



## Notice of meeting of

### Scrutiny Management Committee

**To:** Councillors Merrett (Vice-Chair), Blanchard, Cuthbertson, Hill, Hyman, Livesley, Kirk (Chair), Hall, Holvey and B Watson

**Date:** Monday, 22 January 2007

**Time:** 6.00 pm

**Venue:** Guildhall

### 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. **Minutes p1** (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2006.

#### 3. **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 19 January 2007 at 5.00pm..

**4. Understanding Traffic Congestion in York (Pages 5 - 18)**

To receive a briefing from Damon Copperthwaite (Assistant Director, City Development & Transport) on the key issues relating to traffic congestion and its effects in York. An outline briefing is attached.

**5. Government White Paper - 'Strong & Prosperous Communities'. (Pages 19 - 24)**

Further to the last meeting of the Committee to receive and consider a report on the potential implications for the scrutiny function arising from the White Paper, outlining briefing how these might be addressed in York.

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

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.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| MEETING       | SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE   |
| DATE          | 18 DECEMBER 2006  |
| PRESENT       | COUNCILLORS KIRK (CHAIR), BLANCHARD,<br>CUTHBERTSON, HILL, HYMAN AND LIVESLEY |
| APOLOGIES     | COUNCILLORS MERRETT   |
| IN ATTENDANCE | COUNCILLOR MOORE  |

---

**38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest under this item.

**39. MINUTES P1**

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 20 November 2006 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to a slight correction to line 1, paragraph 3 of Minute No. 35(traffic congestion in York) by inserting the word "up" before "to 7%".

**40. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

**41. WHITE PAPER ON STRONG AND PROSPEROUS COMMUNITIES - REPORT ON IMPLICATIONS FOR SCRUTINY FUNCTION**

Members considered a report summarising the early and potential implications for the scrutiny function arising from the White Paper on Strong & Prosperous Communities. They were informed that the White Paper contained the following proposals for extending the scrutiny role in local authorities:-

- **Community Call for Action** – the potential for policy or neighbourhood issues raised by residents with their local councillors to be referred to scrutiny, with the exception of planning, licensing, council tax and non-domestic rates due to the statutory appeals processes;
- **Partnership Working** - extended powers over services external to the Council in the sense that certain specified partners would be legally required to take part in scrutiny and to have regard to scrutiny recommendations.

It was noted that the Bill was currently scheduled to receive Royal Assent in Autumn 2007.

Members discussed the implications and wider proposals contained in the Bill in some detail and indicated their wish to contribute to any formal Council response on the implications for scrutiny. As such, they agreed to consider the matter further at an already scheduled extra meeting of SMC on 22 January 2007 with a view to receiving a report at that meeting looking in more detail at what the implications could mean for scrutiny in York.

RESOLVED: (i) the report and potential implications for the scrutiny function contained in the White Paper be noted;

(ii) a further report on the potential effects on scrutiny in York be received at the additional meeting of this Committee on 22 January 2007.

REASON: To enable Members to be kept informed upon the potential implications for the scrutiny function arising from the White Paper.

#### **42. BUDGET MONITORING AND CONSULTATION**

Members considered a report setting out current budget expenditure in relation to the support budget for scrutiny and seeking a recommendation to the Executive on an appropriate budget for 2007/8.

A wide-ranging discussion was held on supporting scrutiny in general, from appropriate activities and events to the potential role of scrutiny should the proposals referred to in the White Paper become legislation. In the meantime, given current budgetary restraints and anticipated expenditure against the budget by current financial year end, it was suggested that an equivalent budget be recommended for 2007/8.

RESOLVED: That current and projected budget spend be noted and the Executive be asked to recommend the Council retain a scrutiny support budget of £6,000 for 2007/8.

REASON: To enable Members to fulfil their constitutional budget monitoring requirements and make a suitable recommendation on scrutiny budget to the Executive

#### **43. FLOODS SCRUTINY - UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS IN OCTOBER 2005**

Members received an update report on progress against the original recommendations and agreed actions arising from the Floods Scrutiny Report and in relation to supplementary actions agreed by the Executive when its last received a progress update in October 2005. The Chair of the former Floods Scrutiny Board attended the meeting to give a position update and answer any specific questions.

Members noted that the Executive request for an annual update to the then appropriate Executive Member was still outstanding. Members endorsed the suggestion from Councillor Moore that any such update

should be the responsibility of the Executive in view of the multi-departmental impact of flooding issues. It was further suggested that such annual review be submitted to the Executive prior to annual OFERG meeting during September/October.

