

No.

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Remote meeting held on 22nd September, 2021.

The Committee agenda is available [here](#).

The Meeting recording is available [here](#).

Present: Councillor M.R. Wilson (Chair); Councillor P. Drake (Vice-Chair);
Councillors: G.D.D. Carroll, G.A. Cox, R. Crowley, V.P. Driscoll, G. John,
Dr. I.J. Johnson, S. Sivagnanam and J.W. Thomas.

Also present: Councilors N. Moore (Executive Leader and Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources), L. Burnett (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration), B.T. Gray (Cabinet Member for Social Care and Health); P.G. King (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services and Transport), E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services) and S.M. Hanks.

384 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business the Principal Democratic Services Officer advised that the meeting would be live streamed as well as recorded via the internet for archive purposes.

385 MINUTES –

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 15th July, 2021 be approved as a correct record.

386 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations of interest were received.

387 VALE OF GLAMORGAN PUBLIC SERVICES BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21 (REF) –

The reference from Cabinet of 19th July, 2021 was presented to Committee as contained within the agenda.

The Head of Policy and Business Transformation introduced the reference and report and passed on apologies from Mark Brace of the South Wales Police Commissioner's Office, Vice-Chair of the Public Services Board (PSB), who had been unable to attend the meeting to present the item.

No.

Members were advised that the report had been produced using Microsoft Sway for a second year which contained a series of case studies that focused on the PSB's activities as well as the evidence base for the wellbeing plan. During the year there had been strong partnership working, in particular around Test Trace Protect, immunisations and community support through Vale Heroes. Work with regard to strengthening the relationship with Town and Community Councils was continuing and a subsequent meeting had been held where a programme of work focusing on issues of mutual interest were being explored, e.g. Age Friendly Status and Climate Change.

Since July, work had commenced on the wellbeing assessment which would be reported to the PSB prior to the local government elections in May 2022.

There had been a good response to the survey that had been running over the summer, with nearly 1,300 responses. Officers were now looking at collating the themes that were coming through from those responses, as well as looking to run a series of workshops with PSB partners over the next few months ahead of publishing a draft Wellbeing Assessment later in the autumn and bring that Assessment to this Committee as part of the consultation process.

Councillor Dr. Johnson referred to Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee being the lead Scrutiny Committee and asked to what extent other Scrutiny Committees had been made aware of work that would have been relevant to their remit. He further asked whether an evaluation of how impactful work had been over the last two years.

In response, the Head of Policy and Business Transformation advised that other Committees would have been made aware of the PSB work through quarterly performance reporting, as well as through individual reported updates. Further work was to be undertaken collectively to raise the profile of initiatives that were linked to PSB activities. With regards the evaluation of individual schemes, the Annual Report attempted to evaluate the performance of schemes and looked to develop priorities over the 5-year plan.

The Chair referred to the PSB's 4 priority workstreams on page 4 of the report requesting that these be referred to their respective Scrutiny Committees:

- Move More Eat Well Plan be referred to Healthy Living and Social Care Scrutiny Committee, and possibly Learning and Culture Scrutiny Committee.
- Tackling Climate Change to Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.
- Pathfinder Project – Timebanking be referred to Homes and Safe Communities Scrutiny Committee.
- Organisational Learning Project – Improving Engagement be referred to Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

The Chair asked when it would be possible to have these reports presented to those Committees and added to their respective work plans. The Principal Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer advised that it was possible for Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee to make recommendations to Cabinet in this regard.

No.

Councillor Sivagnanam sought clarity as to why such matters had not been reported to other Committees previously. The Head of Policy and Business Transformation confirmed that the Future Generations legislation required there to be a lead Committee and Cabinet had agreed that that lead Committee be the Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee, but there was nothing to stop individual reports going to individual Scrutiny Committees and reported back to Corporate Performance and Resources Scrutiny Committee as the lead Committee.

Committee, having considered the reference and the report, subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the report and reference be noted.
- (2) T H A T Cabinet be requested to consider recommending that the Public Services Board's 4 priority workstreams on page 4 of the report be referred to the respective Scrutiny Committees and form part of the Committees' work plans.

