



Notice of meeting of

Scrutiny Management Committee

To: Councillors Galvin (Chair), Blanchard (Vice-Chair), Kirk, Moore, Simpson-Laing, Scott, Taylor and R Watson

Date: Monday, 22 October 2007

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: The 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** (Pages 3 - 4)

To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2007.

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 19 September 2007 at 5 pm.

4. Update on Implementation of Recommendations of Previous Scrutiny Reviews (Pages 5 - 8)

This report provides Members with an update on the implementation of recommendations made as a result of a scrutiny review of Takeaways: Powers of Enforcement, completed in October 2005.

Note: Annex A to the above report was published on 19 October.

5. Update on Work of Health Scrutiny Committee (Pages 9 - 12)

This report introduces an update report from Cllr Tina Funnell as Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee, on the activities and work to date of the Committee.

6. Drainage in York - Feasibility Study (Pages 13 - 20)

This report presents the feasibility study for the proposed new scrutiny topic on drainage in York and seeks a decision on whether to proceed with a scrutiny review.

7. Urgent Business - Traffic Congestion Ad-hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee: Co-option (Pages 21 - 24)

The Chair has agreed to consider under this item a report which requests Members to consider formally co-opting Matthew Page, a lecturer at the Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, onto the Traffic Congestion Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Note: The above report was published on 19 October.

Democracy Officer:

Name: Simon Copley

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551078
- E-mail – simon.copley@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.

This page is intentionally left blank

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোঅবী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Executive to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (38 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Advisory Panel (EMAP)) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

MEETING	SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
DATE	17 SEPTEMBER 2007
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS GALVIN (CHAIR), GALVIN (CHAIR), SIMPSON-LAING, SCOTT, TAYLOR, R WATSON, HYMAN (AS SUBSTITUTE FOR MOORE) AND HOLVEY (AS SUBSTITUTE FOR KIRK)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS BLANCHARD, KIRK AND MOORE
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLOR WATT FOR MINUTE NO. 20 BELOW

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

17. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 23 July 2007 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

18. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chair reported that no registrations to speak at the meeting had been made under the Public Participation Scheme.

19. LOOKING AHEAD AT SCRUTINY IN YORK AND THE ROLE OF SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Members considered a report outlining the potential for refocusing the role of Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC) within the Council, in order to enable it set its own annual objectives and scrutiny topics. Members were advised that any change to the working practices of SMC would require constitutional amendment and, as such, would initially need to be reported to Audit & Governance Committee.

A full discussion was held on the proposals and in general, Members felt that the role and operation of SMC should continue as present and the report and consideration of the issues should be deferred for 6 months to enable the position to be reviewed, monitored and assessed.

RESOLVED: That the report be deferred for 6 months to enable the existing role of SMC to be sufficiently monitored and reviewed if necessary.

20. PROPOSED SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SALE OF THE BARBICAN AND SWIMMING FACILITIES IN YORK

Members reconsidered the feasibility report on the above proposed topic registered by Councillor Watt, who had attended the meeting to clarify his purpose in submitting the topic for potential review.

A full discussion on the proposed topic took place and Members sought Cllr Watt's views on their revised suggestions for reviewing the topic he had registered.

Members generally were agreed that a review of the arrangements surrounding the sale of the Barbican site would be useful with a view to learning some key lessons for the future in relation to proposals of a similar nature/scope. They did not, however, believe it would be beneficial to incorporate any review of swimming provision, given that this work was effectively being undertaken through a commissioned 'review' report to the Executive. Cllr Watt agreed to revise his topic submission. As such the following objectives for review were agreed by SMC:

- To understand why the contract in relation to the sale of the Barbican site was not signed, sealed and delivered until May 2003;
- To understand the public consultation processes which took place and the resulting decisions;
- To understand the changes in land values with a view to establishing whether best value was actually achieved in this case; and
- To assess whether decisions taken in relation to the sale resulted in a loss of capital to the Council.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the above objectives be agreed as a potential remit for scrutinising the arrangements for the sale of the Barbican site, as proposed by Councillor Watt; and
- (ii) That an Ad-Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee be established on a 2:2:1 basis with a Fishergate Ward Councillor being co-opted on to the Sub-Committee and Councillor Looker being invited to Chair.

