



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2009 - 2010

April 2010

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Scrutiny in North Hertfordshire District Council	4
The Scrutiny Committee	4
The Scrutiny Finance Sub-group	5
Scrutiny Task & Finish Groups	5
Health Scrutiny	6
Developments in Scrutiny	6
Public Participation	7
Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Committee Recommendations	8
Appendix 2 – Finance Scrutiny Sub-Group Recommendations	17
Appendix 3 - Scrutiny Task and Finish Group on CCTV	19

Foreword



The purpose of Scrutiny is to make sure that the decisions and services of the Council are based on sound advice, in line with its policies and are influenced by the views and needs of local people.

The Scrutiny Committee was introduced at North Hertfordshire District Council nine years ago. The Committee has developed well and many lessons have been learned during this time. This report reflects on the past year and looks forward to developments in scrutiny next year.

There are four main principles of good scrutiny and the Committee have sought to follow these when developing the scrutiny work programme. The principles have been developed by the Centre for Public Scrutiny:

- ✓ to provide a critical friend challenge to executives;
- ✓ to reflect the voice and concerns of the public and its communities;
- ✓ to take the lead and own the scrutiny process on behalf of the public; and
- ✓ to make an impact on the delivery of public services.

The Committee has used various methods, including the establishment of special sub-groups and task and finish groups, to put these principles into practice.

Much of the Committee's work programme has been taken from the Council's Forward Plan. This has given the Committee the opportunity to comment and make recommendations to Cabinet before their final decision on a policy is agreed.

On behalf of the Committee, I would like to express our appreciation to the Cabinet for their continued co-operation and support and also to the Council Officers who have responded to our requests for evidence and information to support our work.

Finally, I would like to thank my Vice Chair Ray Shakespeare-Smith, members of the Committee and its sub-groups and task & finish groups, along with the Council's officers who have worked well together in contributing to the Scrutiny work programme for another year.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2009 - 2010

Cllr Lawrence Oliver (Chair)	Cllr Alan Millard
Cllr Raymond Shakespeare-Smith (Vice Chair)	Cllr Elliot Needham
Cllr Alison Ashley	Cllr Michael Paterson
Cllr David Billing	
Cllr John Bishop	<u>Substitutes</u>
Cllr Simon Bloxham	Cllr Judi Billing
Cllr Melissa Davey	Cllr John Booth
Cllr Steve Jarvis	Cllr Peter Burt
Cllr Lorna Kercher	Cllr Lee Downie
Cllr Marilyn Kirkland	Cllr Sal Jarvis
Cllr Howard Marshall	Cllr David Kearns

Councillor Lawrence Oliver
Chairman, Scrutiny Committee

1. Scrutiny in North Hertfordshire District Council

1.1 The depth and breadth of the Council's work means that the Scrutiny Committee has to use its resources efficiently in order to scrutinise as many topics as possible in the time available. It does so by:

- Considering a number of issues during its committee meetings and making recommendations to Cabinet;
- Appointing dedicated task and finish groups which can examine issues in depth and make recommendations to improve services;
- Charging a dedicated Finance Sub-group with keeping an eye on the Council's finances;
- Membership of the Hertfordshire County Council Health Scrutiny Committee which enables the interests of our District to be represented.

2. The Scrutiny Committee

2.1 The full Scrutiny Committee normally meets six times a year. It considers a range of topics including key decisions going to Cabinet as well as other issues which the Committee has decided would benefit from closer scrutiny.

2.2 The Committee scrutinises issues in a number of ways:

- By considering reports from, and questioning officers about matters which are being considered by the Scrutiny Committee;
- By submitting written questions which require a written answer, and which members can follow up by asking supplementary questions in Committee;
- By interviewing and questioning cabinet members about their portfolios; and
- By calling in decisions which are of concern to members or to the public.

2.3 The Committee made 41 recommendations on 14 topics to Cabinet and Council. A full list of these recommendations along with Cabinet's and Council's responses can be found in Appendix 1.

