

		AGENDA ITEM 6
		PSEG/11/18
Committee:	Place Services and Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee	
Date:	17 May 2018	
The Localism and Subsidiarity Task and Finish Group.		
Enquiries to:	Robert Fox, Scrutiny Officer Robert.Fox@essex.gov.uk	

The following pages are the interim report of the Localism and Subsidiarity Task and Finish Group.

Members are requested to consider and agree the actions and recommendations as the work of the Group continues.

Scrutiny

Improving public services

Scrutiny Report

Localism and Subsidiarity: A Task and Finish Group review

**Interim Report by the Place Services and Economic
Growth Scrutiny Committee**

Dated: May 2018

Index

	Page No
Index	3
Foreword from the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group, including Summary of Recommendations and Actions	5
Background	7
Issues, Evidence and Recommendations	9
Appendices	17

Foreword by the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group



It was John Major, when Prime Minister in the early 1990s, who invented the dictum that the closer to the people a decision to do or not to do so something was taken, the more palatable it would be likely to be to residents, the people we all represent. When in 2011 the County Council signed a strategic agreement for highways provision, and created the parking partnerships a little later on, much local knowledge was actually lost, and decisions were taken further from the residents.

We all know that the people taking decisions in this area are acting from the best interests of the County, but that is not necessarily how it appears to our residents. “They” seem to have become further away, not closer to the people.

The Group was determined to examine methods of working that would dispel this perhaps undeserved perception, and I want to thank my colleagues, Councillors Hillier, Kendall, and Sheldon, for their purposeful tackling of these issues. Our indefatigable clerk, Robert Fox, has helped us meld our sometimes disparate thoughts into a cogent interim report.

The drafting of a final report must await receipt from Highways of their dossier of what functions might be passed on, and under what conditions, and that paper must, in itself, give rise to further issues for us to consider and work on.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS

The Task and Finish Group has agreed its interim recommendations to the relevant Cabinet Members and will formally file these at the 17 May 2018 meeting of the Committee; along with the actions for the scrutiny function at Essex County Council. These recommendations are outlined below. In the event that the Cabinet Members do not accept any of the recommendations below, the Committee should be advised, in each case, the reasons for rejection in writing.

Recommendations:

1. The libraries estate be reviewed, without any withdrawal of existing services from any locality, and parished areas invited to run any additional community libraries. The provision of stock and rotation be undertaken under a Service Level Agreement with the County, if, and when, such community libraries are established;

2. That every district study the Maldon District Council model of incorporating local functions with a view to seeing if can be effective in other parts of the county;
3. The ECC Highways Ranger scheme be devolved completely to district councils, or consortia thereof, recognising there would need to be a series of agreements, with light-touch legal understandings for the transfer of responsibilities;
4. To enhance emerging localism the Task and Finish Group the County Council provides express support to Essex County Councillors' so, wherever possible, they be encouraged to engage with their Parish and Town Councils and assist the facilitation of local ideas;
5. That Essex County Council find a way to make it easier to sort out insurance liabilities, as parishes are likely reluctant to take on public liability;
6. That dialogue commences at the earliest convenience with second-tier and parish authorities to determine those functions which can realistically be devolved and any transference of funding required for devolution;
7. The final report be received by Full Council following the deferral to this Committee and that the report also be filed with all second-tier authorities so that it may encourage those districts that did not respond to the initial requests, and follow-up, to consider the areas that they might consider carrying-out locally;
8. That a workshop take place bringing together key stakeholders to include *inter alia* districts, parishes, County Council. The Task and Finish Group will organise this workshop, to take place as soon as practicable after the May local elections, with the aim of giving a richness to the final report regarding the practical responsibilities of discussing how localism can be taken forward.

