
Meeting	Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee
Date	13 February 2017
Present	Councillors Williams (Chair), Crisp, D'Agorne, Fenton, Gates, Levene, Reid, Dew (Substitute for Councillor Galvin) and Steward (Substitute for Councillor Lisle)
Apologies	Councillors Galvin and Lisle

Part A - Matters Dealt With Under Delegated Powers

36. Declarations of Interest

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

37. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 7 November 2016 and the CSMC Call-in meetings held on 21 November 2016 and 3 January 2017 be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

38. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on the following item:

8. Schedule of Petitions ('Save our Clifford's Tower')

Councillor Hayes, Ward member for Micklegate, spoke on the petition regarding Clifford's Tower. He stated that there had been over 3000 signatures which showed the strength of public feeling on this issue and that many felt the planning process had passed them by.

39. Report on Air Quality Motion Referred by Council

Members considered a report presenting information on a motion around air quality which was submitted to Council for consideration in accordance with Standing Order 23.1.

Members considered a report presenting information on a motion around air quality which was submitted to Council for consideration in accordance with Standing Order 23.1.

Officers gave a brief background to the report, stating that this motion had been referred to CSMC by Full Council for further examination. However, the Officer recommendation was to refer this to Economic Development & Transport Policy & Scrutiny Committee (EDAT) as it was felt this was the most relevant committee due to the regular air quality updates it was already receiving firmly within its remit.

During debate the following points were raised:

- Members felt there had been no clear rationale given as to why this had been referred to CSMC by Full Council
- This was an inappropriate way to deal with a motion as air quality had already been considered by scrutiny and the motion contained clear actions for the Executive to consider
- There was some concern that this item may get 'lost' on the EDAT work plan and not be discussed for some time, due to the high workload the committee already had
- To the contrary, some Members believed it was the right decision to refer to scrutiny as Full Council had insufficient information to debate the motion

Councillor Levene moved to refer the motion back to Council as they had been denied the opportunity to debate the issue fully. Councillor D'Agorne seconded this. On being put to a vote the motion fell.

Referral of the motion to EDAT Scrutiny Committee was then moved and seconded on the proviso that it be referred back to this Committee, should it not be considered relatively quickly by that Committee.

Resolved: To refer the Council Motion around Air Quality to the Economic Development & Transport Policy & Scrutiny for further consideration. If the issue could

not be considered in a timely manner then it is to be reported back to CSMC.

Reason: In order that the Council Motion on Air Quality is considered by the most relevant scrutiny committee.

40. Future Ways of Working in Scrutiny

[See also Part B minute]

Members were asked to consider a report which provided an update on the ongoing work to examine alternative committee structures to support the Council in delivering its scrutiny function and reported back on the consultation with political groups and the Corporate Management Team.

Resolved: That Members note the report and receive a further report at its next meeting proposing terms of reference for the new scrutiny committees for approval by Council.

Reason: To fulfil the scrutiny management role of this Committee, and enable any changes required to the scrutiny function to be presented to Full Council in March 2017 for approval.

41. Scrutiny Review Support Budget

Members considered a report which set out the current position in relation to available Council funding for research in support of scrutiny reviews.

Members were asked to consider what recommendation to make to the Executive in relation to a scrutiny support budget for use on external consultation/market research, for consideration as part of the Council's budget setting process for 2017/18.

During debate Members suggested that a continuation of the current budget be recommended, particularly in light of the increased level of Member training that may be required should changes be made to the scrutiny structure.

Resolved: That the Committee recommend Executive retains the current budgetary support for external research and consultancy work.

Reason: To address the Committee's constitutional right to comment to Executive on setting the above scrutiny budget.

42. 2nd/3rd Quarter Finance & Performance Monitoring Report

Members were asked to consider a report which provided an analysis of the services falling under the responsibility of this committee, including corporate, strategic and business services.

In response to Member questions Officers confirmed that the Customer Relationship Management System (CRM) would allow for smoother, more efficient back office processing. The delay in implementing this was mainly due to the work involved in connecting to existing technical systems.

