



## Notice of a public meeting of

### Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee

- To:** Councillors Levene (Chair), Galvin (Vice-Chair), D'Agorne, Crisp, Fenton, Gates, Lisle, Reid and Williams
- Date:** Monday, 25 July 2016
- Time:** At the conclusion of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee (Call-In) meeting but no sooner than 6.00 pm
- Venue:** The Thornton Room - Ground Floor, West Offices (G039)

### AGENDA

#### 1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

#### 2. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2016.

#### 3. **Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is

**5.00pm on Friday 22 July 2016.** Members of the public can speak on agenda items or matters within the remit of the Committee.

To register to speak please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of the agenda.

### **Filming, Recording or Webcasting Meetings**

Please note this meeting may be filmed and webcast or audio recorded and that includes any registered public speakers, who have given their permission. The broadcast can be viewed at <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts> or, if sound recorded, this will be uploaded onto the Council's website following the meeting.

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This includes the use of social media reporting, i.e. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officer (whose contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council's protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at [https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/6453/protocol\\_for\\_webcasting\\_filming\\_and\\_recording\\_council\\_meetingspdf](https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/6453/protocol_for_webcasting_filming_and_recording_council_meetingspdf)

#### **4. Attendance of the Executive Member for Finance and Performance (Pages 9 - 14)**

The Executive Member for Finance and Performance has been invited to attend the meeting to outline the priorities and challenges for 2016-2017 in his portfolio.

#### **5. Schedule of Petitions (Pages 15 - 24)**

This report provides the committee 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. Members are asked to consider the petitions received and actions reported, and agree an appropriate course of action in each case.

**6. 2015-16 Draft Outturn Report (Pages 25 - 28)**

This report provides a year end analysis for the services falling under the responsibility of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee, which includes all corporate, strategic and business services.

**7. Overview Report on Electoral Organisation (Pages 29 - 42)**

This report presents Members with an overview of the electoral organisation in York and issues needed to be considered by the elections team.

**8. Procurement Update Report (Pages 43 - 48)**

This report sets out a range of performance information for procurement. The report also includes comparative information from other councils, as requested by the committee at their meeting in January 2016.

**9. Future Ways of Working in Scrutiny (Pages 49 - 96)**

This report was originally presented to Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee in March 2016 but has recently been updated in response to the recent announcement of forthcoming changing to Directorates. It presents options for the revision of the scrutiny committee remits taking account of national best practice etc, and Members are asked to agree which option they would like to propose to Council.

**10. Work Plan 2016-17 (Pages 97 - 98)**

Members are asked to give consideration to the committee's work plan for 2016-17.

**11. Any Other Business**

Any other business which the Chair decides is urgent.

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jayne Carr

Contact Details:

Telephone – (01904) 552030

Email – [jayne.carr@york.gov.uk](mailto:jayne.carr@york.gov.uk)

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

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

**This information can be provided in your own language.**

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

 (01904) 551550

City Of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

Meeting	Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee
Date	13 June 2016
Present	Councillors Levene (Chair), Fenton, Galvin (Vice-Chair) - items 1 to 6, Crisp, Gates, Lisle, Reid, Williams and D'Agorne

---

## Part A - Matters Dealt with Under Delegated Powers

### 1. 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. Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 (Potential Topics for Review this Municipal Year), as his employer was one of the organisations involved in One Planet York.

### 2. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2016 be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair subject to the wording "*That appropriate officers report to the Executive analysing the potential impact of TTIP upon the Council and its services, with a view to...*" being deleted from minute 56 and 58.

### 3. Public Participation

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

#### 4. Attendance of Leader and Deputy Leader

The Leader and Deputy Leader had been invited to attend the meeting to outline their priorities and challenges for 2016-2017. Copies of a paper detailing progress on the 12 Point Policy Plan had been circulated and are available with the online agenda papers for the meeting.

Discussion took place on the following issues:

- The plans that were in place to share good practice in respect of the delegation of ward funding. A training event was planned to consider issues in respect of area based work. Members suggested that it would be helpful for more information and guidance to be issued to Members to support them in making informed decisions as to how ward funding could be spent most effectively.
- The Leader and Deputy Leader were questioned regarding the arrangements that were in place to secure the future of Yearsley Pool as part of the Community Stadium contract and as to how this would be funded within the business case. Members were informed that contract negotiations with GLL were ongoing but that more detailed information regarding the inclusion of Yearsley Pool within the contract and the funding arrangements could be circulated to Members following the meeting.
- Clarification was sought as to the timescale for the review of senior management. The Leader and Deputy Leader stated that the new Chief Executive would be involved in the process and that the top tier review should be completed within eight weeks. It was intended that the overall review would be completed within six months. In response to concerns expressed by some Members regarding delays in carrying out the review, the Leader and Deputy Leader outlined some of the work that had already taken place, including making permanent some Director posts. A paper was due to be considered at the July meeting of the Executive.
- Members queried the decision to reduce bus subsidies in light of the stated priority to support rural bus services and services in communities where they were needed. The Leader and Deputy Leader stated that this issue had been subject to pre-decision scrutiny and that a report was due to be considered by the Executive in June. Many of the routes concerned were very rarely used and a targeted approach had been adopted after consultation had been carried out.

- The Leader and Deputy Leader were questioned regarding a delay in putting in place an action plan following the LGA Peer Review. They stated that the action plan was due to be considered by the Executive in July and would then be presented to Full Council in October. The Leader and Deputy Leader commented that they did not believe that the delay had been prejudicial and that the LGA had concurred that it would not have been appropriate for the action plan to have been presented at the Annual Council meeting in May.
- Members questioned why, in respect of the Guildhall project, the decision had been taken to no longer develop this as a digital media arts centre. The Leader and Deputy Leader stated that they favoured a more commercial approach and did not feel it appropriate to subsidise a particular sector. They drew attention to other options that would also be available to businesses, including York Central. The aim was to attract high value jobs to the city. At the request of Members of the Committee, the Leader and Deputy Leader agreed to circulate information on the work that had been carried out to attract digital arts media jobs to the city.

Referring to the fact that the Executive was due to make a number of decisions arising from the 12 point policy plan in June and July, Members suggested that it may be appropriate for the Leader and Deputy Leader to give a further report back to the Committee after that time. The Leader and Deputy Leader confirmed that they would be willing to do so. They were thanked for their attendance at the meeting.

Resolved: That the update from the Leader and Deputy Leader be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the committee is kept updated on progress in implementing the 12 Point Policy Plan.

## **5. Schedule of Petitions**

Members noted that the information presented in this report had been considered at the last meeting. An updated report would be presented at the next meeting.

## 6. Pre-Decision Report - Guildhall Project

Members considered a report which provided an update on progress on the development of the Guildhall complex as a business club/serviced office venue, with supporting commercial development on the riverside. The report was presented to allow for pre-decision scrutiny ahead of a report being presented to July's Executive seeking approval to proceed with project delivery.

A presentation was given on the project *[a copy of the presentation has been attached to the online agenda papers for the meeting]*.

Members questioned officers about details of the design, including the measures that would be in place to address issues in respect of flooding and the arrangements for servicing the businesses. Officers also gave details of the pre-application discussions that had taken place with Historic England regarding the plans.

Officers were asked about the financial implications arising from the delays in the project. They agreed to circulate further information on this matter following the meeting.<sup>1</sup>

Members also questioned officers about the reasons why the provision would no longer focus on the digital media sector. Officers stated that the rental yields had been calculated on market factors irrespective of the type of business. The accommodation could still meet the requirements of the digital media sector as well as other businesses.

Officers responded to Members' questions regarding the arrangements that would be in place to ensure that best value would be achieved, including the tendering process.

Members raised the following issues:

- Whilst some concerns were expressed regarding the delays that had arisen in progressing the project, Members were generally pleased with the current position.
- There was general support for the design plans however some Members were very concerned at the proposed demolition of the Mansion House garages and that no alternative vehicle parking for the Mansion House would be



in place. They commented on the difficulties that this would cause the Lord Mayor in carrying out their duties.

- Some Members commented that they believed that there had been a lost opportunity to focus on the digital media sector, as this had been a unique selling point of the project.
- Members did not feel that they had had sufficient time to consider the business case in order to comment on this aspect of the project.

Resolved: That the Executive be requested to take into account the comments raised by Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee when considering the report at their meeting in July.

Reason: In accordance with pre-decision scrutiny arrangements.

Action Required

1. Circulate requested information

TC

**7. Ideas for Potential Topics for Review in this Municipal Year including potential review of elements of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) motion to support the work of One Planet York**

Members were asked to put forward suggestions for potential topics for review in this municipal review. They were also asked to consider a potential review of elements of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) motion to support the work of One Planet York.

Members agreed that, rather than focus solely on one aspect of One Planet York, for example the Local Food Strategy, it may be worthwhile to carry out a scrutiny review focussed on putting in place a framework to help achieve the objectives of the strategy.

Referring to discussions that had taken place at the previous meeting, Members agreed that the Committee could play a useful role in helping to achieve the Council's target of 70% take up of digital services across three years for those customers with internet access. It was agreed that the E-Democracy Task Group would reconvene to support the work of officers during the roll-out of online services.

Members suggested that consideration should also be given to carrying out a scrutiny review on issues arising from the LGA Peer Review, including monitoring the implementation of the recommendations arising from the most recent review, and determining whether there were any recurring issues.

- Resolved: (i) That scoping reports be presented on the following topics:
- One Planet York
  - The implementation of the recommendations arising from the LGA Peer Review (to include contextual information in respect of the previous reviews that had been carried out to determine whether there were any recurring issues).
- (ii) That the E-Democracy Task Group, comprising of Councillor Lisle, Councillor Fenton, Councillor Gates and Councillor Williams, work with officers to help achieve the take-up target for online services.

Reason: In accordance with agreed scrutiny protocols and procedures.

## **8. Work Plan 2016-17**

Members gave consideration to the Committee's draft work plan for 2016-17.

- Resolved: That the work plan for 2016-17 be approved subject to the following additions:
- Scoping report on One Planet York (July or September meeting)
  - Scoping report on LGA Peer Review (July or September meeting)
  - Attendance of Executive Leader and Deputy Leader to provide an update on the progress in implementing the 12 Point Policy Plan (September meeting)

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

## Part B - Matters Referred to Council

### 9. Draft Annual Scrutiny Report 2015-16

Members gave consideration to the draft Annual Scrutiny Report 2015-16, prior to the report being presented to Full Council in July 2016.

It was noted that paragraph 11 should be amended to read "... the Task group was reformed in June **2015**".

Recommended: That the Annual Scrutiny Report for the period June 2015 to May 2016 be approved subject to paragraph 11 being amended to read "*...the Task Group was reformed in June **2015***".

Reason: To ensure that Council receives an Annual Scrutiny Report in accordance with Constitutional requirements.

Councillor D Levene, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.45 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee**

25 July 2016

### **Report of the Executive Member for Finance & Performance**

#### **Finance**

Financial management remains strong and last year there was an under-spend of over £800,000. The Executive recognise the range of future challenges and prudently set most of this aside into the Council's contingency.

We set the budget in February and we were able to invest significantly in priority areas, with a focus on frontline services. In particular the budget saw the largest investment in recent times in looked after children, recognising our responsibilities in this area. We also addressed unachieved budget savings from the previous administration.

The budget is based on a four year time frame so we can plan effectively as the council changes. Our capital programme made a number of key investments in transport and housing. Our reserves remain at reasonable levels, and our long term plans are prudent and maintain investment in key frontline services.

The Statement of Accounts was again completed on time, and in view of the requirement to complete this 1 month earlier next year, was completed earlier than any previous years.

Looking ahead challenges continue to be dealing with reduced grants and increased costs (particularly in relation to adult care/health sector). Our financial planning process is designed to deal with these challenges effectively, and as part of this we set out our 4 year efficiency plan recently to the Executive, as part of the Government's offer to fix future year settlements.

#### **Procurement**

We have increased the percentage of Council spend directly with SMEs from 53% to 56% and increased the amount the Council spends within the local economy, with £52.9m being spent with suppliers in a YO postcode (increased from £49.2m in 2014/15).

The procurement function has helped drive out approximately £2m of savings across the Council.

We have delivered £210k of staffing savings directly from within the finance and procurement teams.

We have also reviewed the Contract Procedure Rules to strengthen controls in place and encourage use of local suppliers and smaller businesses where possible.

A comprehensive training programme is being developed to embed awareness of the rules across the organisation.

Improved visibility of spend across the organisation so that 50% of spend is now sighted by the procurement team (increased from 18% in 2012/13). It is important this trend continues.

The team have held numerous “Meet the Buyer” and other supplier engagement events. This early engagement with the supply chain has delivered improved outcomes and reduced the risk of a failed procurement.

We have developed strong working relationships with both the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Small Business to try and encourage local suppliers and SMEs to bid for Council contracts.

Embedding procurement compliance across the organisation will continue to be developed and we will review areas where controls and checks could be strengthened, whilst recognised services need sufficient flexibility to operate effectively.

### **Customer Services**

The 2015/16 year saw considerable improvement in Customer Service performance. This was across all channels:

Channel	2014/15	2015/16	Imp
Phone – Service Level (80% of calls in 20 seconds)	45.3%	66.5%	21%
Phone – Calls Answered	77.9%	91.06%	13%
Phone – Customer Satisfaction	89.98%	91.29%	1%
Face to Face – Customer Satisfaction	79.26%	92.34%	13%

The improvement across 15/16 saw a consistent service level target of 80% been achieved consistently by quarter 4 along with the higher customer satisfaction level.

## **Revenues**

The Council continues to collect above both Unitary and National average collection rates for both Council Tax and NNDR the outturn figures for 2015/16 were:

CT: 97.5% (14/15 97.5%)

NNDR: 98.4% (14/15 98.2%)

In addition the Housing Benefit team were finalists in the Innovation category for the Municipal Journal Awards for their Customer Insight work which has now been adopted by the DWP and shared with other LA's, although they did not win they were Highly Commended.

Overall 2015/16 has seen substantial improvement in customer services including an increase in the number of compliments the service is now receiving. Revenues continues to be a high performing collection service for all local tax and Housing Benefits now outperforms all other local Unitary LA's other than East Riding .

## **2016/17**

The improvement in Customer Services performance has carried forward into 2016/17:

Service level at end of Quarter 1: 76%

Calls Answered: 95%

Customer satisfaction: 92%

Revenue performance remains in line with last year for both NNDR and Council Tax with CTS collection been a little above last year at this point possibly reflecting the reduction passed on at budget.

The key challenges this year include delivering the new CRM, My Account and Digital Platforms for York residents. This will fundamentally change the way that residents do business with the council in the future.

There is also consultation work been undertaken with DCLG with regard to how business rates may work once they are 100% localised. This also includes involves colleagues in both Accountancy and Policy. This also includes ongoing consultation with both VOA and Business on revising the problematic appeals process.

## **Assets and projects**

### York Central

Significant progress on York Central to form a partnership: secure £5.135m external funding for early development of the scheme, initiate site surveys, acquire third party land, undertake successful public consultation and stakeholder engagement, procure advisors, secure Housing Zone Status and Enterprise Zone status to secure delivery of the regeneration of this essential Brownfield site.

### Guildhall

Completed RIBA stage 3 designs and business case to conserve and redevelop the Guildhall as a Business Club and serviced office scheme supported by commercial restaurant and a cafe. The designs will now be finalised in preparation for a planning application and the procurement of both a construction contractor and an operating partner, also we will be seeking a commercial leaseholder for the restaurant space

### Southern Gateway

Demolition of the 17-21 Piccadilly in preparation for a joint venture redevelopment. Delivery options for the broader area are being evaluated and we are continuing negotiations with adjoining land owners. There will be a report to Executive in the Autumn setting out a direction of travel. In the meantime there will be 2 papers coming - one on options for the sale of the freehold or the extension to the leasehold for Stonebow House to enable redevelopment and one on options for our land around Clifford's Tower to support the creation of a Visitors Centre by English Heritage Trust.

