

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 12th November, 2013

10.00 am

**Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall,
Maidstone**





AGENDA

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 12th November, 2013, at 10.00
am
Darent Room, Sessions House, County
Hall, Maidstone**

Ask for: **Anna Taylor**
Telephone: **01622 694764**

Membership

Conservative (6): Mr R J Parry (Chairman), Mrs S V Hohler, Mr A J King, MBE,
Mr L B Ridings, MBE, Mr J E Scholes and Mrs P A V Stockell

UKIP (2) Mr M Baldock and Mr C P D Hoare

Labour (2) Mr G Cowan and Mr R Truelove

Liberal Democrat (1): Mrs T Dean

Church Representatives (3): Mr D Brunning, Mr Q Roper and Mr A Tear

Parent Governor (2): Mr P Garten and Mr G Lawrie

Refreshments will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting

County Councillors who are not Members of the Committee but who wish to ask questions at the meeting are asked to notify the Chairman of their questions in advance.

Webcasting Notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

By entering the meeting room you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If you do not wish to have your image captured then you should make the Clerk of the meeting aware.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

A - Committee Business

- A1 Introduction/Webcast Announcement
- A2 Substitutes
- A3 Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting
- A4 Election of Vice-Chairman
- A5 Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2013 (Pages 5 - 6)

B - Select Committee - Work Programme

- B1 Select Committee Work Programme (Pages 7 - 20)

EXEMPT ITEMS

(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services
(01622) 694002

Monday, 4 November 2013

Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers maybe inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 23 May 2013.

PRESENT: Mr M Baldock, Mr G Cowan, Mrs T Dean, Mr C P D Hoare, Mrs S V Hohler, Mr A J King, MBE, Mr R J Parry, Mr L B Ridings, MBE, Mr J E Scholes, Mrs P A V Stockell and Mr R Truelove

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Sass (Head of Democratic Services)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

26. Membership

(Item 1)

The Committee noted its Membership as set out above.

27. Election of Chairman

(Item 3)

RESOLVED that Mr R Parry be elected Chairman.

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Peter Sass, Head of Democratic Services
To: Scrutiny Committee – 12 November 2013
Subject: Select Committee – Work Programme

Summary: The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and prioritise the three Select Committee proposals set out in this report.

1. Introduction

- (1) One of the Scrutiny Committee's responsibilities is to co-ordinate the programme of Select Committee Reviews.
- (2) The Select Committee Work Programme co-ordinated by this Committee is subject to endorsement by Cabinet.
- (3) Three proposal forms for Select Committees have been received for consideration by this Committee (see **Appendix 1**).

2. Select Committees

- (1) It is the responsibility of any Select Committee to agree its Terms of Reference. However, the proposal forms in Appendix 1 do contain some suggested issues to be covered by the Terms of Reference to assist the Scrutiny Committee in deciding whether to include the review in the Work Programme.
- (2) If agreed, there will be 9 Members on each Select Committee, comprising 5 Conservative, 2 UKIP, 1 Labour and 1 Lib Dem.

3. Resources to support the Select Committees

- (1) The Research Officer resource now sits within the Business Intelligence Team. These resources will need to be diverted from current evaluation and transformation work and therefore Members are asked to consider timescales, the impact the reviews might have on limited resources and how best to prioritise the use of such resources.
- (2) Democratic Services will continue to provide support for Select Committees.

4. Timetable for Select Committee Reviews

- (1) If Members are minded to include the Select Committee proposals onto the Work Programme an approximate timetable will need to be agreed.

5. Recommendation

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to agree which Select Committee proposals to include within the Select Committee Work Programme.

