OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 11 AUGUST 2014

A meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board will be held at 5.30pm on Monday 11 August 2014 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Mahoney
Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Management Board

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes.
   To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2014.

2. Apologies.
   To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest.
   To receive declarations of –
   
   (a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;
   
   (b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and
   
   (c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

   Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their non-pecuniary interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a pecuniary interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.
Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a non-pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.

4. Motion from Council – Hunters Lane Recycling Centre.

5. Overview and Scrutiny – future structure.

PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION

There is no business involving exempt information to be transacted.

Any additional papers or relevant documents for this meeting can be accessed here via the website.

The Reports of Officers (Ref. OSMB 2014/15-03) are attached.

Membership of the Board: -

Councillors Mahoney (Chairman), G Francis, Mrs Garcia, Keeling, Miss Lawrence, Roodhouse, Dr Shera, Stokes and Helen Walton.

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Linn Ashmore, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail Linn.Ashmore@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.
**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Meeting</strong></th>
<th>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Meeting</strong></td>
<td>11 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Title</strong></td>
<td>Motion from Council – Hunters Lane Recycling Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Relevance</strong></td>
<td>All Wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contact Officer** | Paul Ansell  
(01788) 533591 |
| **Summary** | On 22 July Council referred a motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in accordance with Council Standing Order 11. The Board is asked to consider whether to consider the matter itself and report to Cabinet, or whether to instruct an overview and scrutiny committee to appoint a task group to consider the matter. |
| **Financial Implications** | There are no financial implications for Rugby Borough Council but there would be financial implications for Warwickshire County Council if the opening hours of Hunters Lane recycling centre were to be extended. |
| **Equality and Diversity Implications** | None |
| **Risk Management Implications** | None |
| **Environmental Implications** | None |
| **Legal Implications** | None |
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11 August 2014

Motion from Council – Hunters Lane Recycling Centre

Summary

On 22 July Council referred a motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in accordance with Council Standing Order 11.

The Board is asked to consider whether to consider the matter itself and report to Cabinet, or whether to instruct an overview and scrutiny committee to appoint a task group to consider the matter.

1. BACKGROUND

On 22 July Council considered a motion submitted on notice by Cllr Mrs O’Rourke as set out below.

In light of the fact that Rugby is the fastest growing town in the whole of the West Midlands and will continue to be so for the next 5 Years, could I ask for all Councillors to support the notice of motion below.

The Council reviews the current opening hours at Hunters Lane recycling centre to see if they meet the needs of the local community now and in the future.

The review includes robust community engagement processes which should include surveys and focus groups as well as national recommendations.

Once the review is completed, if there is an identified need to increase the opening hours of the recycling centre at Hunters Lane, officers implement the revised opening hours as soon as practicable.

In accordance with Council Standing Order 11, the motion stood referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

2. RECENT SCRUTINY WORK

Hunters Lane recycling centre is a county council facility and the borough council has no power to implement any revised opening hours. Nevertheless, aspects of the
Hunters Lane recycling centre’s operation were scrutinised as part of the reviews of Local Recycling Centres and Household Waste Services in New Developments which took place last municipal year.

During the review of Household Waste Services in New Developments, task group members met with the Warwickshire County Council portfolio holder and the group manager to explore a number of concerns relating to the recycling centre as well as the arrangements for the disposal of residual (ie not recyclable or compostable) waste from kerbside collections. A number of concerns about Hunters Lane were raised, not only about opening hours but also about vehicle restrictions, pedestrian access, signage, publicity and the lack of facilities for the disposal of certain materials (paint being the main point of discussion).

The following note, taken from the review report, outlines the response made at the meeting to a proposition by task group members that changing the opening hours of the Hunters Lane recycling centre should be considered to match users’ requirements better.

April-October the site is open on Wednesdays until 6.30pm. The choice of Wednesday for late opening is based on trend data.

As part of a wider review that took place in 2011/12 WCC evaluated the opening times, with the following results:

- Saturday was the busiest day with peak trading hours of 11-12 noon
- Wednesday was the quietest day and quietest hours were 8am-9am and 5-6pm

As part of the review members of the public were asked if they would prefer shorter opening hours and more days, or longer opening hours and fewer days.

