

## **DISCLAIMER**

**The attached minutes are DRAFT minutes. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting.**

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD  
HELD ON 20<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2014 AT 6.00 P.M.**

- P Councillor Pickup (in the Chair)
- P Councillor Bailey
- P Councillor Brain (substituting for Cllr Hammond)
- A Councillor Campion-Smith
- A Councillor Eddy
- P Councillor Goulandris
- A Councillor Hammond
- P Councillor Holland
- A Councillor Kent
- A Councillor Khan
- P Councillor Morgan (substituting for Cllr Campion Smith)
- P Councillor Pearce (substituting for Cllr Khan)
- A Councillor Telford
- P Councillor Weston (substituting for Cllr Eddy)

**OSMB**

**82.02/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, SUBSTITUTIONS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Campion Smith, Eddy, Hammond and Khan

**OSMB**

**83.02/14 CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONTIME - PART A**

The Assistant Mayor for Leisure, Tourism, Licensing and Community Safety Councillor Simon Cook responded to questions which were asked by Councillors at the meeting. There were no questions submitted in advance and no actions for the Assistant Mayor.

During the discussion Councillor Cook proposed scrutiny involvement in the review of the library service due for consultation over the next 1-2 years. It was suggested that either the Review of Libraries Select Committee could be reconstituted, or a working group initiated. Members agreed in principle, with further

discussion required about the appropriate vehicle for review and in line with available resources.

**OSMB  
84.02/14 PUBLIC FORUM**

None received.

**OSMB  
85.02/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**OSMB  
86.02/14 MINUTES – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT  
BOARD – 19<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2013**

With reference to resolutions of minute number 69.12/13 – *Scrutiny of the Budget Savings Proposals* - Members highlighted the lack of response to the resolutions.

With reference to minute number 72.12/13 – *Progress Report on the Community Safety Projects funded through the Police and Crime Commissioner's (PCC) Community Safety Grant 2013/14* - it was noted that information provided to the Board in December had been different to that provided to Budget Council in February and asked for clarification of why the correction provided to Budget Council was not highlighted before. The Chair agreed to write to the Mayor to raise the question.

With reference to Annex 1 to the minutes it was highlighted that funding identified for a small park adjacent to Lawrence Weston School was for £80k rather than £8m.

**RESOLVED -**

**(1) That, subject to the correction of an error in Annex 1, the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

**(2) That the Chair write to the Mayor to ask why incorrect information provided to the December 2013 meeting of the Board was not corrected until the day of Budget Council on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2014.**

**OSMB**

**87.02/14**

**MINUTES – CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE OVERVIEW  
AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 7<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2014**

**RESOLVED -**

**That, subject to the correction of a small typing error, the minutes of the Call-In Sub-Committee meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair**

**OSMB**

**88.02/14**

**MINUTES – CALL-IN SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE OVERVIEW  
AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 6<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY  
2014**

With reference to the item of public forum submitted to the Call In by Councillor Telford, the Chair reported that he had written to Councillor Telford asking him to withdraw his remarks and Councillor Telford had declined. It was reiterated by the Board that the language used and presumptions made within the statement were considered disrespectful and the Chair outlined his intention to contact the Monitoring Officer about submitting a complaint.

**RESOLVED -**

**That the minutes of the Call-In Sub-Committee meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

**OSMB**

**89.02/14**

**WHIPPING**

No whipping was declared.

**OSMB**

**90.02/14**

**CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

None.

**OSMB**

**91.02/14**

**RECORDING AND MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
ACTION WHICH IS AGREED AT MEETINGS**

The Board considered a report of the Head of Legal Services (agenda item no. 8) in response to a request from the last meeting of the Board, that a report be presented on the arrangements which are being considered for the recording of action which is agreed at meetings, particularly as a result of public forum submissions.

During the ensuing discussion, particular reference was made to ;

- Members receive action sheets attached to the minutes of the subsequent meetings to note the action taken and response received. Following completion the action would be removed from the list after the next meeting.
- With reference to the response to public forum at Cabinet it was highlighted that if the Mayor particularly identified a specific reply as required it could be interpreted as the Mayor only answering those items he had a particular interest in.
- There was concern that members of the public did not receive an acknowledgment or thanks for their involvement in response to public forum submitted. In particular, Members felt that statements be acknowledged and petitions should receive a response. The Chair agreed to write to the Mayor and City Director recommending a change in practice.
- The Board were advised that the Executive Procedure Rules (EPR4b) within the Constitution stated that the time taken by the executive member in responding to each representation and the nature of the response given would be at the discretion of the executive member.

After further discussion it was;

**RESOLVED -**

**(1) That the report be noted.**

**(2) That the Chair write to the Mayor and City Director recommending that all petitions and statements to Cabinet should receive an acknowledgement or response following meetings.**

**RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES - CROSS PARTY WORKING GROUP REPORT**

The Board considered a report from the Chair of the Working Group (agenda item no. 9) detailing the recommendations of the Working Group.

With particular reference to recommendation 3 it was noted that a park and ride route to Clifton had now been established to commence in April 2014.

With reference to recommendation 5 it was highlighted that initial projections of cost had been based on the commencement of the outer ring which had now been put on hold. It was proposed that the capital repayment scheme should remain at 10 years in order to reduce the cost to residents.

With reference to recommendation 6 it was noted that it had been altered following the consideration of the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission to: 'That where possible alternative schemes should be considered and incorporated by the officers into the final model (i.e. such as Clifton BID and Ashley proposals). Where a proposal is not feasible then a clear explanation as to why should be made available to the public.'

It was confirmed that there would be review stages for each RPS at the relevant time in conjunction with implementation dates of surrounding areas.

