Scrutiny Committee

28 September 2016

9.30 am, Colman & Cavell Rooms
South Norfolk House, Cygnet Court,
Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available

Contact: Sue Elliott on 01508 533669 or democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Cllr L Neal (Chairman)
Cllr T Lewis (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr B Bernard
Cllr B Duffin
Cllr D Fulcher
Cllr C Gould
Cllr K Kiddie
Cllr G Minshull
Cllr J Wilby

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however anyone who wishes to do so must inform the chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council’s guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.
Agenda

1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972. Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency;

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members; (Please see guidance attached page 6)

4. To confirm the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 28 June 2016; (copy attached – page 7)

5. Review of Route Optimisation Delivery; (report attached – page 13)

6. Scrutiny Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda; (attached – page 21)
Working style of the Scrutiny Committee and a protocol for those attending

Independence
Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership
Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee’s questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council’s activities.

A constructive atmosphere
Meetings of the Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust
Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency
The Committee’s business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee’s meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.

Consensus
Members of the Committee will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.
Impartial and independent officer advice
Officers who advise and support the Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee in the Council's arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review
There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.

Programming and planning
The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work. Members will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

Managing time
The Committee will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

Members are asked to declare any interests they have in the meeting. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates.

- In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote on the matter.
- If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed.
- If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting.
- Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.
- In any case, members have the right to remove themselves from the meeting or the voting if they consider, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to do so.

Should Members have any concerns relating to interests they have, they are encouraged to contact the Monitoring Officer (or Deputy) or another member of the Democratic Services Team in advance of the meeting.
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on 28 June 2016 at 9.30am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: L Neal (Chairman), B Bernard, B Duffin, D Fulcher, C Gould, K Kiddie, T Lewis and G Minshull

Apologies: Councillor: J Wilby

Substitute: Councillor: M Wilby

Cabinet Members in Attendance: Councillors: Y Bendle, J Fuller, L Hornby and C Hudson

Other Members in attendance: Councillors: D Bills, L Dale, M Gray, C Kemp, J Mooney and V Thomson

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Business Development (D Lorimer), the Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Director of Community Services (P Boyce), the Governance and Business Manager (L Mickleborough) and the Scrutiny Officer (E Goddard)
MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 18 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL

Cllr Fuller introduced the report to members and advised the Committee that the Devolution Deal proposal took account of an increase in overall funding since the original Deal was put forward; bringing the total infrastructure funding available to £25m per year for the next 30 years. The proposal also included additional funding allocated to housing so that a total of £130m was ring-fenced over five years to deliver new homes, although members noted that it was unlikely that the Council would receive much of these funds as the Council no longer managed housing stock, and because the needs for funding were greater elsewhere. Cllr Fuller stressed that this was by far the most financially generous Deal offered by the Government, although he was disappointed that agreement had not been reached on a Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Deal.

The Director of Business Development delivered a presentation to the Committee, which had been received by Council Leaders the previous week. She outlined the key benefits of the Deal, including how it could assist the region and councils to achieve national recognition. It would also increase the influence of the participating Authorities and improve the life chances of Norfolk and Suffolk residents. Members noted aspects of the governance arrangements and how the public would be consulted. The Committee also noted the timeline in relation to the progression of the Deal; including consideration by Cabinet on Thursday 30 June 2016 and the final sign off in October 2016, which would eventually lead to an Order in the House of Commons. In light of the recent result in the European Union (EU) referendum, members noted the proposal to remove the reference to EU funding from paragraph 12 of the Deal document.

