	Six monthly report in Nov (Q2), Mar(Q3) and July(annual report)	Review the Cabinet report outside the meeting and identify any exceptions for potential scrutiny. (Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager)
Final Budget consultation Budget working group then O&S committee	Scrutiny	Review final budget proposals 2013-14 and comment	Report in January	Refer to the budget scrutiny working group and O&S committee. (Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources)
DRAFT Corporate Strategy 2012-13 (ALL)	Scrutiny	Review DRAFT strategy prior to Cabinet (	Annual Report In February	O&S to consider at its February meeting to identify any potential topics for further review. (Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager)
Annual review of the Gloucestershire Airport – Green Policy	Scrutiny	Review of the Green Policy	Report in July	Proposed that the Cheltenham members of the joint airport working group could meet to consider the issues for Cheltenham when necessary and a STG could be set up on an exception basis (Gill Morris, Climate Change and Sustainability Officer)
Approval of community grants (Soc and Corn)	Scrutiny	As and when required	Report	Scrutiny Members should continue to be represented on the panel but doesn't need to come to O&S committee. (Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager)

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
------	---------	---------	-------------------	--

POTENTIAL ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR THE WORKPLAN IN THE FUTURE				
Warden Hill Elections	Scrutiny	Consider the report of the independent investigator into this matter and consider any recommendations necessary.	Report	Timetabled for the July meeting.
Green Travel Plan	Scrutiny	Consider the impact of a draft Green Travel Plan prior to approval	Discussion paper	Keep track of this issue via the Cabinet Forward Plan and consider setting up a STG if appropriate.  (Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability)
Gloucestershire Airport Business Plan	Scrutiny	Review the business plan 12 months after the start of the drawdown of the loan	Report	Consider setting up a STG to review the delivery of expected benefits from the investment in airport safety.  (Pat Pratley, Executive Director)
Asset Management	Scrutiny	Communication to members	Discussion	A process has been agreed with the Chair of O&S and the Chair of AMWG whereby the agenda for the meeting will be circulated electronically to members with an option to request to see any exempt report. Any member with a ward interest in any matter can attend AMWG and speak.  (David Roberts, Property and Asset Mgt)

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
GO Programme (EBI)	Scrutiny	Update on implementation	Report	Possible topic for budget scrutiny working group regarding cost benefits (Amanda Attfield, Director People, Organisational Development and Change)
Scrutiny of Cheltenham partnerships	Scrutiny	A review of latest partnership structures and proposed scrutiny arrangements	Presentation supported by report	Must give the new partnerships time to settle down and O&S would recommend a presentation to all members as part of a Council meeting. Should be aware of any working groups being set up by any of the partnerships to avoid any overlaps. Agreed that an update can be provided in the fortnightly members briefings. .  (Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager)
<b>PROPOSED SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS (see separate sheet)</b>				

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
------	---------	---------	-------------------	--

**PROPOSED MEMBER BRIEFINGS OUTSIDE OF O&S COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Winter Weather procedures	Scrutiny	Keeping the town/borough moving	Presentation	Officer, Gloucestershire County Council
Glos Integrated Economic Strategy (EBI)	Scrutiny	David Owen from GFirst be invited to explain their vision currently being developed		GFirst have produced a 1 page vision and are due to produce a supporting action plan. (Mike Redman, Director Built Environment)
Gloucestershire Airport	Update	The Airport have asked if they can come and update the committee on the future direction of travel	Presentation	Potential member seminar.
Absence Management (EBI)	Scrutiny	6 monthly Update requested at the January meeting	Report	Julie McCarthay, HR operations Manager
Art Gallery and Museum (Soc and Com)	Update	Quarterly review of development scheme and service provision during closure	Discussion paper	Jane Lillystone, Museum, Arts & Tourism Manager
Leisure@ (Soc and Com)	Scrutiny	Annual performance review	Discussion paper	Stephen Petherick, Commercial Manager – Leisure@
Everyman Theatre (Soc & Com)	Scrutiny	Annual Report	Presentation	Geoffrey Rowe, Chief Executive
Cheltenham Festivals (Soc & Com)	Scrutiny	Annual Review	Presentation	Donna Renney, Chief Executive, Cheltenham Festivals
Proscenium Building/Gardens Gallery	Scrutiny	Tri-annual review (next due 2015)	Presentation	Bob Freeman, Chairman-Gardens Gallery

O&S Committee 2012/13 work plan

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Proposal under new arrangements (Lead Officer)
Town Hall and Pittville Pump Rooms (Soc and Com)	Scrutiny	Annual performance review	Discussion paper	Gary Nejrup, Entertainment and Business Manager
Flood update	Update	Biannual update on flood prevention in Cheltenham	September 2012	Geoff Beer, Geoff Beer, Principal Engineer (Land Drainage)