

**ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2010/2011**

Paragraph 6.04(d) of Article 6 of the Council's Constitution requires that the Scrutiny Management Board must report annually to the Council on the workings of scrutiny groups and panels and the operation of the scrutiny function generally. To accord with that requirement, the Annual Scrutiny Report for 2010/11 is set out below, for submission to Council.

*Introduction by the Chair of Scrutiny Management Board,, Councillor M. Hunt*

*The four principles of good scrutiny defined by the Centre for Public Scrutiny are briefly these:*

- *Challenging the executive as a critical friend.*
- *Enabling the voice of the public to be heard.*
- *Being independent minded and*
- *Driving improvement of services.*

*Our record of scrutiny during the year 2010/11 is outlined for members and the public in the following report. The committee structure changed during the summer, but the principles remain constant. The tests of our success are, as always, whether our work can be shown to have had an effect on the decisions and policies of the Council. In so saying changes in policies or decisions as a result of the investment we make in scrutiny are reflected in various ways. Whilst it's not the primary purpose of scrutiny we have also succeeded in engaging the interests of many members to whom thanks are due.*

*I would like to commend the report to Council and to the public and community in the Borough we serve.*

*As the current Council four year term comes to an end I would like to thank all members and officers for their participation and assistance over the previous four years during which I have served as Scrutiny Chair.*

**Monitoring the Work of the Executive 2010-2011**

Scrutiny at Charnwood Borough Council is tasked with undertaking four general roles (Article 6.03 of the Constitution sets these out).

The first is to "review and/or scrutinise decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Council's functions". The second is to "make reports and/or recommendations to the Council and/or the Cabinet in connection with the discharge of any functions". These roles are principally carried out through monitoring of the Forward Plan and the Call-in of decisions.

*Forward Plan and Future Programme of Key Decisions*

At each meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board and Overview Scrutiny Group, a copy of the most recently published version of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions is submitted for consideration. The purpose of this item is to enable Scrutiny to be

aware of the key decisions to be taken over the coming months in advance and to programme them onto scrutiny agendas where necessary.

In most cases, the selected items will be considered by Overview Scrutiny Group prior to consideration by Cabinet. Overview Scrutiny Group meets after the agenda for Cabinet has been published and considers the Cabinet report in order to make recommendations to Cabinet on the action it should take when determining the issue.

Since its first meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2011, Overview Scrutiny Group has undertaken the following pre-decision scrutiny:

- Loughborough Eastern Gateway Funding Position
- Financing options – New Build Council Housing
- Charnwood Grants – Round 2 Community Development Grant Applications
- Changes to Executive Arrangements – Consultations
- Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011/12 to 2014/15
- Conservation & Landscape Service Review
- Organisational Review
- Consultation on the third Leicestershire Local Transport Plan
- Public Conveniences – Service Review Update Position
- Commissioning Council
- Draft 2011/12 General Fund and HRA Budgets
- Work Programme/ Forward Plan
- Interpretation and Translation Policy
- Localism in Charnwood – Neighbourhood Agreements
- Article 4 Direction: House in Multiple Occupation in Loughborough
- 2011/12 General Fund and HRA Revenue Budgets
- Organisational Review Phase 2

### General Exception

As part of the Scrutiny Management Board's role with monitoring which Key Decisions are due to be taken, the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board is informed when either Cabinet or an officer under delegated powers from Cabinet, is likely to take a Key Decision, which was not included in the Forward Plan. This is called the General Exception Procedure and is detailed in Access to Information Procedure Rule 15.

The following Key Decisions were taken by Cabinet under the General Exception Procedure and in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangement) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and Access to Information Procedure Rule 15(b) the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board was informed five working days prior to the decision being taken:

<b>Cabinet Date</b>	<b>Key Decision</b>
10th June 2010	Capital Plan Outturn 2009/10
8th July 2010	Public Conveniences Service Review
25 <sup>th</sup> November 2010	Public Conveniences Service Review
20th January 2011	Article 4 Direction: Houses in Multiple Occupation in Loughborough

