



Notice of meeting of

Scrutiny Management Committee

- To:** Councillors Kirk (Chair), Merrett (Vice-Chair), Blanchard, Cuthbertson, Hill, Hyman and Livesley
- Date:** Monday, 4 September 2006
- Time:** 5.00 pm
- Venue:** The Guildhall, York

AGENDA

1. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, Members will be invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

2. Public Participation

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit can do so. Anyone who wishes to register or requires further information is requested to contact the Democracy Officer on the contact details listed at the foot of this agenda. The deadline for registering is **Friday, 1 September at 10:00 am.**

3. Proposed New Scrutiny Topics: – Results of Feasibility Studies (Pages 1 - 26)

This report asks Members to consider the topic registration forms and feasibility reports in respect of the following newly registered Scrutiny Topics and to decide whether or not to progress the topics:

- Key Strategic Partnership Working (no 138)
- Local Transport Plan – LTP2 (no 139)
- Parking, Paving and Verges (no 140).

4. Proposed New Scrutiny Topics: Public Art (Pages 27 - 36)
(no 137)

This report asks Members to re-consider the topic registration form for Public Art and to decide whether this topic can be approved for progression to a future Ad Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

5. Any other business which the Chair decides is urgent under the Local Government Act 1972

Democracy Officer:

Name: Dawn Steel

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551030
- E-mail – dawn.steel@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.



Scrutiny Management Committee**4 September 2006****Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services****Proposed New Scrutiny Topics: Key Strategic Partnership Working (no 138), Local Transport Plan – LTP2 (no 139) and Parking, Paving and Verges (no 140) – Results of Feasibility Studies****Summary**

1. This report asks Members to consider the topic registration forms and feasibility reports that have been carried out in respect of three newly registered Scrutiny Topics and to decide whether or not to progress the topics, giving reasons for their decision.

Background

2. A feasibility report has been prepared in respect of each of the following registered scrutiny topics:
 - No 138 Key Strategic Partnership Working by Cllr David Merrett in May 2006. The topic registration form is attached at Annex A and the feasibility report at Annex B.
 - No 139 LTP2. Registered by Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laing in May 2006. The topic registration form is attached at Annex C and the feasibility report at Annex D.
 - No 140 Parking, Paving and Verges. Registered by Cllr Andrew D'Agorne in July 2006. The topic registration form is attached at Annex E and the feasibility report at Annex F.
3. The purpose of the feasibility report is to:
 - support Members in making an informed decision as to whether to progress the registered topic

- alert Members as to whether the new topic duplicates work already being done through another channel
- provide evidence that would enable Committees and Sub-Committees to scope a topic more effectively and faster if it is decided to take it forward.

Consultation

4. The feasibility process involved consultation with relevant officers and the appropriate Executive Member - details can be found in the Annexes to this report. Members need to be aware that some consultees may not have responded.

Options

5. After considering the contents of the topic registration forms and feasibility reports Members may decide to:
 - Not progress the topic further, giving reasons
 - Add the topics to the list of those available for progression to an Ad Hoc Sub Committee when resources become available to form these.

Analysis

6. Members need to be aware that uncompleted reports from former Scrutiny Boards are still being finished by Ad Hoc Sub Committees. This may limit the opportunities to progress new topics at this time.

Corporate Priorities

7. Members may consider that Topic 138 is relevant to the Corporate Priority 12, Topic 139 is relevant to Corporate Priority 2 and that Topic 140 is relevant to Corporate Priority 3.

Implications

8. There are no known Financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, IT or other implications at this stage.

Risk Management

9. In compliance with the Councils risk management strategy. There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

Recommendations

10. Members are asked to decide how they wish to progress scrutiny topics numbers 138, 139 and 140.

Reason: In order to carry out their responsibilities in managing the Scrutiny function in York

Contact details:

Author:

Barbara Boyce
Scrutiny Officer
01904 551714
barbara.boyce@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Suzan Hemingway
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Report Approved

Date 18/8/06

Dawn Steel, Democracy & Member Support Manager

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Topic 138 Registration Form
Annex B – Topic 138 Feasibility Report
Annex C – Topic 139 Registration Form
Annex D – Topic 139 Feasibility Report
Annex E – Topic 140 Registration Form
Annex F – Topic 140 Feasibility Report

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

Dear Reader

Scrutiny Members examine the decisions, policies and performance of the Council and make recommendations where they feel things could be improved for the citizens of York.