Reason for recommendations

- (1) Having regard to the contents of the report and reference and discussions at the meeting.
- (2) In order for Cabinet to consider that the priority workstreams are reported to the respective Scrutiny Committees for consideration.

388 ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN MONITORING REPORT: QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE 2021/22 (MD) –

The performance report presented the Council's progress at Quarter 1 (1st April to 30th June, 2021) towards achieving its Annual Delivery Plan (2021/22) commitments as aligned to its Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives. The Head of Policy and Business Transformation, in presenting the report, provided Committee with an overview PowerPoint presentation. The Council had made positive progress in delivering its in-year commitments in relation to its Annual Delivery Plan (2021/22). This performance had contributed to an overall Green status for the Plan at Quarter 1 (Q1).

All 4 Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives had been attributed a Green performance status at Q1 to reflect the progress made to date. This was positive given the ongoing challenges arising from the pandemic.

Of the 7 actions attributed a Red performance status during the quarter, 29% (2) were directly as a result of service reprioritisation measures undertaken in response to the impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. In relation to these areas work was now recommencing as part of the Council's recovery plans and strategy. The presentation also advised of progress in relation to Coronavirus recovery and highlighted issues pertinent to the Committee's remit. This Coronavirus recovery

No.

update formed part of quarterly performance reporting to ensure Members maintained an oversight of the recovery issues impacting on the work of their respective Committees. From this perspective, Members were requested to note the progress to date in relation to Coronavirus recovery.

Of the 42 quarterly performance measures aligned to the Council's Corporate Plan Well-being Objectives, data was reported for 34 measures where a performance status was applicable. 50% (17) measures were attributed a Green performance Status, 17% (6) an Amber status and 33% (11) a Red status. In relation to the 11 measures attributed a Red performance status during the quarter, the impact of COVID-19 had contributed to 54% (6) missing target.

The report also sought Elected Members' consideration of Q1 performance results and the proposed remedial actions to address areas of identified underperformance. Upon consideration, the Scrutiny Committee was recommended to refer their views and any recommendations to Cabinet for their consideration.

Councillor John referred to the work of the Dementia Working Group and advised that in light of his experience with the subject, he would like to contribute to their work if possible.

Councillor Driscoll drew attention to emails from constituents that he had been made aware of to C1V where responses were taking over three weeks to be actioned. The Head of Service apologised for the delays due to staff absences and technical issues advising that he had been made aware that the current oldest email for attention was dated 17th September. He further advised that C1V were being supported by colleagues in HR to address the issues.

Councillor Carroll asked whether enquiries needed to be reported to be logged with C1V or undertaken directly with Service Areas. The Head of Service advised that it was important for the enquiries to be directed to C1V in order that these could be logged and tracked.

The Chair in referring to paragraph 3.2.1 of Appendix A, 'What have we done well', and asked for some further information on a possible date for the Stage 3 business case submission to Welsh Government and the Barry Docks Interchange study. He further asked what was meant by a town centre first approach to retail, in terms of the planning system.

The Head of Service drew attention to the Beggars Pound application, which was a planning application submitted by Welsh Government for outline planning permission to demolish existing buildings and erect a Class B floor space of up to 3,000 square metres. The application included the provision of land to the Council to be able to improve the active travel route. The Head of Service advised that the Stage 3 business case related to the transport interchange at Barry and Barry Docks station. The town centre first approach related to Welsh Government's Transforming Towns programme, and the Head of Service agreed to provide information to Members on this having regard to targeted grants to improve the public realm.

No.

The Chair in referring to Page 21 of the document in respect of carbon off-setting and the grass cutting regime commented that it would be interesting to measure the benefits, e.g. increased biodiversity. The Head of Service said that the Council's Biodiversity Forward Work Plan was the mechanism for achieving that and would circulate the latest version of that Plan to Committee Members for information.

The Chair also referred to Page 23 enquiring when the Waste Management Strategy would be available. The Chair was advised that there would be a briefing to the Council's Cabinet in October which would include a reference on to the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee. The anticipated implementation date for the Strategy was April 2022.