2.4 Seven formal scrutiny questions have been asked by Members during the year. A list of topics is set out in table 1 below, and the full questions and answers can be found at http://www.north-herts.gov.uk/index/about_council/democracy/council_meetings/scrutiny_committee1.htm

Table 1: List of questions and topic asked by the Scrutiny Committee

Topic	Questioner	Date of answer
Cadwell Lane Crossing	Cllr David Billing	June 2009
3Cs	Cllr David Billing	June 2009
Rough Sleepers	Cllr David Billing	December 2009
Bancroft Recreation Ground	Cllr David Billing	December 2009
Comprehensive Area Assessment	Cllr David Billing	January 2010
Cycling to work policy	Cllr David Billing	January 2010
Gritting	Cllr David Billing	January 2010

2.5 The Scrutiny Committee has not called in any items this year. However the Committee held two special meetings: one in May 2009 to review the decision to rationalise the museums service in North Hertfordshire; and another in February 2010 to scrutinise the process leading to the decision to award the Churchgate development contract.

2.6 Portfolio Holders have continued to attend Committee meetings to present areas of their work, highlight their achievements and challenges and discuss how the Committee can assist them in developing policies. As in previous years, the Committee values their support and contribution.

3. The Scrutiny Finance Sub-group

3.1 The members of the Sub-group are Cllrs Lorna Kercher (Chair), John Booth, Sal Jarvis, Steve Jarvis, Paul Marment, Howard Marshall, Michael Muir and Martin Stears-Handscob

3.2 The Finance Scrutiny Sub-group has continued to scrutinise the quarterly outturns and the annual draft budget, making recommendations to Cabinet through the Scrutiny Committee. The Finance Portfolio Holder has also appeared before the Group to answer questions and explain the main issues in his portfolio.

3.3 The Finance Sub Group have made eleven recommendations to Cabinet. A full list of recommendations along with Cabinet's response, can be found in Appendix 2.

4. Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups

4.1 Two task and finish groups met last year. The Task and Finish groups are dedicated sub-groups of the Scrutiny Committee. The groups can consider topics in much more depth than is possible in a single Scrutiny Committee meeting. Each group consists typically of between five and eight members, and can appoint external members who have particular areas of expertise which can assist the Group. The task and finish group take written and oral evidence over a series of meetings, quiz witnesses and consider a good deal of other evidence through literature review. A report is produced at the end which makes a number of recommendations for improvements. This is considered by the full Scrutiny Committee before being sent to Cabinet.

4.2 The CCTV Task & Finish Group

4.2.1 The members of the task and finish group were Cllrs Sal Jarvis (Chair), Julian Cunningham, David Kearns, Elliot Needham and Michael Paterson.

4.2.2 CCTV is a topic of great interest to the public. The Group looked at a number of aspects including its costs and benefits, its potential for tackling crime and how surveillance can be balanced with civil liberties and right to privacy. The Group met eight times between January and June 2009, and also visited the CCTV control room at Stevenage. The Group's report and recommendations were considered by the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet in October 2009. The Group's recommendations along with Cabinet's response can be found at Appendix 3.

4.3 Scrutiny of Trade Waste Task & Finish Group

4.3.1 The members of this task and finish group are Cllrs Michael Muir (Chair), Alison Ashley, John Bishop, Marilyn Kirkland, Deepak Sangha and Martin Stears-Handscob.

4.3.2 The Group undertook a different approach to scrutinising the trade waste collection service. Instead of setting its own timetable and agenda, the Group decided to scrutinise a review which officers were already undertaking.

4.3.3 The Group held its first meeting on 9 December 2009 and has since held a further two meetings. At its last meeting, the Group endorsed the officers' recommendations on the future of the service, and its comments were sent straight to the Waste Management Project Board with the approval of the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee.

4.4 Facilities for Teenagers Task & Finish Group

4.4.1 The Scrutiny Committee has set up a task and finish group to consider the facilities available for teenagers. The members of this task and finish group are Cllrs Judi Billing (Chair), Marilyn Kirkland, Paul Marment and Michael Weeks.

4.4.2 The Group has yet to meet to agree the scope of the review which will take place in the next civic year.

5. Health Scrutiny

5.1 Hertfordshire County Council's Health Scrutiny Committee is responsible for scrutinising health services (and other health matters) in Hertfordshire. 15 County Councillors sit on the Committee along with 10 District Councillors and 5 representatives of the Patient and Public Involvement Forums. The Committee meets at least quarterly.