This non-Executive Member cross-party role was created by the Local Government Act 2000 which is all about modernising local government and creating better ways for citizens to be more involved in local decision making.

The scrutiny boards will consider possible suggestions about issues to look at from anyone, so long as these are not specific issues of an individual nature which should be taken up with a local Councillor or addressed through the Corporate Complaints system.

Scrutiny at York has already investigated things as diverse as the response to the 2000 floods, affordable housing, provision for young people in York, rail-side safety and street cleaning.

If you have a suggestion for something the scrutiny boards might consider, then please fill in this registration form and return it to us, either by post or by e-mail.

Madeleine Kirk

Cllr Madeleine Kirk
Chair, Scrutiny Management Committee



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

SUGGESTED TITLE OF TOPIC Key Strategic Partnership Working	
ABOUT YOU Please fill in as many of the details as you are able to.	
Title (delete as applicable): Mr Other please state	
First Name: David	Surname: Merrett
Address: 27 White House Gardens Tadcaster Road York YO24 1DZ	Daytime Phone: 01904 551939 Evening Phone: 01904 643405 Email: cllr.dmerrett@york.gov.uk
Are You (delete as applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Resident of York • A Visitor • A City of York Councillor • A City of York Council Employee • A Representative of a Voluntary Organisation or Charitable Trust (if YES please tell us the organisations title and your relationship to the organisation below) • Other (please comment) 	YES NO YES NO NO

ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC

Please write your responses to as many of the questions below as you are able to.

WHY DO YOU THINK THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT?

Partnership working is key to delivering the Council and the Government's wider agendas for York. There was a clear indication in the recent CPA review of dissatisfaction from some Council partners including regarding the Local Strategic Partnership (Without Walls) Board. There has also been internal recognition of problems with the Council's partnership working.

-Successful partnership working is of key importance in terms of working effectively to deliver LPSA targets which will also bring additional financial rewards. This is important in terms of maintaining the good CPA rating in future tests, as opposed to dropping to 'fair'.

DO YOU KNOW IF THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT TO OTHER PEOPLE? IF SO, WHO AND WHY?

-The Council's partners
-The topic is important to York residents in terms of efficiently delivering good quality joined up services across the public sector from the Council and its partners.

WHAT DO YOU THINK SCRUTINY OF THIS TOPIC MIGHT CHANGE, DO OR ACHIEVE?

-We need to understand what is wrong locally with the present arrangements and allow the identification of good practice.

-Identify which partnerships, such as perhaps the Children's Trust, are performing well and why and use these as examples of good performance.

-Recommend improvements to other partnerships, working procedures, etc.

DO YOU HAVE IDEAS ABOUT THE APPROACH SCRUTINY MEMBERS MIGHT TAKE TO YOUR SUGGESTED TOPIC?

-Look at the Without Walls and other partnership resources and structures and modes of operation.

-Talk to partners about the way partnerships are performing.

-Seek best practice advice and examples from elsewhere.

-Talk to officers involved in supporting partnerships

WOULD YOU BE HAPPY TO TALK TO SCRUTINY MEMBERS ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC AT FORMAL MEETINGS?

YES

PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR OTHER INFORMATION YOU FEEL MIGHT BE USEFUL BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION OF THIS TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION.

OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU

Thank you for proposing a new scrutiny topic. As Members of the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Boards we promise the following things;

- To advise you of any meetings where a decision will be taken as to whether to progress your topic and invite you to attend
- If Members would like you to speak in support of your topic at such meetings you will be notified and supported through the process by a Scrutiny Officer
- If you do not wish to speak you do not have to; your choice will not influence fair consideration of your topic.

Please return this form to the address below or send it by email. If you want any more information about Scrutiny or submitting a new topic for consideration then please contact the Scrutiny Team.

By Writing to:

The Scrutiny Services Team
C/o The Guildhall
York
YO1 9QN

Or Email: Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk

Or Phone: 01904 552038

For Scrutiny Administration Only

Topic Identity Number 138

Date Received 2 May 2006

SC1- date sent

Report on Results of Feasibility Consultation

Registered Topic: Key Strategic Partnership Working (No 138)

This topic was registered by Cllr David Merrett in May 2006. The following officers and/or members have been consulted about these topics and have provided a response based on their professional knowledge.