Cllr Galvin, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 6.35 pm].



Scrutiny Management Committee

22 October 2007

Report of the Head of Civic Democratic & Legal Services

Update on Implementation of Recommendations of Previous Scrutiny Reviews

Summary

1. This report provides Members with an update on the implementation of recommendations made as a result of a scrutiny review of Takeaways: Powers of Enforcement, completed in October 2005.

Background

2. At a previous meeting of Scrutiny Management Committee, Members requested an update on the implementation of the recommendations made as a result of all completed scrutiny reviews since 2004 which were subsequently approved by the Executive. In February 2006 Members considered a report which highlighted those reviews and a decision was taken to write off any where full implementation had occurred. Members then requested that each of the outstanding reviews be looked at in detail with the relevant officers in attendance.
3. In July 2007, following a request from Members of the ad-hoc scrutiny committee set up to look at 'Traffic Congestion in York', SMC looked in detail at an update relating to the Cycling Policy and Provision of Facilities' review and were able to write off all but one of the recommendations as completed.
4. Also, Members agreed the order in which the remaining reviews would be looked at in detail:

Take-Aways; Powers of Enforcement – completed October 2005

Recycling & Re-use – completed September 2006

Reducing Carbon Emissions – completed September 2006

Guidance for Sustainable Development – completed October 2006

Highways Maintenance & PFI (Part A) – completed April 2007

Home to School Transport – completed April 2007

Consultation

5. The Assistant Director of Planning & Sustainable Development has agreed to provide an update on the review of Take-Aways; Powers of Enforcement and this will be circulated to Members, prior to this meeting (Annex A to follow).

Options

6. Members may decide to sign off those individual recommendations where implementation has been completed, and can:
 - a. request further updates to clarify any outstanding recommendations or;
 - b. agree to receive no further updates on this review

Corporate Priorities

7. This process of monitoring the implementation of approved recommendations will contribute to improving our organisational effectiveness.

Implications

8. There are no known Financial, Human Resources, Equalities, Legal, ITT or Other implications connected to this report”.

Risk Management

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

Recommendations

10. Members are asked to note the contents of this report and agree which of the recommendations can be written off as fully implemented.

Reason: To raise awareness of those recommendations which have still to be implemented.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Services
01904 552063

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Colin Langley
Acting Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services
01904 552001

Report Approved



Date 13 July 2007

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes

Annex A (to follow)– Update on implementation of agreed recommendations from Takeaways: Powers of Enforcement Scrutiny Review

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendations as approved by the Executive on 6 December 2005	Update on Implementation of Recommendations as at September 2007
Environmental & Sustainability Scrutiny Board - Take-Aways; Powers of Enforcement (Review Completed October 2005)	1	The Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Board would welcome the positive contribution that the success of the penalty notice support bid would make to addressing these issues.	I have no information on this
	2	A multi-agency access database containing details about all individual take-away properties should be created. Such details should be in the form of notes on disturbance, environmental health issues, actions taken to ensure compliance etc and updated by licensing, planning, environmental health and the community police as appropriate. This should be maintained to ensure that it remains current	The UNIFORM system provides information, including any conditions imposed on take-aways granted planning permission since 1996. Subject to available IT licences this information is available to other Council departments. Limited information on Planning Enforcement cases is also available. Licensing and Environmental Health do not use the UNIFORM system and currently their FLARE system cannot 'talk' to UNIFORM and share information. The PSO G7 - Use of technology to integrate planning, regulation and licensing functions project is currently working towards a solution.
	3	Under Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 this information could, and should, be shared with North Yorkshire Police. This would allow Police Officers to assist in the collecting of evidence about late-night activities. The Environment and Sustainability Scrutiny Board would welcome the positive contribution that the success of the IT bid would make to addressing these issues.	I have no information on this.
	4	That activities be coordinated between all relevant City of York Council Departments (including Street Environment, Environmental Protection Unit, Planning Enforcement and Licensing Officers); especially at the point of determining which enforcement regime would be most effective. Working practices need to be agreed and joint training sessions considered where relevant, to avoid duplication or unwitting interference in each other's cases.	Co-ordination does take place in relation to Enforcement matters.Noise issues in relation to Elvington airfield is good example where officers from Planning and EPU with legal advice determined a site specific approach to enforcement having regard to the different powers available to CYC.Our working relationship with other Directorates is informal. Officers speak to each other, share information and apportion work depending on their statutory function.

