
Meeting	Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Management Committee
Date	31 July 2017
Present	Councillors Williams (Chair), Galvin (Vice-Chair), D'Agorne, Fenton, Gates, Reid, S Barnes, Flinders and K Myers (Substitute for Councillor Steward)
Apologies	Councillor Steward

9. Declarations of Interest

Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests which they might have in respect of business on the agenda. None were declared.

10. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2017 be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

11. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

12. Schedule of Petitions

Members considered a report which provided them with details of new petitions received to date, together with those considered by the Executive or relevant Executive Member/Officer since the last report to the Committee.

It was highlighted by some Members that there was still confusion amongst residents over the removal of a previous rule stating that a petition with 1000 plus signatories would be debated at Full Council. It was suggested that the Petitions Scheme be amended to make this clearer.

Resolved: That the petitions at Annex A be noted.

Reason: To ensure the Committee carries out its requirements in relation to petitions.

13. 2016-17 Draft Outturn

Members considered a report which provided a year end analysis for the services falling under the responsibility of the Customer & Corporate Services Scrutiny Management Committee, which include all corporate, strategic and business services. The Corporate Finance Manager was in attendance to present the report and answer Member questions.

In response to points raised by Members she stated:

- Some vacancies had been held in particular service areas to deliver budget savings.
- Sickness absence varied across the organisation and figures were available on the KPI machine, which could be accessed by Executive Members.
- In relation to a question about the categories of complaints received Officers stated they would send a written response to Members as they did not have a breakdown to hand.

Resolved: That Members note the contents of the report.

Reason: To update the Committee on the 2016/17 outturn

14. Police & Crime Commissioner Proposal on Future Governance of North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service

Members gave consideration to a report and presentation by the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) on her proposal for the future governance of North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue in order to support enhanced collaboration between emergency services. The report also suggested a number of issues arising from the PCC's consultation document that committee Members considered during the course of the meeting.

Members were asked to:

- i) Consider the views of the invited consultees listed at paragraph 13 & 14 above

- ii) Consider and comment on the LBC at Annex A
- iii) Consider and comment on the North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority response and alternative proposal at Annex B

Julia Mulligan, North Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner was in attendance to present the report and answer Member questions.

In response to Member questions she stated:

- She would vote against any further cuts to staffing within the fire service as she had concerns around the risk this was creating.
- Any savings realised would be put back into front line services.
- There would be no conflict when budget setting under the governance arrangement, as there would still be two legally separate precepts and budgets and legislation to ensure they remained separate.
- The scale and breadth of collaboration between the emergency services could definitely improve and the proposal reflected this.

Councillor Backhouse, Chair of the Fire Authority was also in attendance to offer his thoughts on the proposal and answer Member questions.

In response to the points raised by the PCC and Member questions he stated:

- It would be a risk to leap straight into the governance model, as once this in place there would be no going back to a representation model.
- NYFRS was high performing, not a failing service and so there was no rush to change the governance model.
- There was strong York representation on the Fire Authority and a local knowledge base. This would be lost with the governance model.

Councillor Mason was also in attendance to represent the Police and Crime Panel, for which he was Vice Chair. He stated that he felt there was a rush towards this change and that it was felt

by the Panel that the NYFRS offer was a fair one. If this did not go far enough there would still be a chance to move up to a governance model. He also felt that it would make proper scrutiny impossible for the Police and Crime Panel if they were to also take on board the Fire Service.

Having considered the information provided Members agreed that:

- A direct move to the governance model would prevent any future return to the representation model.
- There was insufficient evidence to support the financial savings stated as a result of a move to the Governance Model (as identified within the LBC).
- There was no evidence to suggest that the improvements in frontline services suggested in the LBC could not be achieved through greater collaboration, as a result of a formal move to the Representation Model.
- The Governance Model would reduce the opportunity for local elected Members to influence and monitor the delivery of Fire & Rescue Services across North Yorkshire
- A move to the Representation Model now would not rule out a move to the Governance Model in the future, should it prove appropriate based on evidence and good practice

Following this discussion it was: -

Resolved: That Members recommend the representation model of future governance to Executive.

Reason: To facilitate the effective consideration of the Police & Crime Commissioner's LBC ahead of the Executive's consideration in order to inform their consultation feedback.

15. Draft ICT Policy

Officers requested that this item be deferred to September's meeting, given the size of the presentation and the time spent discussing agenda item 6 (minute item 14).

Resolved: That this item be deferred to the Customer and Corporate Services Scrutiny Management

Committee Meeting to be held on 4 September 2017.

Reason: To ensure that scrutiny members have the opportunity to be consulted on a key strategy that will influence the future delivery of frontline services.

16. Work Plan 2017/18

Members gave consideration to the Committee's draft work plan for the municipal year.

Resolved: That the committee's work plan for 2017/18 be approved subject to the following amendments:

- September – Draft ICT Policy (deferred from July)

Reason: To ensure that the committee has a planned programme of work in place.

Councillor D Williams, Chair
[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.40 pm].