Actions

1. The Chairman of the Place Services and Economic Growth Policy and Scrutiny Committee engages with the Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Customer with regard to any outcomes from the library service public engagement events;
2. Through the Chairman of the Place Services and Economic Growth Policy and Scrutiny Committee ask the Scrutiny Board to determine a scrutiny review of the Community Initiatives Fund to further establish local partnerships as well as governance to create unified approaches for specific areas;
3. The Place Services and Economic Growth Policy and Scrutiny Committee should commence a review of grass verges as agreed at the Committee meeting of 22 February 2018.

Each of the recommendations and actions above will take consideration of the key issues of management, funding, scrutiny and public liability. The final report will include a check-list pertinent to each of these key issues against each of the recommendations and actions to enable the Committee to evaluate fully how the implementation and, subsequent impact of the Committee's considerations is progressing.

I commend this interim report to the Committee.

Councillor Chris Pond

Vice-Chairman, Place Services and Economic Growth Policy & Scrutiny Committee
Chairman of the Localism and Subsidiarity Task and Finish Group

BACKGROUND

Background to the Scrutiny Review

At the Full Council meeting on date July 2017 it was moved by Councillor Chris Pond and seconded by Councillor Colin Sargeant that:

'This Council applauds achievements of the Administration to date in the field of localism, such as the Community Initiatives Fund. Local Highways Panels were a useful step in bringing together County and District members; their funding needs to be sufficient, and their processes (including Highway Rangers) more effective, the better to suit local needs.

This Council now needs to take further initiatives to ensure that decisions affecting local people are taken as close to them as possible, instead of centrally at County Hall, or by remote joint boards. Devolution to or involvement of districts and parishes in such functions as highway repairs, parking control and enforcement would all increase local buy-in, and should be attainable within existing budgets.

This Council refers this whole question to the Corporate Scrutiny Committee for further examination.

It was moved by Councillor Ian Grundy and seconded by Councillor Eddie Johnson that the motion be amended to read as follows:

'This Council applauds achievements of the Administration to date in the field of localism, such as the Community Initiatives Fund. Local Highways Panels were a useful step in bringing together County and District members; their funding needs to

be sufficient, and their processes (including Highway Rangers) more effective, the better to suit local needs.

This Council now needs to consider further initiatives to ensure that decisions affecting local people are taken as close to them as possible, instead of centrally at County Hall, or by remote joint boards. Devolution to or involvement of Districts, Boroughs, the City and parishes in such functions as highway repairs, parking control and enforcement would all increase local buy-in, and could be attainable within existing budgets.

This Council refers this whole question to the Place Services and Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee to be considered along with other important issues for inclusion in their work programme.'

Councillor Pond and the seconder Councillor Sargeant accepted the amendment and, with the approval of Council, the amendment having become the substantive motion it was put to the meeting and was carried.

Membership

The Place Services and Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee agreed on 21 September 2017 to include in its work programme, and commence with immediate effect, a review of Localism and Subsidiarity and, therefore, established a Task and Finish Group, under the Chairmanship of Councillor Chris Pond.

The full membership of the Task and Finish Group was:

Councillor Chris Pond (Chairman), Loughton Central
Councillor Stephen Hillier, Pitsea
Councillor David Kendall, Brentwood South
Councillor Andrew Sheldon, South Benfleet

Evidence Base of the Scrutiny Review

A scoping document (Appendix 1) was agreed at the first meeting of the Task and Finish Group. The Group agreed, at the outset, that the issue of street lighting is far too big to deal with within the review, as constituted. Evidence was sought from those identified on the scoping document and the following list of those who attended as witnesses or provided a written submission:

Councillor Susan Barker, Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Customer
Councillor Ian Grundy, Cabinet Member for Highways
Andrew Cook, Director for Commissioning: Transport and Infrastructure
Peter Massie, Head of Commissioning Essex Highways
John Gili-Ross, Vice-Chairman Essex Association of Local Councils
Councillor Penny Channer, Maldon District Council

Richard Holmes, Director of Customer and Communities, Maldon District Council
Councillor Graham Butland, Leader of Braintree District Council
Councillor Colin Riley, Leader of Castle Point Borough Council
Councillor Roy Whitehead, Leader of Chelmsford City Council
Councillor Paul Smith, Leader of Colchester Borough Council
Councillor Neil Stock, Leader of Tendring District Council

The Task and Finish Group is content that it has received, to date, a range of views and received contributions from a number of key individuals and groups to undertake this review, whilst acknowledging the evidence base could have been wider. However, despite invitations to attend Task and Finish Group meetings or provide written evidence not all were taken up. The contributions received are highlighted in the section below, which is presented together with recommendations for the Cabinet Members for Highways; and Culture, Communities and Customer from whom the Task and Finish Group invites a response.

