

CABINET

Time & Date of Meeting: 3.00pm, Wednesday 6 December 2016

Venue: Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

Membership: Councillors P Mullineaux (Leader of Council) (Chairman), C Clark (Corporate Support & Assets) (Vice-Chairman), J C Hughes (Strategic Planning & Housing), Mrs Mort (Public Health, Safety & Wellbeing), P J Smith (Regeneration and Leisure), Mrs Snape (Finance), G Walton (Neighbourhoods and Street Scene)

Queries: Andy Houlker, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH
Telephone: 01772 625308
Fax: 01772 625319
Text: 07776176981
E-mail: democraticservices@southribble.gov.uk

The minutes of this meeting will be available on the internet at www.southribble.gov.uk

AGENDA

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Declarations of Interest

Members are requested to indicate at this stage in the proceedings any items on the agenda in which they intend to declare an interest. Members are reminded that if the interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (as defined in the Members' Code of Conduct) they must leave the room for the whole of that item. If the interest is not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, but is such that a member of the public could reasonably regard it as being so significant that it is likely that it would prejudice their judgment of the public interest (as explained in the Code of Conduct) then they may make representations, but then must leave the meeting for the remainder of the item.

3 Minutes of the Last Meeting

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26 October 2016, to be signed as a correct record.

4 Scrutiny Review of Licensing – Cabinet's Response (Leader of the Council)

Report attached.

5 Scrutiny Review of Flooding – Cabinet's Response (Corporate Support & Assets)

Report attached.

Forthcoming Meetings:

5.00pm Wednesday 11 January 2017 Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH
5.00pm Wednesday 20 February 2017 Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH
5.00pm Wednesday 15 March 2017 Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held at 5:00pm on Wednesday, 26 October 2016 in the Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

Present:-

Councillor Mullineaux (Leader of the Council) (in the chair)

Councillors Clark (Corporate Support & Assets), P Smith (Regeneration & Leisure), Mrs Snape (Finance) and G Walton (Neighbourhoods and Street Scene)

In Attendance:-

Interim Chief Executive (Jean Hunter) and Senior Democratic Services Officer (Andy Houlker)

Public Attendance: - 0

Other Members and Officers: - Councillors Ms Bell, Bennett, Bird, Coulton, Donoghue, Evans, Forrest, Foster, Michael Green, Mrs S Jones, Martin, Marsh, Mrs Moon, Mrs B Nathan, Nelson, Mrs Noblet, Rainsbury, M Tomlinson, Mrs K Walton, Wharton and Yates and 9 Officers

Minute No.	Description/Resolution
83	Apologies for Absence An apology for absence had been received from Councillors Hughes (Strategic Planning & Housing) and Mrs Mort (Public Health, Safety and Wellbeing).
84	Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest.
85	Minutes of the Last Meeting RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2016 be approved as a correct record.
86	Council Tax Support Scheme 2017-18 In presenting the report Councillor Clark (Corporate Support & Assets) commented that whilst a regular item the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) was to bring in new regulations hence the recommendation to include delegated authority. A number of members in the audience expressed concern at the recommended delegation which would allow the level of contribution to be increased from £3.50 to as much as £5.00 per week. It was wondered if a decision on the final level could be deferred for member consideration at the next meeting. Also any increase affected those least able to pay. Councillor Clark confirmed the council had no control of the timescale and it could not risk the scheme not being in place. He added that whilst there was a range for the level of contribution, at this point there was no decision to increase this and any increase not exceed 2%. In response to an enquiry regarding publicity for the scheme, the Revenues+ Manager in the audience indicated the range of publicity which included promoting Discretionary Housing Payments, use of the council's website and information to registered social landlords (identifying potential vulnerable tenants). He did not have to hand information

of how many people had been able to take advantage of the Discretionary Housing Payments.