RESOLVED: That (i) the report be received and referred to the Executive suggesting it review the floods position annually in respect of the recommendations contained in the Floods Scrutiny Report. Such review be undertaken during the September/October cycle to enable any necessary information to be fed into the multi-agency, OFERG, group; and

(ii) Councillor, former Chair of Floods Scrutiny Board, be formally thanked for maintaining a watching brief in relation to the recommendations of the Scrutiny Floods Review.

REASON: To enable Scrutiny to meet the monitoring requirements associated with the original recommendations of the above review.

**44. EDUCATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORKPLAN**

Further to a request at the last meeting of this Committee, Members received a report giving details of the work plan for Education Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of 2006/7. It was noted that the remaining available meeting slots and time were largely allocated to completing the home to school transport review.

RESOLVED: That the report and work plan be noted.

REASON: To enable the Committee to fulfil its constitutional monitoring and managerial role.

**Councillor Kirk, Chair**

[The meeting started at 5.00pm and finished at 6.50pm].

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Scrutiny Management Committee

22 January 2007

### Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

## Proposed Scrutiny Review of Traffic Congestion in York

### Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to ask members to reconsider a registered scrutiny topic which was deferred from the meeting of 23 October 2006. Members may make a recommendation as to whether it can be the subject of an Ad Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee either immediately or in the future.

### Background

2. At their meeting on 23 October members considered Topic 120 on the subject of Traffic Congestion in York which was originally submitted by Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laing (see Annex A for original topic registration form) . At that meeting, it was decided to defer a decision to enable a draft remit to be produced and discussions to take place with the relevant officers.
3. At the meeting of 23 October 2006 the Head of Financial Services mentioned funding sources specifically aimed at reducing congestion on roads. Further investigation of this has revealed that this has been allocated to funding a review by consultants Kendrick Ash and that there is no additional funding via that route.
4. The suggested draft remit based on the topic registration form was considered at the meeting on 20 November 2006 - see Annex B. Members considered the impact on resources of undertaking this review and requested that a report or presentation on the key issues be brought to the next meeting by relevant officers from City Strategy to enable them to decide whether to proceed to review. An outline of the information to be provided in the presentation is attached at Annex C.

### Consultation

5. Consultation with relevant officers was carried out when this topic was originally registered and further detailed discussions have been held in order to provide the information presented to date. This should enable members to

decide if it would be useful to take this topic further.

## Options

6. Having regard to the draft remit and presentation made at this meeting members may decide to:
  - a. Not progress the topic further, giving reasons
  - b. Form an Ad Hoc Sub Committee to consider the topic and make amendments to the remit as they consider appropriate. Also establish a timescale for any such review.

## Analysis

7. If members decide to create an Ad Hoc Sub-Committee immediately, this will mean that currently the resources of Scrutiny Services will be working to capacity. Brief, clear remits and short to medium timescales should ensure that reviews are progressed efficiently. Progress with current reviews is being regularly monitored to assess workflow and resource capacity to ensure completion during the current municipal year.

## Corporate Priorities

8. Members might consider that this topic would contribute to Corporate Priority no 2 – Increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport.

## Implications

9. There are no known Financial, HR, Equalities, Legal, Crime and Disorder, IT or other implications associated with this report. Should Members decide to proceed with a review of this topic, naturally, there will be usual costs associated with resourcing the review, depending on its agreed remit.

## Risk Management

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

## Recommendations

11. Members are asked to consider the outstanding scrutiny topic in line with the options above, and to agree a remit and timescale for any review which might be authorised.

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



**Contact details:**

**Author:**

Melanie Carr  
Scrutiny Officer  
01904 552063  
melanie.carr@york.gov.uk

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Suzan Hemingway  
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

**Report Approved**

**Date** 12/01/2007

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** None at this stage

**Wards Affected:**

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Annexes**

Annex A – Draft remit for Topic 120  
Annex B – Presentation Outline

**Background Papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex A



## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>SUGGESTED TITLE OF TOPIC</b><br><b>Reducing Traffic Congestion in York</b>   |   |
| <b>ABOUT YOU</b> Please fill in as many of the details as you are able to.  |   |
| <b>Title (delete as applicable):</b> Mr Mrs Miss Ms<br><b>Other please state</b> Councillor   |   |
| <b>First Name:</b> Tracey   | <b>Surname:</b> Simpson-Laing   |
| <b>Address:</b> 21 Salisbury Rd<br>Leeman Rd<br>York  | <b>Daytime Phone:</b><br><br><b>Evening Phone:</b><br><br><b>Email:</b> |
| <b>Are You</b> (delete as applicable)   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A Resident of York</b></li> </ul>   | YES / NO  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A Visitor</b></li> </ul>  | YES / NO  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A City of York Councillor</b></li> </ul>  | <b><u>YES</u></b> / NO  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A City of York Council Employee</b></li> </ul>  | YES / NO  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A Representative of a Voluntary Organisation or Charitable Trust</b><br/>           (if YES please tell us the organisations title and your relationship to the organisation below )</li> </ul> | YES / NO  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other</b> (please comment)</li> </ul>   |   |

