Date: 17th May 2016

The Arc
High Street
Clowne
Derbyshire
S43 4JY

Dear Sir or Madam

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Growth Scrutiny Committee of the Bolsover District Council to be held in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne on **Wednesday 25th May 2016** at **1000** hours.

Register of Members' Interest - Members are reminded that a Member must within 28 days of becoming aware of any changes to their Disclosable Pecuniary Interests provide written notification to the Authority's Monitoring Officer.

You will find the contents of the agenda itemised on page 2.

Yours faithfully

Sarah Sternberg

Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer
To: Chairman and Members of the Growth Scrutiny Committee

ACCESS FOR ALL

If you need help understanding this document or require a
larger print or translation, please contact us on the following telephone number:-

☎ **01246 242529   Democratic Services**
Minicom: 01246 242450   Fax: 01246 242423

INVESTORS IN PEOPLE   **Tel** 01246 242424   **Fax** 01246 242423   **Minicom** 01246 242450
Email enquiries@bolsover.gov.uk   **Web** www.bolsover.gov.uk

CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE   0137

GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday 25th May 2016 at 1000 hours in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne

Item No.		Page No.(s)
	PART 1 – OPEN ITEMS	
1.	To receive apologies for absence, if any.	
2.	To note any urgent items of business which the Chairman has consented to being considered under the provisions of Section 100(B) 4 (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
3.	Members should declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and Non Statutory Interest as defined by the Members' Code of Conduct in respect of:	
	a) any business on the agenda b) any urgent additional items to be considered c) any matters arising out of those items	
	and, if appropriate, withdraw from the meeting at the relevant time.	
4.	To approve the minutes of a meeting held on 20th April 2016.	To Follow
5.	List of Key Decisions & Items to be Considered in Private.	To Follow
	(Members should contact the officer whose name appears on the List of Key Decisions for any further information).	
6.	Corporate Plan Targets Performance Update – January to March 2016 (Quarter 4 2015/16).	3 to 8
7.	Asset Backed Joint Venture Company; Assistant Director – Property & Estates.	Verbal Update
8.	Joint Venture/Housing; Assistant Director - Property and Estates and Assistant Director - Community Safety and Housing.	Verbal Update
9.	Scrutiny Work Plan 2016/17.	9 to 12
10.	Scrutiny Review – selection and scoping.	13 to 24

GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Growth Scrutiny Committee of the Bolsover District Council held in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne, on Wednesday 20th April 2016 at 1000 hours.

PRESENT:-

Members:- Councillors T. Alexander, A. Anderson, P. Barnes, J.A. Clifton, M. Dixey, P. Smith, S. Statter, B. Watson and J. Wilson.

Officers:- D. Swaine (Chief Executive Officer), G. Galloway (Assistant Director - Property and Estates), M. Broughton (Commercial Property and Developments Manager) and A. Bluff (Governance Officer).

Also in attendance in the public gallery were Councillors D. McGregor, J.E. Smith and M.J. Dooley.

Councillor S.W. Fritchley in the Chair

0948. APOLOGY

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor T. Cannon.

0949. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were no urgent items of business to consider.

0950. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

0951. MINUTES – 16TH MARCH 2016

Moved by Councillor B. Watson and seconded by Councillor A. Anderson
RESOLVED that the minutes of a Growth Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 16th March 2016 be approved as a correct record.

0952. LIST OF KEY DECISIONS AND ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE

Members considered the list of key decisions and items to be considered in private document.

In response to Members' questions, the Assistant Director - Property and Estates provided an update to the meeting with regard to the situation with the chimney at Pleasley Vale

Mills. It was noted that further discussion would be necessary with regard to the future of the chimney.

0953. **MONITORING GROWTH AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY – DISCUSSION ON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TO ASSIST THE GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WITH MONITORING GROWTH**

Members considered a presentation of the Chief Executive Officer in relation to a list of proposed performance indicators to assist the Committee with the monitoring of Growth in the District.

Members had previously discussed the role of Growth Scrutiny Committee in relation to the Council's Growth agenda and also whether the current Growth Corporate Plan Targets were meaningful.

After considering how they wished to monitor performance of Growth, Members had proposed the following indicators to scrutinise;

- National Non Domestic Rates received
- Number of planning applications determined
- Number of Job Seekers Allowance claimants

With regard to the number of planning applications determined, the Chief Executive Officer referred to current performance indicator, G08 – *Process all major planning applications 10% better than the minimum for special measures per annum*; he suggested that more relevance could be given to how quickly applications were processed, for example, showing the reasons why some applications had been able to be processed more quickly than others, and with comparisons against previous years.

With regard to the value of business rates collected in a year, the Chief Executive Officer suggested that this information could be accompanied by graphs to show trends.

Further suggestions were sought from Members.

A lengthy discussion took place.

The following points were made by Members;

- more challenging targets *were* needed,
- Members should be involved in the setting of targets,
- the PERFORM system should be kept updated on an ongoing basis and not just quarterly so Members could see targets developing,
- any financial impact on the Council should also be included with a target.

It was also suggested that a process be put in place for reviewing targets on a six monthly basis if Members felt that any targets needed addressing.