RESOLVED:

That the council be recommended to approve

1. delegated authority be granted to the Revenues+ Manager in consultation with the Cabinet member for Corporate Support and Assets to make all necessary updates to this council's Council Tax Support Scheme to comply with any prescribed requirements that may be issued by central government. This may be by the making of specific regulations, or by amendment to the Local Government Finance Acts of 1992 and 2012;
2. delegated authority be granted to the Revenues+ Manager in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support and Assets to make all necessary amendments to the Council's scheme to uprate the allowances and premiums in accordance with the revised Housing Benefit Circular when it is issued by the DWP. This process is a requirement of the prescribed elements of the scheme;
3. the publication of the updated scheme in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 2012; and
4. the level of the deduction to be applied to Working Age recipients of Council Tax Support from 1st April 2017 be finalised and agreed in accordance with South Ribble's Scheme and as part of the Council's Budget and Council Tax Setting at the Council Meeting on the 1st March 2017. This figure would continue to be within the range (between £3.00 and £5.00 per week) which was consulted upon during the introduction and implementation of the council's scheme in 2012.

87

Private Sector Housing Grants Programme

In absence of Councillor Hughes (Strategic Planning & Housing), the Leader (Councillor Mullineaux) reported the proposal to implement a £500,000 grant scheme over three years to support home owners. A housing survey in 2012 had identified that the borough (19.6%) was below the national average (22%) for homes that failed the Decent Homes Standard. This scheme supported the council's Housing Framework and endeavoured to stop the number of properties that failed the standard from increasing.

Whilst glad to see the council introduce such a scheme a number of other members expressed concern at the lack of detail of definitions, evidence to support proposals, absence of recycling monies, use of local traders, means testing and suggested changes to the certain age criteria and the maximum value of grant payable for works. It was suggested those in most financial need would not be able to afford 50%. There was concern that as presented there might be problems with running the scheme as there had previously been with Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG). Those members felt a decision on the scheme should be deferred and given further consideration.

The Strategic Housing Manager in the audience responded in detail to the concerns/questions raised by other members. This scheme was similar to previous successful ones such as the Winter Warm Campaign. Instead of recycling the monies it was felt the five year limit was appropriate and dissuade abuse. Regarding the level of grants, insulation was in three parts (cavity wall, external wall cladding (expensive) and loft). It was felt with a contribution a boiler could be acquired for the amount. There was a lot of detail behind the report (including lengthy definitions). It suggested members' might benefit from a Member Learning Hour on Decent Housing (*session subsequently arranged for Wednesday 2 November 2016*). She confirmed that at present the council was using information from 2012 pending a new study along with ongoing information received through Gateway. Advice had been sought and confirmed Right to Buy monies could be used. Experience with the DFG scheme showed that recipients got three quotes with the lowest successful – about 9/10 of those successful were local.

In response to comments expressed by other members, the Leader commented that there had been so many questions that it had been appropriate to ask officers to contribute. He was conscious of members' feelings, they needed to work together and he confirmed he was happy to take the report back and look at their concerns/questions.

RESOLVED:

	That the report be deferred to enable further consideration of the concerns/questions raised.
88	<p>Taxi Licensing Review – budgetary matters</p> <p>Councillor Clark (Corporate Support & Assets) introduced this item indicating that in June he had been appointed to the Cabinet with the Finance & Resources portfolio. He was concerned of the possibility of expenditure exceeding £25000 and asked former Chief Executive to look at and provide an update on the financial position. The recommendation for a supplementary estimate in the sum of £94167 related to current costs to date. The Leader (Councillor Mullineaux) added that this was a purely budgetary report for works undertaken.</p> <p>Councillor Clark responding to questions confirmed that the budget was not exceeded for phase 1, phase 2 was for further work by the external solicitors (including involvement in disciplinary proceedings) and referred to the council's constitution regarding the role of the Section 151 Officer.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by other members that this matter had had a huge impact on the council notwithstanding the overall cost was £196536 (solicitors £88688) of which there was only approval from a non-published delegated decision for £25000. It was suggested that the external solicitors had been prepared to present their report sooner and format changed for the published final report. This topic raised questions about corporate governance within the council and it was not clear who had done what. It was confirmed when expenditure was incurred there was an investigation but other matters would be dealt with when the review's recommendation were considered.</p> <p>The report was welcomed as it gave clarity/transparency to some aspects, however it appeared on recent information that the former Chief Executive had been tasked to investigate the budget variances which was basically was to investigate himself. There was a denial that the external report had been stopped or additional expenditure agreed. There were questions concerning the actions of the council's Section 151 Officer.</p> <p>Looking at the figures in the report, there were questions whether or not the scrutiny Review had exceeded £10000 and had procurement protocols/rules in the constitution been followed. In respect of this expenditure, it was suggested that appeared that phase 3 (£3080) related to the external solicitors meeting the scrutiny task group with their report and charged for expenses (and this should be added to the fee for the report not to the review). Also the appointment of LGA support had been commissioned in line with governance requirements. It was hoped members would stop the debate and innuendo on finances and spending.</p> <p>The Cabinet member commented that some good points had been raised and reiterated that this report was to address the financial expenditure already incurred. He confirmed that the external solicitors' invoices had been scrutinised and paid.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Cabinet agreed and recommended to council a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum of £94,167 in 2016/17 to cover the estimated costs.</p>
89	<p>The Cabinet's Forward Plan</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Forward Plan submitted under Section 22 of the Local Government Act 2000 be approved.</p>
90	<p>Exclusion of Press and Public</p> <p>The press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item of business as it involves the discussion of information which is defined as</p>