**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?**

LTP 2 will see set the future of transport and its infrastructure for the coming decades. If the submission is not robust it could have devastating consequences for the city, both materially and financially

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

Residents top concern for a number of years has been the issue of congestion and the future of the city.

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

Scrutiny will give Councillors, organisations and members of the public the opportunity to see the 'document' before submission. The process of Scrutiny will give Councillors the chance to ensure that it meets the aspirations being set by members of the Planning & Transport Panel in their current work and discussions and allow members to question the Executive Member on any issues they have concerns on.

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

Members should be presented with the draft document 4 weeks before the first meeting of discussion to allow time for reading and questions that they may wish to ask officers. At the initial meeting I would see the format of an Officer presentation with Q & A's. Following this at the second meeting the Executive Member would be requested to attend to answer questions/justify decisions. A 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> meeting would enable members to address issues and draw up a report to enable amendments to the draft LTP2 before its submission.

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

**Or Email:** [Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk](mailto:Scrutiny.services@york.gov.uk)

**Or Phone:** 01904 552038

York  
YO1 9QN

---

**For Scrutiny Administration Only**

|                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Topic Identity Number</b> | <b>120</b>           |
| <b>Date Received</b>         | <b>13 April 2005</b> |
| <b>SC1- date sent</b>        |                      |

**Reducing Traffic Congestion in York (topic no. 120)****Remit****Aim**

To understand what contribution LTP2 makes to the reduction of the anticipated 7% rise in traffic and what can be done to eliminate the air quality hotspots and the impact of the forecasted traffic increase on secondary routes.

**Objectives**

The above aim to be achieved through the following objectives:

- To identify improvements to current and future congestion and air quality problems.
- To investigate issues around the 5 poor air quality 'hot spots' identified in LTP2 and other Council documents.
- To seek quick solutions to immediate problems rather than long term strategies, eg. School term time solutions, inclement weather difficulties or particular events (ie. Caravan show on Knavesmire)
- To promote the use of environmentally viable and financially practical alternative methods of transport.

**Scope**

1. Consultation with residents – including disadvantaged groups, older and younger people – of the effects of traffic on people's lives.
2. To research good practice in other Authorities.
3. To work with Transport Unit on projects to promote modal shift.

**Officer and partner involvement**

Other Local Authorities and Europe (Denmark)

Colleagues in Transport Planning

York Cycling groups

Bus Company (Quality Bus Partnership)

Transport 2000

Motoring organisations

York Environmental Forum – Air Pollution

**Consultees**

Officers from City Strategy

Expert witnesses to be identified and/or co-opted by Ad-Hoc Sub-Committee

**Timescale**

Medium term – estimated to be 3-6 months, in accordance with new scrutiny procedures.

**Constraints**

**Resources**

Scrutiny Officer support and involvement of officers in City Strategy, as well as time of any co-opted experts.



## **Traffic Congestion – Scrutiny**

### **Background**

- Highway Network operating at or near capacity in many locations at peak times.
- Congestion levels remained static in AM peak over last 5 years.
- Car is the dominant mode of transport, in excess of 50%.
- 2% annual growth in traffic.
- 3% annual increase in journey times (Probably easiest way to understand congestion).
- Reducing revenue and capital budgets in transport.
- Corporate Priority

“To increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport”

### **Where is congestion in York?**

- York is a compact historic city, opportunities are limited.
- Outer Ring Road
- Tadcaster Road
- Wigginton Road
- Fulford Road
- Many junctions around the City

### **Traffic problems facing York**

- 50% of households have 1 car, 25% have 2 cars (or more).
- Minor disruption ie accident, can lead to major congestion.
- Short commuting journeys at peak hours.
- School run at peak hours.
- Insufficient capacity in the network.
- Journey times are increasing.

- Increase in city wide land use development, ie York Central.
- Increasing goods vehicles accessing York.
- Number of taxis and buses.
- Bus Journey times reliability.

