



MEETING OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2006 2.00 PM

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Mrs Joyce Gaffigan
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor John Nicholson (Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Margery Radley
Councillor Mike Williams (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Azar Woods

OFFICERS

Corporate Head, Finance and Resources
Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Support Officer
Service Manager, Economic Development
and Town Centre Management
Business Manager, Development and
Building Control
Service Manager, Planning Policy

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Gerald Taylor

20. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel were notified that Councillor Exton would be substituting for Councillor Mrs. Smith, Councillor Mrs. Gaffigan would be substituting for Councillor Joynson and Councillor Mrs. Radley would be substituting for Councillor Stokes for this meeting only.

21. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Pease.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

23. ACTION NOTES

Noted.

24. GRANTHAM CANAL BASIN UPDATE

An update report on the Grantham canal basin project was circulated with the agenda and noted.

25. RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME

The Grantham Local Forum requested that the DSP set up a working group to look into a residents' parking scheme. The Chairman advised the committee that a scheme would only be possible if Lincolnshire County Council decriminalised parking. This could only be done after consultation and with consent from all district councils. Decriminalisation was not expected for a minimum of two years. Members felt that this was a long time and suggested that a representative from the County Council should be invited to the next meeting on 30th January 2007 to discuss the issue, the Panel would then decide on any further action. They agreed that a response should be sent back to the Grantham Local Forum explaining what they intended to do.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. *A representative from the County Council should be invited to attend the DSP meeting on 30th January 2007 to discuss the decriminalisation of parking.*
2. *A response should be sent to the Grantham Local Forum explaining that following a visit by a representative from the County Council the DSP will decide what action to take.*

26. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

The report from the Stamford Car Parking Working Group was noted. The DSP considered the working group's recommendations. Panel members agreed that the group should be disbanded until the findings of other working groups had been published. The Chairman thanked members of the working group.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. *The Stamford Car Parking Working Group should be disbanded until reports of other working groups examining car parking in Stamford are completed;*
2. *To request an update from the Economic Development Portfolio Holder on the status of other working groups looking at car parking in Stamford;*
3. *When reports are available from other working groups, the Stamford Car Parking Working Group should be reconvened to scrutinise any recommendations that have been made.*

To recommend to Cabinet that:

1. *Subject to a favourable report from the County Council, consideration should be given to making appropriate budgetary provision in advance of the expected decriminalisation of parking by the County Council;*
2. *Subject to a favourable report from the County Council on the decriminalisation of on-street parking, the District Council should undertake consultation and feasibility work on a district-wide residents' parking scheme.*

27. PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AUDIT

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Gerald Taylor to the meeting. The Resources

DSP recommended that a “public convenience audit” should be carried out in villages across the District and Councillor Taylor was present to represent that view. The Council had satisfied its toilet provision policy for towns and members of the Resources DSP felt that it would be appropriate to address toilet provision in villages. The operation of a scheme in conjunction with Parish Councils was suggested. Queries were made about access to external funding sources.

Members of the DSP supported the idea of rural toilet provision. Discussion ensued on how this could be achieved. Suggestions included: joint working with Parish Councils; use of facilities within village halls and investment from private business. A list of local service centres or sustainable villages was circulated with the agenda. Further to those listed, Members requested that the Witham Valley villages, Castle Bytham and South Witham be added.

Members also considered whether the District Council should subsidise toilet provision or whether they should pay for one element of it, such as planning costs.

The Scrutiny Officer reminded Members that the District Council was hosting a Parish Council Conference on 7th December 2006. One of the items for consideration was the provision of shared services. Members asked the Scrutiny Officer to prepare a paper for circulation at the meeting to find out the level of interest and commitment from Parish Councils’

CONCLUSIONS:

1. *To request the Scrutiny Officer prepare a paper on public conveniences in rural areas for circulation at the Parish Council Conference on 7th December 2006.*
2. *Investigations should be made to identify any external funding sources for the provision of public conveniences in rural areas.*

28. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Noted.

- Indicator SK51 (the number of businesses assisted/ supported) was red because it was a yearly target and the figure was taken from a half-yearly review.
- Indicator SK33 (number of residents satisfied with the choice of shopping in the district) was red. This was based on people’s perceptions.
- BVPI 106, BVPI 109a, BVPI 109b and BVPI 109c were all red. No report had been received from the Business Manager, Development and Building Control.