During discussion, reference was made to the following matters;

- It was important that developments in public transport took place in line with the process from the start in order to make it work. It was a concern if the bus reactivity was suggested as 3-6 months residents would not benefit from alternative options.
- It was suggested that reference to the statement of community involvement could have featured within the recommendations.
- Communication within areas proposed for RPS and those undergoing consultation was very important as some mixed messages had already been reported. Members reiterated

the importance of involving residents in shaping individual schemes at the earliest possible opportunity.

- The installation of disabled parking bays was highlighted as it had been reported that the process had been delayed in some areas by plans for RPS. Officers were asked to confirm if this was the case.
- Members highlighted the possibility of the schemes becoming income driven once repayments of the capital had been completed and suggested safeguards would be advised to stop that happening in future. It was suggested that the Mayor be asked to consider using excess fines to pay off the capital cost quicker and as soon as possible.
- Members highlighted the practices in some other authorities to provide permits to medical practitioners to aid them in their duties. Members asked that something similar be added to the scheme for BCC.

After further discussion, it was:

**RESOLVED -**

- (1) That the report be noted and recommended to Full Council for discussion.**
- (2) That the working group be approached about adding the following recommendations to the report;**

**5.1: That any enforcement charges gathered throughout the inner zone should be used to repay the capital costs as early as possible, and that once the capital costs are paid off a review of permit prices take place with the goal of reducing permit pricing to the lowest possible level.**

**5.2: That medical professionals needing to carry out their duties within the city be issued with permits free of charge to allow them to carry out their duties in protecting public health.**

**OSMB**

**93.02/14**

## **CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONTIME - PART B**

The Assistant Mayor for Health and Social Care Councillor Barbara Janke responded to questions which were asked by councillors at the meeting. There were no questions submitted in advance and no actions for the Assistant Mayor.

During discussions, Members raised concerns that the new appointment to Director of Public Health needed to be timely in order to maintain the reputation of public health in Bristol, its momentum, direction and staff morale. It was highlighted that the Human Resources Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> February would receive a report regarding the terms and conditions of the appointment and dates for the interviews had been set. The Chair agreed to write to the City Director, Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Head of HR to urge timely appointment, request a timetable and confirmation of appointment when made.

### **RESOLVED -**

**That the Chair write to the City Director, Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Head of HR to urge timely appointment of a new Director of Public Health, request a timetable and confirmation of appointment when made.**

**OSMB**

**94.02/14**

## **OSM BOARD WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14 - UPDATE**

The Board considered a report of the Scrutiny Coordinator (agenda item no. 11) updating the OSM Board of the current work programme.

Councillor Pearce highlighted that the current Statement of Community Involvement was due for a review from May 2014 and there was the opportunity for scrutiny involvement and recommendations for use across the Council. The SOCI worked well when applied and provided an exemplar model of consultation by highlighting the importance of talking to the public. It was also suggested that use of the SOCI could save legal expenses by ensuring a process of good practice was followed. It was suggested that officers confirm when the SOCI was likely to be reviewed and discussions for input take place accordingly.

The Board were also asked to consider a specific request from the Neighbourhoods and Communities Scrutiny Commission to explore

the possibility of a Joint Inquiry Day with the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission to look at education and employment opportunities in South Bristol. In response, Members agreed to add the request for consideration within discussions about the work programme for the next municipal year.

The Board returned to the discussion during Councillor Cook Assistant Mayor question time that scrutiny fully consider the review of the library service due to take place over the next 1-2 years, with further consideration needed of what form of scrutiny such as a working group or Select Committee was appropriate. It was agreed to add the suggestion to the list of topics to be considered by scrutiny for the next municipal year.

It was highlighted that due to the cancelled OSM Board meeting in January, that Councillor Hoyt had not attended an Assistant Mayor's question time. Officers were instructed to invite Councillor Hoyt to the next meeting.

Councillor Weston highlighted the timescale for submission of questions from the public to Scrutiny Commissions which was set in the constitution as three clear working days for all Committee/ Commissions. He argued that in order to allow more flexibility for members of the public to submit questions relating to scrutiny agenda items either the publication of papers needed to be brought forward or the deadline for questions moved back. The Board were advised that requests for changes to the constitution would could be directed to Governance/ Constitution Working Group as a recommendation.

#### **RESOLVED -**

- (1) That the Board's work programme be noted.**
- (2) That the Board ask to be involved in the review of the Statement of Community Involvement due in May 2014.**
- (3) That the joint inquiry day to look at Education and Employment Opportunities in South Bristol be considered as part of the work programme for scrutiny in 2014/15.**
- (4) That the review of Libraries be considered as part of the work programme for scrutiny in 2014/15.**

- (5) That Councillor Hoyt be invited to attend the meeting of OSM Board on 20<sup>th</sup> March for Assistant Mayor Question Time.**
- (6) That the Governance/Constitutional Working Group consider the issue of deadlines for questions to Scrutiny to allow more time for the public to submit questions for reply.**

**OSMB**

**95.02/14**

**MAYOR'S FORWARD PLAN AND RECORD OF OFFICER DECISIONS**

It was highlighted that the Mayors Forward Plan featured a key decision going to Cabinet on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 'Key arts provider funding 2015-18' and scrutiny input listed as 'not envisaged'. It was suggested that the Neighbourhoods & Communities Scrutiny Commission should consider the issue at their meeting prior to the relevant Cabinet meeting which would be the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2014. The tight timescale was noted and officers were asked to facilitate scrutiny remarks and recommendations for Cabinet.

**RESOLVED -**

- (1) That the Mayor's Forward Plan be noted.**
- (2) That the relevant Scrutiny Commission discuss the Key Arts Provider Funding 2015-18 prior to its consideration at Cabinet on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014.**

(The meeting ended at 8pm)

CHAIR