5.2 The Health Scrutiny Committee has power to:

- review or scrutinise decisions made in connection with the discharge of any functions whether or not they are the responsibility of the Executive;
- report and make recommendations in accordance with standing orders with respect to the discharge of any functions whether or not they are the responsibility of the Executive;
- report or make recommendations in accordance with standing orders on matters which affect the County or its inhabitants;
- recommend that a decision which is the responsibility of the Executive which has been taken but not implemented be reconsidered by the decision maker;
- refer to the Council for review or scrutiny a decision which is the responsibility of the Executive and which has been taken but not implemented.

5.3 Cllr David Miller has attended the County Council's Health Scrutiny Committee on behalf of NHDC throughout the year and gave a presentation to the January meeting of NHDC's Scrutiny Committee about his work in promoting NHDC's interests on health matters.

6. Developments In Scrutiny

6.1 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act came into effect on 1st April 2009 and introduced the Councillor Call for Action which enables any member of the Council to refer to an overview and scrutiny committee any local government matter which is relevant to the functions of the committee and to his or her electoral area.

6.2 Further changes are expected as a result of new legislation. The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 enables joint committees in two-tier areas to examine any issue that affects the local area, not just Local Area Agreements.

7. Public Participation

7.1 As often as possible, the scrutiny process is open to involvement by local people. This can be face to face, online or in writing. The Scrutiny process is strengthened by involving partners, residents and service users. They can bring in expertise, local knowledge, fresh ideas and an element of external challenge.

7.2 The Committee encourages public participation. Ways to get involved include:

- Suggesting a topic for investigation;
- Providing evidence to or at a meeting; and
- Becoming a co-optee on a topic group.

7.3 Over 90 members of the public have attended the meetings of the Scrutiny Committee this year. Eleven of these have spoken at this year's Scrutiny Committee meetings, raising particular points of concern or making representations on topics being considered by the Committee. There were 7 speakers on the future of the museums service and the proposal to use Hitchin Town Hall as a venue for a district-wide museum; 3 speakers on the proposed Churchgate development; and one speaker on the Council's communications policy.

7.4 There was also a good deal of outside participation in the task and finish group on CCTV. This included evidence from representatives of the Bedfordshire, Essex and Hertfordshire Courts Board, North Herts Constabulary, the Hertfordshire CCTV Partnership, Parish Councillors, The Voice of Hitchin Youth, Fearnhill School, Town Centre Managers and the businesses of Hitchin and Letchworth.

7.5 For further details about the work of scrutiny or how to get involved, please contact the Scrutiny Officer using any of the methods below:

- Write to: NHDC Offices, Gernon Road, Letchworth Garden City, SG6 3JF
- Tel: 01462 474612
- Fax: 01462 474633
- Email: brendan.sullivan@north-herts.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET 2009 - 2010

<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>	<u>CABINET DECISION</u>
<p style="text-align: center;">18 May 2009</p> <p>1. That the Scrutiny Committee recognises the need to improve the Museums Service;</p> <p>2. That the Scrutiny Committee expresses concern at the lack of consultation;</p> <p>3. That the Museum Collection Service be separated from the public Museum Service and progressed separately;</p> <p>4. That future provision for current users of Hitchin Town Hall be addressed;</p> <p>5. That all external grant funding opportunities be pursued;</p> <p>6. That the need to address the problems of Museums, Hitchin Town Hall and a Museums Collections Service is acknowledged and further feasibility work is undertaken on all of these;</p> <p>7. That dialogue with all relevant bodies regarding museums is continued.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">19 May 2009</p> <p>Cabinet resolved that</p> <p>1. That a full feasibility study be commissioned in order to ascertain the suitability or otherwise of the future use of Hitchin Town Hall as a North Hertfordshire Museum;</p> <p>2. That the recommendations and views of the Scrutiny Committee and the public speakers at the meeting be taken into account as part of the work on the feasibility study.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">16 June 2009</p> <p>1. a) That the adoption of an Interim Green Space Management Strategy that will provide a value for money approach for the provision and maintenance of the Green Space within the district that meets the needs of the community be approved in principle;</p> <p>b) That the proposed framework to develop the Strategy be approved;</p> <p>c) That the completed Interim Green Space Management Strategy be presented to Cabinet in September 2009 and then circulated to the Area Committees.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">23 June 2009</p> <p>1. Cabinet supported the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee and resolved:</p> <p>a) That the adoption of an Interim Green Space Management Strategy that will provide a robust value for money approach for the future provision and maintenance of the Green Space within the District that meets the needs of the community be approved, in principle;</p> <p>b) That the framework proposed to develop the Strategy, as set out in the report, be approved;</p> <p>c) That the completed interim Strategy and</p>

