



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 2 September 2013
6.00 pm
Pittville Room - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Duncan Smith (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Barbara Driver, Colin Hay, Helena McCloskey, Ian Bickerton, Diane Hibbert and Chris Ryder

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

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING Minutes of the last meeting held on 16 May 2013	(Pages 1 - 6)
4.	PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS	
5.	MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE None referred.	
6.	FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED Feedback from Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 16 July attended by Councillor Penny Hall. A Police and Crime Panel was held on 19 July but no one was in attendance from Cheltenham Borough Council. Minutes are available on the county council website.	
7.	PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GRASS VERGES TASK GROUP Report of the Cabinet Member Sustainability	(Pages 7 - 10)
8.	UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS The latest update from all the scrutiny task groups	(Pages 11 - 12)

9.	MEMBER WORKING GROUPS A discussion paper	(Pages 13 - 24)
10.	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND THE CABINET A discussion paper	(Pages 25 - 26)
11.	CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING An update from Cabinet Members to be agreed	
12.	REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN The committee to review their current workplan and decide how they are going to populate their future workplan	(Pages 27 - 38)
13.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING Date of next meeting: 3 October 2013 at 6 pm if required to receive any task group reports, new topic registrations or call ins If no such business, the next scheduled meetings is on Monday 25 November 2013 at 6 pm	

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 16th May, 2013

6.00 - 7.20 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Duncan Smith (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Barbara Driver, Colin Hay, Helena McCloskey, Andrew Wall, Penny Hall (Reserve) and Simon Wheeler (Reserve)
Also in attendance:	Councillor Jon Walklett, Councillor Rowena Hay, Councillor Roger Whyborn, Richard Gibson and Jane Griffiths

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Bickerton and Councillor Hibbert. Councillor Wheeler was standing in as a replacement for Councillor Bickerton.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Driver declared a personal but non prejudicial interest in agenda item 8 as a member of the Cheltenham Borough Homes Board. The chair indicated that this would also apply to himself and Councillor C Hay.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting of 18 March 2013 were approved as a correct record.

4. MEMBER AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS

None received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters were referred to the committee.

6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED

Councillor McCloskey advised that the Police and Crime Panel were due to meet in June. This panel has to be politically balanced so there may need to be some adjustments to the membership as a result of the recent county council elections.

Councillor Sudbury informed the committee that she was now a county council representative on the Gloucestershire Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee (GHOSC so would be standing down as the Cheltenham Borough Council's representative. Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, had written to the political party group leaders requesting nominations for her replacement. This should be a Cheltenham Borough Council member who is not on the Cabinet. There is a GHOSC meeting on the

4 June 2013. Councillor Hay said he would be a substitute at the meeting if there wasn't an appointment by this date.

7. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

The chairman referred members to the summary of scrutiny task groups which had been circulated with the agenda. The following points were noted.

Deprivation- This task group is about to start its work and this begins at its first meeting on the 22 May 2013.

Sex trade in Cheltenham- Cabinet considered the report by O&S on 16 April 2013 but decided to refer the report to the Cheltenham Safeguarding Forum and Positive Lives Partnership. A report to Cabinet is expected in July. Following a recommendation from the task group, this report was sent to the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and a letter has been received back from the commissioner, Mr Martin Surl. The letter stated the PCC's gratitude in investigating this matter and he encouraged members to revisit the matter in further detail. The report has now been taken to the Chief Police Constable in order to discuss this matter further.

Events Submissions task group- Cabinet received the report from O&S and decided they needed more time to consider its findings. A report back to Cabinet on implementing the recommendations is expected in July.

Youth Provision- This was discussed at the O&S chair's briefing. This has become more of a Cabinet working group and so will be closed down as a scrutiny task group. Scrutiny members will continue to be invited to attend the 'Activities and facilities for young people partnership group' and advise the Cabinet member on future funding bids.

Community Governance review- This will be referenced in the report to Council in July on council size and electoral cycle. It was mentioned that it has been difficult to populate this working group and therefore members should be asked again if they want to be on the task group. The chair suggested a paper be brought back to this committee after the Council meeting when the terms of reference should then be refreshed. There should be an aim to restart this process in September. The chair stated that there was clearly a need for fresh ideas.

Budget scrutiny – Councillor Wall gave a brief update on the role of the standing budget scrutiny working group. He mentioned that the committee were not there to look at the minutiae of the budget. It is not an ideas generating working group, but it is instead there to hold the council to account. The numbers at the meetings have been quite small and meetings have been difficult to arrange, but the group has fed back comments on ICT and Leisure and Culture. The task group have had presentations from the county budget scrutiny working group and at the next meeting they will receive a presentation from Andrew North, Chief Executive, and Councillor Jordan as the Leader of the council, on their vision for the council's trajectory. Questions were raised as to whether the council should still shave money off individual budgets and it was stated that there are still big things that impact on the council budget that the working group could examine more closely.

Councillor Sudbury as a member of the budget scrutiny working group said it was a shame that meetings had to be cancelled. The Democratic Services Manager reminded members that all dates for future meetings of this group were fixed in the council diary so members of the working group were encouraged to keep those dates free.

A member questioned where any reports from the budget scrutiny task group should go to. In reply, it was stated that where the task group had examined an issue, their views should be incorporated into the relevant reports to Cabinet or Council. Their responses should be updated at O&S, but the committee don't want to hold things up. The working group should formally report back to O&S in January each year as part of the budget cycle.

8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Agenda item 8 was introduced by Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager. This corporate performance report relates to delivery of the Council's Corporate Strategy Action Plan 2012-13 agreed by council in March 2012. The aim of the report was to review, challenge and comment on the council's performance over the last year.

The Strategy and Engagement Manager talked through the structuring of the report mentioning that there were some amber milestones that hadn't been reached.

The chair referred to the red milestones, such as the Joint Core Strategy and the review of Parish Council boundaries. He also mentioned that there is already a cabinet member group that is reviewing the approach to household waste management and that there had been an O&S review of Ubico.

Another councillor commented on the amount of good information the report had revealed, although he said that it was difficult to link the activity milestones with the performance indicators and the achievement of outcomes. He mentioned that the linkage between milestones and outcomes can be lost. The Strategy and Engagement manager said that the linkages are there, but that they could do with being better defined in the 2014/15 corporate strategy.

The chair referred to the report's assessment of the council's carbon emissions and suggested there be a scrutiny task group on this. Jane Griffiths, Director of Commissioning, responded that there is already a Cabinet Member task group on carbon emissions, the members of which had built up a good deal of expertise and they could report back to O&S if there was a specific issue that the committee wanted to cover. If there was a Scrutiny task group on this matter, then the task group may end up duplicating the work of the Cabinet Member task group. The chair felt that an O&S review would focus on the council's performance and approach to climate change and carbon reduction as opposed to policy and operational delivery so there should not be any duplication.

A member commented that the Review and Outcomes section of the report highlights a lot of possible subjects that O&S could look into.

The member went on to say that Cheltenham Borough Homes is delivering excellent services to council tenants but that their performance is not replicated by other housing providers leading to the possibility that tenants are receiving very different levels of service across the town with those in the private sector who may be at greatest risk. .

Finally the member referred to the People and Healthy Lifestyle stream of the report. She suggested that Scrutiny should start looking into youth provision and highlighted the good example of the local charity, CCP, which provides a youth café - open to youngsters four nights a week.