- 1200 people across Warwickshire were surveyed.
- 170 responses were received from the Hunters Lane site
- Overall the public were satisfied with the current opening hours. This equated to 82.7 per cent overall and 75.8 per cent for Rugby.
- All sites – 30 per cent of people visit once a month and 33 per cent every two months
- Rugby – 35 per cent of people visit once a month and 34 per cent every two months
- Rugby – 34 per cent of people were aware of the late night opening compared with 18 per cent overall.
- Rugby - 84.5 per cent of people were aware assistance was available.
- Rugby – number of visits (2010) was 199,000.

Two of the review’s recommendations were that:

Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to expand the services, accessibility and information regarding the county council recycling centres in order to meet current and future demands of the borough: and
the Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder send a letter to Warwickshire County Council, expressing the points of concern raised following the evidence gathering meeting with the county council Portfolio Holder.

Cabinet approved these recommendations on 7 April 2014. Recent findings of overview and scrutiny and the view of Cabinet therefore already share the sentiment behind the motion. The need for further scrutiny is therefore open to debate, and any such work would need to be carefully specified in order to avoid repetition.

3. MOTION ON NOTICE PROCEDURE

The Constitution requires the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to decide whether to consider the motion itself, or refer it to an overview and scrutiny committee for consideration by a task group. Any task group so appointed will report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Once the Board has considered the motion or received a report back from a task group it will report to the next available meeting of Cabinet, which in turn will report to the next ordinary meeting of the Council. Where a motion is referred to a committee for consideration, it will report to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

The Board is asked to consider whether there is a need for further scrutiny or action of any other sort.
Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
Date of Meeting: 11 August 2014
Subject Matter: Motion from Council – Hunters Lane Recycling Centre
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AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

**Name of Meeting**  Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

**Date of Meeting**  11 August 2014

**Report Title**  Overview and Scrutiny – future structure

**Ward Relevance**  All

**Contact Officer**  Paul Ansell, Tel: (01788) 533591  
Debbie Dawson, Tel: (01788) 533592

**Summary**  On 16 June, the Board decided to devote the 11 August meeting to discussion of future governance arrangements and the overview and scrutiny structure. This paper sets out the key issues and some of the options available. The Board has invited a member of Cabinet, group leaders and scrutiny committee chairmen and vice-chairmen to attend and participate in the discussion.

**Financial Implications**  There are no financial implications arising from this report.

**Risk Management Implications**  There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

**Environmental Implications**  There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

**Legal Implications**  There are no legal implications arising from this report.

**Equality and Diversity**  No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
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Overview and Scrutiny – future structure

Summary

On 16 June, the Board decided to devote the 11 August meeting to discussion of future governance arrangements and the overview and scrutiny structure. This paper sets out the key issues and some of the options available. The Board has invited a member of Cabinet, group leaders and scrutiny committee chairmen and vice-chairmen to attend and participate in the discussion.

1. BACKGROUND

In October, the Board discussed whether there was any need to change its role or composition and decided at that time not to recommend any changes. Since then, two developments have prompted the reopening of discussion not only of the future of the Board but also the future shape of the whole of overview and scrutiny. These are:

- The disestablishment of the Crime and Disorder Committee and the reallocation of its functions to the Customer and Partnerships Committee.
- The proposal to reduce the size of the council to between 30 and 35 members

This has prompted a number of questions including:

- Should we retain the current structure of a Board and two scrutiny committees?
- Should each scrutiny committee have a rigidly defined remit?
- Is an overarching Board necessary to carry out its present functions?

There is a multiplicity of different factors to consider and it would aid discussion if these were to be worked through in a systematic manner. Figure 1 (page 5) provides a checklist of matters to discuss, though it is quite open-ended.

The issues should be discussed in relation to the period up to May 2016 and also in relation to the longer term, assuming a reduction in council size. An option would be to adopt the long-term option immediately and not to have an interim stage. Alternatively, it could be decided to change nothing until May 2016. A further alternative might be to discuss only the shorter-term issues on the grounds that there is no certainty about the May 2016 position in terms of the total number of members and the number of those members required for the regulatory committees.
It should be remembered that Council approval is required for any structural changes and for any changes to the functions of the Board and scrutiny committees, as listed in the constitution.