The Chairman outlined the format of the meeting, advising that questions should be tabled in line with the issues raised by Council in October 2015, as detailed in the report. Members raised the following points:

Finance

In response to a question regarding how much Devolution would cost, particularly funding for a Combined Authority Mayor, members were advised that this was still unknown as questions remained relating to the level of Government funding, staffing required for the Mayor and whether staff would be devolved from the civil service to the Combined Authority. However, the Committee noted that the Combined Authority would be able to raise precepts, which would be used to cover expenditure incurred by the Mayor or in
connection with the exercise of the Mayoral function. The Combined Authority could levy the constituent authorities to pay for its expenses. The constituent Authority had agreed the principle that the Combined Authority costs would be met as far as possible from existing resources. Precise details regarding levels of business rates were yet to be defined, but the Mayor could decide to raise a 2p increase in the business rates to fund growth.

In terms of members’ allowances, the Committee noted that the individual Councils would provide allowances to their members who had a role on the Combined Authority and that any Special Responsibility Allowance would be considered by the individual Council’s Independent Remuneration Panel.

In response to a member’s question, the Committee was advised that the funding detailed in the Deal was largely made up of existing finance, however the Deal represented an opportunity for the Council to have more control over how these funds were spent.

**Strategic Transport**

Members were advised that the budget allocated to transport related to general maintenance of roads in Norfolk and Suffolk and could not be used for improvements to infrastructure, such as new roads, river crossings or highway dualling. Improvements to infrastructure were likely to be financed from borrowing and funds allocated to the LEP, with the risk of borrowing shared by the members of the Combined Authority. Members noted that improvements to the A140 could be secured through further borrowing via the Single Investment Fund and would greatly benefit both Norfolk and Suffolk, however any improvements to the A47 were a separate issue and control over this would remain with central Government and would not be devolved.

In response to questions relating to rail and bus transport, members were advised of the benefits to the region of increased interaction with Network Rail and the planned upgrading of the Ely junction, which would be felt across the region. Members were pleased to note the possibility of a discount card that residents could use on both bus and rail travel, which would cover Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire.

**Double Devolution**

The Committee discussed possible services that might be devolved and considered services that could be provided by a single team covering the Combined Authority area, rather than separate teams in each District, such as economic development.
Members discussed the future role of town and parish councils and if any services might be devolved down. Members noted that no firm decision had been made regarding this, and the Governance and Business Manager advised the Committee that this would require careful consideration and discussion regarding whether town and parish councils were best placed to deliver specific services.

**Geography**

In response to a query regarding whether the Government was supportive of the brother/sister relationship between the Norfolk/Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Combined Authorities, members were advised that although this was not initially the preferred choice, the Government was supportive of this.

Members noted the shift in focus to ‘travel to work areas’, which would form clusters around key economic centres, however, the Committee was also advised that rural issues would not be ignored.

It was noted that geographically, Diss was well placed in the centre of the Combined Authority area. This was recognised as a great opportunity for the town and could increase its influence.

**Governance**

Cllr Kemp addressed the Committee on the subject of Governance and advised that there were a number of anomalies in the documents that would need to be addressed. Members were reassured any issues would be rectified as the Deal progressed.

Members noted the details regarding voting arrangements and recent changes which would mean the Mayor no longer having a casting vote, resulting in a motion being lost in the event of an equality of votes. In response to a question regarding whether weighted voting might be allowed, the Committee noted that this was unlikely, however were advised that a veto would be granted to authorities when considering matters that were the statutory duty of the relevant authority. The Committee was also advised that governance arrangements would allow for non-voting members to be co-opted onto the Combined Authority from time to time.

The Committee discussed provisions relating to the Combined Authority’s Scrutiny Committee and noted that the Chairman was not permitted to be of the same party as the Mayor to safeguard the scrutiny function.

Members were advised that there was uncertainty over the exact future of the Deal and continuing support of the Government, in light of the EU referendum result and the consequent changes in the leadership of the Government.
Key Benefits

In response to a member’s query regarding possible implications on health provision, the Committee was advised that this was still unknown and that it was expected that this level of detail could be included in future Deals.

Members discussed the public consultation and were keen for all authorities involved to develop a consistent message for use throughout the consultation. The Committee agreed that the literature would need to consist of no more than five key benefits of the Deal to be presented to the public, concluding that the material needed to be clear and brief.