**What impact does traffic congestion have?**

- Detrimental to,
  - Air quality
  - Economic performance
  - Quality of life
  - Accessibility to services, employment, education, health
  - Physical environment
  - Road safety
  - Bus reliability

**What will happen if we do nothing?**

- Congestion will increase significantly
- Peak hours will extend in length
- Use of residential roads will increase
- Traffic in air quality action areas will increase
- Journey speeds will significantly decrease
- Journey times will increase
- Bus travel will become increasingly unreliable
- Park and ride capacity will be inadequate

**What are we doing about it?**

- More roads are not the answer, it is not sustainable.
- City Region, Congestion Partnership.
  - Transport Innovation Fund
- Local Transport Plan 2006-2011

- Objectives are,
  - Reduce traffic growth
  - Reduce levels of congestion
  - Improve public transport systems
  - Work in partnership
  - “60% in favour of radical measures”
- Education
  - Smarter choices campaigns
  - Travel plans
  - Car clubs
  - Car sharing
  - Cycle training
- Encouragement
  - A sustainable public transport system that is affordable, principally buses, exceeding 18m passengers annually
  - Improvements to the Outer Ring Road
  - Increase in capacity of the Park and Ride
  - Improved rail services, Harrogate, Scarborough, Leeds/Pennine lines
  - Walking and Cycling, gaps in the network, safety
- Control
  - Parking Measures
  - Effective management of the highway network, traffic signals
  - Bus priority measures
  - Congestion charging

Damon Copperthwaite  
15 January 2007

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Scrutiny Management Committee

22 January 2007

*Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services*

### **Strong & Prosperous Communities: the Local Government White Paper and its implications for the scrutiny function**

#### **Summary**

1. This report provides members' with information on how Scrutiny Services intends meeting the requirements of the above Local Government White Paper.

#### **Background**

2. In December 2006 SMC considered a report which detailed the background to the recently published White Paper on Local Government. This set out the proposals on new accountability and leadership arrangements for elected members, community empowerment initiatives and a new performance framework. More specifically, the White Paper also includes proposals for extending the role of scrutiny in local authorities.
3. At the last SMC meeting in December 2006, Members requested that a further report be presented which set out how Scrutiny Services in York might provide this extended scrutiny function and how it could be managed and resourced.

#### **Consultation**

4. Scrutiny officers have looked at the following White Paper proposals when considering the new requirements:
  - a. Community Call for Action - Local residents with concerns about their neighbourhood or who want to influence policy can raise these matters with their local councillor. The councillor will then deal with the issue informally by discussions with the executive and local service providers or by referring the issue to scrutiny. Exempt issues are: Planning, licensing, council tax and non-domestic rates because these have a statutory appeals process. Also exempt are crime and disorder issues as these are covered by a similar process under the Police and Justice Act 2006.
  - b. Extended scrutiny powers over services external to the council – Specified partners to be legally required to take part in council scrutiny and to have regard to scrutiny recommendations. (Specified partners include: the Police Authority, Primary Care Trust, NHS Health Trust,

Learning and Skills Council, Jobcentre Plus, Health and Safety Executive, Regional Development Agency).

## **Analysis**

### Community Call for Action (CCfA)

5. In response to this, Councillors will from their knowledge of their area and its people, be able to identify issues which are of significant concern to their communities. Ward meetings / advice surgeries will also allow members of the public to raise local and neighbourhood matters with their ward councillors. Under this provision, Councillors will in effect be encouraged to play a gate keeping role in deciding how to resolve matters of concern. Where informal approaches do not appear to be working and after due consideration of the public concerns, Councillors may deem it appropriate to refer the issue to scrutiny by registering the topic for review. Under CCfA such referrals will be a local Councillor's decision with SMC constitutionally being responsible for considering how to handle that referral.
6. New working practices have recently been introduced in Scrutiny, designed to help the scrutiny process but which will also provide the mechanism for responding to CCfA – see flow chart at Annex A. The revised topic registration form assists Members to provide all the necessary information, thus allowing a thorough feasibility study to be produced with a suggested remit for the review. This, in turn should assist SMC in fully understanding the issue and in considering the ways in which it could be reviewed. If a decision is taken to carry out a review, a timeframe for the review will be set and a scoping report will be produced to clarify the methods of investigation and consultation. At the end of the review, the committee set up to deal with it will make recommendations to address the public concerns raised through the local Councillor.
7. Work is ongoing to enable Members to register topics on line through the new Committee Management System. It is also intended to introduce a Scrutiny Forward Plan. Councillors and members of the public will be able to access this online to see what topics are scheduled for review in the future and the deadlines for carrying out those reviews. It is recognised that more could be done to advertise and inform the public of their rights in regard to raising issues, so public awareness will have to be addressed as these proposals move forward. For example, more information could be included on the council website in relation to scrutiny and the role it plays.

