POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 64

11 October 2012

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Shared Services: Request for Scrutiny Review –

Extract from the proceedings of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting held on the 10th

September 2012

Date of Meeting: 11 October 2012

Report of: Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer: Name: Tom Hook Tel: 29-1110

Email: tom.hook@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Councillor Morgan (Chair) Councillor Cox (Deputy Chair), Brown,

Buckley, Farrow, Follett, Hawtree, Marsh, K Norman and Duncan

PART ONE

21 OSC DRAFT WORK PLAN/SCRUTINY UPDATE

- 21.1 The Head of Scrutiny Tom Hook introduced the report on the OSC Draft Work Plan and Suggestions for Scrutiny Panels
- 21.2 Members noted the draft work plan and discussed how to progress suggestions received for scrutiny panels.
- 21.3 Regarding establishing a joint scrutiny panel with HWOSC on alcohol, based on the Intelligent Commissioning pilot and the Big Debate earlier this year; some members felt enough was already being done by and with health organisations, Sussex Police and the licensed trade. Alcohol was a big part of the business and social scene in the City. Councillor Ben Duncan, Chair of the Licensing Committee supported the scrutiny suggestion and others spoke in favour, especially since the recommendations would go not only to Committee but also to key Partner organisations. Members resolved to agree to this request; groups would be asked for member nominations to the Panel.
- 21.4 Considering scrutiny of the Community Safety Forum, Councillor Ben Duncan as Chair of CSF said the performance of the CSF was a separate issue from the performance of community safety measures. The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) would be responsible from November for the setting of Community Safety budgets.
- 21.5 Issues were raised such as reporting community safety concerns, how partners worked together in practice, and how the community was involved and felt it would be useful to investigate community safety and the work of the CSF.

- 21.6 OSC Chair Councillor Warren Morgan had served on the Council's cross-party forum on the new Constitution and reminded the meeting that the establishment of the CSF had been affirmed only recently, in May this year. He suggested that the request be put on hold until after the election of the PCC. Members agreed to revisit the suggestion as part of the Committee's future work plan.
- 21.7 In considering the provision of public toilets, and acknowledging the 2012/2013 budget debate and financial pressures, some Members had concerns about people with health conditions, older people, children and visitors for whom accessible public toilets were particularly important. It was fully agreed that this was a suitable topic for scrutiny.
- 21.8 On the principle of shared services, some Members had reservations; this approach could be impractical and not necessarily good value for money. However it may be possible to make savings under some circumstances and experience from other local authorities, local partners or other organisations could be drawn upon.
- 21.9 There were wide-ranging views on the potential of scrutinising shared services and Members agreed that it would be difficult to achieve a consensus on the matter, and that it was a large and complex issue.
- 21.10 The Chair Councillor Warren Morgan suggested there may be alternative ways to consider shared service proposals other than scrutiny and following further discussion it was agreed to refer the request on, to Policy & Resources Committee.
- 21.11 The Committee noted that CVSF has requested a scrutiny review of implementing the Social Value Act 2012 and agreed to do this. Groups would be contacted for member nominations.
- 21.12 With reference to the Housing Capacity of the City, several members said there was risk of duplication as this was being dealt with as part of the City Plan. Members generally considered that there would be no added value that a scrutiny review could bring to the subject. The request was not agreed.

21.13 **RESOLVED**:

- 1) That the OSC work plan and progress of work on current scrutiny panels be noted.
- 2) That two scrutiny reviews be agreed: of public toilet provision (Appendix 3) and implementing the Social Value Act 2012 (Appendix 5)
- 3) That a joint scrutiny panel on alcohol with HWOSC be agreed.
- 4) That requests for reviews of child sexual exploitation and weekend cover in hospitals are referred to HWOSC for consideration
- 5) That the request for scrutiny of shared services (Appendix 4) be referred on to Policy & Resources Committee.