Another member highlighted that the Boots corner closure was omitted from the report and that a lot of her constituents wanted to know what was happening. This, the Strategy and Engagement responded, was because funding was secured from the local sustainable transport fund and the activity should take place in the current year.

The chair talked about supporting neighbourhood management. He suggested that the Community Governance task group could look at the effectiveness of the neighbourhood management structures.

The Strategy and Engagement Manager said that he was bringing together the chairs of the various neighbourhood management groups in early June to begin a review of structures and he stated that it would be good if Scrutiny could support this work. The chair responded that he would have a discussion with colleagues and discuss this at the next meeting.

9. REVIEW OF CURRENT SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS

The Democratic Services Manager opened this topic up for discussion stating that Democratic Services wanted feedback on how the new scrutiny arrangements were working since their introduction in May 2012.

A member stated that he had seen a change in the scrutiny arrangements and said that the call in process should also be looked into.

Another member discussed how Scrutiny task groups relate to Cabinet working groups and asked for the relationship between them to be defined. The member said that she did not think this relationship was working well. She considered that scrutiny should be the 'power house' and be holding Cabinet to account. In reality, Cabinet have delayed making decisions on the recommendations of some task groups. She called for a proper protocol to be drawn up regarding the involvement of Cabinet Members in reviews and suggested that they should be invited to the final meetings of the task group so they could express any concerns they may have on the report and recommendations.

Another member said that the council is being scrutinised, but the scrutiny groups aren't themselves being measured. They aren't necessarily being held to account. The member asked, 'have we made a difference?' and what were the success measures for overview and scrutiny? The chair suggested the Annual Report to Council will set out the achievements of overview and scrutiny and there should be a regular progress report. It was also important to track the

implementation of any scrutiny recommendations agreed by Cabinet.

A member suggested that it would be useful if Cabinet working groups knew what Scrutiny had been doing and visa-versa. The chair asked the members whether they thought it would be useful to hear from the Cabinet working groups through the provision of a written report. The Democratic Services Manager agreed to progress this. The chair suggested that the relevant Cabinet Member could then be invited to attend this committee to answer questions on their working group.

There was a suggestion from a member that the Cabinet Member working groups tended to be involved in policy development leaving scrutiny to the task groups. The chair reminded members that 'overview' was part of overview and scrutiny's remit. The Cabinet Member could also commission policy development work from Overview and Scrutiny and they would be free to accept the recommendations or not. If the Cabinet Members working groups were to report back to this committee, that might start to redress this balance.

It was suggested that work should not be duplicated but it was acknowledged that here was some confusion. As an example, a member had suggested the garden bag scheme should be looked into as a scrutiny topic, but was advised that a Cabinet working group were also looking into this.

The chair stated that O&S should be about visibility, accountability and transparency. However, he stated that the Cabinet working groups worked behind closed doors. With regard to the Events task group, policy had been developed but was then stalled when it got to Cabinet. The Cabinet member had then set up a further working group to recreate the recommendations from the task group. This approach had duplicated work and the process was dysfunctional..

The chair asked the committee if they were happy with the questionnaire provided by Democratic Services. He wanted to encourage a 100% return on the questionnaire and said that some members may prefer to be contacted over the telephone to fill it in. The intention was the results would help with understanding why some members were still not engaging in the scrutiny process.

One member suggested that it would be useful to invite the Leader to a session with the chair and vice chair of this committee in order to understand their views on O&S.

The Democratic Services Manager confirmed that a report on the results of the review would be brought back to this committee.

10. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The following subjects were suggested as possible future topics for the future scrutiny workplan:

- Events working group outcomes
- Review of new scrutiny arrangements
- Dog fouling
- Pubs and licensing

- Use of 106 money's
- External partnerships – how are they being scrutinised and held to account

A member suggested that the recommendations from the ICT scrutiny task group should be followed up. This could be a paper exercise by officers reporting back to O&S rather than a reconvening of the task group.

Another member raised the subject of partnerships and suggested there could be a potential for joint scrutiny. An example of this is a group of tenants working as a scrutiny group with Cheltenham Borough Homes. There may also be potential for joint scrutiny groups with the county council.

The vice-chair of this committee suggested that one or two Cabinet Members should be invited to each future meeting of the committee to give a briefing and answer questions on their portfolio. The chair questioned whether this was within their remit as a managing and co-ordinating committee. This would be reviewed as part of the review of the new scrutiny arrangements.

Councillor Penny Hall was asked to speak about her proposal for a Scrutiny working group to look into dog fouling. She said she had received complaints about dog faeces in her ward, particularly after she had become involved in Charlton Kings Parish Council. Councillor Hall was asked if she thought the issue was related to the council's corporate objectives – she said she thought it was.

The chair asked if everyone was happy with the terms of reference. One member said that the dog fouling problem was not just about the provision of dog bins, but the management of them as well. He went on to suggest that mixed bin usage might be an idea. Another member suggested that the problem had been getting worse and Councillor Driver said that there was a real problem in her ward along the Honeybourne line.

The chair asked who would like to sit on the working group – Councillors Hall, McCloskey, Britter and Driver said they would like to sit on the scrutiny task group. The chair suggested that the task group should be opened up to other members before firm decisions are made on the membership. .

Resolved that a scrutiny task group be set up to review dog fouling with the terms of reference as circulated at the meeting. The chair be Councillor Penny Hall and membership to be determined once all non Executive members had been invited to participate.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was agreed for 11 July 2013 at 6pm.

Duncan Smith
Chairman

Overview and Scrutiny committee– 2 September 2013 Progress report on recommendations from Grass Verges Task Group

Accountable member	Councillor Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member Sustainability
Accountable officer	Jane Griffiths, Commissioning Director
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee established a task group to review grass verge maintenance and this group made a number of recommendations which were approved by Cabinet in December 2012. This committee had requested a progress report to be presented so that the committee could satisfy themselves that the recommendations had been actioned.</p> <p>Set out in the report is progress against each of the specific recommendations. As members will see from this report actions have been progressed and indeed officers valued the review as it has led to a better working relationship with the county council who hold the verge maintenance contract.</p> <p>Work will continue to be undertaken on the outstanding matters. Where the actions are ongoing these recommendations have been embedded into working practices.</p>
Recommendations	To consider progress against the recommendations and identify any issues where the committee have concerns that recommendations are not being progressed as planned.
Financial implications	<p>There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Note that the financial subsidy in the 2013/14 approved budget for Highways Agency Verges and Trees is £112,500</p> <p>Contact officer: Des Knight, Temporary Accountant GO Shared Services Finance</p> <p>des.knight@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264124</p>

1. Background

- 1.1** The Overview and Scrutiny Committee set up a task group looking at verge maintenance. The working group involved officers in the discussions so that there was a consensus on the approach which was outlined within their report and considered by Cabinet in December 2012. The working group were mindful of the current financial situation and their recommendations were framed in this light.
- 1.2** The council does contribute to the maintenance of the verges which is a highways authority responsibility. In accepting the recommendations from the O&S it was on the assumption that the council could for the foreseeable future continue with the financial subsidy.
- 1.3** The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 26 November 2012 indicated that they wanted to see a progress report brought back to them. Set out below are the recommendations and the progress to date along with other issues which may have arisen since the original work was undertaken.