Board and Topic	Rec No.	Recommendations as approved by SMC on 23 October 2005	Update on Implementation of Recommendations as of September 2007
Environmental & Sustainability Scrutiny Board - Take-Aways; Powers of Enforcement (Review Completed October 2005)	5	That the Assistant Director in responsible for the Planning and Enforcement Team be instructed to review risk assessments carried out for all aspects of the officer's duties and to thereafter produce appropriate working practice agreements in consultation with the appropriate Officer In Human Resources.	Risk assessments have been carried out and published. Out of hours protocol 'to be finalised'. Late night visits are always carried out by officers in pairs and using a Council vehicle where appropriate.
	6	An official vehicle should be available during the day, or close parking provided for the on-call officer's personal vehicle. Council owned transport should be provided if the officer is working a night shift. Both marked and unmarked vehicles should be available, as required; especially for out of hours working.	Both "marked" and "unmarked" pool cars are available during the day and in the evening, the latter subject to pre-booking. Planning Enforcement officers have permits valid for most Council owned car parks.
	7	That Planning Enforcement Officers be enabled to process their own prosecutions, that at least one Planning Enforcement Officer to undergo formal Court Training in order to support this.	PEOs do not process their own prosecutions. At least one enforcement officer has undergone Court Training.
	8	That an investigation should be undertaken to assess which other officers are able to supplement the Planning Enforcement team.	Admin support.
	9	Officers should be equipped with the necessary tools to undertake their work. The present level of equipment between departments is variable. Equipment should be assessed to meet the needs of the work and ensure equality of access between equivalent areas of work	PEOs are issued with Personal Protective Equipment , cameras, measuring equipment, mobile phones etc as required.

Comment from Scrutiny Management Committee as of 23 July 2007:

The implementation of these recommendations is not complete therefore this review cannot be signed off. Assistant Director of Planning & Sustainable Development to attend next meeting of SMC in September 2007 to present update and answer any questions arising



Scrutiny Management Committee

22 October 2007

Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Update on Work of Health Scrutiny Committee

Summary

1. This report introduces an update report from Cllr Tina Funnell as Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee, on the activities and work to date of the Committee.

Background

2. The Health Scrutiny Committee was formed in May 2006 to carry out the statutory health scrutiny function which was previously under the remit of the Social Services and Health Scrutiny Board.
3. Cllr Tina Funnell will update members on:
 - a. A work planning event in which members learned about the plans and priorities of health partners
 - b. A community consultation event in which members listened to the concerns of patient and community groups
 - c. Planned work for the remainder of the municipal year
 - d. Other relevant issues connected with the health of the citizens of York.
4. The programme of work for the remainder of the year is likely to include some or all of the following:
 - a. Contributing to the "Annual Health Check" – the assessment process for NHS Trusts
 - b. Working with City of York Council Officers who are responsible for procuring the host organisation for the new Local Involvement Network (LINK)
 - c. Alternatives to in-patient hospital treatment, particularly in relation to the care and management of one or more long-term conditions.

- d. The work of North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust's (NYYPCT) Exceptions Panel
- e. Updates on issues investigated by the former Health Scrutiny Committee, i.e. dental services in York and the financial status of NYYPCT.

Consultation

- 5. Members working in health scrutiny are in close and frequent consultation with colleagues from the health trusts and other organisations which impact on the healthcare of people in York as well as community representatives.

Options

- 6. Members may receive this report and ask any relevant questions of the Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee. They can decide the frequency of future reports to SMC.

Analysis

- 7. Members need to consider the future workload of the committee when requesting frequent updates from any source.

Corporate Values

- 8. This report is relevant to the Corporate Value of encouraging improvement in everything we do.

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 receive the report on the progress of the Health Scrutiny Committee and decide on the frequency of future updates.