ISSUES, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Key Evidence

The first meeting of the Task and Finish Group established the scope of the review and it was agreed the following should be tested as part of the review:

- How possible and practical is it to take decisions to deliver services at a more local level and how can budgets be devolved locally?
- What responsibilities, by service area, would the County Council be prepared to devolve to the more local level?
- How are services being delivered now?
- What would the advantages and disadvantages of services being devolved be?
- What would the staffing and funding implications be?
- What is the appetite/willingness of the City, Borough, District, Parish and Town Councils to take on the responsibility?
- What services could realistically come under more local control?

The Task and Finish Group heard the original motion to Full Council was supported as it is no longer effective to have a central provider; many functions are done far better locally, and with that comes cost benefits as well as more effectiveness and responsibility for Parish Councils – some of whom will welcome the move.

By theme, the key evidence received at the Task and Finish Group sessions are outlined below:

Libraries

Co-location of library services with parish council hubs encourages localism and would, as such, provide efficiencies. Parish willingness to take on paid staff might be a barrier to delivering a more localised library service although some libraries have different potential solutions in terms of office space. It is understood that by making them stand-alone entities local libraries would not have the buying power that the County service has; and, therefore, if devolved to Parish Councils the County might take the opportunity to rotate books between libraries, within a service level agreement. The County could also provide the check-in and check-out service for the stock.

There are examples of the diversification of use in libraries, for example the homework clubs at both Danbury and Fryerns libraries. The public engagement conversations held throughout the county are likely to provide further ideas for the use of the county libraries and the Committee should be briefed on any future plans for the library service. The Task and Finish Group suggests an **ACTION** that the Chairman of the Place Services and Economic Growth Policy and Scrutiny Committee engages with the Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Customer with regard to any outcomes from the public engagement events.

The Task and Finish Group recognised the Essex Libraries public engagement exercise would undoubtedly produce many good ideas for the future running of the service. The Task and Finish Group would **RECOMMEND** that the libraries estate be reviewed, without withdrawal of existing services from any locality, and parished areas invited to run any additional community libraries. The provision of stock and rotation be undertaken under a Service Level Agreement with the County, if, and when, such community libraries are established.

With regard to Local Plans the Task and Finish Group suggests that they should include, where there is sufficient population growth, consideration of new local library provision being part of that plan, such to be developer funded.

It was reported to the Group that Registration centres are now provided in libraries. Registration statistics in terms of timescales are not as they should be as people get the choice where to register a birth or death, but most choose their local registration centre as it is the nearest but are not, necessarily, open on certain days, so customers prefer to await convenient availability. Where registration is provided is in some cases an historical accident; and it should be an aim that registration facilities be easily available in most towns via the wider library estate.

Highways

Key Evidence members discussed the previous agency arrangements of managing the highways function

There are two tiers of activity that may be considered:

- i) Activities which are the responsibility of the County Council (or have issues of dispute over ownership and responsibility between Local Authorities and may lead to service withdrawal) but are not currently being undertaken by County and are either not, or insufficiently budgeted for (e.g. sign washing);
- ii) Activities that are being done at the present but, given the need to find savings, cannot continue to be done by the ECC (e.g. Public Rights of Way maintenance, verge cutting). There are currently a substantial number of contracts with district councils to carry out such work; but there is no consistency across the County. Whereas with highways, the drawing together of all the work has achieved substantial savings and improved performance in respect of Priority 1 (PR1) and Priority 2 (PR2) roads.

