Dear Sir or Madam

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee of the Bolsover District Council to be held in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne on **Tuesday 24th May 2016 at 1000 hours.**

Register of Members' Interest - Members are reminded that a Member must within 28 days of becoming aware of any changes to their Disclosable Pecuniary Interests provide written notification to the Authority's Monitoring Officer.

You will find the contents of the agenda itemised on page 2.

Yours faithfully

Sarah Shrubbery
Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer

To: Chairman and Members of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee

**ACCESS FOR ALL**

If you need help understanding this document or require a larger print or translation, please contact us on the following telephone number:-

📞 01246 242529 Democratic Services
Minicom: 01246 242450 Fax: 01246 242423
HEALTHY, SAFE, CLEAN AND GREEN COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Tuesday 24th May 2016 at 1100 hours in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne

Item No.  Page No.(s)

PART A – FORMAL
PART 1 OPEN ITEMS

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Urgent Items of Business**
   
   To note any urgent items of business which the Chairman has consented to being considered under the provisions of Section 100(B) 4(b) of the Local Government Act 1972

3. **Declarations of Interest**

   Members should declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and Non Statutory Interest as defined by the Members’ Code of Conduct in respect of:

   a) any business on the agenda
   b) any urgent additional items to be considered
   c) any matters arising out of those items

   and if appropriate, withdraw from the meeting at the relevant time.

4. Minutes of a meeting held on 19th April 2016. 3 to 14

5. List of Key Decisions & Items to be Considered in Private. (NB: Members should contact the officer whose name appears on the List of Key Decisions for any further information). To Follow


7. Director of Public Health Annual Report Update by the Principal Health Manager for Public Health, Derbyshire County Council To Follow

8. Scrutiny Work Plan 23 to 27

9. Scrutiny Review – Selection and Scoping 28 to 39
Minutes of a meeting of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, The Arc, Clowne on Tuesday 19th April 2016 at 1000 hours.

PRESENT:-

Members:-

Councillor S. Peake in the Chair


Also in attendance in respect of Minute No. 0942, were Councillors R.J. Bowler, M. Dooley (Portfolio Holder for Performance (Corporate Plan)/Human Resources/Social Inclusion/Leisure) and C.P. Cooper.

Officers:-

P. Hackett (Executive Director – Transformation) (Minute No. 0942 to 0946), S.E.A. Sternberg (Assistant Director – Governance and Monitoring Officer), L. Hickin (Assistant Director – Leisure) (until Minute No. 0942), D. Whallett (Housing Enforcement Manager) (from Minute No. 0946), J. Selby (Community Safety Officer) (from Minute No. 0946) and A. Brownsword (Governance Officer)

0937. APOLOGY

An apology for absence was received from Councillor S. Statter in respect of Minute No. 0942.

0938. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were no urgent items of business.

0939. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.
0940. ORDER OF BUSINESS

Due to availability of Officers and Portfolio Holders, the Chair consented to the order of business being changed.

0941. THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Moved by Councillor H.J. Gilmour and seconded by Councillor C.R. Moesby RESOLVED that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the 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 defined in the stated Paragraphs 1 & 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act and it is not in the public interest for that to be revealed.

The Executive Director – Transformation entered the meeting during the following item of business.

0942. CALL IN OF EXECUTIVE MINUTE NO. PROV 13 – CASTLE LEISURE PARK OPTIONS EXEMPT – PARAGRAPH 3

The Chair presented the item and asked Councillor Bowler to outline the reason for the Call In.

Councillor Bowler raised concerns regarding the press release being published prior to the expiration of the Call In period.

The Call In had been made as Castle Leisure Park had been out of use since 2015, but prior to that there had been up to 8,500 visits per year, with no effort to encourage usage. The site had been neglected which had resulted in vandalism causing nearby residents problems such as emotional distress.

Consultation regarding Vale Park Section 106 monies had been ongoing for over a year with suggestions requested from local people and it was hoped to install a multi-use games area (MUGA) at Vale Park which was only a 5 minute walk from Castle Leisure Park. There was no need for 2 such facilities so close together.
Castle Leisure Park was very visible and central to New Bolsover. The improvements to New Bolsover which were about to get underway and the work of the Friends of New Bolsover Group would help to raise the profile of the area and creating a MUGA could have a negative effect on the well used bowling green next door.

No consultation regarding the Castle Leisure Park Options had been carried out with either local Members or the community.

Councillor P.A. Cooper added that Old Bolsover Town Council had received many complaints from residents who felt that there would be too many MUGAs close together and the community would prefer something else.

The Assistant Director – Leisure responded that there had been many pressures regarding the financial pressures of the Authority and the Leisure department. Within the Leisure Strategy, all leisure facilities within the Authority had been looked at. The department was not structured in a way that allowed for management of remote facilities. There was a lot of anti-social behaviour and vandalism at Castle Leisure Park which was costly to repair. The bowling green was now community run and as a consequence, suffered less vandalism as there was usually someone on site. Meetings had been held with clubs and people in the community to try to find someone who would be willing to run Castle Leisure Park.

There was Section 106 money and an insurance settlement available and the facility could be returned to its original state, however usage records showed that the users were not from the local community and no enquires had been made to use the site since its closure in 2015.

An Astroturf pitch was expensive to fit and maintain and needed to be staffed to ensure that it was not vandalised. The proposal offered a larger MUGA which would be free to use and more activities could be carried out e.g. Extreme Wheels. This would make it more accessible to the immediate community and bring self policing. A MUGA would also be less susceptible to vandalism.

The Portfolio Holder for Performance (Corporate Plan)/Human Resources/Social Inclusion/Leisure noted that the options needed to be looked at and welcomed the call in. It was an opportunity for everyone to get involved and move forward and give New Bolsover a facility to be proud of.

The Assistant Director – Leisure agreed that there was no need for 2 MUGAs close together and suggested that a large one be installed at Castle Leisure Park and different facilities be looked at for Vale Park.
A question was asked regarding whether CCTV could be installed and it was noted that it would be a Member decision, however costs could be prohibitive.

Members felt that it was necessary to get the consultation right and ensure that all relevant groups had the opportunity to contribute to ensure that the facility was something the Council could be proud of.

It was noted that the community would prefer the MUGA to be installed at Vale Park, due to the boggy nature of the ground.

Councillor Bowler noted that there had been a lengthy consultation on a Section 106 for public art which had heavily involved the community. As a result everyone felt that they had ownership of the project and there had been no vandalism. There was a need to bring the community on board.

Moved by Councillor T. Munro and seconded by Councillor H.J. Gilmour

**RESOLVED** that the matter be referred back to the Executive for reconsideration to allow the Executive and Officers to consider the need for wider consultation with local residents and Members.

