

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

THURSDAY, 31ST MARCH 2016, 5.30 PM  
COMMITTEE ROOM 1, TOWN HALL, CHORLEY

### **AGENDA**

#### **APOLOGIES**

##### **1 DECLARATIONS OF ANY INTERESTS**

Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any pecuniary interest in respect of matters contained in this agenda.

If you have a pecuniary interest you must withdraw from the meeting. Normally you should leave the room before the business starts to be discussed. You do, however, have the same right to speak as a member of the public and may remain in the room to enable you to exercise that right and then leave immediately. In either case you must not seek to improperly influence a decision on the matter.

#### **MINUTES**

##### **2 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

To confirm the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 28 January and 2 March 2016.

**A MINUTES OF MEETING THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2016 OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** (Pages 5 - 10)

**B MINUTES OF MEETING WEDNESDAY, 2 MARCH 2016 OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** (Pages 11 - 14)

##### **3 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PERFORMANCE PANEL** (Pages 15 - 22)

To note the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel meeting held on 3 March 2016 (enclosed).

##### **4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Members of the public who have requested the opportunity to ask a question(s) on an item on the agenda will be asked to put their question(s) to the Committee. Each member of the public will be allowed to ask one supplementary question within his/her allocated 3 minutes.

## **SCRUTINY OF EXECUTIVE CABINET**

- 5      **MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE CABINET MEETINGS** (Pages 23 - 34)
- To consider the minutes of the Executive Cabinet meeting held on 21 January and 18 February 2016 (enclosed).
- 6      **NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**
- To view the notice of Executive decisions published on 21 March 2016 [click here](#).
- 7      **PCSO DEPLOYMENT IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING ARENA** (Pages 35 - 38)
- Representatives from Lancashire Constabulary Neighbourhood Policing Team will be in attendance at the meeting to report on PCSO deployment in the neighbourhood policing arena.
- The original report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 8 October 2015 is enclosed.
- 8      **FIRST MONITORING REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TASK GROUP (NEIGHBOURING WORKING)**
- Report of the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community (to follow).
- 9      **FINAL MONITORING REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TASK GROUP (CCTV PROVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE)**
- Report of the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community (to follow).
- 10     **HEALTH SCRUTINY**
- Councillor Hasina Khan, Vice Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to provide a verbal update.
- 11     **FINAL REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TASK GROUP ( STAFF SICKNESS ABSENCE)**
- To consider the final report of the Staff Sickness Absence Review (report to follow).
- 12     **WORK PROGRAMME** (Pages 39 - 40)
- To note the update Work Programme for 2015/16 (enclosed).
- 13     **ANY URGENT BUSINESS PREVIOUSLY AGREED WITH THE CHAIR**

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Councillor John Walker (Chair), Councillor Hasina Khan (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Aaron Beaver, Eric Bell, Paul Clark, Margaret France, Mark Jarnell, Margaret Lees, Matthew Lynch, June Molyneaux, Greg Morgan, Alistair Morwood, Debra Platt and Kim Snape.

If you need this information in a different format, such as larger print or translation, please get in touch on 515151 or [chorley.gov.uk](http://chorley.gov.uk)

To view the procedure for public questions/ speaking click here

<https://democracy.chorley.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD852&id=852&rpId=0&sch=doc&cat=13021&path=13021>

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****MEETING DATE Thursday, 28 January 2016****MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillor John Walker (Chair), Councillor Hasina Khan (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Aaron Beaver, Eric Bell, Paul Clark, Margaret France, Margaret Lees, Matthew Lynch, June Molyneaux, Greg Morgan, Alistair Morwood, Debra Platt and Kim Snape**OFFICERS:** Gary Hall (Chief Executive), Lesley-Ann Fenton (Director of Customer and Advice Services), Jamie Carson (Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community) and Dianne Scambler (Democratic and Member Services Officer)**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Mark Jarnell**16.OS.21 Declarations of Any Interests**

There were no declarations of any interest.

**16.OS.22 Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**AGREED – That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 8 October 2015 be confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chair.**

**16.OS.23 Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel**

**AGREED – That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel held on 3 December 2015 be noted.**

**16.OS.24 Public Questions**

There were no questions from any member of the public.

**16.OS.25 Minutes of Executive Cabinet meetings**

**AGREED – That the minutes of the Executive Cabinet held on 22 October, 19 November and 10 December 2015 be noted**

**16.OS.26 Notice of Executive Decisions**

The Committee considered the list of Executive Decision that was published on 18 January 2016. In response to a query about the proposed decision for Unrecoverable Council Debts, the Chief Executive confirmed that it would be recorded in the budget papers.

**AGREED - That the Executive Decisions published on 18 January 2016 be noted.**

**16.OS.27 PCSO deployment in the neighbourhood policing arena**

The Chair advised that the agenda item was deferred until the next meeting on 31 March 2016, to allow for the outcome of the Council's budget be announced at the Council meeting on 1 March 2016.

**16.OS.28 Budget Scrutiny - Draft budget and summary budget position over the medium term 2016/17**

The Committee considered a report which had been presented at the Executive Cabinet meeting on 21 January, on the draft budget position for the medium term that set out the budget position for 2016/17 including the forecast for the following two years to 2018/19 and also presented the relevant proposals in respect of:

- Potential investment in the Council's Corporate Strategy priorities in 2016/17
- Increasing budget resilience in the longer term and structuring the budget, taking into account the Spending Review (SR 2015)
- Providing funds to support the transitional period of the fundamental service review being undertaken by Lancashire County Council
- Budget consultation

Councillor Peter Wilson, Executive Member for Resources attended the meeting to give an overview of the proposals and answer any questions of the Committee.

It had been proposed that Council Tax be frozen in 2016/17. This would be the fourth consecutive year that the current administration had achieved a balanced budget position for the forthcoming financial year without increasing Council Tax.

Due to the successful implementation of the MTFs, budget efficiency savings totalling £0.214m had been applied to the budget to achieve a balanced budget position for 2016/17. This had mainly been achieved by the Council entering into a Business Rates Retention Pooling agreement within Lancashire effective from 1 April 2016.

In addition, contributions to the New Investment Packages for 2016/17, totalling £2.845m for both Revenue and Capital projects, the New Homes Bonus also provided an opportunity for the Council to invest in three other additional areas to protect public services within the borough and increase financial resilience given the revolutionary funding changes.

A budget of £0.500m would be available for the next two years to assist in the transitional period public services currently provided for and funded by Lancashire County Council and a £0.500m provision per annum to increase General Balances to

mitigate against the financial risk of a core grant income shift to 100% local taxation sources. £0.603m was also available to be used to invest in projects that would provide income streams to the Council.

Potential investment proposals were summarised in the report and set out in detail in project mandates. Funding had been achieved by not building all the New Homes Bonus income received since 2013/14 into the base budget. An approach taken to enable the Council flexibility and resilience in order to address the volatile and variable nature of future core funding which continued to be under review by central government. The latest round of projects would bring the total new investment on the Council's corporate priorities to £12.008m since 2013/14.

The consultation on the proposed budget focused on obtaining feedback on the key investment areas in order to help priorities activity. It would also highlight the impact of a reduction in Council funds and seek the views of residents on the budget. The consultation would invite responses from residents, partners, parish groups and other stakeholders through a variety of methods which included a short survey. The results would be analysed and published in February for consideration as part of budget finalisation.

Members of the Committee highlighted various aspects of the report, which included the forecasted figures for the Market Walk project in light of the reduction of units available. The Executive Member for Resources explained the reasoning behind not reducing the forecast for Market Walk at this time.

In response to concerns raised about the loss made in respect of Chorley Flower Show, the Executive Member for Resources confirmed that there had been a 3% overspend. However, as it had been the first time Chorley had hosted the flower show and the weather had not been ideal; the event had been considered a success making approximately £30k. It was clarified that it was not the intention to compete with other flower shows in the area, but to capitalise on their popularity. There had been awareness that the event could make a loss in its first year but that it was an investment in the future. Lessons learned from the event would be implemented for this year's Show, which would include a discount for booking tickets in advance.