Concerns were raised regarding how the public consultation would be carried out and how parish and town councils would be involved. In response to a query regarding the Town and Parish Consultation, members were reassured that officers would work with town and parish councils and would address clerks at the next Parish Clerks Consultation meeting.

It was then:

RESOLVED: 1. To note the progress made in relation to addressing the issues raised by Full Council in October 2015.

2. TO RECOMMEND THAT CABINET

   a. Agrees that the Leader of the Council should sign the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Agreement and supports the publication of a Scheme of Governance for public consultation. Consultation literature should be uniform across Norfolk and Suffolk and present a consistent message, focusing on no more than five key benefits for residents.

   b. Notes the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee in relation to governance arrangements, and address these concerns to the governance team working on the Deal.
The Committee noted the Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda.

(The meeting concluded at 12:15 pm)
Review of Route Optimisation Delivery

Report of Bob Wade, Head of Environmental Services
Cabinet Member: Cllr Mrs. K. Mason Billig, Environment and Recycling

CONTACT
Bob Wade 01508 533787
bwade@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 During 2015/16 South Norfolk Council (SNC) embarked on a review of its in-house waste and recycling collection routes and rounds. Every house in South Norfolk requires collection of waste and recycling material, making 116,000 separate collections every two weeks. This report summarises the drivers for the changes, describes the planning and analysis that was undertaken ahead of implementing the new waste and recycling rounds on 6 June 2016 and customer feedback since the new routes went live.

1.2 This report has been prepared in line with the Committee's brief which is to ‘Review the Council's waste collection round remodelling in June 2016 and assess whether it has realised the objectives sought and achieved the financial savings anticipated. Members to make any recommendations as required.”

2. Background

2.1 As a Waste Collection Authority, SNC has a legal duty to arrange for the collection of household waste including recyclable materials in its area under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Members will recall that in this context, Norfolk County Council is the Waste Disposal Authority and as the names suggests under the same legislation, Norfolk CC has a legal duty to arrange the treatment and/or disposal of households wastes that this council collects. Together with the other district, city and borough councils and the county council we work under the auspices of the Norfolk Waste Partnership.

2.2 In terms of SNC’s collection methods, the legislation does not prescribe exactly how this duty should be discharged. Like many councils SNC provides a separate alternate weekly kerbside collection service for waste and recyclable materials. As part of our service the crews will help residents in need of physical help to wheel the bins from the property to the kerbside by virtue of a requested 'assisted collection'. The size of containers and the frequency of collections are determined by each district council.

2.3 Given passage of time since the then waste and recycling rounds were established in 2003/04, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, officers embarked on detailed analysis during 2015/16 of modelling new waste and recycling collection routes in order to future-proof the service. The data modelling as part of this project took into consideration the following parameters:
• Current number of properties served for collections – households and commercial properties
• Predicted housing growth across the district area for the next 2 and make ready for 5 years
• The need to ensure the service remains cost effective and as efficient as possible
• The need to provide an easy to use, reliable collection service for residents
• The changing location of local waste transfer stations used for onward treatment/disposal – these were re-procured by the County Council in November 2015

2.4 Prior to route optimisation, the Council operated 16 collection rounds; 13 large vehicle rounds and 3 ‘mini’ rounds. Over recent years the number of properties in the district has grown in line with the Council’s economic prosperity and growth agenda from around 55,000 households in 2012 to over 58,000 currently with another 5,000 properties planned to 2019/20. In terms of our collection rounds, the historic growth to date had been accommodated by work arounds e.g. adding properties as they were completed to the most convenient collection round. This had meant that a number of the collection rounds were unbalanced with variable work demands on crews. This in turn was impacting on efficiency and not making the best use of our resources.