### Call-in

Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 13 (Call-in) provides a mechanism for reviewing decisions of Cabinet and Key Decisions taken by an Officer under delegated authority from Cabinet prior to those decisions taking effect. If an item is called-in, implementation of the decision is stopped while Scrutiny Management Board reviews the decision and the information which was submitted to the decision taker. Following consideration, Scrutiny has one of three options:

- Agree with the Cabinet decision, in which case the decision takes immediate effect, Scrutiny can send comments back to Cabinet for further discussion;
- Disagree with the Cabinet decision and request that the item be reconsidered by Cabinet, in this case Scrutiny must submit an alternative recommendation and a reason behind the alternative recommendation; or
- Disagree with the Cabinet decision because in the opinion of the Scrutiny Management Board the decision is contrary to the Council's Policy and Budgetary Framework, in this case Scrutiny must submit an alternative recommendation and a reason to Council setting out why the original decision is outside the Policy and Budgetary Framework and why the alternative recommendation is within the framework. Council, if it agrees, will resubmit to Cabinet (or the officer if taken under Delegated Powers from Cabinet).

During the 2010/2011 Council Year, the following items were called-in and considered by the Scrutiny Management Board:

<b>Cabinet Date</b>	<b>Decision Called-in</b>
8 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Public Conveniences Service Public Review.
16 <sup>th</sup> December 2010	Development and Disposal of Land at Cemetery Road Sileby
20 <sup>th</sup> January 2010	Neighbourhood Agreements

In the case of Public Conveniences Service Review and Neighbourhood Agreements, alternative recommendations were put to cabinet. These were accepted in part for Public conveniences Service Review and accepted in full for Neighbourhood Agreements.

### Call-in Exemption

An exemption process exists (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 14 (Call-in and Urgency)) in order to take into account circumstances where if a decision was not implemented immediately, due to being called in, such a delay would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests.

The process involves the Mayor giving prior consent that he/she is satisfied that the decision can be exempt from Call-in and therefore have immediate effect. Details of such decisions are then submitted to the next available Council meeting.

The following decisions of Cabinet during 2010/2011 were exempted from Call-in:

<b>Cabinet Date</b>	<b>Decision exempted from Called-in</b>
8 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Extension of Leisure Centre Contract
16 <sup>th</sup> December 2010	Decent Home Funding

## **Policy Scrutiny Group and Scrutiny Panels**

### *Comments of the Chair of Policy Scrutiny Group, Councillor Shepherd*

*The Policy Scrutiny Group met for the first time on 17 August 2010, and from that first meeting onwards members have been contributing effectively to the development of the Council's new scrutiny process*

*A Witness Charter has been agreed and brought into use, which gives those who attend panels as witnesses a clear understanding of process and "terms of engagement". Panels are responding to opportunities to invite witnesses to attend, a move away from a reliance by scrutiny on officers' reports and giving much more of a "first-hand account" flavour to evidence and the chance for helpful dialogue between members and witnesses. A Scoping Document has also been agreed, which is proving to be a useful means of giving clarity and focus to a scrutiny topic and providing a summary of each panel's work as it evolves. That in turn helps Policy Scrutiny Group members to monitor each panel's progress.*

*The Policy Scrutiny Group has succeeded in maintaining an appropriate flow of panel work. Members have responded to requests from other bodies and have themselves identified issues, so that the Council's scrutiny resources are not spread too thinly but nor are there wasteful gaps in activity.*

*In short, the method of "task and finish" panels seems to be welcomed by and rewarding to members and, it is hoped, will be prove to be of benefit in Council decision-making and in the development of Council policy.*

*I should like to thank all Policy Scrutiny Group members and the officers who have worked with us for the enthusiastic way in which all have responded to the challenge of learning together as we shape the new approach to scrutiny. I think the outlook is promising.*

In 2010/11, the Council has initiated the following Scrutiny "Task and Finish" Panels:

- Anti-social Behaviour Scrutiny Panel
- Equality and Diversity Scrutiny Panel
- Markets in Charnwood Scrutiny Panel
- Olympics 2012 Scrutiny Panel
- Reducing Re-offending Scrutiny Panel
- Start-up Units in Sileby Scrutiny Panel

Scope documents for these Panels are attached at Appendix I.