<p>2. a) That the Climate Change Strategy be recommended to Council: b) That attention be paid to the urgency of the issue and the need to draw up effective and comprehensive action plans including SMART targets.</p> <p>3. (Local Economic Development) a) That the work currently being undertaken by the Authority in a number of service areas relating to economic development generally and managing the impact of the recession be endorsed; b) That the promotion of the Baldock Town Centre Enhancement project as a case study for the Hertfordshire Forward Conference on “Vibrant Towns” be supported; c) That section of the report entitled “Issues” and Appendix A of the report updating the recommendations from the Scrutiny Task and Finish Group on Economic Development and Town Centres be endorsed.</p>	<p>associated action plans be reported back to the September 2009 meeting of Cabinet and then circulated to Area Committees; d) That the Scrutiny Committee be thanked for its comments and recommendations regarding the report.</p> <p>2. Cabinet supported the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee and resolved that attention be paid to the urgency of the issue and the need to draw up effective and comprehensive action plans including SMART targets.</p> <p>3. Cabinet supported the recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee and resolved: a) That the work currently being undertaken by the Authority in a number of service areas relating to economic development generally and managing the impact of the recession be endorsed; b) That the promotion of the Baldock Town Centre Enhancement project as a case study for the Hertfordshire Forward Conference on “Vibrant Towns” be supported; c) That Section 4 the report entitled “Issues” and Appendix A of the report updating the recommendations from the Scrutiny Task and Finish Group on Economic Development and Town Centres be endorsed; d) That the comments and recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee be noted; e) That Cabinet’s congratulations be conveyed to all staff involved in the successful completion of the Baldock Town Centre Enhancement Scheme.</p>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">1 September 2009</p> <p>No recommendations were made</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8 September 2009</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">13 & 14 October 2009</p> <p>1. a) That Cabinet revisit all aspects of the options for improving museum provision in the District, whilst delivering required savings; b) That Cabinet should examine ways to retain sustainable community use of Hitchin Town Hall, irrespective of any decision regarding museums; c) That Cabinet reconsider their decision to close Letchworth Museum, until such time that a new museum provision is available; d) That recommendations 9.2 and 9.3 of the report entitled Hitchin Town Hall - Museum Feasibility Study - Outcome be deleted.</p> <p>2. a) That Recommendation 3 of the Report of the Scrutiny Committee Review of CCTV Task and Finish Group read “That the Community Safety Team analyse and explain the key themes and changes for CCTV every 6 months. b) That Recommendation 8.2 of the Report of the Scrutiny Committee Review of CCTV Task and Finish Group read “Lobby through the LGA, for detailed guidelines on fly tipping as well as stronger penalties for environmental crime.” c) That the Report of the Scrutiny Committee Review of CCTV Task and Finish Group and the recommendations contained within the report be supported.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20 October 2009</p> <p>1. Cabinet resolved:</p> <p>a) That the findings set out in the report and Feasibility Study for conversion of Hitchin Town Hall into a new Museum be supported; b) That the comments, views and recommendations of the public speakers, the Hitchin Committee, the Letchworth Committee and the Scrutiny Committee be noted. and recommended to Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the necessary financial and other resources necessary to progress the conversion of Hitchin Town Hall into a new Museum be put in place; • That, subject to this, the financial impact of delaying the closure of Letchworth Museum to coincide with the plans to open the new museum be quantified. <p>2. Cabinet considered each of the Task and Finish Group’s recommendations, together with the CMT comments upon each of them, and resolved:</p> <p>a) That Recommendations (1), (2), (3), (6), (10) and (11) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted; b) That, in respect of Recommendation (4) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group, it be agreed that it will always be open for Area Committees to make suggestions as to the use and placement of CCTV cameras; c) That, in respect of Recommendation (5) of the</p>

3. That if Cabinet does not decide to purchase the grammar school, it should pursue option 2 in appendix B (minor improvements to the DCO along with improvements to shower and toilet facilities).

CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group, it be agreed to support the Scrutiny Committee's recommendation that it would be more appropriate for Area Committees (as opposed to the Locality Panels) to review the use and placement of CCTV cameras and make recommendations to the Responsible Authorities Group;

- d) That Recommendations (7) and (8) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted, subject to the consideration of the narrative set out in Paragraph 4.6 of the covering report;
- e) That Recommendation (9) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted, with the caveat that the final decision on the inclusion of an item on CCTV within the annual Town and Parish Conference agenda will be subject to discussion with Town and Parish Councils, not necessarily imposed upon them.

3 Cabinet resolved:

- a) That no further action be taken on the proposal to purchase the former Letchworth Grammar School site;
- b) That Option 2 in Appendix B to the report (minor improvements and essential repairs to the District Council Offices, improvements to the showers and toilet facilities, and internal alterations to enable hot desking), and as recommended by the Scrutiny Committee, be supported in principle;
- c) That a report providing a more detailed breakdown of the costs associated with Option 2 in Appendix B to the report be submitted to the next meeting of Cabinet.

<p style="text-align: center;">8 December 2009</p> <p>1. That recommendations 9.1 and 9.2 of the report entitled Hitchin Town Hall – Progress on Trust Arrangements - be supported.</p> <p>2. That the recommendations made at 9.1 and 9.2 of the report entitled <i>Waste Management – Contract Extension</i> be supported.</p> <p>3. That the recommendations in paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of the report entitled <i>Leisure Procurement – Award of Hitchin and Royston Leisure Management Contracts</i> be supported.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">15 December 2009</p> <p>1. a) That the proposal as set out in Paragraph 4.9 of the report to amend the boundary, in accordance with the red line on Plan B attached, be agreed, subject to agreeing terms to be negotiated for a long lease of the Trust premises granted to the District Council at a nominal rent, to allow consideration for the current management arrangements of the building; b) That it be confirmed that NHDC should continue to ensure arrangements are in place for the on-going management of the Hitchin Town Hall property over all, including the property belonging to the Trust, until such time as a formal agreement to replace the existing informal arrangements has been agreed with the Trust.</p> <p>2. Cabinet resolved: a) That the implications set out in the report be noted, and that an extension of the waste contract for a minimum of two years and a maximum of five years, in accordance with Appendix A and Paragraphs 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 of the report, be approved; b) That, as part of the Corporate Business Planning process, the savings made from the contract extension be used to build up the General Fund – Special Reserve to fund issues mentioned in Section 6 of the report.</p> <p>3. Cabinet resolved: a) That the Hitchin and Royston Leisure Management contracts that are due to commence on the 1st April</p>

	<p>2010 for a period of seven years, with an option to extend up to a further seven years, be awarded to Company A, on the terms set out in the report;</p> <p>b) That Paragraph 5.2 of the report, regarding the standstill period in line with EU Regulations, be endorsed.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">19 January 2010</p> <p>(New Contracts for Grounds Maintenance)</p> <p>1. a) That recommendations in the report be supported;</p> <p>b) To note that the early letting of the contract for grounds maintenance will not be finalised without specific authority.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">26 January 2010</p> <p>1. Cabinet supported the recommendations, and resolved:</p> <p>a) That Officers be authorised to proceed with preparations to produce new contract documents for the renewal of the Grounds Maintenance Contract earlier than usual, for the reasons set out in Paragraph 4 of the report;</p> <p>b) That the Area Committees be consulted in respect of any proposed changes to the contract specification and service delivery issues;</p> <p>c) That a further report be presented to Cabinet to explain any amendments to the contract specification and their potential impacts, prior to the publication of any tender documents;</p> <p>d) That a report be presented to Cabinet to inform Members of the results of the tendering process, and to seek approval for award at that time;</p> <p>e) That the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee be noted.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">22 February 2010</p> <p>1. That prior to any decision on the award of contract for the development of the Churchgate Shopping Centre and Surrounding Area officers be requested to provide the additional information below for review by Council on 25 February 2010.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Full Council - 25 February 2010</p> <p>Council resolved that the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations be noted and that:</p> <p>a) subject to the award of contract to a developer for the redevelopment of the Churchgate shopping</p>