Following the discussions at the meeting, it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the performance results and progress towards achieving the Annual Delivery Plan 2021/22 commitments as aligned to the Council's Corporate Plan Wellbeing Objectives within the remit of the Committee be noted.
- (2) T H A T the remedial actions to be taken to address areas of underperformance and to tackle the key challenges identified within the remit of the Committee be noted.
- (3) T H A T the progress being made through the Council's Recovery Strategy and Directorate Recovery Plans in response to the ongoing Coronavirus pandemic be noted.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1&2) Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.
- (3) To ensure Members maintain an oversight of the recovery issues impacting on the work of the Council and their respective Scrutiny Committee.

389 ENFORCED SALE POLICY (REF) –

The reference from Cabinet of 19th July, 2021 was presented to Committee as contained within the agenda.

The Principal Regeneration Officer advised Committee that the use of enforcement action whether using Planning legislation, the Building Act or environmental health legislation was always an option of last resort, and enforcement action was usually a means to engage with a property owner to bring about a positive outcome. Paragraph 2.7 of the report listed the checks and balances that would be used before the presentation of any case for use of the Policy.

Councillor John thanked the Principal Regeneration Officer for the detailed report and stated that he was happy with the report and its recommendations.

No.

Councillor Carroll asked if there were a number of cases that would be expected annually that would require use of the Policy. The Principal Regeneration Officer said that over the last 6 to 12 months there had only been one property in this regard and a potential property but there was still engagement ongoing currently with the owners. The officer stated that it was his view there would be a very small number of properties that could potentially be considered. Councillor Carroll further stated that in his view, as long as the Policy was a last course of action to be used with other methods being pursued he would be happy to endorse the recommendations.

Councillor Driscoll queried that if there was already a charge on the property would the matter not proceed, or would a second charge be made or would the Council force a sale. In referring to Appendix 1 he stated the impression was that officers were looking for empty properties and asked whether there would be charges for officer time, whether the proceeds would go to the owner and if an owner could not be traced, what would happen to the proceeds.

The Principal Officer responded that paragraphs 4.2 and 4.5 of the Cabinet report referred to these issues advising that officer time would be recoverable including legal, surveying, marketing and officer time under administrative costs. In terms of legal charges, each case would be different due to the condition of the property, where it was, the valuation etc., and so those specifics would need to be known.

Having regard to a further query from Councillor Driscoll relating to bringing back 10% of all empty properties into habitable use, the Principal Officer stated an annual survey of all of the county's empty private sector dwellings was undertaken and on average there were 800 empty private sector dwellings in the Vale of Glamorgan.

The Chair said he felt there had been a constructive debate and good questions asked by Members and in his view considered that the policy was a good policy being long overdue.

The Committee having considered the reference and the report and being in agreement with the policy and the Chair's comments subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the report and reference be noted.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and reference and discussions at the meeting.

390 WELSH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT LOCAL ELECTIONS (PRINCIPAL AREAS) (WALES) RULES 2021 AND DRAFT LOCAL ELECTIONS (COMMUNITIES) (WALES) RULES 2021 (MD) –

The Returning Officer (RO) and Electoral Registration Officer in presenting the report as pre Cabinet Scrutiny referred to the ongoing consultation by Welsh Government regarding the draft Local Elections (Principal Areas) (Wales) Rules 2021 and the

No.

draft Local Elections (Communities) (Wales) Rules 2021 and set out at Appendix A, a draft response to the consultation.

The RO drew attention to the Executive Summary and the key proposed changes to the Rules governing Principal Council and Town / Community Council (T/CC) Elections which in particular related to:

- enabling powers for the RO to offer online provisions for obtaining and submission of nomination papers;
- requiring self-nomination by Candidates for Principal Council and T/CC elections;
- broadening the provisions relating to descriptions a Candidate may use on the nomination paper;
- allowing “Wales”, “Welsh”, “Cymru” or “Cymreig” to be prefixed or suffixed to a political party name or descriptor;
- introducing a requirement for the completion of a home address form with the option of the home address not to be made public or published on the ballot papers;
- the requirement for the Candidate to declare on the nomination papers if they are/or have been members of a registered political party in the last 12 months (other than the party for which they were seeking to stand in the Election in question);
- broadening the options relating to commonly used names;
- permitting for Principal Council Elections only, the option for Candidates to provide a personal statement, and arrangements for publication of the same by the Returning Officer.