## **Performance Monitoring**

The Performance Panel has monitored a range of issues during the year including:

- Performance Indicators
- Human Resources Issues
- Treasury Management
- Rent Arrears
- Fly Tipping and Graffiti
- Capital Monitoring
- Revenue Monitoring

## **Overview Scrutiny Group**

*Comments of the Chair of Overview Scrutiny Group, Councillor Walker*

< Chair of Overview Scrutiny Group's comments to be inserted here >

## **Review of Scrutiny**

The Leader of the Council commissioned a Review of Scrutiny in 2010. The first stage of the Review was the opportunity for members of the Scrutiny Commission and Cabinet to indicate issues that they thought should be included. This was followed by an Away Day on Saturday 20th March 2010 at Beaumanor Hall facilitated by the IDeA. This provided an opportunity for all members to be involved in shaping the Council's scrutiny structure and arrangements for the future.

Following consultation with the Council's Scrutiny Commission, a report was made to full Council on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and a new Scrutiny Structure was approved with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010.

A Scrutiny Management Board was established consisting of 8 members who would also Chair any Scrutiny Panels that were established. The Board would be politically balanced on the basis of 5 Conservative 2 Labour and 1 Liberal Democrat members on the following basis:-

- a. 5 "Commissioners (Chair and Vice-Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board, Chair of the Policy Scrutiny Group, Chair of the Overview Scrutiny Group and Chair of the Performance Panel), and
- b. 3 "Assistant Commissioners" (Vice-Chair of the Policy Scrutiny Group, Vice-Chair of the Overview Scrutiny Group and Vice-Chair of the Performance Panel;

The Council also agreed:-

- That the Cabinet/Scrutiny Liaison Group informs the scrutiny work programme and be a joint meeting between members representing the Scrutiny Management Board and Cabinet consisting of 3 members of the Cabinet and 3 members of the Scrutiny Management Board;
- That meetings of the Cabinet / Scrutiny Liaison Group not be held in public;
- That the Policy Scrutiny Group not be politically balanced;
- That scrutiny panels not be politically balanced and that any councillor (other than Cabinet members and Cabinet Support members) could serve on them.

At the Council meeting, appointments were made to the Scrutiny Management Board and the Overview Scrutiny Group. Later, on 13<sup>th</sup> September, Council made appointments to the Policy Scrutiny Group and other scrutiny groups/panels.

Since the introduction of the new structure, there have been a number of scrutiny panels established and their work is outlined elsewhere in this report.

It is perhaps too early to give a true reflection of the success of the new scrutiny system, but some comments from councillors indicate:-

- An increase in pre-decision scrutiny as undertaken by the Overview Scrutiny Group. This has increased the influence of scrutiny and, as a result, Cabinet has accepted many of the suggestions made;
- Greater involvement and interest shown by councillors who are members of scrutiny panels who now see themselves as contributing more to the decision making process. This has been assisted by the work of the Policy Scrutiny Group;
- A reduction in “politics” in scrutiny;
- Greater knowledge of the workplan of Cabinet as a result of the Forward Programme being available to the Cabinet/Scrutiny Liaison Group;

It is proposed that a report be produced during the summer (a year after the implementation of the new system) to review its success or otherwise and suggest any modifications.

# **APPENDIX I**

## **SCRUTINY PANELS 2010/2011**

### **SCOPE DOCUMENTS**

- Anti-social Behaviour Scrutiny Panel
- Equality and Diversity Scrutiny Panel
- Markets in Charnwood Scrutiny Panel
- Olympics 2012 Scrutiny Panel
- Reducing Re-offending Scrutiny Panel
- Start-up Units in Sileby Scrutiny Panel



