

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday, 22 March 2022

Time: 6.00pm

Location: Council Chamber, Daneshill House, Danestrete, Stevenage

Contact: Ian Gourlay (01438) 242703

committees@stevenage.gov.uk

Members: Councillors: L Martin-Haugh (Chair), P Bibby CC (Vice-Chair), M Arceno, S Booth, A Brown, M Downing, A Farquharson, C Howells, W Kerby, S Mead, R Parker CC, C Parris, L Rossati and S Speller.

AGENDA

PART I

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2. MINUTES - 9 FEBRUARY 2022 AND 15 FEBRUARY 2022

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 9 February 2022 and 15 February 2022.
Pages 5 – 14

3. PART I DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

To consider the following Part I Decisions of the Executive taken on 16 March 2022.

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Page Nos.</u>
2. Minutes – 2 February 2022 and 9 February 2022	5 – 26
3. Minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Select Committees	27 - 40
4. Covid-19 Update	
5. Towns Fund Business Case – Stevenage Enterprise Centre	41 – 146
6. Equalities, Diversity & Inclusion Policy and Strategy	147 – 178
7. Corporate Performance – Quarter 3 2021/22	179 – 238
8. Approval of the Discretionary “Energy Rebate” Scheme	239 – 242
9. 3rd Quarter Revenue Budget Monitoring Report 2021/22	243 – 256
10. 3 rd Quarter Capital Programme Monitoring Report 2021/22	S3 – S22

Notice of Decisions to follow

PLEASE BRING YOUR AGENDA AND REPORTS FOR THE EXECUTIVE MEETING HELD ON 16 MARCH 2022

4. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2022-23

To consider the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 2022-23.
Pages 15 – 20

5. URGENT PART I DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To consider any urgent Part I Decisions authorised by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

6. URGENT PART I BUSINESS

To consider any Part I business accepted by the Chair as urgent.

7. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

To consider the following motions:

1. That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in Paragraphs 1 – 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as amended by Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.
2. That Members consider the reasons for the following reports being in Part II and determine whether or not maintaining the exemption from disclosure of the information contained therein outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

8. PART II MINUTES - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 9 FEBRUARY 2022

To approve as a correct record the Part II Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 9 February 2022.
Pages 21 - 22

9. PART II DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

To consider the following Part II Decisions of the Executive taken on 16 March 2022.

Item No.

Page Nos.

12. Part II Minutes – Executive - 2 February 2022
13. Write Offs

257 – 260
261 - 268

Notice of Decisions to follow

PLEASE BRING YOUR AGENDA AND REPORTS FOR THE EXECUTIVE MEETING HELD 16 MARCH 2022

10. URGENT PART II DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To consider any urgent Part II Decisions authorised by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

11. URGENT PART II BUSINESS

To consider any Part II business accepted by the Chair as urgent.

This page is intentionally left blank

STEVENAGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, 9 February 2022

Time: 6.00pm

Place: Council Chamber, Daneshill House, Danestrete

Present: Councillors: Lin Martin-Haugh (Chair), Myla Arceno, Adrian Brown, Alex Farquharson, Chris Howells, Wendy Kerby, Andy McGuinness, Sarah Mead, Robin Parker CC, Loraine Rossati and Simon Speller.

Start / End Time: Start Time: 6.00pm
End Time: 7.03pm

1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Phil Bibby, Michael Downing and Claire Parris.

There were no declarations of interest.

2 **PART I DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

2. **Towns Fund Business Case – New Towns Heritage Centre and**
3. **Towns Fund Business Case – Sport and Leisure Hub**

The Committee noted the support of the Executive to both the Heritage Centre and the Sports and Leisure Hub Towns Fund Business Cases.

The following questions/comments were made by Members:

- In response to a question, Officers confirmed that there were 10 projects coming forward in 9 Business Cases. These would be submitted to four separate Executive meetings followed by Overview and Scrutiny Committees for approval. It was noted that there was strong support for the Business Cases from the Stevenage Development Board.
- Officers advised that the Digital Connectivity Study was not large enough to justify its own Business Case and would likely form part of the Transport Connectivity Business Case although this was yet to be confirmed.
- It was noted that in accordance with Government requirements, the MP for Stevenage had received an open invitation to attend all meetings of the Stevenage Development Board although he had not yet attended any meetings.
- In response to a question about the possible inclusion of an Aerospace exhibition in the new Museum, Officers advised that no firm details had

been confirmed regarding the scope or what exhibitions should be included in the Museum at this stage. The report did set out examples but this was not an exhaustive list. The Community Select Committee had carried out an initial piece of work around New Towns Heritage Centre, incorporating a new museum and their recommendations had been incorporated into the business case and would be involved in the final consideration of the curation and the design and profile of the Museum.

