

**STRATEGY
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**11 November 2002
(6.00 – 7.55pm)

PRESENT: Councillors Smart (Chair), Bagnall, Bradnack, Currie, Durrant, Knowles, Sian Reid, Schofield, Stuart and Ward.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor David Howarth, The Leader

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**02/STR/21 MINUTES**

The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting on 15 July as a correct record which were signed by the Chair.

02/STR/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

02/STR/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

02/STR/24 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No members of the public wished to address the Scrutiny Committee.

**02/STR/25 SERVICE PLANS AND GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGETS –
REVISED 2002/03 (see also Record of Decision 02/STR/21)**

Councillor Bradnack stated that having considered Service Plans in three Scrutiny Committee areas, he felt that recruitment and retention of staff was a matter of concern. The Chief Executive stated that the estimated turnover of 13% for 2002/03 should be compared to an ideal turnover of 10% and was against the County Council's current rate of over 20%. However, there were difficulties in recruiting in particular areas (e.g. policy) and of retaining staff beyond the first year. It was noted that the Head of Human Resources, once in post, would be investigating various options to address these matters.

The Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 4) the recommendation for the Leader as stated in the report.

The Leader agreed to the recommendation.

02/STR/25 **KEY DECISION CORPORATE IT STRATEGY** (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/22*)

In response to comments from Councillor Bagnall, the Leader agreed to include additional comments with reference to the Medium Term Objective of Better Housing Page 4) .

The Committee agreed the recommendation for the Leader as stated in the report.

The Leader agreed to the recommendation.

02/STR/26 **KEY DECISION REPORT ON DECENTRALISED DECISION MAKING: THE NEXT STEPS** (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/23*)

In introducing his recommendations, the Leader noted that as it had not been possible to reach a consensus on any of the recommendations and the Citizen's Panel would be consulted on all of the proposals. The Leader highlighted the Liberal Democrats' preference for map 2 for the geographical area on which the committees would be based. He also stated that it was not intended to delegate budgets to area committees (except for under the Environmental Improvements Programme), but to delegate managerial control (e.g. how Rangers allocate their time to their duties). With reference to the inclusion of non-voting members, the Leader stated that it would be important to include County Councillors and other representatives as non voting members, to enable points to be answered at committees which were outside of the City Council's remit. He was also of the view that additional non-voting members should be a matter for area committees as each evolved.

The Leader stated that the detail of which elements of each function were to be delegated was still being worked through (and would firstly be considered at the member/officer working group).

Councillor Bradnack stated that the Labour Group objected to the delegation of planning applications to area committees. Councillor Stuart also did not agree to devolve planning applications. Councillor Durrant expressed discomfort with the way in which the proposal had been developed and did not agree with any of the geographical areas as it divided communities; he advocated an urban parish approach.

Councillor Bagnall was concerned that recommendation 2.4 was not inclusive and that there should be a capacity to draw people in to committees at a later date. The Committee agreed that an additional recommendation be added to 2.4 to reflect that individuals and/or representatives of local groups could be invited to participate as non-voting members. (*This was subsequently agreed by the Leader in consultation with the Chair and spokes*).

The Scrutiny Committee agreed (by 6 votes to 4, with Councillor Durrant being recorded against) the recommendations from the Leader.

The Leader agreed to the recommendations.

02/STR/27 REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000 (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/24*)

In response to a question from Councillor Ward, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services undertook to review how the procedure was operating after a year and report back to members.

Councillor Ward proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.2 to reflect that the Director of Central Services should only be permitted to delete names from the list of authorising officers. In response to suggestions from the Head of Legal & Democratic Services on how best to ensure member involvement in adding names to the list, the Committee agreed that the Leader be authorised to add names, in consultation with Chair and spokes, and that the action should be reported to the next Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee agreed (by 7 votes to 0) the recommendations for the Leader in 2.1 as stated in the report and in 2.2 as amended above.

The Leader agreed to the recommendations as amended.

02/STR/28 CRITERIA FOR EXPANSION OF CCTV (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/25*)

The Director of Central Services stated that the criteria would apply to fixed cameras. Separate considerations applied to mobile cameras and could be reported to a future meeting of the Committee. Councillor Smart requested an amendment to paragraph 5 of the criteria to cover the issue of displacement: add in third line '...immediate and neighbouring areas...' The Committee also agreed that paragraph 4 of the criteria be amended to: delete 'matching' from the first sentence and insert 'of capital and/or revenue..' in the second line. In response to points made by Councillor Bradnack, the Leader stated that paragraph 4 as amended was broad enough to consider as a special case a proposal which had no provision for revenue funding.

Councillor Stuart requested that the Council should consider providing support for future privately funded CCTV schemes (e.g if residents wanted to pursue a private scheme for Cherry Hinton High Street). The Leader stated that any CCTV scheme in the City which would benefit from Council support would have to be assessed against the Council's criteria. Councillor Bradnack proposed that the criteria should be assessed against a proposed scheme, and suggested Mill Road. The Committee agreed to refer the matter to Commercial & Human Resources, being the relevant Scrutiny Committee, for its consideration.

The Committee agreed (by 9 votes to 1) the recommendations for the Leader as stated in the report and amended as referred to above.

The Leader agreed to the recommendations.

02/STR/29 KEY DECISION CORPORATE PROCUREMENT STRATEGY (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/26*)

In response to comments from Councillor Bagnall, the Committee agreed to make changes to the Strategy as follows:

3.1 Third bullet point under 'The Council will not pursue alternative procurement arrangements where' (page 176 of Scrutiny Committee agenda)

- It is impossible to specify the service sufficiently precisely for a commercial contract or agreement

3.2 to include a reference about the Council considering whether it should be working to develop new markets for services

4.3 to include views of service non-users

Regarding a further point by Councillor Bagnall concerning the need to cover the corporate implications of procurement, the Leader stated that paragraph 4.9 detailed this point, which would also include the marginal costs across the organisation.

The Committee agreed the recommendation for the Leader as stated in the report and amended as referred to above.

The Leader agreed to the recommendations.

02/STR/30 ALLOCATION OF CITY LOTTERY GRANTS TO DANCE EAST AND CROSS BORDER ARTS (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/27*)

The Committee was advised that Dance East had been awarded a grant by the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Leisure.

The Committee agreed the recommendations for the Leader as stated in the report.

The Leader agreed to the recommendations.

02/STR/31 APPOINTMENT TO GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP BOARD (see also *Record of Decision 02/STR/28*)

Councillor Smart proposed that Councillor Howarth be re-appointed, Councillor Bradnack proposed Councillor Bagnall.

The Committee agreed to nominate Councillor Howarth (by 6 votes, with 3 votes for Councillor Bagnall).

The Leader agreed to the recommendation.

The meeting ended at 7.55 pm.

CHAIR