(Governance Officer)

The Portfolio Holder for Performance (Corporate Plan)/Human Resources/Social Inclusion/Leisure and the Assistant Director – Leisure left the meeting.

The meeting moved back into open business.

0943. **MINUTES – 15TH MARCH 2016**

Moved by Councillor H.J. Gilmour and seconded by Councillor C.R. Moesby

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of a meeting of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee held on 15th March 2016 be approved as a true and correct record.
0944. LIST OF KEY DECISIONS AND ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE

Members considered the List of Key Decisions and Items to be Considered in Private document.

Moved by Councillor T. Munro and seconded by Councillor H.J. Gilmour

RESOLVED that the List of Key Decisions and Items to be Considered in Private document be noted.

0945. SAFEGUARDING ADULTS POLICY

The Executive Director – Transformation presented the policy and explained that the Social Care Act 2014 had placed a duty of care on the Council for vulnerable adults. This included anyone over the age of 18 very often with mental health issues or who were classed as vulnerable individuals. It was noted that the lead officers had had the appropriate training and there were also a number of safeguarding link officers throughout the authority and all front line staff had had basic awareness training which was renewed every 3 years. The policy had been reviewed by the Derbyshire County Council (DCC) Safeguarding Team and it was felt to be robust.

Members noted that it was pleasing that there was more discussion and support and asked how it could be ensured that vulnerable adults were not being led by their carers. The Executive Director – Transformation noted that any concerns would be forwarded to the Social Care Team for professional assessment. In most cases the Council would inform and signpost. In VARM cases it was possible for the Council to become the lead agency in some cases.

A question was also asked regarding the photograph consent form and whether it would be required to be signed for every event. The Executive Director – Transformation noted at large events, it was not always possible to get everyone’s consent and it would be used mainly for smaller events, but the form did need more refinement.

Members were pleased to see that the policy included contracts and asked whether this would be included within the Council’s contracts. It was noted that it was included and the Councils contractors also had a duty to ensure that this was picked up in any sub contracts.

A question was also asked regarding whether Councillors should be subject to a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and it was noted that there was no statutory provision to require a DBS check.
No Bolsover number was included within the policy and it was noted that the numbers included were in relation to the 24 hour service so it could be accessed at evenings and weekends.

It was noted that the policy referred to ‘a adult’ throughout and it was requested that this be changed to ‘an adult’.

It was noted that there was some repetition within the actions to be taken/actions not to be taken section and it was explained that this was positive reinforcement of the message.

It was also felt that there was some ambiguity regarding whether people should be seen immediately or referred to another agency and it was noted that the message was that if a vulnerable adult contacted the Council, they would be guided to the correct place and not just left to make contact with another agency by themselves.

Members asked whether safeguarding training for all staff was recorded and the Executive Director – Transformation noted that training was recorded. Human Resources held the training register as the training needed to be refreshed every 3 years.

It was felt that most staff were not expected to be experts, but the message needed to get across that it was everybody’s business to report any concerns. The Executive Director – Transformation noted that the majority staff understood their responsibilities.

Members felt that it would be useful to have the relevant Portfolio holders present when discussing policies in future.

Moved by Councillor C.R. Moesby and seconded by Councillor T. Munro

RESOLVED that the draft Safeguarding Adults Policy be noted and the comments of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee be passed to the Executive for their consideration.

(Executive Director – Transformation/Governance Officer)

The Housing Enforcement Manager and the Community Safety Officer entered the meeting.
0946. CHILD PROTECTION POLICY

The Executive Director – Transformation noted that the Child Protection Policy had been reviewed and noted that it was draft at this point.

Members asked what the role of the Council was and what the role of Councillors was within child protection. It was noted that child protection was everybody’s duty and the Council’s primary role was to ensure awareness of issues and forward any concerns to the appropriate agency. The aim of the policy was to be open and transparent, while maintaining a level of confidentiality. Every case and report was logged, but it was difficult to get feedback once cases were passed to the appropriate agency (DCC or the Police). Everyone had a duty and needed to be vigilant.

It was noted that when the Rotherham Report was published a lot of blame had been levelled at Councillors and a question was asked regarding the role of the Councillor. The Housing Enforcement Manager explained that the main difference was that Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council was responsible for child protection and Bolsover District Council did not. The responsibility lay with DCC and Bolsover District Council made the appropriate referrals.

Members asked whether Cabinet Members would be informed if referrals were made and it was noted that this was unlikely as if a member of the public raised an issue, they would be asked to refer the matter to DCC.

Members asked what the definition of ‘young people’ was within the policy, as it generally covered up to age 24, but this age would be covered by the Vulnerable Adults Policy. It was noted that the policy covered children and young people up to the age of 18. A query was made as to whether this should be made explicit.

Moved by Councillor T. Munro and seconded by Councillor H.J. Gilmour
RESOLVED that the review of the Child Protection Policy be noted and the comments of the Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee be passed to the Executive for their consideration.

(Executive Director – Transformation/Governance Officer)

The Executive Director – Transformation left the meeting.
0947. ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP


The Community Safety Officer provided answers to previously circulated questions from the Committee:

Efficiency

1. What are the latest statistics and trends in local crime? How do these compare to average regional and national measures and experiences?

- Up to February 2016, crime in Bolsover had increased by 10.2% compared to previous 12 month period. This is greater than the other CSP areas in Derbyshire with the exception of High Peak (+11.1).
- The largest increases were in violence with injury (+107), theft from vehicle (+72) and violence without injury (+60). Increases in these three crime types are in line with county and the national picture.
- The largest decreases were seen in domestic burglary (-32) and non domestic burglary (-22). The reduction in domestic burglary is in contrast to the county which has seen a slight increase and nationally which has remained stable. The reduction in non domestic burglary is in line with county and nationally.
- ASB saw a 6.3% reduction equating to 219 less calls for service. This is a greater reduction than seen for the county. Nationally ASB calls for service have seen a slight reduction however percentage reductions are currently unavailable.

It was noted that there had been a large increase of crime in the Tibshelf area and a question was asked regarding whether there was anything that stood out. The Community Safety Officer explained that there were no particular trends.

2. How are the priorities of the CSP established?

The CSP priorities link to those identified in the county wide Community Safety Agreement and the Police and Crime Plan. The CSP has a duty to produce a three year rolling Partnership Plan which is refreshed annually. The Plan is informed by an annual strategic assessment of its previously identified priorities (see attached) which is an analysis of statistical data relating to community safety issues and takes account of local community priorities. The SA is then presented to the CSP Strategic Group for consideration, amendment and approval.
3. What role does each of the responsible authorities play in the CSP’s work?

