



**EAST STAFFORDSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**REPORT COVER SHEET**

<b>Title of Report:</b>	Chairman of the Scrutiny (Value for Money Council Services) Committee: Annual Report 2015/16
<b>Meeting of:</b>	Council
<b>Date:</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
<b>Is this an Executive Decision:</b>	NO
<b>Is this a Key Decision:</b>	NO
<b>Is the Report Confidential:</b>	NO
<b>If so, please state relevant paragraph from Schedule 12A LGA 1972:</b>	N/A
<p><b>Essential Signatories:</b></p> <p><b>ALL REPORTS MUST BE IN THE NAME OF A HEAD OF SERVICE</b></p> <p>Monitoring Officer: <b>Angela Wakefield</b></p> <p>Date ..... Signature .....</p> <p>Chief Finance Officer: <b>Sal Khan</b></p> <p>Date ..... Signature .....</p>	

**EAST STAFFORDSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**Report to Council**

**Date: 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

<b>REPORT TITLE:</b>	Chairman of the Scrutiny (Value for Money Council Services) Committee: Annual Report 2015/16	
<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	Leader of the Council	
<b>HEAD OF SERVICE:</b>	Chief Executive	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	James Abbott	Ext. No. x1244
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	<b>Non-specific</b>	

**1. Purpose of the Report**

1.1. To provide a summary of the Scrutiny activities undertaken by the Scrutiny (Value for Money Council Services) Committee during 2015/16.

**2. Background**

2.1. The Council's various Scrutiny Committees discharge the overview and scrutiny function under Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

2.2. The Committees are tasked with:

2.2.1. Reviewing and/or scrutinising decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Council's functions;

2.2.2. Reviewing and scrutinising the performance of the Council;

2.2.3.

2.2.4. Serving as consultees in relation to executive decisions and key elements of service plans when required; and

2.2.5. Producing progress reports and recommendations to the Executive arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process or refer to the Executive

entire reports produced as a result of the scrutiny process. However it is the decision of the Executive whether or not such a report is subsequently submitted to Full Council.

### **3. Contribution to Corporate Priorities**

3.1. This report can contribute to all priorities to some degree (depending on the subject matter of the scrutiny review in question); however the remit of this particular Scrutiny Committee is to consider services within the corporate priority area of "Value for Money Council Services".

### **4. Scrutiny Activities**

#### **4.1. WASP Funding**

4.1.1. In addition to scrutinising the standing items of the Corporate Plan Performance Report and Executive Decision Records, the Committee has completed a review into the Council's Ward Action Service Plan (WASP) funding process.

4.1.2. Completed in February 2016, this was a detailed review, including an in-depth look at the current arrangements, the budget levels, type of projects funded and the role of the WASP funding panel.

4.1.3. Following these discussions, consultation with Members and benchmarking with other local authorities, a number of draft recommendations were proposed with the final report scheduled to be taken to Cabinet in March.

#### **4.2. Burton Market Hall**

4.2.1. In February 2016 upon completion of the WASP funding review, it was also agreed that the Committee would undertake a review of Burton Market Hall.

4.2.2. This review will be looking at a range of subjects relating to the Market Hall including footfall into the Hall, occupancy levels and turnover of trade, rent rates, marketing of the Hall and events being held at the venue.

4.2.3. This review is ongoing with recommendations arising to be discussed at future meetings of the Committee.

### **5. Financial Considerations**

*This section has been approved by the following member of the Financial Management Unit: Lisa Turner*

5.1. There are no financial issues arising from this Report.

### **6. Risk Assessment and Management**

6.1. The main risks to this Report and the Council achieving its objectives are as follows:

6.1.1. **Positive** (Opportunities/Benefits):

6.1.1.1. None

6.1.2. **Negative** (Threats):

6.1.2.1. None

6.2. The risks do not need to be entered in the Risk Register. Any financial implications to mitigate against these risks are considered above.