A full debate on the proposals would take place at the Council meeting on 1 March.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member for Resources for attending the meeting.

**AGREED – That the report be noted.**

#### **16.OS.29 Final Monitoring Report - Overview and Scrutiny Task Group (Adoption of Estates)**

The Committee received the third and final monitoring report from the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community informing them on progress made against the recommendations of the Task Group review into the Adoption of Estates.

The final report of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group considering the Adoption of Estates was presented to the Executive Cabinet on 20 June 2013, and detailed fourteen recommendations, all of which were agreed by the Executive Cabinet in its response on 24 October 2014.

Members were made aware of adoptions that had been completed. Some of them would be full developments such as Fairview. Others would be elements of particular streets for example Buckshaw and Gillibrand. However, a number of factors had resulted in progress not being made as anticipated against some recommendations which included –

- Internal staffing issues
- Lancashire County Council not able to provide pre-application highways and transport related advice.

Members welcomed the progress that had been made. However, concern was raised about the length of time it was taking for some areas to be adopted such as Lower Burgh Way. It was recognised that timescales were an issue. However, the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community reiterated to members that the developer could choose not to transfer areas to be adopted by either the Borough or County Council and instead make their own arrangements, such as engaging a management company to maintain the development.

In response to a query raised by Councillor Beaver regarding an un-adopted estate in his ward, the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community advised that he would speak to Councillor Beaver outside the meetings.

It had been suggested that small areas of Buckshaw Village located within the South Ribble boundary had already been adopted. The Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community agreed to establish how South Ribble Borough Council had achieved this progress given adoptions for this area were in the main led by Chorley Council and would seek speedy adoption for the rest of Buckshaw Village.

The Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community advised that one key finding from the Task Group was that all those involved in the adoption process, including developers, were keen to work together to progress adoptions of estates faster. It was made clear that a more co-ordinated response was required from the Council and its partners, in particular from Lancashire County Council and United Utilities, to help speed the process along by making their relevant inspections in a timely fashion. Members of the Committee went on to discuss the role of management companies.

It was suggested that a Member Learning Session be held on the adoption of estates.

#### **AGREED –**

- 1. That the report be noted,**
- 2. The Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community to investigate how the quick adoption of some parts of Buckshaw Village that fell within the South Ribble borough boundary had been achieved, and seek a speedy adoption for the rest of Buckshaw Village.**
- 3. The Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community to meet with Councillor Beaver to discuss issues related to an un-adopted estate in his ward**
- 4. A Member Learning Session on the Adoption of Estates be programmed in to the Member Development Programme for 2016/17.**



**16.OS.30 Final Report - Overview and Scrutiny Task Group (Single Front Office)**

Members of the Committee considered the final report of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group – Single Front Office. Councillor Alistair Morwood presented the groups findings and drew members' attention to the recommendation for the Council to look at ways to improve the process of customer call backs by officers, outside of the Contact Centre, across the authority.

The Task Group was impressed by the work that the Council was currently undertaking to promote greater efficiencies against the backdrop of ever decreasing resources and commended the implementation of the Single Front Office. All councillors who took part in the review had learned a great deal about the work of the service and fully supported the aims that the Council were trying to achieve.

Members of the Committee discussed the finale report and concern was raised about officers not taking ownership of call backs. The Director of Customer and Advice Services that a system was in place to address this issue and that heads of services were being tasked to make sure it happened.

**AGREED – That the finale report of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group – Single Front Office be submitted to the next meeting Executive Cabinet for consideration in March.**

**16.OS.31 Overview and Scrutiny Task Group: Public Transport Issues in Chorley - Response of Executive Cabinet**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Executive that provided the Executive Cabinet's response to the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group review in to Public Transport Issues in Chorley.

Given the responsibility of overseeing local transport matters at present rested with Lancashire County Council, the majority of the recommendations put forward by the Task Group were not within the remit of Chorley Council to take forward. However, the Executive Cabinet was supportive of all the recommendations made and would use a variety of mechanisms to influence partners and operators directly involved in public transport provision.

Members of the Committee discussed various aspects of the report including the impact on local communities should the proposed removal of subsidised services of Lancashire County Council provision be approved, in light of bus companies saying they would not continue the subsidised services. The Director of Advice and Customer Services understood that when Cumbria County Council removed their subsidised bus services, bus companies initially said that they would not be able to replace them. However, a few months in to the removal of Cumbria County Council's bus subsidies, bus companies did take some of them back on. It was expected that the same scenario would happen at Chorley.

**AGREED – That the topic be reviewed in six months-time to evaluate the current position of public transport provision in Chorley.**

**16.OS.32 Reports from the Task and Finish Groups**Staff Sickness Absence Scrutiny Task Group

Councillor Walker, Chair of the Task Group gave a verbal update on the inquiry in to staff sickness absence.

It had been noted that there had been an increase in staff sickness absence and the purpose of the Task Group was to conduct a mini review to find out if there was a underlying cause for the increase in staff sickness absence that needed to be addressed.

A meeting took place on the 27 January. The Acting Head of HR and OD, and the HR & OD Advisor were in attendance at the meeting to support the Council's position.

The Task Group was pleased with the Council's policies and procedures in place and it was felt that there was no one particular issue causing the increase in sickness absence. The Chair also commented on the range of health and wellbeing opportunities available to staff.

However, in order to get a balanced view, it had been agreed that a further meeting take place with representatives from Unison and the Staff Matters group to find out staff's opinion on the current policy and procedures on 3 February and the final report will be presented to the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 31 March.

**16.OS.33 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2015/16**

Members of the Committee considered the Work Programme for 2015/16.

Amendments to the Work Programme included –

- The date of the next Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel detailed as the 10 March had been brought forward to 3 March
- That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to receive a Section 106 update at the meeting on the 6 October 2016
- That the PCSO deployment in the neighbourhood policing area item had been deferred to the next meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 31 March
- Councillor Khan to present a short overview report at the next meeting on 31 March meeting for Health Scrutiny.

**AGREED – that the Work Programme and the above amendments be noted.**

Chair

Date



<b>MINUTES OF</b>	<b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>
<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>Wednesday, 2 March 2016</b>
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Councillor John Walker (Chair), Councillor Hasina Khan (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Aaron Beaver, Margaret France, Mark Jarnell, Margaret Lees, Matthew Lynch, June Molyneaux, Alistair Morwood and Kim Snape
<b>OFFICERS:</b>	Lesley-Ann Fenton (Director of Customer and Advice Services), Simon Clark (Head of Health, Environment and Neighbourhoods) and Cathryn Filbin (Democratic and Member Services Officer)
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Councillors Eric Bell, Paul Clark, Greg Morgan and Debra Platt
<b>OTHER MEMBERS:</b>	Councillor Alistair Bradley, Beverley Murray, Mark Perks, Steve Murfitt, Alan Whittaker and Paul Leadbetter

#### **16.OS.34 Declarations of Any Interests**

Councillor Lynch and Councillor Morwood both declared an interest in the consideration of the Call-in request for Community Action Plans in that they were Chairs of the Clayton Brook and Chorley East Ward respectively.

Both Councillor Lynch and Councillor Morwood took part in the debate and the subsequent vote.

#### **16.OS.35 Consideration of Call-in Request: Community Action Plans**

The Chair agreed to a request from Councillor Alistair Bradley, the Executive Leader of the Council to table a copy of an email that he had submitted to the Chair of the Committee prior to the commencement of the meeting. The content of the email questioned the validity of the application for the Call-in request submitted by Councillor Perks in relation to Community Action Plans.

Both Councillor Bradley and Councillor Perks put forward arguments to the validity of the call-in. However, the Chair reminded the Committee that the validity of the call-in request was not open for debate, and that it was in his gift to decide whether or not a call-in request was valid. It was the role of the Committee to decide if the decision made by the Executive Cabinet on Community Action Plans should be referred back to the next Executive Cabinet meeting for further consideration.