	<p>exempt from publication under paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and in which case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
<p>91</p>	<p>Insurance Procurement Councillor Clark (Corporate Support & Assets) presented the results of the joint insurance procurement exercise with Chorley Borough Council.</p> <p>The Cabinet member confirmed that this matter came within his portfolio (under risk) and that self-insurance had not been considered on this occasion but could be in the future. It had been essential to have the council's insurer in place by 1 January 2017.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the council's insurer (for the respective classes of insurance mentioned) with effect from 1 January 2017 be as recommended in the report.</p>

The meeting finished at 6.29pm

..... Chairman

REPORT TO	DATE OF MEETING
Cabinet	6th December 2016



Report template revised June 2008

SUBJECT	PORTFOLIO	AUTHOR	ITEM
Scrutiny Review of Licensing	Leader	Chief Executive	4

SUMMARY AND LINK TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

This report sets out proposed improvement actions relating to the recommendations agreed by the Scrutiny Committee as part of the Review of Licensing in October 2016. The recommendations have been noted by Council and proposed actions have been considered, where appropriate, by the Governance Committee on 23rd November 2016.

The proposals link directly to the Council's corporate priority to be an "efficient, effective and exceptional council".

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- Consider and endorse the proposed actions as the basis of their response to the Scrutiny Committee and as part of the Council's Annual Governance Statement.
- Endorse the development of a more detailed action plan incorporating key milestones and targets for monitoring both by the Employment Panel (who are responsible for overseeing the performance of the Interim Chief Executive) and by Scrutiny Committee, Governance Committee and Cabinet as appropriate.
- Agree match funding of up to £70,000 to enable the Interim Chief Executive to secure additional capacity support on governance and legal workloads. This will be supplemented with significant support from the LGA for proposals relating to governance, project management, communications, surveys, training and development.
- Approve a Residents Survey to be carried out as soon as practicable by the LGA, with a further survey six months on to enable progress to be measured.
- Endorse the Governance Committee's strong recommendation that all members diligently adopt and follow all of the principles outlined in the Governance Framework and ensure they are fully implemented moving forward.

DETAIL

Following the publication of the Scrutiny Review of Licensing and consideration of the proposed Annual Governance Statement, detailed discussions have taken place with key partners including the Council's external auditors, the LGA and DCLG together with key officers and members.

The attached response has been shaped with their input and has also been considered, in part, by Governance Committee on 23rd November. The Governance Committee supported the proposed actions included in the draft Annual Governance Statement and have agreed that other actions supported by Cabinet should also be incorporated into the Annual Governance statement to be presented to the special Governance Committee on 14th December. The Committee also recommended that all members should diligently adopt and follow all of the principles outlined in the Governance Framework and ensure they are fully implemented moving forward.

It is proposed that the responses should be developed into a more detailed action plan and monitored on a timescale to be agreed. The LGA has agreed to provide project management support for the

action plan in order to achieve this in addition to contributing capacity funding for governance and communications support.

The LGA has also offered to fund and commission two residents' surveys, one immediately and one six months on to measure progress. It is some time since the Council undertook a residents' survey and this would enable the Council to benchmark itself against other councils across the country who have used the same survey. The responses will also be developed into a more detailed action plan and monitored on a timescale to be agreed. The plan will need to be agile and flexible in order to respond to changing circumstances and events and will be kept under review.