Under Sec 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998, each Responsible Authority has a statutory duty to work together to address identified CSP priorities. Bolsover CSP has a robust structure which ensures that Senior Officers from each of the RA’s provide governance and direction via the Safer Communities Tasking and Action Group through to the Bolsover CSP crime theme action groups. RAs share information and develop action plans that make best use of each agency’s expertise and resources to implement problem solving initiatives that address identified priorities and emerging trends in a timely and effective manner and avoid duplication.

Members noted that the weak link seemed to be the Police and their inability, owing to funding cuts, to service all Parish Council meetings and the community. The Community Safety Officer noted that there was Police attendance at all Community Safety Partnership meetings.

4. Are there improvements that can be made in the CSP’s delivery of services?

Service delivery is provided by each RA dependent upon its role and resources. It is the role of the CSP to ensure that services are delivered in partnership to ensure best use of resources and provide a holistic approach to problem solving to address identified priorities. The CSP is able to identify gaps in service delivery or areas requiring improvement and to raise the awareness with relevant agencies.

Members felt that the Positive Ticket Scheme mentioned in the Newsletter, should be publicised more widely.

**Effectiveness**

5. How does the CSP compare with other CSP’s in the region in terms of working practices and in relation to tackling crime and disorder?

- A recent county wide review of CSP Strategic Groups highlighted that Bolsover had the most well attended Strategic Group meetings in the county.
- The CSP maintains a robust performance monitoring framework including a Performance Monitoring Group in contrast to most other CSP’s.
- The CSP has also been commended for its meeting structure and current action plans at county level in contrast to some other CSPs which have been criticised for not having a meeting structure or action plans.
- The weekly ASB Tasking meeting has been held up as best practise across the county.
**HEALTHY, SAFE, CLEAN AND GREEN COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

- CSP Strategic Group Minutes noted comments from C/Supt Roger Flint, Divisional Commander of C Division, stating that in his opinion Bolsover CSP was “the best CSP and CSP team in the county”.
- The above translates into a CSP where there is continual communication and information sharing and recognition of good partnership working.

6. Does the CSP have the best possible partnership working arrangements in place?

- Self assessment is a standing agenda item on the Strategic Group meeting. The CSP team recently carried out a self assessment questionnaire the results of which were submitted into the CSP Self Assessment Review of Performance 2016.

The Housing Enforcement Manager added that the self assessment had given the opportunity to look at the strengths and weaknesses of the service. A workshop event was being planned with the Partnership Team and the CSP to look at maximising the involvement and effectiveness of all partners.

7. Does the CSP represent value for money? What evidence is there to support this claim?

- The CSP receives £25K from the PCC to use towards its identified priorities which must link to the Police and Crime Plan.
- It also receives £3K from BDC, £500 of which is allocated to the Homeless Bond scheme for ex-offenders which is part of the county wide Integrated Offender Management scheme (IOM). The remaining £2,500 is allocated to BDC initiatives e.g. signs for the Public Space Protection Orders, etc.
- The CSP avoids duplication in spending resources by providing a holistic approach to problem solving identified priorities. It evaluates the cost effectiveness of individual projects.

It was noted that the Community Safety Partnership is a Statutory Partnership.

**Understanding local communities**

8. What evidence does the CSP provide to show that its work is based on local priorities? Is this evidence robust?

- The work of the CSP is evidenced based. Statistical data and analysis is provided by the Safer Derbyshire Information and Research team.
- Community engagement, Safer Neighbourhood Team local priorities and liaison with Elected Members ensure that the views of local communities are taken into account when setting the CSP priorities – please see Partnership Plan attached.
HEALTHY, SAFE, CLEAN AND GREEN COMMUNITIES SCRUTINITY COMMITTEE

9. How do you ensure that all communities receive a minimum level of Community Safety presence when officers are re-directed to those areas where there are higher levels of crime?

The work of the CSP is evidence based and initiatives will be implemented in target areas and hot spots. However, much of the work of the CSP is district wide e.g:
- Community safety messages and awareness raising takes place across the district e.g. personal/home/vehicle security, cyber security, CSE awareness raising, DV services etc.
- District wide CAN Rangers patrols.
- Police SNTs – deployment of police officers is at the discretion of Police Inspectors and their Senior Officers and cannot be determined by other RAs that make up the CSP.

Members felt that there was some inconsistency between divisions of the service provided to Councils.

Accountability

10. Does the CSP communicate its work and achievements clearly to the local community?

- The CSP does communicate its work and achievements to the local community in a variety of formats e.g. PRs, Shirebrook Public Information Pillar, forthcoming Christmas radio campaign, BDC, Police and DCC websites.
- However, as part of the recent CSP Self Assessment it has recognised that it could make better use of social media sites to get messages across. In view of this a Facebook campaign is being developed to run alongside the Christmas radio campaign which is being match funded by the SMART Group. In addition the Bolsover CSP is working with other North Derbyshire CSPs to implement a Child Sexual Exploitation awareness campaign on Facebook to our target audience.

Any other questions

11. What effect have the Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO) in Shirebrook and Langwith had on the community and have they made a difference in the policing of these areas? – Question from Councillor Peake.

- The PSPO in Shirebrook is working well with 40+ Fixed Penalty Notices having been issued of which 22 have been paid and 10 are now with legal who would be submitting the cases to court.
- Community tensions in Shirebrook have reduced considerably although CSP work still continues to improve community cohesion.
Updated posters now in place and new Sports Direct (SD) employees will be made aware of the PSPO via posters in SD, distribution of leaflets and information published in the SD employee newsletter.

Langwith PSPO has been less successful with regard to particular individuals flouting the legislation. Work ongoing to address this with consideration being given to installation of a redeployable camera at target area and patrols from SNT from outside the area so officers are less identifiable. Also consideration being given to issuing main offenders with Community Protection Notices.

The Housing Enforcement Manager noted that the PSPO’s had been very successful, more than 40 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) had been issued in Shirebrook. 10 were currently with the Legal Department for Court action. One FPN had so far been issued in Langwith. Posters had been erected and updated and some were on display at Sports Direct and an article had been included in the Sports Direct Employee Newsletter. Work was ongoing in the area, but tensions were reducing. Introducing the PSPO had sent the right message to the community, that the Council was taking their concerns seriously.

12. Is there anything else that the Scrutiny Committee should be aware of?

• Not at present.

13. Is there anything that the Scrutiny Committee can do to assist or support the work of the CSP over the next year?

Please reiterate CSP messages when engaging with your communities:

• Lock vehicles and don’t leave ANYTHING on show – put valuables in the boot and remove sat nav marks from the windscreen.

• Ensure your home is locked with all the windows closed when you go out and where possible leave a light on at night when you’re not in.

• In summer months don’t leave windows open on the front when you are in the garden at the back – keep them shut/locked.

• Increase in burglaries on other CSP areas have mainly be through patio doors at the back of the property. Ensure locks on patio doors are robust and don’t leave valuables in sight.

• Counter Terrorism - Report anything suspicious e.g. someone taking photographs of police stations, suspicious packages etc.