The Chair summarised the background of the call-in request for a decision made by the Executive Cabinet at its meeting on 18 February 2016. The application was made on the

grounds that the Community Action Plans, overall, failed to be consistent in its approach or fairness. It was also stated that the Community Action Plan for Astley Village had missed an opportunity to make a serious impact on the community and the lives of individuals in the area. The proposed Action Plan/Proposals for resources was not good enough or had/would make a real impact on long standing issues.

The decision taken by the Executive Cabinet had been to

- note the progress made in the development of Community Action Plans for each of the pilot areas (Chorley East Ward, Clayton Brook, Astley Village and Rural).
- approve the budget allocation to the Community Action Plan projects identified and described in the report.

The Chair invited Councillor Perks to put forward his reasons for calling-in the decision. Councillor Perk raised concern about the lack of consultation with councillors, residents and community groups, in respect of the Action Plan for Astley Village, which was contrary to how the other three Action Plans had been developed.

It was felt that opportunities to make effective changes to the lives of residents in Astley Village had been missed, and that the data used to identify community priorities would not have been reflective of the whole demographic of Astley Village, but instead would be the opinion of a minority of residents.

The Community Action Plan identified the five main differences between Astley Village and the rest of Chorley -

- Housing
- Unemployment
- Deprivation
- Health
- Crime

Councillor Perks agreed that the priority for Astley Village was housing. The report for Astley and Buckshaw Ward identified that the population density was more than double that of all Chorley at 11.9 persons per hectare (Chorley 5.3 persons per hectare). The percentage of flats, maisonettes or apartments in Astley and Buckshaw was more than double that of Chorley at 23.0% (Chorley 9.2%). It was also had a much lower percentage of semi-detached and terraced houses/bungalows, the figures for which were comparable to Chorley. Overcrowding was also higher at 7.7% (Chorley 3.8%).

In the report, the first bullet point for Astley Village stated that 'community cohesion due to high numbers of rented properties' was a key priority. Councillor Perks agreed that this was a high priority as there had been a lot of issues related to poor and substandard housing in Astley Village, many of which were properties owned by Places for People. As part of the Action Plan it had been hoped that the Council would develop strong links with Places for People so that residents could complain to the Council if they felt that the housing association was not responding quickly to rectify issues. The Council would then be able to put pressure on Places for People to ensure complaints were dealt with swiftly and to a satisfactory outcome. It was also felt that a lot of the recommendations in the Action Plan had already been included in the Council's Corporate Strategy.

When challenged about his need to call-in the decision, rather than attending the Executive Cabinet and airing his views there or raising his concern of the Community Action Plans when first approved, Councillor Perks explained that he had been unable to attend the last meeting of the Executive Cabinet on the 18 February, and when the initial recommendation was approved, he had been in poor health. Councillor Perks added that he had approached officers on four occasions seeking information, to which he received no response. He therefore felt no option, but to submit a Freedom of Information request, and to call-in the decision.

In response to the Chair's question of how the four areas were identified to take part in the pilot, Councillor Murray, Executive Member (Community Services) explained that the concept for the Action Plans came from neighbourhood working. Suggestions had been made for improvements for which the Council had little or no influence over. The four areas had been chosen for the pilot because they all had similar issues, some of which were hidden.

The four community action plans had each developed a unique approach to developing their action plan, and in each case they were led by a lead member and senior officer –

<b>CAP area</b>	<b>Lead Member</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>
Astley Village	Councillor Steve Murfitt	Gary Hall
Chorley East Ward	Councillor Alistair Morwood	Simon Clark
Clayton Brook	Councillor Matthew Lynch	Jamie Carson
Rural Areas	Councillor Alan Whittaker	Lesley-Ann Fenton

In the case of Astley Village it was decided not to consult ward councillors, residents and community groups at an early stage, but instead, rely on data that was already available. It was considered that this approach would drive forward and deliver some key improvements that had been needed and discussed for a long time with little or no progress being made. It was felt that by delivering smaller projects/improvements quickly it would increase residents' confidence and trust in the Council, and would have residents support for delivering larger more significant improvements.

There had been some criticism that the lead member for each action plan was not also the ward councillor for that area. However, it was reported that the lead members chosen were able to identify with their Action Plan area as it faced similar issues to their own ward. It was felt that to make the Action Plans a success there needed to be a fresh approach, with members who were not familiar with the history or individuals involved and so were not influenced by them.

In response to questions raised by members of the Committee, the Executive Leader explained the work that was taking place to improve relationships with housing providers.

Councillor Murfitt, Chair and Lead Member for Astley Village explained some of the work that had been carried out in the area, advising that part of the process was to win over the community. It was felt this way, residents would be more willing to get involved in future projects and take ownership of their community.

The other three Chairs responsible for the Community Action Plans in Clayton Brook, Chorley North West and Rural detailed the findings of their groups and explained how those decisions were made.

The Executive Member (Community Services) reminded the Committee that this was the first year that the Action Plans had been piloted and it had been important that each area went about developing them in different ways to see which was best. The process will be reviewed to find out what went well and what did not. Once the findings were known, changes to the process would be implemented for the future.

The Executive Leader reminded the committee that this was a project of the administration, and therefore it was felt there was not a need to consult all ward councillors, but the concerns raised had been noted.

In response to a question posed by the Chair, Councillor Perks advised that he had felt that he had finally been given the opportunity to raise his concerns on the Action Plans which he had unable to do so previously.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to put forward their views, in which some of them admitted to having their own reservation about the Action Plans, and had challenged this project previously. However, it was accepted that there was a real need to progress improvements, and consultation in respect of Astley Village's Action Plan could have delayed progress.

**AGREED – That the call-in in respect of the Community Action Plans be dismissed.**

Chair

Date



**MINUTES OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PERFORMANCE PANEL**

**MEETING DATE** Thursday, 3 March 2016

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillor John Walker (Chair), Councillor Hasina Khan (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Paul Clark and Alistair Morwood

**OFFICERS:** Lesley-Ann Fenton (Director of Customer and Advice Services), Rebecca Huddleston (Head of Policy and Communications), Jason Mills (Policy and Communications) and Chris Moister (Head of Governance and Property Services)

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor June Molyneaux and Debra Platt

**OTHER MEMBERS:** Councillor Alistair Bradley and Danny Gee

**16.OSP.13 Minutes of meeting Thursday, 3 December 2015 of Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel**

**AGREED – That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel meeting held on 3 December 2015 be confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chair.**

**16.OSP.14 Declarations of Any Interests**

There were no declarations of any interest

**16.OSP.15 Performance Focus: Town Centre**

Members of the Committee received a report which provided contextual information and initial questions for focus in respect of the town centre including Market Walk and future development plans.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Bradley, Executive Leader of the Council and Executive Member (Economic Development and Partnerships), Councillor Danny Gee, Chair of the Town Centre Team and Chris Moister, Head of Governance to the meeting who attended to answer questions in relation to Market Walk and the town centre.

Achieving a vibrant town centre was a key objective of the Council's corporate strategy under the priority of 'a strong local economy'. Performance in this area was currently strong both across the wider town centre and in respect of the Market Walk shopping centre, which was purchased by the Council in November 2013 and taken into internal management in April 2015.

The majority of key indicators for the town centre were performing above target at the end of quarter 3, 2015/16 (December 2015). Performance for floor space improved/created and vacant town centre floor space was excellent. The percentage occupancy of the covered market had decreased slightly compared to last year (95.7% against almost full occupancy of 99% for 2014/15) but remained above target of 95%.

Performance of Market Walk across September, October and November 2015, footfall followed a similar trend to previous years. However, there had been a significant increase of footfall in December 2015 of 13.5%, which was likely to be a result of a successful programme of creative marketing and PR over the Christmas period.

A range of improvement activity had been undertaken in Market Walk itself which had included new wooden bins, planters PA system and replacement paving in some areas.