Finally, the LGA will provide grant funding to enable the Council to commission the Centre for Public Scrutiny to deliver training and development to support and strengthen the Council's governance arrangements.

The Council is required to match fund the resources provided by the LGA with up to £70,000 to contribute to the additional senior governance support and to address backlogs created by additional demands on legal services.

WIDER IMPLICATIONS

In the preparation of this report, consideration has been given to the impact of its proposals in all the areas listed below, and the table shows any implications in respect of each of these. The risk assessment which has been carried out forms part of the background papers to the report.

FINANCIAL	The additional funding of £70,000 provided by the Council will be spent over two financial years. Approximately £50,000 will be spent in 2016/17 with the remaining £20,000 committed in 2017/18. This cost will be incurred to increase officer workload capacity and will be funded by way of a Funded Budget Increase to be authorised by the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance through the Council's scheme of delegation.		
LEGAL	The proposals will enable progress to be made with the Council's Annual Governance Statement. It is imperative that we make substantial progress against the action plan. To achieve this there needs to be additional capacity for governance and legal issues on a temporary basis. We must do everything practicable to ensure that our corporate governance arrangements are as robust as possible.		
RISK	The proposals in the report will strengthen the Council's governance arrangements, address areas for improvement and minimise risk moving forward. There would be significant risk in not implementing the recommendations given the current challenges the Council is facing.		
OTHER (see below)			
<i>Asset Management</i>	<i>Corporate Plans and Policies</i>	<i>Crime and Disorder</i>	<i>Efficiency Savings/Value for Money</i>
<i>Equality, Diversity and Community Cohesion</i>	<i>Freedom of Information/ Data Protection</i>	<i>Health and Safety</i>	<i>Health Inequalities</i>
<i>Human Rights Act 1998</i>	<i>Implementing Electronic Government</i>	<i>Staffing, Training and Development</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Report to Scrutiny Committee October 2016

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
1. The political group leaders work together to stabilise and strengthen the Council's political leadership.	Yes	This will be achieved through the Employment Panel set up to appoint and monitor the performance of the Interim Chief Executive
2. Following concerns expressed in the Wilkin Chapman report, the Council develops a new, robust and SMART corporate plan that sets our priorities, objectives and actions that will achieve our vision and unifies the whole council team in working together to improve the quality of life of our residents.	Yes	<p>This will be discussed at Scrutiny Committee on 13th December and Cabinet on 11th January. The risk register will also be developed further within this context as part of the process moving forward.</p> <p>Given the extremely tight timescales, the late start and the potential for an imminent residents' survey, it is proposed that a more a fundamental review should be planned for next year. This will enable more effective engagement with members, staff, partners and residents.</p>
3. Member and officer training and development be re-prioritised and extended to include training on roles and responsibilities, council structure, governance arrangements and constitution. The clear distinction between the Cabinet, quasi-judicial and other committees such as licensing is to be emphasised.	Yes	Training and development will be delivered as part of a programme commissioned from the Centre for Public Scrutiny and funded by the LGA (see attached for comment).

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
4. The Standards Committee be strengthened and role be enhanced to improve the ethical governance of the authority and set the standard for Members and Officers to follow.	Yes	To be addressed as part of the proposed programme to be provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny.
5. Greater priority, liaison and support be provided to the Scrutiny, Governance and Standards committees in promoting high ethical, performance and governance standards.	Yes	To be addressed in the interim by additional senior governance support part funded by the LGA and by additional capacity to address backlogs created by increased demand. This will be reviewed once the current position with the Monitoring Officer is resolved and also via the proposed review of the senior management structure.
6. That the conduct of the five Members of Cabinet involved in taking unconstitutional decisions be referred to the Monitoring Officer for formal consideration as to whether any breach of the members Code of Conduct has taken place.		The proposed action does not require Cabinet approval.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
7. The conduct, behaviour and competency of the Monitoring Officer be considered further.		This is not a matter for Cabinet and is already being progressed as a matter of urgency by a Member Panel with independent support
8. A Member/Officer relations protocol is developed and political awareness training is provided to Members and Officers.	Yes	To be addressed as part of the proposed programme provided by the Centre for Public Scrutiny.
9. The senior management structure is reviewed as a matter of urgency to ensure it is fit for purpose and that senior managers have the necessary skills, qualifications and experience to undertake those roles.	Yes	Interim arrangements for statutory officer posts are now in place until such time as permanent arrangements are agreed. The new Corporate Plan will provide the context for the senior management structure. This action will be progressed with support from the North West Employers Organisation once the Plan is agreed.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
		Interim arrangements will also be put in place to increase capacity until a more sustainable structure can be implemented.
10. The role, capability and capacity of the in-house legal and democratic services team and that of Shared Financial Services be reviewed to ensure they provide proactive advice to Members and Officers to ensure compliance with the constitution and governance frameworks.	Yes	The additional senior governance support, part-funded by the LGA, will be tasked with reviewing legal and democratic services. A review of current Shared Assurance and Financial Services arrangements has been instigated.
11. A review of the way in which the Council has dealt with the	Yes	To be undertaken by a Head of HR from a