A major concern here concerns budgets, both for revenue and capital projects., and connected with this is quality assurance for any activity passed down. We have not yet received guidance from Essex Highways on the mechanism for devolution of moneys, but the Panel appreciates ECC would need to be sure such devolution was cash limited. Parishes and Districts could of course add to the devolved moneys such funds of their own as they considered appropriate. Whilst recognising that public expenditure is constrained at all levels of local government, a district that attached importance to a particular activity or project (for instance, the cosmetic or aesthetic upgrade of a high street or conservation area, might be prepared to invest in that project, especially if it would unlock local economic growth. Parishes, which are not subject to capping, might be willing to contribute their own funds as well, especially where there was a clear desire among their electorate to deal with a particular issue. The Panel had its attention drawn to initiatives by Devon County Council (see below) which could well be instructive in this field.

As for quality control, the Panel would expect all work to be subject to inspection by the Highways inspectors.

For the first tier of activity public expectation is important – it should be clear what is being achieved if any extra costs are incurred. Therefore, cleaning contracts, for signage and bus shelters etc., could be arranged on a local basis. Another issue is maintaining timetables in bus shelters – although the maintenance of bus shelters is not straightforward, as they are owned by different parties, as are streetlamps.

The Task and Finish Group heard from representatives of Maldon District Council on how the Highways Ranger Team have been incorporated into the Park and Maintenance Team at the Council, and how they had made a real difference to the team and enabled a more linked-up approach. It was felt that the district could

manage the needs at a more local level because they are closer to the ground. It was confirmed that without the funding Maldon District Council would not be able to take on the function. There are other functions that could, potentially, be devolved into a Highways' Rangers 'Plus' scenario, such as drainage, Public Rights of Way, relevant elements of Trading Standards, signage (such as finger posts) and street lighting.

Therefore, the Task and Finish Group would **RECOMMEND** that every district study the Maldon District Council model with a view to seeing if can be effective in other parts of the county. Additionally, with regard to the second tier of activity, the Task and Finish Group would **RECOMMEND** the ECC Highways Ranger scheme be devolved completely to district councils, or consortia thereof, recognising there would need to be a series of agreements, with light-touch legal understandings for the transfer of responsibilities.

Communities Initiative Fund (CIF)

The Task and Finish Group recognises the excellent practice undertaken over several years through the Community Initiative Fund (CIF) enabling local needs to be met and improving outcomes for local people. The CIF has enabled the better use of resources, the sharing local knowledge together with the utilisation of community assets, and making use of voluntary efforts to give local people greater control over their services.

Through the Committee the Task and Finish Group would ask **ACTION** to be taken by the Scrutiny Board to determine a scrutiny review on the CIF to further establish local partnerships as well as governance to create unified approaches for specific areas. The Scrutiny Board should determine which Committee is best placed to undertake that – the Corporate Policy and Scrutiny Committee has the Fund within its Terms of Reference currently.

Culture and Heritage

The Task and Finish Group heard that with regard to local archives, records and histories some require a specialist controlled environment which the Essex Record Office (ERO) can provide – although the preference is for material that can be kept locally should be so. However, some libraries, notably Clacton, Kelvedon and Manningtree have their local historical records and artefacts in a separate room. The ERO is currently in the process of digitising the archives, and it is understood that the question of its future location may soon be for discussion.

Parish and Town Councils

To enhance emerging localism the Task and Finish Group **RECOMMENDS** the County Council provides express support to Essex County Councillors so, wherever possible, they be encouraged to engage with their Parish and Town Councils and assist the facilitation of local ideas. The Group heard that all but one of the 275 parish/town councils in Essex were members of the Essex Association of Local Councils (EALC); there are District associations and each one of these has an executive member who meet every two months as part of the EALC executive committee. The EALC had approached ECC to see if there might be certain activities that local councils could undertake; examples being greenswards; parking enforcement; parking at schools – possibly assisting parking partnerships, acting as a second party; training the locally engaged volunteers to issue tickets (the North Essex Parking Partnership has indicated it would be happy with this, as long as the individuals were accredited); dog warden patrols etc. Much of this is already happening in Maldon, and the Group commends this is an example of joined-up working between the tiers for the public good.