The Chief Executive Officer would liaise with officers regarding the points raised by Members and provide an update to the Committee in June. The Chief Executive Officer

would also ensure that relevant officers attended future Growth Scrutiny Committees when required by Members.

Moved and seconded
RESOLVED that the presentation be received.

(Chief Executive Officer/Scrutiny Officer)

0954. **DEMONSTRATION ON THE PUBLIC ASSETS DATABASE**

The Commercial Property and Developments Manager provided a demonstration of the Public Assets Database to the meeting.

The database was a good visual aid and used by Property and Estates to help focus on delivery, for example, engaging with parish and town councils regarding joint working and joint ventures.

The presentation slides highlighted the following;

Ownership and Extent Datasets; The system was a Spatial (Polygon) service only for local authorities and was defined by administrative area, District or County, and based on the Land Registry's internal map data layer. It provided free information on Public Sector ownership and information was supplied under a Data Sharing Agreement. Refreshes were also available.

Potential Benefits; The system helped the Authority to meet obligations under the Government's Transparency Agenda. The Land Registry dataset complemented and built upon existing geographic datasets. Information data repository, on a centralised GIS layer, aids fast and accurate information access and retrieval via 'My Maps'. It identifies how many titles and ownerships cover an area (30,133). The data is used to assist with projects, it reduces ad hoc checks and general Land Registry spend but doesn't include 'unregistered' land.

Data Costs; Polygon, title number, class of title and tenure information, for 5p per title. Registration = £1,506

A range of additional data was also available;
- Ownership records for £1.00 per title
- Registered on dates for 1p per title
- Lease Details on Leasehold Titles for 25p per title

All public/Government owned title registrations were provided for free and ownership information on this sector was also supplied. The annual update cost was £400

Land Registry defined public owned assets; Local health authorities / town councils / parish councils / NHS / Primary Care Trust / Local Authority / Secretary of State / Government departments / Majesty / Crown Estate / emergency services: Fire, Ambulance and Police.

The system also included other specific information such as areas of 'high risk' of flooding, political boundaries, bus stops etc. The system was populated by the GIS team and all departments had access to the system.

The Chief Executive Officer noted that the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority was developing a prospectus of housing opportunities and putting together an indication of what was in the pipeline for developers. The Chief Executive Officer felt that Bolsover could do this locally; the public assets database was used for identifying areas of Council owned land as part of the Authority's proactive approach to housing development opportunities in the District.

The Chief Executive Officer advised Members that Bolsover's development prospectus was being progressed and would include information relating to B@Home and Joint Ventures such as Pleasley Vale etc. The Chief Executive Officer had also met with the Housing Lead at DCLG who was aware of the prospectus and both Councils' innovative approach to housing development. DCLG's Local Government Policy Localities Lead, Chrissie Farrugia, would also be visiting Bolsover and North East Derbyshire District Councils on 29th April and would be shown a number of development sites in both Districts' areas.

The Assistant Director - Property and Estates added that in a lot of cases the Authority was leading the way on joint working, especially in relation to sharing accommodation with partner organisations.

A short discussion took place.

Councillors McGregor, Smith and Dooley left the meeting.

Moved and seconded
RESOLVED that the presentation be received.

0955.   WORK PLAN 2015/16 AND 2016/17

Members considered the Committee's Work Plans for 2015/16 and 2016/17.

Moved and seconded
RESOLVED that the Committee's Work Plans for 2015/16 and 2016/17 be noted.

The Chief Executive Officer, the Assistant Director - Property and Estates and the Commercial Property and Developments Manager left the meeting.

The formal part of the Growth Scrutiny Committee meeting concluded at 1110 hours and Members then met as a Working Party to continue their review work.

The Working Party concluded at 1120 hours.

Key Decisions & Items to be Considered in Private

To be made under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Published on: 13 May 2016

INTRODUCTION

The list attached sets out decisions that are termed as "Key Decisions" at least 28 calendar days before they are due to be taken by the Executive or an officer under delegated powers.

Preparation of the list helps Executive to programme its work. The purpose of the list is to give notice and provide an opportunity for consultation on the issues to be discussed. The list is updated each month with the period of the list being rolled forward by one month and republished. The list is available for public inspection at the The Arc, High Street, Clowne, S43 4JY. Copies of the list can be obtained from Sarah Sternberg, Assistant Director – Governance & Monitoring Officer at this address or by email to sarah.sternberg@bolsover.gov.uk.

The list can also be accessed from the Council's website at www.bolsover.gov.uk. The Executive is allowed to make urgent decisions which do not appear in the list, however, a notice will be published at The Arc and on the Council's website explaining the reasons for the urgent decisions. Please note that the decision dates are indicative and are subject to change.

The names of Executive members are as follows:

Councillor A M Syrett - Leader
Councillor M Dooley – Deputy Leader
Councillor T Connerton
Councillor B R Murray-Carr
Councillor K Reid
Councillor J Ritchie

The Executive agenda and reports are available for inspection by the public five clear days prior to the meeting of the Executive. The papers can be seen at The Arc at the above address. The papers are also available on the Council's website referred to above. Background papers are listed on each report submitted to the Executive and members of the public are entitled to see these documents unless they contain exempt or confidential information. The report also contains the name and telephone number of a contact officer.