<b>REVIEW TITLE: Anti-social Behaviour Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of reporting processes</li> <li>• Safety and security of information held</li> <li>• Reporting back procedures</li> <li>• Accountability</li> <li>• Considerations of potential improvement to the Case Management System</li> </ul>
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
To identify potential improvements and make recommendations as appropriate
<b>GROUP MEMBERSHIP</b>
Councillors Brown, Burr, K. Jones, S. Jones, Miah, Pacey, Shepherd (Chair)
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
Consideration of Cabinet Report, Review of Multi Agency Anti-Social Behaviour Processes in Charnwood, including Improvement Plan. The Panel will investigate the reporting back process, using example cases and evidence provided to the Panel from witnesses and stakeholders.
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>
<b>KEY TASKS</b> ** including consideration of efficiency savings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To determine how wide the Panel’s definition of anti-social behaviour is to be</li> <li>• To further the knowledge of Panel members regarding anti-social behaviour issues</li> <li>• To understand current procedure and problems, including the use and functions of the Case Management System</li> <li>• To understand the relative responsibilities of key partners and multi-agency partnerships</li> </ul>

<b>STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor David Walker (as ward councillor)</li> <li>• Leicestershire Police</li> <li>• Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing</li> <li>• Charnwood Community Safety Partnership (Councillor David Snartt)</li> <li>• Youth Offending Service</li> <li>• Leicestershire Youth Service</li> </ul>	
<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	
<b>Is an impact needs assessment required?</b>	
Yes – This is included at the end of the Panel’s report	
<b>LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS</b>	
Overlap with review of Charnwood’s Multi-Agency Anti-Social Behaviour Practices.	
<b>RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Technical: Tom Kiernan and Wendy Brown Administrative: Richard Stratford	
<b>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)</b>	
<b>REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT</b>
17 November 2010	End of February 2011
*Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.	

**PROGRESS WITH PANEL WORK**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>PROGRESS TO DATE</b>
Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> November 2010	The Panel’s first meeting considered the scope of ASB itself and the best way of investigating the issue according to its terms of reference. The Panel identified representatives from Leicestershire Police, Leicestershire Youth Services, Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing, the Youth Offending Service and the Cabinet Lead Member for Community Safety, Councillor David Snartt as witnesses to be invited to future meetings. The Panel also wished to invite Councillor David Walker to speak to the Panel to discuss the reporting process for ward councillors, having made the Chair aware of issues that he had been involved with previously.

<p>Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010</p>	<p>For the Panel's consideration a demonstration of the Sentinel Case Management System was given, and the Panel were provided with a redacted version of minutes from a recent meeting of the ASB Steering Group. Councillors Walker and Snartt attended the meeting to discuss reporting trails for ward councillors. Councillor Walker outlined his experiences of dealing with ASB on behalf of constituents and the Anti-social Behaviour Co-ordinator detailed the Council's response, emphasising the need to ensure that such issues are reported as fully as possible. The Panel considered whether or not existing training provision for new councillors on ASB issues was sufficient and discussed further issues and procedures relating to participation in, and reporting of, ASB cases as ward councillors. Discussion of Councillor Snartt's role with the Community Safety Partnership was deferred to a later date.</p>
<p>Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011</p>	<p>The Panel met with Inspector Tim McCabe of Leicestershire Police and Clare Holford, Housing Service Manager at CNH to discuss their respective roles in tackling ASB issues. The Panel discussed the differences between approaches taken by CNH and Charnwood Borough Council, the methods used to manage neighbour disputes, and reporting issues that may arise where housing ownership type is unknown. The Panel also discussed the distinction between ASB and Criminal Behaviour and the implications of having two different Police Inspectors working across the Borough on ASB issues.</p>
<p>Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011</p>	<p>The Panel met with Damion Nickerson of the Youth Offending Service, Andrew Lake of Leicestershire Youth Services and Councillor David Snartt, Cabinet Lead Member for Community Safety. The Panel discussed the methods used to engage young people in the democratic process and proactive approaches to tackling ASB. The Panel also discussed the work of the Community Safety Partnership and were once again informed of the importance of reporting known incidents to the appropriate officers. The panel requested a draft copy of its report be circulated to members ahead of its next meeting.</p>
<p>Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011</p>	<p>The ASB Co-ordinator presented the Panel with information relating to equalities and reporting issues among ethnic minorities for the Panel's consideration. The Panel discussed its draft report and made a number of amendments and additions. It was decided that the meeting scheduled for 24<sup>th</sup> February would now be required to consider the Panel's final report.</p>
<p>Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011</p>	<p>The Panel watched the information DVD produced by CBC and CNH. As this was its final meeting, the Panel discussed its report and made final amendments and additions before approving it for submission to the Scrutiny Management Board.</p>