Response from the Leader of the Council

“Given that partnerships are subject to a current Audit review I would have thought that any scrutiny involvement would need to be post the receipt of that report - albeit it now is probably more a matter for the Audit and Governance panel.

I think that the scrutiny request is flawed anyway as it seems to prejudge issues. (i.e. the wording on the proposal form assumes that something is wrong).

If you do choose to scrutinise "partnership" working, you will need to focus on a limited number of interfaces. Given the relationships between the Council and the voluntary and statutory sectors in the City - not least the funding arrangements - any likely definition of partnerships might involve hundreds, if not thousands, of bodies. I find it difficult to believe that it would be a sound use of our limited resources to examine more than a sample of the more significant ones”

The Leader also pointed out that although he chairs the LSP Board he does not exercise an executive powers through that role. He also considers that the current position on negotiating LAAs is relevant

Response from Policy Development Team

I don't have too much to add regarding this scrutiny topic, other than that I think issues identified in the scrutiny request would hopefully be being considered already e.g. identifying improvements to partnership working, especially as this issue has a high profile locally and nationally at the moment. Because of this high profile though, members may particularly want to find solutions and so scrutiny could create an added focus in doing this.

Response from Equalities Officer

Any evaluation of strategic partnerships should consider how effectively disadvantaged communities have been engaged, their concerns incorporated into the priorities, planning and performance monitoring of the partnership.

Report prepared by Barbara Boyce Scrutiny Officer Tel. 01904 551714	Report prepared August 2006
---	-----------------------------

For further information please contact the author of the report

This page is intentionally left blank



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

Dear Reader

Scrutiny Members examine the decisions, policies and performance of the Council and make recommendations where they feel things could be improved for the citizens of York.

This non-Executive Member cross-party role was created by the Local Government Act 2000 which is all about modernising local government and creating better ways for citizens to be more involved in local decision making.

The scrutiny boards will consider possible suggestions about issues to look at from anyone, so long as these are not specific issues of an individual nature which should be taken up with a local Councillor or addressed through the Corporate Complaints system.

Scrutiny at York has already investigated things as diverse as the response to the 2000 floods, affordable housing, provision for young people in York, rail-side safety and street cleaning.

If you have a suggestion for something the scrutiny boards might consider, then please fill in this registration form and return it to us, either by post or by e-mail.

Madeleine Kirk

Cllr Madeleine Kirk
Chair, Scrutiny Management Committee



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

SUGGESTED TITLE OF TOPIC LTP2	
ABOUT YOU Please fill in as many of the details as you are able to.	
Title (delete as applicable):	
Other please state Cllr	
First Name: Tracey	Surname: Simpson-Laing
Address: 21 Salisbury Road Leeman Road York YO26 4YN	Daytime Phone: (01904) 640947 Evening Phone: (01904) 640947 Email: cllr.tsimpson-laing@york.gov.uk
Are You (delete as applicable)	
• A Resident of York	YES
• A Visitor	NO
• A City of York Councillor	YES
• A City of York Council Employee	NO
• A Representative of a Voluntary Organisation or Charitable Trust (if YES please tell us the organisations title and your relationship to the organisation below)	NO
• Other (please comment)	

ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC

Please write your responses to as many of the questions below as you are able to.

WHY DO YOU THINK THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT?

-This issue is of vital importance to the people of York in terms of the proposals for the next five years and the longer term planning for the next fifteen years. We need to understand if the right strategy has been adopted given the failure to consult on strategic options.

-Need to avoid repeating any mistakes for LTP3

-Need to understand how certain schemes have been prioritised and see if adjustments to the strategy and spending profiles are needed to make the best use of LTP2 resources.

-The LTP2 has failed to include local actions to address air quality issues in the five areas of the City identified as being in breach of air quality standards.

DO YOU KNOW IF THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT TO OTHER PEOPLE? IF SO, WHO AND WHY?

The draft LTP2 itself has received extensive press coverage, and more generally, transport issues are of major public interest. There is strong public pressure on the council to address key transport issues – which is only likely to increase.