Meetings of the Executive are open to the public and usually take place in the Chamber Suites at The Arc. Occasionally there are items included on the agenda which are exempt and for those items the public will be asked to leave the meeting. This list shows where this is intended and the reason why the reports are exempt or confidential. Members of the public may make representations to the Assistant Director – Governance & Monitoring Officer about any particular item being considered in exempt.

The list does not detail all decisions which have to be taken by the Executive, only "Key Decisions". In these Rules a "Key Decision" means an executive decision, which is likely:

(1) to result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(2) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the District.

In determining the meaning of "significant" the Council must have regard to any guidance for the time being issued by the Secretary of State. The Council has decided that income or expenditure of £50,000 or more is significant.

The dates for meetings of Executive in 2016/17 are as follows:

2016		2017	
	13 June		3 January
	11 July		30 January
	5 September		27 February
	3 October		27 March
	31 October		24 April
	28 November		22 May

The Council hereby gives notice of its intention to make the following Key Decisions and/or decisions to be considered in private:

Matter in respect of which a decision will be taken	Decision-maker	Date of Decision	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Is this decision a Key Decision?	Is this decision to be heard in public or private session
Oxcroft House Refurbishment Contract To approve the contract for the refurbishment of Oxcroft House	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council	Assistant Director – Property and Estates	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Private – relates to the Council's financial or business affairs
Site Acquisition, Clowne To consider the purchase of a development site	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council	Assistant Director – Property and Estates	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Private – relates to the Council's financial or business affairs
CCTV To consider future options for CCTV in the District	Executive	June - October 2016	Report of Councillor J Ritchie, Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT	Assistant Director – Community Safety and Head of Housing (BDC)	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Public
Additional Car Parking To consider a report on additional car parking provision at The Arc.	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council	Assistant Director – Property and Estates	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Private – relates to the Council's financial or business affairs

Matter in respect of which a decision will be taken	Decision-maker	Date of Decision	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Is this decision a Key Decision?	Is this decision to be heard in public or private session
Pleasley Vale Mill Pond To consider repairs to Plealsey Vale Mill Pond.	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council	Assistant Director – Property and Estates	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Private – relates to the Council's financial or business affairs
Hill Top, Shirebrook To consider a report concerning development at Hill Top, Shirebrook.	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council	Assistant Director – Property and Estates	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Private – relates to the Council's financial or business affairs
Vehicle Replacements To approve the purchase of vehicle replacements utilised within Streetscene Services	Executive	June - October 2016	Report of Councillor B Murray-Carr, Portfolio Holder for Environment	Assistant Director – Streetscene	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Public
External Doors Contract To award the contract for external doors provision.	Executive	June 2016	Report of Councillor J Ritchie, Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT	Assistant Director – Housing and IT	Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.	Public

Bolsover District Council

Growth Scrutiny Committee

25th May 2016

Corporate Plan Targets Performance Update – January to March 2016 **(Q4 – 2015/16)**

Report of the Assistant Director – Customer Service and Improvement

This report is public

Purpose of the Report

- To report the quarter 4 outturns for the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 targets.

1   Report Details

1.1   The attached contains the performance outturn for targets which sit under the 'unlocking our growth potential' aim as of 31st March 2016. (Information compiled on 11th May 2016)

1.2   A summary is provided below:

1.3   **Unlocking our Growth Potential**

- ➢ 14 targets in total (1 target achieved previously – G04)
- ➢ 9 targets on track with **G08** achieving its annual target for 2015/16.
- ➢ 2 targets have been achieved:
  - o **G02** 'Establish business support programme by engaging with D2N2 and SCR Growth Hub by March 2016'.
  - o **G14** 'Identify with partners key actions and funding mechanisms to bring forward priority employment sites at Markham Vale, Shirebrook and former Coalite site by March 2016'.
- ➢ 2 targets have been flagged as an 'alert' i.e. it may not achieve its intended outcome by the target date:
  - o **G11** 'Through a programme of targeted refurbishment bring 15 empty private sector properties back into use per annum. Target not met for 2015/16 – 9 units brought back into use. As noted on the appendix work continues to influence this target.
  - o **G13** 'Work with partners to deliver an average of 20 units of affordable homes each year'. Target not met for 2015/16 with no units of affordable housing being completed for 2015/16. The appendix notes some completions due summer 2016.

2   Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation

2.1   Out of the 14 targets 9 are on track, 3 have been achieved (1 previously) and 2
       have been flagged as an 'alert' i.e. they may not achieve its intended outcome this
       financial year.

2.2   This is an information report to keep Members informed of progress against the
       corporate plan targets noting achievements and any areas of concern.

3   Consultation and Equality Impact

3.1   Not applicable to this report as consultation was carried out on the original
       Corporate Plan.

4   Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

4.1   Not applicable to this report as providing an overview of performance against
       agreed targets.

5   Implications

5.1   Finance and Risk Implications

       No finance or risk implications within this performance report.

5.2   Legal Implications including Data Protection

       No legal implications within this performance report.

5.3   Human Resources Implications

       No human resource implications within this performance report.