<p>a) Regarding the potential award of contract to a single bidder that evidence of the effectiveness of assuring transparent competition in the bidder's supply chain be provided;</p> <p>b) Further clarification of the prospects and outcomes regarding possible Compulsory Purchase Orders be provided;</p> <p>c) Request for an update and assessment of the current financial standing of Simons Developments Limited as to their ability to undertake this development of Churchgate and Surrounding Area should they be awarded the contract;</p> <p>d) Confirmation that post contract award the submitted design proposal can be changed or rejected in a major way following assessment by Members, stakeholders, local interest groups and members of the public;</p> <p>e) That prior to the award of contract the matter of continuity of trading during the construction phases of Churchgate and Surrounding Area be assessed by officers and presented to Council;</p> <p>f) That an assessment be made of the agreed components of the Planning Brief for Hitchin compared to the proposals by Simons Developments Limited and presented to Council before a decision is made on award of contract.</p> <p>2. (Governance)</p> <p>a) That Item 2.2 of the Terms of Reference be amended so that the Leader of the Council be the Chairman of the Churchgate Project Board;</p> <p>b) That there should be a new Paragraph 3.4 inserted in the Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Liaison Forum: "That consultation with local stakeholders, local interest groups and members of the public who were not members</p>	<p>centre and surrounding area, the involvement of the Hitchin Town Centre Working Party in the project ceases, to be replaced by the formulation of the Churchgate Project Board and the Churchgate Liaison Forum;</p> <p>b) Paragraph 2.1 of the draft Constitution and Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Project Board (Appendix A) be amended to show officer titles (followed by the names of the present incumbents), and it be made clear that the Principal Planning Officer is on the Board as he has no day to day responsibility for planning applications in Hitchin;</p> <p>c) the words "and this Constitution" be added to Paragraph 2.4 of the draft Constitution and Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Liaison Forum (Appendix B), so that this now reads "Membership of the Forum and this Constitution will be reviewed at key stages of the project, namely after the submission of any planning application and again prior to work commencing on site;</p> <p>d) Item 2.2 of the Terms of Reference be amended so that the Leader of the Council be the Chairman of the Churchgate Project Board;</p> <p>e) a new Paragraph 3.4 be inserted in the Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Liaison Forum - "3.4 That opportunity be given to local stakeholders, local interest groups and members of the public who were not members of the Churchgate Liaison Forum to make representations to the Forum prior its meetings;"</p> <p>f) the Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Liaison Forum be amended to make provision for the substitution of Members, Officers and</p>
--	--

<p>of the Churchgate Liaison Forum be undertaken prior to meetings of the Forum to allow their views to be received and considered by the Forum”;</p> <p>c) That the Terms of Reference for the Project Board and Churchgate Liaison Forum be amended to make provision for the substitution of Members, Officers and representatives of local stakeholders and local interest groups.</p> <p>3. That prior to any decision on the award of contract for the development of the Churchgate Shopping Centre and Surrounding Area the additional information requested by the Scrutiny Committee should be reviewed and debated by Council on 25 February 2010.</p>	<p>representatives of local stakeholders and local interest groups;</p> <p>g) the Terms of Reference for the Churchgate Liaison Forum be amended so that the words “town centre users” be included after the words “local residents” in Paragraph 1.1 and the addition of a new Paragraph 2.1(a) “The Forum shall also include a representative of the Southern Rural Committee”.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">23 March 2010</p> <p>(Adoption of a new housing allocation scheme)</p> <p>1. That the recommendations in the report be supported.</p> <p>2. a) That the first sentence of Paragraph 4.2 of the Policy on Statutory Nuisance read: “Usually, the first action will be to speak to or visit the complainant and person complained about to ensure the issues are fully understood.”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">30 March 2010</p> <p>1. Cabinet resolved that the comments of the Scrutiny Committee be noted and that:</p> <p>a) the new version of the Common Housing Allocation Scheme, incorporating the amendments set out in the revised version of Appendix 2 tabled at the meeting, be agreed;</p> <p>b) upon receipt of any minor amendments to the proposed Common Housing Allocation Scheme, the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Environmental Health, in conjunction with the Head of Housing and Environmental Health, be authorised to consider and agree such requests.</p> <p>2. Cabinet noted the comments of the Scrutiny Committee be noted; and resolved that the policy set out at Appendix A to the report be adopted as the Council’s formal policy in relation to statutory</p>

