

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY BOARD**

13th July 2010

**SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION PROPOSAL**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Mike Webb – Portfolio Holder for Community.
Relevant Head of Service for Overview and Scrutiny	Claire Felton – Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services
Non-Key Decision	

**1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- 1.1 An Overview and Scrutiny Proposal Form relating to the Future of Bromsgrove Urban and Rural Transport (BURT) has been completed by Councillor C. R. Scurrall, which the Board needs to consider.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Board considers the completed proposal form (at Appendix 1), and agrees to one of the following:
- (a) that the topic is included on the work programme and the Board undertakes the investigation;
  - (b) that the topic is included on the work programme and a Task Group is established to undertake a more in-depth investigation (if this option is agreed, membership forms would be sent out to all non-Cabinet members and completed forms, along with a completed overview and scrutiny exercise scoping checklist would be considered at the next meeting);
  - (c) that further information be requested from a relevant source before deciding whether or not further investigation is required; or
  - (d) decides to take no further action.

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 An Overview and Scrutiny Proposal Form relating to the Future of BURT submitted by Councillor C. R. Scurrall is attached at Appendix 1 for the Board to consider and discuss.
- 3.2 If the Board decides that it does wish to investigate this topic further, it then needs to decide whether it is appropriate for the Board itself to undertake the investigation or whether a more in-depth investigation is required and a task group established.
- 3.3 Another option is for the Board to request further information on the topic from a relevant source to assist Members to decide whether an investigation is required.

**SCRUTINY BOARD**

13th July 2010

---

3.4 Alternatively, the Board could decide that it is not a topic it wishes to investigate, in which case no further action would be required.

**4. KEY ISSUES**

4.1 Consideration if the topic proposed is feasible for investigation and a high priority.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no financial implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 None.

**8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

8.1 This report does not directly link to the Council Objectives.

**9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 There are no risk management issues directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 There are no customer implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

**SCRUTINY BOARD**

**13th July 2010**

---

11.1 There are no implications directly relating to this report for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT**

5.1 There are no value for money implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY**

13.1 There are no climate change, carbon implications and biodiversity implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of any subsequent investigation undertaken.

**14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 None for the purpose of this report.

**15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

15.1 None for the purpose of this report,

**16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998**

16.1 None for the purpose of this report.

**17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

17.1 None for the purpose of this report.

**18. LESSONS LEARNT**

18.1 Not applicable for the purpose of this report.

**19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

19.1 None for the purpose of this report.

**20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT**

Portfolio Holder	Yes
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	No
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	No
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	No
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Resources	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

**21. WARDS AFFECTED**

All Wards

**22. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Overview and Scrutiny Proposal Form

**23. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.

**24. KEY**

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY BOARD**

---

13th July 2010

None.

**AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Michael Carr – Scrutiny Officer  
E Mail: m.carr@bromsgrove.gov.uk  
Tel: 01527 881407