6   Recommendations

6.1   That year one progress against the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 targets be noted.

7   Decision Information

Is the decision a Key Decision? (A Key Decision is one which results in income or expenditure to the Council of £50,000 or more or which has a significant impact on two or more District wards)	No
District Wards Affected	Not applicable
Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework	Links to all Corporate Plan 2015-2019 aims and priorities

8   Document Information

Appendix No	Title	
1.	Corporate Plan Performance Update – Q4 January to March 2016	
Background Papers (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)		
All details on PERFORM system		
Report Author		**Contact Number**
Kath Drury, Information, Engagement and Performance Manager on behalf of Assistant Director – Customer Service and Improvement		01246 217641

Aim – Unlocking our Growth Potential

Key Corporate Target	Directorate	Status		Progress	Target Date
G 01 - Through the use of Key Account Management develop a relationship with a minimum of 50 local businesses by March 2019.	Growth	On track		Q4 2015/16 **28 Businesses Engaged to date**. Support provided to businesses on completing Bolsover Local Growth Fund EOIs. Companies: Reality3, Nightingale Engineering Group, Jesters Soft Play and Crèche, Perfect Pastries, J M Hill Building Services, Jacquest, Nevilles Precision Engineering, Barley Associates, Walkgrove Ltd, Acorn Mouldings, Ben Yeates, Bladdon Box, The Oven Door, Road and Rally Accessories Ltd, Love Marketing, Bistro pl, Alliance Electronics, Two Flags, S&G Inflatables, School of Fine Woodwork, Veritas Management.	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 02 - Establish business support programme by engaging with D2N2 (Local Enterprise Partnership for Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire) and SCR (Sheffield City Region) Growth Hub by March 2016.	Growth	Achieved		Q4 2015/16 Meetings held with SCR Growth Hub to agree Start Up services (CEBS). Hosted a multi agency meeting to map current and future business support and funding with all the delivery agencies. Hosted a SCR overlap area meeting to map provision offered by the SCR Growth Hub. Attendance of the Chamber Business Expo (D2N2).	Thu-31-Mar-16
G 03 - Optimise business growth (as measured by gross NNDR) by £2.5m	Growth Operations	On track		Q4 (2015/16) **Estimated NNDR income figure at 31/3/16 is £23,370,950.** (Baseline: £23,476,638 Gross NNDR for 2014/15)	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 05 - Through the Bolsover North East Derbyshire LEADER Approach collectively support the creation of 65 sustainable jobs in the combined programme area by December 2020.	Growth	On track		Q4: 74 initial enquires have been received, with 18 from the BDC area. To date 10 Outline Applications (OAs) have been received (1 from BDC area) and from One Full Application is currently in Appraisal (from NEDDC area). Following a national delay the RPAs agreement to accept bids on 20.01.16. Work has commenced on the review of the annual delivery plan and revise the programme targets, whilst 8 drop-on sessions were	Thu-31-Dec-20

Key Corporate Target	Directorate	Status		Progress	Target Date
				held in March across the two Districts to support the ongoing promotion and business engagement. **No jobs have been created as yet as the EU funding has not been budgeted to be allocated until 16/17.**	
G 06 - Undertake statutory public consultation on the Local Plan (Strategic Policies and Site Allocations) in line with the adopted Local Development Scheme timetable by July 2017.	Growth	On track		Q4 (2015/16) Members have approved a preferred strategy approach and work is currently on target to work up the Draft Plan for public consultation in September 2016.	Mon-31-Jul-17
G 07 - Submit Local Plan (Strategic Policies and Site Allocations) for examination by the Planning Inspectorate by November 2017.	Growth	On track		Q4 (2015/16) Members have approved a preferred strategy approach and work is currently on target to work up the Draft Plan for public consultation in September 2016 and submission by November 2017.	Thu-30-Nov-17
G 08 - Process all major planning applications 10% better than the minimum for special measures per annum.	Growth	On track		Q4 As at 31st March 2016 **75%** achieved despite some staffing issues (a reduction in staff resource from loss of one officer and a Principal Enforcement Officer and a reduction in hours of one Principal Officer. Recruitment to replace the posts is ongoing). (Target 2015/16: 60%, National Target 50%) 2015/16 Target achieved	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 09 - Deliver a minimum of 100 new Council properties by March 2019.	Operations	On track		Q4 Started on site for Rogers Avenue at Creswell. Planning permission has been approved for a site at the Blackwell Hotel and planning permission is being sought for two further sites. A viability assessment is underway for 35 houses at a scheme in Shirebrook.	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 10 - Enable the development of at least 1,000 new residential properties within the district by March 2019.	Growth	On track		Q4. Final completion figures are monitored at the end of the financial year so are not yet available. It is estimated that the number of new build completions will be in line with the average of the last few years.	Sun-31-Mar-19