Reason: to inform Scrutiny Management Committee of the work and progress of other Scrutiny Committees.

Contact details:

Author:

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

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Colin Langley
Acting Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

Report Approved



Date 12.10.07

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

None

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Management Committee

22 October 2007

Drainage in York– Feasibility Study

Summary

1. In September 2007 Cllr Richard Moore registered a proposed new scrutiny topic on the subject of drainage in York. A copy of the topic registration form is enclosed at Annex A.

Criteria

2. **Public Interest** – there was media interest after the heavy rain in June 2007, but not the concentrated reporting that followed serious flooding in other parts of Yorkshire. Members must consider whether or not there is still strong public interest in the subject.
3. **Corporate Priorities for Improvement** -This topic does not obviously fit with any of the Corporate Priorities for Improvement – members need to consider what their view is on this.
4. **National, local or regional significance** – incidences of flooding, if severe, could be considered to be of local and regional significance.
5. **Under performance or service dissatisfaction** – after the heavy rains of 25 June there were 46 reports of flooding on the highway, 42 reports of blocked gullies, 12 cases of sandbags being required, 13 reports of flooding almost entering properties and 5 reports of flooding entering properties. There were also reports from seven elected members of incidences of flooding or blocked drains from residents in their wards.
6. **Level of risk** – so far as is known there are no risks which could be alleviated by the investigation of this topic,
7. **Service efficiency** –so far as is known there are no aspects of service efficiency which would benefit from this review being carried out.

Consultation

Relevant Member Consultation

8. Political group leaders and relevant officers were asked to comment on the feasibility of carrying out this scrutiny review.
9. The Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group had not responded at the time of writing.
10. The Leader of Labour Group wants to register his sympathy with York residents who have suffered as a result of the flooding, but does have concerns that this scrutiny topic can achieve its objectives. His main concerns are:
 - a. Much of the Scrutiny involves organisations which CYC have no ability to question or influence. They may not co-operate with us productively or even not at all.
 - b. The information he has indicates that the flooding was of such a nature that no matter how good the drainage was it could not have been sufficient to meet the demands that were called upon it on this occasion.
 - c. The proposed scrutiny does not take matters much further than the motion approved at Council on 4 October (see below).
11. The Leader of the Conservative Group is of the opinion that the motion agreed at Council (see below) on 4 October 2007, and the programme of work being carried out by the Drainage Team, already commits CYC to the issues requested in this scrutiny topic registration. There is therefore no requirement for a scrutiny review to be commissioned.
12. The Leader of the Green Group, Cllr Andy d'Agorne, welcomes this proposal.
13. If any further responses are received from the Leaders these will be reported at the meeting.

Relevant Officer/External Consultation

14. The supporting Scrutiny Officer has held discussions with the Head of Engineering Consultancy and his colleagues in City Strategy.
15. They report that the request in this topic registration for an examination of the events of June 2007 is already taking place. In June 2007 the rainfall was

above the design criteria for the sewerage system – it was recorded as the wettest June on record. In many of the weather stations in Yorkshire the rain that fell in June this year was between 300 and 450 per cent of the average rainfall that had fallen in the last 30 years.

16. The exceptionally heavy rain of 24-25 June fell onto ground that was already exceptionally wet. This would affect the ability of the ground to absorb the water and mean more was attempting to enter the sewerage system.
17. This heavy rainfall would result in the potential for flash floods as the amount of water was beyond the design capacity of sewers, becks and watercourses.
18. The Scrutiny topic registration form asks whether the sewers in York are adequate to meet expected increases in demand. Yorkshire Water are responsible for the construction of sewers, and any increase in size would need revised government standards to be produced and then implemented and the financing of this to be agreed.
19. The issue of inter-agency communications and working practices is acknowledged by the Environment Agency as lacking in cohesion. This is as a result of the structure of the water industry which was defined in the deregulation programme several years ago.
20. The Drainage team are, however, in ongoing discussions with all other relevant agencies. They are developing a programme of co-ordinated cleaning of Yorkshire Water's sewers and City of York Council's roads and gullies. There is a good record of joint working between the agencies and the Flood Defence Plan now in force is a result of this joint working.
21. The Drainage team do acknowledge that there may be a case for the education and informing of residents. The Environment Agency do hold a Flood Awareness Week which is connected with river flooding, but there could be a case for informing people about what to do in adverse weather conditions. Decisions would need to be made by the Executive about funding a team from Neighbourhood Services to attend emergency flash flood sites to pump and sandbag.
22. Ray Chaplin, Head of Engineering Consultancy, has agreed to attend this meeting to clarify any queries Members may have about this proposed topic.
23. Members will also be aware that the following motion was approved at Full Council on 4 October 2007:

“Council notes with concern the flooding caused around York this summer as a result of blocked gullies and the drainage systems being unable to cope with the level of rainfall. Council recognises that it has a duty to ensure that all the gullies in the City work to their maximum capacity. This should include not being blocked with detritus or not maintained due to roads or sewers also needing maintenance.

Council firstly calls on CYC Officers to take an urgent review of the Gully Cleaning process in the City and report to Councillors all gullies which are damaged or blocked and need urgent work undertaken. Secondly, that Officers bring forward a scheme to undertake a maintenance program to ensure the situation is not repeated again.

Council calls for the government to introduce a statutory duty on the private water companies to review and upgrade drainage in line with the increased usage of modern life and to investigate future capacity level changes and environmental security of infrastructure, including pumping stations, which may result from climate change.”

Conduct of Review

24. This scrutiny topic registration is requesting that affected residents give evidence as to the problems they experienced and the response they received. It is understood from the Drainage and Highways Infrastructure teams that the location and extent of the problems in June are already well documented.
25. There is also a request for interviews with external agencies as to their responses. Outside organisations cannot be obliged to participate in Scrutiny reviews, however it is understood that ongoing discussions are already taking place with City of York Council officers.
26. The request for seamless working practices within the network is impracticable because of the unpredictability of the events which lead to the drains being full to over-capacity.
27. The request to examine the review being undertaken by CYC’s Drainage team acknowledges that this is taking place, and an additional review may involve a duplication of effort.

Implications

28. The Assistant Director for City Development and Transport is of the opinion that if this scrutiny is to go ahead it will require a manager to support the review over a period of at least 3 months at 50% of his time. The impact of that is work on the subsidised bus and dial and ride contracts will cease and delay occur in delivering these - this will result in criticism for the Council. His opinion is that this scrutiny is premature given that we are currently assembling

an officer review of the events to be submitted to Neighbourhood Services EMAP in due course.

Risk Management

- 29. In compliance with the Council’s risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

Conclusion

- 30. On balance, based on the information and evidence gathered in this feasibility report, it is recommended that a review be not proceeded with at the present time. However, if members wish to proceed it would be advisable to focus on:

Whether there is a need for education of residents as to what measures and precautions should be taken by householders in adverse weather situations, if these are possible, practical or advisable.

Recommendation

- 31. That the review be not proceeded with at the present time given the potential duplication of resources referred to in paragraph 27 above and the prematurity of any review pending the findings emerging from the existing review referred to in paragraph 28.

Contact Details

Author:

Barbara Boyce
Scrutiny Officer

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Colin Langley
Acting Head of Legal, Civic and Democratic Services

**Feasibility Study
Approved**



Date 12.10.07

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

None

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes:

Annex A – Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

This page is intentionally left blank



Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

Fields marked with an asterisk * are required.

* Proposed topic: **Review of York's flood defence protocols**

* Councillor registering the topic **Councillor Richard Moore**

Please complete this section as thoroughly as you can. The information provided will help Scrutiny Officers and Scrutiny Members to assess the following key elements to the success of any scrutiny review:

How a review should best be undertaken given the subject

Who needs to be involved

What should be looked at

By when it should be achieved; and

Why we are doing it ?

Please describe how the proposed topic fits with 3 of the eligibility criteria attached.

	Policy Development & Review		Service Improvement & Delivery		Accountability of Executive Decisions	
	Yes?		Yes?		Yes?	
Public Interest (ie. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under Performance / Service Dissatisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In keeping with corporate priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level of Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* *Set out briefly the purpose of any scrutiny review of your proposed topic. What do you think it should achieve?*

Work was undertaken by the various agencies after the flood of November 2000. This should have ensured the safety of the residents in York. Unfortunately many issues are

now arising which have the potential to seriously affect the quality of the response in a flood situation. Flooding is the major natural threat to the economic welfare of the city, and to the peace of mind of residents living in threatened areas. The scrutiny should be given assurance to those who live in threatened areas that any response is appropriate and expeditious.

* Please explain briefly what you think any scrutiny review of your proposed topic should cover.

The scrutiny would focus on the procedures and protocols in place, and the ability of the agencies to respond appropriately. It would seek to ensure that the agencies are aware of developments in the last six years, and have amended their flood plans accordingly. It would also consider the level of resource available, especially if the flooding was as great as in November 2000, when equipment was unavailable due to needs of other areas of the county.

** Please indicate which other Councils, partners or external services could, in your opinion, participate in the review, saying why.*

All agencies who are resources to "Silver Command" in an event, in particular City of York Council, the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Water.

** Explain briefly how, in your opinion, such a review might be most efficiently undertaken?*

The Panel could start with the recommendations of the Flood Scrutiny Panel (with update reports) as determine that the recommendations have been actioned. The Panel could consider the improvements made to defences in the last six years and attempt to ascertain whether these are adequate. The Panel could call agencies to give witness to the Panel about the works undertaken, especially in the critical areas (e.g. communication) to improve responses. Most importantly the Panel could ascertain whether the agencies are working to current measures or have factored for increased levels of rain etc., in accordance with the predictions of climate change.

Estimate the timescale for completion.

- 1-3 months
- 3-6 months
- 6-9 months

Support documents or other useful information



Scrutiny Management Committee

22 October 2007

Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

**URGENT BUSINESS - TRAFFIC CONGESTION AD HOC SCRUTINY
SUB-COMMITTEE – CO-OPTION****Summary**

1. This report requests Members to consider formally co-opting Matthew Page, a lecturer at the Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, onto the Traffic Congestion Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
2. Councillor Galvin, the Chair of Scrutiny Management Committee, has agreed to accept this item on to the published agenda under urgent business as it has been outstanding for some time and Mr Page requires clarity as to his role and position with regard to his work with the Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Background

3. Mr Page has been attending recent meetings of the Sub-Committee in an advisory capacity to offer his independent technical advice and the position needs formally regularising to establish him as a non-voting co-opted Member with the same entitlements as the other co-opted Member already sitting on the Sub-Committee.
4. Constitutionally, Scrutiny Management Committee, has the power to make appointments to its established Scrutiny Sub-Committees.
5. Mr Page, if appointed as a non-voting co-optee, will be eligible to claim travel and subsistence expenses for any meetings he attends and will of course, contribute, through his advice and expertise, to the work and final report of the Sub-Committee.

Consultation

6. Members of the Traffic Congestion Sub-Committee are pleased to be able to benefit from the expertise of Mr Page and would welcome his formal co-option. It is in keeping with the spirit of scrutiny reviews being informed by relevant 'experts'.

Options

7. Members can either approve or reject the proposal to co-opt Mr Page in a non-voting capacity for the remainder of the existing review.

Analysis

8. The benefits of inviting Mr Page to become a formal co-opted Member are considerable. His expertise and external knowledge of Local Transport Plans 1 & 2 are essential to the progress of this review.

Corporate Improvements

9. Although not directly relevant to the current identified corporate improvements, it would be beneficial to the Council and this particular scrutiny to maximise the technical knowledge and expertise available to it.

Implications

10. There are no known financial, HR, legal, crime & disorder or other implications associated with this report or the recommendation below.

Risk Management

11. There are no risk management implications in relation to this matter.

Recommendations

12. That Members consider formally appointing Matthew Page as a non-voting co-opted Member for the duration of the Traffic Congestion Ad Hoc Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
13. Reason: In keeping with other existing co-option practices.

Contact Details

Author:
Dawn Steel
Democratic/Scrutiny Services
Manager
Tel; 01904-551030

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Colin Langley
Interim Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal
services
01904 551004

Report Approved



Date 18/10/07

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

N/A

Wards Affected: All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

None

Annexes

None

This page is intentionally left blank