Members commented that they were pleased to see an improvement in the number of staff receiving Personal Development Reviews (PDR) and that sickness absence reporting would soon be available online via iTrent.

Resolved: That the report be noted and that a written update on the Customer Relationship Management System (CRM) be brought to the meeting of CSMC to be held in May.

Reason: To update the Committee on the forecast position for 2016/17.

43. Schedule of Petitions

Members were provided with a report detailing both new petitions and those considered by the Executive or relevant Executive member since the last report to committee.

Members were asked to consider the petitions received and actions reported, and agree an appropriate course of action in each case.

Councillor Hayes, who had spoken under public participation on this item, clarified that the 'Save our Clifford's Tower' petition had already been passed to English Heritage.

Resolved: That the petitions received and actions reported, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the report and Annex A be noted.

Reason: To ensure the committee carries out its responsibilities in relation to petitions.

44. Work Plan 2016-17

Members were asked to give consideration to the committee's Work Plan for 2016/17.

It was suggested a replacement may be required for Councillor Lisle on the Elections Scrutiny Review Task Group. It was felt that, as the review was coming to an end, the Group could continue without a representative from the Conservative group.

Resolved: That the committee's work plan for 2016/17 be approved subject to the following additions:

Update Report on the work of the E-Democracy Task Group (in particular regarding the Customer Relations Management System (May 2017)).

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

Part B - Matters Referred to Council

45. Future Ways of Working in Scrutiny

[See also Part A minute]

Members were asked to consider a report which provided an update on the ongoing work to examine alternative committee structures to support the Council in delivering its scrutiny function and reported back on the consultation with political groups and the Corporate Management Team.

The Corporate Director of Economy and Place was in attendance in order to give the Committee feedback from the

Corporate Management Team (CMT). He stated that whilst this was purely a Member decision, CMT were in full support of the recommendation of Officers. They felt that scrutiny in its current format was ineffective and that the suggested structure would allow a culture change; moving away from silo working towards a one council approach. In response to member questions he clarified that CMT were in full support of Option (iv).

Officers gave a brief background to the report and an overview of how the new structure would work in practical terms. They also circulated an update to the table at para.13 of the report.

After questions from Members they stated:

- The number of statutory co-opted Members required under the new structure would be the same as under the existing structure. This would be on an invitation basis to any committee where relevant matters were being discussed. In the example of parent governors, it could be that work plans were organised to ensure that discussion of education matters be limited to a set number of meetings per year.
- Research for the report had been sourced from the Centre for Public Scrutiny in December 2016. It was clarified that Selby was used as an example as they were the authority which had most recently gone through the process of making changes to overview and scrutiny.

Members then extensively debated the issue, which focussed on:

- what model might best achieve the organisational cultural change required to improve the effectiveness of scrutiny in York
- existing skills and specialisms already developed by Members in scrutiny and what model would best utilise those
- the advantages and disadvantages of the models before them: aligning to Directorates might exacerbate silo working but might also provide simpler working lines/reporting structures; option (iv) would give clear focus on scrutiny roles, providing early opportunities for engaging with and flagging up policy development
- appropriate skills training for Members

- irrespective of the model adopted, Members expressed some concerns about the operation of the current pre-decision call in process, triggered by business appearing on the Forward Plan. Officers added that Option (iv) would facilitate removal of the current process by providing a clear route for early policy development and engagement

Councillor Levene then moved and Councillor Crisp seconded the adoption of Option (iv) to Council. On being put to the vote that motion fell.

Option (iii) aligning Scrutiny Committees to Directorates was then moved and seconded on the understanding that opportunities be made available to review the current pre-decision call in arrangements and to improve engagement generally with scrutiny.

Recommended: That Council approve and adopt Option (iii) to align Scrutiny Committees to the new Directorates in accordance with the approach for this option set out in the report.

Reason: To fulfil the scrutiny management role of this Committee, and enable any changes required to the scrutiny function to be presented to Full Council in March 2017 for approval.

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