It was reported that since coming under Council management in 2015, the centre had continued to generate revenue above anticipated levels and provided an additional income stream for the Council. A recent management report highlighted one vacant unit out of 35 which equates to 97% occupancy. However, there were a number of tenants with outstanding or part payments; this applied to approximately 9 units currently showing arrears.

The report detailed town centre marketing and PR for the Christmas period which attracted significant visitor numbers to the town centre due to key attractions including –

- Chorley's Christmas lights switch on – 5,000 visitors
- Santa Express from town centre to see Father Christmas at Astley Hall – 1,900 families
- Giant Ferris wheel – 10,800 rides

The report posed a number of questions to which answers were received -

#### Market Walk

*How do existing Market Walk tenants contribute towards:*

*a) The wider marketing and promotion of the town centre?*

There was no central fund for which tenants could contribute towards. However, tenants had provided prizes/incentives to encourage shopper engagement, and some tenants had also sponsored events.

*b) Improvements and upgrades to the centre such as street furniture?*

Tenants did not contribute directly. The Council, as landlord, provided improvements and upgrades which was usual practice. The street furniture in Market Walk had been integrated with the rest of the town centre to encourage shoppers/visitors to explore the whole of the centre of Chorley; this was one reason why tenants were not asked to contribute. It was intended that when the Market Walk extension was built it would offer the opportunity to look at the whole configuration of Market Walk and public realm areas to make improvements.

The Committee were informed that there were examples of street furniture within the town centre that was not the responsibility of the Council. One example was a coffee shop that rented space outside their premise in which they had placed tables, chairs and fencing.



*The report identified a number of existing tenants in arrears. Why was this-the case and what action was being taken to address the situation?*

The arrears totalled approximately £25,000, which equated to an average of just over 5 days of late payments. This was partly attributed to the way the national or larger retailers make their payments, which did not necessarily fall on the payment due dates (eg payments were often made on a particular day of the month, bi-monthly or even quarterly).

It was also explained that some tenants were still making payments to Deloitte (the company which had managed Market Street on behalf of the Council from its purchase to April 2015), and there was a delay in Deloitte sending the rents on. Tenants had been notified about paying the Council rather than Deloitte, but some had failed to update their records. Most of those tenants in arrears, had arrears worth less than £1,000. Members of the Committee were pleased to note that none of the tenants in arrears, where in that situation due to hardship.

Councillor Bradley advised that the figures for arrears needed to be reconciled and balanced, at the latest, six weeks following the closure of the financial year.

*The purchase of Market Walk was expected to bring in additional revenue of £400,000 per year. What had been the return on this investment so far and was this forecast to be maintained in future years?*

It was estimated that the Council should make £1 million on this investment but was making £150,000 more than anticipated. This was due to more units than expected being let, and which also allowed the Council to borrow less to finance Market Walk. Leases due to expire are being renewed by tenants due to the prospect of the Market Walk extension and the possibility of big name high street stores locating in Market Walk.

#### Market Walk extension

*Please provide an update on the current position in regard to Market Walk phase 2.*

The Council was in a position that if an 'A' grade retailer signed a tenancy agreement, progress would be made relatively swiftly as a significant amount of preparation work had already been completed. The Council was waiting to hear from a big name retailer about locating in Chorley.

The next stage was giving consideration to the design, and whether the design should be prepared earlier than expected in anticipation of retailer sign up. Whatever the design, it would be up to the expected standard for an A grade retailer. All details would be brought before Council for approval, and if members were happy with the recommendations, work could commence reasonably quickly.

*How will the Market Walk phase 2 development impact on:*

a) *Existing Market Walk tenants?*

There had been more interest from tenants wanting to stay in Chorley. One retailer was not entirely happy with the proposals, due to the potential loss of car parking and increased competition. The Council had made certain commitments in relation to car parking, and was trying to help the retailer, but that it would not be to the detriment of the rest of the town centre.

b) *The wider town centre?*

Since Market Street reopened there had been a significant increase in trading. The public realm areas had been improved and the majority of Market Street repainted. There had been a decrease in empty properties, and three out of the four units at the old McDonald's site had been leased. There was a possible tenant for the fourth unit but they had pulled out. However, there was no intention to fill the empty unit with the first interested party as the occupier had to compliment the other units and not detract from them.

A number of retailers/landlords to premises towards the top of Market Street had successfully secured Council grants to make improvements to shop floor and shop fronts. This had improved the look and feel of that part of Market Street substantially.

It had been noted that the night-time economy had increased without any interventions from the Council.

In response to questions raised by the Panel, it was confirmed that the Town Centre Master Plan included questions posed to residents about the type of retailers/entertainment venues they wanted to see in the town centre. The results were fairly consistent with residents wanting big named stores, cinema and leisure opportunities. It was anticipated that on the completion of the Market Walk extension, which was proposed to include a cinema and leisure activities it would encourage visitors to extend their stay and explore the rest of the town centre, including Market Street.

*What are the risks for the town centre and have mitigating actions been identified?*

There were some public realm areas, the responsibility for which lay with Lancashire County Council; that showed signs of deterioration. It was felt that due to the anticipated service cuts by the County Council this was likely to worsen and that pressure was needed to be put on Lancashire County Council to ensure the areas are maintained.

The Panel was interested to know what impact the Asda superstore had on Market Street. The impact from the superstore was unknown as no study/survey had been completed. However, it was thought that there had been an increase in footfall in that area. This could be credited due to a number of factors which included the increased parking available following the Fleet Street work.

As well as Market Street improvements, it was reported that retailers round St George's Street had got together to make their own improvements.

Members of the Panel discussed various aspect of the report, including the activities which took place over the Christmas period which contributed to the level of footfall.

Due to the planned extension for Market Walk and other town centre improvements, members of the Panel enquired if consideration had been made to possible improvements to alleviate congestion at the Hartwood roundabout. It was recognised that at peak times traffic flow was slow. However, it was not considered that the congestion was so severe that it warranted changes to the road network.

The planned development of Botany Bay was still at planning stage, but it was expected that there would be a mix of housing and retail opportunities. It was important that the retail at Botany Bay did not duplicate the town centre.

The Chair thanked Councillor Bradley, Councillor Gee and Chris Moister for attending the meeting after which they left the room.

**AGREED – That the report be noted.**

## **16.OSP.16 Monitoring of the Organisational Plan 2015/16**

Members of the Panel considered a report of the Chief Executive which provided an update on the performance of the Organisational Improvement Plan 2015/16 which included 18 key corporate priority projects set out in the Council's Corporate Strategy. It was reported that overall performance of the Corporate Strategy projects was good with 83% of projects rated green or complete.

The report also provided an update on all the Corporate Strategy and local performance indicators which could be reported at this time. Performance was good with 83% of the 92 indicators achieving or exceeding their target with a further 9% performing within the 5% threshold; 8% of these indicators were below target and outside the 5% threshold.

The Organisational Improvement Plan for 2015/16 contained all priority improvement activity to be undertaken during the year by the organisation. This included the key projects as set out in the 2014/15 Corporate Strategy. The Plan also set out a number of business improvement, budget growth items and neighbourhood priority projects that had been agreed in 2015, and were due to run until the end of the financial year, and in some cases for larger projects into 2016/17 and beyond.

All projects were recorded in the MyProjects system along with detailed milestones and milestone tasks so that progress could be monitored and managed throughout the year.

The Corporate Strategy 2015/16 included 18 key projects. At the end of January 2016 overall performance of key projects was good with 83.3% of the projects either completed or on track. Six projects had been completed; nine projects were rated green; two projects were rated amber, and one project had been closed.

One project which was to 'Deliver Improvements to Market Street' had been closed off as progress had been made over the past year on the concept design for the town centre public realm to incorporate the Market Walk extension, Youth Zone and High Street projects.

