

Improving Places Select Commission – 29 July 2016

Title: Work Planning and Prioritisation

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Assistant Chief Executive

Report Author(s)

Christine Majer – Scrutiny Officer
01709 822738 or christine.majer@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

All wards

Summary

This paper provides Members with further information arising from an informal work planning session held on 20 July 2016 to assist with the prioritisation of items for inclusion in the Commission's work programme for the 2016/17 municipal year.

Recommendations

- 1. That consideration be given to the prioritisation of items within the Improving Places Select Commission Work Programme for 2016/17.**

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 - Terms of Reference – Improving Places
Appendix 2 – Notes of the Informal Meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 20 July 2016

Background Papers

Nil

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

N/A

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Work Planning and Prioritisation

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 That consideration be given to the prioritisation of items within the Improving Places Select Commission Work Programme for 2016/17.

2. Background

- 2.1 Members of the Improving Places Select Commission held an informal work planning session on 20 July 2016 to consider what items to include within the commission's work programme for the 2016/17 municipal year. In doing so, Members gave consideration to the following items:

- Cemeteries and Crematorium Service through Dignity
- Emergency Planning
- Housing Revenue Account
- Impact of Business Rate Retention
- Impact of HS2 in the Borough
- Public Transport across the Borough
- Regeneration of Town Centres

- 2.2 It was considered that the following items should not be progressed to the work programme:

Housing Revenue Account	This would be a consideration for the Neighbourhood Review Member Working Group, and it was considered unhelpful to create any confusion or duplication.
Impact of Business Rate Retention	It was considered that this would be of limited use for a scrutiny review at this stage, however it may be beneficial to receive a paper later in the municipal year once more information was available on how this would work in practice.
Impact of HS2 in the Borough	As this was a Government Initiative on a national scale, it was recognised that there was little opportunity for the Commission to influence this work. It was further noted that much of the discussions on local impact would take place at City Region level.

- 2.3 Given that the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment was reviewing contractual arrangements with Dignity in respect of bereavement services in cemeteries and crematoriums, it was considered that this should not be included for review. Members indicated that they would require an update report on the progress made in reviewing the contractual arrangement with the service provider given the varying quality of service being anecdotally experienced across the Borough.

- 2.4 The following items were considered to be relevant to the Commission's work programme where Members could add value:

- Emergency Planning

- Public Transport across the Borough
- Regeneration of Town Centres

3. Key Issues

- 3.1 On 8 July 2016, members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board commenced the work planning and prioritisation process for the 2016/17 municipal year. In doing so they adopted the use of the 'PAPERS' prioritisation tool following advice from the Centre for Public Scrutiny. The acronym PAPERS highlights the following considerations for prioritisation in work programme for Overview and Scrutiny:

Public Interest: the concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny;

Ability to change: priority should be given to issues that the Committee can realistically influence;

Performance: priority should be given to the areas in which the Council, and other agencies, are not performing well;

Extent: priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the district;

Replication: work programmes must take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort;

Statutory responsibility – where an issue is part of a statutory duty to scrutinise or hold to account.

- 3.2 This report requests that the Commission formally prioritises the three items listed above at paragraph 2.4 according to the PAPERS prioritisation tool. Once this has been done and formally agreed, work can commence to plan what review work may be undertaken and what papers will be brought to future meetings in accordance with the work programme.
- 3.3 The Commission should be mindful of the timeliness of the matters within its work programme and ensure that it leaves sufficient flexibility within its work programme to undertake any pre-decision scrutiny arising from matters in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions or any items referred to it directly from either the Cabinet or the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

4. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 4.1 Members of the Improving Places Select Commission have already commenced the process of planning a work programme and this paper is submitted to assist the finalisation of the work programme for the year ahead.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 In developing its work programme, the Commission should have regard to input from Cabinet, Senior Leadership Team, partners and the public who may identify issues which may be relevant to its remit. The work programme to date has been largely developed by Members.

6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 6.1 The Commission is responsible for the preparation and delivery of its own work programme, with support provided by the Scrutiny Team and designated Link Officers from the council's Senior Leadership Team.

7. Financial and Procurement Implications

- 7.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.
- 7.2 There are no procurement implications arising from this report.

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

9. Human Resources Implications

- 9.1 Members should have regard to the resources required to undertake the activities within a work programme over the course of a municipal year. In doing so, Members should be mindful of their own commitments as well as the available officer resource to support any activity across the authority.

10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 10.1 There are no implications for children, young people or vulnerable adults arising from this report.

11. Equalities and Human Rights Implications

- 11.1 In developing a work programme, the Commission should be mindful of equalities implications. At the time of writing of this report an equalities impact assessment has not been undertaken, but is a relevant consideration when developing a work programme.

12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates

- 12.1 Overview and Scrutiny activity will have implications for partners and other directorates. The Commission has been allocated a link officer to work with Members to identify implications in the planning of Overview and Scrutiny activity and this will form part of the considerations of Members.

13. Risks and Mitigation

- 13.1 There are no risks directly arising from this report.

14. Accountable Officer(s)

James McLaughlin, Democratic Services Manager & Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Approvals Obtained from:-

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:- N/A

Assistant Director of Legal Services:- N/A

Head of Procurement (if appropriate):- N/A

Christine Majer, Scrutiny Officer
01709 822738 or christine.majer@rotherham.gov.uk

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>