Key Corporate Target	Directorate	Status		Progress	Target Date
G 11 - Through a programme of targeted refurbishment bring 15 empty private sector properties back into use per annum.	Growth	Alert		Q4. Funding was approved by HCA and awarded to Action Housing who are now working with the empty properties officer to identify suitable properties. 2015/16 Target not achieved. 9 units bought back into use	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 12 - Achieve an increase of £850,000 in additional New Homes Bonus from the government by March 2019.	Growth	On track		Q4 Proposed changed to the New Homes Bonus scheme are currently being consulted on by the government. Any changes subsequently implemented may have consequences for the amount of New Homes Bonus achieved by the Council. New Homes Bonus allocation for 2016/17 £257,091.80. Instalments over 6 years - £1,542,550.80. (Please note that these figures are provisional as they are calculated using last year's average national council tax bands. Allocations will be confirmed when the new national council tax bands are confirmed in the new year)	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 13 - Work with partners to deliver an average of 20 units of affordable homes each year.	Growth	Alert		Q4. No units of affordable housing have been completed in quarter 4 or for 2015/16.The B@home scheme is progressing well, with the first completions due summer 2016. Rogers Avenue, Creswell is progressing well. 2015/16 Target not achieved	Sun-31-Mar-19
G 14 - Identify with partners key actions and funding mechanisms to bring forward priority employment sites at Markham Vale, Shirebrook and former Coalite site by March 2016.	Growth	Achieved		Q4 - Former Coalite site - Bolsover Planning Committee commented on the NEDDC reconsultation for the residential planning application, for the 20th April Planning Committee. The approval will bring forward the entire site, employment and residential. Delivery will commence in partnership between BDC/NEDDC/DCC/ATLAS/DV/ Bolsover Land Ltd to secure the development of the site Shirebrook HCA land and Markham Vale are now both to capacity.	Thu-31-Mar-16

Growth Scrutiny Committee

Work Programme – 2016-17

Date of Meeting	Items	Lead Officer	Notes
25th May 2016, **10.00 am**	• Quarter 4 – Performance Monitoring • Asset Backed Joint Venture Company • Joint Venture/Housing • Scrutiny reviews 2016/17 – selection and scoping exercise.	Jane Foley, Assistant Director of Customer Service and Improvement Grant Galloway, Assistant Director, Property and Estates Grant Galloway, Assistant Director, Property and Estates and Peter Campbell, Assistant Director of Community Safety and Housing. Claire Millington, Scrutiny Officer.	
29th June 2016, **2.00 pm**	• Growth Update	Dan Swaine, Chief Executive Officer	
27th July 2016, **10.00 am**	• Quarter 1 – Performance Monitoring		
21st September 2016, **10.00 am**	•		

19th October 2016, 10.00 am	• Growth Update	Dan Swaine, Chief Executive Officer	
16th November 2016, 10.00 am	• Quarter 2 – Performance Monitoring		
14th December 2016, 10.00 am			
18th January 2017, 10.00 am	• Growth Update	Dan Swaine, Chief Executive Officer	
15th February 2017, 10.00 am	• Quarter 3 – Performance Monitoring		
15th March 2017, 10.00 am			
19th April 2017, 2.00 pm	• Growth Update	Dan Swaine, Chief Executive Officer	
17th May 2017, 10.00 am	• Quarter 4 – Performance Monitoring		

Growth Scrutiny Committee Membership –

Councillors: -

Growth Scrutiny Committee

2016/17

Suggestion	Reason or further information	Will this piece of work make a difference? How?	Is this subject currently under review elsewhere? Or has it been under review in the last few years? Has anything changed since it was last reviewed?	Take forward as a piece of work for the Committee for 2016/17. Yes or No
Creation of a Development Prospectus	Looking at what should be contained within a development prospectus, how other authorities present theirs, etc.	Yes, lots taking place that BDC Members don't know about. Promoting the District to developers. Lots of different documents – nothing pulled together. What do we have?	No.	Yes – Possibly a review. Active involvement in prospectus development. What could be it?
Rural Broadband	Looking at how broadband services can be enhanced.	BT doing current review. Linked to growth. Plan to influence BT.	Brook Vale Park – Need a proper infrastructure.	Growth involvement rather than scrutinise. Regular update/report.
Rural Mobile signal	Looking at how services can be enhanced. z	As above		

Built and Technical Environment	How the District looks – How the District looks: -want people to spend money -want people to operate in our District		Dialogue between Executive and Growth Scrutiny.	

Suggestions for the Work Plan in the form of a briefing or update.

1. **Housing and Planning Bill implications**

2. **Joint Venture to develop housing and employment land**

3. **Joint Venture in general for land development**

4. **Joint venture for Pleasley Vale**

5. **Review Growth elements of Corporate Plan Targets – are the targets challenging enough? – e.g. raising aspirations.**

Managing a Scrutiny Review

Report authors: Luke Petherbridge and Peter Herlinger

Contact: Ed Hammond, (020) 7187 7369, ed.hammond@cfps.org.uk

This briefing is one of a series exploring the skills required by members for effective scrutiny. Together the papers are designed for use by new members or anybody involved in scrutiny who is seeking to better understand the skills that will assist them in attaining best practice. This paper will specifically examine the process of managing a "task and finish" scrutiny review.

Overview and scrutiny committees play an important role in monitoring performance and delivering effective accountability, but work carried out at committee is often only the tip of the iceberg. Real impact for the scrutiny function tends to come through the commissioning and reporting of task and finish groups, carrying out time-limited scrutiny reviews.   Scrutiny reviews are conducted, amongst other reasons, in order to examine a specific policy's impact, or to evaluate service provision in the local area more generally.

Contents

1. Setting objectives - defining when it is appropriate to devote resources to considering an item

1.1 The resources available to scrutineers are limited. It is therefore vital before any item is deemed worthy of detailed scrutiny that a decision is made as to the appropriateness of such a study being launched. Our report on work programming, "A cunning plan?" published in 2011, explores this in some detail.