The RO also drew attention to two specific issues, firstly at Question 2 and the need for robust processes and procedures coupled with a stable ICT platform and preferably a centrally provided portal, given the potential risks to systems failure in the context of the strict statutory cut-off for the receipt of nominations; and Question 9 regarding personal statements, advising Members of the suggested need for additional measures akin to those in the Police and Crime Commissioner Elections Order 2012 and the potential conflict of the use of the Council’s website for the publication of personal statements during the pre-election period and the associated statutory provision also highlighted. The Leader had also shared an additional point with the RO in respect of Question 11 being that the Rules should require individuals standing for election to be on the Register of Electors where they lived, this would assist with confirming identity.

During the discussion Councillor Thomas queried if the new provisions would now not require the ten signatures on a nomination paper, as previously required, which was confirmed to be the case by the RO. Following a query from the Chair regarding the 3 mile rule, the RO advised that the existing qualifying criteria would continue to apply, it being noted that the 3 mile rule related to nomination to T/CCs Councillor Carroll expressed concern regarding the provision of statements for party membership as it was his personal view this was politicising T/CCs which he considered was not appropriate. Councillor Sivagnanam however, disagreed with this view advising that she considered it was important members of the public had an

No.

idea of a person's political background. Councillor John echoed Councillor Sivagnanam's comments.

Councillor King, with permission to speak, stated he endorsed Councillor Carroll's view for independence as a TCC rep but understood why the provision had been made.

The RO advised that a candidate would continue to be able to stand as an independent Member but that there would be requirement to declare affiliation to a party.

With regard to the provision for personal statements, the Chair sought the Committee's views on this. The RO advised that she considered that further guidance and rigour needed to be provided and that learning from the Police and Crime Commissioner's Elections Order 2012 would assist here. The Chair wondered from an equalities perspective if support could be provided to Candidates in writing / typing personal statements with the RO advising that enquiries would be made to ascertain organisations that candidates could be signposted to.

Following a vote as to whether Members agreed with the option of a personal statement to be provided by candidates for Principal Council elections it was

RECOMMENDED – T H A T Cabinet be informed of the Committee's agreement to the option of a personal statement to be provided by candidates for Principal Council elections and of the Committee's discussions at the meeting.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

391 REVIEW OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP TEAM STRUCTURE (REF) –

In view of conflicts of interest with regard to the contents of the report Members of the Senior Leadership Team withdrew from the meeting when the matter was to be considered. The Leader set the scene for the review report advising that he had been pleased that all Group Leaders had agreed it was timely to undertake a review. The report had been placed on the agenda in light of the fact that the matter was due to be considered by Full Council on 28th September, 2021 and the reference from Cabinet of 13th September, 2021 which had not been available at the time of agenda despatch had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Steve James, the External HR consultant, had following an objective procurement process been commissioned from the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) to undertake the review of the Council's Senior Leadership Team Structure. The consultant presented the report in the form of a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of the contents which included details of the structural changes required to build the senior level capacity and capability to drive the transformational changes to service delivery required in the Corporate Plan,

No.

ensure appropriate operational leadership and management to maximise opportunities from the emerging national and regional agenda and develop a leadership direction that provided the basis for an organisation structure for 2022/23 and beyond that would embed the capacity and capability needed to fully implement the new operating model and deliver services as envisaged in the Corporate Plan.

The consultant in conclusion reiterated that the review confirmed that the Vale Council within budget and to a high standard was successful at delivering services, however, given finite resources and the strategic pressures on the Council to meet increasing demand for services and to respond to national and regional opportunities for growth and partnership working these could not currently be met from the current leadership structure.

The current Senior Leadership structure and recommended structure were detailed at Appendices 4 and 5 attached to the report.

Following the presentation, a member of the public who had registered to speak on the matter was introduced by the Chair to make their representations.