We continue to work on the development of and to support the Older people's accommodation project as properties are released from operational use with Grove House currently going on the market and procurement of a partner for the redevelopment of Oakhaven. We are also supporting the development of plans for Lowfields.

We are working with Children's Services and Communities teams to explore ways in which the assets in residential areas might be better exploited to provide sustainable integrated services which may result in sites being released for residential development. The Academisation of schools also creates significant work for property in establishing the long term leases for school land and property.



We gained £350k in the One Public Estate programme to support work in asset management and as part of a LCR LEP Consortium (bid submitted under the WYCA banner) we secured further funding to develop work on estate rationalisation and a further bid is to be submitted focusing on Health and social care integration.

We have in-sourced the operation of the Eco Centre, a managed office space at Clifton Moor, turning it from a significant loss maker to an almost break even position. West Offices continues to be a highly successful office venue to attract partners and generates of £650k a year income for CYC.

The Commercial portfolio generates £2.3m and there are further targets within the budget to increase this. Proposals are being developed to explore the establishment of a commercial property trading company to increase income we make from our surplus and commercial property.

### **Business Intelligence Hub/Performance**

The BIH has significantly increased the variety of information available to the organisation through the 'KPI machine' and has rolled this desktop out to the social care and housing services as the gateway to access reporting.

- The BIH has, alongside IT and the service area, been responsible for the introduction of the new children's social care system, Mosaic. The BIH took responsibility for the migration of over 25 years worth of data from a variety of systems in to a single place,
- The BIH has undergone a further restructure which has led to a reduce staffing budget of over 200k. The BIH's role in system design and architecture has allowed efficiencies to be found in system connectivity and processes. This combined with a slightly different staffing profile of the department where technical skills have been increased could lead to further efficiencies in 19/20
- The BIH is involved in a number of major system replacements and introductions with examples being the "upgraded" Adults system and the CRM in the autumn of 2016. These will create much improved working practices and opportunities to make data available but create short-term issues in replacement reporting and connectivity.
- The BIH will need to support systems and data needs of a number of new CYC initiatives from the "Healthy Child" initiative through to the way that CYC provides locality based services.

## **Human Resources**

### Pay

- Continued support of the Living Wage as an accredited Living Wage Employer.
- Incorporated the national pay settlement into our local pay grades.
- Following a change in employment legislation we negotiated a local collective agreement which set out how we would deal with any backdated employee claims for payment for holiday when additional hours or overtime is worked.

### Workforce Strategy

- In April 2015 we took to Corporate Management and Scrutiny Committee the outturn report for the 2012-15 Workforce Strategy setting out achievements over this period.
- The People Plan (the next version of this strategy) is going to Executive this month for sign off. Work is now starting on the detailed action plans to deliver the priorities in the plan.

### Trade Unions

We implemented the changes to Trade Union facility time, funding and office accommodation which were agreed at Council in July 2015 which will see a saving to the council of £76k per year

### ICT

The ICT service continues to deliver services across the whole Council and has lead on the development of a new Health and Safety system, and the implementation of a new Children's system. It is working with the Customer service team on the CRM system which will significantly change how the Council interacts with customers.

During the year the service has started to provide management support to Harrogate Council in running their ICT service, and this may develop further into provision of specific dedicated projects.

The service has continue to develop superfast broadband across the city, working with the private sector and supporting businesses in the city.



---

**Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee****25 July 2016**

Report of the Assistant Director Governance &amp; ICT

**Schedule of Petitions****Summary**

1. Members of this Committee are aware of their new role in the initial consideration of petitions received by the Authority. The current petitions process was considered by the Audit and Governance Committee on 2 October 2014 and endorsed by Council on 9 October 2014. This process aimed to ensure scrutiny of the actions taken in relation to petitions received either by Members or Officers.

**Background**

2. Following agreement of the above petitions process, Members of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee had been considering a full schedule of petitions received at each meeting, commenting on actions taken by the Executive Member or Officer, or awaiting decisions to be taken at future Executive Member Decision Sessions.
3. However, in order to simplify this process Members agreed, at their June 2015 meeting, that the petitions annex should in future be provided in a reduced format in order to make the information relevant and manageable. At that meeting it was agreed that future petitions reports should include an annex of current petitions and agreed actions, but only following consideration of the petitions by the Executive or relevant Executive Member or Officer.
4. This was agreed, in the knowledge that the full petitions schedule was publicly available on the Council's website and that it was updated and republished after each meeting of the Committee.  
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13020&path=0>

## 5. Current Petitions Update

A copy of the reduced petitions schedule is now attached at Annex A of the report which provides a list of new petitions received to date together with details of those considered by the Executive or relevant Executive Member/Officer since the last meeting of the Committee. Further information relating to petitions which have been considered by the Executive Members/Officers since the last meeting are set out below:

### **Petition Number**

#### 48. **Mill Lane, Heworth**

A copy of this petition, containing 29 signatories was emailed to Councillors Boyce and Funnell on 8 February 2016, on behalf of the lead petitioner, the petition requested 'a dramatic decrease in traffic on Mill Lane, Heworth'.

Consideration was given to the petition at the Executive Member for Transport and Planning Decision Session on 12 May 2016.

Officers confirmed that the street, for at least the past 30 to 40 years, had been a mixture of residential and retail properties. Over the past 2 to 3 years the street scene on Mill Lane had changed considerably as a petrol station / convenience store, newsagents, hair dresses and taxi private hire office had all closed. The majority of the closed retail properties had been replaced, or were due to be replaced, with residential properties. It was considered that this, in turn, should reduce some of the vehicle movements into the street.

The Executive Member noted that Mill Lane provided a link from Heworth Green to East Parade and Layerthorpe both of which contained retail and residential properties and that currently Mill Lane was one of three roads that could be used to access East Parade, Layerthorpe and beyond from Heworth Green, the others being Heworth Road and Foss Bank.

Officers had further highlighted that construction was due for commencement and completion this year as the final section of a link road which would provide a more direct route between Heworth Green, Layerthorpe, James Street and beyond. It was considered that this should significantly reduce any through traffic using Mill Lane.

Consideration was given to the following options:

- Option 1 – Carry out a vehicle count / speed survey and undertake diffusion tube monitoring prior to construction of the new link road and again 12 months after completion at a cost of £1250. Take no immediate action to restrict vehicles using Mill Lane.
- Option 2 – Design a scheme to introduce traffic calming and restrictions on vehicle movements.
- Option 3 – Take no action.

In view of the Officers comments, the Executive Member agreed Option 1 to carry out a vehicle count/speed survey and undertake diffusion tube monitoring prior to construction of the new link road and again within 12 months after completion at a cost of £1250.

This was agreed in order to gauge the current number and speed of vehicles using the highway and to obtain air quality information for Mill Lane. This information could then be used to identify any changes that may be required once the new link road was completed.

- 50. Proposed Cuts to Bus Services** – concern about the proposed cuts to the No 19 and No 20 buses that form a vital lifeline for many residents living along these routes. Urge the Council to reconsider its plans.

The Delivery of Reductions in the Subsidised Bus Service Budget was due to be considered by the Executive Member for Transport and Planning. The item was called in for Pre-Decision Scrutiny and was considered by the Economic Development Policy and Scrutiny Committee (Calling In) on 18 May 2016.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Economic Development Policy and Scrutiny Committee (Calling In), this item was considered by the Executive at their meeting on 30 June 2016. Executive approved Option B, to retain a reduced subsidy for evening bus services and a scaled back level of service on a proportion of route 20. This was agreed as, although it would not achieve the savings target agreed through the Council's budget process, it would potentially meet many of the needs identified through the public consultation.

- 51. Bishopthorpe Road near Campleshon Road junction** – Request for a safer pedestrian crossing point.

This issue was considered by the Executive Member for Transport and Planning at a Decision Session held on 14 July 2016. It was agreed that officers should continue developing proposals as part of this year's School Safety Programme with a view to implementing an appropriate scheme this financial year. This decision was taken in order to improve pedestrian crossing facilities on Bishopthorpe Road at its junction with Campleshon Road.

**53. Buffer Zones for gas drilling sites**

This petition requested that the Council includes in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan the requirement for buffer zones around drilling sites. It is proposed that the issues raised will be addressed through the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

**6. The Process**

There are a number of options available to the Committee as set out in paragraph 7 below, however these are not exhaustive. Every petition is, of course, unique, and it may be that Members feel a different course of action from the standard is necessary.

**Options**

7. Having considered the reduced Schedule attached which provides details of petitions received and considered by the Executive/Executive Member since the last meeting of the Committee; Members have a number of options in relation to those petitions:
- Request a fuller report, if applicable, for instance when a petition has received substantial support;
  - Note receipt of the petition and the proposed action;
  - Ask the relevant decision maker or the appropriate Executive Member to attend the Committee to answer questions in relation to it;
  - Undertake a detailed scrutiny review, gathering evidence and making recommendations to the decision maker;
  - Refer the matter to Full Council where its significance requires a debate;

If Members feel that appropriate action has already been taken or is planned, then no further consideration by scrutiny may be necessary.

8. Following this meeting, the lead petitioner in each case will be kept informed of this Committee's consideration of their petition, including any further action Members may decide to take.

### **Consultation**

9. All Groups were consulted on the process of considering more appropriate ways in which the Council deal with and respond to petitions, resulting in the current process. Relevant Directorates are involved and have been consulted on the handling of the petitions outlined in Annex A.

### **Implications**

10. There are no known legal, financial, human resource or other implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report. However, depending upon what, if any, further actions Members agree to there may, of course, be specific implications for resources which would need to be addressed.

### **Risk Management**

11. There are no known risk implications associated with the recommendations in this report. Members should, however, assess the reputational risk by ensuring appropriate and detailed consideration is given to petitions from the public.

### **Recommendations**

12. Members are asked to consider the petitions received and actions reported, as set out in paragraph 5 above and on the attached Schedule at Annex A, and agree an appropriate course of action in each case.

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

**Contact Details**

**Author:**

Jill Pickering  
Democracy Officer  
Tel No. 01904 552061  
e: [jill.pickering@york.gov.uk](mailto:jill.pickering@york.gov.uk)

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Andrew Docherty  
AD Governance & ICT

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 15 July 2016

Wards Affected:

All



**Background Papers:** None

**Annexes:** Annex A – Extract from schedule of petitions received and action taken to date



Petition Details	Petition Type	No of Signatures (Approx)	Responsible Officer	Decision maker (e.g. Cabinet Member, Director)	Date of Consideration	Action Agreed	Date of Consideration by CSMC & Outcome
<p><b>46. Ban Lettings Boards</b> - petition the council to apply to the Government for special planning powers granting the ability to ban letting boards in locations with an excessive amount and where there is local support.</p>	<p>E-Petition running 17-11-2015 to 31-03-16</p>	<p>5 signatories</p>	<p>Jonathan Carr, Head of Development Services &amp; Regeneration T: 01904 551303 / Martin Grainger, Head of Integrated Strategy T: 01904 551317</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning Decision Session</p>	<p>Officers have been considering the potential ways of applying for special powers to ban letting boards under Schedule 3, Part 1, Class 3A of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 – including discussions with other local authorities who have undertaken this process. Once this investigation work is completed they will confirm the details</p>	<p><b>CSMC 09-05-16</b> <b>Update requested</b></p>
<p><b>46a Ban Lettings Boards</b> Petition calling on the Government to give City of York Council the power to ban letting boards in locations with an excessive amount and where there is local support.</p>	<p>Presented to Council by Cllr Shepherd 17-12-15</p>	<p>182 signatories</p>	<p>Jonathan Carr, Head of Development Services &amp; Regeneration T: 01904 551303 / Martin Grainger, Head of Integrated Strategy T: 01904 551317</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning Decision Session</p>	<p>(see 46 above)</p>	<p><b>(See 46 above)</b></p>

Petition Details	Petition Type	No of Signatures (Approx)	Responsible Officer	Decision maker (e.g. Cabinet Member, Director)	Date of Consideration	Action Agreed	Date of Consideration by CSMC & Outcome
<p><b>48. Mill Lane, Heworth -</b> To dramatically reduce traffic into Mill Lane</p>	<p>Emailed to Cllrs Boyce/ Funnell 08-02-16 on behalf of lead petitioner Trevor Rowell</p>	<p>29</p>	<p>Alistair Briggs Traffic Network Manager T: 01904 551368</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning Decision Session</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning Decision Session  12-05-16</p>	<p>The Executive Member agreed to carry out a vehicle count/speed survey and undertake diffusion tube monitoring prior to construction of the new link road and again within 12 months after completion at a cost of £1250.</p> <p>Reason: To gauge the current number and speed of vehicles using the highway. To also obtain air quality information for Mill Lane. This information can then be used to identify any changes that may be required once the new link road is completed.</p>	
<p><b>50. Proposed Cuts to Bus Services</b> – concern about the proposed cuts to the No 19 and No 20 buses that form a vital lifeline for many residents living along these routes. Urge the Council to</p>	<p>Hard copy sent to Cllr Gillies 03-05-16</p>	<p>596 approx plus 127 signatures from Skelton residents concerned</p>	<p>Andrew Bradley Sustainable Transport Manager T: 01904 551404</p>	<p>Executive Member for Transport &amp; Planning Decision Session</p>	<p>Economic Development &amp; Transport Policy &amp; Scrutiny Committee (Pre Decision Call-In)</p>	<p>Following consultation and representations made the Executive approved Option B, to retain a reduced subsidy for evening bus services and a</p>	

Petition Details	Petition Type	No of Signatures (Approx)	Responsible Officer	Decision maker (e.g. Cabinet Member, Director)	Date of Consideration	Action Agreed	Date of Consideration by CSMC & Outcome
reconsider its plans.		at losing their Sunday service plus 176 residents			18-05-16  Referred to Executive as part of the Delivery of Reductions to the Subsidised Bus Services Budget report  30-06-16	scaled back level of service on a proportion of route 20, as detailed in the report.  Reason: Whilst this option would not achieve the savings target agreed through the Council's budget process, however it would, potentially meet many of the needs identified through the public consultation	
<b>51. Bishopthorpe Road near Campleshon Road junction</b> – Request for a safer pedestrian crossing point.	Emailed to Louise Robinson, Transport Projects 10-05-16.	188 plus more to follow.	Louise Robinson Engineer, Transport Projects T: 01904 553463	Executive Member for Transport & Planning Decision Session	Executive Member for Transport & Planning Decision Session  14-07-16	The Executive Member agreed that officers should continue developing proposals as part of this year's School Safety Programme with a view to implementing an appropriate scheme this financial year.  Reason: In order to improve pedestrian crossing facilities on	

Petition Details	Petition Type	No of Signatures (Approx)	Responsible Officer	Decision maker (e.g. Cabinet Member, Director)	Date of Consideration	Action Agreed	Date of Consideration by CSMC & Outcome
						Bishopthorpe Road at its junction with Campleshon Road.	
<b>52. Lighting on Walmgate Stray</b> – request for lighting on the footpaths through Walmgate Stray, particularly for the safety of students at night and following recent events.	E-Petition running 27-05-16 to 07-07-16	33	Neil Ferris Director of City & Environmental Services T: 01904 551448	Executive Member for Transport & Planning Decision Session	Executive Member for Transport & Planning Decision Session  08-09-16	TBC	
<b>53. Buffer Zones for gas drilling sites</b> – request that the Council includes in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan the requirement for buffer zones around drilling sites.	Handed over at LPWG by Cllr Kramm 27-06-16	313	Martin Grainger Head of Planning and Environmental Management T: 01904 551317	Executive Member for Transport & Planning Decision Session	TBC	Address through the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan	



---

**Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee**25<sup>th</sup> July 2016**Report of the Director of Customer & Business Support Services****2015-16 Draft Outturn**

1. This report provides a year end analysis for the services falling under the responsibility of the Corporate Scrutiny Management Committee, which include all corporate, strategic and business services.