The LTP2 must be prepared in line with a strict schedule – which would therefore impose a clear timetable on the work of the scrutiny board on this topic.

WHAT DO YOU THINK SCRUTINY OF THIS TOPIC MIGHT CHANGE, DO OR ACHIEVE?

-It will analyse whether the LTP2 will deliver the anticipated results and what the effect the 7% growth in traffic will be on travel times, business and air quality issues.

-Identify why in terms of the 2005 APR the authority only received a 'fair' assessment and what is needed to avoid it in the future.

DO YOU HAVE IDEAS ABOUT THE APPROACH SCRUTINY MEMBERS MIGHT TAKE TO YOUR SUGGESTED TOPIC?

The Scrutiny Board should play an active part in consulting with residents. In addition they should meet with experts and interest groups in York (cycling groups, bus users, businesses etc) to hear first hand their views on the plan and what they would like to see in terms of action on transport in the City in future.

WOULD YOU BE HAPPY TO TALK TO SCRUTINY MEMBERS ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC AT FORMAL MEETINGS?

YES

PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR OTHER INFORMATION YOU FEEL MIGHT BE USEFUL BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION OF THIS TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION.

OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU

Thank you for proposing a new scrutiny topic. As Members of the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Boards we promise the following things;

- To advise you of any meetings where a decision will be taken as to whether to progress your topic and invite you to attend
- If Members would like you to speak in support of your topic at such meetings you will be notified and supported through the process by a Scrutiny Officer
- If you do not wish to speak you do not have to; your choice will not influence fair consideration of your topic.

Please return this form to the address below or send it by email. If you want any more information about Scrutiny or submitting a new topic for consideration then please contact the Scrutiny Team.

By Writing to:

The Scrutiny Services Team
C/o The Guildhall
York
YO1 9QN

Or Email: Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk

Or Phone: 01904 552038

For Scrutiny Administration Only

Topic Identity Number 139

Date Received 22 May 2006

SC1- date sent

Report on Results of Feasibility Consultation

Registered Topic: LTP2 (No 139)

This topic was registered by Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laird in May 2006. The following officers and/or members have been consulted about these topics and have provided a response based on their professional knowledge.

Response from the Executive Member for City Strategy

I feel that that there is no real value in progressing the LTP 2 as a Scrutiny Topic. As LTP 2 has been formally adopted by the Council and submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) and it is difficult to see how a Scrutiny Review of it would add any real value.

Provisional LTP 2 received a 'very promising' status from the DfT, making it officially in the top 16 in the country and there is no reason to suspect that mistakes have been made. As with LTP1, the format and process may change in line with changes to national transport policy over the 5 year period as required by the DfT. Delivery of the LTP 2 strategy is continually reviewed through approval of the capital programme at EMAP - this therefore gives an arena for any changes and discussion of existing and future.

On the specific points in the Topic Registration Form:-

“We need to understand if the right strategy has been adopted given the failure to consult on strategic options.”

The strategies that were chosen in the LTP2 were based on extensive public consultation which included the successful Tell Ann Campaign (covering all Ward Committee and Parish Councils), extensive distribution of questionnaires and face to face meetings with key stakeholders and residents for which the council was praised by the DfT. In addition when DfT disseminated good practice regarding public consultation, York was used as an example of just that, in DfT presentations to other Local Authorities. The LTP seeks to establish the individual strategies from which an emerging overall strategy will be developed. It needs to be flexible enough for the strategy to change with circumstances e.g the amount of funding the council receives or the emerging regional. LTP should not be looked at in isolation from other, wider, initiatives.

“Need to avoid repeating mistakes for LTP3”

This presumes we have made some, I would be interested to know where.

“Need to understand how certain schemes have been prioritised and see if adjustments to the strategy and spending profiles are needed to make the best use of LTP2 resources.”

Our priorities are set by the need to address a number of different issues. To a large extent these are set for us by the need to achieve targets within the LTP and therefore secure future funding based upon our performance. This very much restricts how and where we commit resources. The LTP itself sets out our spending profile over the 5 year period against which we are measured. Programmes are put together to meet strategic as well as local demands. Members have had the opportunity of shaping those programmes through the capital programme process.