K. Medhurst thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak and commenced by stating that in May the Head of Human Resources in conjunction with the Leader had commissioned Solace in Business Ltd to undertake a review of the Council's senior management structure. In August Solace in Business Ltd received 2 payments from the Council's general fund totalling £7,930. Mrs. Medhurst asked the Scrutiny Committee to confirm if these payments had been for the Review and if they met the criteria of 'best value' and to establish if Solace in Business Ltd would be undertaking further work for the Council regarding the senior management shake-up. The incumbent Managing Director had been in post since May 2015 and had been appointed unanimously by the Senior Management Appointments Committee for a post that had been publicly advertised. The Committee having been supported by external consultants Solace Enterprises Ltd. Since November 2018 she stated the Managing Director had been the Chair of the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers (Solace Group) Ltd Wales branch – the parent company of Solace in Business Ltd. Solace in Business Ltd was the successor company to Solace Enterprises Ltd. Based on these facts, Mrs. Medhurst advised that she had "concerns that the appointment of Solace in Business Ltd to undertake the Review was truly objective as stated in paragraph [1.1] of the Report to Cabinet."

In referring specifically to the report Mrs. Medhurst referred to the title 'Responsible Officer' to the external HR consultant being not a Council Officer. Documents prepared by an external source and always she stated been appended to or shown as a link in a 'Responsible Officer's Report'. Mrs. Medhurst asked the Scrutiny Committee to consider whether this was an abuse of the democratic process to "mask" the involvement of Solace in Business Ltd a 'profit for purpose' company because she stated there was no reference in the Report to the company. Mrs. Medhurst also stated that with regard to paragraph [4.13] of the Report the Scrutiny Committee must subject the comment 'It has been clarified that this post will not need to be advertised as the current post holder is already designated as Head of Paid Service' to vigorous scrutiny. Mrs. Medhurst concluded by commenting that "whoever is appointed in the newly created posts of Chief Executive, Director of

No.

Place and Director of Corporate Resources then as a matter of law they must be appointed 'on merit'. Should any current senior manager be the subject of disciplinary action or misconduct allegations that remain unresolved because the Appeals Committee or the Investigating Committee has either not convened or are yet to complete their deliberations on the case then clearly such a senior manager cannot be considered for a newly created post 'on merit' unless and until their name is cleared".

Following Mrs. Medhurst's representations the Chair, having thanked Mrs. Medhurst, afforded Committee Members the opportunity to raise questions and discuss the report.

Councillor Carroll took the opportunity to thank the consultant for the opportunity to consider the review at other sessions with Group Leaders and acknowledged the statutory provision within legislation for the Head of Paid Service to be titled Chief Executive. However, he had concerns regarding justifying the costs of the two Director posts of Corporate Resources and Place to the public.

The consultant in response stated the report set out his findings in respect of the brief he had been provided in meeting the objectives of the Corporate Plan, the broader ambitions of the Council and the potential risks of a relatively flat structure going forward for the delivery of such matters. The structure had therefore been positioned as an investment opportunity to ensure delivery and mitigation of risk.

Councillor John enquired of the consultant as to whether, in his view, the Council had made the wrong decision in previous years in dispensing with the role of Chief Executive and in dealing with savings required to be made by the Authority. The consultant advised that at that time Councils in England and Wales were responding to significant and immediate needs in the context of reduced budgets and service priorities at that time. The issue now he stated was about maximising opportunities in order to deliver the ambitions in the Corporate Plan which the two new posts would help to deliver.

Councillor Moore advised that prior to consideration of a review a synopsis had been undertaken as to where the Council was, how the Council should move forward, having regard to legislation, the impact of Covid 19 and recovery and provide an opportunity to rethink what was needed to ensure the Council continued to remain the best Authority in Wales.

Councillor Burnett, with permission to speak, stated that she was still ambitious for the Council, but appreciated what the Council had asked its officers to do as a result of the pandemic which in her view maybe she said had been a bit too much. The role of Chief Executive was a legislative requirement which the Council had to address, and the Council also needed to look strategically at Place going forward and what the public would want the Vale to look like.