2. Progress against the recommendations

2.1 Ubico should continue to cut grass where feasible in wet weather.

2.2 *At the time of drafting the report the weather has been relatively fine which has enabled grass cutting and weed control to be undertaken as planned. Ubico are currently on their ninth grass cutting cycle of the year, throughout the town, with the aim of achieving fifteen grass cuts per annum.*

2.3 Monthly contract management meetings between Gloucestershire County Council and Ubico should commence as a matter of urgency

2.4 *Officers from Ubico, CBC and GCC now meet on a monthly basis. These meetings have been productive as they enable issues to be resolved quickly and for all parties to share plans and report progress. They have been seen as a positive outcome from the review and there is now a better understanding between all parties.*

2.5 *Monthly meetings with CBC, GH and Ubico are progressing with positive outcomes. The current contract with GCC/Atkins has been retendered with a commencement date of 01 April 2014. Tenders have been received from Amey, Ringway, Balfour Beattie and Skanska (Atkins) and are currently being evaluated with a decision on the successful company being known early November.*

2.6 The current frequency of cutting should continue but officers from CBC/Ubico and Gloucestershire County Council should meet to consider the biodiversity opportunities for verges within the town.

2.7 *Discussions are taking place with GH/CBC/Ubico for the sowing of wildflower mixes on larger grass verges and focus is being given to gateway entrances to the town such as the A40 Golden Valley, Benhall areas, Arle Gardens and Coronation Square. An officer from the green space development team is taking this forward*

2.8 When the green space strategy is updated specific reference is made to verges and the role they can play as green corridors recognising their importance in the quality of the environment and assisting in biodiversity.

2.9 *Developers are increasingly including areas of wildflower planting in their landscape proposals and the areas are usually more extensive than verges. There are some maintenance implications when planting wildflowers in grass verges. However, in some locations it might be appropriate, both in terms of visual amenity and providing food for wildlife.*

2.10 *Due to other work commitments the green space strategy is not yet reviewed but officers are aware of the importance of grass verges and the role that they play*

2.11 The planning committee should give due consideration to layout and maintenance implications of verges and consider the use of wild flowers or slow growing grass seed in reserved matters.

2.12 *In addition to the existing Green Space Strategy, there is an emerging Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy for Cheltenham being developed as part of the Joint Core Strategy. Green Infrastructure encompasses all elements of the landscape in both public and private ownership, whereas the Green Space Strategy concentrated on the amenity value of open spaces in CBC ownership.*

Examples of GI include:

- *Public parks, open spaces and urban squares*
- *Private gardens and grounds*
- *Watercourses and water features*
- *Green roofs/ Roof gardens*
- *Green walls*
- *Sustainable urban drainage systems*
- *Living components of the townscape such as street trees, hedges, grass verges. Roundabouts, if appropriately managed, could also contribute to GI.*

One of the purposes of green infrastructure, in general, is to increase biodiversity by providing a network of habitats and food sources for wildlife. It is often referred to as being 'multifunctional space' e.g. a sustainable urban drainage system can aid flood alleviation and also provide amenity space and wildlife habitat. It is within the broader context of GI that management of the grass verges should be considered.

Within the JCS area the GI strategy also seeks to provide amenity value along green connections within and between settlements, focussing principally on links along watercourses. Its overarching aim is to link the Cotswold AONB in the east with the River Severn and its washlands in the west. An aspiration of the strategy is the creation of a regional park around the River Severn and its washlands.

2.13 To build into the highways agreement that Gloucestershire County Council should liaise with CBC/Ubico ahead of highways adoption to ensure any verge maintenance issues are resolved ahead of adoption

The regular meetings with the GCC lead officer has lead to more effective communication with regards to highways adoption.

2.14 In negotiating the 2013/14 verge contract ensure that there is a flexible approach to the use of resources across the contract to maximise the resources being put into the contract.

Resources are being used flexibly and discussions are held with the lead officer from GCC at the monthly meetings. At the time of drafting the report discussions have yet to be held with regards to the 2014/15 arrangements.

2.15 Discussions are held with Gloucestershire County Council about enforcement of illegal parking on verges and remedial action where damage occurs due to CBC or GCC vehicles

2.16 *The county council have confirmed that the contract with Apcoa enables enforcement to be taken where vehicles are parked on grass verges adjacent to restricted parking shown with double yellow lines.*

2.17 The web site is updated as a matter of urgency to ensure that the service standards are specified and that during periods of service disruption that the website is updated accordingly

2.18 *The website has been updated. For a period of time the information was not available but once alerted to this matter the appropriate links were re-established so that the information was available to the public.*

2.19 Quality audits should be arranged to ensure the full coverage of the town

2.20 *Quality audits are being undertaken by Environmental Maintenance Officers on a random monthly*

basis throughout the town.

Report author

**Contact officer: Jane Griffiths, director of commissioning,
jane.griffiths@cheltenham.gov.uk,**

01242, 264126

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

KEY	Relevant Cabinet Member	STG in progress	New topics not yet started	Update
O&S Task group	Agreed nominations/membership Chairs in bold	Facilitating Officer	Sponsoring Officer	Cabinet Member
Purpose	Target for reporting recs	Update	Update	Update
New topics	A number of new topics are currently under consideration			
Dog fouling	Clrs Britter, Driver, Fletcher, Penny Hall, McCloskey and Williams	Bev Thomas Sam Howe	Jane Griffiths	Sustainability Clr Whybom
Budget scrutiny working group	Clrs Coleman, Garmham, Harman, Hibbert, Massey and Sutbury Clr Prince (sub) Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation.	Rosalind Reeves Democratic Services Manager	Mark Sheldon	Finance Clr Rawson
JCS and Planning Liaison Group (STG)	Clrs Bickerton, Harman, Wall, Godwin and McCloskey, Simon Wheeler	Judith Baker	Tracey Crews	Leader Jordan
Deprivation	Councillor Driver suggested a review should be carried out of small pockets in the town which may suffer from deprivation but may not get the consideration that the more obvious deprived areas get.	Sam Howe	Richard Gibson	Leisure and Culture Clr Hay
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.	Rosalind Reeves	Andrew North	Housing and Safety Clr Jeffries
Event Submissions task group (STG)	Review and make recommendations for the process for organisers of events to submit proposals.	Democratic Services - Saira Main/Rosalind Reeves	Grahame Lewis	Housing and Safety Clr Jeffries
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.	Helen Down Commissioning	Jane Griffiths	Leader Jordan
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 allocations	Richard Gibson	Jane Griffiths	Leisure and Culture Clr Hay
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	Rosalind Reeves		Corporate Services Clr Walklett
Allotments (STG)	Review allotment strategy Identify lessons learnt from Weavers Field.	DS- Bev Thomas 10 days	Sonia Philips or Grahame Lewis	Sustainability Clr Whybom
Grass verge cutting (STG)	Review grass cutting policy and operational issues.	Jane Griffiths	Jane Griffiths	Sustainability Clr Whybom
UBICO (STG)	To review the service post implementation of UBICO and benefits realisation.	Saira Main	Jane Griffiths	Sustainability Clr Whybom

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee -

2 September 2013

Member Working Groups

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 At the Council meeting on the 22 July, following the publishing of the Annual Scrutiny report, a debate was had about the differences between Scrutiny Task Groups and Cabinet Member Working Groups. It was suggested at Council, that the opportunities for 'Scrutiny' to carry out its overview role would be constrained if all the policy development work was carried out by Cabinet Member working groups.
- 1.2 The chair of O&S went so far as to suggest that all Cabinet Member Working Groups should become scrutiny task groups. However this might not be acceptable to Cabinet Members who want to be in position to influence policy development which they ultimately will take to Cabinet, particularly if there are associated targets or objectives in the Council's Corporate Plan for which they are accountable.
- 1.3 From the debate it was clear that there needs to be some clarity on the differences between these two groups and some arrangement needs to be sought to make sure they complement and are compatible with one another. The role of the Cabinet Member on scrutiny task groups also needs to be more clearly defined.
- 1.4 At the last O&S meeting it was noted that O&S received regular updates on all the scrutiny task groups but there was no similar update on all the other groups members were involved in. They requested a summary for their next meeting to help them understand the roles of the different groups and potentially identify any areas for follow up or scrutiny. This is attached as Appendix 2.
- 1.5 This report informs members on the various types of working groups operating in the council and suggests a way forward for setting these up and monitoring them in the future.