The Chair thanked the Housing Enforcement Manager and the Community Safety Officer for their report.

The meeting concluded at 1221 hours.
Bolsover District Council
Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee

24th May 2016

Corporate Plan Targets Performance Update – January to March 2016
(Q4 – 2015/16)

Report of the Assistant Director – Customer Service and Improvement

This report is public

Purpose of the Report

- To report the quarter 4 outturns for the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 targets.

1 Report Details

1.1 The attached contains the performance outturn for targets which sit under the ‘supporting our communities to be healthier, safer, cleaner and greener’ corporate aim as of 31st March 2016. (Information compiled on 10th May 2016)

1.2 A summary is provided below:

1.3 Supporting our Communities to be Healthier, Safer, Cleaner and Greener

- 16 targets in total (1 target previously achieved – H14)
- 14 targets on track with H01, H02, H03, H05, H07, H08, H10, H11, H12 and H16 achieving their annual targets for 2015/16.
- 1 target has been flagged as an ‘alert’ i.e. it may not achieve their intended outcome by the target date:
  - H05 – ‘Support 417 inactive 16+ individuals per year and increase their activity levels to more than 30 minutes of moderate intensity physical activity per week’. A total of 132 inactive adults were engaged in year 1 of the programme (December 2014 – November 2015). Any yearly targets not met will roll over to years 2 and 3 of the programme. Two new projects will be funded in year 2 to support more inactive individuals.
- H13 – ‘Develop an action plan for the improvement of each of the four town centres by March 2019’. Recommendation to be made to Executive on 13th June 2016 to bring this target end date forward to March 2017 to reflect the progress being made.
2 Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation

2.1 Out of the 16 targets, 14 are on track, 1 has been achieved (previously), and 1 has been flagged as an ‘alert’ i.e. the target may not achieve its intended outcome by the target date.

2.2 This is an information report to keep Members informed of progress against the corporate plan targets noting achievements and any areas of concern.

3 Consultation and Equality Impact

3.1 Not applicable to this report as consultation was carried out on the original Corporate Plan.

4 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

4.1 Not applicable to this report as providing an overview of performance against agreed targets.

5 Implications

5.1 Finance and Risk Implications

No finance or risk implications within this performance report.

5.2 Legal Implications including Data Protection

No legal implications within this performance report.

5.3 Human Resources Implications

No human resource implications within this performance report.

6 Recommendations

6.1 That year one progress against the Corporate Plan 2015-2019 targets be noted.

7 Decision Information

| Is the decision a Key Decision? (A Key Decision is one which results in income or expenditure to the Council of £50,000 or more or which has a significant impact on two or more District wards) | No |
| District Wards Affected | Not applicable |
| Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework | Links to all Corporate Plan 2015-2019 aims and priorities |
Appendix No | Title
--- | ---

Background Papers (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)

All details on PERFORM system

Report Author | Contact Number
--- | ---
Kath Drury, Information, Engagement and Performance Manager on behalf of Assistant Director – Customer Service and Improvement | 01246 242280
## Bolsover District Council