Councillor Moore, in referring to the position of Chief Executive, stated that he had taken advice from Welsh Government as to whether the position of Chief Executive needed to be advertised and had been advised that it did not as the Chief Executive

No.

was the Head of Paid Service which the Managing Director was. The two Director positions would however need to be advertised for open competition.

Councillor Sivagnanam commented that the Council was indeed ambitious but that also it could not deliver what the Council needed to deliver going forward with a lean Management structure. Councillor Sivagnanam also recommended that Cabinet be asked to note the comments made by Mrs. Medhurst in her representations.

Councillor Thomas, in referring to the previous discussions with regard to the CJsCs item earlier in the agenda, stated that Local Government was changing and he was happy to support the report.

Councillor Driscoll sought confirmation as to how many Councils in Wales had a similar structure to that being proposed with the consultant referring to a number of Councils in Wales, including Cardiff and Swansea, which operated with director roles as those being proposed in the revised structure.

The Chair having regard to the fact that the report was being considered by Council on Tuesday, 28th September, 2021, sought Members' views as to the recommendations of Cabinet. There being no dissent from the majority of Members save for Councillor Carroll and Councillor Driscoll, who wished their views to be recorded in the minutes that they could not support the two new Director roles identified in the report, it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the Cabinet report be accepted, that Cabinet be requested to reflect on the concerns of Mrs. Medhurst as outlined above and that the views of the Committee be also forwarded to Full Council for the meeting on 28th September, 2021 as requested by Cabinet.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report, representations, and discussions at the meeting.

392 MATTER WHICH THE CHAIRMAN HAD DECIDED WAS URGENT –

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the following matter, which the Chairman had decided was urgent for the reason given beneath the minute heading, be considered.

393 DRAFT RESPONSE TO WELSH GOVERNMENT' CONSULTATION ON THE CORPORATE JOINT COMMITTEES: DRAFT STATUTORY GUIDANCE (L) – **(Urgent by reason of the need that the Council's response to the consultation needed to be with Welsh Government by 4th October, 2021 as opposed to 28th September, 2021)**

The matter had been placed on the agenda as an urgent item for consideration by the Committee by the Chair and the Monitoring Officer advised that the deadline for the response to the consultation to Welsh Government was 4th October, 2021 as

No.

opposed to 28th September, 2021. The Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021 created the framework for a consistent mechanism for regional collaboration between local government, namely Corporate Joint Committees (CJCs) and provided for the establishment of CJCs through Regulations.

Welsh Government had been consulting on the introduction of regulations and guidance to accompany the introduction of CJCs over the last year and the report sought endorsement from Cabinet of the Council's response (at Appendix A to the report) to the latest consultation regarding the guidance which supported the setting up of the four CJCs which are separate bodies. The document also highlighted the key principles underpinning the development of the guidance. Consultation on further legislation for the operation of the CJCs and its functions was planned for the Autumn of 2021 and a further consultation in the Spring of 2022 would cover any remaining provisions which a CJC might need but which were unlikely to be needed at the point at which they began to deliver their functions. Further reports to Cabinet would follow in due course.

The Chair commented that one of his concerns was around the democratic process and the need to ensure adequate representation on the Committees as they were not directly elected bodies and would be dealing with major issues. The Chair asked the Leader if he had any further detail he could share on the proposals and how they would work in terms of the Scrutiny function. In response the Leader advised that in terms of Scrutiny this would need to be addressed as there would need to be a mechanism for reporting back to the respective Local Authorities and that the detail for the CJCs would fully operate was not yet fully known. The Monitoring Officer's view was that it was important that the role of Scrutiny was raised, that it had been referred to in the draft response set out in Appendix A, and that officers would also prefer that the role was embedded in the legislation.

Councillor Thomas considered that although there were a number of questions in respect of the detail of how they would work, CJCs had now been enshrined in legislation. Councillor King, in echoing the Leader's comments, stated that he was also of the view that CJCs would be in a better position to deliver the services required.

In noting that further updates would be provided on the matter in due course and there being no dissent to the response, it was subsequently

RECOMMENDED – T H A T Cabinet be requested to consider in the response the views of the Scrutiny Committee in relation to the role of the Scrutiny of Corporate Joint Committees being adequately provided for.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and the response at Appendix A.