**Overview and scrutiny role**

This paper is written on the basis that the agreed roles of overview and scrutiny continue to be:

- holding the Executive to account
- policy development and review
- reviewing and scrutinising the performance of the council
- scrutinising the work and impact of external agencies

Inevitably the council has placed a greater or lesser emphasis on these different roles as overview and scrutiny has evolved in Rugby and there is, perhaps, a wider discussion to be had about what emphases the council wishes to give to different scrutiny roles in the future – particularly as resource pressures may demand some streamlining of overview and scrutiny work. This is not the focus of discussion in this paper, but will be a consideration for members in determining future governance arrangements. For example, a greater emphasis on holding the executive to account might suggest one structure, whilst a focus on policy development and review may demand a different approach.

2. WHAT HAPPENS ELSEWHERE IN WARWICKSHIRE?

There is no fixed “best practice” for overview and scrutiny structure and for roles within that structure. In Warwickshire, only Nuneaton and Bedworth District Council has a committee that approximates to our Board, though it is constituted quite differently. The following survey of practice in the other Warwickshire districts and boroughs gives a flavour of the diversity of practice.

**Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council** has three overview and scrutiny panels (ie committees). All members of these panels meet together to form the Overview Joint Scrutiny Commission. There is a requirement for the Commission to meet biannually but, in practice, it meets four times a year. The Commission sets the work programme, assists in the coordination of scrutiny arrangements and reviews the effectiveness of the function. The individual panels exercise call-in, and the Commission has no explicit role in receiving motions on notice or holding the executive to account (because this is done by the panels).

**Stratford-on-Avon District Council** has just one overview and scrutiny committee, and this carries out all overview and scrutiny functions, allocating work as necessary to task and finish groups. It meets monthly and scrutinises the budget and council performance and strategies. The committee carries out the call-in role required by the Local Government Act 2000 but has no explicit role in relation to motions on notice. The Leader reports to the committee annually.

**Warwick District Council** has two overview and scrutiny committees: the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee. The purpose of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is to “review items to be considered by the Executive, review past decisions, policy development, specific
issues, and problems within any service area, and any matters not within the remit of
the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee.” The Finance and Audit Scrutiny
Committee deals with issues of financial robustness and propriety, value for money,
procurement and treasury management. The committees set their own work
programmes and can set up their own task groups. Additionally, the Overview and
Scrutiny Committee has recently set up a Health Sub-Committee.

**North Warwickshire Borough Council** is a “fourth option” authority with a structure
of committees (called Policy Boards) that are empowered to make decisions. Under
the Local Government Act 2000, fourth option authorities were required to have a
scrutiny committee. North Warwickshire has an overview and scrutiny committee
(called the Scrutiny Board), so a role in relation to other scrutiny committees’ work
programmes does not arise. In addition to its scrutiny workload – with review work
carried out by task and finish groups – it reviews changes in the budget and policy
framework, analyses policy issues, and selects items in the corporate action plan on
which it wishes to receive reports. It can call in and scrutinise any decisions of the
executive Policy Boards, area forums and of officers. Council may refer motions on
notice to any council body that it chooses, of which the Scrutiny Board may be one.

Under the Localism Act 2011, any council may revert to an old-style committee
system with no scrutiny committee at all. In practice, few, if any, councils have gone
back to an exact copy of their committee systems that existed before 2000: there is a
tendency to have fewer committees. However, a number have implemented hybrid
arrangements with an executive supported by committees. In such cases,
committees may make decisions that are subsequently ratified by the executive, or
they may have extensive delegated powers. Although councils that revert to a
committee system do not have to have a scrutiny committee, there is nothing to stop
them from having one.

See Section 5 below for examples of apparently successful structures in other parts
of the country.
### Figure 1 – Outline options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Subsidiary issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</td>
<td>Keep as it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain but make changes</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abolish</td>
<td>Reallocation of functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holding Leader and Executive Directors to account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gatekeeper role, eg call-in, motions on notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview and scrutiny committees</td>
<td>Keep CUSP and CORP with same terms of reference</td>
<td>Size of membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of amount of scrutiny of certain topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep two committees but rebalance workload</td>
<td>Basis for rebalancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outward looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of amount of scrutiny of certain topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size of membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce to one committee</td>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce amount of scrutiny of certain topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size of membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater number of committees</td>
<td>Split of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size of membership (could be smaller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From May 2016</td>
<td>Does the recommended long-term option depend on the reduction in council size?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, is there any reason to have a different short-term solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. THE ROLE OF THE BOARD

The Board was established in June 2008.

