

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD**

**29TH APRIL 2008**

**SCRUTINY PROPOSALS**

Responsible Portfolio Holder	
Responsible Head of Service	Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 To consider scrutiny requests received from: (a) a member of the public, Mr. C. Bateman, who is representing the Older People's Forum; and (b) Councillor P. M. McDonald.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Members are requested to consider the scrutiny requests received and decide whether or not the items should be placed on the Board's Work Programme.

**3. BACKGROUND**

**Scrutiny Request from Mr. C. Bateman, Older People's Forum**

- 3.1 Members of the public are encouraged to get involved with scrutiny and one of the ways in which they can participate is by suggesting a topic which they feel should be scrutinised. They can do this a number of ways including: through their Ward Member; using the online scrutiny form; via the dedicated scrutiny email ([scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk)); or by writing a letter to the Committee Section. This is publicised through the Council's website where there are five web pages dedicated to scrutiny ([www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/scrutiny)).
- 3.2 Mr. Bateman, representing the Older People's Forum, completed an online scrutiny form on 20th March 2008 which provided the following information:

*"Sir, We the members of the Older People's Forum would welcome a proper evaluation to be made of the 'savings' to be made by removing the 30 concession.*

*To count the cars displaying a permit on one day on one car park to estimate potential savings of 90/120K is quite frankly a nonsense.*

*Charles Bateman"*

- 3.3 As the Agenda for the Scrutiny Steering Board Meeting on 1st April 2008 had been published on 19th March 2008, Mr. Bateman was informed that his comments would be incorporated into a report which would be placed on the Agenda for the Scrutiny Steering Board Meeting on 29th April 2008.
- 3.4 Mr. Bateman asked if he could expand on his scrutiny request and his letter and enclosures are attached as Appendix 1. (Please note that the enclosure entitled "Concessionary Fares Savings Calculations" was compiled by the Council's Transport and Engineering Officer following a Freedom of Information Request in January 2008 from Mr. Bateman.)
- 3.5 Members of the Board need to consider the scrutiny request and decide whether or not this issue should be scrutinised and added to the work programme.
- 3.6 Mr. Bateman has been informed that as the Scrutiny Steering Board Meetings are open to the public, he may attend (if he wishes) as an observer. However, regardless of whether or not Mr. Bateman is in attendance, a written response will be sent to Mr. Bateman following the meeting stating what the Board's decision is together with reasons.

#### Scrutiny Request from Councillor P. M. McDonald

- 3.7 Councillor McDonald submitted the following motion for the Full Council Meeting on 23rd April 2008:

#### **Motion - Senior Citizens' Task Group**

"That the Scrutiny Steering Board organises a task group that undertakes to review with senior citizens whether Bromsgrove District Council offers good quality of life to its senior citizens, in terms of housing and the home, the neighbourhood, getting about, social networks and keeping busy, information, income, health and healthy living, as the basis for seeking to achieve improvement."

- 3.8 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Monitoring Officer decided that the above motion should be referred to the Scrutiny Steering Board. Therefore, Members of the Board now need to consider the scrutiny request and decide whether or not this issue should be scrutinised and added to the work programme.
- 3.9 The Board need to bear in mind that the topic "Older People" is currently on their Work Programme. As Members will be know, at the last meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board, Councillor Mrs. Bunker informed the Board that focus groups were being set up to find out from older people themselves what specific issues they believe should be scrutinised.

#### **4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications directly relating to this report. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all financial implications in relation to their findings and recommendations.

#### **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all legal implications in relation to their findings and recommendations.

#### **6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

- 6.1 This report does not directly link to Council Objectives. However, the topics could relate to improvement and sense of community and well being.

#### **7. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 7.1 There is no risk, either negative or positive, directly associated with this report. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all risks in relation to their findings and recommendations.

#### **8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no customer implications directly relating to this report. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all customer implications in relation to their findings and recommendations.

#### **9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no implications directly relating to this report for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all equality and diversity implications in relation to their findings and recommendations.

#### **10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 There are no Value for Money implications directly relating to this report. However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider value for money implications in relation to their findings and recommendations.

## 11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues – None.
Personnel Implications – None
Governance/Performance Management – None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – None
Policy – None
Environmental – None

However, if Task Groups were set up to scrutinise the suggested issues, Members of the Task Groups would need to consider all of the possible implications stated above in relation to their findings and recommendations.

## 12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holders	No
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director (Partnerships and Projects)	Yes
Executive Director (Services)	Yes
Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

## 13. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards.

#### **14. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Letter and three enclosures from Mr. C. Bateman, representing the Older People's Forum.

Enclosure 1 – Report to Cabinet on 9th January 2008 on Concessions Policy for Users of Council Services.

Enclosure 2 – Letter to Mr. Bateman dated 31st January 2008 from the Council's Chief Executive

Enclosure 3 – Concessionary Fares Savings Calculations compiled by the Council's Transport and Engineering Officer following a Freedom of Information Request in January 2008 from Mr. Bateman.

#### **15. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Letter to the Monitoring Officer from Councillor P. M. McDonald

#### **CONTACT OFFICER**

Name: Della McCarthy, Committee Services Officer  
E Mail: [d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 881407