The scope had been widened beyond Market Street to include the whole of the town centre, with Market Street likely to accommodate the Flat Iron market during the redevelopment of the Flat Iron site. This had been incorporated into a new project to 'improve the look and feel of the town centre' which was considered and approved as part of the Corporate Strategy refresh in November.

The report also provided a breakdown of organisational plan projects by Corporate Priority, as of the end of January 2016. 59 projects made up the Organisational Plan for 2015/16, consisting of Corporate Strategy projects, business growth items and business improvement projects. In addition to these projects was a further 24 neighbourhood priorities.

Data on the current position of projects, not including the individual neighbourhood priorities, as at the of January 2016 showed –

- 14 projects being completed

- 39 projects rated green
- 6 projects rated amber
- 0 projects were rated red

A breakdown of organisational plan projects by Corporate Priority was provided for the Panel. Where projects had been rated amber an explanation about the issue(s) and action(s) that were being taken to address them was provided.

The report provided the latest position as the end of quarter 4 approached –

- There were 14 completed projects
- 11 projects due to be completed by 31 March 2016
- 3 projects which would be carried over in to 2016/17 in order to complete
- 14 projects receiving new funding for 2016/17
- 17 projects which would carry over into 2016/17, as they had existing investment and were schedules to complete over multiple years

The 24 neighbourhood priorities was determined by the neighbourhood area meetings in January and February 2015, and agreed by Executive Cabinet in March 2015. From this –

- 13 priorities were rated green
- 10 priorities had been completed
- 1 priority (Euxton, Astley, Buckshaw – Balshaw Lane Ponds and not been started.

On noting that the 'Deliver the Steeley Lane/Gateway project was on hold, Councillor Khan enquired if that included the installation on CCTV as there was a lot of vandalism and anti-social behaviour. It was explained that that CCTV was not part of the project, and it was thought that the possible delay was due to the relocation of the CCTV team in the police station. Councillor Khan asked if an update could be provided.

In response to queries raised by members of the Panel in regards to the School Place Projections, it was confirmed that the Council liaised with Lancashire County Council on behalf of schools in the area, instead of approaching schools for information directly.

Members of the Panel were informed that in relation to school growth the County Council were invited to include schools on the CIL 123 list. Although the County Council did add some new schools to the list, extensions to existing schools to meet demand had not been put forward by the County Council.

The 123 list was expected to be reviewed in the next twelve months, and that this was a good opportunity for parish/town councils, ward councillors and chairs of governors to feed in to the process.

The Director Customer and Advice Services explained that from September 2014, CIL money for Chorley was payable for new development schemes. For those developments in parished areas, that particular parish would receive 15% of CIL monies, with no limitations as to how the money was spent. It was reported that some parish councils had already started to receive CIL money. Council's however, were only permitted to spend CIL monies on infrastructure on the 123 list.

Members of the Panel noted that the performance indicator for those people who regularly participated in volunteering was below target at 21% (the target being 25%). This indicator measured the proportion of the adult population who said that over the last 12 months they had given unpaid help once a month or more to any groups, clubs or organisations. 14% of residents said that they had given unpaid help to groups, clubs or organisations at least once a week, with 7% saying they had given unpaid help less than once a week but at least once a month. The Head of Policy and Communications advised that the indicator, which had come from the residents' survey, did not match with what was known about the success of the Time Credits Scheme within Chorley. The 2015 evaluation report regarding Time Credits

suggested that between August 2012-December 2014, 21,000 hours had been given by 1081 people through a network of 103 local groups and that 72% of Chorley Time Credits volunteers gave their time at least once a week. The additional corporate strategy indicator for Volunteering; 'CS 1.07% increase in the number of volunteering hours earned' also returned a 36% increase at its last bi annual return (31/12/2015)

The level of avoidable contact continued to be a result of customers having to contact the Council to follow up on a service request that had not been fulfilled or had been closed off prematurely. This was primarily an issue for high volume, transactional services such as waste and Streetscene and related to a proportionately small number of cases. There were a number of systems in place to enable managers to monitor service fulfilment and technology was being continually updated to ensure effective management of service requests. Regular performance monitoring was undertaken through Strategy Group and remedial action communicated to relevant managers and officers.

In response to questions raised by members of the Panel, the Head of Policy and Communications advised that the figures were monitored weekly, if not daily by the Contact Centre for the wider Council. The figures included employees not responding to call-backs. It was also about making sure someone was responding to tasks on behalf of colleagues who were absent from work due to leave or sickness.

There was a discussion in regards to the percentage of remittances to suppliers by electronic means, and the increasing popularity of cheques being issued the Council had re-introduced printed remittance advice as an additional control on the accuracy of supplier bank account details.

Members of the Panel discussed the performance of various projects.

**AGREED – that the report be noted, and that the CCTV**

Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF****EXECUTIVE CABINET****MEETING DATE****Thursday, 21 January 2016****MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councillor Alistair Bradley (Chair), Councillor  
 Peter Wilson (Vice-Chair) and Councillors  
 Beverley Murray and Adrian Lowe

**MEMBER RESPONSIBLE:**

Councillors Danny Gee, Matthew Lynch and  
 Alistair Morwood

**COUNCIL CHAMPIONS:**

Councillors Julia Berry, Jean Cronshaw and  
 Gordon France

**OFFICERS:**

Gary Hall (Chief Executive), Lesley-Ann Fenton  
 (Director of Customer and Advice Services),  
 Jamie Carson (Director of Public Protection,  
 Streetscene and Community), Chris Moister (Head of  
 Governance and Property Services), Simon Clark  
 (Head of Health, Environment and Neighbourhoods),  
 Susan Guinness (Head of Shared Financial Services),  
 Asim Khan (Head of Customer, ICT and Transactional  
 Services), Chris Sinnott (Project Director),  
 James Thomson (Principal Management Accountant),  
 Vanessa Fitzgerald (Policy and Engagement Assistant)  
 and Dianne Scambler (Democratic and Member  
 Services Officer)

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors Graham Dunn and Paul Walmsley

**OTHER MEMBERS:**

Councillors Aaron Beaver, Charlie Bromilow,  
 Margaret France, Tom Gray, Marion Lowe,  
 June Molyneaux, Eric Bell, Paul Leadbetter and  
 Greg Morgan

**16.EC.182 Minutes of meeting Thursday, 10 December 2015 of Executive Cabinet**

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Cabinet held on 10 December 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Executive Leader.

**16.EC.183 Declarations of Any Interests**

There were no declarations of any interests.

**16.EC.184 Public Questions**

The Chair reported that there had been no requests from members of the public to speak on any of the meeting's agenda items.

#### **16.EC.185 Transformation Strategy**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Leader and set out the Transformation Strategy that had been developed following the council's consideration of the future governance models overview report and supporting evidence in November. The Strategy sets out the challenges to face public services in the coming years, the key areas that would need to be considered in delivering the change required, and also identified key actions to be implemented over the next year.

Key themes identified within the strategy aimed to set out the key elements that would need to be addressed throughout its implementation. Following its approval, an overview action plan will be developed alongside the implementation of a new management structure for the organisation, to be overseen by an all-party working group.

**Decision: Approval of the Transformation Strategy was granted.**

#### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

The Transformation Strategy has been developed following the council's consideration of the future governance models overview report and supporting evidence. It provides a framework to support the organisation in the change that will be required to respond to the challenges in the coming years and to reach the ambitions set out in the November council reports.

#### **Alternative option(s) considered and rejected**

To not produce a transformation strategy, would mean that the council would not have a clear framework to manage the implementation of a major change programme.

#### **16.EC.186 2016/17 Draft Budget and summary budget position over the medium term**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Member (Resources), Councillor Peter Wilson.

It was proposed that Council Tax be frozen and not increase in 2016/17. This would be the fourth consecutive year that the current administration had achieved a balanced budget position for the forthcoming financial year without increasing Council Tax.

The recent Local Government Finance Settlement included provisional core grant allocations for the forthcoming four years, from 2016/17 to 2019/20. The announcement continued the programme of Central Government core grant reductions across all four years adding to previous cuts. The Revenue support Grant would also be reduced to zero over this time.