2. Definition of Overview and Scrutiny

- 2.1 It will be useful at this point to remind members of the differences between Overview and Scrutiny as this is very relevant to the issues raised.
- 2.2 In this report and in general parlance the term "overview and scrutiny" is frequently abbreviated to "scrutiny" and some explanation may be helpful as to the definitions of the two terms.
- 2.3 When overview and scrutiny was first introduced, **overview** was often referred to as policy review. It seeks to involve itself before a decision is made, to bring information

and ideas to the table to help improve decision making. It gave Members a role in policy and decision making far earlier than had previously been possible. It also involves monitoring of on-going actions to ensure they are delivering the intended and best outcomes. Similarly a definition of **scrutiny** was defined. The scrutiny of decisions takes place after decisions have been made. It is an opportunity to question why the course of action was taken, and if necessary propose an alternative. Decisions can be monitored over a longer period of time to ensure that the intended outcomes are realised. In its strongest form it can stop a decision being implemented until it has been scrutinised using a mechanism called “call-in”.

3. Types of members working groups operating within the council

Scrutiny task groups

- 3.1** At Cheltenham Borough Council we have an O&S committee which commissions scrutiny task groups to carry out detailed scrutiny work on a topic. A scrutiny task group is chaired by a scrutiny member and the Cabinet Member may attend by invitation. The outcome is a report from O&S in the name of the working group. In the past year there have been ten scrutiny task groups and a number of these have been involved in developing policy, the events Scrutiny task group being a good example. Others such as the ICT scrutiny task group carried out more of a scrutiny role, for example in examining the internal audit response to the ICT virus.

Involvement of the Cabinet Member in scrutiny task groups

- 3.2** Cabinet Member involvement in scrutiny task groups is seen as important as it means that when a task group makes any recommendations, the Cabinet Member is more likely to be supportive of the group’s findings if they have been involved in their development and understand the rationale behind the recommendations. Cabinet attendance at an initial meeting also means that they would be able to advise on any current work relevant to the task group. However, it is important that the scrutiny task group is led by scrutiny members and they are free to set their own agenda. They may wish to formally question the Cabinet Member and so there needs to be a clear distinction in roles and the Cabinet Member is only present at the task group meetings by invitation.
- 3.3** Involvement of Cabinet Members near the end of the review may also be helpful to ensure that there are no surprises when the task report comes to Cabinet for consideration of the recommendations. They should be given a copy of the draft report and invited to make comments before it is made public.
- 3.4** When the task group report is received by Cabinet, a practice has developed during this first year of the new scrutiny arrangements for the Cabinet Member to publish a supporting document setting out their response to the recommendations which is circulated with the scrutiny task group report. This can be considered by Cabinet when deciding whether or not to accept the recommendations from the task group and provides a vehicle for setting out the implications and risks of making that decision.

Cabinet Member working groups

- 3.5** There are a number of Cabinet Member working groups in operation. These are set up by Cabinet or a Cabinet member and they invite cross party members to join a

working group to help them develop policy or move forward on a particular issue related to their Cabinet portfolio. For example such a working group was set up to assist in the development of the new Housing Strategy. The Cabinet Member sets the agenda for these working groups. The outcome is not a report of the working group but the Cabinet Member listens to their views when finalising their own report to Cabinet. As such there is no particular requirement for them to feedback to O&S as scrutiny can summon the Cabinet Member to question them on policy issues at any time.

- 3.6 It has been recognised that there could be a potential conflict of interest if members on such a group are subsequently asked to scrutinise the policy that have helped to develop. Ideally it would be a different set of members wherever possible.
- 3.7 A waste working group was set up to support the Cabinet Member Sustainability in developing waste and recycling strategy. With the setting up of the Joint Waste Committee there is still a need to develop local policies but the Cabinet Member has suggested that the role of the waste working group should be reviewed once it is has completed its current work on plastics recycling and reported in the autumn. Task and finish groups may be more appropriate than an ongoing group.

Commissioning working groups

- 3.8 As part of the commissioning process, a working group of members has been set up for each of the commissioning projects. For example there is a Leisure and Culture commissioning working group and there is currently one looking at the various commissioning options for Green Environment. They have sometimes been called Cabinet Member Working groups which has perhaps caused some confusion as they are very different to the policy development groups described in the previous section. The commissioning working groups act as sounding boards for the duration of the project, facilitating consultation with members and seeking their views. They are nominally chaired by the Cabinet Member but the direction of the group is set by the needs and timescales of the project.
- 3.9 It is not appropriate for these groups to report to Cabinet or O&S in their own right. Appropriate reports from the project will be taken to Cabinet/Council at key project milestones. If scrutiny wishes to understand more about a commissioning project they should call the Cabinet Member and/or the Lead Officer to account at any stage.

Other member working groups

- 3.10 There are other member working groups such as the Climate Change working group. This is an ongoing group and is neither Cabinet nor scrutiny led but is made up of members who are interested in the issue of climate change and have built up some expertise through their ongoing involvement. The Cabinet Member or O&S could make a request to the group to look at a particular issue on their behalf and report back.
- 3.11 Other working groups may be set up to review bids for potential funding. Examples in 2012 were the Environmental Improvements Fund Group and the Promoting Cheltenham Fund groups set up to consider the bids for the funding made available from the New Homes Bonus and make recommendations to Cabinet.
- 3.12 Other committees may set up working groups. For example the Planning Committee set up a working group in January 2012 to examine the use of the gardens and to

make recommendations back to that committee. It reported back in January 2013 but Members requested that this group had an ongoing role so it is still in existence. It may be helpful to review its terms of reference.

- 3.13 It is questionable whether we need the title 'Cabinet Member working groups' as these are effectively member working groups with a Cabinet Member chair.
- 3.14 What is important for these working groups is that they have clear terms of reference and reporting lines.

Governance groups with member representation

- 3.15 These are not working groups but are included here for completeness as they do have member representation and may be of interest to scrutiny. They include the Joint Management Liaison Groups (JMLGS) which were established to monitor shared services. Their terms of reference are incorporated into the agreements between the shared service partners. Typically they meet quarterly. Their minutes are not published and consideration could be given to circulating them more widely to members so they can see they types of issues being discussed by these groups.
- 3.16 If scrutiny is to play its part in the scrutiny of shared services, it needs to be more aware of what these groups are doing.

Joint Airport Working Group

- 3.17 This is a long standing joint working group with Gloucester City set up in 2002 to scrutinise issues relating to the airport. It formerly reported to EBI/Environment O&S committee depending on the issue. Its reporting lines needs to be reviewed under the new scrutiny arrangements.

Membership of outside bodies

- 3.18 Elected Members are represented on a number of outside bodies and partnerships and details are available on the council's website. Scrutiny can ask for an update from the relevant member at any time.