Contact: Peter Sass
peter.sass@kent.gov.uk
01622 694002

ASSESSMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TOPIC REVIEW

<p>Subject of Proposed Review:</p> <p>Commissioning</p>
<p>*Reason for the Review: (see Note 1 below)</p> <p>Facing the Challenge: Whole Council Transformation commits KCC to becoming a commissioning authority. The purpose of the Select Committee will be to understand what KCC needs to do to become a better commissioning authority, with a particular focus on removing barriers to entry for the provision of KCC services from new providers, particularly small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and members of the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector (VCSE) and ensuring that the authority is using its commissioning processes to ensure it meets its duties un the Social Value Act.</p>
<p>Issues to be covered by the Terms of Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the costs of entry into KCC commissioning and procurement exercises, and assess if these costs present a significant barrier to new providers • How any barriers to entry for new providers might be mitigated or removed • The extent to which KCC decommissions and re-commissions services based on provider performance • How KCC can best discharge its responsibilities through the Social Value Act • What type of social benefits should be sought through commissioning / procurement practices (e.g. apprenticeships) • The extent that social value requirements be sought throughout the KCC supply chain
<p>Scope of the review:-</p> <p>As above, but it is expected that the review will undertake some analysis of examples of KCC commissioning practice both in established services areas (e.g. social care) and new services areas (e.g. public health) in order to understand the range and breadth of commissioning activity across KCC.</p>
<p>Purpose and objectives of the Review:-</p> <p>The purpose of the review and objective of the review is to make recommendations to KCC to support the improvement in commissioning KCC service as set out in Facing the Challenge, and to support the strategic direction of KCC becoming a commissioning authority.</p>
<p>Proposer of the review - (Please print name and sign)</p> <p>Mike Angell.....</p>

To be completed by the Directorate/Cabinet Member(s)

Are there any reasons why this review should not be put forward for inclusion in the work programme for 2013/14? (see Note 2 below)

None.

Will the review support the achievement of Bold Steps for Kent aims? If yes, please identify aim(s) and give details:-

Yes. Under Priority 3, Putting the Citizen in Control, Bold Steps for Kent stated: “Encourage the voluntary sector and social enterprises to supply KCC goods and services: All contract details will be made available online to ensure easy and equal access to contract information. We will ensure our procurement system allows wider public value judgements to be included in the assessment of tenders so that the added value of the voluntary and community sectors can be recognised in the decision about procuring our goods and services.” The proposal will support the continued deliver of this priority of KCC by examining how, in becoming a commissioning authority through Facing the Challenge; the VCSE can play an more important role in the provision of KCC services.

How will the review contribute to corporate objectives and priorities?

The review will be a timely input into the transformation programme that County Council have agreed through Facing the Challenge. This sets out a direction of travel for the authority to become a commissioning authority, but this requires KCC to actively improve its skills and approach to commissioning, increasingly undertaking both market shaping and market development activity – which Facing the Challenge identified as areas for corporate improvement.

How will this review have an impact on KCC policy development and/or help to influence national policy?

As above.

How will this review add value to the County Council and residents of Kent?

The review will make recommendations that will add to the knowledge base around the role of KCC as a commissioning authority and the programme of activity through Facing the Challenge that will move the authority to have a commissioning focus and improve how we do commissioning.

Does the review need to be completed within a specific timeframe? If yes, please give details:

No.

Any additional comments from the Portfolio Holder/Strategic Director:	
Portfolio Holder's Signature:- Paul Carter	
Corporate Director's Signature:- David Cockburn	
Contact Officer:	Date:

ASSESSMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TOPIC REVIEW

Subject of Proposed Review: Review of Kent's European Relationship
Reason for the Review: (see Note 1 below) To reflect Member and public interest on the benefits to Kent as the Front Line County
Issues to be covered by the Terms of Reference: To review Kent's European activities (as the front line county) in terms of: 1) benefits and disbenefits from European funding for Kent organisations 2) benefits and disbenefits from European trade and inward investment in the Kent Economy. 3) cultural and educational benefits and disbenefits for Kent people from European contact. 4) knowledge transfer benefits and disbenefits over the period 2009 to 2013
*Scope of the review: All European activities relating to Kent
*Purpose and objectives of the Review: As Above
Proposer of the review - (Please print name and sign) original signed by Alex King

To be completed by the Directorate/Cabinet Member(s)

Are there any reasons why this review should not be put forward for inclusion in the work programme for 2013/14? (see Note 2 below)

No

Will the review support the achievement of Bold Steps for Kent aims? If yes, please identify aim(s) and give details:-

The purpose of KCC's European activity is to support the delivery of KCC's strategic priorities, particularly the Bold Steps ambition to grow the Kent economy. The review will therefore consider the contribution to date of this activity to the achievement of Bold Steps' aims, and how it might contribute to these in the future.

How will the review contribute to corporate objectives and priorities?

The review will assess the contribution of KCC's European activity, including EU-funded projects, to the authority's corporate objectives and priorities as set out in Bold Steps and other key strategies, including KCC's Regeneration Strategy, 'Unlocking Kent's Potential', Kent's Environment Strategy, 'Growth Without Gridlock'.

How will this review have an impact on KCC policy development and/or help to influence national policy?

The review will examine KCC's role and impact in addressing policy issues that have been deemed as important to KCC, for example, cross-border transport including international passenger rail services, environment, health and care issues, public sector innovation; knowledge transfer and learning from European best-practice, shaping and seeking to influence EU and government policy, including on EU funding regimes.