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
disciplinary arrangements be carried out once they are completed.		neighbouring authority once disciplinary issues have been resolved.
12. Scrutiny Committee receives an annual report on safeguarding to ensure the Council is taking it seriously.	Yes	This has already been actioned and an annual report will be presented both to Scrutiny Committee on the 14 th March and Cabinet on the 15 th March.
13. The way in which the Council communicates with Members, employees, residents and partners is overhauled to improve our reputation and the trust they have with the Council.	Yes.	The current comms team is significantly stretched by recent events. Additional interim resource will be provided by the LGA to work with the team to develop a more strategic approach and an action plan to be considered and approved by Scrutiny and Cabinet.
14. The Council's Our People Plan be completely refreshed to support our employees and improve employee morale.	Yes	An employee survey is currently taking place in order to establish a benchmark so that progress can be measured. The results will be used, together with the

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
		new Corporate Plan and extensive staff engagement, to produce a new People Plan for consideration by Scrutiny Committee on 14 th March and Cabinet on 15 th March.
15. An internal audit of the management of the legal instructions and associated costs be carried out.	Yes	<p>The Internal Audit will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 ascertain whether the Council's Contract Procedures and Procurement Rules were followed in the appointment of Wilkin Chapman & Weightmans to carry out their external investigations. 2 ascertain what formal/legal instructions were issued to Wilkin Chapman & Weightmans, when and by whom (both in terms of the main service review and disciplinary investigation). 3 ascertain what arrangements were put in place to manage the contracts with Wilkin Chapman & Weightmans, including budgetary provision, authorisation of expenditure and financial reporting.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
		<p>4 review all transactions made through the entire procure to pay process to ascertain whether there has been full compliance with Financial Regulations.</p>
16. The Local Governance Association be asked to carry out an ethical governance peer review in six months' time.	Yes	<p>The LGA no longer conducts ethical governance peer reviews. They have therefore been approached to schedule a corporate peer review with an ethical focus. The proposed employee and residents' surveys will provide a benchmark against which progress can be measured.</p>

REPORT TO	DATE OF MEETING
Cabinet	6 th December 2016

Report template revised June 2008



SUBJECT	PORTFOLIO	AUTHOR	ITEM
Scrutiny Review of Flooding - Cabinet's Response	Corporate Support & Assets	Garry Barclay	5

SUMMARY AND LINK TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

Following the adoption of the Scrutiny Task Group Review of Flooding report by members of the Scrutiny Committee it now falls on Cabinet to respond to the recommendations made.

The proposals below link directly to the Council's corporate priority to be an "efficient, effective and exceptional council".

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet agrees the attached Action Plan as the basis of its response to the Scrutiny Task Group Review of Flooding.

DETAILS AND REASONING

In the immediate aftermath of Storm Eva which occurred over the Christmas period in 2015, a Scrutiny review was commissioned to assess the Council's response to the flooding which affected a number of residential properties and businesses in the Borough.

Separate to this was a routine officer de-briefing which occurs following any situation when the Council's Emergency and Flood Response Plans are put into operation. This is to ensure that procedures are improved to incorporate any learning resulting from emergency incidents.

The Scrutiny Task Group report endorsed the suggested improvements from the officer de-briefing process and also contained other recommendations for Cabinet's consideration.