The articles of the constitution define its role as follows:

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (‘the Board’ [also referred to as OSMB] manages the overview and scrutiny work programme and oversees a budget to support this work. In addition, the Board holds the Leader and Executive Directors to account, acts as gatekeeper for councillor call for action and co-ordinates motions referred to it by Council [Constitution Part 1B 6.1]

Additionally, the Overview and Scrutiny Standing Orders define the functions of the Board as follows

a) Where Cabinet has asked for a committee or committees to consider an item, to refer the matter to the appropriate committee or committees.

b) Ensure that the policies supporting the council’s priorities are regularly reviewed by one or more of the overview and scrutiny committees.

c) To approve an annual overview and scrutiny work programme to ensure that there is efficient use of the committees’ time and that duplication of effort is minimised.

d) To receive and determine requests from committees for approval for expenditure from the overview and scrutiny budget in excess of £100 for a single item.

[Constitution Part 3C Section 2]

The constitution also gives the OSMB these other specific roles:

- Managing call-ins (call-in being a requirement of the Local Government Act 2000)

- Allocation of work to a committee where the topic falls within the remit of more than one committee.

In formal terms, then, OSMB’s role is predominantly one of allocating work and managing scrutiny resources.

Figure 2 on the next page presents some options and issues to consider.
## Figure 2 – Options for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEEP BOARD AS IT IS</strong></td>
<td>Provides clear, impartial leadership for scrutiny.</td>
<td>Lacks legitimacy because its membership is not drawn from the membership of committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not onerous to support.</td>
<td>Although the agendas may be short, members and officers still have to commit diary space to the meetings (and, for some, pre-meetings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not have a work programme, and does not generate work to justify its existence. Meetings may be cancelled if there is insufficient business (and this has happened).</td>
<td>Creates an unproductive layer of bureaucracy in the call-in and motion on notice procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In monitoring the committee work programmes and review action plans, it rarely adds value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring of review action plans simply duplicates the work of CUSP and CORP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The role of holding to account the Leader and Executive Directors normally only amounts to receiving a presentation with a question and answer session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RETAIN BUT MAKE CHANGES</strong></td>
<td>Will maintain leadership role with greater legitimacy and fewer demands on member time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the roles of the scrutiny committees were more fluid, it would be possible for one of them to carry out the holding the Leader and Executive Directors to account role, though this might be regarded as a constitutional check that is available but that is not necessarily exercised at a particular meeting every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RETAIN BUT MAKE CHANGES

Such changes might include:

**Composition**

OSMB to consist of chairman and vice chairman of the other scrutiny committees plus nominations from political groups to ensure that the political composition reflects that of the Council.

**Role**

Limited to:
- agreement of review work programme and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| allocation of reviews to committees  
- approval of annual report  
- scrutiny development issues  
- Holding Leader and Executive Directors to account | |
| **Frequency of meetings**  
Could probably carry out its revised role in three meetings per year. | |
| **ABOLISH**  
Reallocation of functions  
The gatekeeping and work programming roles could be carried out equally well by joint informal meetings of scrutiny committee chairmen and vice-chairmen as and when required.  
Call-in and motions from Council would be sent direct to the scrutiny committees.  
Monitoring of work programme and holding of Leader and Executive Directors to account would be carried out by one of the scrutiny committees. | The “for and against arguments” are likely to be the reverse of the arguments for and against keeping as it is. |

### 4. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

The present committees were established in June 2008.

The Articles of the Constitution detail the roles of the committees. These are not entirely repeated here, but members may refer to them at Part 1B Article 6 of the constitution.

The Corporate Performance Committee (CORP) is primarily concerned with the council’s organisation and resources and how these are used and managed to deliver the council’s obligations and services. It will, for example, be concerned with corporate strategy, organisational health, performance management, financial monitoring and budget-setting and support services. It is responsible for all finance and performance monitoring.
The Customer and Partnerships Committee (CUSP) is primarily concerned with the impact of the council’s services and actions on customers and partners. It is concerned with outward-facing services, matters which have a direct impact on the council’s customers, communities and the local area, and partnership working in this regard. The committee now performs the role of crime and disorder scrutiny committee.

Broadly speaking, this means that, as well as the general cross-cutting roles specified in CORP’s brief, CORP deals with matters that come within the Resources and Corporate Governance portfolio and CUSP generally deals with the other three portfolios.

In response to the issues described in Section 1 (above) the meeting is asked to consider the following options, along with any other variations that may be suggested.