**Corporate Plan Targets Update – Q4 January to March 2016**

**Aim** – Supporting our Communities to be Healthier, Safer, Cleaner and Greener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Corporate Target</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H 01 - Deliver a minimum of 8000 hours of positive activity through community based culture and leisure engagement per year.</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 - At this stage of the year the target figure is 8000 hours, actual performance to date is 11090 - substantially exceeded target.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 02 - Increase participation/attendances in leisure, sport, recreation, health, physical and cultural activity by 3,000 per year.</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q 4 - Target for quarter 4 (annual figure) is 231,000 we have exceeded the annual target by achieving 236,459. Increase 5459.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 03 - Deliver a health intervention programme which provides 900 adults per year with a personal exercise plan via the exercise referral scheme.</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 - For the financial year 2015/16, the health referral team received a total of 1130 referrals from both the Derbyshire County Integrated Wellbeing approach and the Bolsover Wellness Plus programme. We have received referrals into Clowne and Creswell Sports Centres as well as working with partners to deliver the programme in Shirebrook Leisure Centre, Welbeck Road Health Surgery and Frederick Gent Community Sports Centre.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 04 - Tackle childhood obesity through the delivery of a child focused health intervention programme to all Key Stage 2 year groups by the end of each academic year.</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4. The Five:60 programme will have been delivered to all key stage 2 pupils within the 28 schools in the Bolsover Schools Sports Partnership area during the current academic year.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Corporate Target</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 05 - Support 417 inactive 16+ individuals per year &amp; increase their activity levels to more than 30 minutes of moderate intensity physical activity per week.</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>Q4. Year 2 of the project started in December 2015. Active 4 Life project being delivered by Community Sports Trust has started. Stage 1 which is the gathering of insight data in Whitwell wards and 2 of Bolsover wards has been done. Stage 2 which is Engaging the Community System will start in next 6 weeks. We are currently appointing a Project Officer to lead on this. Girls Hub at Hillstown is due to start in next month. No new participants engaged in either of 2 projects since last quarter.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 06 - Provide signposting and support for people who want to volunteer and recruit 60 new volunteers by February 2016.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4: Delivery of this work has been subcontracted to the Volunteer Centre for Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire and aims to increase participation in volunteering activity. Delivery commenced in April 2014. The number of new volunteers recruited at the end of March 2016 was <strong>63 against a revised target of 60</strong> (NB a figure of 71 was reported in error in Q3). A six month project extension to May 2016 has been agreed to enable a review of the service to be undertaken. Target to be reviewed then.</td>
<td>Mon-29-Feb-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 07 - Assist partners in reducing crime by delivering 12 Crime Cracking events in the community each year.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 The CSP attended <strong>12 events</strong> during 2015/16 providing advice and information on personal safety and crime prevention to approximately 2650 people – 23.04.15 - Creswell Crags Health Centre Healthy Living event 18.05.15 – Healthy Arc Day/Stroke Awareness event</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Corporate Target</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H08 - With partners organise 3 community cohesion events each year to bring communities together in identified areas.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 The Community Cohesion Officer helped to organise <strong>7 events</strong> in Shirebrook during 2015/16: 31.05.15 - BDC Cycle Fest event at Shirebrook Academy 04.07.15 - Family Fun Day at Shirebrook Academy 22.08.15 - Shirebrook Model Village Family Fun Day at the Victoria Inn 05.11.15 - International Week Polish Heritage exhibition and Taste &amp; See continental cuisine event held at the Christian Centre 25.11.15 - Eats &amp; Treat event with Public Health at the Christian Centre 22.01.16 - Polish Consular Day held at Shirebrook Library 04.02.16 - Coffee Morning for Polish parents at the Children's Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Corporate Target</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 09 - Achieve a combined recycling and composting rate of 49% by March 2019.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 (2015/16) Waste Data Flow information is estimated on like performance at ending March 2015, in particular as WDF information will not be available until July 2016. It is estimated 2,006 tonnes of recyclable/compostable wastes will be diverted, yielding a combined estimated recycling rate of 42% between April 2015 and March 2016 (Q1 to Q4).</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 10 - Sustain standards of litter cleanliness to ensure 96% of streets each year meet an acceptable level as assessed by Local Environment Quality Surveys (LEQS).</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 (2015/16) LEQS’s established 3% of streets and relevant land surveyed fell below grade B cleanliness standards resulting in 97% meeting the target standard. Combined (Q1, Q2, Q3 &amp; Q4) performance is 3.9% falling below grade B, resulting in 96.1% achieving the 96% target.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 11 - Sustain standards of dog fouling cleanliness to ensure 98% of streets each year meet an acceptable level as assessed by Local Environment Quality Surveys (LEQS).</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 (2015/16) LEQS’s established 2% of streets and relevant land surveyed fell below grade B cleanliness standards resulting in 98% of land surveyed meeting the target standard. Combined (Q1, Q2, Q3 &amp; Q4) performance is 0.5% land surveyed falling below grade B and achieving the 98% target.</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 12 - Annually undertake 10 local environmental enforcement and educational initiatives in targeted areas to deal with dog fouling, littering or fly tipping.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 (19/04/16) - three enforcement initiatives were delivered, one at Creswell (dog fouling) one at Horncroft Park, Bolsover (dog fouling) and one at Barlborough (fly tipping) This means the annual target of 10 initiatives has been exceeded as a total of 11</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Corporate Target</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 13 - Develop an action plan for the improvement of each of the four town centres by March 2019.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4 2015/16 Regeneration Frameworks - Consultants Bauman Lyons Architects are in the process of wide ranging consultations with stakeholders and the community, to support the development of the Regeneration Frameworks. To date there has been several consultation events with district-wide agencies and individuals’ community groups, thematic interest groups, business community etc, with more to follow in April and May, in addition to regular meetings to communicate with BDC Cabinet and Members. Recommendation to be made to Executive on 13th June 2016 to bring the target end date forward to March 2017</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 15 - Reduce energy use in sheltered housing schemes by 10% by March 2019.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Q4. Detailed proposals received for three schemes to be included with capital programme for 2016/17 (numbers to be included depends on cost). Estimated reduction in fuel use estimated at over 40% per property. Awaiting baseline data, contained within the reports we have commissioned</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 16 - Replace each year 200 gas fired back boilers in our Council houses with more efficient 'A' rated combi boilers.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>For 2015/2016 we fitted the following numbers of boilers: 101 fitted by BDC operatives 732 fitted by contractor Total 833 2015/16 Target Achieved</td>
<td>Sun-31-Mar-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Healthy, Safe, Clean and Green Communities Scrutiny Committee**  
**2016/17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Reason or further information</th>
<th>Will this piece of work make a difference? How?</th>
<th>Is this subject currently under review elsewhere? Or has it been under review in the last few years?</th>
<th>Take forward as a piece of work for the Committee for 2016/17. Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Licensing</td>
<td>Considering the application process (looking at whether a test should be introduced for licence applicants) and/or considering how DBS checks are viewed and what criminal convictions should be classed as spent after a period of time.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Licensing Policy reviewed and amended a year ago so no benefit in reviewing this now.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adoption of a Section 106 Public Health Policy | To look at the possibility of adoption of a Section 106 Public Health policy for the use in planning applications. **Members are also asked to consider whether this is the appropriate committee to consider this issue as planning is under** | Yes – In the first instance, we need to consider the impact of large developments on health services and the role of the CCGS. | No                                                                               | In the first instance – invite officer to meeting to discuss;  
Where does health provision fit within planning policy? |
| Things for Young People to do | Picking up the results of the survey that Leisure have distributed to all Secondary Schools in the District through the Youth Council. Identifying any areas with a lack of facilities/provision. Results due in June 2016. | Leisure has carried out a survey throughout the secondary schools within the District. | Scrutiny Committee to receive the results of the survey to decide whether there is anything that the Scrutiny Committee can assist with. |
| GP services in Creswell and Langwith | To consider the delays in providing a new GP surgery in Langwith. | DCC Health Scrutiny are currently considering the issue – Scrutiny Officer to contact DCC Scrutiny Officer before any further work is progressed. | |
| Clean Vehicles | Looking to influence the move to clean vehicles e.g. hybrids. | (Could be considered by Customer Service and Transformation Scrutiny Committee as part of the vehicle leasing review). | |

Suggestions for the Work Plan in the form of briefing or update.
1. A Healthy Bolsover – monitoring progress of the Plan.

2. Sustainable Communities Strategy – monitoring progress of the Strategy (with 4 years remaining to the 2020 visions).

3. Community Cohesion Project update.

4. Joint Enforcement Policy – There are concerns that litter and fly tipping are increasing across the District. It seems appropriate for Scrutiny to consider the policy in light of these concerns.

   NB: Q3 Performance data suggests that the Corporate Plan targets H10 – Sustain standards of litter cleanliness to ensure 96% of streets each year meet an acceptable level as assessed by Local Environmental Quality Standards (LEQs) and H11 – Sustain standards of dog fouling cleanliness to ensure 98% of streets each year meet an acceptable level as assessed by Local Environment Quality Surveys (LEQs) are both on track.

5. Annual Review of the Community Safety Partnership

6. Civil Enforcement – to deal with issues of parking on streets where roads/pavements are blocked and may potentially result in emergency service vehicles being unable to pass easily. *(Needs more consideration of the issues before progressing.)*
## Work Plan – 2016 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24th May 2016, 11.00 am</td>
<td>• Quarter 4 Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Kath Drury, Information, Engagement and Performance Manager/Jane Foley – JAD, Customer Service &amp; Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health Update – Focusing on the Director for Public Health Annual Report</td>
<td>Mandy Chambers, Public Health, DCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scrutiny reviews 2016/17 – selection and scoping exercise</td>
<td>Claire Millington, Scrutiny Officer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th June 2016, 10.00 am</td>
<td>• Update on the Community Cohesion project</td>
<td>Deborah Whallelt – Housing Needs Manager &amp; Mariola Babinska -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th July 2016, 11.00 am</td>
<td>• Quarter 1 Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th September 2016, 10.00 am</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th October 2016, 10.00 am</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th November 2016,</td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>• Quarter 2 Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th December 2016,</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th January 2017,</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th February 2017,</td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>• Quarter 3 Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th March 2017,</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th April 2017,</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>• Annual Review of the Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Whallett – Housing Needs Manager &amp; Jo Selby – Community Safety Officer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEMBERS HAVE REQUESTED THAT NO OTHER ITEMS ARE TO BE ADDED TO THIS AGENDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th May 2017,</td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>• Quarter 4 Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This briefing is one of a series exploring the skills required by members for effective scrutiny. Together the papers are designed for use by new members or anybody involved in scrutiny who is seeking to better understand the skills that will assist them in attaining best practice. This paper will specifically examine the process of managing a "task and finish" scrutiny review.