1.2 Why do it? Sorting out your objectives - What makes a topic worthy of detailed study? Before devoting resources to a review it might be worthwhile asking if there is a simple underlying problem that scrutiny can help to resolve. Is, for instance, a problem in service delivery traceable to a simple fault, which is relatively easy to put right? In this case, a full-blown scrutiny review may not be required. A scrutiny review needs to be able to add value – to add a unique perspective and deliver results which, arguably, no other local decision-maker could.

1.3. If a scrutiny review is to be undertaken, what are its aims to be? These are normally likely to be structured around documenting the existing situation, highlighting difficulties and opportunities and making suggestions for improvements. Sometimes this will involve a tightly focused piece of work – sometimes a wider approach will need to be taken. For example, such reviews may involve outside organisations. The degree of co-operation possible from these organisations is a factor in the feasibility of a review, and its likely complexity (the "working with partners" skills briefing paper touches on these issues). It is likely that there will be constraints and limitations on any review which will be reflected when the terms of reference are drawn up.

1.4 Cost effectiveness - Any scrutiny review needs to be cost effective. The focus of scrutiny needs to be on making recommendations that are value for money and that deliver tangible improvements to services, although some scrutiny work may be able to suggest opportunities for cost efficiencies as well. The fresh eyes that scrutiny brings to a given subject make it easier for members to identify new ways of working that might be less apparent to officers. If a subject being suggested for a scrutiny review relates to a service that is high-performing, has recently gone through an executive-led review, or where user satisfaction is particularly high, the value of a review should be questioned.

1.5 Timespan, member availability and other risks - Scrutiny reviews are usually carried out by a small group of members, away from the landscape of formal committee meetings. Clearly the availability of members willing and able to undertake a review under these arrangements needs to be established before a review can get started. Members should be selected (either by volunteering or by group nomination) on the basis of their areas of interest and expertise. There also needs to be clarity and realism about the likely amount of time

they will need to dedicate to the work – scrutiny reviews need active involvement from all members.

1.6   The nature of a particular issue might mean that a review has to be concluded within a certain time span to be relevant. Members need to understand the pressure under which this may put them to read papers, attend meetings, and actively contribute to the group's business. If the timespan is too tight, it might make sense to think of other ways to conduct the work, such as a one-off, single item "challenge panel" meeting. Whenever there are time constraints, there also needs to be sufficient officer resources in place at the appropriate time to make the deadline.

1.7   It could make sense for timescale to be considered alongside other potential risks (for example, political risks) when a review is being planned.

1.8   Scrutiny review groups, and their commissioning committees, need to plan work with these limitations in mind. It is no use starting an involved piece of work only for it to grind to a halt half way through – because of resource constraints, or political disagreement, or the nature of the debate having moved on.

1.9   Where will it go? – it makes sense to establish at the outset to whom recommendations will be addressed. Often this is likely to be executive members. At other times it could include an external partner. Bringing in those with responsibility early will be very helpful. These post holders will be able to provide information and guidance early on in a scrutiny review, which can help to influence the planning and scoping process for the review itself. Should these key people not be available in the short term to help in a review – or should they be ambivalent about the subject chosen - it might influence the scope and range of that review.

2.   Scoping - how to project plan a review topic - different lengths of and types of review and different possible methodologies

2.1   Much of the lead in scoping (another word for "project planning") is likely to be provided by the chair, on the basis of advice from the scrutiny officer (if there is one). Detailed information on chairing is provided in a separate skills briefing. Nevertheless, most of the councillors involved in a scrutiny review should have some say in the scoping exercise.

2.2   The chair is likely to seek early and quick agreement for a project plan setting out the direction and timings of that review. Putting the plan together will require some basic background research, and a meeting of the review group to narrow down the area under discussion. The plan might be able to sketch out where the issue is now, and where members might want performance to get to in the future, with scrutiny's

help. It should be possible to define some general outcomes at the start, on the basis of the initial research carried out.

2.3   If there is no agreed final desired outcome at the start then the review is more likely to be structured around the possible avenues for improvement. It might be prudent to allow time to test suggested improvements with interested parties to narrow down potential options.

2.4   If there is a feeling that there are plenty of examples of best practice elsewhere the project plan would be wise to build in time for these alternatives to be seriously examined. It might be that site visits would be desirable to make meaningful comparisons, or some desktop time put aside to carry out benchmarking or other kinds of research.

2.4   Involving the public and service users - In drawing up the plans the involvement of the public needs to be considered. Ideally many reviews would benefit from hearing a wide range of public views – although this will not be appropriate or relevant in all cases.

2.5   The aim is to ensure, when seeking to involve the community at large, that the right people are getting involved in the right way. Part of this is about effective publicity – part of it lies in ensuring that scrutiny is going out to where people already are, rather than expecting people to come to wherever scrutiny is. All these issues must be built into project plans to ensure maximum success.