The EALC provided a full list of activities, to the Task and Finish Group, it might propose be taken over by some local parish councils. ECC recognises that local communities have a better understanding of their local issues and there is an ever-increasing list of activities that the County Council might find difficult to fund in future years; therefore, devolution of some tasks will be essential and some work has already been done on this. There have been discussions with Ringway Jacobs, which already has several schemes in place in other parts of the country with a substantial number of parishes carrying out a range of tasks. The Group heard Devon County Council has a scheme in place, for example, that has provided free training for several hundred volunteers, known as community road wardens, to do varied tasks within parishes. This has included a limited number of pothole repairs, although there has been some concern about the efficiency of this. It should be noted that the safety of individuals is always the prime concern and the County cannot devolve its duty of care as a highways authority. As the largest authority involved in the chain, it would have to exercise vicarious responsibility.

It is reasonable to expect that local priorities be determined by local Parish and Town Councils in direct consultation with community residents and, therefore, subsequent budgets be set accordingly. There is a desire amongst some Parish and Town Councils to undertake more and this is demonstrated by the response to the ECC Local Services Fund for which responses were predominantly applications to replace or supplement services traditionally provided by ECC with many prepared to contribute more in matched-funding than the limit imposed by the fund. Parish and Town Councils would wish to see ECC provide funding for them in taking functions from the County Council – parishes have seen a reduction of funding, like all other councils and the ability to undertake services would be predicated by adequate funding for them so to do, as well as the appropriate powers being passed down to

the Parish or Town Council from ECC. In order to override the district boundary issues that can, on occasion, bring difficulties to contend with the Task and Finish Group **RECOMMENDS** that Essex County Council find a way to make it easier to sort out insurance liabilities, as parishes may be reluctant to take on public liability.

Borough, City and District Councils

The Chairman of the Task and Finish Group wrote to all the Leaders of the Essex districts for their views, providing the scope of the group and asking them what functions they would like to see devolved and seeking responses to the key lines of enquiry. Only six of the Authorities provided responses which were largely positive to the suggestions, with caveats around funding. Table 1.1, below illustrates the responses received which the Task and Finish Group acknowledges is something of a wish-list and that one-size does not, necessarily, fit all.

TABLE 1.1

LOCALISM AND SUBSIDIARITY TASK AND FINISH GROUP: RESPONSES FROM BOROUGH/CITY/DISTRICT COUNCILS IN ESSEX

BOROUGH/CITY/DISTRICT	DEVOLVED RESPONSIBILITY REQUESTS	NOTES
BASILDON	NIL RESPONSE	
BRAINTREE	Weed control Highway grass cutting Accidental debris removal from the public highway Overgrown hedge cutting Gully emptying Cutting grips in rural highways Flooding enforcement Landscaping including tree clearing following high winds Maintenance of street furniture Pothole repairs Health & Wellbeing agenda Communities agenda Trading Standards Registry	Devolved budget responsibility will need careful consideration and discussion to plan, prioritise and develop detailed actions and a fully funded work programme that can be endorsed politically and taken forward for implementation.
BRENTWOOD	NIL RESPONSE	
CASTLE POINT	Minor carriageway repairs Minor footway repairs SW drainage maintenance Gully clearing Weed control Street furniture cleansing and maintenance	ECC should consider devolving all management and delivery of basic highways maintenance functions to Districts and Boroughs. CPBC would be happy to start a dialogue about this, which could be considered in partnership with other Districts/Boroughs. Disappointed with the complete failure of the current highways contract which fails to provide a basic pothole repair service in Castle Point – additional