- A question was asked regarding the funding for the project. It was confirmed that £936k would be funded by the Council although discussions would be held with external stakeholders for alternative funding bids. The term 'match funding' related to the amount of funding required to deliver the project separate to the amount of grant funding being offered by the Government.
- Officers confirmed that there had been Member involvement in the process for both Business Cases from the relevant Portfolio Holders prior to submission to Executive. In complying with Government requirements the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Regeneration were Members of the Development Board and the Portfolio Holder for Children, Young People, Leisure and Culture has been involved in the Leisure and Culture Theme Board considering the Heritage Centre. All Business Cases would be subject to further Member involvement.
- Members agreed the importance of the Business Cases being informed by the good policy development work of the Select Committees and noted the engagement that had taken place to help inform the Heritage Centre Business Case.
- All Business Cases would be through the approval process by 24 March 2022. It was noted that work on some of the Business Cases would start imminently but there would be others that would be 4 to 5 years before the start of development.

4. Urgent Part I Business – Levelling Up White Paper

The Committee note the statement made at the Executive in relation to the Levelling Up White Paper.

The following comments were made by Members:

- It appeared that all the Levelling Up Funds from Central Government had been allocated to Towns in the North of England and Stevenage and Hertfordshire as a whole had missed out.
- Officers advised that Stevenage had secured money through the Towns Fund Deal. In terms of the Levelling Up Funding Scheme, Stevenage had been classed as a Category 3 Town (lowest priority) as a result of factors such as transport accessibility/travel to work/skills and pay levels compared to rural towns. Officers agreed to circulate to members the full category levels. It was noted that very few Category 3 Towns had been successful in securing any funding through the Levelling Up Fund. Officers advised that feedback had been sought

from the Government although there would be an opportunity to submit further Bids in Rounds 2 and 3 of the Fund.

- Members were concerned to hear that a letter of support from the local MP had not been received so could not form part of the Council's bid. Officers advised that they hoped that the MP would be supportive of future bids. Regular meetings were held between the Chief Executive and the MP and this would be discussed at these meetings.
- Members asked about other Towns similar to Stevenage that had submitted bids. Officers advised that some had also received funding through the Towns Fund Scheme and further details would be made known to Members.
- In response to a question regarding Local Authority Reorganisation and whether this was a factor in receiving funding, Officers advised that the White Paper had set out a series of powers and freedoms available to Local Authorities but it was unclear as to the extent of the funding available for those authorities without an elected Mayor. Further clarification was awaited.

3 **URGENT PART I DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None.

4 **URGENT PART I BUSINESS**

None.

5 **EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was **RESOLVED**:

1. That, under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 to 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended by SI 2006 No. 88.

2. That having considered the reasons for the following item being in Part II, it be determined that maintaining the exemption from disclosure of the information contained therein outweighed the public interest in disclosure.

6 **PART II DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

6. **Leisure Management Contract – Procurement Strategy**

Members noted the Part II Decisions related to the Procurement Strategy for the Leisure Management Contract.

7 **URGENT PART II DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

None.

8 **URGENT PART II BUSINESS**

None.

CHAIR

STEVENAGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 15 February 2022

Time: 6.00pm

Place: Council Chamber, Daneshill House, Danestrete, Stevenage

Present: Councillors: Lin Martin-Haugh (Chair), Myla Arceno, Adrian Brown, Michael Downing, Alex Farquharson, Chris Howells, Wendy Kerby and Robin Parker CC.

Start / End Start Time: 6.00pm

Time: End Time: 7.25pm

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for Absence were received on behalf of Councillors Phil Bibby CC, Andy McGuinness, Sarah Mead, Claire Parris and Loraine Rossati.

There were no declarations of interest.

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 25 January 2022 be approved for signature by the Chair.

3 PART I DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

2. Minutes

Noted.

3. Minutes from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Select Committees

Noted.

4. Covid-19 Update

The Strategic Director advised that two dates had been secured for the pop-up vaccination facility in Bedwell during March. A Communication Plan was being drawn up and it was confirmed that the Council would be promoting the facility via both digital and non-digital forms of communication.