2.5 In addition in March 2016 the County Council’s contracts for waste transfer station and disposal locations across Norfolk came to an end which meant that during 2015, the County had to procure new contracts with potentially different waste transfer locations. This level of uncertainty therefore had to be factored in to our scenarios for round and route modelling. In the middle of the project (in late November 2015) the outcome of the County Council’s procurement was announced which culminated in SNC being directed to a single residual waste transfer location at Costessey from 1 April 2016. Previously SNC’s routes were established to deliver waste to Costessey and Pulham Market.

3. Rounds optimisation

3.1 In depth modelling of scenarios was undertaken on the resource requirements, costs, possible savings, risks and benefits for future proofing the service. The modelling undertaken looked at the logistical operation of the service to ensure resources are balanced, that productivity is optimised and collection rounds are organised to ensure they can accommodate new properties. Key determinants of productivity include the location of the depot facility, the transfer location(s) for recycling and for waste, and collection round productivity. Given the council’s budgetary pressure within the context of the Medium Term Plan and the need to service a growing number of properties, a range of factors were considered:
Permutations of routing and size of each collection round depending upon whether it was a ‘recycling week’ or a ‘refuse week’ i.e. variable week on week rounds as well as the same (or mirrored) waste and recycling routes/rounds per week

- The customer experience, how we communicate changes and the level of ongoing service required
- The risk and benefits of 5-day and a 4-day working week with variable length of the working day
- The potential cost/savings per option given the anticipated locations of future transfer locations

3.2 After much deliberation and due diligence to mitigate risk including cross-checking on deliverability with the frontline workforce and union representatives, a 4-day collection week based with one residual waste transfer location was the final chosen option.

3.3 Bearing in mind the growth in housing numbers inherited and those predicted for the next two years, the final optimised service was modelled to deliver with 17 rounds; 15 large vehicle rounds and 2 small rounds.

3.4 A comprehensive communications plan was developed involving a customer pack sent to each household/commercial waste customer, media and social media and member and parish/town briefings. Concurrently extensive operational preparations were made in route checking, workforce and individual briefings. This was accompanied by measures to manage risk and operationally manage the transition to the new service.

4. Outcomes

4.1 The 4-day week collection service went live on 7 June 2016 and we have been operating the new 4-day service model for three months. Given the scale of the change and expanse of the service i.e. delivered to every household in the district, it is fair to say that the project was ambitious. A cross-council project team worked to deliver the requirements from communications and marketing, to IT systems, HR, data analysis and operational practicalities. The ultimate beneficiaries of these changes are likely to be council tax payers over the next two years. The benefits of the new service include:

- The council maintaining a reliable alternate weekly service for less cost whilst taking on a greater number of properties.
- Improved productivity and equity of work allocated to each collection round.
- Avoidance of the need for residents to remember to place bins out for emptying one day late after Monday Bank Holidays.
• No Saturday ‘catch up’ after Monday Bank Holidays other than Christmas and Easter.
• Making Mondays a day dedicated to either essential maintenance/checks on the fleet or provision of commercial waste collections.
• Ensuring we have an optimised set of collection routes that can be maintained by officers and updated over the next two years by virtue of the council purchasing the software package which maps and builds the routes.

4.2 The risks in relation to moving to a 4-day week which have largely been mitigated include:
• Communicating the day change and new Bank Holiday arrangements with residents. A comprehensive multi-channel communications plan was implemented up to the ‘go live’ date and for 4 weeks after to end of July 2016.
• This was a major change to service model for customers with enhanced risk of service disruption during transition. Whilst the Council experienced a rise in number of reported missed bin collections, the level of reporting was minimal when compared to the total number of collections made.
• It was established that 84% of customers would have some form of a collection day change. As a consequence, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, officers increased the one-off communications budget for the project to ensure the information pack included bin stickers as well as an explanation leaflet and a keep safe collection calendar. Members may be interested to know that we require fourteen different permutations of collection calendar in order to explain collection dates clearly to residents.
• Longer service days with tighter time constraints on productivity; therefore if service disruption occurs due to vehicle breakdown for example, there is less opportunity to recover the situation the same day. This is being mitigated by use of the Monday for proactive maintenance checks and programmed parts replacement. We also work with three spare vehicles on standby.