		funding will not improve the service under fundamental changes are made.
CHELMSFORD	Park & Ride Highways signage Dropped kerbs LHP budget Libraries	There would be TUPE considerations as well as the transfer of equipment and files if Highways functions were devolved to the City Council. Would need confirmation of the true cost of services over the last five years before any transfer of any services.
COLCHESTER	Libraries Highways Waste Trading Standards	Would be happy to take all of Essex County Council's functions for the Colchester Borough geographical area. Without a total commitment of protecting the financial budget and a clear legal agreement that functions can be returned to the County should the resources be reduced there is no point discussing. If these can be agreed then (see devolved responsibility).
EPHING FOREST	<i>An oral response to the Task and Finish Group on parking and highways issues will be forthcoming</i>	
HARLOW	NIL RESPONSE	
MALDON	Drainage Public rights of way Trading Standards Street lighting Signage (finger posts)	Attended T&F Group. Highways Rangers have been incorporated into the Parks and Maintenance Team which has enabled a more linked-up approach – this did come with funding without which MDC would not be able to undertake the function.
ROCHFORD	NIL RESPONSE	
TENDRING	Car parking Highways maintenance	Would welcome further discussion on these two areas.
UTTLESFORD	NIL RESPONSE	
EALC (ON BEHALF OF PARISHES)	Antisocial parking Fly posting Grass cutting Hedge cutting Drainage and ditches Vehicle Activated Sign maintenance Road and Footway Weed Growth Pothole repairs Parking and Dog Warden Responsibilities Public Rights of Way maintenance	A pilot scheme, with Heads of Agreement to ensure against the burden of exhaustive and unnecessary legal activity, would be beneficial involving selected Parish or Town Councils – the EALC would help identify willing councils.

It is clear from the responses received that the second-tier Authorities are, at the very least, happy to start a dialogue with County Council on the devolution of the management and delivery of certain functions – but, at the same time, very clear that devolved funding would need to be provided in order for them to take up some of these functions. The districts are clear about this and will not take up any of the funding until it has been seen that heads of agreement and other legal and public liability issues are taken care of. Without this there would be little appetite for devolved responsibility. Therefore, the Task and Finish Group would **RECOMMEND** that dialogue commences at the earliest convenience with second-tier and parish authorities to determine those functions which can realistically be devolved and any transference of funding required for devolution.

The Task and Finish Group heard that Maldon District Council Community Protection Officers have functions which include: TruCam (speed enforcement); antisocial behaviour; litter enforcement; dog fouling; and enforcement of district council car parks and cash collections. The Task and Finish Group believes that under a localised service council officers should be able to issue general enforcement notices in terms of parking, dog fouling, littering etc. A way to find a means of doing such at a local level, and at times, erasing district/parish boundaries could be found to facilitate this.

The Task and Finish Group would wish to confirm an **ACTION** on the Committee that it should commence a review of grass verges as many of the second-tier authorities as well as the EALC have suggested this is an area that could be devolved – this was agreed at the Committee meeting of 22 February 2018. Currently, the Task and Finish Group found that in the Uttlesford district there are some parishes that do their own grass-cutting but that Essex County Council is not devolving further, currently, due to the Ringway Jacobs contract. The Group heard that this could possibly be resolved. Grass-cutting on new estates is an issue, and will continue to be so with ongoing building works, as this land moves on from the developer to district/borough responsibility. Another factor is grass cutting on current and former council estates, where the Districts have much experience.

Miscellaneous

Finally, the Task and Finish Group **RECOMMENDS** that the final report be received by Full Council following the referral to this Committee and that the report also be filed with all second-tier authorities so that it may encourage those districts that did not respond to the initial requests, and follow-up, to consider the areas that they might consider carrying-out locally.

Following acceptance of this interim report, and in advance of the final report the Task and Finish Group **RECOMMENDS** a workshop take place bringing together key stakeholders to include *inter alia* districts, parishes, County Council. The Task and

Finish Group will organise this workshop, to take place as soon as practicable after the May local elections, with the aim of giving a richness to the final report regarding the practical responsibilities of discussing how localism can be taken forward. Cabinet Members from all Essex Local Authorities will be invited to attend.