All vaccines including first, second and booster vaccines would be available at the pop-up centre.

In response to a question regarding the impact of Covid on elective surgery and the resulting backlog, Officers advised that further information would be brought back to the Executive.

In response to a further question related to national statistics, some information had been provided regarding the numbers of patients that had been hospitalised without being vaccinated, however, more detailed information was still being sought by Officers.

In response to a number of questions, the following responses were given:

- There were no plans for a second booster although an annual booster was likely to be rolled out;
- Pre-booking for the pop-up centres would not be required. Although located in Bedwell, the Ward with the lowest numbers of people vaccinated, the facility would be open to all Stevenage residents;
- working with health colleagues across the County, Officers were investigating the potential for additional pop-up centres in other parts of the Town;
- It was noted that the majority of people who were being hospitalised were unvaccinated. Officers were working with the Herts Health Protection Board to obtain more detailed local information;
- as soon as information on the future use of the Nightingale Wards was available, officers would advise Members;
- In terms of the role of Environmental Health, officers confirmed that Herts Public Health had contacted surgeries within Stevenage regarding vaccine tracing with a view to SBC contacting individuals who had not received any vaccines so far;
- Officers were looking to review the outstanding Covid restrictions which were due to expire on 24 March. Further information would be circulated to Members along with information regarding Tier 3 and Tier 4 requirements.

5. Gambling Act 2005 – Review of Statement of Licensing Principles

In response to a question about whether the Living Room, an organisation established to support people living with addictions, had been approached as part of the consultation. Officers advised that they had not and although it was too late to consult with The Living Room on this consultation due to the required timeline for adoption of this Policy, they would make contact with them about the wider harms of gambling and would take their views on board for future consultations.

6. Final General Fund and Council Tax Setting 2022/23

The Committee was informed that the report had not been published in time to take into account the recent interest rate rise announced by the Bank of England.

A question had been asked at Executive regarding the £150 energy relief

scheme, which would be given out to residents via the Council Tax lists. Concern was expressed that not every Council Tax Payer paid by direct debit but would be responsible for paying the utility bills. Also in relation to houses of multiple occupation (HMO's), the landlord would pay the Council Tax rather than those responsible for the energy bills. Officers would be working on a resolution to this issue.

The following comments/questions were raised by Members:

- Councillors could help with communicating the message within the community regarding the funding;
- The majority of homes within the Town would be eligible for the £150;
- Officers advised that although there were a number of residents not paying by Direct Debit, the preferred method was direct to bank so this would need to be worked through by officers;
- Making Your Money Count was the new version of financial security;
- Members were informed that the identification of a further half a million savings were likely to go through the Leaders Financial Security Group for scrutiny.

7. Railway Station Multi-Storey Car Park – Business Case

The following questions/comments were raised by Members:

- Although options for Lytton Way were still under consideration, Officers confirmed that any of the four options within the Area Action Plan would work with the access to the new multi storey car park;
- In relation to the St George's Way Multi Storey Car Park, Officers advised that there was more work to be done but that there had already been some improvements, including enhancements to the lighting and the CCTV cameras;
- In terms of the 5th Platform and the additional demand at the station for parking, Officers agreed to provide a written answer although this would be challenging due to the impact of Covid on the demand for parking currently;
- Members asked about alternative parking arrangements for commuters during the construction of the MSCP. Officers advised that there was sufficient capacity in the Town Centre Car parks including the St Georges Way MSCP;
- Construction of the new MSCP would take approximately 40 to 50 weeks.

8. Stevenage Connection Area Action Plan: Issues and Options Report Public Consultation Feedback

The following questions/comments were raised by Members:

- In terms of the comments from Consultees, the report only noted the comments rather than to provide a response to each point. Members

requested that a more meaningful response to the consultees was required. Officers agreed to take this on board and it would be provided in future reports on the topic;

- The current situation on Lytton Way with the construction of the crossing relating to the Bus Interchange did not form part of the Area Action Plan and this had caused some confusion for the public. Officers agreed to ensure that this would be clarified in the communications for future plans;
- Members asked about the retention of the bridge and the potential for an underpass to be constructed. Officers confirmed that the raised walkway and the works that were currently underway including the 'at grade' crossing between the new bus interchange and the railway station were not part of this consultation but had been included in the permission which formed part of the Bus Station application;
- Members were welcome to submit further representations in response to the Area Action Plan which could be included in the consideration of the consultation responses;
- The timescale for the Area Action Plan around the Railway Station was within the Local Plan and was a different timeline to the Bus Interchange work and the linked works. The AAP process was much longer term and there would be a number of years of consultation before a preferred option was chosen and approved. Officers agreed that a timeline to help separate the two would make the situation clearer for Members and the public.