CONCLUSION:

The Panel requests that the Business Manager, Development and Building Control provide a report explaining why BVPI 106, BVPI 109a, BVPI 109b and BVPI 109c are below target.

29. WORK PROGRAMME

Noted.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, it was resolved that the public be excluded because of the likelihood in view of the nature of the business to be transacted that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1-4 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended.

30. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT

The Service Manager, Economic Development and Town Centre Management presented his draft service plan for 2007/07. He explained how the service related to corporate priorities and provided information for comparison with neighbouring authorities. The presentation included information on performance indicators and new areas of responsibility for the service.

Panel Members discussed the impact of work absorbed from the former leisure and cultural services and diversity across the district. Areas where savings could be made were considered.

The Panel went through the Gateway 2 Checklist.

No.	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	No.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	Yes.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	<i>In part.</i>
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	Yes.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.

10	Have major deviations been identified to current years budget	Yes.
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	No.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	Yes.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	No.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	No
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	Yes.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	<i>Mostly. Some additional projects needed adding.</i>
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	<i>No – some areas were identified by the Panel.</i>

ACTION POINTS:

- 1. Costings work on equalities should be undertaken.**
- 2. The breakdown of figures in section 6 of the service plan should be completed fully. A copy of the summary across all budget heads should be circulated to members of the Economic DSP.**
- 3. Major procurement proposals should be identified prior to Gateway Review 3.**
- 4. Outstanding capital projects for the next 3-5 years should be identified and project appraisal forms completed.**
- 5. To include areas for potential savings, as identified by the Economic DSP.**

31. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL

The Development and Building Control Service Plan was presented. The service was underperforming and actions for mitigation were identified. The service was statutory and the key driver was service users. The service priority would be implementing recommendations made by the planning peer review.

Budget sheets were available. These needed to be supplied to all DSP members.

Panel Members went through the Gateway 2 Checklist.

No.	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	No.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	Mostly.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	Yes.
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	No.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.
10	Have major deviations been identified to current years budget	Yes.
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	Yes.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	No.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	Yes.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	N/A
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	No.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project	N/A

	appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	No

ACTION POINTS:

1. ***To circulate budget sheets for Development and Building Control to all members of the Economic DSP.***
2. ***To identify potential Gershon savings.***
3. ***To circulate a copy of the proposed structure to all members of the Economic DSP.***
4. ***To circulate a copy of the PESTLE analysis to all members of the Economic DSP.***
5. ***To complete the financial summary looking particularly at the cost centres for employee growth and supplies and services.***
6. ***To identify areas for potential savings.***

32. GATEWAY REVIEW 2: PLANNING POLICY

Members considered the Planning Policy service plan in conjunction with the Gateway Review 2 checklist.

No	Check Point	Comments
1	Have all budget figures for current year and future years been identified in the service plan.	Yes.
2	Have all staffing resources been identified and costed in the service plan	Yes.
3	Have all other relevant costs been identified and included in the service plan e.g. supplies and services etc.	Yes.
4	Is there clear quantification of how the service contributes towards the council priorities	Yes.
5	Have inflationary increases been absorbed, i.e. no growth on net service cost.	Yes.
6	Is the balanced score card complete and evidenced	No.
7	Have income streams been reviewed and (as a minimum) inflationary increases applied	Yes.
8	Are Gershon efficiency savings identified and evidenced	Yes.
9	Have risks been identified and actions for mitigation applied	Yes.
10	Have major deviations been identified to current years	Yes.

	budget	
11	Has equality costs been included (if relevant)	No.
12	Has section 4 of the service plan been adequately completed and resource costs identified	Yes.
13	Has a SWOT analysis been completed	Yes.
14	Has the PESTLE analysis been completed	No.
15	Has section 6 – financial summary been completed	Yes.
16	Has any major procurement proposals for the next three years been identified and costed	N/A
17	Have service staff been consulted on the compilation of the service plan	Yes.
18	Have any capital projects been identified and project appraisal forms completed for the next 3-5 years	No.
19	Have areas for potential savings been identified	Yes.

ACTION POINTS:

1. ***To identify any equality costings for the service.***
2. ***To complete a PESTLE analysis and circulate to members of the Economic DSP.***

33. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:25.