4.3 Within the first 5 weeks, the Council received a heightened number of missed bin reports which were managed on an individual basis working with the crews and in liaison with the respective householder. For comparison purposes, the typical level of justified missed bins per week ranges between 10 and 20 (Extrapolated from the 2015/16 Annual Performance Outturn Report Local Indicator LI263 i.e. 22 per 100,000 collections. To also note, the 2016/17 year end outturn target for LI263 is 30 per 100,000 collections). However a comparatively small proportion of properties were experiencing repeated missed collections (Weeks 7 and 8), which then resulted in officers modifying some of the routes servicing the south of the district. This resulted in 247 properties
having a further collection day change to a Friday in order to address a vehicle weight capacity issue on the waste week. The change appears to have returned the service to its typically reliable service level.

![Reported Missed Bin Collections](image)

**Number of reported missed bins (w/c 6 June to w/c 29th August 2016)**

4.4 The Council received some direct compliments and other comments in relation to the general route optimisation project and the content/design of the residents’ information pack. Examples are shown below:

I am very sorry that, due to reorganisation, our regular collection crew will no longer be calling on us. [They] have become more like friends than bin men; they always have time for a friendly greeting ….. I accept that change has to happen sometimes, and I wish the lads well with their new round. They are a credit to South Norfolk Council and I hope that they are appreciated.

Just to say full marks on a really understandable info leaflet and guide to the changes. Great visuals as well. It must be really difficult to get the message across to so many different individuals and I am really impressed at the simplicity and clarity that you have managed to achieve. Please make sure this gets to all concerned.
4.5 In relation to public understanding of the new service, we have learnt that beyond the initial communications plan period, the council needs to continue to reinforce the service change – especially in relation to Monday Bank Holidays. This will be particularly important ahead of Christmas given the way the Bank Holiday falls during this time. Officers will continue to work with local ward members as well as via the Council’s Link Magazine, social media channels and Town/Parish Council communication channels to ensure residents are aware that, other than at Christmas and Easter, there is no day change for a standard Bank Holiday.

4.6 In relation to revenue savings, clearly with only three months beyond implementation it is a little early to measure the level of savings. However there is no reason to suggest that the saving target over the next two years will not be met.

5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 Clearly the change to the service involved a number of risks which were managed as part of the project management of the service. Whilst it is recognised that there were a few issues with some aspects of the delivery of the changes, the issues and risks in terms of service interruption, customer impact and reputation have now diminished.

- There has been a positive financial impact notwithstanding that the full effect will not be realised until end of Year 2 (2017/18) and is being monitored in Year 1.
- The optimised service poses no greater risk to the Council than the previous and the general service risks remain unchanged.
- There is no change to any impact on disadvantaged groups from the service.
- There is no change to any impact on the environment from the service.
- There is no change to any impact on crime and disorder from the service.
6. Recommendation

6.1 That Scrutiny Committee notes the content of this report, provides feedback on the overall success of the project or otherwise and/or makes any recommendations flowing from lessons learned in relation to the project.
Scrubinity Committee – Work Programme

In setting future Scrubinity TOPICS, the Committee is asked to consider the following: T imely – O bjective – P erformance – I nterest – C orporate Priority

T Is this the right time to review this issue and is there sufficient Officer time and resource to conduct the review? What is the timescale?

O What is the reason for review; do officers have a clear objective?

P Can performance in this area be improved by input from Scrubity?

I Is there sufficient interest (particularly from the public)? The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny.