9. Stevenage Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2021: Public Consultation Feedback

Officers advised that residential parking policy and guidance was not included in the design guidance SPD. The Sustainable Transport and Parking SPD which included parking standards had been adopted in 2021 and would not be revisited for 3 to 5 years.

10. Filming Opportunities in Stevenage

In relation to a question relating to road closures and the charges for this, the Strategic Director advised that she would ascertain details for the process and respond to Members.

11. Capital Strategy 2021/22 – 2025/26

Noted.

12. Annual Treasury management Strategy Including Prudential Code Indicators

Noted.

13. Urgent Part I Business – Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund

The following questions/comments were raised by Members:

- Members asked if the Council had an asset management database of the Council's housing stock. Officers advised that there was a database and would provide an explanation in writing, following the meeting, of the 400 properties that would fall within the scope of the project;
- In response to a question, regarding the saving on energy bills for these properties when the work was completed, Officers advised they would have to come back to Members with the information following the meeting.

4 URGENT PART I DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

None.

5 URGENT PART I BUSINESS

None.

6 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Not required.

7 PART II DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

None.

8 URGENT PART II DECISIONS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

None.

9 URGENT PART II BUSINESS

None.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Portfolio Area

Date 22 March 2022

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - POSSIBLE WORK PROGRAMME ITEMS BASED ON MEMBERS' SUGGESTIONS 2022-23

22 MARCH 2022

Authors Stephen Weaver | 2332

Contributors Tom Pike SD

Contact Officer Stephen Weaver | 2332

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To agree the Scrutiny Work Programme for the Select Committee for the new Municipal Year from a list of suggested possible work programme items by Members.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Scrutiny Members' feedback on ideas for improving Scrutiny (see section 4) be noted.
- 2.2 That having considered ideas put forward by individual Members, (see section 5), the Committee determines the subject matters to be added to a work programme of potential Scrutiny reviews items for 2022/23.
- 2.3 That the Portfolio Holder Advisory Group meetings to carry out policy development work identified so far for the Committee (see section 7.1) be noted.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Scrutiny Committees are asked to draft their work programme ahead of the new Municipal year in order that work may begin as soon as the Committees are appointed at Annual Council. Any outstanding and unfinished studies, where applicable, might also need to be included.
- 3.2 During February 2022 Members provided feedback on the current Scrutiny activity and on ideas for the Work Programme for the 2022/23 Municipal Year.
- 3.3 When considering what work to undertake in the coming year, Members may wish to consider if the matter in question is of a cross-cutting nature and might lend itself to being considered jointly with another Select Committee.
- 3.4 Officers have also been requested to bring to the Committee's attention, likely Portfolio Holder Advisory Group (PHAG) policy development items that the Select Committee might be requested to consider and comment on before reports there are submitted to the Executive.
- 3.5 The Committee may also consider whether specific time should be allocated for monitoring or review of recommendations of previous studies. During the summer the Committee will receive a copy of the Action Tracker for the Community Select Committee at which time the Committee can note progress on past reviews and determine whether they wish to bring back any further detailed updates on specific former review items at that time.
- 3.6 It is recognised that there is a limited dedicated officer resource for the scrutiny work of three Scrutiny Committees and therefore it is important to ensure that work plans are in place in order that the call on those resources and on each Committee's time on all its activities are prioritised and evenly spread across the year. To make best use of the resource it is suggested that each Select Committee chooses 1 substantive review item for the year which will be the Committee's main review, undertaken over a number of meetings. In addition each Select Committee could receive between 2 or 3 one-off single issue performance items and 3 to 4 Portfolio Holder Advisory Group (PHAG) meetings during the year. The O&S Committee will have to make a judgement as to whether it has the extra capacity to take on more work.