Overview and scrutiny committees play an important role in monitoring performance and delivering effective accountability, but work carried out at committee is often only the tip of the iceberg. Real impact for the scrutiny function tends to come through the commissioning and reporting of task and finish groups, carrying out time-limited scrutiny reviews. Scrutiny reviews are conducted, amongst other reasons, in order to examine a specific policy's impact, or to evaluate service provision in the local area more generally.
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1. **Setting objectives - defining when it is appropriate to devote resources to considering an item**

1.1 The resources available to scrutineers are limited. It is therefore vital before any item is deemed worthy of detailed scrutiny that a decision is made as to the appropriateness of such a study being launched. Our report on work programming, "A cunning plan?" published in 2011, explores this in some detail.

1.2 **Why do it? Sorting out your objectives.** What makes a topic worthy of detailed study? Before devoting resources to a review it might be worthwhile asking if there is a simple underlying problem that scrutiny can help to resolve. Is, for instance, a problem in service delivery traceable to a simple fault, which is relatively easy to put right? In this case, a full-blown scrutiny review may not be required. A scrutiny review needs to be able to add value – to add a unique perspective and deliver results which, arguably, no other local decision-maker could.

1.3 If a scrutiny review is to be undertaken, what are its aims to be? These are normally likely to be structured around documenting the existing situation, highlighting difficulties and opportunities and making suggestions for improvements. Sometimes this will involve a tightly focused piece of work – sometimes a wider approach will need to be taken. For example, such reviews may involve outside organisations. The degree of co-operation possible from these organisations is a factor in the feasibility of a review, and its likely complexity (the "working with partners" skills briefing paper touches on these issues). It is likely that there will be constraints and limitations on any review which will be reflected when the terms of reference are drawn up.

1.4 **Cost effectiveness.** Any scrutiny review needs to be cost effective. The focus of scrutiny needs to be on making recommendations that are value for money and that deliver tangible improvements to services, although some scrutiny work may be able to suggest opportunities for cost efficiencies as well. The fresh eyes that scrutiny brings to a given subject make it easier for members to identify new ways of working that might be less apparent to officers. If a subject being suggested for a scrutiny review relates to a service that is high-performing, has recently gone through an executive-led review, or where user satisfaction is particularly high, the value of a review should be questioned.

1.5 **Timespan, member availability and other risks.** Scrutiny reviews are usually carried out by a small group of members, away from the landscape of formal committee meetings. Clearly the availability of members willing and able to undertake a review under these arrangements needs to be established before a review can get started. Members should be selected (either by volunteering or by group nomination) on the basis of their areas of interest and expertise. There also needs to be clarity and realism about the likely amount of time
they will need to dedicate to the work — scrutiny reviews need active involvement from all members.

1.6 The nature of a particular issue might mean that a review has to be concluded within a certain time span to be relevant. Members need to understand the pressure under which this may put them to read papers, attend meetings, and actively contribute to the group’s business. If the timespan is too tight, it might make sense to think of other ways to conduct the work, such as a one-off, single item “challenge panel” meeting. Whenever there are time constraints, there also needs to be sufficient officer resources in place at the appropriate time to make the deadline.

1.7 It could make sense for timescale to be considered alongside other potential risks (for example, political risks) when a review is being planned.

1.8 Scrutiny review groups, and their commissioning committees, need to plan work with these limitations in mind. It is no use starting an involved piece of work only for it to grind to a halt halfway through — because of resource constraints, or political disagreement, or the nature of the debate having moved on.

1.9 Where will it go? — it makes sense to establish at the outset to whom recommendations will be addressed. Often this is likely to be executive members. At other times it could include an external partner. Bringing in those with responsibility early will be very helpful. These post holders will be able to provide information and guidance early on in a scrutiny review, which can help to influence the planning and scoping process for the review itself. Should these key people not be available in the short term to help in a review — or should they be ambivalent about the subject chosen - it might influence the scope and range of that review.

2. Scoping - how to project plan a review topic - different lengths of and types of review and different possible methodologies

2.1 Much of the lead in scoping (another word for “project planning”) is likely to be provided by the chair, on the basis of advice from the scrutiny officer (if there is one). Detailed information on chairing is provided in a separate skills briefing. Nevertheless, most of the councillors involved in a scrutiny review should have some say in the scoping exercise.

2.2 The chair is likely to seek early and quick agreement for a project plan setting out the direction and timings of that review. Putting the plan together will require some basic background research, and a meeting of the review group to narrow down the area under discussion. The plan might be able to sketch out where the issue is now, and where members might want performance to get to in the future, with scrutiny’s
help. It should be possible to define some general outcomes at the start, on the basis of the initial research carried out.

2.3 If there is no agreed final desired outcome at the start then the review is more likely to be structured around the possible avenues for improvement. It might be prudent to allow time to test suggested improvements with interested parties to narrow down potential options.

2.4 If there is a feeling that there are plenty of examples of best practice elsewhere the project plan would be wise to build in time for these alternatives to be seriously examined. It might be that site visits would be desirable to make meaningful comparisons, or some desktop time put aside to carry out benchmarking or other kinds of research.

2.4 **Involving the public and service users** - In drawing up the plans the involvement of the public needs to be considered. Ideally many reviews would benefit from hearing a wide range of public views – although this will not be appropriate or relevant in all cases.

2.5 The aim is to ensure, when seeking to involve the community at large, that the right people are getting involved in the right way. Part of this is about effective publicity – part of it lies in ensuring that scrutiny is going out to where people already are, rather than expecting people to come to wherever scrutiny is. All these issues must be built into project plans to ensure maximum success.

2.6 The communications professionals in the town hall will be able to advise on the best way of presenting material to get it published or broadcasted, and community engagement officers (if your council has them) will be able to provide advice on direct dialogue with local people. It might be that early interaction with the public could lead to suggestions on how the scope of the review might be altered or extended to associated matters of public concern. It can help to assure that the subject under discussion is of genuine interest to local people.

2.7 The public, if sufficiently motivated, may see the start of a review as the spur to start making some of its own investigations. Knowing that whatever they bring forward as evidence is likely to be seriously considered may spur them on. A project plan could plan for a truly collaborative investigation. This may seem a remote possibility, but a number of scrutiny reviews – including many which have receive CfPS Good Scrutiny Awards – have actively sought to involve the public in this way, on an essentially joint basis. Scrutiny reviews in **Enfield** (young people), **North East** (ex-servicepeople and health inequalities), **Warrington** (cemeteries) and **Westminster** (young people’s scrutiny panel) all demonstrate this work in action.
3. Evidence gathering

3.1 Working out how to gather evidence - The methodology of the review will need to be detailed in the project plan. The review could blandly call for evidence and see what turns up. The review will probably find it more beneficial to identify people, organisations and post holders that could contribute as expert witnesses.