4. Summary of evidence/information

- 4.1 The different types of working group are set out in the table in Appendix 1.
- 4.2 It is suggested that a protocol is introduced when setting up a new working group and a form similar to that in Appendix 3 is adopted. The protocol would require members to be informed of the new group and in particular for O&S to give its view on scrutiny's involvement.

5. Next Steps -

- 5.1 Members of O&S are requested to decide what actions they wish to take to address the issues set out in this report.
- 5.2 Recommended actions:
 - an informal meeting with members of the Cabinet has been scheduled for the Chair and Vice-Chair and they will give feedback at the meeting.
 - use the term commissioning working groups going forward

Page 17

- review whether we need to distinguish Cabinet Member working groups from any other member working groups if their chairmanship and remit are clearly defined
- maintain a summary on the intranet of all the groups
- consider making minutes available to all members.

Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Types of working groups2. Update from current groups in operation3. Draft form for setting up a new working group
Background Papers	None
Contact Officer	Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager 01242 77 4937 Rosalind.Reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk ,
Accountability	Chair of O&S committee, Councillor Duncan Smith
Cabinet Member	Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 18

Table showing different types of member groups operating across the council

nnGroup	Function	Membership and chair	Cabinet Member	Options for scrutiny	Reports to
Scrutiny task group	Task and finish group set up to scrutinise a particular issue	Members selected from scrutiny 'pool' and chair elected from that group	Attends by invitation	O&S sets Terms of Ref and reviews progress via task group summary at every meeting. Committee receives final report.	O&S committee then Cabinet or Council
Commissioning working group	Consultative and provides a member view to the development of a commissioned services	Cross party membership. Cabinet Member is usually the chair but the agenda is very much driven by the stage of the project	Yes	O&S can request Lead Officer and/or Cabinet Lead to attend O&S to answer questions on the project	Output feeds into the project on an ongoing basis and into reports to Cabinet/Council
JMLG	Part of the corporate governance arrangements set up to monitor performance and development of a shared service	Joint officer/member group. Some have non-Cabinet member nominee. Chairs selected from members within the shared service.	Relevant Cabinet Member	O&S can call the service to account via the Cabinet lead, Client Lead Officer or Service	
Cabinet Member working group	Develop policy or move forward on a particular issue related to their Cabinet portfolio.	Cabinet Member is chair and selects the group after asking for nominations from groups	Yes	Not really relevant but O&S may want to be aware of the work of the group. Can call Cabinet Member to answer questions on the policy area.	Informs Cabinet Member's report
Member working groups	Set up with a one-off remit or may be an ongoing role.	Members select their own chair	Can be a member of the group	O&S may want to be aware of the work of the group and refer items to it for scrutiny	Depends on the remit set. Could be Council or a committee or any other body.

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 20

KEY		Advisory Grps to Cabinet (those in light green are no longer meeting)		Commissioning working groups		Advisory Grps to Council		Appointment to an outside advisory body		Governance group for shared or commissioned services	
Name of Working Group	Purpose	Membership	Cabinet portfolio	Lead Officer	Any target dates currently set	Update	Advisory Group to other committee	Advisory Grps to Council	Advisory Group to other committee	Update	Update
Climate Change Working Group	Identifying, prioritising, scrutinising and reviewing carbon reduction projects Reviewing investment plans and sponsoring invest-to-save schemes. Championing carbon reduction, and gaining an understanding of the potential effects of climate change on the council's operations.	Penny Hall, Ian Bickerton, Pat Thornton, Suzanne Williams, Roger Whyborn	Sustainability - Cllr Whyborn	Gill Morris	No reporting targets as such. It is an ongoing group rather than a group with a specific task.	Discussion with Matt Thomas, ICT manager for CBC and Forest of Dean District Council, about future investment plans. The group was particularly interested in how these plans will impact on carbon emissions and improve climate resilience. The discussion included plans for the server room, the disaster recovery system, merging of systems. PC replacement and telephony and officers were required to provide further information. Input to Cabinet report on the feasibility of adopting a 40% carbon emissions reduction target. Additions and changes requested. Updates received on the retained CBC transport function. Cllr Whyborn taking up the issue of a green travel plan for the council. Updates received on energy projects and county council PV framework. Cllr Bickerton investigating the possibility of the council claiming zero carbon emissions from its electricity supply. Cabinet briefing note received on what the council is doing on adapting to climate change.					
Public Art Panel	The Public Art Panel was set up in 1992 in order to encourage the provision of public art within the Borough; to provide direction, advice and support to those delivering it; and to encourage wider community involvement in the siting and development of projects.	Diggy Seacombe, Andrew Lansley are member representatives. It has an external chair.	Leisure and Culture - Cllr Rowena Hay Built Environment - Cllr McKinlay	Wilf Tomaney	Targets dates are set by spending targets for the budgets which come its way (usually tied to a 5 year period by S106 agreement before unspent funds need to be returned to the contributing developer).	The group meets on the last Wednesday of every second month. It meets its objectives through - directing spend of public art budgets (largely funded through S106 agreements under the Planning Act); - putting project manager into the delivery of art, where required; - engaging with artists; - commissioning work as appropriate; - advising developers who are providing art on-site; - assessing design quality of public art; - Selecting artists when required, for commissions. Currently there is an issue about public accountability as minutes are taken, but decisions are not published or reported to Cabinet or open to member scrutiny.					
Waste	To provide advice on the identification of new projects which will reduce waste and encourage recycling and the prioritisation of them. To review the progress of existing projects and reviewing the effectiveness of completed projects. To review the effectiveness of the current delivery arrangements and the identification of any changes which may need to be made and to review funding and investment plans and sponsor invest to save schemes	Jacky Fletcher, Diggy Seacombe, Nigel Britter, Pat Thornton, Suzanne Williams	Sustainability - Roger Whyborn	Jane Griffiths	The working group gave views on the waste and recycling policy which went to Cabinet last year	The group meets on a quarterly basis with the aim to coincide with the meeting of the Joint Waste Committee. The group provided input into the review of the service disruptions during the snow and provided input into suggested improvements which was reported via a briefing note to Cabinet, they considered the draft business plan for the Joint Waste Committee and their views were incorporated into the plan which is being discussed at the first GJWC meeting in July. They have talked about service improvements and how we can increase recycling rates. This is an ongoing working group which provides a useful cross party sounding board on waste and recycling matters but the Cabinet Member has suggested that its role should be reviewed in the Autumn once a report has been produced for Cabinet on the latest stage of waste and recycling.					
Asset Management working group	The role of the Asset Management Working Group is to act as a sounding board on strategic asset management issues and to make recommendations to Cabinet on controversial disposals or those falling outside best consideration.	Andrew Chard, Bernard Fisher, Jacky Fletcher, Wendy Flynn, Rowena Hay, John Rawson, Malcolm Stennett.	Finance - John Rawson	David Roberts	Timetable are driven by the Asset Management plan	Meets four times a year and formal minutes are produced which are available to members on request.					
Air Quality Management Steering Group	To produce air quality plan, raise awareness and work with County to secure funding.	Penny Hall, Ian Bickerton, Rowena Hay, Helena McCloskey,	Housing and Safety - Peter Jeffries	Paul Scott	Awaiting clarification on when it last met and future meetings	Used to report to former Environment O&S committee on a regular basis.					
Housing Review Group (not currently meeting)	The group was set up with a specific remit to look at the welfare reforms and other legislative housing changes.	Andrew Chard, Barbara Driver, Wendy Flynn, Peter Jeffries, Klara Sudbury, David Prince	Housing and Safety - Cllr Jeffries Built Environment - Cllr McKinlay	Jane Griffiths	Housing and Homelessness strategy reported to Cabinet in June 2012	The group helped support the development of the housing and homelessness strategy which went to Cabinet in June 2012 but there has been no requirement for the group to meet in the last 12 months.					
Environmental Improvements Fund	To review potential bids for funding and make recommendations to Cabinet.	Penny Hall, Andrew McKinlay, Klara Sudbury, Suzanne Williams, Roger Whyborn	Built Environment - Cllr McKinlay Sustainability - Cllr Whyborn	Mike Redman	Last reported to Cabinet in September 2012	In 2012-2013, Council agreed to allocate £160,000 from the New Homes Bonus to the Cheltenham Environmental Improvements Fund. Bids were prioritised by a member panel comprising the Cabinet Members for Built Environment and Sustainability and a Cabinet appointed advisory group.					
Promoting Cheltenham Fund	To review potential bids for funding and make recommendations to Cabinet.	Rob Garnham, Peter Jeffries, Klara Sudbury, Malcolm Stennett	Leader - Steve Jordan	Richard Gibson	Last reported to Cabinet in July 2012	The Promoting Cheltenham Fund was a pot of funding allocated from the New Homes Bonus in 2012/13 to support events, projects and initiatives that would stimulate economic and business growth in Cheltenham. It is no longer in operation.					