2.6   The communications professionals in the town hall will be able to advise on the best way of presenting material to get it published or broadcasted, and community engagement officers (if your council has them) will be able to provide advice on direct dialogue with local people. It might be that early interaction with the public could lead to suggestions on how the scope of the review might be altered or extended to associated matters of public concern. It can help to assure that the subject under discussion is of genuine interest to local people

2.7   The public, if sufficiently motivated, may see the start of a review as the spur to start making some of its own investigations. Knowing that whatever they bring forward as evidence is likely to be seriously considered may spur them on. A project plan could plan for a truly collaborative investigation. This may seem a remote possibility, but a number of scrutiny reviews – including many which have receive CfPS Good Scrutiny Awards – have actively sought to involve the public in this way, on an essentially joint basis. Scrutiny reviews in **Enfield** (young people), **North East** (ex-servicepeople and health inequalities), **Warrington** (cemeteries) and **Westminster** (young people's scrutiny panel) all demonstrate this work in action.

3. Evidence gathering

3.1 <u>Working out how to gather evidence</u> - The methodology of the review will need to be detailed in the project plan. The review could blandly call for evidence and see what turns up. The review will probably find it more beneficial to identify people, organisations and post holders that could contribute as expert witnesses.

3.2 Calling witnesses is not the only information-gathering technique. The internet and other desk-based research can be used to find things out. The drawback to this technique is that the opportunity for cross-examining is limited, and such desk-based research is often something carried out by officers. Members may feel that they lack the time, confidence or skills to carry it out themselves, but this will often not be the case. The scoping exercise (see above) may reveal opportunities to carry out member-led research that plays to the strengths of those on the review group, as well as building up their relevant skills.

3.3 When setting up the project plan the divisions of tasks between the various members of the scrutiny review can be established. It might be that the size of the group means that everybody is involved in every stage. However that might also be times when there is an obvious and sensible division of tasks, and individual members might be able to investigate particular points as "rapporteurs", reporting back to the group as appropriate. There are risks in this approach – it can fragment the scrutiny process and does put a lot of onus on one member – but if it enables better utilisation of the limited resource then it should be encouraged.

3.4 This "rapporteur" process – and, indeed, the evidence-gathering process more generally – may lead to suggestions for improvements being developed as the review is under way. It may make sense to put these ideas to witnesses as the work progresses, to test out their viability in preparation for recommendations to be made. Some evidence may also lead you in a different direction to the one you had previously considered. These two factors emphasise the importance of flexibility in gathering evidence.

3.5 A project plan should also build in allowances for delays in the evidence-gathering process. Either though illness or other events certain tasks may slip. While any review group will want to report its results as soon as possible, a sensible project plan might allow some flexibility.

3.6 <u>Working out how to weigh evidence</u> - different sources of evidence will require that you place different weight on them, depending on their reliability, representativeness, authoritativeness and so on. No evidence should be discounted purely because it is anecdotal or parochial in nature – although this may mean that you don't attach much weight to it on its own (although you may find it useful to see

whether other sources of evidence confirm it). All your evidence taken together, and weighed effectively, will allow you to build up a comprehensive picture of the issue you are investigating.

3.7   The project plan will have identified where information should be sought, and how. It is likely to have looked at providers and service users as the most interested parties. Those who have the expertise to provide evidence should do so (we discuss engaging with partners, and other organisations external to the council, in a separate briefing). Evidence from local experts will be extremely useful and will need to have a significant amount of weight placed on them. We explore in our skills briefing on engaging with partners exactly how people from outside the council can be persuaded to attend scrutiny meetings.

3.8   One of the most traditional forms of gathering evidence is through surveys conducted by the scrutiny review committee itself. Surveys can be conducted both verbally (person asking person) or self-recording (on paper or on the web). It is sensible to ensure that questions chosen to be asked are representative and the survey allows the flexibility for respondents to give full and frank opinions. It will be important when asking trade bodies to give evidence to establish if they are able to give answers that have universal support from their members or if they merely representing a summation of differing opinions. Surveys are usually most useful to get a broad overview of the public perception of a service, and allow more detailed investigations to be carried out based on your findings. How you carry them out will influence what weight you place on them when you come to consider your findings.

3.9   The most public form of evidence gathering is through formal interviews, getting witnesses to give their comments and views to the scrutineers. (The skills involved in questioning form the basis of another skills briefing). Questioning needs careful planning so that witnesses know what objectives the group is trying to achieve, and so that the group can target questions appropriately.

3.10   The members on the review will able to bring their own thoughts and observations to the review. As sitting councillors they will have been made aware of what is happening in their ward by their constituents. Councillors will be keen to establish why. What will be of concern are cases where the normal monitoring by service providers shows no problems. As scrutineers, members may be able to undertake spot checks, doing random sampling, to get a better picture of how things currently work. Getting an accurate picture of frontline services – by talking to staff, residents, or others – can be a crucial way of getting hold of accurate, timely evidence about what really happens on the ground.. Again, the weight attached will depend on an accurate assessment based on these principles.

4.   Bringing together findings and formulating recommendations

4.1   After all the evidence has been gathered it will be the task of the scrutiny review to move towards making recommendations. A thorough examination will have established the key issues, and identified some options for improvement. The review will have to reconcile all the comments that have emerged while gathering evidence.

4.2   The review should make a number of key findings of fact – building blocks on which recommendations can be constructed. Recommendations must refer to and reflect these findings to be taken seriously.