“The LTP2 has failed to include local actions to address air quality in the five areas of the City identified as being in breach of air quality standards”

Our approach is to address the underlying cause of the poor air quality, less polluting vehicles, reductions in congestion, promotion of more environmentally acceptable vehicles, promotion of public transport, cycling and walking rather than introduce restrictions that would only redirect the problem somewhere else

“The LTP2 must be prepared in line with a strict schedule – which would therefore impose a clear timetable on the work of the scrutiny board on this topic.”

As already stated LTP2 has already been approved by Council and submitted to DfT in line with their timetable. If this is this an attempt to put together a process for delivering the plan then I think the way it is reported to Members already does this.

“This Scrutiny topic will analyse whether LTP will deliver the anticipated results and what the effect the 7% growth in traffic will be on travel times, business and air quality issues.”

We have set targets in the LTP against which we will be measured. Our ability to achieve those targets will depend upon the soundness of the various strategies, our ability to deliver them and the resources provided.

“Identify why in terms of the 2005 APR the authority only received a ‘fair’ assessment and what is needed to avoid it in the future.”

The reasons were highlighted by the DfT and are being addressed as LTP2 progresses.

“The Scrutiny Board should play an active part in consulting with residents.”

This must be for the Board to decide if this topic goes ahead. However, a new round of consultation on the LTP (if based on the previous extensive consultation) would require significant staff time which could be put to far better use developing proposals for addressing the issues through the adopted strategies in the LTP.

The issues have brought to Members on several occasions and continue to do so at regular intervals and there has been ample opportunity for Members to question and shape the process and content.

Response from Marketing and Communications

In July 2005, York's provisional five year Local Transport Plan (LTP) was submitted to the Department for Transport. The provisional plan highlighted issues that arose from the first stage of consultation undertaken in 2004. The main findings from this consultation revealed that reducing congestion, improving access to jobs, education and leisure and improving health by helping more people to walk and cycle are the city's top three priorities for transport policy.

To evaluate whether the draft plan reflects the needs of the city and how effective it will be at cutting traffic, improving accessibility and health, a consultation programme was drawn up to consult residents and local businesses (LTP2). In October 2005 residents and local business were invited to comment on the Plan via a self-completion survey. The surveys were posted to 351 local businesses in the city and residents were able to complete a survey at ward committee meetings or by picking one up from a council reception area, at the library or via the council's website.

A Better 4 York video was also available to give residents an outline of the plan before completing the survey. The video incorporated the Plan's main objectives and was shown at ward committee meetings and available to download via the council's website. A copy of the Plan was also available on the website.

11% of the 351 businesses invited to comment on the LTP2 plan completed a self completion survey (N=39) and 137 residents completed a survey. The research assessed residents' views about the plan's strategy for the whole city, rather than specific local areas. Overall, 81% of respondents supported the aims and objectives of York's Second Local Transport Plan.

Response from Policy Development Team

I don't have too much to add regarding this scrutiny topic, other than that I think issues identified in the scrutiny request would hopefully be being considered already e.g. learning from LTP2 to inform LTP3, especially as this issue has a high profile locally and nationally at the moment. Because of this high profile though, members may particularly want to find solutions and so scrutiny could create an added focus in doing this.

Response from Equalities Officer

Any evaluation of LTP2 needs to consider whether appropriate equality objectives and measures were identified and given sufficient priority

Members should consult with community forums representing people from disadvantaged communities (e.g. Older People's Assembly, BME Citizens Open Forum, Disabled People's Forum, LGBT Forum, and Inter-Faith Forum)

Report prepared by Barbara Boyce Scrutiny Officer Tel. 01904 551714	Report prepared August 2006
---	-----------------------------

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annex E



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

Dear Reader

Scrutiny Members examine the decisions, policies and performance of the Council and make recommendations where they feel things could be improved for the citizens of York.

This non-Executive Member cross-party role was created by the Local Government Act 2000 which is all about modernising local government and creating better ways for citizens to be more involved in local decision making.

The scrutiny boards will consider possible suggestions about issues to look at from anyone, so long as these are not specific issues of an individual nature which should be taken up with a local Councillor or addressed through the Corporate Complaints system.