**Financial Analysis**

2. The council's net General Fund budget for 2015/16 was £119,760k and the net budget for the areas covered by this report is £16,121k. Of this £13,389k relates to Customer & Business Support Services (CBSS) and £2.7m to the Office of the Chief Executive (OCE). The outturn shows an underspend on CBSS of £155k and an overspend on OCE of £283k.
3. Within the Office of the Chief Executive directorate there has been an overspend due to delays in implementing the directorate restructure which has now been fully completed, higher than budgeted redundancy costs and the use of external consultants at the start of the financial year, all of whom have now left. Some of these costs were incurred in order to progress the Councils approach to project management, including the creation of a project management framework.
4. The draft outturn shows an underspend of £155k, an improvement from the Monitor 3 report. There have been increased costs associated with maintaining surplus properties (£144k) and additional posts within Facilities Management (£93k). The delay in implementing the new Customer Relationship Management system has also delayed achievement of the associated saving of £340k. Other overspends have been mitigated by underspends in housing benefit due to improved performance in debt recovery (£273k), savings due to vacant posts within Customer Services (£151k) and Finance and Procurement (£238k) and increased income in Health & Safety (£130k).
5. In addition, there has been an underspend of £468k on the York Financial Assistance Scheme (YFAS). This underspend has been

transferred to an earmarked reserve to deal with potential future pressures that may arise from ongoing welfare reform. The total of the reserve now stands at £971k. Of this balance, £200k is earmarked for 2016/17 leaving £717k currently unallocated.

### **Performance Analysis**

6. Quarter 4 call service levels saw a small decrease with 75.4% of calls answered in 20 seconds (76.9% Q3) however this arises from the issue of annual council tax and business rate bills in March and the monthly performance was more than 20% higher than in 2015 whilst the annual overall percentage increased to 64.9% (from 47.6% in 2014/15) and continues to improve into quarter 1 2016.
7. In 2015/16 the number of residents visiting the Customer Centre fell to 69,563 (77,549 in 2014/15) but the average wait time increased to 8.49 minutes (7.80 minutes in 2014/15), with 70% of customers served within the waiting time target of 10 minutes (74% in 2014/15).
8. The collection rate for Council Tax at the end of the year was 97.51% compared with 97.55% at the end of 2014/15 and Business Rates 98.43% compared with 98.20% in 2014/15.
9. Housing Benefit performance remains on target at the end of quarter 4 with a combined (New Claims/Change of Circumstance – DWP measure) average of four days.
10. The York Open Data website currently has 630 machine readable datasets available. There were over 12,500 visits during its first year and the platform has had more than 4,600 dataset downloads plus almost 11,000 dataset previews. The council was one of five local authorities to receive top marks from NESTA, for its York Open Data platform, which has opened up data to residents and businesses across the city.

### **Performance – Employees**

11. In 2015/16 61 employees were made redundant, 46 on a voluntary basis and 15 compulsory. In 2014/15 a total of 83 employees were made redundant, 62 voluntary and 21 compulsory.
12. The average sickness days per FTE (excluding schools) has reduced to 10.2 days from 11.4 last year with the number of days lost due to stress also reducing to 2.3 from 2.5 in 2014/15.

13. Overall the number of employees voluntarily leaving the organisation remained static at 7% of all leavers (exc. Schools) in 2015/16, although there was some variation between departments.
14. The number of people employed by the Council (excluding schools) has continued to decrease in 2015/16, at the end of March the headcount was 2,635 (2,104 Full Time Equivalentents) down from 2,812 in March 2015 (2,194 FTEs).
15. Additional salary and overtime expenditure have both decreased between 2014/15 and 2015/16 but spend on casual employees has increased from £4.3m in 14/15 to nearly £5.2m in 2015/16.

### **Performance – Customers**

16. Overall Customer Centre satisfaction increased to 91.5% in 2015/16 from 58% in 2014/15. Satisfaction with face to face and Call Centre services both increased while website feedback, which historically reported low satisfaction ceased to be collected in Q1 after the launch of the new CYC website.
17. The Talk-about panel, a random sample of approximately 800 residents has been reconstituted for 2016/17 and bi-annually views to a standard set of questions will be sought with results published within the relevant scorecard.
18. Executive Member scorecards present a detailed update of the key performance indicators contained in each of the Executive Member Portfolios. These can also be found online alongside other data sources at: [www.yorkopendata.org](http://www.yorkopendata.org). Work is currently ongoing to look at the performance management reporting arrangements to ensure a transparent and effective system in line with scrutiny arrangements and the Council Plan.

### **Implications**

19. The financial implications are all dealt with in the body of the report.
20. There are no other specific implications of this report.

### **Recommendations**

21. Members are asked to note the contents of the report.

*Reason: To update the Committee on the 2015/16 outturn.*

<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>		
Debbie Mitchell, Corporate Finance Manager, Ext 4161  Ian Cunningham Group Manager - Shared Intelligence Bureau, Ext 5749	Ian Floyd, Director for Customer & Business Support Services		
	<b>Report Approved</b>		<b>Date</b>
<b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>All</i>			
<b>For further information please contact the authors of the report</b>			





---

**Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee****25 July 2016**

Report of the Assistant Director Governance &amp; ICT

**Overview Report on Electoral Organisation****Summary**

1. This report presents Members with an overview of the electoral organisation in York and issues needed to be considered by the elections team.

**Background**

2. At a meeting of the Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee (CSMC) in January 2016, Members requested a report on the electoral organisation in York and it was agreed that this be added to the work plan to be considered at a future meeting following the election of a Police and Crime Commissioner in May 2016 and the EU Referendum in June 2016.
3. The City of York is a unitary authority and the most recent local elections took place on 7 May 2015 to elect members to City of York Council. The whole council was up for election. These elections were held on the same day and combined with the General Election and Parish Council elections in York.
4. Since the previous election in 2011 a review of boundaries has affected some wards. The total number of councillors remained at 47 although the number of wards was reduced from 22 to 21. This comprised five single-member wards, six two member wards and 10 three-member wards. The local elections were therefore the first based on these new boundaries. The combination of all out local elections on new boundaries with a Parliamentary election made the elections in York in 2015 particularly and almost uniquely complex.

5. In 2015 a record number of new councillors were elected, almost half the council, and of the 47 seats contested 25 were won by candidates with council experience while 22 were won by debutants.
6. While York had a particularly difficult set of elections to deliver in 2015 the complexity of organising elections generally and specifically in 2015 following the introduction of individual electoral registration has been recognised in national reports by the Electoral Commission<sup>1</sup> and the Association of Electoral Administrators<sup>2</sup>. The latter reported of the 2015 elections:

“Electoral administrators continue to deliver elections within an increasingly complex and challenging environment even when the odds are stacked against them. This was clearly the situation for the complex elections held on 7 May 2015 following the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration (IER). Electoral administrators and suppliers were stretched beyond belief during the 18 months before polling day with the introduction of IER and the complexities and bureaucracy it brought with it. Preparations for the elections were behind as a result of the impact of the introduction of IER and electoral administrators were exhausted before the election timetable even started.”

### **Electoral Arrangements**

7. Electoral arrangements are the responsibility of the Returning Officer (RO), and in York the key aims are:
  - To allow those who are eligible and wish to vote to do so
  - To ensure that the processes followed are robust and produce an accurate result which is not open to challenge.
8. York electoral services are well respected among election professionals both local and nationally as evidenced by the fact that York was asked to provide project management, legal and other expert assistance to the Police Area Returning Officer at the Police & Crime Commissioner elections. In addition, for the EU Referendum York’s risk profile rating, as

---

1

Report on the administration of the 7 May 2015 elections, including the UK Parliamentary general election. July 2015

2

Elections and Individual Electoral Registration - The challenge of 2015. July 2015

assessed by the Electoral Commission, was **green**. A green rating means the minimum level of scrutiny from the Regional Counting Officer and Electoral Commission. York follows the guidance of the Electoral Commission (EC) in administering elections and there are more than a dozen Acts, Regulations and Rules which must be followed. The key ones are:

- Representation of the People Act 1983
- Representation of the People Act 1985 (overseas electors)
- Representation of the People Act 2000 (postal votes)
- Local Elections (Principal Areas) (England & Wales) Rules 2006
- Representation of the People(England & Wales) Regulations 2001
- Others are listed in the EC guidance and all can be found on the [www.legislation.gov.uk](http://www.legislation.gov.uk) website

9. Electoral administration and the conduct of elections is complex and has become more difficult in York in recent years. Some of the reasons for this are:

- The administration of elections is inherently complex affair with a need to follow regulatory requirements to the letter while delivering a significant project. In York that includes making arrangements : to establish and perform around 500 job roles in York, to set up and work from around 120 polling stations and to communicate with 155,000 electors. These roles are performed under intense media and political scrutiny;
- More demand for postal voting. In the last local election around 10% of the electorate, 15,000 voters opted for postal votes compared with just 800 in 1988. In the EU Referendum in excess of 20,000 electors opted for postal votes. The administration of postal voting significantly increases the workload of the core election team and adds risk which has to be managed;
- Overnight counting becomes more difficult with postal votes because security checks have to be carried out on postal votes handed in at polling stations;

- Individual Electoral Registration. Since 2014 individuals have become responsible for registering themselves to vote rather than registering a household as before.

10. Specific Challenges in York include:

- The new elections footprint following boundary changes;
- For local elections, the diversity of many wards means that a number of different candidates have a realistic hope of being elected, leading to close results;
- Local elections in most York wards are multi-vacancy elections, meaning that a more complicated count model has to be used than for “first past the post” elections.
- In York the count is held in the biggest room available but even so space limitations impacts on the number of counters that can be used.

### **Returning Officer**

11. The Returning Officer plays a central role in the democratic process. The role is to ensure that the elections are administered effectively and that, as a result, the experience of voters and those standing for election is a positive one. The RO seeks to set out at an early stage what they want to achieve and what success would look like.
12. In York elections are organised as a full project with the election team initially meeting on a monthly basis and then more frequently as polling day nears. Project planning starts approximately a month after the previous election with a review of lessons learnt from that poll. A list of core documents used by the team includes a project plan; time table; risk assessment; agent and candidate count guide; ballot box collection arrangements; count model; counting assistants guide; team supervisor instructions; a training schedule; instructions for postal voting; inspecting officer guidance and polling staff guidance.
13. The RO is personally responsible for the administration of the election, including:
  - nominations
  - the provision of polling stations
  - the appointment of Presiding Officers and Clerks

- management of the postal voting process
- the verification and counting of votes

14. Where the Local Government election is combined with a poll for a further electoral event the RO will take responsibility for the combined poll including:

- the provision of polling stations
- the appointment of Presiding Officers and Clerks
- the notice of situation of polling stations
- the equipment of polling stations
- the notification of the secrecy requirements at polling stations
- signing certificates of employment for polling station staff allowing them to vote at the polling station they are working at, as opposed to the one allocated to them
- authorisation to order the removal of persons from polling stations
- verification of all ballot papers
- where it has been decided to combine the issue of postal votes:
  - the corresponding number list
  - the issue of postal votes including creating a copy of the postal voters list and proxy postal voters list and marking it on issue
  - the opening of postal votes including the marking the returned postal vote statements on the lists and the verification of the personal identifiers on the returned postal voting statements

15. While the RO can appoint one or more persons to discharge any or all of the RO functions they cannot delegate personal responsibility for delivering the election.

### **Planning For The Election**

16. To plan effectively for the election, a project plan is prepared and treated as a “living document”. It is kept under regular review and used to monitor progress.

17. This planning supports the delivery of the following outcomes:

- Voters are able to vote easily and know their vote will be counted in the way they intended
  - It is easy for people who want to stand for election to find out how to get involved, what rules are, and what they have to do to comply with these rules, and they can have confidence in the management of the process and the result.
18. Before starting detailed planning the election team looks at what needs to be achieved and what success will look like. The project plan includes clearly defined objectives and success measures. The project plan also includes a plan to evaluate procedures post-election and identify lessons learnt.
  19. This planning reflects any legislative changes which have come into effect since the last poll, for example, there are a number of areas in which processes and practices will need to be reviewed as a consequence of legislative change, such as in relation to postal voting, where there is now the ability to issue postal ballot packs earlier in the election timetable.
  20. The project plan covers contingency planning and business continuity arrangements. The continuity arrangements include provisions to cover loss of staff and loss of venues during the election
  21. It also identifies the resources required and ensures the necessary steps are taken for the local authority makes resources available to enable the discharge of election functions.
  22. A risk register is prepared and kept under regular review to monitor any risks and document any changes in risk, as well as ensuring that mitigating actions are identified and taken forward as appropriate.

### **Staffing**

23. The project plan identifies staffing requirements and ensures the necessary appointments are made at the earliest opportunity.
24. A project team is then established to support the RO in carrying out their functions and in delivering a well-run election. The project team includes:
  - Any appointed deputies
  - Other electoral services staff members
  - The Electoral Registration Officer (ERO) where the RO is not also the ERO.

25. The project team has a clear remit and understanding of the tasks to be carried out. At the planning stage, a schedule of meetings is prepared, and a record of each meeting is kept as an audit trail of what has been discussed and of any decisions made.
26. The RO has a legal duty to appoint and pay a Presiding Officer and such Poll Clerks as may be necessary to staff each polling station. In order to ensure that voters receive a high-quality service it is important that polling stations are properly staffed. The Electoral Commission recommends the following ratios:
  - A polling station should not have more than 2,500 electors allocated to it.
  - In addition to a Presiding Officer, there should be one Poll Clerk for polling stations with up to 750 electors.
  - One additional Poll Clerk should be appointed for polling stations with up to 1,500 electors
  - One further Poll Clerk should be appointed to a polling station with up to the maximum of 2,500 electors
27. These ratios are recommended minimum levels and there may be circumstances a higher number of staff are employed. In York particular consideration is given to areas with high numbers of student electors where more assistance may be required in polling stations.
28. In order to ensure that voters can have confidence that their votes will be counted in a way they intended, appropriate resources are put in place to ensure that the verification and counts are timely and that the processes followed are designed and managed in such a way as to secure an accurate result. The number and type of staff require to run the verification and count are identified and appointed as soon as possible.
29. Typically the following types of roles make up the overall staffing required at the verification and count:
  - A senior officer responsible for the overall operation, assisting with the organisation of the event and the co-ordination of the verification and count processes
  - A responsible officer to supervise a team dealing with the receipt of ballot boxes, postal votes and paperwork at the verification and count venue, and the verification of the unused ballot papers and tendered ballot papers.

- An officer to oversee the secure transportation of the sealed boxes of postal ballot papers to the verification and count venue and to deal with the final opening of postal votes.
  - A team of staff to who check ballot paper accounts and keep records of count totals including ensuring that all of the necessary forms and statements are completed accurately and formally signed off, and providing an audit trail for the verification and count processes.
  - A team of senior staff responsible for managing those staff sorting and counting the votes.
  - Teams of staff dealing with the receipt of ballot boxes, postal votes and paperwork, and the verification of unused and tendered ballot papers.
  - Counting assistants to accurately sort and count the ballot papers.
  - Porters, security staff and door attendants to deal with the security of the site and the management of the facilities within and around the site.
  - An officer to oversee the security of ballot boxes and relevant stationery.
30. The project plan contains a plan for training which identifies the training needs of both permanent and temporary staff. While training activities for temporary staff may not take place until shortly before the election, planning for those activities starts at the earliest opportunity.

### **Register to Vote**

31. Under the system of individual electoral registration each individual is now responsible for registering themselves and by law people must register to vote. When registering to vote:
- People need their National Insurance number and date of birth; these are used to check their identity with the Department of Works and Pension.
  - These details are uploaded to a national portal.
  - Once details have been checked, people will either receive a letter requesting more information or a letter to confirm that they are registered. Submitting an application does not automatically mean a person will be registered, several checks must be made.