Due to the successful implementation of the MTFs, budget efficiency savings totalling £0.214m have been applied to the budget to achieve a balanced budget position for 2016/17 achieved mainly by the Council entering into a Business Rates Retention Pooling agreement within Lancashire effective from 1st April 2016.



In addition contributing to the New Investment Packages for 2016/17, totalling £2.845m for both Revenue and Capital projects, the New Homes Bonus also provides an opportunity for the Council to invest in three other additional areas to protect public services within the borough and increase financial resilience given the revolutionary funding changes.

A budget of £0.500m would be available for the next two years to assist in the transactional period public services currently provided for and funded by Lancashire County Council and a £0.500m provision per annum to increase General Balances to mitigate against the financial risk of a core grant income shift to 100% local taxation sources. £0.603m would all be available for use to invest in projects that will provide income streams to the Council.

Potential investment proposals were summarised in the report and set out in detail in project mandates. Funding has been achieved by not building all the New Homes Bonus income received since 2013/14 into the base budget. An approach taken to enable the council flexibility and resilience in order to address the volatile and variable nature of future core funding which continues to be under review by Central Government. The latest round of projects would bring the total new investment on the Councils corporate priorities to £12.008m since 2013/14

The consultation on the proposed budget would focus on obtaining feedback on the key investment areas in order to help prioritise activity. It would also highlight the impact of a reduction in Council funds and ask residents to give the Council their views on the budget. The consultation would invite responses from residents, partners, parish groups and other stakeholders through a variety of methods including a short survey. Results would be analysed and published in February for consideration as part of budget finalisation.

The Executive Leader commented on the ambitious nature of the budget and Members supported the projects proposed.

**Decision: Approval granted to start the Budget Consultation process and to note the following proposed budget items, in particular:**

- **Council Tax to be frozen in 2016/17**
- **The proposed new investments for 2016/17**
- **The balanced budget position for 2016/17**
- **The forecasted budget position to 2017/18**

**Reason for recommendation(s)**

To progress the Council's 2016/17 Budget setting process to achieve an approved and balanced budget.

**Alternative option(s) considered and rejected**

Setting the budget is a statutory responsibility.

**16.EC.187 Stray Dogs, Kennelling Arrangements and Charges**

The report of the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community was presented by the Executive Leader.

The report advised Members of the current and proposed arrangements for dealing with stray dogs and sought agreement to a revision in service provision and charges.

The Council has a long standing stray pick up dog service that includes the use of an external kennel contractor to retain dogs for the statutory 7 day period whilst the owner is traced or comes forward to claim their dog. The current kennel contract ends in March 2016, providing the authority with an opportunity to review its current arrangements. A number of kennel providers are now offering a stray dog collection service and although this service is currently part of the neighbourhood officer's duties, around 30% of collections are dealt with outside of normal Council hours, incurring additional costs to the Council. It was therefore proposed to include this element of the service within the new procurement specification.

Currently the Council makes a charge to dog owners seeking to reclaim their dogs that have been picked up as strays. This charge is made up of a flat rate release fee of £32.50 plus the kennel costs incurred during the dogs stay in kennels. Currently these amount to £10 per day up to the statutory maximum stay of seven days (£70).

Other authorities make a significantly greater charge which is inclusive of the maximum kennelling costs (up to seven days) irrespective of length of stay as well as a release fee. It was considered that a flat rate charge at this level would reflect more accurately the cost in officer time and administration for dealing with a stray dog and the report proposed amending the charging structure to reflect this in line with neighbouring authorities.

Any charge may be subject to a discretionary waiver in exceptional circumstances and on a case by case basis to be determined by the Director following written representation to the Council by the dog owner"

As part of the Council's commitment to tackling stray dogs, the authority would continue the provision of a microchipping service free of charge to any Chorley resident, encourage dog owners to neuter their dogs and the offer of a transfer service for dog owners who no longer want to keep their dog, facilitated through kennel contacts, dog rescue centres and local contacts.

#### **Decision:**

**1. Approval granted that the Council's stray dog pick up service be provided through an external contractor should out of hours neighbourhood officer cover be unavailable and that this service element is included in the forthcoming procurement of a kennel provider.**

**2. That subject to discretionary waiver in exceptional circumstances and on a case by case basis to be determined by the Director following written representation to the Council by the dog owner, approval be granted to an increase in the kennel release charge from £32.50 to £80 for owners who wish to recover their dogs from the Council and the per day kennelling costs to be met by the dog owner on release and recovery of the dog at the daily kennelling fee agreed between the Council and the kennel provider.**

#### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To ensure the Council has a stray dog service appropriate to meet demand with a charging scheme that reflects actual costs incurred and is commensurate with neighbouring local authorities.

#### **Alternative option(s) considered and rejected**

Retain the current means of stray dog service operation without testing the market and retain the current charges for the release of kennelled dogs.

#### **16.EC.188 Exclusion of the Public and Press**

To exclude the press and public for the following items of business on the ground that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

#### **16.EC.189 Proposed Acquisition of former Stagecoach Depot, Eaves Lane, Chorley**

The confidential report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Member for Resources. The report sought approval for the purchase of the former Stagecoach Depot.

##### **Decision:**

**Approval granted to purchase the Stagecoach Depot, Eaves Lane, Chorley and authority granted to for the Head of Governance and Property Services to complete the acquisition.**

##### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

The acquisition of the building will provide the Council with a facility that can be used as it currently stands as a Council depot which will assist the Council in its future town centre strategy requirements.

The use of the depot can continue as an employment site rather than being converted for housing or other commercial use. There are very few depots currently on the market that can be utilised within the same reasonably close proximity to the town centre and on a main commuter route.

The acquisition of this building will mean that the existing facility at Bengal Street belonging to Chorley Borough Council could be used for other purposes and regeneration, which will assist with its economic delivery of the town centre.

##### **Alternative option(s) considered and rejected**

A decision not to purchase the building will prevent the re-location of staff from an existing depot,

#### **16.EC.190 Council Tax Local Discounts and Exemption Scheme 2016/17**

The confidential report of the Director of Customer and Advice Services was presented by the Executive Member for Resources. The report sought approval of changes to the Local Discount and Exemption Scheme for Council Tax from April 2016.

**Decision: Recommendations approved.**

##### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

The change to the Council Tax empty premium is one of several measures that will help support an effective Empty Property Policy to encourage the occupation of empty properties and will have financial implications.

**Alternative option considered and rejected.**

The premium could remain at its existing level but may be interpreted as the Council not using all available measures to incentivise the return to use of long term empty properties.

Chair

Date

**MINUTES OF****EXECUTIVE CABINET****MEETING DATE****Thursday, 18 February 2016****MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councillor Alistair Bradley (Chair), Councillor Peter Wilson (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Beverley Murray, Graham Dunn, Adrian Lowe and Paul Walmsley

**MEMBER RESPONSIBLE:**

Councillors Danny Gee, Matthew Lynch and Steve Murfitt

**COUNCIL CHAMPIONS:**

Councillor Jean Cronshaw

**OFFICERS:**

Gary Hall (Chief Executive), Jamie Carson (Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community), Dianne Scambler (Democratic and Member Services Officer), Andrew Daniels (Communications Manager), Fiona Daniels (Housing Options and Support Manager), Susan Guinness (Head of Shared Financial Services), Asim Khan (Head of Customer, ICT and Transactional Services), James Thomson (Principal Management Accountant) and Elizabeth Walsh (Solicitor)

**APOLOGIES:**

None

**OTHER MEMBERS:**

Councillors Charlie Bromilow, Tom Gray, Marion Lowe, June Molyneaux, Paul Leadbetter, Eric Bell, Mick Muncaster and John Walker

**16.EC.190 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Cabinet held on 21 January 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Executive Leader.

**16.EC.191 Declarations of Any Interests**

There were no declarations of any interests.