4 MEMBERS' IDEAS FOR IMPROVING SCRUTINY

- 4.1 In February 2022, all Members of the Council's Scrutiny Committees were emailed a survey to gauge views of the Scrutiny work undertaken and ideas for future studies. The following summary is based on the 8 replies received from the 23 Members who are on one or more of the Council's Scrutiny Committees.
- 4.2 Members were asked to (i) comment on current scrutiny activity and (ii) identify any issues that could be addressed to improve the current arrangements and (iii) state what training needs they may have. Members provided comment and challenge around the following areas that relate to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

Survey Question 1 - Please rate the following aspects of this year's scrutiny activity:

What reviews did you take part in? SS scoring: 3 = good, 2 = okay, but and 1 = not okay really

- O&S held the Executive to account 3! Pretty good
- O&S repairs and voids 2

In 2009, the Scrutiny of Cycling. Nothing in particular in 2021/2022

O&S not great. I don't feel that proper responses are secured to questions asked. I don't think the scrutiny work has sufficient depth at times.

I think that the engagement on the plans for the leisure facilities (CSC & O&S) has been very good so far. I hope it continues and that members will be given the opportunity to submit ideas that will be taken seriously.

Survey Question 2 - What aspect of scrutiny could be improved to provide a better scrutiny service?

1. More **officer support for the Scrutiny Officer**;
2. A clear **portfolio of methods / processes for different types of reviews**, to codify them (must be my officer background peeping through);
3. A coherent and standard **Gap Analysis approach to major reviews** as per the Best Value reviews we did 1998 – 2010ish (happy to expand with the Scrutiny Officer and the three Chairs).

Summary: Step 1 = Where are we? Step 2 = Where should we be? Step 3 = What are the gaps? Step 4 = So, what are we going to do about them?!

As previously discussed but never taken forward, a structural change is needed whereby the chair and vice chair of scrutiny are chosen not by the leader or Executive but by secret ballot of scrutiny members.

Also, much more involvement of non-councillors is needed, as 'expert' or ordinary witnesses and consultants, and more use of the 'public's views

More public involvement in scrutiny - publicise meetings and make it clear that the public are welcome to attend. A more timely response to recommendations

When we receive presentations, etc. I would like to be better signposted to the raw underlying data, for example in the resident survey, so I can better draw my own conclusions.

The most desirable changes would see Scrutiny resources matching its supposed importance in the Council. Unfortunately the chances of this happening are small, but we do need some respect for the integrity of our work plans. I accept the need for improvisation in recent times, but it has been very difficult to do a good job in the circumstances.

Priorities for the future. Where are we with the review of Scrutiny itself? We do need to be sure that we have the best system to make use of limited resources. I think the Council's ways of engaging the public are still based on outmoded ideas about consultation and we could look at this and learn from better practice elsewhere, including outside local govt.

...I think it would be good to have a roadmap of all of the projects the council is working on to help us be clear on what we are going to be consulted on and when. A one page gantt chart or something similar would be really helpful showing key milestones of each, including consultation periods and when they will come to which scrutiny group

Survey Question 3 - Regarding supporting you in your Scrutiny role is there any specific training you would like for next year, and would you (occasionally) like to receive information about possible Member Scrutiny training?
I would like the Scrutiny Officer and Members to run our own Training and Development, but then I would like to transform MMPs too. Too much generic stuff from the LGIU, some of which we will always need! New members need full and proper support. The last few batches of new members seem very unaware of crucial aspects of their roles and of their conduct. (I partly blame social media for encouraging a verbal recklessness, with potential legal, safety and safeguarding implications.)
No, but happy to receive information about training.
A general refresher training session on the role of scrutiny, which could be useful for newer Members. Yes, I would like to receive information about possible Member training.
The recent email of You tube video of Executive meeting with video timings of specific topic was very helpful.
Watch other scrutiny work - other council practice?
Yes, information on relevant training would be useful. Particularly in obtaining and processing data. What data is available to us as Councillors? What investigative tools can we use?, call-in, freedom of information requests, access to information as Cllrs, etc., etc.

5 MEMBERS’ IDEAS FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY REVIEWS

5.1 Scrutiny Members’ Suggestions for Future Scrutiny Review Items

5.1.1 In response to Survey question 4 “What issues would you like to be considered for inclusion in scrutiny work programme for next year” The following issues have been raised by Members as potential Scrutiny review items:

Survey Question 4 - What issues would you like to be considered for inclusion in the (Com Select Committee) scrutiny work programme for next year? (Max 3 items)	What type of review (main, PHAG, one off performance)?
The SBC Constitution. Is it still fit for purpose? Focus = Member – Officer relations; Executive – Scrutiny balance. Challenge: How is it that it’s so far from 50:50? There are some big gaps between the Constitution in theory, and in practice. It probably comes down to leadership style, and culture? These look to be out of alignment with our strategies and goals/ambitions.	This would be considered via a Portfolio Holders Advisory Committee (PHAG)
Communications including; Customer complaints - what are expectations on replies? Are we using the right language? Council social media - is it effective, is it following a routine? Is it being utilised effectively?	one off performance review