- People can only vote in Parliamentary and City of York Council elections if their name is on the register of electors.
- If people are not on the register of electors they may find it harder to get a loan, mortgage, finance agreement or even a mobile phone as certain credit reference agencies use the register to confirm stability of residence.

### **Who can register?**

32. People can only register to vote in York if they are:

- 18 (or will become 18 during the life of the register)
- a British, Irish, Commonwealth or European Union Member State citizen (a full list of all eligible countries provided)
- resident at a York address or an eligible overseas elector or service voter,

### **Students registering to vote**

33. Students can register to vote both at their home address and where they are at college, their term time address.

### **Updates to the register of electors**

34. The register of electors is published once each year, but there are updates to the register generally the first of every month, except during October and November.

35. There are strict statutory deadlines which mean that you can only be added to the register if an application is received by the required time, and it includes all the information need to process it.

### **Absent voting**

36. In addition to voting at a polling station, registered electors in York can vote by post or by proxy. Voters must apply for a postal vote if they want to vote by post, e.g. if they are away from home or abroad.

37. People can apply to vote by post for a single election on a specific day, for a specific period or permanently. In York some 20,000 people, around 13% of the electorate, used postal voting in the EU Referendum. Postal voting is a time consuming exercise for elections staff, who are responsible for the production and issue of postal vote packs, dealing with returned postal votes and completing anti-fraud checks. They also deal with a high volume of public enquiries in relation to postal voting during the run up to the election.

38. Voting by proxy means getting someone else to vote on your behalf. Again a proxy vote can be for a single election, for a specific period or permanently. People can apply for a proxy vote under certain circumstances, including:

- Being away on polling day
- Having a medical issue or disability
- Not being able to vote in person because of work or military service

39. Historically in York there have been a small number of proxy voters, around 100. However, there was a big increase for the Referendum in large part due to the Council being proactive with people who were too late to register for postal votes or for whom a postal vote may not have been the best option and who therefore took up the proxy option.

### **Verifying and Counting the Votes**

40. Verification and count arrangements are designed in line with the following key principles:

- All processes are transparent, with a clear and unambiguous audit trail.
- The verification produces an accurate result. This means that the number of ballot papers in each box either matches the number of ballot papers issued as stated on the ballot paper account or, if it does not:
  - the source of the variance has been identified and can be explained, and/or
  - the box has been recounted at least twice, until the same number of ballot papers is counted on two consecutive occasions.

As part of this verification process the unused ballot papers are also counted and the totals compared with the number of papers originally provided to the Presiding Officer and those shown as issued to voters on the ballot paper account.

- The count produces an accurate result, where:
  - a. for single-member vacancies, the total number of votes cast for each candidate and rejected votes matches the total

number of ballot papers given on the verification statement for the election;

- b. for multi-member vacancies, the total number of votes given for each candidate added to the unused votes and number of rejected votes (i.e. the number of completely rejected ballots multiplied by the number of vacancies plus the number of rejected votes from those ballots) matches the total number of votes expected (i.e. the total number of ballot papers as given on the verification statement multiplied by the number of vacancies)

- The verification and count are timely.
- The secrecy of the vote is maintained at all times.
- The security of ballot papers and other stationery is maintained at all times

41. Arrangements for the verification of ballot paper accounts are made as soon as practicable after the close of poll. Postal votes received on polling day, including those delivered to polling stations, are also processed at the count.

42. Arrangements for counting the votes are made as soon as practicable after the close of poll.

43. In considering how to organise the verification and count the following factors are taken into account:

- The number of tables required – there should be a sufficient number to accommodate the number of counting assistants appointed.
- The layout of the tables – they should allow easy viewing by all of those entitled to be present, and take into account the number of candidates standing, as well as the size of the ballot papers.
- Circulation areas and the amount of space available around the tables – this space should be maximised, and any obstructions such as stored furniture should be removed.
- Seating – for those entitled to attend proceedings.

- Access – the room should be laid out in a way that ensures that all of the proceedings are accessible to anyone entitled to attend, including disabled people.
- Public address systems.
- Media requirements –.
- Health and safety – the RO has a responsibility for the health and safety of all persons present. This has particular implications for layout, access to emergency exits and venue capacity
- Security – of the count and for those present

### **Count comparisons**

44. It is noteworthy that in the Referendum the York and Humber region was the first region to declare its result. The priority in York, however, is not to be the first to declare, but that the count is accurate.
45. The speed of the count is determined by a number of factors:
  - The number of votes cast.
  - Time taken to get ballot papers to the count. In York Presiding Officers deliver the ballot papers in their own car having completed the ballot paper account. Some areas use taxis.
  - The number of counters in proportion to the votes cast. York uses the largest room available but this is small in comparison to those used by others. Benchmarking with other areas confirms that York is in the bottom quartile with regards to number of counters in comparison to the volume of votes.
  - The counting method used. First past the post is the easiest and by far the quickest to count. In multi-vacancy elections there are two methods traditionally used where voters have not used all their votes for candidates of one party: counting sheets, which are easy to use but prone to inaccuracy, or the “grass skirt” method which should be more accurate but takes longer.
  - Voting patterns. Votes for one party can simply be grouped together and counted. The fewer votes which have to be counted using one of the alternative methods, the faster the count.

- The Returning officer's attitude towards variations and the tolerance between the votes counted and those verified;
- The number of double or triple polling stations used. Inevitably votes will be placed in the wrong ballot box, meaning that ballot paper accounts will not balance. The votes will be counted but the verification of each box can only be concluded once the contents of both have been counted.
- Any requirement to recount.

### **Consultation**

46. This report has been prepared with the assistance of the CYC Electoral Services manager.

### **Options**

47. This report is for information only.

### **Council Plan**

48. This report is associated with the Focus on Frontline Services and A Council That Listens to Residents elements of the Council's Plan 2015-19.

### **Implications & Risks**

49. This report is for information only and there are no implications or risks associated with its recommendation. However, the administration of elections carries a very high degree of risk as evidenced by issues that arose during the London Mayoral Election which resulted in the resignation of the Chief Executive of a London Borough.

### **Recommendation**

Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Reason: To comply with Scrutiny protocols and procedures

## Contact Details

### Author:

Steve Entwistle  
Scrutiny Officer  
Tel: 01904 554279

[steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk](mailto:steven.entwistle@york.gov.uk)

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty  
Assistant Director Governance and ICT  
Tel: 01904 551004

Report Approved  Date 13/07/2016

### Wards Affected:

All

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

### Background Papers:

Electoral Commission Guidance on Electoral Administration

<http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/electoral-administrator>

### Abbreviations

CSMC – Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee

EC – Electoral Commission

ERI – Electoral Registration Officer

EU – European Union

IER – Individual Electoral Registration

RO – Returning Officer



## Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee

25 July 2016

### Procurement Update

#### Purpose of Report

1. This report sets out a range of performance information for procurement and compares this to the position in other councils. An update report on procurement activity was presented to this Committee in January 2016. Members asked to see comparative information from other Councils to determine how well the procurement service was functioning within the Council.

#### Analysis of expenditure and benchmarking information

2. The Council spent £146m on goods and services during 2015/16 of which approximately 70% was in contract, no change from the previous year. The team will continue to work on engaging staff across the Council to improve the position. There has been continued improvement in the reach of the Commercial Procurement Team from 18% in 2012/13, 32% in 2013/14, 41% in 2014/15 and 50% in 2015/16
3. The table below compares our 2014/15 performance with the region. This information is collated by Leeds City Council on behalf of the regional Strategic Procurement Group. However, out of the 22 authorities in Yorkshire & Humber, only 10 returns were received. This relatively low return rate means that the results needed to be treated with some caution, however they are the best figures we have available to us at this time.
- 4.

Indicator	York 2015/16	York 2014/15	Region average 2014/15	Is York better or worse than region?
Total cost of Procurement as a % of organisational running costs	0.15%	0.16%	0.19%	Better
Total cost of Procurement as a % of third party spend	0.20%	0.22%	0.35%	Better
% channelled directly through Small & Medium Enterprises (SMEs)	56%	53%	43.36%	Better

% of spend via Local Suppliers (in this context local means within the Yorkshire & Humber Region)	60%	57%	42.19%	Better
FTE's Professionally qualified as a percentage of total procurement FTE's	11.1%	11.1%	41.19%	Worse
Spend managed via structured category management	50%	41%	67.15%	Worse

Table 1 – regional benchmarking information

5. This comparison tells us that York spends less on the procurement function than its neighbours, both as a percentage of total running costs and as a percentage of total spend and we have fewer qualified staff (just one out of 9 in the team). This reflects the Councils view that the currently available procurement qualifications are more focussed on process and does not cover all the commercial skills the Council requires to drive down costs and deliver best value. Less spend is managed through the procurement team, which reflects the relatively small size of the procurement function in York.
6. It also shows that we perform better than others in spending within the Yorkshire and Humber region and in our use of SMEs.
7. Further analysis is available on the type of organisation the Council spends money with. The tables below show the total expenditure with third party suppliers for 2014/15 and 2015/16, split by organisation size and location.

Size of business	2014/15 spend £'000	2014/15 % of total	Of which in Yorkshire & Humber £'000	Of which in a YO postcode £'000
Micro (less than 10 employees)	12,059	8	8,875	6,210
Small (11 to 49 employees)	39,380	26	29,559	21,783
Medium (50 to 249 employees)	29,068	19	16,793	7,234
Large (250 or more employees)	70,494	47	30,535	13,896
Supplier size not known	129	0	86	84
Total	151,130	100	85,848	49,207

Table 2 - 2014/15 expenditure by supplier type and region

Size of business	2015/16 spend £'000	2015/16 % of total	Of which in Yorkshire & Humber £'000	Of which in a YO postcode £'000
Micro (less than 10 employees)	10,718	7	8,261	6,387
Small (11 to 49 employees)	43,987	30	33,935	22,499
Medium (50 to 249 employees)	27,577	19	15,414	8,908
Large (250 or more employees)	64,451	44	30,727	15,120
Supplier size not known	36	0	33	33
Total	146,769	100	88,371	52,947

Table 3 - 2015/16 expenditure by supplier type and region



8. This information demonstrates that there has been continued improvement in spend with both local suppliers and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) despite an overall reduction in Council expenditure.

### **Other issues and regional procurement opportunities**

9. York, along with most other councils in the Yorkshire & Humber area, operates a category management approach to procurement. This essentially means that the team is structured to reflect the categories of goods and services we buy, rather than the directorates who buy them, ensuring a joined up approach to supplier management and expenditure across the council.
10. All councils in the region use a common system to advertise tender opportunities, called Yortender. This system allows any supplier to register on the system and receive alerts to let them know when tenders are advertised. The system is currently funded from regional monies and costs the region just £20k per year. Further charges to the council for the use of this system are very small (just £912 in 2015/16) and it therefore represents excellent value for money. The system also allows us to meet the requirements of the Local Government Transparency Code as it is available to anyone to view the current contract register and tender opportunities. Training on how to use the system is available for any supplier, but priority is given to local suppliers, and the team are planning a “drop in” event where small York based businesses can receive one to one training on the system as well as help in setting up an email address if they don't currently have one.
11. North Yorkshire County Council has recently embarked on a strategic review of procurement and we will continue to liaise with them, and other local partners as appropriate, on regional and collaborative opportunities. Dialogue on the shared service agenda has been opened up, but there are a range of issues that would need to be considered before advancing further with this. Regional procurement can be complex for various reasons due to different contract end dates and the local nature of services. It can be very difficult to match opportunities at the right time and generally some compromise is required by all parties concerned. Even if councils require exactly the same outputs, their current contractual arrangements can mean that often one council is unwilling or unable to wait for the other council's contracts to end.
12. A refresh of the Council's procurement strategy is also underway and will be reported to the decision session of the Executive Member for Finance & Performance later this calendar year.

## **Defining Commissioning & Procurement**

13. Commissioning is the strategic activity of assessing needs, resources and current services, to develop a strategy to make best use of available resources to meet the assessed needs and desired outcomes. It is the informed design of what we want to deliver as our core business in meeting our priority outcomes for residents.
14. Procurement is the process of acquiring goods, works and services, covering acquisition from both third parties and in-house providers. The process spans the whole life cycle from identification of needs, through to the end of a works or services contract or the end of the useful life of an asset. It is supply market facing with its internal customer in the council. It involves options appraisal and the critical 'make or buy' decision. Procurement seeks value for money in how we deliver commissioning plans.
15. Commissioning & Procurement are not mutually exclusive. The procurement function is designed to support and deliver the commissioners intentions in a legal and compliant manner. Whilst the procurement function sits centrally within the council, and commissioning sits within departments it is key that we develop and maintain strategic links to commissioners to ensure procurement activities are undertaken efficiently and economically. The Council's Category Management approach to procurement brings together the expertise from commissioning and procurement across the Council to identify the most appropriate and effective approach to deliver required outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

16. The Council performs well, when compared to the region, in the use of SMEs and local businesses and despite an overall reduction in expenditure performance has continued to improve from 2014/15 to 2015/16. Some £57.6m has been spent with SMEs in Yorkshire & Humber, £37.8m of which was directly with businesses with a YO postcode.
17. Clearly, there is always room for improvement and the procurement team will continue to work hard on engaging with the local business community. Other areas for continued improvement include strengthening the links with commissioners and ensuring procurement is an early consideration in any service planning. July Audit and Governance Committee approved a refresh of the Councils Contract Procedure Rules for final agreement at Full Council. We will take this opportunity to highlight awareness of procurement by delivering a comprehensive training programme to help with improvement in contract management, visibility of spend and value for money. However,

given the relatively small size of the team, there are limits to how quickly and how much performance can be improved.

18. In light of the continued financial challenge being faced by all aspects of the public sector, the procurement team will continue to maintain its focus on driving down costs and delivering value.

**Recommendation**

19. Members are asked to note the contents of the report.

Reason: To update the Committee on current procurement activity

<b>Author:</b>	<b>Chief Officer responsible for the report:</b>		
Debbie Mitchell Finance & Procurement Manager Ext 4161	Tracey Carter Assistant Director - Finance, Asset Management & Procurement		
	<b>Report Approved</b>	√	<b>Date</b> 11 <sup>th</sup> July 2016
<b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>All</i>			
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>			

This page is intentionally left blank



---

**Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee**

25 July 2016

Report of the Assistant Director, Governance &amp; ITT

**Proposals for the Future Ways of Working in Scrutiny****Summary**

1. This report was originally presented to CSMC in March 2016 but has recently been updated in response to the recent announcement of forthcoming changing to Directorates. It presents options for the revision of the scrutiny committee remits taking account of national best practice etc, and Members are asked to agree which option they would like to propose to Council.

**Background**

2. Following the local election this year, a joint administration was formed and at the annual meeting in May 2015, new 'Policy & Scrutiny' committees were created together with newly packaged Executive Member portfolios. As a result it became apparent that the scrutiny committee remits required review.
3. In July 2015 consideration was given to the Executive's proposals for ensuring greater cross-party involvement in the decision making process. The report highlighted that a key priority of the new council leadership was for future decisions to be taken in a more open and transparent way, with policy and scrutiny committees having the opportunity to debate and make recommendations on matters requiring an executive decision before a final decision was taken.
4. The report set out proposals for the introduction of a system which would seek to balance three key principles:
  - That there should be an opportunity for scrutiny of executive decisions before they are made
  - That proper decision making should not be unduly delayed or fettered
  - That there should be greater transparency not only of what decisions are made but by whom.

5. It was recognised that scrutiny committees may want early reports on significant issues in advance of the Executive considering them, in order to inform policy development and the contents of Executive reports. This would not preclude them from considering an Executive report in its final (or close to final) form and debating the report recommendations prior to the final decision being made.
6. Whilst the Committee expressed their support for the proposed changes, they recognised the effect the additional work would have on the scrutiny committee workloads. It was agreed that Scrutiny Committees may need to meet more frequently and it again highlighted concerns with the current committee remits. Also that along with more frequent meetings, discipline would be required to make the new system work, with improved Member commitment, and improved corporate engagement and support.
7. In September 2015 this Committee received a further report from the Executive which invited them to consider the remits of Scrutiny Committees and how best to involve Scrutiny Committees in pre-decision call-in. The aim of introducing this mechanism was to enable more transparency and engagement in council decisions. It was also felt that it would help shift the focus of scrutiny committees from an over emphasis on overview to one of policy development, inline with the change of committee titles.
8. In regard to managing pre-decision call-in, it was agreed that Corporate & Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) would be responsible for carrying out pre-decision call-in of Executive decisions, and that an open invitation would be made to Chairs and Vice Chairs of the four standing Scrutiny Committees, to attend future meetings of CSMC, and that as non-voting Members they would be give the opportunity to speak/ participate in the debate on those Executive pre-decision items that fell within their individual committee remits. The four standing committees would be responsible for pre-decision call-in of Executive Member decisions. Furthermore, all Members would start to receive an alert informing them of the weekly publication of the Forward Plan and highlighting the new items on the plan to encourage them to initiate the pre-decision call-in process.
9. In regard to the scrutiny committee remits, some Members expressed the view that in order to increase corporate engagement, encourage more policy development work and better support the Council's priorities, the remits would be better aligned with the new Executive Member

portfolio areas. Some Members suggested remits should take account of the new organisation review (resulting in forthcoming changes to Directorates), while others agreed they should reflect the Council's move towards a commissioning role and better support partnership working and the promotion of the city's health and wellbeing.

10. The Committee therefore instructed the scrutiny team to review all options for revising the remits, including the financial implications, in order to improve the Council's scrutiny function and working arrangements, better balance the committees workloads, increase corporate engagement, encourage more policy development work and better support the Council's priorities. Ultimately the aim of the review was to ensure an annual scrutiny workplan that supports the Council's priorities and allows for reactive scrutiny.
11. A report containing a number of options was considered by this Committee in March 2016. However at that time the results of the review of the council's operating model were yet unknown and the Committee were unable to consider the option of aligning scrutiny committee remits to Directorates. That review has since been completed and the new structure of senior management roles has been agreed, enabling option (iii) - scrutiny committee remits aligning to directorate, to be considered.

### **National Best Practice**

12. In an age of austerity it is only through demonstrating the value and impact that effective scrutiny can have in supporting councils to deliver better, more cost-effective services, that scrutiny will itself survive as a valued element of local democracy. It can go beyond the traditional adversarial and organisational boundaries and be a genuinely creative force in generating new ideas. It enables the public to engage in the difficult choices a council has to make and can play a significant role in ensuring implementation is done correctly.
13. Examining how others carry out successful scrutiny and what can be achieved, is a useful tool for identifying good practice. The Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS)<sup>1</sup> carries out an annual survey of overview and scrutiny in local government to examine how well local councils are responding to the challenge of delivering scrutiny in a way that is alive

---

<sup>1</sup> The Centre for Public Scrutiny is an independent charity, focused on ideas, thinking and the application and development of policy and practice for accountable public services. CfPS believes that accountability, transparency and involvement are strong principles that protect the public interest. It publishes research and practical guides, provides training and leadership development, supports on-line and off-line networks, and facilitates shared learning and innovation.

and dynamic, cost effective and meaningful, and seen as essential to all decision-makers.

14. The 2014-15 survey received its highest response rate since 2010 giving real confidence in the value of the results. 283 councils provided a full response to the 2014-15 survey, which is 76% of all councils. 90% of the local council across the North East region took part (including York). Of the 283 councils that took part, 233 were Leader-Cabinet councils (as in York) and 46 were unitary authorities in England (like York). Key highlights from the survey are detailed in Annex A.
15. In addition, CfPS created the annual Good Scrutiny Awards to celebrate and draw attention to examples of good practice, and the impact and effectiveness of scrutiny and accountability in public services. Each year, the awards recognise the quiet determination of scrutiny committees up and down the country to get to the bottom of intractable problems, listen to the people whose concerns decision-makers have not heard, and make practical recommendations for improvements.
16. Last year was no exception. CfPS reported that the standard of entries was extremely high in 2015 and although they had no pre-set categories, it was notable how a number of common themes emerged, whether tackling widespread issues such as economic resilience of communities, involving and engaging communities and groups of disadvantaged people, or seeking to open-up service commissioning, design and delivery to improve transparency. This demonstrates that the best overview and scrutiny functions in local government are well attuned to the big, shared, issues facing the country and that the process of scrutiny review and challenge is an effective one for tackling those issues in an open, inclusive and democratic way.
17. In 2015 the categories and shortlisted organisations were:

#### Economic Resilience

- Brighton and Hove City Council: Seafront Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel
- City of Lincoln Council: Lincoln Against Poverty (WINNER)
- Peterborough City Council: Scrutiny in a Day

#### Influencing Beyond Boundaries

- Birmingham City Council: "We Need to Get it Right": Scrutiny's Role in Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation in Birmingham
- Calderdale Council: People's Commission - Improving Health Together (WINNER)



- Surrey County Council: Member's championing Friends, Family & Community Support

#### Involvement

- Birmingham City Council: "Living life to the full with dementia" (WINNER)
- Brighton & Hove Council: Seafront Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel
- Paragon Community Housing Group: Paragon's scrutiny team – our journey to excellence

#### Raising the Profile

- Birmingham City Council: "We Need to Get it Right": Scrutiny's Role in Tackling Child Sexual Exploitation in Birmingham (WINNER)
- Cornwall Council: Child and Adolescent Mental Health Select Committee
- Gloucestershire County Council: Badger Cull Scrutiny Task Group

#### Working Together

- Paragon Community Housing Group: Paragon's scrutiny team – our journey to excellence (JOINT WINNER)
- London Borough of Redbridge: Health Needs of Disabled Children (JOINT WINNER)
- Surrey County Council: Member's championing Friends, Family & Community Support

Overall Impact Award - City of Lincoln Council: -Lincoln Against Poverty

### **Scrutiny Arrangements in Good Practice Authorities**

18. Looking back over the last four years, a number of council's have consistently featured in the CfPS Good Scrutiny Awards:
  - Brighton & Hove Council - 2015, 2014 & 2012 Awards
  - Lincoln City Council - 2015 & 2014 Awards
  - London Borough of Redbridge, Gloucestershire County Council and Birmingham City Council - 2015 & 2012 Awards
  - Telford & Wrekin Council - 2014 & 2013 Awards
19. Brighton & Hove City Council has one Overview & Scrutiny Committee which covers all scrutiny including health related matters, and co-ordinates overview and scrutiny work in the council with the power to scrutinise all council functions as follows:
  - Scrutinises NHS services across Brighton and Hove

- Statutory consultee body for major changes in local health provision
  - Responsible for setting up Scrutiny Review Panels to undertake individual scrutiny reviews
  - The designated Crime and Disorder Committee (as required under the Police and Justice Act 2006) for the city and undertakes the scrutiny of flood and coastal erosion plans (as required by the Localism Act 2011)
20. Lincoln has four scrutiny committees which scrutinise the work of the Executive and the Council as a whole and have a role in the development of policy. Those committees have the following remits:
- Performance Scrutiny Committee
  - Select Scrutiny Committee
  - Policy Scrutiny Committee
  - Community Leadership Scrutiny Committee
21. Their committees can allow citizens' representatives and other stakeholders to contribute to their work by involving them in reviews of the council's policies and performance. They may also be consulted by the Executive or the council on forthcoming decisions and the development of policy. The Select Scrutiny Committee is responsible for post decision call-in.
22. London Borough of Redbridge has two committees and two standing scrutiny panels as follows:
- Overview Committee – This has a key role in the Council's governance arrangements with a particular emphasis on cross cutting thematic scrutiny i.e.:
    - Policy development - in-depth working groups; receiving final reports; monitoring implementation and receiving updates
    - Considering cross cutting issues - potentially referred from advisory committees or Council
    - Budget monitoring - to review the annual budget revenue and capital budget proposals for the authority
    - Considering requisitioned items
    - Petitions - quarterly monitoring of the petitions scheme; receiving petitions to hold an officer to account; and considering appeals against a disputed petition outcome
  - Health Scrutiny Committee – to scrutinise the planning, delivery and performance of local health services
  - Education Scrutiny Panel - to discharge scrutiny of education matters

- External Scrutiny Panel - to discharge the authority's functions relating to crime and disorder and other external matters
23. Gloucestershire County Council has an Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee and four standing Overview & Scrutiny Committees, working in the same way that CYC's scrutiny committees work. These are based on the following remits:
- Children & Families
  - Health & Care
  - Environment & Communities
  - Economic Growth
24. Birmingham City Council has five Overview & Scrutiny Committees with remits that are structured to cover every aspect of the council's work:
- Corporate Resources
  - Economy, Skills and Sustainability
  - Education and Vulnerable Children
  - Health and Social Care
  - Neighbourhood and Community Services
25. In Telford and Wrekin there is a Scrutiny Management Board responsible for the strategic direction and oversight of the scrutiny function and work programme. The Board holds the Executive to account and reviews issues of a strategic cross-cutting nature. There are also four committees with remits that cover the range of services that the Council delivers:
- Finance & Enterprise
  - Children & Young People
  - Customer, Community & Partnership
  - Health & Adult Care

### **Current Scrutiny Arrangements in York**

26. Here in York Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee manages the scrutiny function and carries out all post decision call-in. It also undertakes scrutiny reviews and policy development work specific to its remit.
27. The four standing Policy & Scrutiny Committees carry out review and policy development work specific to their individual remits. Some of the standing committees are also responsible for discharging the statutory

functions conferred on the Council by various Acts e.g. crime & disorder, flood plans, education and health.

28. All the Committees tend to set up Task Groups made up of their committee members to carry out reviews on their behalf. CSMC considers any topic submission that may cross over more than one committee remit and allocates it to a specific committee. Alternatively, CSMC can set up an ad-hoc scrutiny committee to carry out the review, made up of members from one or more scrutiny committees.
29. The current arrangements enable all non-Executive Members to be involved in the work of one or more scrutiny committees. The Scrutiny Committees are supported by two F/T scrutiny officers and each committee has a Lead Officer responsible for 'championing' scrutiny within their Directorates and ensuring Scrutiny Officers receive appropriate technical support and information.
30. Most recently, new arrangements have been introduced to encourage a closer working relationship between the Executive / Executive Members and scrutiny committees. These new arrangements require scrutiny to do policy development /consultation on decision making more effectively, through the mechanism of pre-decision call-in as detailed in paragraph 8 above.
31. Disadvantages with Current Arrangements  
The current scrutiny committee remits were originally agreed back in 2009, designed around the then Local Area Agreement themes, in an effort to encourage improved partnership working. That agreement is no longer in place and the Council priorities, Executive Member portfolios and partnership working arrangements have been changed a number of times since that time. Therefore, there is now no longer any clear and recognisable link between the current scrutiny committee remits and the priorities of the Council and its partners.
32. Historically in York, there has been limited policy development scrutiny carried out. A majority of scrutiny review work was reactive – looking at the way the Council delivers its services and holding to account previous Executive/Executive Member decisions. However, since the new Executive/Scrutiny arrangements outlined in paragraph 8 have been initiated, there has been a move towards more pro-active policy development work, mainly through the pre-decision call-in route. Whilst this is a recent development, it is already clear that this new arrangement can only be successful if scrutiny committees are consulted early about ongoing policy development work in Directorates, and are able to

consider Executive / Executive Member reports early enough in the process to be able to inform the report recommendations.

33. Differing work priorities for the Executive and scrutiny committees present a challenge in the terms of the corporate capacity to consistently support effective scrutiny with senior officer support. This is an increasing challenge as the size of the senior officer corps continues to diminish. This is compounded as some senior officers are currently required to support the work of more than one scrutiny committee.
34. Scrutiny committee members are expected to participate in Task Group review work regardless of their interest in or knowledge of the subject matter.
35. The organisation has changed significantly since the existing scrutiny structure and committee remits were introduced and scrutiny committee remits are not equally balanced.
36. Some scrutiny committees struggle to identify suitable topics for review i.e. topics that will result in ambitious recommendations with measurable outcomes.
37. Since the introduction of the scrutiny function, the Health Scrutiny Committee has completed the least number of scrutiny reviews (only 9 since 2005), with the majority of its time spent on overview work, bringing together external health colleagues to discuss ongoing health issues within the city and region. This has not changed even though Public Health is now a responsibility of the Council and a Health & Wellbeing Board has been introduced. Whilst the focus of this council's scrutiny committees has recently changed to policy and scrutiny, the Health Committee's workplan has remained predominantly overview.

### **Options & Analysis**

38. **Option (i) - Current – no change other than remits i.e. CSMC plus 4 standing Policy & Scrutiny Committees**

Assuming no increase in the number of Policy & Scrutiny Committees, the current remits have been considered and compared against some alternative remits, based on the following suggested new Policy & Scrutiny Committees (as detailed in Annex B):

- CSMC
- Environment & Transport
- City & Economy
- Communities & Housing
- Adults & Children

39. Advantages

- Changing the current remits in line with the proposals detailed in Annex A would better balance the workloads.
- The suggested remit for the City & Economy Policy & Scrutiny Committee would bring together all of the areas covered by Make it York, enabling them to report to just one committee. This is a good example of one way that scrutiny can support new ways of working i.e. scrutinising the delivery of partners / commissioned services.
- Bringing together environment & transport under one committee remit recognises the links that exist between those two issues.
- Bringing Adults and Children together which would include all the health scrutiny functions conferred on the Council by the Local Government Act 2000 would significantly change the dynamic of the current Health Scrutiny Committee i.e. its current over focus on overview work as detailed in paragraph 37 above.

40. Disadvantages

This option will do nothing to improve:

- corporate capacity
- The number of suitable scrutiny topics submitted
- The number of scrutiny reviews that result in ambitious recommendations and measurable outcomes
- Non-Executive Members participation in review work
- More pro-active scrutiny i.e. more policy development work, although this may continue to improve through the new Executive/Scrutiny arrangements over time
- Finance and performance monitoring. The information provided would continue to be aligned differently to how it is provided to the Executive and CMT. This would maintain the level of work required of the Business Intelligence Hub and Finance officers and would not support the Council's intention to have a lighter, more coherent performance management framework. A suggested change to the way that performance monitoring information is provided in the future is detailed in paragraphs 85-90 below.

41. Furthermore, this option would not improve support to the new Executive / Scrutiny working arrangements detailed in paragraph 8 above.

42. **Option (ii) - Current – no change other than bringing remits in line with Executive Member portfolios**

There are currently eight portfolios (see breakdown at Annex C):

- Leader, Finance & Performance

- Deputy Leader, Economic Development & Community Engagement
- Transport & Planning
- Education, Children & Young People
- Housing & Safer Neighbourhoods
- Culture, Leisure & Tourism
- Adult Social Care & Health
- Environment

43. Without increasing the number of scrutiny committees, each committee's remit will need to cover more than one Executive Member portfolio. How they are allocated to ensure the remits are equally balanced, may affect the number of scrutiny committees required. A reduction in the number of scrutiny committees will lead to a saving, and an increase will incur additional costs through an increase in the number of SRAs for Committee Chairs.

44. In order to explore this option in more detail, consideration was given to how best to group the portfolios over the existing number of scrutiny committees.