3.2 Calling witnesses is not the only information-gathering technique. The internet and other desk-based research can be used to find things out. The drawback to this technique is that the opportunity for cross-examining is limited, and such desk-based research is often something carried out by officers. Members may feel that they lack the time, confidence or skills to carry it out themselves, but this will often not be the case. The scoping exercise (see above) may reveal opportunities to carry out member-led research that plays to the strengths of those on the review group, as well as building up their relevant skills.

3.3 When setting up the project plan the divisions of tasks between the various members of the scrutiny review can be established. It might be that the size of the group means that everybody is involved in every stage. However that might also be times when there is an obvious and sensible division of tasks, and individual members might be able to investigate particular points as “rapporteurs”, reporting back to the group as appropriate. There are risks in this approach – it can fragment the scrutiny process and does put a lot of onus on one member – but if it enables better utilisation of the limited resource then it should be encouraged.

3.4 This “rapporteur” process – and, indeed, the evidence-gathering process more generally – may lead to suggestions for improvements being developed as the review is under way. It may make sense to put these ideas to witnesses as the work progresses, to test out their viability in preparation for recommendations to be made. Some evidence may also lead you in a different direction to the one you had previously considered. These two factors emphasise the importance of flexibility in gathering evidence.

3.5 A project plan should also build in allowances for delays in the evidence-gathering process. Either though illness or other events certain tasks may slip. While any review group will want to report its results as soon as possible, a sensible project plan might allow some flexibility.

3.6 Working out how to weigh evidence - different sources of evidence will require that you place different weight on them, depending on their reliability, representativeness, authoritativeness and so on. No evidence should be discounted purely because it is anecdotal or parochial in nature – although this may mean that you don’t attach much weight to it on its own (although you may find it useful to see
whether other sources of evidence confirm it). All your evidence taken together, and weighed effectively, will allow you to build up a comprehensive picture of the issue you are investigating.

3.7 The project plan will have identified where information should be sought, and how. It is likely to have looked at providers and service users as the most interested parties. Those who have the expertise to provide evidence should do so (we discuss engaging with partners, and other organisations external to the council, in a separate briefing). Evidence from local experts will be extremely useful and will need to have a significant amount of weight placed on them. We explore in our skills briefing on engaging with partners exactly how people from outside the council can be persuaded to attend scrutiny meetings.

3.8 One of the most traditional forms of gathering evidence is through surveys conducted by the scrutiny review committee itself. Surveys can be conducted both verbally (person asking person) or self-recording (on paper or on the web). It is sensible to ensure that questions chosen to be asked are representative and the survey allows the flexibility for respondents to give full and frank opinions. It will be important when asking trade bodies to give evidence to establish if they are able to give answers that have universal support from their members or if they merely representing a summation of differing opinions. Surveys are usually most useful to get a broad overview of the public perception of a service, and allow more detailed investigations to be carried out based on your findings. How you carry them out will influence what weight you place on them when you come to consider your findings.

3.9 The most public form of evidence gathering is through formal interviews, getting witnesses to give their comments and views to the scrutineers. (The skills involved in questioning form the basis of another skills briefing). Questioning needs careful planning so that witnesses know what objectives the group is trying to achieve, and so that the group can target questions appropriately.

3.10 The members on the review will able to bring their own thoughts and observations to the review. As sitting councillors they will have been made aware of what is happening in their ward by their constituents. Councillors will be keen to establish why. What will be of concern are cases where the normal monitoring by service providers shows no problems. As scrutineers, members may be able to undertake spot checks, doing random sampling, to get a better picture of how things currently work. Getting an accurate picture of frontline services – by talking to staff, residents, or others – can be a crucial way of getting hold of accurate, timely evidence about what really happens on the ground. Again, the weight attached will depend on an accurate assessment based on these principles.
4. Bringing together findings and formulating recommendations

4.1 After all the evidence has been gathered, it will be the task of the scrutiny review to move towards making recommendations. A thorough examination will have established the key issues, and identified some options for improvement. The review will have to reconcile all the comments that have emerged while gathering evidence.

4.2 The review should make a number of key findings of fact - building blocks on which recommendations can be constructed. Recommendations must refer to and reflect these findings to be taken seriously.

4.3 Developing firm findings will allow you to draw conclusions which can themselves form the basis of recommendations for action. This is often an organic process, and a meeting of the review group will often serve to very effectively tease out recommendations once the evidence-gathering phase is complete. As this happens, scrutineers will need to critically examine any proposals, and look at potential drawbacks or barriers to their implementation. It is possible that there will be more than one option to improve any specific area and therefore scrutineers should make suitable comparisons. For any proposed change there needs to be clearly identified benefits, which outweigh any risks or costs.

4.4 Scrutineers must think about the potential acceptability of any proposed improvements - principally, whether the outcomes being suggested are ones that would make a tangible, positive impact on the community. Scrutineers must be prepared to ground their recommendations in achievable reality, and to back them up with robust evidence if challenged.

4.4 The review report will need to be aware of the variety of groups who will be looking at the recommendations. These will include the executive, the full council, external agencies, and the press and service users. Not all recommendations need to be addressed to the council’s Cabinet – it may be appropriate to direct some to partner agencies or to other bodies.

4.5 Ideally a final report should have the support of all scrutiny members involved in the investigation. Unanimity of recommendations carries a more powerful message. While there is a precedent for the production of “minority reports”, it is far better to try to deal with any concerns about content by trying to incorporate those concerns into the final report.

4.6 A final report should give some form of action plan showing likely timescales to make changes. Setting timescales for the implementation of recommendations - and indicating what “implementation” will look like – is absolutely critical to ensuring success. It will make the
monitoring process described below much more straightforward. We explored this issue in more detail in our publications “Global challenge, local solutions” (2009) and “Green Light” (2010), but in brief the rule of thumb is to ensure that all recommendations should be SMARTER – specific, measurable, agreed, realistic, timed, evaluated and reviewed.

4.7 It is usual practice for reports and recommendations to be presented to the council’s Cabinet for agreement, but some recommendations may also be submitted to partners (this can happen directly – legally, recommendations do not need to be agreed by Cabinet or Full Council first). Whenever recommendations are submitted, it is good practice for the recipient to advise whether they will be accepted or rejected. If recommendations are rejected, a response should indicate the reasons why. Cabinet “noting” recommendations – as has happened in some instances – does not represent good practice, or reflect the respect that should be accorded to members for the work they have carried out on behalf of the authority and local people.