4.1 Keep CUSP and CORP with the same terms of reference

Additional options (select either or both of them):

Reduce the size of the committees

This may be an appropriate response to the reduction in size of the Council as it would free members to carry out other work as members of regulatory committees. It might be argued, however, that, if the nine-member OSMB were disbanded, this alone would liberate sufficient member capacity.

Reduce the amount of scrutiny of particular topics

For example, remove health and wellbeing as a standing item on CUSP and concentrate on borough council services (though not to the exclusion of all external scrutiny).

4.2 Keep two committees but change their terms of reference to rebalance their workload

This could be done in many different ways but possibilities would be:

Each committee to be responsible for all of the overview and scrutiny work relating to two portfolios

For example, one committee might do Economy, Development and Culture and Sustainable Inclusive Communities while the other did Sustainable Environment and Resources and Corporate Governance. The committees would share the performance management work currently carried out by CORP. There would inevitably be some blurring of boundaries, but this would happen with any allocation of responsibility.
Overview and Scrutiny work to be divided between two committees without strict regard to any predetermined areas of work

The work in question could be allocated by the Board, if it still existed, or by the chairman and vice chairman of the committees meeting together. Another option would be to use the annual work programme workshop (or another meeting like it) to decide on the work that each committee should carry out during the ensuing year. The committees would be free to scope and refine their work programmes.

The allocation of work would not be random, and regard would need to be had to the developing areas of expertise in each committee. Committee chairmen could negotiate with each other to move work between committees during the course of the year.

The work could consist of just a few major items.

Each committee to be responsible for different types of work

The categories of work could include: policy development and review, performance monitoring, financial monitoring, risk management, budget scrutiny and the statutory crime and disorder scrutiny function. Call-ins and motions from Council could be allocated by agreement between the committee chairmen. Some councils’ audit committee functions are included within the remit of an overview and scrutiny committee.

4.3 Reduce to just one overview and scrutiny committee

Many councils have only one overview and scrutiny committee. In some cases this may be because the council is not fully committed to overview and scrutiny and just wants to satisfy the minimum requirement. However, there can be good reasons for a reduction, especially if the intention is to commission task groups to carry out all or most policy development and review work. The committee might be expected to meet more frequently: perhaps ten times a year, linked to the dates of Cabinet meetings, to facilitate quicker submission of recommendations to Cabinet and more rapid consideration of call-ins and motions from Council.

In setting the size of such a committee, regard would need to be had to the time demands that would be placed on each of its members, so it would be necessary to resist the temptation to make it a large committee on the grounds that it is the only one.

4.4 Abolish OSMB but increase the number of committees to three or more

This would enable committees either to specialise in particular service areas or types of work (as discussed in relation to the two committee system above). To preserve the savings in member resources achieved by the abolition of the Board, it would be necessary to reduce the size of the committees.

Recent research by the Centre for Public Scrutiny suggests that, although reduction in committee size does not have a negative effect on the quality of scrutiny, councils that have fewer committees seem to be more successful when looked at in terms of
the number of recommendations accepted by the Executive and implemented. However, it is debatable whether there is a genuine causal link here.

5. EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL STRUCTURES

The following are just three examples of scrutiny structures used in other lower-tier authorities that have been successful in the CiPS’s annual Good Scrutiny Awards, demonstrating that these are councils that take scrutiny seriously and have achieved results. These, combined with the Warwickshire examples described at the beginning of this paper, demonstrate that there is no single right way to do scrutiny well and that the way in which scrutiny is organised is not necessarily dependent on the total number of councillors. None of these councils have a close equivalent of our OSMB.

**Boston Borough Council – small council, relatively slimmed-down scrutiny**

32 members

Two committees between which the seven portfolios are divided:
- Corporate and Community Committee (11 members)
- Environment and Performance Committee (11 members)

**Lincoln City Council – small council, multiple scrutiny committees**

33 members

Four scrutiny committees and a sub-committee:
- Performance Scrutiny (9 members)
- Select (5 members – meets infrequently, mainly to deal with call-ins)
- Policy (7 members)
- Community (8 members)
- Housing Sub-Committee (5 elected members plus tenant representatives)

**Braintree District Council – many members, relatively slimmed-down scrutiny**

60 members

Two scrutiny committees:
- Overview and Scrutiny Committee (11 members) which this year has chosen just two topics for its own agenda and two other topics for task and finish group scrutiny.
- Governance Committee (8 members) which carries out the audit committee function and does some performance monitoring
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