- It makes sense to have CSMC continue to manage the scrutiny function. Therefore it would only be feasible for it to also cover one Executive portfolio. A majority of the elements of the Leader, Finance & Performance portfolio are currently covered by CSMC and they fit well alongside the management of the scrutiny function, so there is nothing to be gained from changing the current remit of CSMC.
- As the city's economy is supported by its cultural heritage and tourism, it makes sense to group together the Deputy Leader's Economic Development & Community Engagement portfolio with Culture, Leisure & Tourism. Although it is recognised that some elements of the Deputy Leader's portfolio fit less well in this grouping e.g. Electoral Services, Legal Services, Civic & Democratic Services etc. Furthermore, Community Engagement and ward committees are elements of the Deputy Leader's portfolio that are quite distinct from Economic Development and Culture, Leisure & Tourism, and therefore may not fit well alongside those as part of one scrutiny committee remit.
- Due to the nature of the business, and their connections, it makes sense to group together the Transport & Planning portfolio and the Environment portfolio. This committee would take responsibility for the scrutiny of the city's flood plans (as required by the Localism Act 2011).

- The scrutiny committee linked to the Adult Social Care & Health portfolio would also be required to take responsibility for the discharge of the health and scrutiny functions conferred on the Council by the Local Government Act 2000. This would include:
  - (a) Undertaking all of the Council's statutory functions in accordance with section 7 of the Health and Social Care Act 2001, NHS Reformed & Health Care Professional Act 2002, and section 244 of the National Health Service Act 2006 and associated regulations, including appointing members, from within the membership of the Committee, to any joint Overview and Scrutiny Committees with other local authorities, as directed under the National Health Service Act 2006.
  - (b) Reviewing and scrutinising the impact of the services and policies of key partners on the health of the City's population
  - (c) Reviewing arrangements made by the Council and local NHS bodies for public health within the City
  - (d) Making reports and recommendations to the local NHS body or other local providers of services and to evaluate and review the effectiveness of its reports and recommendations
  - (e) Delegating functions of Overview and Scrutiny of health to another Local Authority Committee
  - (f) Reporting to the Secretary of State of Health when it is concerned that consultation on substantial variation or development of service has been inadequate, or if it considers that the proposals are not in the interests of the health service
- Due to the size of the remit, it therefore makes sense not to group the Adult Social Care & Health together with another Executive Member portfolio.
- This leaves the Education, Children and Young People Portfolio and the Housing & Safer Neighbourhoods Portfolio. As both are linked to families and communities, they too could be covered by one scrutiny committee remit. Which ever scrutiny committee covers the safer neighbourhoods' element, it will also need to be responsible for the scrutiny of education matters and discharging the functions conferred on the Council by sections 19 & 20 of the Police & Justice Act 2006, in relation to the scrutiny of community safety issues, and the work of the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

45. In summary the suggested grouping of portfolios is as follows:



CSMC - Leader, Finance & Performance

Standing Committee 1 – Deputy Leader, Economic Development & Community Engagement, and Culture, Leisure & Tourism

Standing Committee 2 – Transport & Planning, and Environment

Standing Committee 3 – Adult Social Care & Health

Standing Committee 4 – Education, Children & Young People, and Housing & Safer Neighbourhoods

46. It is recognised this is not a perfect fit. The only way to maximise the benefits from this option, would be to make some changes to the portfolios, which would require the agreement of the Executive/Leader.

47. Advantages

- Better supports the new working arrangements between the Executive and scrutiny committees than options (i) & (iii) (as detailed in paragraph 8 above)
- May improve corporate capacity
- Executive members need only attend meetings of one scrutiny committee (including call-in)
- Will best fit with the external performance framework which the Executive and CMT use i.e. it will align performance information considered by the Scrutiny Committees with that which is considered by the Executive/Executive Members – for further information on how this will work, see paragraphs 85-90 below.
- Will allow the same quarterly finance report to the Executive to be used for reporting to scrutiny, thereby minimising the work required by Finance officers.

48. Disadvantages

- Some senior officers will still be required to support more than one scrutiny committee which would not improve the issue of competing workloads for those officers
- Could become out of date quickly if remits are not kept update with future changes to Executive Member portfolios
- Too close a relationship with Executive Members could be perceived as a loss of objective challenge
- Committee remits/workloads may remain imbalanced

49. In addition, this option will do nothing to improve:
- The number of scrutiny topics submitted
  - The number of scrutiny reviews that result in ambitious recommendations and measurable outcomes
  - Non-Executive Members participation in review work
  - More pro-active scrutiny i.e. more policy development work, although this may improve through the new Executive/Scrutiny arrangements over time
50. **Option (iii) - Current – no change other than bringing remits in line with Directorates**
- There are currently six Directorates and five Scrutiny Committees (including CSMC). However, in June 2016 the Executive agreed proposals for the restructuring of senior management roles and responsibilities within the Council and a reduction in the number of Directorates – see a breakdown of the new Directorate services at Annex D.
51. The new structure has been designed to support the delivery of the council's future operating model taking account of a number of emerging national policy changes including new funding arrangements for councils; housing; education and schools; and devolution.
52. General Disadvantages of this Approach
- Encourages directorate/silo working
  - Potential for losing the independence and challenge of scrutiny as committees become 'owned' by directorates
  - Can become out of date quickly through regular directorate change
  - Working in silos has the potential for scrutiny committees to become less corporately supportive, and less outward looking – may require some other mechanism to ensure this
  - Finance and performance monitoring information would be aligned differently to how it is provided to the Executive and CMT.
53. In addition, Option (ii) will do nothing to:
- Improve corporate capacity
  - Increase the number of suitable scrutiny topics submitted
  - Increase the number of scrutiny reviews that result in ambitious recommendations and measurable outcomes
  - Increase non-Executive member participation in review work
  - Improve the quantity/quality of policy development work
54. In considering aligning Scrutiny Committees to the new Directorates, Members are first asked to note that the current scrutiny committee

remits are already reasonably aligned to the new directorate structure as shown below:

CSMC:	Corporate Services
Learning & Culture	Children's Services, plus one element of the Place Services directorate i.e. Public Realm/parks and open spaces
Health	Adult Services & Public Health less one AD from Adult Services i.e. Housing & Community Safety etc
Economic Development & Transport:	Incorporating the majority of the Place Services Directorate, less specific elements which fall within the remit of Communities & Environment
Communities & Environment:	Incorporating the responsibilities of one AD from Adult Services i.e. Housing & Community Safety etc, one AD from Children's Services i.e. Communities & Equalities etc and some elements of the Place Services Directorate i.e. Waste, Licensing, Environment and Environmental Health & Trading Standards.

55. Advantages

- This would not increase the current number of ADs (1) having to report to more than one Scrutiny Committee and the current number of Executive Members attending to each Scrutiny Committee.
- Scrutiny members understand the current remits, and officers are clear on who they currently report to.
- Scrutiny Committees and officers can maintain their current working relationships

56. The disadvantages of remaining with the current scrutiny committee set up are detailed above in paragraphs 31-37.

57. If this option was to be progressed and the scrutiny Committee remits revised to match the new directorates, there are a number of ways this

could be done. The obvious allocation would be one scrutiny committee aligned to each new Directorate i.e.:

CSMC:	Corporate Services
Standing Committee 1:	Children's Services
Standing Committee 2:	Adult Services
Standing Committees 3:	Public Health
Standing Committee 4:	Place Services

58. Advantages

- Officer clarity on which Committee they report to – ADs will be required to support one scrutiny committee only
- Scrutiny Committees and officers can establish a clear and consistent working relationship
- Senior officer support may be improved as they take more direct ownership
- Publicly transparent – easily understood reporting lines throughout organisation
- Better supports the new relationship between scrutiny committees and Executive members than option (i), and may encourage more pro-active scrutiny i.e. more policy development work, although this may continue to improve through the new Executive/Scrutiny arrangements over time
- Supports the new Executive / scrutiny working arrangements detailed in paragraph 8 above.

59. Disadvantages

- Five Executive Members would be required to attend meetings of the Place Services Scrutiny Committee (the other committees would only require two to attend).
- Committee remits/workloads would remain imbalanced
- If some of the remits were limited there could be a tendency for those committees to scrutinise for the sake of being seen to do some work
- As the remit of the Place Services Scrutiny Committee would be so large, it would likely be necessary to increase officer support to the Committee and the cycle of its meetings and perhaps specific meetings would need to be delegated to specific service areas.

60. To address these disadvantages, an alternative allocation could be:

CSMC:	Corporate Services
Standing Committee 1:	Children's Services
Standing Committee 2:	Adult Services & Public Health
Standing Committees 3 & 4:	Place Services (to be divided between two scrutiny committees)

61. Disadvantages

- The proposal above would result in Committee 2 – 'Adult Services & Public Health' being responsible for two of the main statutory scrutiny functions conferred on the Council by various Acts i.e. crime & disorder and health, which would be time consuming based on the amount of associated overview and review work and the number of partners involved.
- Identifying a suitable division of Place Services may be difficult if the two scrutiny committees are to have balanced remits and workloads.

62. One suggestion would be to divide the service areas as follows:

Committee 3 – Place Services	Committee 4 – Place Services
Travel & Infrastructure	Environment & Assets
Highways	Public Realm / Parks & Open Spaces
Transport	Waste
Parking	Fleet
Sustainable Development	Environmental Health & Trading Standards
Planning & Environment	Licensing
Building Control & Property Information	Bereavement Services
Economic Regeneration	Estate Commercialisation
Infrastructure Programme Management	Assets & Property Management
Economy & Place Strategy	Programme Management
Client Management: Make it York	Client Management: YorWaste

63. Disadvantages

The disadvantage of this split would be that three Executive Members would be required to attend meetings of the two Place Services Committees, with one of those having to report to both i.e. the Executive Member for Environment. This replicates the current situation with the Executive Member for Environment reporting to both the Economic Development & Transport Committee and the Communities & Environment Committee.

**64. Option (iv) - New – 1 Parent Committee & 3 Standing Committees with specific roles as follows:**

65. Corporate & Scrutiny Management Committee - Responsible for managing and monitoring the scrutiny function and any post-decision call-ins.
66. Policy Scrutiny Committee - Responsible for all pre-decision scrutiny of forthcoming Executive & Executive Member decisions, and any policy development scrutiny reviews e.g. the recent Housing Allocations Scrutiny Review where the review supported an ongoing officer led Allocations Service Development review, and the recent Economic Strategy review in which scrutiny members worked with partners and the business community to help develop a draft strategy for the Executive's consideration.
67. Select Scrutiny Committee - Responsible for holding the Executive to account and undertaking any reviews on significant local issues e.g. Bootham Hospital, Floods etc. This committee would also receive the quarterly Finance reports and performance scorecards.
68. Statutory Scrutiny Committee – Responsible for all the statutory scrutiny functions i.e. Health, Education, Crime & Disorder and Flood Plans.
69. Advantages
- This allows scrutiny to focus on the way it works in a more coherent and strategic way.
  - Would enhance the opportunities for policy development work
  - Would help to minimise the issues currently with corporate capacity as it would support the work of senior officers and the Executive in developing policies and practices, and delivering improvements in services.
  - Would help focus review topics before proceeding
  - Would help streamline the time spent on scrutinising statutory functions – see issue with current Health Scrutiny committee as detailed in paragraph 37.
  - Prevents silo working
  - Support the new Executive/scrutiny working arrangements detailed in paragraph 8.
  - Not affected by future changes to Executive Member portfolios or directorates
  - Would encourage more ambitious recommendations and measurable outcomes

- This option is in line with the best practice scrutiny model in place at Lincoln – see paragraphs 18-19.

70. Disadvantages

- Executive Members and senior officers would be required to attend more than one scrutiny committee as necessary.
- If scrutiny committee membership remains at 7/8 members, not all non-Executive Members will be involved in Scrutiny. However a slight increase in committee membership (2 Committees with 9 and 2 Committees with 10) would address this.

71. **Option (v) - New – Scrutiny Management Committee plus 3 standing Policy & Scrutiny Committees in line with Corporate Priorities**

The Council Plan 2015-19 is based on three corporate priorities (see breakdown of corporate priority aims and direction of travel at Annex E):

- A Prosperous City For All, where local businesses can thrive and residents have good quality jobs, housing and opportunities
- A Focus on Frontline Services, to ensure all residents, particularly the least advantaged, can access reliable services and community facilities
- A Council that Listens to Residents, to ensure it delivers the services they want and works in partnership with local communities

72. This option feels very different to the current arrangements in that there is no clear distinct link between each of the Council's priorities and either the individual services delivered by each Directorate or the Executive Member portfolios. So more than any other option, this will require scrutiny members to focus on what they are aiming to achieve through a scrutiny review, in order to deliver measurable outcomes as good practice suggests – see Annex A.

73. To best support this, the aim of each scrutiny topic submitted will need to be clearly defined within the topic submission form to provide clarity on which scrutiny committee should consider it. Applying agreed criteria to assess the appropriate allocation of scrutiny topics, based on delivering corporate priorities and making a measurable difference, will ensure all review proposals are properly assessed. Where there is no clear evidence that a review would achieve either of these, Members will have the option to decide not to proceed.

74. Where a topic has the potential to support more than one priority, CSMC could be called on to decide which committee it should be allocated to,

depending on workloads, or they may decide to form an ad-hoc Committee drawn from Members of more than one scrutiny committee

75. Furthermore, this option would better support the recent shift away from overview towards more policy development work, as initiated through the new Executive/scrutiny arrangements and the change of scrutiny committee names.
76. With this option, it is suggested that the remit of CSMC would remain the same, incorporating both the scrutiny management function and the internal corporate processes e.g. Business Services, Communications, and Procurement etc.
77. Advantages:
- Clear and transparent link between service delivery, corporate priorities and scrutiny work - streamlining scrutiny work with service delivery work would make it easier for senior officers, key stakeholders and partner organisations to recognise the benefits of engagement.
  - Reducing the number of scrutiny committees will reduce the number of Committee Chairs Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) and therefore lead to a saving.
  - Scrutiny Committees could be made larger to enable maximum number of non-Executive members to be involved, thereby providing a larger pool of Members from which to undertake Task Group reviews, enabling members to only participate in reviews they have a clear interest in
  - Will require updating in 2019 when Council Plan is refreshed – this is sensible as it will ensure the work of scrutiny remains current and topical.
  - Focussing on corporate priorities will ensure all scrutiny reviews and policy development work supports the Council's direction of travel.
  - Balanced committee remits
  - Removes all suggestion of silo working
  - Easy to allocate policy development work
  - Moving to an approach that feels significantly different, with a reduced number of scrutiny committees, may provide the impetus needed to refresh levels of engagement from members and senior officers, and make scrutiny more pro-active.
  - Would better support emerging themes from the future CYC operating model e.g. a move towards more community based working
78. Disadvantages:
- Executive Members may report to more than one Scrutiny Committee



- Senior Officers may be required to support more than one scrutiny committee which could lead to competing workloads for those officers
- If scrutiny committee membership remains at 7/8 members, not all non-Executive Members will be involved in Scrutiny. However a slight increase in committee membership (2 Committees with 9 and 2 Committees with 10) would address this.
- Finance and performance information would continue to be aligned differently to how it is provided to the Executive and CMT, This would increase the work required of the Business Intelligence Hub and Finance officers and would not support the Council's intention to have a lighter, coherent performance management framework – A suggested change to the way that performance monitoring information is provided in the future is detailed in paragraphs 85-90 below.

79. This option would still allow for scrutiny committees carrying out performance monitoring as the Council's new KPI system enables performance indicators to be grouped in a number of ways including by corporate priority.

80. **Option (vi) - New – Scrutiny Management Committee only, with ad-hoc Task & Finish Working Groups set up to carry out Policy Development & Scrutiny Reviews as and when required.**

Scrutiny Management Committee would be responsible for managing the scrutiny function and setting up Task & Finish Working Groups. They would consider all scrutiny topic submissions and sign off all review final reports before their consideration by the Executive. They would also be responsible for monitoring the implementation of all approved scrutiny review recommendations.