Name of Working Group	Purpose	Membership	Cabinet portfolio	Lead Officer	Any target dates currently set	Update
Future Council Size	To assess the appetite amongst members for a change to the size of the council and to the electoral cycle and to make any recommendations from this point.	Rob Garnham, Steve Jordan, Diggy Seacombe, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Leslie Godwin	Corporate Services - Cllr Walklett	Rosalind Reeves	Reported to Council on 22 July 2013	The working group have completed their work and the Cabinet Member Corporate Services took a report to Council on the 22nd July. Council supported the recommendations and decided that any further work to reduce the number of councillors or move to a four yearly electoral cycle would not be followed at this time.
Green Environment	As part of work strand 1 of the Cheltenham Futures programme the lead officer has been asked to ascertain if those service areas which are likely to be "retained" within the core function of the Council are fit for purpose or if there is a feasible opportunity to externally commission them or share the service with others.	Tim Harman, Nigel Britter, Bernard Fisher, Charles Stewart, Roger Whyborn	Sustainability - Roger Whyborn	Grahame Lewis	31/10/2013 to Council	The group is still meeting. There is an officer working group and a Member steering group. From work already undertaken its clear that there is no appetite or need to externally commission or share some services. However one element of the Green Environment portfolio is the Nursery. Officers are currently considering if there is a viable business case to retain the nursery activity.
Leisure and Culture	To act as member champions for the review and to act as a consultative/reference group for the Cabinet Member on the commissioning of the services. Specifically it has recently received the out of the procurement process.	Barbara Driver, Paul McLain, Anne Regan, Chris Ryder, Garth Barnes, Wendy Flynn, Rowena Hay, Andrew Lansley.	Leisure and Culture - Rowena Hay	Ken Dale	1/4/2014 to complete the review process.	The group are currently discussing how it can best support the Cabinet Member responsible in the remainder of the review and are planning to put out suggestions to them and to ask for their feedback.
Gardens Working Group	To advise on use of the gardens by Cheltenham Festivals and other organisers	Penny Hall, Garth Barnes, Roger Whyborn	Sustainability - Roger Whyborn	Adam Reynolds		Completed its work.
Joint Airport Working Group	Joint working group with Gloucester City to scrutinise issues relating to Gloucestershire Airport.	Tim Harman, Steve Jordan, Suzanne Williams, Leslie Godwin.	Leader - Steve Jordan	Pat Pratley	Annual review of the green policy in the autumn	The group meets when there is a need. The chair was briefed on the financial situation with the airport. The next task will be to review the airport's green policy.
Development Task Force	An advisory body set up to lead on regeneration and development opportunities for the town.	Rob Garnham, Andrew McKinlay	Built Environment - Cllr McKinlay Leader - Cllr Jordan	Jeremy Williamson	The business plan was considered and endorsed by Cabinet in March 2013 to provide legitimacy, given that the Cheltenham Development Task Force is purely an advisory body.	The group meets quarterly and has its own website. The first part of the meetings are open to the public and there are plans to make the public minutes available via the CDTF webpages. The Council is one of the sources of funding for the delivery of its work and assists in the delivery of projects.
Appointments to outside bodies	The Council appoints members to a range of outside bodies with varying purposes	Appointments listed on the council's website	All	Democratic Services		There is no formal reporting requirements for members appointed to outside bodies.
JMLG One Legal	Set up in December 2009 to oversee the performance and development of the Shared Legal Service on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council	Andrew Wall, Jon Walklett	Corporate Services - Jon Walklett	Jane Griffiths	??	Meets twice a year and at other times when required and does not formerly report to any other body
JMLG Built Environment	Set up in December 2009 to oversee the performance and development of the Shared Building Control Service on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council and	Andrew Wall, Andrew McKinlay	Built Environment - Andrew McKinlay	?	??	Meets quarterly and does not formerly report to any other body
GO JMLG	Set up in July 2011 to oversee the performance and development of GO Shared Services of the council partners	Jon Walklett	Corporate Services - Jon Walklett	Pat Pratley	The group meets on a quarterly basis to consider matters of relevance to GO, monitors service performance and achievement of the GO business case. The group is tasked with considering the strategic direction of GO.	Next meeting is scheduled for 12 August 2013.
ICT JMLG	Set up in December 2012 to oversee the performance and development of the ICT Shared Services on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council and Forest of Dean	Jon Walklett	Corporate Services - Jon Walklett	Sanjay Mistry, Mark Sheldon	??	Meets ? and does not formerly report to any other body

SETTING UP A NEW MEMBER WORKING GROUP

Date:						
Member Contact:						
Lead Officer:						
Why is a working group needed?						
Who is proposing that a working group should be set up: (tick one of the following)						
Council:	Cabinet:	Cabinet Member:	O&S:	Officer:	Other:	
What is the main function? New policy development Policy review Scrutiny Corporate Governance Support commissioning exercise Support to a major project Funding bid evaluation Build up a group of members with expertise in a particular area Other						
How will members be selected?. Eg via groups Open invite to all members Target members with specific skills or expertise						
Does the remit of the group contribute to the Corporate Objectives or delivery of an action on the Business plan?						
What are the timescales for the group?						
Who will provide steer to the group?						

Who is accountable for its successful delivery?				
What role would the Cabinet Member like to play in the group i.e active or happy to let the group go away and come up with some recommendations				
Is it a one-off working group or will it have an ongoing role?				
Where will the group report its final recommendations?				
Any other comments:				
Recommendation for a working group and reasons:				
Member working group	Cabinet Member Working Group	Scrutiny task group	Commissioning working group	Corporate Governance group

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

2 September 2013

The relationship between Overview and Scrutiny and the Cabinet

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 At the Council meeting on the 22 July, following the publishing of the Annual Scrutiny report, a debate was had about the differences between Scrutiny Task Groups and Cabinet Member Working Groups. From the debate it was clear that there needs to be some clarity on the differences between these two groups and some arrangement needs to be sought to make sure they compliment and are compatible with one another. The role of the Cabinet Member on scrutiny task groups also needs to be more clearly defined. This has been covered in a report to this meeting on member working groups.
- 1.2 The results from the scrutiny questionnaire also highlighted that there was a general view from both Cabinet and non Cabinet members that Scrutiny was not being very effective at holding the Cabinet to account and this needed to be improved.
- 1.3 In order for the new scrutiny arrangements to be effective, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee needs to put in place an action plan to address the areas identified in the questionnaire and debated at the Council meeting. This report is designed to initiate that process.