<b>REVIEW TITLE: EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
To include the Equality Framework for Local Government and consider how the Council responds to the new legislative requirements.
<b>GROUP MEMBERSHIP</b>
Councillor Seaton (Chair) Councillors Gay, Green, Edwards, Newton and Ranson
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
To monitor progress with the impact assessments and outputs and to ensure that progress has been made and that demonstrable outputs are being achieved as a result of the impact assessments.
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
Consideration of 3 EIAs Consideration of the three year rolling programme of EIA completion
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>
Previous practice An in-depth analysis of the implications of the act – due to time constraints
<b>KEY TASKS</b> ** including consideration of efficiency savings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Invite three officers who have undertaken EIAs, to talk through the process, for the Panel to consider the robustness of those EIAs and demonstrable outputs. It would be helpful to consider frontline EIAs, possibly at different levels of achievement.</li> <li>■ Consider the three year rolling programme of EIA completion</li> <li>■ Consider a presentation in respect of Equality and Diversity be given to a full meeting of Council</li> </ul>
<b>STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *</b>
Invite Chhaya MacDonald Invite witnesses from partner organisations

<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	
Is an impact needs assessment required?	
No	
<b>LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS</b>	
Consultation Scrutiny Panel – submitted to Cabinet in July 2007	
<b>RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Technical support - Chris Traill and Rachel Beaumont Admin support – Frances Whittington	
<b>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)</b>	
<b>REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT</b>
16th November 2010	22nd February 2011

\* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

### **PROGRESS OF PANEL WORK**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>PROGRESS TO DATE</b>
Tuesday, 16th November 2010	The first meeting included an introduction to Equality and Diversity, the second meeting to be arranged towards the end of November/beginning of December to present the results of the Equalities Framework survey which is feeding into the Single Equality Scheme and to provide an update on the rolling programme of Equality Impact Assessments.
Tuesday, 30th November 2010	The Head of Planning Policy attended the meeting to assist the Panel with the consideration of the Local Development Framework EIA.
Monday, 13th December 2010	The Waste Policy Manager and the Head of Development Control attended the meeting to assist with the consideration of the Litter Bin Policy, Waste Collection Policy and Enforcement Policy EIAs. At the meeting reference was made to the Licensing Policy EIA and the Panel requested details of that document be submitted to its next meeting.
11th January 2011	Considered Shared Services across Districts with C. McDonald and EIAs and how they work with L. Donnelly. An update report in respect of the Licensing Policy EIA was given to the meeting.
24th January 2011	Consideration was given to the recommendations proposed during the course of earlier Panel meetings for inclusion in the recommendations of the Panel report.
14th February 2011	The Panel considered the draft Panel report and agreed final recommendations.

<b>REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD</b>
9th March 2011



<b>REVIEW TITLE:    MARKETS IN CHARNWOOD PANEL</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To examine the health of the market as measured by the number of stall holders and their views about their future participation.</li> <li>• To identify the success of the market in attracting stall holders in relation to other markets, such as Hinckley, Leicester etc.</li> <li>• To explore the possibilities of holding markets in the other towns and villages of the Borough.</li> <li>• To discuss the effectiveness of the Farmers’ Market on Wednesday mornings.</li> <li>• To look at the publicity that is given to the market, particularly the Farmers’ Market.</li> </ul>
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
To consider the current performance of the market, potential improvements to current arrangements, a range of alternative markets and the possibility of holding markets in alternative locations around the Borough.
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
Loughborough Market plus the other markets in Charnwood. Analysis of current use, casual use, costs, facilities and forecasts for the future. Analysis of what happens in other areas around the UK.
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>
Fairs and other events held in the market square, street traders and policing of markets.
<b>KEY TASKS</b> ** including consideration of efficiency savings
<b>STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representative from the Loughborough Branch of the Market Traders Federation.</li> <li>• Representative from the Farmers’ Market.</li> <li>• Other market owners/operations – consideration of programme in South Derbyshire to assist young people in developing market skills.</li> </ul>