81. Advantages:

- Removing the standing scrutiny committees from the committee structure would result in a saving by reducing the number of Scrutiny Chair SRAs.
- Task Group reviews would be undertaken by Members with an interest in the subject matter.
- Not affected by future changes to Executive Member Portfolios, Directorates or the Council Plan.
- Would limit the time available for overview which would remove the over emphasis on overview currently experienced by some of the scrutiny committees.

82. Disadvantages:

- Heavy workload for CSMC - would need to meet more regularly in order to get through the business – probably monthly, and therefore may benefit from having a larger pool of members, to ensure meetings remain quorate.
- CSMC would be responsible for all overview work including finance and performance monitoring for all services
- May result in less time being focussed on statutory functions e.g. Health and Crime & Disorder. This could be addressed in a number of ways e.g. carrying out a related review, receiving bi-annual updates from Safer York Partnership, holding an annual meeting with health partners etc.
- CSMC would have sole responsibility for implementing the new Executive/scrutiny arrangements, which may significantly increase CSMC's workload.
- Reliant on topic submissions which is already an issue for some scrutiny committees.
- Less Non-Executive members required as formal scrutiny committee members
- Scrutiny Members will find it more difficult to build up a level of knowledge and understanding.
- Finance and performance information would continue to be aligned differently to how it is provided to the Executive and CMT, This would increase the work required of the Business Intelligence Hub and Finance officers and would not support the Council's intention to have a lighter, coherent performance management framework – A suggested change to the way that performance monitoring information is provided in the future is detailed in paragraphs 85-90 below.

83. Furthermore, this model has previously been in place in York and it was not successful in generating:

- Corporate engagement
- Scrutiny topic submissions
- Successful scrutiny reviews
- Non-Executive Members participation in the scrutiny process
- Pro-active policy development work

84. Furthermore, those non-Executive Members who were not members of CSMC became disenfranchised. As a result, less scrutiny topics were submitted, less review work was undertaken, and there were less positive outcomes from scrutiny. This in turn led to less and less non-Executive Member engagement.

85. Future Finance & Performance Monitoring Arrangements

Historically the organisation has reported performance in line with its council plan priorities or by department. However most recently each scrutiny committee has been receiving, a scorecard of all relevant indicators generated through the council's KPI machine (the Council's central repository of performance and management information), and presented as part of a quarterly Finance & Performance update report.

86. However an alternative approach would be to have this presented as an 'information only' agenda item at every scrutiny meeting. This to appear at the end of a scrutiny agenda for use as a discussion point, to enable scrutiny members to define topics and areas that they want more detailed information on and/or to scrutinise. It is expected that the relevant senior manager and/or executive member present at the meeting would be able to answer the majority of queries around performance, and therefore no written report would be required and an officer from the business intelligence hub would not be expected to attend.
87. It is also suggested that in order to continue to make sure the council has a lighter, coherent performance management framework, that outside of the arrangement outline above, if a scrutiny committee is interested in performance in a specific area within its remit, then this could be considered through a separate agenda item with its own scorecard/report. If this information is already available within the councils KPI machine it will be provided by the business Intelligence hub. Otherwise it will be the responsibility of the Scrutiny Officer to source the relevant information.
88. In addition, as a continuation of existing arrangements, requests for performance information held within the KPI machine could also be made via the scrutiny officer and circulated to committee members between meetings. All information that is published via scorecards externally, will also be published in raw data form on the open data platform: [www.yorkopendata.org](http://www.yorkopendata.org)
89. In regard to finance monitoring, the existing arrangement for quarterly reporting by exception would continue, with the information taken from the quarterly reports provided to the Executive.
90. It is possible to revise the parameters set in the KPI machine for generating scorecards. Currently Executive Members and Corporate

Management Team receive scorecards based on Executive Member portfolios and current local and national priorities. If a decision were taken to progress option (ii) in this report i.e. aligning scrutiny committee remits to Executive Member portfolios, each scrutiny committee would receive the same scorecards as CMT and the relevant Executive Members, which would reflect the importance the administration has put on transparency and the ability of policy and scrutiny committees to interact with decision making. However should a decision be taken to progress an alternative option, it would require minimum work to create additional parameters to suit alternative scrutiny committee remits.

### **Previous Consultation on Options**

91. In January 2016 CMT considered this report and recommended that Option (ii) 'current with no change other than bringing remits in line with Executive Member portfolios' be progressed as the most suitable option. This was before Option (iv) was included in this report. At the time they agreed that the alignment of scrutiny remits with Executive Member portfolios would best achieve:
- the Council's intention to improve transparency
  - the new working arrangements between the Executive and scrutiny committees
  - the new arrangements for performance monitoring, and
  - help address the issue of competing workloads for senior officers
  - improve corporate capacity to support scrutiny
92. Scrutiny Chairs & Vice Chairs also met to consider the options in this report prior to the new operating model and senior management restructure being known and prior to option (iv) being included. At that time Members agreed that option (iii) matching scrutiny committee remits to the new directorates may be the most sensible approach but agreed they needed to await the outcome of the restructure process in order to consider the associated advantages and disadvantages.

### **Implications**

93. Finance – Both Option (iv) to have four standing scrutiny committees, and Option (v) to have CSMC plus three standing Policy & Scrutiny Committees in line with corporate priorities would reduce the number of Scrutiny Chair SRAs by one, leading to an annual saving of £4,200. In regard to Option (vi) removing all four standing scrutiny committee from the Council's committee structure – this option would result in an annual saving of £16,800 through the removal of four Scrutiny Chair SRAs.

94. HR – The implementation of any of the options (i) – (v) would not change the level of officer support required. Option (vi) has the potential to result in a reduction in the amount of review work undertaken, as evidenced the last time this structure was in place in York. This could result in less officer time and resources being required to support scrutiny.
95. Legal – Overview and Scrutiny is a required function of local authorities in England and Wales. It was introduced by the Local Government Act 2000 which created separate Executive and Overview and Scrutiny functions within councils.
96. Councils operating executive arrangements are required to create an Overview and Scrutiny Committee which is composed of Councillors who are not on the Executive Committee, or Cabinet, of that council. Overview and Scrutiny Committees are required to meet the rules on proportionality defined in the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 (i.e. the committee must reflect the respective sizes of the political groups on the council).
97. There are no other known implications associated with the recommendation in this report.

### **Risk Management**

98. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy; there are no known risks, associated with the recommendation in this report.

### **Recommendations**

99. Members are asked to:
  - a) Note the contents of this report
  - b) Comment on the individual options (i) – (v), as detailed in paragraphs 38-85 above
  - c) Consider the feedback from CMT & Scrutiny Chairs etc, as shown at paragraph 86 & 87 above
  - d) Agree a preferred option and seek the approval of Council.

Reason: To fulfil the scrutiny management role of this Committee, in line with the current scrutiny arrangements

**Contact Details**

**Author:** **Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Melanie Carr  
Scrutiny Officer  
Ext. 2063

Andrew Docherty  
Assistant Director, Governance & ITT  
Ext 1004

**Report Approved**

**Date**

July 2016

**Wards Affected:**

**All**

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

**Background Papers:** N/A

**Annexes:**

**Annex A** – Key Highlights from CfPS 2014-15 Survey

**Annex B** – Option (i) Same Number of Committees with Revised Remits

**Annex C** – Option (ii) Remits in line with Executive Member Portfolios

**Annex D** – Option (iii) Remits in line with Directorates - Breakdown of revised Directorate Services

**Annex E** – Option (iv) Remits in line with Corporate Priorities

**Abbreviations:**

CfPS – Centre for Public Scrutiny

CMT – Corporate Management Team

## Key Highlights from 2014/15 CfPS Survey

### 1. Scrutiny Models

In general, there are four model types:

- *Specialist model* - councils have a dedicated scrutiny support team (as in York)
- *Committee model* - scrutiny support is principally provided by democratic services officers
- *Integrated model* - scrutiny support comes mainly from policy officers in service departments
- *Generic model* - officers sit in a large team and have responsibilities for scrutiny, corporate policy, and corporate performance. This is a new option for this year – previously, these councils would have been described by us as operating under the integrated support model.

2. CfPS have expressed concern with the generic support model for scrutiny. Inevitably, it fails to take into account the unique skillset required by dedicated scrutiny officers, and risks officers' time for scrutiny support being 'crowded out' by work for the Executive, to say nothing of the potential for conflicts of interest between Executive and non-executive support. However, they do recognise that in some authorities, resources are such that this appears to be the only sustainable way to retain some scrutiny support.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Specialist</b>	47%	59%	47%	55%	55%	51%	53%	48%	45%	43%
<b>Committee</b>	19%	12%	8%	4%	10%	14%	15%	19%	19%	15%
<b>Integrated</b>	31%	28%	37%	33%	27%	22%	32%	34%	36%	33%
<b>Generic</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%

3. The largest concentration of 'generic' support is in District/Borough, London Borough, and Other Unitary councils.
4. Unsurprisingly, councils using a specialist model reported higher rates of scrutiny having a positive impact on the lives of local people. 43.7% of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to effectively monitor the implementations of recommendations also reported using the specialist mode. Many of those who responded to those questions pointed out that the level of impact scrutiny can have in their authority was highly dependent on the elected members and the

topics they were looking at. A few respondents noted members were not always able to fully take on the scrutiny role, that they may have faced interference from their Executive, were limited by finances, or had recommendations ignored. Although some of those comments are concerning, they highlight some of the many challenges councils face in their efforts to have a meaningful and positive impact through scrutiny.

5. Resourcing

The survey results showed that resources continue to be a concern; the merging of scrutiny support into other roles means that even though the average number of full time equivalent scrutiny support posts is holding up, more of those officers will be spending only a quarter or a third of their time on scrutiny, limiting their ability to work with members to make an impact. Moving away from dedicated officer resourcing means that many councils lack the capacity to provide support to councillors to scrutinise transformation and major change. This should be a big concern to those councils.

6. The 2013/14 survey results showed the full time equivalent (FTE) scrutiny officer average was 1.75. When asked for projections during that survey for 2014/15, the predicted FTE average was 1.63. However, the average number of FTE officer posts for the municipal year of 2014/15 was 1.87, well above the predicted average. This is positive news and may in part be due to a higher response rate compared to last year. It also supports the evidence that FTE scrutiny officer support goes in cycles with increases and decreases every few years.
7. 43% of councils reported having one or more dedicated scrutiny officers. This is down 5% from last year, and is at its lowest level since 2006. Evidence suggests an increasing number of officers are splitting their time between scrutiny work and other obligations due to shrinking officer resources. In York there are 2 dedicated scrutiny officers.
8. The dedicated average scrutiny budget does not follow this trend. For the 8th year in a row, council's scrutiny budgets have declined and the average budget for 2014/15 is £3, 277, down from £3, 447 in 2013/14. In York the annual budget for scrutiny is £5k.
9. Overall, scrutiny's capacity and resources are clearly declining as 22% out of the 275 councils reported they were facing a decrease in officer resourcing or discretionary budget.



10. Involvement in Major Projects

The 2014/15 survey asked about scrutiny's involvement in major projects and service changes, and reasons why scrutiny may not be involved in such projects in the future. Of the 36% of respondents who advised they did not believe scrutiny would be involved in major projects in the future, the most common reason listed was opposition from the executive/senior officers, with the lack of resources indicated as being the second biggest barrier.

11. Transformation

Over the last couple of years it has steadily become apparent that local authorities will be facing increasing pressures to maintain or increase services with fewer resources. As a result, large numbers of councils are undertaking major transformation projects.

12. Transformation presents a huge opportunity for scrutiny councillors to influence decisions which will affect local people's lives for many years. Despite the fact that a majority of councils feel that scrutiny has a clearly defined role in improvement and governance arrangements, this is not the case in a substantive number of councils. In a sizeable minority, scrutiny is effectively cut out from exercising any meaningful role.

13. Over 80% of respondents advised their council was or would be undertaking some form of major transformation. Of those, as many as 22% indicated that scrutiny was not involved or only involved in a limited way.

14. 84% out of 256 councils reported they would be going through major service changes. The majority of respondents indicated scrutiny would have some level of involvement in the process but only 19% reported being heavily involved or involved from the start.

15. 65.6% agreed that scrutiny in their council had 'a clearly defined and valued role in the council improvement and governance arrangements.' In York, the council's governance arrangements currently fall within the remit of CSMC, although the value it adds is minimal.

16. Impact & Influence

The 2014/15 survey evidenced a robust attitude towards the need for scrutiny to focus on securing positive outcomes, but a substantial proportion of councils reported still needing to do more work in that area.

17. Many councils expressed the view that they were not producing 'ambitious' recommendations. In asking questions about this CfPS wanted to understand whether scrutiny was challenging group thinking and making recommendations which provoked decision-makers to think differently, rather than going with the grain. Although 'ambition' is a subjective concept, it is still troubling that only a minority of respondents felt that they were doing this.
18. More respondents felt they secured impact through the two more traditional and direct means – direct acceptance of recommendations and holding the council and its partners to account. However, in three areas the impact of scrutiny appeared to be significantly lessened – brokering in policy disputes, exposing wrongdoing and poor decision making, and 'generating fear' i.e. provoking decision-makers to do things merely because a scrutiny review is expected or ongoing. The fact that for many authorities, a lack of data made these judgments difficult to come by is instructive.
19. 47% of councils indicated recommendations included measurable outcomes that allowed them to judge progress and implementation. However only 30% of respondents indicated they had ambitious recommendations where changes may be challenging or difficult to achieve, for organisational or political reasons. Evidence suggested there were multiple factors influencing those results. The largest being an aversion to suggesting ambitious recommendations to avoid them being rejected by the council, executive, or cabinet for being too difficult or complicated, and lack of resources to adequately tackle them. This indicates that scrutiny is working within confines to ensure that positive changes are made in smaller, more manageable steps to avoid no changes being made at all. Historically, here in York scrutiny has struggled to make ambitious recommendations or those with measurable outcomes.
20. 77% of respondents reported they were able to effectively monitor the implementations of recommendations. The previous year's report indicated 70.3% of councils had a formal mechanism to monitor recommendations. Here in York, each scrutiny committee regularly monitors implementation of their scrutiny recommendations as approved by the Executive.
21. Effectiveness  
A question based on the "characteristics of effective scrutiny" revealed that respondents were generally positive with two exceptions. The first

related to people's confidence that resources were adequate (as detailed above). The second focussed on scrutiny's ability to build and sustain positive working relationships with others. 29% disagreed or disagreed strongly that scrutiny was seen as a key tool for citizen involvement and engagement; a similar proportion considered that scrutiny was not seen as encouraging participation in democratic accountability. Many Councils confirmed they were unclear on what effect ongoing austerity would have on scrutiny's effectiveness.

22. The survey results suggested there was no proven structural formula for effectiveness. A range of different council types scored both well and poorly, against the impact and influence measures CfPS set out. The only obvious link that could be made, which had also been noted in previous years, was that between dedicated officer support and effectiveness. Particularly in the case of councils who now support scrutiny through large, generic teams (who are also responsible for supporting executive services) a decline in scrutiny's effectiveness had been seen. Furthermore, Councils with more committees seemed, broadly speaking, to be more effective. This was an interesting finding which tends not to reflect the long-held assumption held by some, that 'fewer committees = better scrutiny'.
23. Many respondents felt that scrutiny was most effective and rigorous when chaired by a member of the opposition but there was no concrete evidence to support that. However, the evidence did suggest there was a relationship between how chair and vice-chairs were appointed and how positively scrutiny is viewed in the authority. Evidence showed that the political and organisational culture towards scrutiny was most positive in authorities where the minority party held the chair position (as in York) and the majority party held the vice-chair position.
24. CfPS tried to establish a clear link between scrutiny's impact and effectiveness, and other factors measured about scrutiny's operation. The key findings were:
  - Councils that reported scrutiny having a larger impact on the lives of local people, were those better able to effectively monitor the progress and impact of recommendations.
  - Councils reporting more positively against the characteristics of effective scrutiny and positive impact, tended to be those reporting that scrutiny was valued by their authority and better resourced.