Scrutiny at York has already investigated things as diverse as the response to the 2000 floods, affordable housing, provision for young people in York, rail-side safety and street cleaning.

If you have a suggestion for something the scrutiny boards might consider, then please fill in this registration form and return it to us, either by post or by e-mail.

Madeleine Kirk

Cllr Madeleine Kirk
Chair, Scrutiny Management Committee



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

SUGGESTED TITLE OF TOPIC Paving policy - Parking, paving and verges	
ABOUT YOU Please fill in as many of the details as you are able to.	
Title (delete as applicable): Mr Mrs Miss Ms Cllr Other please state	
First Name: Andy	Surname: D'Agorne
Address: 10 Broadway West	Daytime Phone: 01904 770433 Evening Phone: 01904 633526 Email:
Are You (delete as applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Resident of York • A Visitor • A City of York Councillor • A City of York Council Employee • A Representative of a Voluntary Organisation or Charitable Trust (if YES please tell us the organisations title and your relationship to the organisation below) • Other (please comment) 	YES NO YES NO YES / NO

ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC

Please write your responses to as many of the questions below as you are able to.

WHY DO YOU THINK THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT?

The present policy adopted in 2002 seeks to minimise future maintenance and injury claims by replacing footway paving with black tarmac, unless it is a Conservation Area or there is an intervening grass verge. Increasingly this is also being removed and replaced by tarmac too because of damage by vehicle over-run. Residents often feel this policy damages the appearance of a suburban street and reduces ambient light levels particularly in winter . It also increases storm water run-off into the drains (with greater risk of flash flooding) and creates more ponding problems, particularly if the cheaper slurry sealing is applied or traffic calming features are present.

DO YOU KNOW IF THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT TO OTHER PEOPLE? IF SO, WHO AND WHY?

Yes - recent several reports in the local media of residents unhappy with this policy in the past year.

WHAT DO YOU THINK SCRUTINY OF THIS TOPIC MIGHT CHANGE, DO OR ACHIEVE?

Alternative options to removing verges and paving could be discussed and pilot measures tried where there is clear support for this from residents in the street affected. The scrutiny may raise public awareness of the damage done by heavy vehicles driving onto the verge or footway and help to reduce this type of damage or recover more of the costs of repair.

Options that reduce storm runoff might be identified.
The council will be seen to be 'listening' on the issue.

DO YOU HAVE IDEAS ABOUT THE APPROACH SCRUTINY MEMBERS MIGHT TAKE TO YOUR SUGGESTED TOPIC?

A scrutiny report on the drainage implications of paving of front gardens was completed for London, There may be other councils have identified innovative solutions to this problem that could be applied in York

In addition to the damage, parking on verges and footways is of concern to people with disabilities, parents with small children and those concerned about road safety.

The appearance of the street is an important aspect of building support for 'York Pride' If residents feel that the council doesn't care about the appearance of their street they are less likely to continue to take a pride in the public realm in their neighbourhood.

WOULD YOU BE HAPPY TO TALK TO SCRUTINY MEMBERS ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC AT FORMAL MEETINGS?

Yes

PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR OTHER INFORMATION YOU FEEL MIGHT BE USEFUL BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION OF THIS TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION.

OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU

Thank you for proposing a new scrutiny topic. As Members of the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Boards we promise the following things;

- To advise you of any meetings where a decision will be taken as to whether to progress your topic and invite you to attend
- If Members would like you to speak in support of your topic at such meetings you will be notified and supported through the process by a Scrutiny Officer
- If you do not wish to speak you do not have to; your choice will not influence fair consideration of your topic.

Please return this form to the address below or send it by email. If you want any more information about Scrutiny or submitting a new topic for consideration then please contact the Scrutiny Team.

By Writing to:

The Scrutiny Services Team
C/o The Guildhall
York
YO1 9QN

Or Email: Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk

Or Phone: 01904 552038

For Scrutiny Administration Only

Topic Identity Number	140
Date Received	26 July 2006
SC1- date sent	

This page is intentionally left blank

Report on Results of Feasibility Consultation

Registered Topic: Parking, Paving and Verges (No 140)

This topic was registered by Cllr Andrew D'Agorne in July 2006. The following officers and/or members have been consulted about these topics and have provided a response based on their professional knowledge.