One potential outcome of the workshop would be the development of a pilot scheme featuring one larger and one smaller district authority delivering services devolved from Essex County Council.

APPENDIX 1

<p align="center">Essex County Council Place Services and Economic Growth Policy & Scrutiny Committee</p>
--

This form is a tool that should be compiled at the start of each inquiry to set out clearly the aims and objectives of the committee's involvement in a particular matter, and will be completed at the end of the inquiry to confirm what has been achieved. It is an iterative form; and also acts as an audit trail for a review.

WHAT ARE WE LOOKING AT?	
Review Topic	Localism and Subsidiarity
Type of Review	TASK AND FINISH GROUP
WHY ARE WE LOOKING AT THIS?	

<p>Rationale for the Review</p>	<p>Extract from the minutes of the full Council meeting of 12 July 2017:</p> <p><u>Localism and Subsidiarity</u></p> <p>It was moved by Councillor Pond and seconded by Councillor Sargeant that:</p> <p>‘This Council applauds achievements of the Administration to date in the field of localism, such as the Community Initiatives Fund. Local Highways Panels were a useful step in bringing together County and District members; their funding needs to be sufficient, and their processes (including Highway Rangers) more effective, the better to suit local needs.</p> <p>This Council now needs to take further initiatives to ensure that decisions affecting local people are taken as close to them as possible, instead of centrally at County Hall, or by remote joint boards. Devolution to or involvement of districts and parishes in such functions as highway repairs, parking control and enforcement would all increase local buy-in, and should be attainable within existing budgets. This Council refers this whole question to the Corporate Scrutiny Committee for further examination.</p> <p>It was moved by Councillor Grundy and seconded by Councillor Johnson that the motion be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>‘This Council applauds achievements of the Administration to date in the field of localism, such as the Community Initiatives Fund. Local Highways Panels were a useful step in bringing together County and District members; their funding needs to be sufficient, and their processes (including Highway Rangers) more effective, the better to suit local needs.</p> <p>This Council now needs to consider further initiatives to ensure that decisions affecting local people are taken as close to them as possible, instead of centrally at County Hall, or by remote joint boards. Devolution to or involvement of Districts, Boroughs, the City and parishes in such functions as highway repairs, parking control and enforcement would all increase local buy-in, and could be attainable within existing budgets.</p> <p>This Council refers this whole question to the Place Services & Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee to be considered along with other important issues for inclusion in their work programme.’</p> <p>Councillor Pond and the seconder Councillor Sargeant accepted the amendment and, with the approval of Council, the amendment having become the substantive motion it was put to the meeting and was carried.</p>
	<p>WHAT DO WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE?</p>

Indicators of success	What would you wish to see happen as a result of the review? What value can scrutiny bring to the review? Why do you think the desired outcome is achievable?
HOW LONG IS IT GOING TO TAKE?	
Timescales	Three month review with final report to Committee in January 2018
Provisional Timetable	19 October – 18 January 2018
WHAT INFORMATION DO WE NEED?	
Terms of Reference	To review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How possible and practical is it to take decisions to deliver services at a more local level and how can budgets be devolved locally?
Key Lines of Enquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What responsibilities, by service area, would the County Council be prepared to devolve to the more local level? • How are services being delivered now? • What would the advantages and disadvantages of services being devolved be? • What would the staffing and funding implications be? • What is the appetite/willingness of the City, Borough, District, Parish and Town Councils to take on the responsibility? • What services could realistically come under more local control?
What primary/new evidence is needed?	
What secondary/ existing information is needed?	<p>What have other counties done? Practice elsewhere and maybe visit e.g. Somerset CC is said to be a model of good practice, inc. parking</p> <p>Suffolk CC – libraries run with local input through an Industrial Provident Society</p> <p>CIF Prospectus</p>
What briefings and site visits might be relevant?	CIF funded projects
Other work being undertaken/Relevant Corporate Links	School Crossing Patrols Cabinet Member Reference Group (Cllr Gooding)
What is inside the scope of the review?	<p>Highways and Highways Rangers</p> <p>Libraries</p> <p>Parking Partnerships</p> <p>Devolved budgets, i.e. CIF</p> <p>County records: Liaison between the museum service and ERO; historic buildings and monuments advice (Heritage and Culture 2011 scrutiny report); local accessibility of records</p>