2. Holding the Cabinet to account

- 2.1 Under the previous scrutiny arrangements, Cabinet Members frequently attended the O&S meetings to give an update on their portfolio. This was thought to be not relevant for the new single O&S meeting which has a managing and co-ordinating role. However this has resulted in members feeling less well informed than previously. The Leader of the Council has said that he has tried to address the issue of provision of information to members through a range of member seminars on important issues and these have been generally well attended.
- 2.2 The Chair of O&S is reluctant to schedule regular slots for Cabinet Members as if every Cabinet Member was to attend it could make for a long meeting and if it was done on a rota basis it could take a year to run through all the Cabinet Members. The vice-chair of O&S by contrast is very keen for these slots to be reintroduced in some form.

- 2.3 As an alternative, O&S could choose a Cabinet Member to attend their next meeting where there is a particular issue that they wish to question the Cabinet member on.
- 2.4 O&S could also hold the Cabinet to account more effectively if there were to choose more topics for their workplan that reflect the priorities on the Cabinet Forward Plan.
- 2.5 This area could be the subject of further discussion with Cabinet Members.

3. Summary of evidence/information

- 3.1 As set out in the report.

4. Next Steps -

- 4.1 Members of O&S are requested to decide what actions they wish to take to address the issues set out in this report.
- 4.2 The chair of O&S will be meeting with the Leader and the Cabinet Member Corporate Services to discuss this paper so can give feedback at the meeting.

Appendices	None
Background Papers	None
Contact Officer	Sam Howe, Democracy Assistant, Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager 01242 77 4937 Rosalind.Reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk ,
Accountability	Chair of O&S committee, Councillor Duncan Smith
Cabinet Member	Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

2 September 2013

Populating the Scrutiny Work Plan

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 During the first year of the new scrutiny arrangements a number of topics were proposed resulting in ten scrutiny task groups being set up. After this initial impetus, the Scrutiny work plan now has a very thin agenda. This was referred to at the Council meeting on 22 July when the Scrutiny Annual report was received by Council and identified as an issue that needed to be addressed.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 Council, on the 22 July, heard from a number of members who had suggestions for the Scrutiny work programme. It is possible that if there were more topics which members felt were interesting, then there may be more who are willing to participate in the scrutiny process. The two areas that need to be addressed are; how Scrutiny can attract a wider spread of members to take part in scrutiny task groups and, increasing the amount of topics which are brought to the Overview and Scrutiny committee for consideration.

3. Attracting more members to take part in Scrutiny task groups

- 3.1 The Annual Report on the Overview and Scrutiny process highlighted that there were still a number of members who had not engaged in Scrutiny or joined a scrutiny task group. 25% of members did not respond to the survey and generally they did not speak up in Council as to why they had not got involved. Some members did cite lack of time as a reason or lack of interesting topics and some members suggested that if the public had a greater part to play in the process then this would mean they would get more heavily involved.
- 3.2 At Council it was suggested that the Skills Audit, which was carried out by HR, could be used to help match members skills to those required for new scrutiny task groups. A personal invite could then be issued to members, rather than a global invite, which may have more success in attracting members to sit on task groups. The skills matrix was only completed by 15 members in 2011.
- 3.3 There is also the possibility that if the topics for scrutiny task groups were more directly linked to the Corporate plan, then members may get involved as they may feel that it is a way of holding the Cabinet to account by a greater degree. This may also encourage a greater degree of involvement and interest from the Cabinet

member if the task group were scrutinising a current issue in their portfolio.

4. Sources of topics for Scrutiny

4.1 The scrutiny registration process

This provides a facility for members to propose topics for scrutiny. There was also a view from members responding to the questionnaire that we should raise public awareness of Scrutiny and encourage them to put forward topics for scrutiny. A form was included in the Annual report but members may like to consider publicising this more widely via the website or publicity in the media.

4.2 The Forward Plan

The Forward plan sets out all the decisions to be taken by Council and Cabinet in the next four months and so should be an ideal starting point for O&S in formulating their work plan. It is available on the website and circulated to members via email on a monthly basis (see Appendix 2). The Forward Plan was discussed at the Chair's briefing on 15 August and they identified a number of topics in the Forward Plan where O&S may want to have a better understanding of the item and the decision to be made. These are highlighted in Appendix 2 starting with the Joint Waste Committee Business Plan.

4.3 The Corporate Risk Register and Corporate Strategy/Business Plan

If Scrutiny is holding the Council to account on whether it is delivering what it set out to deliver, the Corporate Strategy and resulting action plan are important starting points. Similarly the Corporate Risk Register does not currently come to O&S on a regular basis but it could be added to their workplan and used to identify areas warranting more detailed scrutiny.

4.4 Other Member groups

Since the introduction of new scrutiny arrangements, O&S have received a regular report on the work of the scrutiny task groups which has been in the public domain. It was suggested at the last O&S chair's briefing that Scrutiny may want to be kept informed of the work of other groups where members of the Council are involved. These include the various Cabinet Member working groups, Commissioning working groups as well as the corporate governance groups relating to the new commissioned and shared services. A list of these is attached to a previous agenda item on member working groups and may prompt the committee to request further information or some form of follow up.

4.4.1 What topics have been proposed?

At the last O&S meeting in May and in Council on 22 July a number of topics were proposed for Scrutiny to consider and are set out in the list below:

- Bereavement services
- The nursery
- Car parking and enforcement
- CBH
- The council's obligations to young people
- HR and appraisals
- Policies for the winter work force

- Dog fouling
- Pubs and licensing
- Use of 106 money's
- External partnerships – how are they being scrutinised and held to account

5. Summary of evidence/information

5.1 As set out in this report.

6. Next Steps

6.1 Members are asked to consider the potential source of topics for their scrutiny workplan and decide how they want to proceed.

Appendices	1. Current workplan 2. Cabinet Forward plan
Background Papers	None
Contact Officer	Sam Howe, Democracy Assistant, Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager 01242 77 4937 Rosalind.Reeves@cheltenham.gov.uk ,
Accountability	Chair of O&S committee, Councillor Duncan Smith
Cabinet Member	Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 30

O&S Committee 2012/13 work plan

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	---------	-------------------	--------------

MEETING DATE: 2 September 2013				
STG- Grass cutting	Follow up	Review implementation of any recommendations agreed by Cabinet in December 2012	Update report	Rosalind Reeves, DSM Chair, Councillor Penny Hall
Member working group updates	Workplanning	To kept the O&S committee updated on other member working groups and identify any further issues for scrutiny	Update report	Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager
MEETING DATE: 3 October 2013 (if required)				
MEETING DATE: 25 November 2013				
STG- Events	Follow up	Review implementation of any recommendations agreed by Cabinet in February 2013	Update report	Rosalind Reeves, DSM Chair, Councillor Penny Hall
Q2 Performance Report	Perf monitoring	Review Q2 performance results and identify any items for further scrutiny	Update report	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
MEETING DATE: 12 December 2013 (if required)				
MEETING DATE: 9 January 2014				

O&S Committee 2012/13 work plan

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Budget proposals 2013/14	Scrutiny	Make any recommendations to Cabinet	A presentation A report from the budget scrutiny working group	Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources Chair of the Budget scrutiny working group
MEETING DATE: 3 March 2014				
STG- Allotments Group	Follow up	Review implementation of any recommendations agreed by Cabinet in March 2013	Update report	Beverly Thomas, Democracy Officer Chair, Councillor Anne Regan
DRAFT Corporate Strategy 2013-14	Scrutiny	Review DRAFT strategy prior to Cabinet	Report in March	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
MEETING DATE: 3 April 2014 (if required)				
MEETING DATE: 3 July 2014				

Forward Plan August 2013 - November 2013

This Forward Plan contains details of all the key decisions that are planned to be taken by Cabinet and individual Cabinet members over the next four months together with key decisions by officers. It will be updated and published on the Council website www.cheltenham.gov.uk on a monthly basis.