The totality of the Scrutiny Task Group recommendations have therefore now been considered by Cabinet and the attached Action Plan summarises Cabinet's response.

Members are also advised that as the Leading Local Flood Authority (LLFA) under the Flood & Water Management Act 2010, Lancashire County Council is in the process of issuing a series of district level reports which aim to provide affected communities with information about what all the relevant authorities are doing in their areas to help manage the risk of flooding. These reports will identify opportunities for further investigation and investment and will provide concerned homeowners and businesses with information about what they can do to help protect their own properties from flooding in the future. These reports will be compiled and published by LCC based on data that has been provided by the relevant authorities and will be updated on a quarterly basis to allow affected communities to see progress and resolution of as many issues as possible, as quickly as possible.

WIDER IMPLICATIONS

In the preparation of this report, consideration has been given to the impact of its proposals in all the areas listed below, and the table shows any implications in respect of each of these. The risk assessment which has been carried out forms part of the background papers to the report.

FINANCIAL	There are no financial implications as a result of this report. Actions already undertaken, such as the provision of training, have been met from existing budgets.		
LEGAL	It is clearly important that the council is able to demonstrate that it can respond efficiently and effectively to any emergency situations.		
RISK	Cabinet has agreed to implement a range of recommendations which are intended to mitigate future risks to residents and businesses arising as a result of flooding within the Borough.		
OTHER (see below)			
<i>Asset Management</i>	<i>Corporate Plans and Policies</i>	<i>Crime and Disorder</i>	<i>Efficiency Savings/Value for Money</i>
<i>Equality, Diversity and Community Cohesion</i>	<i>Freedom of Information/ Data Protection</i>	<i>Health and Safety</i>	<i>Health Inequalities</i>
<i>Human Rights Act 1998</i>	<i>Implementing Electronic Government</i>	<i>Staffing, Training and Development</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Report to Scrutiny Committee September 2016

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
1. INTERNAL DE-BRIEF RECOMMENDATIONS (ENDORSED BY SCRUTINY)		
1.1 Upon receipt of flood warnings from the Environment Agency (EA) key services including Gateway & Neighbourhood Services to be put on notice that they may need to open for business out of normal office hours and provisional arrangements also made for the Emergency Management Team (EMT) to meet promptly to co-ordinate activities. This should occur simultaneously to putting rest centres on notice.	Yes	Implemented. A procedure has been agreed whereby Neighbourhoods Out of Hours Duty Officers will open the Civic Centre and contact key officers to attend to co-ordinate activities including the establishment of a Gateway service.
1.2 The Council's Public Relations Officer to attend the Lancashire Resilience Forum (LRF) Media Sub-Group to raise and progress the issue of dove-tailing local communication channels including social media with those of the lead emergency response agency in order to better inform residents and members of ongoing developments.	Yes	In progress. Engaging with social media has now become an integral part of PR's approach. The PR team have also undertaken to attend the LRF Media Group meetings.
1.3 To facilitate this the Council's PRO should also be given access to Resilience Direct.	Yes	Implemented. The PR team was provided with RD access and training July 2016.
1.4 The Council to arrange for detailed mapping of the affected locations and supply these to the South Ribble multi-agency "Making Space for Water Group" at which the EA,	Yes	Implemented. The list of flooded properties has been shared with the lead agencies through the Making Space for Water Group. This information has since been fed into the new LLFA district level flood reporting

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
United Utilities (UU) and Lancashire County Council (LCC) are represented.		process.
1.5 The Council should adopt a clear policy statement setting out its responsibilities with regard to the distribution of sandbags and this should be extensively publicised amongst members and the general public. This may include provision of sandbags at predetermined storage areas near to the most susceptible locations which local communities are able to access themselves.	Yes	Implemented. The Council has neither the statutory responsibility nor the capacity to ensure property level flood defence. The multi-media awareness campaign makes this clear by informing residents of the limited value of sandbags and of their responsibility to prepare and self-protect.
1.6 The EA to be invited to the Central My Neighbourhoods Forum to explain their plans for engaging with the community at Bannister Brook and to discuss how community resilience might operate more generally in the area.	Yes	Implemented. A dedicated event was held at the Civic Centre with representation from EA, LCC, UU and SRBC to promote community resilience within the Borough. As a result of this event a Leyland Flood Action Community Resilience Group was established.
1.7 The learning from Central My Neighbourhood Forums to be applied to the other Forums in due course.	Yes	In progress. The EA are endeavouring to engage with other communities to promote and develop greater resilience amongst residents. The EA are seeking to target specific communities at risk of flooding when opportunities arise.
1.8 In the meantime it is recommended that an article is placed in "Forward" Paper informing residents of the roles	Yes	In progress. An article will be placed in the next edition of Forward. In the meantime other channels of