<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	
Is an impact needs assessment required?	
No	
<b>LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS</b>	
<b>RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Officer support:  Director of Leisure & Environment, Head of Culture, Art & Heritage & the Market Fair and Town Centre Operation Manager  Administrative Support:  Richard Stratford/Helen Tambini	
<b>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)</b>	
Report and recommendations to Scrutiny Management Board	
<b>REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT</b>
26 <sup>th</sup> October 2010	December 2010
<b>REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD</b>	
Wednesday 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2011	

\* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

**Group Membership:**

Councillor Walker (Chair)  
Councillor Burr  
Councillor Day  
Councillor J. Hunt  
Councillor Radford  
Councillor Brown

<b>REVIEW TITLE: OLYMPICS 2012</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
<p>Themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policing and Security,</li> <li>• Tourism,</li> <li>• Visitors,</li> <li>• Culture and</li> <li>• Legacy.</li> </ul>
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
<p>The Olympics 2012 would be significant for the Borough and issues surrounding Policing and Security, Tourism, Visitors and Culture, Legacy need to be properly considered and the Borough properly prepared.</p>
<b>GROUP MEMBERSHIP</b>
<p>Councillors Brown, Day, Harris, M. Hunt (Chair), K Jones, Miah, Ranson, Sutherland and Wilson.</p>
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
<p>Key partnership arrangements in place for the preparation of the Olympics and the post Olympic legacy. The Panel's work will focus on the above themes for the Council to achieve through the Partnership, which will include asking relevant partners to Panel meetings to assist in the consideration of the issues relating to the identified themes.</p>
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>
<p>Loughborough Eastern Gateway project – issues not impacting on transportation.</p>
<b>KEY TASKS</b> ** including consideration of efficiency savings
<p>The Panel's Programme consists of 5 meetings based on the following themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tourism (Leicestershire Promotions to be invited)</li> <li>2. Resilience (Police and Emergency Planning Coordinator to be invited)</li> <li>3. Legacy (University representative to be invited)</li> <li>4. Celebratory/Structure/Monitoring</li> <li>5. Finalisation of Panel Report and Recommendations.</li> </ol>
<b>STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Leicestershire Promotions</li> <li>2. Leicestershire Police</li> <li>3. Loughborough University</li> </ol>

<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	
Is an impact needs assessment required? No	
<b>LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS</b>	
Loughborough Eastern Gateway project (issues which might impact on transportation during the Olympics).	
<b>RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Technical: Chris Traill. Administrative: Darren Tilley.	
<b>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)</b>	
<b>REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT</b>
26th October 2010	Outcome by February 2011

### **PROGRESS WITH PANEL WORK**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>PROGRESS TO DATE</b>
Tuesday 26th October 2010	The Panel considered the latest position with the Loughborough Eastern Gateway project, in order to consider any issues which might impact on transportation during the Olympics. The Panel also considered a Summary Report by the Director of Leisure and Environment, which detailed a summary of the key partnerships and arrangements in place for the preparation for the Olympics and the post Olympic legacy.
Thursday 16th December 2010	Tourism issues were considered. Martin Peters and Janine Williams for Leicestershire Promotions attended to assist the Panel, a report was submitted which identified issues in relation to visitor experience, marketing activities and promoting the area, along with current activity and planned activity. Figures were considered concerning bed spaces for tourism.
Thursday 20th January 2011	CANCELLED – Resilience meeting TO BE RESCHEDULED
Monday 31st January 2011	Legacy issues were considered. Jon Walker (Loughborough University) and Shimul Haider (2012 Games Legacy Director, Inspire LeicesterShire) attended and update the Panel on the initiatives planned by both organisations to create a legacy in the Borough following London 2012.
Tuesday 8th February 2011	Peter Hinton (Emergency Planning Co-Ordinator, Charnwood Borough Council), Roger Kennedy (Loughborough University Security), Tim McCabe (Leicestershire Police) and Mark Newcombe (Leicestershire Police) attended to provide advice and assistance with considering matters relating to resilience, policing and security during the period of the Olympic Games in 2012. The Panel were happy with reassurances given and that the partnership be used to ensure this continued. Joy Clapham (Deputy Head teacher, Humphrey Perkins High School and Community College) attended to inform the Panel about the events the School was organising, along with other local schools, to celebrate the Olympic Games in 2012. The Panel were pleased with this work and wished it to be promoted in other schools, particularly the principle of organising larger events on a locality basis.
Tuesday 22nd February 2011	Chris Traill (Strategic Director) and Sylvia Wright (Head of Culture, Arts and Heritage) attended to provide details of Culture and Celebration and Structure and Monitoring of the Partnership arrangements, including financing and budgeting. Details of these arrangements is included in the report. The Panel also finalised its Report and Recommendations for submission to Scrutiny Management Board.