How will this review add value to the County Council and residents of Kent?

The priorities for KCC's European activity include securing financial resources from the EU to deliver key projects for the benefit of KCC and Kent organisations, Kent business and local people. These include projects in the fields of business, trade and export, inward investment, cross-border tourism, economic development and regeneration, rural development and the environment. The review will add value to the County Council and residents of Kent by identifying the benefits and disbenefits of such European engagement and provide a clear rationale for future activity in this area.

Does the review need to be completed within a specific timeframe? If yes, please give details:

No

Any additional comments from the Portfolio Holder/Strategic Director:-	
Portfolio Holder's Signature:- Mark Dance	
Corporate Director's Signature: David Cockburn	
Contact Officer:	Date:-

ASSESSMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TOPIC REVIEW

Subject of Proposed Review: KCC policy towards traffic speed restrictions and methods of implementing them.
*Reason for the Review: (see Note 1) 1) High costs of changing speed limits e.g. £7,000 to move speed limit about half a mile (on Waterringbury Rd, East Malling. e.g. installation of costly chicanes, bollards constantly needing replacement. 2) Change in public attitude to speed 3) Need for review of partners policies e.g. Police and speed camera Partnership and how far KCC is led by them 4) Public issue identified by Member contact with constituents
Issues to be covered by the Terms of Reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extending policy of traffic speed restrictions to quality of life issues. E.g. residential disturbance by noise and vibration, and pedestrian comfort• Re-examine speed camera policy to allow use e.g. where self – financing• How far are we led by the Police i.e. 20 MPH and enforcement
*Scope of the review: Kent wide – Kent roads
*Purpose and objectives of the Review: Policy acceptable to Kent residents
Proposer of the review - (Please print name and sign) Mrs T Dean.....

To be completed by the Directorate/Cabinet Member(s)

Are there any reasons why this review should not be put forward for inclusion in the work programme for 2013/14? (see Note 2 below)

The request for this review has been overtaken by the extensive 20mph policy review which was approved by Cabinet Committee in October. Repetition at this point will confuse the public, generate unnecessary additional work and undermine a democratic decision on this subject taken in the last 3 weeks. This decision allows more flexibility in the implementation of 20 mph schemes in Kent, specifically through the consideration of public health issues.

The review would also duplicate a concurrent policy review via the development of a new Casualty Reduction Strategy for Kent. This Strategy (a forthcoming Executive Decision via EHW Cabinet Committee on 13 December 2013) is covering areas identified for the proposed select committee including: engineering and enforcement of speed limits, as well as public attitudes to speed and how we can work better with our partners including the Police and Safety Camera Partnership. All Members have been invited to a stakeholder workshop on 13 November which will be the precursor to a wider public consultation. Members will be asked to approve the Strategy.

Further review at this stage will simply duplicate the process and confuse the issues. It may however, be more appropriate to plan for a review of both new initiatives (20mph policy and the Casualty Reduction Strategy) 12 months from the planned adoption date of January 2014 to take stock of its' effectiveness.

How will the review contribute to corporate objectives and priorities?

If undertaken, this review would contribute little or nothing to corporate objectives and priorities beyond the work already done for the brand new 20 mph policy and emerging new strategy which have already covered the subject.

Will the review support the achievement of Bold Steps for Kent aims?

If yes, please identify aim(s) and give details:-

Beneath BS4K within GWG, road safety is stated as a constant priority for central and local government . This review would not assist any further than work already undertaken with meeting targets set out in Bold Steps for Kent and delivering the priorities set out in Growth Without Gridlock (GWG).

Does the review need to be completed within a specific timeframe?

If yes, please give details:-

A review of the new 20mph policy and Casualty Reduction Strategy could usefully be undertaken after both have been in place for a year, around January 2015. However, if undertaken before it would represent wasted effort and would confuse the public.

How will this review have an impact on KCC policy development and/or help to influence national policy?

It would not, being an unnecessary duplication of the work already carried referred to above. New government guidance on the setting of local speed

limits was published earlier this year for which the new 20mph policy and Casualty Reduction Strategy have full regard.

How will this review add value to the County Council and residents of Kent?

This review would add nothing beyond the extensive work already undertaken in this field.

Any additional comments from the Portfolio Holder/Strategic Director:-

Portfolio Holder's Signature:-

David Brazier

Corporate Director's Signature:-

Mike Austerberry

Contact Officers:-

**Tim Read
Andy Corcoran**

Date:-

24 October 2013

This page is intentionally left blank