

<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?	
Rationale for the Review	<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.</p> <p>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>

AGENDA ITEM 7 PSEG/19/17

WHAT DO WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE?	
Indicators of success	<p>What would you wish to see happen as a result of the review?</p> <p>What value can scrutiny bring to the review?</p> <p>Why do you think the desired outcome is achievable?</p>
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	<p>To review:</p> <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>

AGENDA ITEM 7 PSEG/19/17

What is outside the scope of the review?	Passenger Transport Responsive Transport Initiatives/Community Transport Both the above will be subject to future reviews by the Committee
WHO DO WE NEED TO CONTRIBUTE/CONSULT? (INITIAL MEETING TO ESTABLISH THIS)	
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s) and other Member involvement	Councillor Ian Grundy Councillor Susan Barker Councillor John Jowers (inauguration of the CIF) Councillor Chris Whitbread, EFDC Councillor Penny Channer, MDC
Key ECC Officers	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
Partners and service users	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
WHAT RESOURCES DO WE NEED?	
Lead Member and Membership	Councillor Chris Pond (Chairman) Councillor Stephen Hillier Councillor David Kendall Councillor Andrew Sheldon
Co-optees (if any)	
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	Their time to attend Task and Finish Group meetings Information and advice Communications for any potential press release following the review
External stakeholders	Potential time commitment of co-optee Their time to attend T&F Group evidence sessions
WHO ARE WE DIRECTING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TO?	
Recommendations to (key decision makers):	This to be compiled during, and following the review

AGENDA ITEM 7 PSEG/19/17

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?	

AGENDA ITEM 7 PSEG/19/17