C Will the review assist the Council to achieve its Corporate Priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Organisation / Officer / Responsible member</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2016 (Thurs)</td>
<td>Update from the Council’s representative on Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)</td>
<td>Cllr N Legg &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to consider an oral update from the Council’s representative on the NHOSC to assess the impact of issues discussed on South Norfolk residents and the Council. The Committee to consider if any further scrutiny into the issues is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2016 (Thurs)</td>
<td>South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group update paper</td>
<td>Independent Living Team Leader &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>The Committee to be advised of the work that has been undertaken by the Council and South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group in the last 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2016 (Thurs)</td>
<td>Review of Leisure Centre Refurbishments</td>
<td>Head of Leisure and Cllr C Hudson</td>
<td>For members to receive details of usage, income and membership figures since the Diss and Wymondham Leisure Centres have been refurbished. The Committee to evaluate the impact of the refurbishments and whether the outcomes have met targets set and delivered an increase in membership numbers and usage in comparison to previous figures. Members to make recommendations as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 2016</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>South Norfolk Choice Based Letting / Home Option Review</td>
<td>Housing Access &amp; Standards Manager and Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to review the South Norfolk Choice Based Letting Scheme / Home Options ahead of the SLA drawing to a close in 2018. The Committee to consider whether the scheme has met the objectives set and whether new objectives are required when negotiating a new SLA. For members to consider the effectiveness of the scheme and make recommendations regarding moving forward once the SLA has expired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>2017/18 Budget</td>
<td>Director of Business Development &amp; Cllr M Edney</td>
<td>Scrubity Committee to consider the Council’s 2017/18 budget and the recommendations of Cabinet. The Committee should formulate a recommendation to Council regarding the budget for consideration at its meeting at the end of February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Update from the Council’s representative on Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)</td>
<td>Cllr N Legg &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to consider an oral update from the Council’s representative on the NHOSC to assess the impact of issues discussed on South Norfolk residents and the Council. The Committee to consider if any further scrutiny into the issues is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of meeting</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Organisation / Officer / Responsible member</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Waste Collection Round Remodelling - review</td>
<td>Head of Environmental Services &amp; Cllr K Billig</td>
<td>The Committee to review the Council’s waste collection round remodelling introduced in June 2016. Members to assess whether the remodelling has realised the objectives sought and achieved the financial savings anticipated. Members to make any relevant recommendations as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28 June 2016  NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL  Chief Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Resolution and Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2016</td>
<td>NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>1. To note the progress made in relation to addressing the issues raised by Full Council in October 2015.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>As a result of pre-scrutiny of the Devolution documents, Scrutiny Committee was able to highlight any areas which they felt required further consideration. The Committee was also able to evaluate whether the concerns raised previously at Full Council had been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. TO RECOMMEND THAT CABINET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Agrees that the Leader of the Council should sign the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Agreement and supports the publication of a Scheme of Governance for public consultation. Consultation literature should be uniform across Norfolk and Suffolk and present a consistent message, focusing on no more than five key benefits for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Notes the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee in relation to governance arrangements, and address these concerns to the governance team working on the Deal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cabinet also agreed with the recommendation regarding the consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. In relation to the concerns regarding governance arrangements, Cabinet agreed that the Chairman should raise these issues with the governance team working on the Deal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CABINET CORE AGENDA 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions: Key, Policy, Operational</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL COUNCIL 28 OCTOBER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28 Oct</strong></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Performance/Risks/Finance Budget Q2</td>
<td>A Mewes/ E Goddard / M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treasury Management Report Q2</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Local Development Scheme Update</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Pre Commencement Conditions – Response to DCLG consultation</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>D Disney</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Infrastructure Investment Plan</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Dec</strong></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dec</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Review of Conservation Area Appraisals – Loddon, Hingham and Harleston</td>
<td>C Bennett</td>
<td>L Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Community Asset Strategy</td>
<td>B Wade</td>
<td>K Mason Billig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Jan</strong></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jan</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>R Garfoot</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Feb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council’s net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.