

By: Peter Sass - Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership

To: Cabinet Scrutiny Committee – 20 October 2010

Subject: Follow up items and Decisions from Cabinet Scrutiny Committee –
15 September 2010

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report sets out the decisions from the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee and items which the Committee has raised previously for follow up

Introduction

1. This is a rolling schedule of information requested previously by the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee.
2. If the information supplied is satisfactory it will be removed following the meeting, but if the Committee should find the information to be unsatisfactory it will remain on the schedule with a request for further information.
3. The decisions from the meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee on 15 September 2010 are set out in the table below along with the response of the relevant Cabinet Member.

Recommendation

4. That the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee notes the responses to the issues raised previously.

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

01622 694002

Background Information: *Nil*

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
Highways Business Plan IMG 10.12.08	To scrutinise the Highways Service Plan	Cabinet Member during 2008 – Mr Ferrin Managing Director – Mike Austerberry	Highways Business Plan IMG 02.12.08 - A list of gully schedules be supplied to all Members after the elections	21.07.10 – The gully emptying schedules would be issued to Members in the next few weeks. 15.09.10 – Members have received a map showing gully emptying routes and schedule information would be available in the next few weeks 11.10.10 – Members will begin to be provided with the gully emptying schedules from 18 October onwards.
Kent Design Guide 09.12.09		Mr N Chard Mr Austerberry M Mrs B Cooper Mr B White	Kent Design Guide Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking	A report was presented to Environment Highways and Waste Policy and Overview Committee on this issue at its meeting on 29 July 2010. The following recommendations were agreed a) Endorse the testing of the robustness of IGN3 described in Section 4 and receive a report on the outcomes when they are available. b) Acknowledge the concerns of the Kent Developers' Group, and the work that is being undertaken to address

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
				<p>these concerns, and encourage further dialogue at appropriate levels to understand the actual implications of and opportunities presented by IGN3, and its interpretation at local level.</p> <p>c) Note that public consultation on Ashford Borough Council's draft Residential Parking SPD offers developers and designers an opportunity to make further representations on the implications of 'IGN3 based guidance', having regard for the need to address the problems of some past approaches.</p> <p>d) Acknowledge the widespread concern among residents concerning parking in recent residential developments, and the social and cost implications arising from the problems caused, and welcome collaborative working approaches that are seeking to avoid replication of these problems in future developments.</p> <p>15.09.10 – The Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee are due to discuss this issue with the Director of Environment,</p>

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
				<p>Highways and Waste</p> <p>08.10.10 – The Head of Transport & Development has met with the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee. Concerns have been raised by several development companies and members and officers of KCC about the discounting of garages and tandem parking from the minimum guidance levels for certain areas. In particular, it has been argued that this will have the ‘unintended consequences’ of reducing densities of development and degrading the quality of the streets. As a consequence, there has been some pressure for IGN3 to be amended. Because the Kent Planning Officers Group (KPOG) owns IGN3, any review would only be meaningful if it was commissioned by KPOG. After all, IGN3 was endorsed for interpretation at LPA level. A report to address these issues will be taken to KPOG on 29 October, and the Chairman and Spokesmen have been asked to be kept informed of the results of the</p>

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
		Mr J Burr Mrs J Whittle Mrs R Turner Mr C Feltham	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="857 320 1541 576">2. Welcome the assurance that the relevant parts of the Core Monitoring Report will be submitted to the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committees at the most appropriate time, i.e. during the meetings cycle immediately after the report has been considered by the Cabinet <li data-bbox="857 576 1541 871">3. The Cabinet Member be asked to examine the format of the performance monitoring reports submitted to the Kent and Medway Fire and Rescue Authority, as it was felt that these reports were particularly clear and helpful to Members, to see if any improvements can be made in the format of the Core Monitoring Reports <li data-bbox="857 871 1541 1206">4. The Managing Director, Children Families and Education be asked to ensure that the Council's responses to the areas for development and areas for priority action, contained in the letter from Ofsted dated 9 September 2010, are included within the report due to be considered by the County Council on safeguarding, so that they can be debated by all Members. <li data-bbox="857 1206 1541 1350">5. That comparative information on Ofsted's assessment of safeguarding in other Councils be supplied to Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members. 	<p data-bbox="1541 576 2130 655">Agreed and being actioned</p> <p data-bbox="1541 871 2130 983">This has been actioned and is contained in the County Council report for 14 October.</p> <p data-bbox="1541 1206 2130 1318">This will be provided to the Vulnerable Children & Partnerships POSC at the next meeting.</p>

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
<p>Review of SEN Units – Outcome of the Evaluation of the Lead School Pilot 15.09.10</p>		<p>Mrs J Whittle Mrs R Turner Mr C Feltham</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thank Mrs Whittle, Mrs Turner and Mr Feltham for attending the meeting and responding to Members' questions 2. Ask the Managing Director, Children, Families and Education to ensure that the CFE (Vulnerable Children and Partnerships) Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee is given a formal opportunity to monitor progress of the SEN review at all appropriate stages. 3. Ask the Cabinet Member Children, Families and Education to ensure that during the formal consultation process, consultees are made aware of the budgetary implications associated with the proposals as well as the policy implications, and that all headteachers are engaged in the consultation process. 4. Welcome the assurance given by the Managing Director, Children, Families and Education, that KCC will continue to lobby central Government to ensure that, where there are SEN units in mainstream schools, exam results of SEN pupils are 	<p>A report will be taken to the CFE (Vulnerable Children and Partnerships) Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Full consultation on budgetary issues will be undertaken through the Schools Forum</p> <p>Full consultation on budgetary issues will be undertaken through the Schools Forum</p>

Title	Purpose of Consideration	Guests	Decisions / Follow up Items	Cabinet Member Response / Officer Response
			disaggregated. This is to avoid these results affecting league table positions and disincentivising mainstream schools admitting SEN pupils.	