5.2 Budget and Policy Framework Items

5.2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has responsibility to scrutinise Budget and Policy Framework items. The following matters have been identified for scrutiny by the Committee as Budget & Policy Framework items -

- The HRA and Rent Setting

- General Fund Budget and Council Tax Setting
 - Savings and Growth Proposals
 - Council Tax Support Scheme
- 5.2.2 The Committee may be required to scrutinise any further Budget and Policy Framework items as and when required in accordance with the Council's Constitution, Article 4 and Section 4 Rules of Procedure.
- 5.3 Members should note that whatever issues they agree to be scrutinised as a main review item would be subject to a full scoping process and subsequently a scoping document would need to be agreed by the Committee at a future meeting. Other items, which can be addressed by a briefing and discussion item, may not require a full scoping document.
- 5.4 Work Programme Schedule for 2022/23
- 5.4.1 When the Scrutiny Work Programme is agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Scrutiny Officer will, using the agreed dates for generic Select Committee meetings in the Calendar of Meetings, draw together a work programme schedule for the 2022/23 Municipal Year, including scrutiny review meetings, monitoring of previous reviews selected by Members and policy development meetings, which will be circulated to Members, and electronic diary invites will be sent to all Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members.
- 5.5 Role of the Assistant Directors and Scrutiny
- 5.5.1 The Assistant Directors will take a leadership role in assisting and supporting the relevant Scrutiny Committees and specific reviews that align to their area of expertise. The Assistant Directors (ADs) will support each review through its various stages, from scoping of reviews, attending Chair and Vice-Chair briefings and offering support to the Scrutiny Officer in providing written and oral evidence for reviews as well as identifying 'Critical Friends' and other review witnesses. The Assistant Directors will liaise with the relevant Executive Portfolio Holder(s) and the Senior Leadership Team (CE and Assistant CE's).
- 5.5.2 Strategic Director, Tom Pike from the Strategic Leadership Team has overall responsibility for the Scrutiny function, deputised by Strategic Director Richard Protheroe.

6 MONITORING REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS VIA THE ACTION TRACKER

- 6.1 The Committee may consider there is a need to undertake some follow-up work on recommendations arising from previous studies. It may be considered sufficient to simply request update briefings from the relevant Heads of Service to be circulated to Members at appropriate intervals. However, if the Committee requires more detailed consideration or examination of the progress of previous recommendations, this should be factored into its work programme. To help assist Members to consider this, an updated Action Tracker document will be brought to the Committee in the

summer and any additional work programme items will need to be added following that meeting.

7 PORTFOLIO HOLDER ADVISORY GROUP - POLICY DEVELOPMENT WORK FOR 2022/23

7.1 In line with the Council and Executive work plan, and following advice from the Strategic Leadership Team regarding potential future PHAG meetings, the following items have been identified for potential Policy Development to be undertaken with the relevant Portfolio Holders and with Overview and Scrutiny Committee members during the 2022/23 Municipal Year:

- The Constitution, not currently scheduled for Executive/Council to be advised re Executive/Council and PHAG meeting dates.
- Transformation Programme, it is expected that when the programme is close to implementation then a further PHAG meeting will need to be scheduled. To be advised regarding the timing of this PHAG
- In relation to the response to the unfolding crisis in Ukraine and the impact for local services there may be a need for a PHAG meeting with O&S Members. To be advised regarding the timing of this PHAG

7.1.1 The above schedule is subject to change and may be added to. Members will be contacted with a meeting invitation closer to the PHAG meeting.

7.1.2 These meetings are private informal meetings Chaired by the relevant Executive Portfolio Holder and supported by the relevant Assistant Director. It is expected that there would be between 3 or 4 PHAG meetings a year per scrutiny Committee.

8 IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

8.1. There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

8.1.2 A small budget of £1000 is held to support the work of the Select Committees in their research and study.

Legal Implications

8.2. The role of Overview and Scrutiny Committees is set out in the Local Government Act 2000. The recommendations made in this report are to facilitate the Committees to fully undertake this role.

Equalities and Diversity Implications

8.3. There are no direct Equalities and Diversity implications arising from the recommendations in this report. Specific equalities and diversity implications are considered during each scrutiny review.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank