

ITEM 3(c)

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PEER REVIEW TASK AND FINISH GROUP

27 FEBRUARY 2018

REVIEW OF DRAFT SCRUTINY STRUCTURE AND TERMS OF REFERENCE - LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP COMMENTS

The Group is content that the draft proposals should be submitted to the Scrutiny Management Committee, however the following concerns were received:

- Don't like name of General Scrutiny Committee. Growth and Strategic Planning was suggested (although it covers a lot more – something like 'Strategic Placemaking' perhaps?)
- 'Transport' to be explicitly expressed as a priority for the new committee (so 'Public Realm and Transport' instead of 'Public Realm'). With that switch, the L/D Group will likely accept this instead of the original ask of a set aside Environment and Transport committee.
- A query whether Scrutiny Management Committee would be competing with the Cabinet if it has all the other chairs on it, although this was felt to be no bad thing.
- Concern over size of the Scrutiny Management Committee, there would be support for bending proportionality to keep it manageable.
- Agreement over Scrutiny Management Committee taking corporate performance role, no view on whether 'Performance' should be in the name.
- Would having 2 different committees hearing a call-in in the same month incur extra cost, having 2 meetings instead of one? Could a figure be put on this?
- Request for Public Health to be explicitly added to terms of reference for Health and Adult Social Care Committee.
- Concern that the proposals will come to the Scrutiny Management Committee next week with the Task and Finish Group having only agreed proposals the night before – but acknowledgement that there is no real choice given the timescales.