4.3   Developing firm findings will allow you to draw conclusions which can themselves form the basis of recommendations for action..This is often an organic process, and a meeting of the review group will often serve to very effectively tease out recommendations once the evidence-gathering phase is complete. As this happens, scrutineers will need to critically examine any proposals, and look at potential drawbacks or barriers to their implementation. It is possible that there will be more than one option to improve any specific area and therefore scrutineers should make suitable comparisons. For any proposed change there needs to be clearly identified benefits, which outweigh any risks or costs.

4.4   Scrutineers must think about the potential acceptability of any proposed improvements – principally, whether the outcomes being suggested are ones that would make a tangible, positive impact on the community. Scrutineers must be prepared to ground their recommendations in achievable reality, and to back them up with robust evidence if challenged.

4.4   The review report will need to be aware of the variety of groups who will be looking at the recommendations. These will include the executive, the full council, external agencies, and the press and service users. Not all recommendations need to be addressed to the council's Cabinet – it may be appropriate to direct some to partner agencies or to other bodies.

4.5   Ideally a final report should have the support of all scrutiny members involved in the investigation. Unanimity of recommendations carries a more powerful message. While there is a precedent for the production of "minority reports", it is far better to try to deal with any concerns about content by trying to incorporate those concerns into the final report.

4.6   A final report should give some form of action plan showing likely timescales to make changes. Setting timescales for the implementation of recommendations – and indicating what "implementation" will look like – is absolutely critical to ensuring success. It will make the

monitoring process described below much more straightforward. We explored this issue in more detail in our publications "Global challenge, local solutions" (2009) and "Green Light" (2010), but in brief the rule of thumb is to ensure that all recommendations should be SMARTER – specific, measurable, agreed, realistic, timed, evaluated and reviewed.

4.7   It is usual practice for reports and recommendations to be presented to the council's Cabinet for agreement, but some recommendations may also be submitted to partners (this can happen directly – legally, recommendations do not need to be agreed by Cabinet or Full Council first). Whenever recommendations are submitted, it is good practice for the recipient to advise whether they will be accepted or rejected. If recommendations are rejected, a response should indicate the reasons why. Cabinet "noting" recommendations – as has happened in some instances – does not represent good practice, or reflect the respect that should be accorded to members for the work they have carried out on behalf of the authority and local people.

4.8   It is good practice, at the conclusion of a review and once the recommendations have been submitted to Cabinet and other decision-makers, to contact those who took part to advise them of the immediate outcomes. You can then follow this up, as recommendations are monitored in the future (see below) with more information on implementation at a later date.

5.   Monitoring the implementation of recommendations in the future

5.1   It is common that the scrutiny review asks for a report six months or a year after its report's publication to see what has happened as a result of its investigation. This will provide a useful "milestone" at which implementation can be judged.

5.2   Alternatively there could be in place a regular tracking system whereby the council at pre-defined intervals, maybe a fixed three or six month point, does a progress report on all scrutiny reports produced. Broadly reports could fall into one of three categories.

- Little progress or delays in implementation
- Change recommended only at preliminary planning stage
- Satisfactory progress being made.

5.3   This approach can provide an early warning where recommendations are not being implemented effectively. As we noted above, recommendations should be SMARTER, and recommendations fulfilling these criteria will be easier to monitor in the future. Where recommendations which have been accepted are not implemented, scrutiny could reopen the investigation to consider what has happened – although a one-off hearing on the subject is likely to be all that is needed.

5.4   Where recommendations have been agreed to, but implementation appears to have stalled, the relevant Cabinet member (or partners) should be held to account. This could involve an invitation to attend a committee meeting to discuss the matter in more detail, and/or the provision of written reasons for the failure to proceed successfully.

BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

SCRUTINY PROJECT MANAGEMENT

REVIEW SCOPE

NAME OF COMMITTEE:	**SCRUTINY OFFICER:** Claire Millington

SUBJECT TO BE REVIEWED	
REASON(S) FOR THE REVIEW	
IDENTIFY APPROPRIATE CORPORATE PLAN AIMS, PRIORITIES AND TARGETS	**CORPORATE PLAN AIM** – **PRIORITY** –
DIRECTOR	
AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF REVIEW	*Aim*: *Objectives:*
KEY ISSUES	

TIMESCALE	ESTIMATED	REVISED	ACTUAL
Commencement			
Interim Report/ Recommendations			
Finish			
Report			

METHOD(S) OF REVIEW:	
IMPLICATIONS: (legislative, regulatory, etc)	
DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE: (Internal/External)	
STAKEHOLDERS	**RELEVANT PORTFOLIO HOLDER MUST BE INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW**
CONSULTATION/ RESEARCH:	
SITE VISITS	

SCRUTINY REVIEW OUTCOMES	
CONCLUSIONS:	
RECOMMENDATIONS:	
DRAFT REPORT SENT TO DIRECTOR & ANY RELEVANT OFFICERS FOR COMMENT:	
DRAFT REPORT CONSIDERED BY PORTFOLIO HOLDER:	
SIGNED OFF BY COMMITTEE/CHAIR:	
SIGNED OFF BY SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD:	
REVIEW OF PROCESS/COMMENTS:	
EXECUTIVE CONSIDERED:	
OUTCOME:	
FOLLOW UP:	
DATE:	