<b>REVIEW TITLE: REDUCING RE-OFFENDING SCRUTINY PANEL</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
To consider the role of the Borough Council: helping the community to reduce re-offending, ensuring there is a positive impact on the community; look at mental health issues and mentoring.
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
Need to ensure that information and knowledge is gathered so that the Borough Council and its partners can help individuals and communities.
<b>MEMBERSHIP OF THE GROUP</b>
Councillor J M Hunt (Chair) Councillors Brown, Capleton, K. Jones, S. Jones, Pacey, Ranson and Sutherland
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
The Panel to consider ways the Council could look to support people rather than looking at numbers and to assist prolific offenders to find opportunities to a more positive lifestyle.
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>
Consideration of Anti-social Behaviour – as that matter was being scrutinised by a separate Scrutiny Panel.
<b>KEY TASKS</b> ** including consideration of efficiency savings
To look at Integrated Offender Management and how that joint agency working was supporting prolific offenders, in particular in the Charnwood area.  To involve local agencies and charities working in the area of reducing re-offending, to seek their views.  To consider Mental Health issues relating to reducing re-offending.
<b>STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *</b>
TurnAbout Police Probation Service Futures Unlocked

**EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

**Is an impact needs assessment required?**

The recommendations of the Panel do not warrant an independent EIA. As actions and policies are developed, EIAs will be produced for these as appropriate.

**LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS**

None

**RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

Technical support – Tom Kiernan and Allison Fadesco  
 Admin support – Frances Whittington

**REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)**

**REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE**

1st December 2010

**COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT**

23rd February 2011

\* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

**PROGRESS OF PANEL WORK**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>PROGRESS TO DATE</b>
1st December 2010	<p>The Chair made reference to the length of sentences for prisoners, stating that the Head of the Prison Officers Association believed that the system could help those prisoners who were sentenced to more than six months in prison, however there was no support for prisoners serving less than a twelve month sentence upon their release. The Chair proposed that the Panel consider ways the Council could look to support people rather than numbers and assist prolific offenders to find opportunities to a more positive lifestyle.</p> <p>The Panel received presentations in respect of an introduction to Reducing Re-offending, from the Strategic Manager for TurnAbout, detailing a new development entitled Integrated Offender Management and the Council's Policy Officer for Community Safety, detailing Reducing Re-offending work in Charnwood, with a particular focus on Offenders serving short sentences.</p> <p>The Panel agreed to invite witnesses from the following organisations to its future meetings:</p> <p>2nd meeting: Police, Probation Service and Futures Unlocked</p>

	3rd meeting: The Bridge Housing Association, Loughborough College and Job Centre Plus
20th December 2010	With the agreement of the Panel, this meeting was cancelled as the invited witnesses were unable to attend on this date.
18th January 2011	<p>The Panel received presentations from Futures Unlocked and Leicestershire Police. The witness from the Probation Service has been deferred to the next meeting of the Panel.</p> <p>The Chair made reference to the County Resettlement Team and tabled information from Lisa Johnson based at The Bridge Housing and Advice Service about the team. Based at the Probation Service the team provided support to those leaving prison who did not have a probation officer or other relevant agency working with them.</p>
2nd February 2011	The Panel received information from Job Centre Plus, the Bridge Housing and Advice Service and the Exaireo Trust. Invitations had been extended to Loughborough College and the Probation Service, but their representatives had been unable to attend.
23rd February 2011	This meeting was re-arranged, to be held on 16th February 2011, at the request of the Chair
16th February 2011	The Panel received witness statements from two ex-offenders and reviewed its draft report, making minor amendments prior to agreeing it be submitted to the SMB.