Key Decision

A 'Key decision' is one which:-

- requires a budget expenditure or saving of £100,000 or more;
- relates to the acquisition or disposal of land or an interest in land with a value in excess of £250,000;
- has borough wide significance or one on which members of the Cheltenham Community would reasonably expect to be notified or consulted.

Non-key decision

For additional information and completeness the Forward Plan also contains those items to be considered by Cabinet which are outside the definition of a key decision.

Cabinet Meetings

The Cabinet will normally meet every four weeks. Meetings start at 6pm and are held in the Pittville Room at the Municipal Offices.

Meetings of the Cabinet are open to the public (with the exception of discussion regarding reports which contain exempt/confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information). This is formal notice under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 that part of the Cabinet meetings listed in this Forward Plan may be held in private because the agenda and reports for the meeting will contain exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

Documents submitted to the Cabinet or Cabinet member (s) for decision will be a formal report, which if public and non-urgent, will be available on www.cheltenham.gov.uk at least 5 clear working days before the date the decision can be made. If you would like a copy by email please contact democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk. Background papers are listed where known in advance.

Documents shown are listed at Cheltenham Borough Council, Municipal Offices, Promenade, Cheltenham, GL50 9SA.

The members of the Cabinet are:

Leader of the Council

Councillor Steve Jordan

Portfolio Holders

Sport and Culture

Councillor Rowena Hay

Sustainability

Councillor Roger Whyborn

Built Environment

Councillor Andrew McKinlay

Housing and Safety

Councillor Peter Jeffries

Finance

Councillor John Rawson

Corporate Services

Councillor Jon Walklett

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The work of the Cabinet is scrutinised by an overview and scrutiny committee which monitors the work of Cabinet.

Senior Leadership Team (SLT)

The senior management team of the council includes the Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors who review the Forward Plan on a monthly basis and will select reports which they wish to review before going to Cabinet.

Contacting us.

For further detailed information or to give your views regarding specific issues to be considered by the Cabinet/Individual Cabinet Member please contact the named contact officer.

For more information on attending meetings or asking public questions please contact Democratic Services on 01242 77 4937 or email democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Decision Title	Summary of decision to be made	Type of Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Date	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Contact details	If applicable reasons why public excluded	Background documents
Joint Core Strategy- Preferred Option	To approve the plan for public consultation.	Non Key Decision	Council	05/09/13	Steve Jordan Leader of the Council	Tracey Crews	tracey.crews@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Joint Waste Committee Business Plan	To approve the Joint Waste Committee Business Plan	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	Not before 17/09/13	Roger Whyborn Cabinet Member Sustainability	Jane Griffiths	jane.griffiths@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Corporate Risk Register	To note the corporate risk register	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Jon Walklett Cabinet Member Corporate Services	Bryan Parsons	bryan.parsons@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Follow up of the recommendations	To approve the recommendations	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member	Tracy Brown	tracy.brown@cheltenham.gov.uk		

Decision Title	Summary of decision to be made	Type of Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Date	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Contact details	If applicable reasons why public excluded	Background documents
of the Sex Trade Scrutiny Task Group					Housing and Safety				
Weavers Field and the Burrows Playing Field	To execute a deed dedicating Weavers Field and the Burrows Playing Field as Queen Elizabeth 11 Fields with the Fields in Trust.	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Roger Whyborn Cabinet Member Sustainability	Adam Reynolds	tony.mcnamara@cheltenham.gov.uk		
St Paul's Phase Two	A decision to redevelop the second phase of St Paul's was taken earlier this year. A further decision as to whether the affordable units are to be owned by CBC or CBH is still to be formally agreed. Cabinet will also be asked to approve entering into a development agreement with the approved contractor.	Key Decision	Cabinet Council	17/09/13 07/10/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Grahame Lewis	grahame.lewis@cheltenham.gov.uk grahame.lewis@cheltenham.gov.uk	para 3 of schedule 12a of Local Government Act 1972	
Adjustment of Fee in Respect of a New Sex Establishment Licence	To approve the fee	Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Permission to consult on the draft Sexual Entertainment Venues Policy for Venues Policy	To approve the draft Sexual Entertainment Venues Policy for consultation	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Local council tax support scheme (LCTS)	To approve the local council tax support scheme	Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Setting a fee for Scrap Metal	To approve the fee.	Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		

Decision Title	Summary of decision to be made	Type of Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Date	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Contact details	If applicable reasons why public excluded	Background documents
Dealers Licence under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013					Housing and Safety				
Rebranding of Art Gallery and Museum	To approve the rebranding of the Art Gallery and Museum	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	17/09/13	Rowena Hay Cabinet Member Sport and Culture	Sonia Phillips	sonia.phillips@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Statement of Accounts-Report of the Chair of Audit Committee	Statement of the Chair of Audit Committee	Non Key Decision	Council	07/10/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Permission to consult on the draft Licensing policy, guidance and conditions for private hire and taxis	To approve the draft Licensing policy for consultation	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Review of Hackney Carriage Fares	To approve the Hackney Carriage Fares	Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Community Pride Fund	To approve the allocation of funding	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	Steve Jordan Leader of the Council	Richard Gibson	richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Extension of current governance arrangements for GO Shared Services		Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	Jon Walklett Cabinet Member Corporate Services	Jane Griffiths	jane.griffiths@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Adoption of a Late Night Levy	To adopt the late night levy	Non Key Decision	Cabinet Council	15/10/13 16/12/13	Peter Jeffries Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	Louis Krog	louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk louis.krog@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Budget Strategy and Process	To approve the budget setting process	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Quarterly Budget Monitoring Report to end of August	To note the report	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member	Paul Jones	paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk		

Decision Title	Summary of decision to be made	Type of Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Date	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Contact details	If applicable reasons why public excluded	Background documents
Office of surveillance commissioners- RIPA inspection report	Approve the action plan to deliver the recommendations	Non Key Decision	Cabinet	15/10/13	Finance Jon Walklett Cabinet Member Corporate Services	Bryan Parsons	bryan.parsons@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Accommodation Strategy	Cabinet – to approve the business case to support the accommodation strategy Council – any decisions required by Council resulting from the above	Key Decision	Cabinet Council	Not before 12/11/13 Not before 16/12/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk	para 3 of schedule 12a of Local Government Act 1972	
Business Rates Retention Scheme -Pooling 2014/15	To approve the scheme for 2014/15	Key Decision	Cabinet Council	10/12/13 16/12/13	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk		
Asset Management Plan and Capital Strategy	To approve the revised capital strategy	Key Decision	Cabinet Council	17/12/13 11/02/14	John Rawson Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member Finance	Mark Sheldon	mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk		

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 38