## **7. Legal Considerations**

*This section has been approved by the following member of the Legal Team:  
Angela Wakefield.*

7.1. There are no significant legal issues arising from this Report.

## **8. Equalities and Health**

8.1. Equality impacts: The subject of this Report is not a policy, strategy, function or service that is new or being revised. An equality and health impact assessment is not required.

8.2. Health impacts: The outcome of the health screening question does not require a full Health Impact Assessment to be completed. An equality and health impact assessment is not required.

## **9. Human Rights**

9.1. There are no Human Rights issues arising from this Report.

## **10. Sustainability (including climate change and change adaptation measures)**

10.1. Does the proposal result in an overall positive effect in terms of sustainability (including climate change and change adaptation measures)  
**N/A**

## **11. Recommendation(s)**

11.1. To note the report

## **12. Background Papers**

12.1. None

**13. Appendices**

- 13.1. Appendix 1: Scrutiny (Value for Money Council Services) Committee Reviews 2015/16

## Appendix 1: Scrutiny (Value for Money Council Services) Committee Reviews 2015/16

### WASP Funding Review

#### Background and Scope

Following discussion at the Value for Money Scrutiny Committee held on the 17th June 2015, Members agreed to undertake a review of the Ward Action Service Plan (WASP) funding.

The Ward Councillor is the lead responsibility for the WASP funding in their area. The aim of the funding is to provide an opportunity for the Ward Councillors to:

- Identify and, if possible, address local concerns and aspirations;
- Improve communications between the Council and its citizens;
- Inform and influence the Council's planning of its service delivery and budgets.

The following questions were suggested in order to provide a focus for this review. Please note that the list below was not exhaustive.

#### Questions

1. What other review work has been undertaken relating WASP funding?
  - a. Scope / focus of other reviews (if applicable)
  - b. Recommendations arising / outcomes of these reviews (if applicable)
2. Is there a procedure relating to WASP funding?
  - a. What is the procedure?
  - b. Is the procedure fit for purpose?
  - c. If not, suggestions for changes to the procedure?
3. What are the present arrangements?
  - a. Budgets
  - b. Responsibilities
  - c. Funding criteria
  - d. Panel's role

#### Benchmarking / Analysis

4. Do other local authorities operate a similar fund? i.e. Staffordshire County Council
  - a. What is the name of their fund?
  - b. How much is it for?
  - c. What is the procedure for the funding including its criteria?
  - d. Who is responsible for awarding the money?
5. Are there any issues / problems with the current arrangements for the funding?
  - a. Does the process need to be simplified?
  - b. Is the name WASP appropriate?
6. What types of projects has the funding been used for?

## Recommendations Arising

The recommendations arising from this review are scheduled to be presented to the Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2016 for their consideration.

## Burton Market Hall

### Background and Scope

Burton Market is located in the centre of town and includes both an indoor market hall and an outdoor market. Following a £1.5 million redevelopment, Burton Market Hall once again opened its doors to the public on Saturday 21st June 2014. Burton Market Hall is a beautiful Victorian building that has been renovated with sympathy to preserve its historic character.

The following questions have been suggested in order to provide a focus for this review. Please note that the list below is not exhaustive. The committee is not limited to answering only the questions contained within this scoping paper.

1. Of the original traders who opened when the Market Hall re-opened after refurbishment how many are still trading?
2. What has the 'churn' been for traders at the Market Hall?
3. Do we know why traders have left the Market Hall?
4. What are the current trader occupancy levels for the fixed shop units?
5. How are rents calculated for the Market Hall?
6. Are rents comparable with other markets and shopping environments?
7. What is being done to market and advertise the Market Hall and Market Place both for customers and traders?
8. Is any additional support given to traders at the Market Hall?
9. What are footfall figures for the Market Hall?
10. What is being done to attract stallholders and traders?
11. Have the social and economic benefits that were cited in the original business case been delivered with the refurbished Market hall?
12. Is the Market Hall being utilised to its full potential in terms of events?

13. What and how many events have been held at the Market Hall since its reopening?

### **Recommendations Arising**

This review is ongoing, with recommendations to be discussed at future meetings of the Committee.