- Councils reporting that they had more robust work programming arrangements tended also to be those scoring more highly on various measures of effectiveness.
- While just over half of respondents felt positive about scrutiny's future, it was difficult to establish a particular characteristic of the authorities they worked in which explained why this was the case. It is likely to be due to a complex combination of national and local circumstances.
- Councils who reported having a more positive political and organisational culture towards scrutiny also reported scrutiny had a greater impact on the lives of people in their authority.
- Culture, values and behaviours significantly influence effectiveness. So when councils look to enhance and improve their scrutiny functions, this area needs to be addressed first. For the most part, these will be the values and attitudes of decision-makers – cabinet members and senior officers – which can serve either to empower scrutiny, or to hinder it. This has been identified as something to be addressed here in York.

### Option (i) Same Number of Committees with Revised Remits

Current Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits	Proposed New Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits				
CSMC	CSMC	Environment & Transport	City & Economy	Communities & Housing	Adults & Children
Audit & Risk Management	✓				
Strategic Finance	✓				
IT&T	✓				
Public Services	✓				
Property Services	✓				
Policy & Development	✓				
Civic Democratic & Legal Services	✓				
Marketing & Communications	✓				
Human Resources & Directorate HR Services	✓				
Performance & Improvements	✓				
Resources & Business Management	✓				
Business Support Services	✓				
Corporate Services	✓				
Directorate Financial Services	✓				
Management Information Services	✓				
Communities & Environment					
Flood Protection		✓			
Smarter York		✓			
Waste Management		✓			
Street Environment		✓			
Housing Landlord (HRA)				✓	
Housing General				✓	
Taxi Licensing		✓			
Trading Standards			✓		

Current Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits	Proposed New Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits				
	CSMC	Environment & Transport	City & Economy	Communities & Housing	Adults & Children
Communities & Environment cont/d			✓		
Licensing Policy and Enforcement				✓	
Licensing and Bereavement Registrar				✓	
Safer City				✓	
Emergency Planning				✓	
Domestic Violence				✓	
Safer Neighbourhoods				✓	
Anti-Social Behaviour				✓	
Youth Offending				✓	
Environmental Health				✓	
Alcohol and Drugs Action				✓	
Food Hygiene				✓	
Animal Welfare				✓	
Plus, functions conferred on the Council by sections 19 & 20 of the Police & Justice Act 2006				✓	
Economic Development & Transport					
Economic Development & Regeneration			✓		
Local Plan			✓		
Environment Strategy		✓			
Carbon Reduction		✓			
Strategic Housing				✓	
Civil Engineering & Highways		✓			
Parking Services		✓			
Transport Strategy		✓			
Parking Strategy		✓			

Current Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits	Proposed New Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits				
	CSMC	Environment & Transport	City & Economy	Communities & Housing	Adults & Children
Economic Development & Transport cont/d					
Highways Strategy		✓			
Reinvigorate York			✓		
Regional Transport Infrastructure		✓			
Digital Infrastructure, National Transport Infrastructure		✓			
Fleet Management		✓			
Planning, Conservation & Urban Design		✓			
Air Quality		✓			
Learning & Culture					
School Improvement & Staff Development					✓
Children & Families					✓
Partnerships & Early Intervention					✓
Resource Management					✓
Lifelong Learning					✓
Youth Services					✓
School Place Planning					✓
Play Policy					✓
Leisure			✓		
Tourism			✓		
City Centre Management, Markets & Events			✓		
Arts & Culture			✓		
Heritage			✓		
Libraries & Archives			✓		
Parks				✓	
Health & Adult Social Care					
Public Health					✓

Current Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits	Proposed New Policy & Scrutiny Committee Remits				
	CSMC	Environment & Transport	City & Economy	Communities & Housing	Adults & Children
Health & Adult Social Care cont/d					
Services for carers					✓
Adult Safeguarding					✓
Assessment and Personalisation					✓
Older people, mental health, respite					✓
Commissioning and partnerships					✓
Plus, all health and scrutiny functions conferred on the Council by the Local Government Act 2000					✓



## **Option (ii) Change of remits in line with Executive Member Portfolios – List of Portfolios**

### **The Executive - 8 councillors**

#### **Leader, including Housing and Safer Neighbourhoods**

- Policy, Strategy and Partnerships
- Alcohol and Drugs Action
- Housing
- Fraud
- Safer Neighbourhoods
- Police liaison
- Anti-Social Behaviour
- Licensing Enforcement and Licensing Policy (in conjunction with Chair of Licensing)
- Community Cohesion and Prevent
- Local Plan and Regional Matters (jointly with the Deputy Leader)

#### **Deputy Leader, including Economic Development and Community Engagement**

- Electoral Services
- Legal Services and Information Management
- Civic and Democratic Services (inc. Scrutiny)
- Communications and Media
- Community Engagement
- Ward Committees
- Parish Council liaison
- Play Policy
- Youth Support Services
- Economic Development and Regeneration
- Business and Skills Development
- Apprenticeships
- Local Plan and Regional Matters (jointly with the Leader)

#### **Portfolio - Finance and Performance**

- Re-Wiring Public Services
- Customer Services
- Human Resources and Payroll
- ICT

- Financial Services
- Financial Procedures and Risk Management
- Performance and Business Assurance
- Procurement Services and Commissioning
- Property Services
- Operational Accommodation
- Business Continuity
- Emergency Planning
- Facilities Management

### **Portfolio – Environment**

- Environmental Health and Food Hygiene
- Health and Safety (internal and external)
- Flood Protection
- Smarter York / York Pride
- Waste Management
- Street Environment
- Environment Strategy
- Air Quality
- Street based delivery services
- Community Centres

### **Portfolio – Transport and Planning**

- Civil Engineering and Highways
- Parking Services and Parking Strategy
- Transport Strategy
- Highways Strategy
- Taxi Licensing (in conjunction with Chair of Licensing)
- Digital Infrastructure
- Regional and National Transport Infrastructure
- Fleet Management
- Planning Conservation and Urban Design
- Planning and Development Management

### **Portfolio - Culture, Leisure and Tourism**

- Leisure and Sport (including Community Stadium)
- Tourism
- Arts, Culture and Heritage
- Lifelong Learning
- Parks

- Trading Standards
- Licensing and Bereavement
- Registrar
- Animal Welfare
- Volunteering
- Equalities and Inclusion
- Diversity Peer Review

### **Portfolio – Adult Social Care and Health**

- Public Health
- Domestic Violence
- Services for carers
- Adult Safeguarding
- Assessment and Personalisation
- Older People, Mental Health and Respite
- Financial Inclusion

### **Portfolio - Education, Children and Young People**

- School Improvement and Staff Development
- Children and Families
- Partnerships and Early Intervention
- School Place Planning
- Children's Safeguarding
- Special Educational Needs
- Children's Centres and Early Years
- Youth Offending

This page is intentionally left blank

### Directorate Allocation of Functional Responsibilities

<b>Corporate Director - Corporate Services</b>		
<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Reporting to Director</b>
Democratic Services / Civic	Communications	Procurement
Legal Services	Shared Intelligence	Finance
Transparency & Feedback / information governance	ICT Operations and Business Development	Human Resources, Payroll, Workforce Development
Electoral Services	Super connected city	Health & Safety
Business Support and Admin	Customer Services	
Property commissioning and design	Council Tax, Business Rates and Benefits	
Facilities Management	Registrars	
Magistrates, probation and coroners		
<b>Client Management</b>		
		CYT
		Veritau

<b>Corporate Director - Children's Services</b>		
<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>
Social Care and Child protection	School improvement Services	Communities and Equalities
Safeguarding	School support services (admissions, place planning and transport)	York Learning
Specialist Services	School Governance	Ward Committees
Special Educational Needs	School Assets	Youth Services
Looked after Children	City Skills	
Educational psychology	Early years	
Youth Offending	Childcare strategy	
Troubled families	Children's Centres	
	School traveller and ethnic minority	
	Connexions	
	Healthy Child Service	
<b>Client Management</b>		
	School Improvement	GLL
		Explore
		Museums Trust

<b>Corporate Director - Adult Services</b>			
<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	Reporting to Director
Head of care homes	Commissioning provision	Housing services	People and neighbourhoods strategy
Adult services assessment	Commissioning and contract management	Housing maintenance and repairs	
Hospital service and mental health	Joint commissioning	Housing operations	
Adult safeguarding		Emergency Planning	
		Community Safety	
<b>Client Management</b>			
	BelIndependent	Safer York Partnership	

<b>Corporate Director - Public Health</b>
<b>Assistant Director</b>
PH specialist advice to NHS commissioners (CCG)
Wellbeing services – health and lifestyle
Professional and clinical leadership
Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
Health and Wellbeing Strategy
Lifestyle and support
Substance misuse
Health protection

<b>Corporate Director - Place Services</b>			
<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	<b>Assistant Director</b>	Reporting to Director
Public realm / parks & open spaces	Sustainable Development	Economic regeneration	Economy and Place Strategy
Highways	Planning and environment	Estate Commercialisation	Programme management
Transport	Building control and property information	Infrastructure Programme Management	
Waste	Environmental Health and Trading Standards	Assets and property management	
Fleet	Licensing		
Parking	Bereavement Services		
<b>Client Management</b>			
	YorWaste		Make it York

## **Option (iv) Change of Remits in line with Corporate Priorities –Council Plan 2015-19 Corporate Priorities**

### **Corporate Priority 1 - A Prosperous City for All**

Where local businesses can thrive and residents have good quality jobs, housing and opportunities

Aim: A city where:

- Local businesses can thrive
- Residents have the opportunity to get good quality and well paid jobs
- Residents can access affordable homes while the greenbelt and unique character of the city is protected
- Everyone is supported to achieve their full potential
- Efficient and affordable transport links enable residents and businesses to access key services and opportunities
- Environmental Sustainability underpins everything we do
- Everyone who lives in the city can enjoy its unique heritage and range of activities.
- Visitors, businesses and residents are impressed with the quality of our city.

What you will see:

- Dedicated support for local small businesses
- Continued support for high value sectors, including the green economy
- York continues to have high employment and the Living Wage is promoted
- A local plan that delivers housing and development while protecting the Green Belt.
- An increase in the percentage of waste recycled
- Steps taken to improve air quality
- Continued inward investment in transport

### **Corporate Priority 2 - A Focus on Frontline Services**

To ensure all residents, particularly the least advantaged, can access reliable services and community facilities

Aim: A city where:

- All York's residents live and thrive in a city which allows them to contribute fully to their communities and neighbourhoods
- Delivering frontline services for residents is the priority
- All children and adults are listened to, and their opinions considered
- Everyone has access to opportunities regardless of their background
- Support services are available to those who need them
- Every child has the opportunity to get the best possible start in life
- Residents are encouraged and supported to live healthily
- Residents are protected from harm, with a low risk of crime

What you will see:

- Residents feel that their views have been listened to.
- Residents are happy with the frontline services that they receive.
- A smaller gap in the attainment levels between the highest achievers and the most vulnerable groups
- Residents controlling their own care, and enjoying integrated care from the council and NHS.
- Vulnerable people are safe and feel safe

### **Corporate Priority 3 - A Council that Listens to Residents**

To ensure it delivers the services they want and works in partnership with local communities

Internal Aim:

- Focus on the delivery of frontline services for residents and the protection of community facilities.
- Focus on cost and efficiency to make the right decisions in a challenging financial environment.

What you will see:

- That we always consider the impact of our decisions, including in relation to health, communities and equalities.
- Use of evidence-based decision making.
- Improved efficiency, streamlined council management, and we will always look to take government grants on offer to freeze Council Tax.



Aim with Communities & Partners:

- To celebrate and champion the diversity of our population and encourage everyone to play an active role in the city.

What you will see:

- Work with all public sector bodies in the city and the region to make sure we get the most from collective public expenditure in York
- We will be transparent in all we do, including being clear with communities and partners about the scale of the financial challenges we face.

Aim in the Region & Nationally:

- Take the lead on working with partners to make the case for more local power over our finances and future so we have greater control.

This page is intentionally left blank

CYC Services	Corporate Priority 1 - A prosperous city for all	Corporate Priority 2 - A Focus on Frontline Services	Corporate Priority 3 - A Council that Listens to Residents	CSMC
<b>Office of the Chief Executive</b>				
Transformation & Change				✓
Communications				✓
Business Intelligence				✓
Policy & Performance				✓
<b>Customer &amp; Business Services</b>				
Asset Management (Property)				✓
Commissioning & Design				✓
Facilities Management				✓
Finance & Internal Audit				✓
Administration & Business Support				✓
Customer Services			✓	
Human Resources				✓
ICT				✓
Legal Services				✓
Civic & Democratic Services				✓
<b>Children's Services, Education &amp; Skills</b>				
Safeguarding		✓		
Early Intervention/Prevention		✓		
Disability Services & Special Educational Needs		✓		
Educational Psychology		✓		
School Services		✓		
Early Years		✓		
<b>Communities &amp; Neighbourhoods</b>				
Public Protection		✓		
Housing Tenancy & Maintenance		✓		
Bereavement & Registrars			✓	
Emergency Planning		✓		
Safer York			✓	
Community Safety			✓	
Substance Misuse			✓	
Communities & Equalities			✓	

CYC Services	Corporate Priority 1 - A prosperous city for all	Corporate Priority 2 - A Focus on Frontline Services	Corporate Priority 3 - A Council that Listens to Residents	CSMC
<b>Communities &amp; Neighbourhoods (cont/d)</b>				
York Learning	✓			
Public Realm (Highways & Waste)	✓			
Parking	✓			
Strategic Services (Leisure & Community Centres)	✓			
Libraries & Archives			✓	
<b>City &amp; Environmental Services</b>				
Development & Regeneration	✓			
Planning	✓			
Environment	✓			
Property Information	✓			
Transport	✓			
<b>Adult Social Services</b>				
Learning Disabilities & Contracts		✓		
OT, Hospital Sensory, Intensive Support & CELs		✓		
Adult Provider Services		✓		
Commissioning & Contracts		✓		
Adult Safeguarding & Mental Health		✓		

## Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee Work Plan 2016-17

Meeting dates @ 5.30pm	Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy & Scrutiny Committee Work Plan 2016-17
13 June 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of Executive Leader and Deputy Leader to outline Priorities and Challenges for 2016-17</li> <li>2. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>3. Pre-decision report – Guildhall Project</li> <li>4. Annual Scrutiny Report</li> <li>5. Ideas for topics for review in this Municipal Year including potential review of elements of the TTIP motion to support the work of One Planet York.</li> <li>6. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>
25 July 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of the Executive Member for Finance and Performance</li> <li>2. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>3. End of Year Finance &amp; Performance Monitoring Report</li> <li>4. Overview report on electoral organisation</li> <li>5. Update report on procurement activity</li> <li>6. Future Ways of Working in Scrutiny – update/review and financial implications</li> <li>7. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>
5 Sept 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attendance of Executive Leader and Deputy Leader to outline Priorities and Challenges for 2016-17</li> <li>2. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>3. 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr Finance &amp; Performance Monitoring Report</li> <li>4. Scoping Report on potential scrutiny review around One Planet York.</li> <li>5. Scoping report on potential scrutiny review around Peer Challenge review</li> <li>6. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>

7 Nov 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>2. 2<sup>nd</sup> Qtr Finance &amp; Performance Monitoring Report</li> <li>3. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>
16 Jan 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>2. Scrutiny Review Support Budget</li> <li>3. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>
6 March 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>2. 3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr Finance &amp; Performance Monitoring report</li> <li>3. Work Plan 2016-17</li> </ol>
8 May 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schedule of Petitions</li> <li>2. Draft Work Plan 2017-18</li> </ol>