### Extended scrutiny powers over services external to the council

8. There may be issues that are not only the responsibility of the Council, but those where the council works in partnership with others. Scrutiny committees will be able to hold to account service providers, including some outside the council. These bodies will be required to appear before the committee or provide information to the committee within 20 working days (in line with the freedom of Information Act deadline). One option available to SMC would be to recommend the Council establish a new Scrutiny Committee to deal specifically with issues involving external service providers. Consideration would need to be given to this as the White Paper progresses through its legislative phases. Alternatively, the delegated functions of existing scrutiny

committees could be revised to reflect these new powers with the expectation that relevant committees or sub-committees would pick up any reviews resulting from this power.

9. Furthermore, under this provision, a relevant public body must be informed of any recommendations made by a scrutiny committee and they will be required to respond to them. Their responses will be publicised and they will have a duty to co-operate and give due regard to the recommendations when exercising their functions. As with all recommendations made by scrutiny, these will be reviewed to ensure compliance.

10. Those public service providers covered by the duty to co-operate are:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Chief Officer of Police                | Fire & Rescue Authorities                    |
| Police Authority                       | Metropolitan Passenger Transport Authorities |
| Local Probation Boards                 | The Highways Agency                          |
| Youth Offending Teams                  | The Environment Agency                       |
| Primary Care Trusts                    | Natural England                              |
| NHS Foundation Trusts                  | Regional Development Agencies                |
| NHS Health Trusts                      | National Park Authorities                    |
| The Learning Skills Council in England | The Broads Authority                         |
| Jobcentre Plus                         | Joint Waste Disposal Authorities             |
| Health and Safety Executive            |  |

11. There are also new powers contained in the Police and Justice Bill which will allow scrutiny of community safety issues, the work of local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships, and the Police.

### **Options**

12. At this stage there are no options available to the Committee other than making comments on the proposals relating to scrutiny, to enable these to be addressed as part of a corporate response to the White Paper.

13. Work is currently ongoing on a corporate response to the White Paper. Initially, an officer group is coordinating the main issues for consideration in a report to the Council Management Team (currently scheduled for 24 January 2007). It is important that any views Members have on proposals for scrutiny contained in the White Paper, in response to this report, are fed into that process.

### **Corporate Priorities**

14. Fundamentally, the White Paper proposals on scrutiny should help to improve our overall organisational effectiveness by actively encouraging our partners and the public to engage with the scrutiny function. In specific reviews, individual corporate priorities will be met dependent on the subject of the topic under scrutiny.

## Implications

15. There are no known Financial, Equalities or ITT implications at this stage.

- **Human Resources (HR)**

It is expected that through wider public understanding of the White Paper proposals and the ensuing Act the number of topics registered for review may well increase. This will put some strain on the Scrutiny Services team to ensure each topic is dealt with in a thorough and timely manner. There is a vacant but frozen post within the Scrutiny Services structure which could be filled if a case could be proven that these new legislative powers were having a resource impact. Although, more registered topics does not necessarily mean more reviews, more process and consultative work will be required and the likelihood is that there will be some externally generated reviews.

Equally, of course, more work for officers means more work and areas of 'specialism' for Members. This is particularly significant for scrutiny Members given that the nature of scrutiny is such that reviews are Member led and the work ranges from familiarisation with new topics, partners/services to being involved in a wide range of information and learning gathering processes, as well as producing reports. As a part of the corporate response and reaction to the White Paper proposals, Members will, no doubt, wish to comment upon the impact on and role of scrutiny members.

- **Crime and Disorder**

The effects of the Police and Justice Bill in relation to scrutinising crime and disorder issues is not known at this stage. But it is expected that this could also affect the number of topics registered for review.

- **Legal**

Given that the proposals will require legislation, it is understood that the CCfA will, most likely, be introduced from Spring 2008.

## Risk Management

15. There are no risks associated with the recommendation made below.



## Recommendations

16. Members are asked to note and comment on the contents of the report.

**Reason:** To assist in the provision of a corporate response to the White Paper.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

Dawn Steel  
Democratic Services Manager  
Democratic Services  
Tel No. 01904 551030

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Suzan Hemmingway  
Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services

**Report Approved**



**Date** 12/01/2007

**Wards Affected: All**



**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## Background Papers:

Strong and Prosperous Communities – The local Government White Paper

## Annexes

**Annex A** – Flow chart showing how recently adopted working practices in Scrutiny Could be adapted to cover CCfA

### Community Calls For Action