Response from Policy Development Team

I'm not aware of any policy developments which might overlap with this scrutiny topic. I'm afraid I haven't seen any other information relevant to this scrutiny request but can see how it links closely to promoting York Pride

Response from Equalities Officer

The scrutiny request for highlights the important equalities issues associated with this topic. It will be important that the voice of disabled people, older people and people with young children is effectively incorporated into the discussions.

Response from Performance Improvement Team

This would not seem to have a strong direct link to CPA . There is one Performance Indicator in the CPA Environment block about the condition of footways. However our performance on this (BV187) is already well into the top quartile - so its an area of strength not weakness (of course Cllr D'Agorne may argue that its only a strength because we tarmac over everything!)

Indirectly one could make links to CPA Performance Indicators around public satisfaction with their area. Somebody who lived in a street where tarmac replaced paving and grass verges is likely to be very unsatisfied. Street environment has been a priority for this administration - and has been chosen as one of the new 13 corporate priorities.

Response from Neighbourhood Pride Team

This topic relates to the appearance of environment which fundamental to York Pride and also nuisance behaviour.

Some wards do suffer from parking problems on verges - this would include certain areas in Holgate, and Westfield Ward - residents have voiced concern. For example there were significant problems in the Tudor Road area but now much improved due to works carried out to accommodate the FTR (installation of crossings/bays/road widening). Chapelfields still has problems with parking and verge 'run over'. The Windsor Garth/Kingsway West area again has problems because of narrow roads, relatively high density of houses/flats making driving difficult (especially buses) and forcing parking on footways. We have had complaints about Askham Lane and elsewhere as well. Also have been recurring issues on Challoners

Road/Wains Road (again relatively narrow and nothing to prevent parking on opposite sides of the road). Tadcaster Road has had numerous complaints but often here due to construction traffic and tardiness in verge re-instatement.

The issue of parking has been raised at several ward committee meetings in the past year but not as far as I am aware in relation to using tarmac. Street Environment have tried to address these issues as part of the ward audits and have used some of their budget to assist where possible - utilising non tarmac methods.

No response received so far from Chief Officer

Report prepared by Barbara Boyce Scrutiny Officer Tel. 01904 551714	Report prepared August 2006
---	-----------------------------

For further information please contact the author of the report



Scrutiny Management Committee**4 September 2006****Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services****Proposed New Scrutiny Topics: Public Art (no 137)****Summary**

1. This report asks members to re-consider the topic registration form for Public Art (see Annex A) and decide if it can be approved for progression to a future Ad Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee. Members will decide at a later date which of the approved topics will be selected for immediate investigation.

Background

2. A feasibility report for this topic was considered at the meeting of this Committee held on 26 June 2006.
3. Members were of the opinion that they needed more information concerning the decision of 1998 in which it was decided that 1 per cent of the total cost of any new development be set aside for public art.
4. It was requested the member who proposed this topic plus relevant officers be asked to provide further information for members of this Committee.

Consultation

5. Cllr Chris Hogg has been asked to attend this meeting along with Gill Cooper from CYC's Arts and Culture service and officers from Planning.

Options

6. After considering the contents of the topic registration forms and feasibility reports members may decide to:
 - Not progress the topic further, giving reasons

- Add the topics to the list of those available for progression to an Ad Hoc Sub Committee when resources become available to form these.

Analysis

7. Members need to be aware that uncompleted reports from former Scrutiny Boards are still being finished by Ad Hoc Sub Committees. This may delay the opportunities to progress new topics at this time.

Corporate Priorities

8. Members may consider that Topic 137 is relevant to the Corporate Priority 3 – improve the actual and perceived condition and appearance of the city's streets, housing estates and publicly accessible spaces.

Implications

9. There are no known Financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, IT or other implications at this stage.

Risk Management

10. In compliance with the Councils risk management strategy. There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

Recommendations

11. Members are asked to decide how they wish to progress scrutiny topic number 137.
Reason: In order to carry out their responsibilities in managing the Scrutiny function in York

Contact details:

Author:

Barbara Boyce
Scrutiny Officer
01904 551714
barbara.boyce@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Suzan Hemingway
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Report Approved **Date** 18/8/06
Dawn Steel, Democracy & Member Support Manager

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex A – Scrutiny Topic Registration Form No 137

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

Dear Reader

Scrutiny Members examine the decisions, policies and performance of the Council and make recommendations where they feel things could be improved for the citizens of York.