**16.EC.192 Public Questions**

There were no questions from any members of the public.

**16.EC.193 Final Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group - Single Front Office**

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor John Walker, presented the report.

The review had identified a set of recommendations that Members felt would enhance a support current arrangements and future initiatives as the concept of the Single Front Office is embedded into the Council's delivery of its services.

Councillor Walker thanked the Chair, Councillor Alistair Morwood, members of the Task Group and officers involved with the inquiry.

**Decision: Approval granted that the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group be received and accepted for consideration. The Executive Cabinet's response to the recommendations would be reported to a future meeting.**

#### **16.EC.194 Chorley Skills Framework and Action Plan**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Leader and set out the Chorley Skills Framework and Action Plan that had been developed following its identification as a key priority within the refreshed 2014 Economic Development Strategy.

In spring 2015 the Choose Chorley for Business Focus Group was established as a means of Chorley Council engaging with the top businesses in Chorley to help realise their growth ambitions. A key action from the work of the Focus Group was to commission a skills gap analysis for Chorley as securing a skilled workforce was identified as a significant barrier to business growth in Chorley. The Chorley Skills Framework and Action Plan will help to drive the skills agenda forward.

**Decision: That approval of the Chorley Skills Framework and Action Plan be granted.**

#### **Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To make Members aware and support progress being made in relation to economic prosperity and skills.

#### **Alternative option(s) considered and rejected**

None.

#### **16.EC.195 Public Service Reform Partnership Update**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Leader and provided an update for Members on the Chorley Public Service Reform Partnership.

The Partnership brings together partner organisations from all sectors to deliver the Chorley Public Service Reform Strategy which had been formally approved in June 2015, following a review of partnership working and in response to the recommendations from the Commission on the Future of Public Services in Chorley.

The report set out the key elements of the strategy and work programme and included activity and progress made to date. It also provided an update on funding that had been secured through the Transformation Challenge Award that would be used to accelerate delivery towards improved health and wellbeing outcomes and service efficiencies.

An explanation of the Local Area Profile for the Chorley inner-East Lower Super Output Area level was also provided for information.

**Decision: That the report be noted.**

**Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To ensure that Members are informed of the work and progress of the Chorley Public Service Reform Partnership.

**Alternative options considered and rejected.**

None.

**16.EC.196 Chorley Council Performance Monitoring Quarter Three 2015/16**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Member for Resources and set out performance against the delivery of the Corporate Strategy and key performance indicators during the third quarter of 2015/16, 1 October to 31 December 2015.

Overall performance of 2014/15 key projects was good, with 89% of the projects on track or complete. Only two projects had been rated as amber; 'Develop and agree plans for the delivery of the Friday Street Health Centre', for issue relating to funding and 'Delivery of an improved CCTV provision', for unforeseen delays. However, it was reported at the meeting that the Council had now secured a contract for the improved CCTV system.

Performance of the Corporate Strategy indicators and key service delivery measures was excellent. 100% of the Corporate Strategy indicators and 90% of the key service measures were performing above target or within the 5% tolerance.

Only one key service delivery measure, 'Average working days per employee per year lost through sickness absence' was performing below target. An action plan had been developed to improve performance and it was reported that the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee had undertaken a short review of the issue, the results of which, would be reported to the Executive in due course.

**Decision: That the report be noted.**

**Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To facilitate the on-going analysis and management of the Council's performance in delivering the Corporate Strategy.

**Alternative options considered and rejected.**

None.

**16.EC.197 Revenue and Capital Monitoring 2015/16: Report 3 (End of December 2015)**

The report of the Chief Executive was presented by the Executive Member for Resources and set out the provisional revenue and capital outturn figures for the Council as compared against the budgets and efficiency saving targets set for the financial year 2015/16.

The projected revenue outturn currently shows a forecast underspend of £401k against budget in 2015/16, after the deduction of the use of in-year savings previously approved at Executive Cabinet.

The latest forecast excluded any variation to projected expenditure on investment items added to the budget in 2015/16. These projects are forecast to fully expand in 2015/16 and any balances remaining at year end, would be transferred into specific reserves and matched to expenditure in future years.

The performance of Market Walk remained strong with the latest projections showing a forecast outturn of £1.123m, the surplus being driven by lower than budgeted financing costs, and the Council's savings target of £150k in 2015/16 from managing the establishment had been achieved.

The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy proposed that working balances would reach £3.0m over its three year lifespan to 2017/18 due to the financial risks faced by the Council. A budgeted contribution to the General Balances of £350k was contained within the new investment package for 2015/16 and forecast indicated that the General Fund will be £2.741m by the end of the financial year.

**Decision:**

- 1. That the full forecast position for the 2015/16 revenue budget and capital investment programme be noted.**
- 2. That the forecast position on the Council's reserves be noted.**
- 3. Recommend Council approve the virement of £30,000 from the budget position for Business Start-up loans to finance the forecast take-up of Business Investment for Growth (BIG) grants.**
- 4. Recommend Council approve the proposed additions, deletions and re-phrasing of the Capital Programme to better reflect delivery in 2015/16.**

**Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To ensure the Council's budgetary targets are achieved.

**Alternative options considered and rejected**

None.

**16.EC.198 Community Action Plans - Update**

The report of the Director of Public Protection, Streetscene and Community was presented by the Executive Member for Community and updated Members on progress of the four community action plans. The report also sought approval for the budget allocated to each of the projects identified in each of the Plans.

The Council had previously agreed to commence and develop a community action plan programme to augment the existing neighbourhood working service and had agreed the four pilot areas of Chorley East Ward, Astley Village, Clayton Brook and a themed Rural Areas.

The detail of the rationale used and progress made for each community action plan area was provided and it was further explained that each area had undertaken an individual approach to its delivery so that the different methods undertaken could also be reviewed as part of the pilot process.



Some of the projects identified related to parking issues across the borough and although the allocated budgets would not be enough to alleviate all issues, it was more aimed at changing behaviours and was considered to be more of a stepping stone approach to better service delivery on the future.

**Decision:**

- 1. That the progress made in the development of Community Action Plans for each of the pilot areas be noted.**
- 2. Approval of the budget allocation to the Community Action Plan projects identified within the plans be granted.**

**Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To progress the development and delivery of community action plans.

**Alternative options considered and rejected**

None.

**16.EC.199 Selectmove - Piloting proposed amendments to the Allocations Policy**

The report of the Director of Customer and Advice Services was presented by the Executive Member for Customer and Advice Services informing members of a number of proposed changes to the operation of the Select Move Allocation Policy that had been received from the main Registered Providers (RPs) within the Select Move Partnership operating in the Chorley area.

The report also sought formal approval of the Council's consultation response relating to the policy amendments that were being piloted.

The Select Move steering group had conducted a mini review of the Select Move Common allocation Policy in order to achieve a number of aims set out in the report that were around improving performance on Lettings, Inward Migration and High demand properties.

The policy changes would not affect the Council's ability to deliver its statutory obligations regarding the prevention of homelessness and providing that the Council were satisfied that the success factors had been met would seek formal approval of the changes to be made permanent by Executive Cabinet in six-month's time.

**Decision:**

**That approval of the Council's consultation response relating to proposed amendments to the Select Move Allocation Scheme be granted.**

**Reasons for recommendation(s)**

To accept and commit to the changes entered into by the Select Move Partnership which in the main mirrors those proposed and accepted by Preston and South Ribble Councils. However to ensure Chorley residents are not disadvantaged the changes will be piloted by the whole partnership and include quarterly review meetings between the Council and the Registered Providers to review progress and monitor impact.

**Alternative options considered and rejected.**

To refuse to accept the proposed changes could likely result in the Registered Providers giving their notice to withdraw from Select Move and the Council has no powers to prevent this or Chorley Council would operate on and assess households

using a different policy. The demise of Select Move would result in the need for the Council to revert back to the old nominations system whereby Registered Provider's provide the Council with a proportion of their voids as nominations on some of their stock. To operate a different policy from Registered Providers and our neighbouring authorities within the Select Move scheme would not only be confusing for the applicant, but could prove to be a disadvantage for Chorley applicants in obtaining permanent housing.