What is outside the scope of the review?	<p>Passenger Transport Responsive Transport Initiatives/Community Transport</p> <p>Both the above will be subject to future reviews by the Committee</p>
WHO DO WE NEED TO CONTRIBUTE/CONSULT? (INITIAL MEETING TO ESTABLISH THIS)	
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s) and other Member involvement	<p>Councillor Ian Grundy Councillor Susan Barker Councillor John Jowers (inauguration of the CIF) Councillor Chris Whitbread, EFDC Councillor Penny Channer, MDC</p>
Key ECC Officers	<p>Andrew Cook, Director Highways and Transportation Peter Massie, Head of Commissioning Essex Highways Suzanna Shaw, Director Customer and Technology Operations Paul Probert, Head of Community Resilience</p>
Partners and service users	<p>Borough/City/District/Parish/Town Councils Unparished/largely unparished councils (Basildon BC to cover – Clare Hamilton (Chief Regeneration Officer)) EALC SEPP/NEPP Chief Officers/Chairmen</p>
WHAT RESOURCES DO WE NEED?	
Lead Member and Membership	<p>Councillor Chris Pond (Chairman) Councillor Stephen Hillier Councillor David Kendall Councillor Andrew Sheldon</p>
Co-optees (if any)	None
Lead Scrutiny Officer/Other	Robert Fox
Expected Member commitment	Four meetings to be concluded by Christmas 2017
WHAT ARE THE RISKS/CONSTRAINTS?	
Risk analysis (site visits etc.)	Risk management form to be completed if any site visits are included as part of the review
Possible constraints	To be determined, if any
WHAT WILL BE REQUIRED FROM STAKEHOLDERS?	
Internal stakeholders	<p>Their time to attend Task and Finish Group meetings Information and advice Communications for any potential press release following the review</p>
External stakeholders	<p>Potential time commitment of co-optee Their time to attend T&F Group evidence sessions</p>
WHO ARE WE DIRECTING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TO?	
Recommendations to (key decision makers):	This to be compiled during, and following the review

Reporting arrangements	Task and Finish Group final report to be presented to the full Committee, for a response from the relevant Cabinet Member(s), on Thursday, 18 January 2018
Follow-up arrangements	Six month implementation review to full Committee in July 2018. Twelve month impact review to full Committee in January 2019
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/NOTES	
Meeting dates (provisional)	Tuesday, 31 October 2017 at 10.30 a.m.; Room C120: Cllr Barker, Cllr Grundy Tuesday, 14 November 2017 at 2.30 p.m.; Room C120: Cllr Jowers Thursday, 14 December 2017 following the Place Services and Economic Growth Policy & Scrutiny Committee; Committee Room 1: Cllr Grundy, Andrew Cook, Peter Massie

LESSONS LEARNT/SCRUTINY EVALUATION

To be completed in an end of review Workshop* (align to findings of Scrutiny Survey to be attached as an annex). This form should be used in the evaluation of the process adopted by the Scrutiny review Committee/Task and Finish Group and will be used to inform future Scrutiny Reviews.

**Evaluation workshop at the end of the review will typically involve Committee Chairman/T&F chairman, other T&F group members, scrutiny officer, topic proposer and key stakeholders (if applicable)*

DATE OF REVIEW EVALUATION:	
1. Organisation & Planning	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approach used? Proposed and actual start/completion dates: Was the time allocated adequate?	
2. Resourcing	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was officer time/resource adequate for this review?	
3. Evidence sessions/site visits	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
4. Stakeholder and Communications	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews

5. Report and Recommendations

What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was the purpose of the review achieved? Has there/is there likely to be any influence on service delivery as a consequence of the review?	