This non-Executive Member cross-party role was created by the Local Government Act 2000 which is all about modernising local government and creating better ways for citizens to be more involved in local decision making.

The scrutiny boards will consider possible suggestions about issues to look at from anyone, so long as these are not specific issues of an individual nature which should be taken up with a local Councillor or addressed through the Corporate Complaints system.

Scrutiny at York has already investigated things as diverse as the response to the 2000 floods, affordable housing, provision for young people in York, rail-side safety and street cleaning.

If you have a suggestion for something the scrutiny boards might consider, then please fill in this registration form and return it to us, either by post or by e-mail.

Madeleine Kirk

Cllr Madeleine Kirk
Chair, Scrutiny Management Committee



SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

SUGGESTED TITLE OF TOPIC Public Art	
ABOUT YOU Please fill in as many of the details as you are able to.	
Title (delete as applicable): Mr Other please state	
First Name: Chris	Surname: Hogg
Address:	Daytime Phone: Evening Phone: Email:
Are You (delete as applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Resident of York • A Visitor • A City of York Councillor • A City of York Council Employee • A Representative of a Voluntary Organisation or Charitable Trust (if YES please tell us the organisations title and your relationship to the organisation below) • Other (please comment) 	YES / NO YES / NO YES YES / NO YES / NO

ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC

Please write your responses to as many of the questions below as you are able to.

WHY DO YOU THINK THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT?

In 1998 the City Council approved a policy proposing that 1% of the total cost of any new development would be set-aside for Public Art.

It is essential that this policy is scrutinised in order to ensure that the City is gaining maximum benefit for its public environment and cultural life.

A consideration of the nature and use of Public art appropriate to the city would also help inform decisions on the use of such money in the future.

DO YOU KNOW IF THIS TOPIC IS IMPORTANT TO OTHER PEOPLE? IF SO, WHO AND WHY?

This topic is important to the future culture and heritage of York. The Public Art policy is one of the few means of achieving extra funding for a wide range of art forms and with the correct implementation is also capable of increasing visitors to the city. Having these sorts of funds available to the city could also lever in additional external funds for investment in the city. This will be seen as a matter of great importance to many as it could improve the built cityscape for residents and visitors alike.

WHAT DO YOU THINK SCRUTINY OF THIS TOPIC MIGHT CHANGE, DO OR ACHIEVE?

The scrutiny will allow an examination of the policy's relevance eight years after its inception, and where necessary update it to the City's current needs ensuring effective implementation and promoting closer cross directorate working.

DO YOU HAVE IDEAS ABOUT THE APPROACH SCRUTINY MEMBERS MIGHT TAKE TO YOUR SUGGESTED TOPIC?

Review of current implementation

Review of recent public art interventions in the city

Consideration of best practice from similar city environments

Contributions from Planners, developers, architects, urban designers, heritage sector as well as artists.

WOULD YOU BE HAPPY TO TALK TO SCRUTINY MEMBERS ABOUT YOUR PROPOSED TOPIC AT FORMAL MEETINGS?

Yes

PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR OTHER INFORMATION YOU FEEL MIGHT BE USEFUL BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION OF THIS TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION.

OUR COMMITMENT TO YOU

Thank you for proposing a new scrutiny topic. As Members of the Scrutiny Management Committee and Scrutiny Boards we promise the following things;

- To advise you of any meetings where a decision will be taken as to whether to progress your topic and invite you to attend
- If Members would like you to speak in support of your topic at such meetings you will be notified and supported through the process by a Scrutiny Officer
- If you do not wish to speak you do not have to; your choice will not influence fair consideration of your topic.

Please return this form to the address below or send it by email. If you want any more information about Scrutiny or submitting a new topic for consideration then please contact the Scrutiny Team.

By Writing to:

The Scrutiny Services Team
C/o The Guildhall
York
YO1 9QN

Or Email: Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk

Or Phone: 01904 552038

For Scrutiny Administration Only

Topic Identity Number	137
Date Received	11 May 2006
SC1- date sent	

This page is intentionally left blank