4.8 It is good practice, at the conclusion of a review and once the recommendations have been submitted to Cabinet and other decision-makers, to contact those who took part to advise them of the immediate outcomes. You can then follow this up, as recommendations are monitored in the future (see below) with more information on implementation at a later date.

5. Monitoring the implementation of recommendations in the future

5.1 It is common that the scrutiny review asks for a report six months or a year after its report’s publication to see what has happened as a result of its investigation. This will provide a useful “milestone” at which implementation can be judged.

5.2 Alternatively there could be in place a regular tracking system whereby the council at pre-defined intervals, maybe a fixed three or six month point, does a progress report on all scrutiny reports produced. Broadly reports could fall into one of three categories.

- Little progress or delays in implementation
- Change recommended only at preliminary planning stage
- Satisfactory progress being made.

5.3 This approach can provide an early warning where recommendations are not being implemented effectively. As we noted above, recommendations should be SMARTER, and recommendations fulfilling these criteria will be easier to monitor in the future. Where recommendations which have been accepted are not implemented, scrutiny could reopen the investigation to consider what has happened – although a one-off hearing on the subject is likely to be all that is needed.
5.4 Where recommendations have been agreed to, but implementation appears to have stalled, the relevant Cabinet member (or partners) should be held to account. This could involve an invitation to attend a committee meeting to discuss the matter in more detail, and/or the provision of written reasons for the failure to proceed successfully.
## BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL
### SCRUTINY PROJECT MANAGEMENT
#### REVIEW SCOPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF COMMITTEE:</th>
<th>SCRUTINY OFFICER:</th>
<th>Claire Millington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| SUBJECT TO BE REVIEWED | |
|------------------------| |

| REASON(S) FOR THE REVIEW | |
|--------------------------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFY APPROPRIATE CORPORATE PLAN AIMS, PRIORITIES AND TARGETS</th>
<th>CORPORATE PLAN AIM –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DIRECTOR | |
|----------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF REVIEW</th>
<th>Aim:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| KEY ISSUES | |
|------------| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMESCALE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**METHOD(S) OF REVIEW:**

**IMPLICATIONS:**
(legislative, regulatory, etc)

**DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE:**
(Internal/External)

**STAKEHOLDERS**
RELEVANT PORTFOLIO HOLDER MUST BE INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW

**CONSULTATION/RESEARCH:**

**SITE VISITS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRUTINY REVIEW OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSIONS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT REPORT SENT TO DIRECTOR &amp; ANY RELEVANT OFFICERS FOR COMMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT REPORT CONSIDERED BY PORTFOLIO HOLDER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNED OFF BY COMMITTEE/CHAIR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNED OFF BY SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF PROCESS/COMMENTS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE CONSIDERED:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOW UP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Decisions & Items to be Considered in Private

To be made under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Published on: 13 May 2016
INTRODUCTION

The list attached sets out decisions that are termed as “Key Decisions” at least 28 calendar days before they are due to be taken by the Executive or an officer under delegated powers.

Preparation of the list helps Executive to programme its work. The purpose of the list is to give notice and provide an opportunity for consultation on the issues to be discussed. The list is updated each month with the period of the list being rolled forward by one month and republished. The list is available for public inspection at the The Arc, High Street, Clowne, S43 4JY. Copies of the list can be obtained from Sarah Sternberg, Assistant Director – Governance & Monitoring Officer at this address or by email to sarah.sternberg@bolsover.gov.uk.

The list can also be accessed from the Council’s website at www.bolsover.gov.uk. The Executive is allowed to make urgent decisions which do not appear in the list, however, a notice will be published at The Arc and on the Council’s website explaining the reasons for the urgent decisions. Please note that the decision dates are indicative and are subject to change.

The names of Executive members are as follows:

Councillor A M Syrett - Leader
Councillor M Dooley – Deputy Leader
Councillor T Connerton
Councillor B R Murray-Carr
Councillor K Reid
Councillor J Ritchie

The Executive agenda and reports are available for inspection by the public five clear days prior to the meeting of the Executive. The papers can be seen at The Arc at the above address. The papers are also available on the Council’s website referred to above. Background papers are listed on each report submitted to the Executive and members of the public are entitled to see these documents unless they contain exempt or confidential information. The report also contains the name and telephone number of a contact officer.

Meetings of the Executive are open to the public and usually take place in the Chamber Suites at The Arc. Occasionally there are items included on the agenda which are exempt and for those items the public will be asked to leave the meeting. This list shows where this is intended and the reason why the reports are exempt or confidential. Members of the public may make representations to the Assistant Director – Governance & Monitoring Officer about any particular item being considered in exempt.
The list does not detail all decisions which have to be taken by the Executive, only “Key Decisions”. In these Rules a “Key Decision” means an executive decision, which is likely:

(1) to result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(2) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the District.

In determining the meaning of “significant” the Council must have regard to any guidance for the time being issued by the Secretary of State. The Council has decided that income or expenditure of £50,000 or more is significant.

The dates for meetings of Executive in 2016/17 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>3 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July</td>
<td>30 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September</td>
<td>27 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 October</td>
<td>27 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 October</td>
<td>24 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November</td>
<td>22 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council hereby gives notice of its intention to make the following Key Decisions and/or decisions to be considered in private:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter in respect of which a decision will be taken</th>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Date of Decision</th>
<th>Documents to be considered</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Is this decision a Key Decision?</th>
<th>Is this decision to be heard in public or private session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxcroft House Refurbishment Contract</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Private – relates to the Council’s financial or business affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acquisition, Clowne</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Private – relates to the Council’s financial or business affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June - October 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor J Ritchie, Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Community Safety and Head of Housing (BDC)</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Car Parking</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Private – relates to the Council’s financial or business affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasley Vale Mill</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Private – relates to the Council’s financial or business affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter in respect of which a decision will be taken</td>
<td>Decision-maker</td>
<td>Date of Decision</td>
<td>Documents to be considered</td>
<td>Contact Officer</td>
<td>Is this decision a Key Decision?</td>
<td>Is this decision to be heard in public or private session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To consider repairs to Plealsey Vale Mill Pond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Top, Shirebrook</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor A Syrett, Leader of the Council</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Property and Estates</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Private – relates to the Council’s financial or business affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To consider a report concerning development at Hill Top, Shirebrook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Replacements</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June - October 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor B Murray-Carr, Portfolio Holder for Environment</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Streetscene</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To approve the purchase of vehicle replacements utilised within Streetscene Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Doors Contract</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Report of Councillor J Ritchie, Portfolio Holder for Housing and IT</td>
<td>Assistant Director – Housing and IT</td>
<td>Yes – involves savings or expenditure of £50,000 or more.</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To award the contract for external doors provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>