b) That recommendations contained in the report entitled “The Adoption of a Policy on Statutory Nuisance” be supported.

nuisance, subject to the following amendments:

- a new Paragraph 4.3 stating “The Council will usually contact the person or organisation alleged to be responsible for the nuisance complained about at an early stage in the investigation, and before any formal action is taken, to make them aware of the complaint and seek their co-operation in resolving the matter, unless the matter is of an urgent nature or there is another reason why it is not possible or appropriate to do so”;
- the subsequent re-numbering of the remaining paragraphs in Section 4 of the policy.

**Appendix 2 - SCRUTINY FINANCE SUB-GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS
2009/10**

Recommendation	Cabinet Decision
<p align="center">15 June 2009</p> <p>That vacancies which could impact significantly on the Council's income are identified and filled quickly.</p> <p>That receipts from the Growth Allocation Fund be allocated and spent as soon as possible to ensure that the benefits of the fund are realised quickly.</p>	<p align="center">23 June 2009</p> <p>Cabinet supported this recommendation.</p> <p>Cabinet supported this recommendation.</p>
<p align="center">6 July 2009</p> <p>That investment and efficiency proposals considered against criterion no 6 [key criteria to assess revenue investments and efficiencies and capital projects] should only score 4 marks if they affect the Council's priorities or have a positive effect on its revenues.</p> <p>That in assessing value for money, Cabinet should ask officers to review and consider whether existing activities continued to support the Council's priorities, and if not, to consider whether they should be de-prioritised.</p>	<p align="center">15 July 2009</p> <p>Cabinet noted this recommendation.</p> <p>Cabinet noted this recommendation.</p>
<p align="center">7 September 2009</p> <p>That Cabinet should ensure that the third quarter outturn is reviewed before the budget is set to reduce the likelihood of variances in the year end budget.</p> <p>That Cabinet should continue to support [the holiday play service] scheme which is popular, flexible, cost-effective and demand driven.</p>	<p align="center">8 September 2009</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Finance stated that he welcomed the comments of the Scrutiny Committee Finance Sub-Group regarding the timing of budget setting and third quarter outturn reports and Cabinet resolved that officers produce further monitoring information at the close of period 8 to assist the 2010/11 budget formulation process.</p> <p>Cabinet considered that further reductions would not be desirable; that outside funding streams should be sought and that a high level of service was currently being provided for which the team should be congratulated. Cabinet resolved that the revised Play Rangers service be adopted, in principle, for 2010/11; and that the efficiency savings and reduced budgeted cost of</p>