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
and responsibilities of all agencies including the Council in respect of flooding and to provide advice as to how residents should themselves prepare for flooding and build resilience into their properties. The limited value of sandbags should be mentioned and reference made to other products that are available on the market which residents should be encouraged to take a self-help approach (noting the grants that may be available to assist).		communication are being used including the Council website, social media and information leaflets. These provide information on known risk areas, the promotion of self-help and signposting to the flood awareness campaigns of the main agencies. Qualifying residents have also been given support with their applications for property level flood resilience grants.
ADDITIONAL SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS		
2. The Council appoints a Member flooding and drainage champion to support Cabinet in ensuring that flooding issues are promoted, tackled and co-ordinated across the Council at a member and officer level, including strengthening partnership working on these issues.	No	Not required. Already within the portfolio of the member responsible for Emergency Planning and the Council is a fully engaged member of the LRF.
3. The emergency plan be reviewed and updated to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer guidance on when to place relevant officers on standby • • A clear process for briefing and updating the Cabinet Member and other relevant Cabinet Members 	Yes Yes Yes	Implemented. See 1.1 above. Implemented. Already within EP procedures and will be applied on a more timely basis in future Implemented. See 1.1 above.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process for opening and ensuring the Civic Centre is operational during holiday periods 		
4. Provide training and awareness for employees and councillors on the emergency plan.	Yes	Implemented. Refresher training for relevant officers was undertaken to cover improvements to procedures following the internal de-briefing process. A Member Learning Hour took place in May 2016. SMT received refresher training on 29 th November 2016.
5. Carry out practice exercises to test the emergency plan to ensure it is robust and evaluate how they have gone to improve emergency planning further.	Yes	Implemented. Already built into EP procedures. These take place on a cyclical basis, for example a Rest Centre simulation exercise is planned for March 2017. Actual incidents / de-briefings provide further learning opportunities in addition to simulated events.
6. In future EMT meetings are organised and take place more promptly, with a clear log of the decisions and actions taken.	Yes	Implemented. See 1.1 above.
7. The Council opens in between Christmas and New Year on a skeleton staff basis to provide customer services.	No	Alternative approach adopted. See 1.1 above.
8. A clear and proactive strategy is developed by the Council to re-assure and provide information to our residents using the Council's website, social media channels, press releases and automated telephone message. This strategy should include residents, councillors and employees. Forming a key part of the emergency plan, standard and pre-prepared	Yes	In progress. See 1.2 & 1.8 above.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation	Cabinet Response	
	Recommendation Accepted? Yes / No	If yes, how and when is the recommendation going to be implemented? If no, why is the recommendation not going to be implemented?
communications materials should be developed.		
9. The on-call officer support be reviewed to allow more resources to dealing with calls. A process for escalating issues be developed to provide more re-assurance to the on-call duty officer.	Yes	Implemented. See 1.1 above.
10. The newly appointed Member Flooding and Drainage Champion (see recommendation 2) develop a policy for the provision of mobile flood barriers and how local communities through My Neighbourhood Forums could become more resilient and self-sufficient.	No	Not applicable. The new LLFA district level flood reports will seek to identify the relevant flood protection opportunities for further investigation and investment and will also provide concerned homeowners and businesses with information about what they can do to help protect their own properties from flooding in the future. The EA are also endeavouring to engage with local communities to promote and develop greater resilience amongst residents. The EA are seeking to target specific communities at risk of flooding when opportunities arise (see 1.6 and 1.7 above).
11. South Ribble Neighbourhoods Officers inspect gullies and pass on any issues to Lancashire County Council.	No	Not applicable. This is the responsibility of the Highways Authority LCC who have recently completed a programme of gully cleansing and highways maintenance at all the locations flooded.