<b>REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD</b>
--

9th March 2011
----------------



**REVIEW TITLE: START-UP UNITS IN SILEBY SCRUTINY PANEL**

**SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. The options available to the Council for the future of the Oak, keep it freehold or convert into a capital sum;
2. Future capital funding for refurbishment;
3. Marketing the units;
4. Timescale for occupancy;
5. Communication between tenants and Council Managers;
6. Day to day management of the units.

**REASON FOR SCRUTINY**

To ensure the development of a business perspective and enterprise position. Buildings appeared to be getting tired and required investment. To give further consideration to marketing and creating demand for the Sileby Start up units, an easier process for prospective tenants, whether or not to invest further in the units and review the exit strategy and leases. To establish a clear Council management structure.

**PANEL MEMBERSHIP**

Councillors Brown, Capleton, Day, K. Jones, Jukes (Chair), Seaton and Shepherd

**WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED**

Consideration of reinvesting revenue for refurbishment and maintenance use, with particular consideration given to repairs to the building, security and potential improvements to the internal units. The Panel will also consider whether or not the Council should retain the premises to continue the revenue stream in future or to claim value as a lump sum. The Panel will speak with leaseholders at The Oak to obtain a user's perspective.

**WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED**

**KEY TASKS** \*\* including consideration of efficiency savings

- The Panel will visit the Oak Business Centre at its meeting on January 31<sup>st</sup> 2011

**STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS**\*

- Oak Business Centre Users

<b>EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS</b>	
<b>Is an impact needs assessment required?</b> The recommendations as drafted in the Panel's initial report do not require an additional independent Equality Impact Assessment. The impact of those recommendations does not affect existing assessments.	
<b>LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS</b>	
None	
<b>RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Officer Support - Administrative: Richard Stratford Technical: John Leney/Dave Wall	
<b>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)</b>	
To be submitted March 2011	
<b>REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT</b>
11 <sup>th</sup> January 2011	Report to be submitted to Scrutiny Management Board in March 2011

\*\* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

### **PROGRESS WITH PANEL WORK**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>PROGRESS TO DATE</b>
Tuesday 11th January 2011 – 6:00pm	The Panel received a briefing from the Head of Property Services and the Property Manager for background information on The Oak business units in Sileby. The Panel discussed options for the retention of the property and refurbishment of the building and units. The Panel were keen on retaining the property and investigating the possibility of using the generated income for improvement and refurbishment. It was agreed that its next meeting would include a site visit to the units in Sileby and that the Panel's report was to be submitted in March.
Monday 31st January 2011 – 3:30pm	The Panel met with representatives of the Oak Tenants' Association. Those representatives stated that they were generally happy as customers of the council but raised issues regarding the effectiveness of communications from management at the Oak and discussed proposed building works that were shortly to take place at the centre. The Panel discussed with Officers options for improving communications and the possibility of formalising tenants' association arrangements.

<p>Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2011</p>	<p>Debbie Clarke, Asset Surveyor for CBC met with the Panel and representatives of the tenants association to discuss developments with the insulation works being carried on the Oak. The Panel also discussed the service charge for tenants and ways in which it could be made more simple and transparent. The possibility of formalising the Oak's tenant's association was also discussed along with guidance on best practice in this area. The panel determined that the name of the Panel should be changed to Business Units in Sibley Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Chair and two other Panel members would meet with the Strategic Director (Simon Jackson) and Head of Financial Services to discuss financial arrangements for the Oak.</p>
<p>Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011</p>	<p>The Panel's draft report was due for consideration at this meeting. However, after receiving a report of the discussions with the Strategic Director (Simon Jackson) and Head of Financial Services, the Panel agreed that it did not have sufficient financial information to give a full appraisal of the issues surrounding retention of the Oak. The Panel therefore agreed, after advice from the Head of Property Service, that a revaluation of the units would provide clearer financial data, and that it should reconvene once that revaluation was complete.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that an initial report would be submitted to Scrutiny Management Board to reflect this, and to enable more pressing issues to be addressed, and agreed amendments to its draft report for that purpose.</p>