	<p>this service be noted.</p> <p>Both recommendations were accepted</p>
<p>12 October 2009</p> <p>No recommendations were made</p>	<p>20 October 2009</p>
<p>7 December 2009</p> <p>That the balance between disposal of assets and borrowing should be reviewed regularly in view of the rapidly changing economic circumstances;</p> <p>That Cabinet should review the need for and the accuracy of the provision made for its risks;</p> <p>That Cabinet consider that anticipating reductions in Government support may encourage Central Government to give less support to local authorities.</p>	<p>15 December 2009</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Finance advised: that the balance between disposal of assets and borrowing was reviewed regularly by himself and officers;</p> <p>That adequate provision was made for risk in the budget on an annual basis; and</p> <p>That he was fully aware of the strong possibility that the level of future Revenue Support Grant from the Government could be severely reduced.</p>
<p>18 January 2010</p> <p>That, in respect of the Review of the Parish Amenity Capital Improvement Fund (PACIF), Section 106 monies be used, where appropriate, as an additional source of funding for local projects.</p> <p>That, in respect of the Revenue Budget 2010/11, the proposal not to inflate grants to organisations should be subject to further consultation, inviting the organisations concerned to notify the Council of any adverse impact on their agreed service.</p>	<p>26 January 2010</p> <p>That a proposed one year extension of the Parish Amenity Capital Improvement Fund (PACIF) be approved, the available amount of grant remaining at £250,000 per annum, with applications for grant funding to be received by 30 September 2010.</p> <p>(recommended to Council)</p> <p>That the efficiency and income increase proposals be approved, for inclusion in the budget estimates for 2010/11, subject to the removal of Efficiency Item E/21 – Grant aid to organisations to not be inflated from 2009/10 values - £5,000;</p>
<p>15 February 2010</p> <p>No recommendations were made</p>	<p>16 February 2010</p>

Appendix 3 - Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group on CCTV

Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group Cabinet's decision on the Recommendations from the Review of CCTV

The CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group's recommendations, which had been supported by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 13 October 2009, were as follows:

- (1) The Council's CCTV Strategy should set out its aims for the use of CCTV, along with measurable objectives and the means for achieving them;
- (2) There should be proper scrutiny of NHDC's involvement in the CCTV Partnership, and the Portfolio Holder should produce and present an annual report to a suitable scrutiny committee;
- (3) That the Community Safety Team analyse and explain the key themes and changes for CCTV every six months;
- (4) The Partnership should undertake a regular review of camera locations, and take account of the latest evidence when deciding on the use and placement of cameras;
- (5) The Partnership should make this information available for review by the Area Committees so that the Responsible Authorities Group can make decisions based on sound evidence;
- (6) That CCTV reports for individual wards and cameras in the Members Information Service bulletin should be accessible by a link rather than set out in the bulletin itself;
- (7) Cabinet should review the case for using covert cameras for envirocrime to ensure it is getting value for money;
- (8) In order to facilitate this review, the Council should:
 - (i) Develop a local indicator to allow monitoring of the levels of fly tipping in rural areas and provide information on trends;
 - (ii) Lobby through the LGA for detailed guidelines on fly tipping as well as stronger penalties for environmental crimes.
- (9) The Council should include an item on CCTV on the agenda of the annual Town and Parish Council Conference;
- (10) All CCTV publicity and reports should be displayed on the Council website – even if this only links to the Partnership's website;
- (11) There should be a regular article in Outlook bringing out the achievements of the Partnership.

Cabinet noted that CMT had supported the majority of the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group. However, the Scrutiny Committee had disagreed with the view of CMT in respect of recommendation (5) that locality panels were a good forum for Members to consider the use and location of CCTV cameras. The Scrutiny Committee had noted that panels' boundaries sometimes excluded areas of CCTV coverage, including town centres; their proceedings were not

always recorded; and their priority was to listen to the concerns of residents. The Scrutiny Committee considered that it would be better if detailed consideration of local CCTV could be made by the relevant area committee.

Cabinet considered each of the Task and Finish Group's recommendations, together with the CMT comments upon each of them.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Recommendations (1), (2), (3), (6), (10) and (11) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted;
- (2) That, in respect of Recommendation (4) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group, it be agreed that it will always be open for Area Committees to make suggestions as to the use and placement of CCTV cameras;
- (3) That, in respect of Recommendation (5) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group, it be agreed to support the Scrutiny Committee's recommendation that it would be more appropriate for Area Committees (as opposed to the Locality Panels) to review the use and placement of CCTV cameras and make recommendations to the Responsible Authorities Group;
- (4) That Recommendations (7) and (8) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted, subject to the consideration of the narrative set out in Paragraph 4.6 of the covering report;
- (5) That Recommendation (9) of the CCTV Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be accepted, with the caveat that the final decision on the inclusion of an item on CCTV within the annual Town and Parish Conference agenda will be subject to discussion with Town and Parish Councils, not necessarily imposed upon them.