Chair

Date



Report of	Meeting	Date
Director Public Protection Streetscene and Community	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	8 October 2015

## **COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY - POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICER DEPLOYMENT**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To enable Members of O&S to meet the Council's statutory obligation to undertake an annual scrutiny review of the Chorley and South Ribble Community Safety Partnership. The subject of review is PCSO deployment.

### **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2. Members undertake scrutiny of the current and future deployment of PCSO's in the Chorley area and provide recommendations to the Executive.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT**

3. Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) are employed by Lancashire Constabulary to support the work of the police particularly in the role of neighbourhood or community policing. Whilst they are not 'warranted' officers and do not have powers of arrest they do have certain powers delegated such as the issue of fixed penalty notices for certain offences.
4. PCSO numbers have increased steadily since their introduction several years ago and in Chorley the base number of Constabulary PCSO's has been around 22 in number.
5. For a number of years Chorley Council, through a Memorandum of Understanding, has augmented this base number through an arrangement with the Constabulary that originally part funded 50% of the cost of an additional PCSO.
6. In 2009 this amounted to 22 additional PCSO's at a cost to the Council of £242,000. Hence at that time Chorley area had 44 PCSO's who could be tasked and deployed on a range of duties across the Borough.
7. In 2012 we agreed with the Constabulary to part fund a further 5 PCSO's at the same rate increasing our annual contribution to £297,000.
8. This means there are currently have a total of 49 PCSO's in Chorley, of which 22 are base provision and 27 additional provision part funded by the Council.
9. Members should note that whilst our contribution of £11,000 per PCSO has remained static it now no longer provides 50% of the cost of a PCSO. In real terms it now amounts to approximately 33% of the cost. Therefore it can be argued that for the annual Council contribution of £297,000 we lever an additional £584,000 worth of resource from the Constabulary who fund the remaining 66% of the cost of each additional PCSO.
10. Members will be aware of the financial constraints being placed on the Constabulary and as a result of those constraints a review of PCSO numbers across Lancashire has been

undertaken. The review is based on risk and threat and clearly where the greatest risk and threat in terms of crime, disorder and public reassurance exists then resource will be directed there.

11. On that basis the Constabulary have determined that the optimum number of PCSO's for the Chorley area be set at 14. However given our current contributions they have indicated that they will support a total of 27 PCSO's.
12. On that basis Members could take the view that the Council is part funding all proposed 27 PCSO's or fully funding a proportion of them. Either way our contribution currently levers additional PCSO resource than would otherwise have been forthcoming.
13. In addition the Constabulary are seeking to task and deploy a small number of the PCSO resource away from geographic policing duties (i.e. patrols and visibility), to early intervention and prevention case work.
14. Members should note that the application of resources to early intervention and prevention work is one that accords with the Councils focus for resource allocation, in that directing resources upstream reduces the need for expensive crisis intervention later.
15. Members will have the opportunity to question the following as part of the scrutiny of this area of work:

Cllr Paul Walmsley – Executive Member Public Protection  
 Chief Inspector Nick Emmet – Lancashire Constabulary  
 DCI Jonathan Clegg – Lancashire Constabulary  
 Simon Clark – Head of Health Environment and Neighbourhoods

<b>Confidential report</b> Please bold as appropriate	<b>Yes</b>	No
--	------------	----

**CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

16. This report relates to the following Strategic Objectives:

Involving residents in improving their local area and equality of access for all		A strong local economy	
Clean, safe and healthy communities	√	An ambitious council that does more to meet the needs of residents and the local area	√

**IMPLICATIONS OF REPORT**

17. This report has implications in the following areas and the relevant Directors' comments are included:

Finance	√	Customer Services	
Human Resources		Equality and Diversity	
Legal	√	Integrated Impact Assessment required?	
No significant implications in this area		Policy and Communications	

**BACKGROUND**

18. Overview and Scrutiny Committee have a statutory obligation to scrutinise the work of the Community Safety Partnership and as a key partner the police provide significant resources to deliver a safe community across the Chorley Borough area.
19. Chorley Council has made increasing financial contributions to the police over recent years to support the provision of Police Community Support Officers.
20. In 2015/16 the Council will contribute £297,000 and to date this supports the deployment a total of 47 PCSO's.
21. Current financial constraints has led to a review of PCSO deployment by the police and assuming the Council mad no contribution the level of PCSO numbers in Chorley would fall to 14 in total.
22. However due to current contribution levels from the Council the number of PCSO's in Chorley is boosted to 27 in total.

### **EARLY INTERVENTION**

23. Early intervention work is a key aspect of community safety in terms of identifying issues that arise and putting in place appropriate interventions before they escalate to a crisis point where greater resource is required to resolve.
24. The Police Early Action team seeks to coordinate early intervention work and will be utilising a proportion of the PCSO resource in this regard.
25. This work fits well with the Councils approach to early intervention and prevention.

### **SCRUTINY QUESTIONS**

26. Members may wish to cover the following matters as part of the scrutiny process:
  - What scope is there to review the Councils contribution to PCSO funding?
  - What information and data can be made available on PCSO activity?
  - What is the level of resource in terms of PCSO deployment to Early Action?
  - What impact is this likely to have on neighbourhood and high visibility policing?
  - What kind of work will PCSO's be involved as part of the Early Action Team?
  - How flexible are the deployment decisions made with regard to PCSO's
  - What influence can Chorley Council have on deployment decisions

### **COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER**

27. The cost of PCSO's on an annual basis is £297, 000. The annual cost is funded on a one-of annual basis from the New Homes Bonus monies received. The budget provision, therefore, is not held within the Council base budget on a recurring basis. It is assumed that the funding of PCSO's is reviewed each year and the level of funding allocated in accordance with the Council's priorities.

### **COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER**

28. The report correctly states there is a statutory duty to scrutinise the Community Safety Partnership and this is an appropriate area for the Committee to consider.

JAMIE CARSON

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROTECTION STREETSCENE AND COMMUNITY

There are no background papers to this report.

<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Ext</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Doc ID</b>
Simon Clark	5732	7 September 2015	O&SPCSO

This page is intentionally left blank



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

	22 Jun OSPP	16 Jul OSC	24 Sep OSPP	8 Oct OSC	3 Dec OSPP	28 Jan OSC	3 Mar OSPP	31 Mar OSC
--	----------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

**To be considered:**

Panel Meeting (OSPP) to consider Council and related performance in addition to scrutiny of key service areas	*		*		*		*	
Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel minutes		*		*		*		*
Executive Cabinet Minutes		*		*		*		*
Notice of key decisions		*		*		*		*
Budget Scrutiny						*		
Health Scrutiny								*
Annual Reporting Back Report		*						
Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for the year		*		*		*		*

**Scrutiny Reviews:**

Adoption of Estates						3M		
CCTV Provision and Infrastructure		1M						2M
Health Impact Assessment		2M						
Neighbourhood Working		R						1M
Public Transport Issues		FR				R		
Select Move Lettings Scheme				2M				
Single Front Office				S		FR		
Staff Absence						V		FR

**Potential topics for future reviews**

Child Sexual Exploitation								
Counter Terrorism Act								
Communications								
Community Racial Integration								
Waste Management Contract								

**Crime and Disorder Scrutiny:**

Community Safety Partnership – Deployment of PCSO's				*				*
---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---

**Key:**

**Task Group Reviews:**

- S Scoping of the review
- C Collecting and considering evidence
- FR Final report of the review
- R Feedback and response from the Executive Cabinet
- M Monitoring Reports, 1 2 and 3 (if required)
- V Verbal update from the Chair
- ML Member Learning Session

**Acronyms**

- OSC Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- OSPP Overview and Scrutiny Performance Panel

This page is intentionally left blank