



To: Members of the Communities
Scrutiny Committee

Date: 10 July 2012

Direct Dial: 01824 712554

e-mail: dcc_admin@denbighshire.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** to be held at **9.30 am** on **MONDAY, 16 JULY 2012** in **CONFERENCE ROOM 1B, COUNTY HALL, RUTHIN.**

Yours sincerely

G. Williams
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

AGENDA

PART 1 - THE PRESS AND PUBLIC ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THIS PART OF THE MEETING

1 APOLOGIES

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members to declare any personal or prejudicial interests in any business identified to be considered at this meeting.

3 URGENT MATTERS AS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

Notice of items which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

4 MINUTES (Pages 5 - 16)

To receive the minutes of the Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Thursday, 14th June, 2012 (copy enclosed)

PART 2 - CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

It is recommended in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 that the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business because it is likely that exempt information (as defined in Paragraphs 14 and 15 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A of the Act) would be disclosed.

5 ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL RESOURCES TO SEN IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS (Pages 17 - 26)

To consider a report by the Education Finance Manager (copy enclosed) which details the progress made in reviewing the allocation of additional Resources to Special Needs (SEN) in Primary schools.

9.35 a.m.

PART I

6 REVIEW OF DAY SERVICES IN THE NORTH OF THE COUNTY (Pages 27 - 30)

To consider a report by the Head of Adult and Business Services (copy enclosed) which provides an update on the review of Day Services in the North of the County, and advises on a preferred option for future delivery of services for formal consultation.

10.10 a.m.

BREAK

7 MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS: RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (Pages 31 - 50)

To consider a report by the Planning Officer: Renewable Energy Schemes (copy enclosed) which seeks guidance on the resource commitment and level of community engagement for major infrastructure projects.

10.50 a.m.

8 ALLOCATION OF AREA MEMBER FUND (Pages 51 - 60)

To consider a report by the Community Engagement Manager (copy enclosed) which provides an overview on the funding allocated to enable Member Area Groups to support priority projects in their areas and seeks the Committee to review the funding's success.

11.25 a.m.

9 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 61 - 80)

To consider a report by the Scrutiny Coordinator (copy enclosed) seeking a review of the committee's forward work programme and updating members on relevant issues.

12.05 p.m.

10 FEEDBACK FROM COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

To receive any updates from Committee representatives on various Council Boards and Groups

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

James Davies

Peter Evans

Carys Guy-Davies

Huw Hilditch-Roberts

Rhys Hughes

Win Mullen-James

Bob Murray

Joe Welch

Cefyn Williams

Cheryl Williams

Huw Williams

Voting Co-opted Members for Education (Agenda Item No. 5 only)

Ms C. Burgess

Mrs. G. Greenland

Ms. D. Houghton

Dr. D. Marjoram

COPIES TO:

All Councillors for information

Press and Libraries

Town and Community Councils

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Communities Scrutiny Committee held in Conference Room 1a, County Hall, Ruthin on Thursday, 14 June 2012 at 9.30 am.

PRESENT

Councillors James Davies, Peter Evans, Huw Hilditch-Roberts (Chair), Rhys Hughes, Win Mullen-James, Bob Murray, Joe Welch, Cefyn Williams and Cheryl Williams. Councillors J. Butterfield, S.A. Davies, H.C. Irving and H.LI. Jones attended as Observers.

ALSO PRESENT

Corporate Director: Customers (HW), Head of Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services (GB), School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary (JM), Section Manager: Passenger Transport (PD), Senior Community Safety Enforcement Officer (TWE), Housing Strategy Manager (SK), Housing Strategy Officer (SL), Scrutiny Coordinator (RE) and Administrative Officer (CW).

1 APOLOGIES

Councillor C. Guy-Davies and C. Burgess, D. Houghton, D. Marjoram (Co-opted Members). It was explained that Councillor C Guy-Davies, having been appointed as one of the Council's representatives on North Wales Fire and Rescue Authority, had been invited to attend its induction day ahead of its Annual Meeting, hence the reason she could not be present at the Committee's meeting.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor T.R. Hughes regarding Co-opted Members needing to attend all three Scrutiny Committees which discussed items pertaining to education matters.

The Corporate Director: Learning and Communities explained that the changes to the scrutiny structure had been agreed by Council and a further review of the system would be undertaken at the end of the current Council year. He confirmed that in order to attempt to address the problem items relating to education matters would be included for consideration at the beginning of the agenda. The Scrutiny Co-ordinator outlined the role of the Scrutiny Chairs and Vice Chair Group in coordinating the Work Programmes of the respective Scrutiny Committees, which included the consideration of items pertaining to education matters. The Chair agreed that he would convey the concerns expressed by Members to the Scrutiny Chairs and Vice Chair Group.

2 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

In accordance with the Council's Constitution CVs/statements had been requested from interested parties for the office of Committee Vice-Chair. A CV had been received from Councillor H.O. Williams prior to the meeting and circulated to all Members. Councillor Williams was nominated and seconded for the post of

Committee Vice-Chair. A second nomination was received at the meeting for Councillor W. Mullen-James and the Committee agreed that the nomination be accepted for consideration despite the fact that no CV/statement had been received beforehand. Councillor Mullen-James' nomination was seconded.

The Committee received presentations from Councillors W. Mullen-James and H.O. Williams, outlining their qualities and attributes for the office of Vice-Chair of the Committee for the ensuing year. Following a secret ballot it was:-

RESOLVED – *that Councillor H.O. Williams be appointed Vice Chair of the Communities Scrutiny Committee for the ensuing year.*

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No personal or prejudicial interest were declared

4 URGENT MATTERS AS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

No items were raised which in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972.

5 MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Thursday, 12th April, 2012 were submitted.

The Scrutiny Co-ordinator informed Members that Appendix 4 to the Scrutiny Work Programme report included information on the progress achieved to date with the resolutions agreed at the previous meeting of the Committee.

Matters arising:-

6. Community Engagement Update – In response to a question from Councillor P.A. Evans, the Scrutiny Coordinator explained that the request relating to the boundary maps had been referred to Ordnance Survey for amendment.

RESOLVED – *that, subject to the above, the Minutes be received and approved as a correct record.*

6 ESTYN ADULT COMMUNITY EDUCATION INSPECTION

A copy of a report by the School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

The School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary provided a summary of the report which detailed the findings of the Estyn Inspection of the Conwy and Denbighshire Adult Community Education Partnership (Cyswllt Dysgu). The salient points outlined in the report included:-

- Estyn had aimed to answer the three following key questions through an analysis of self-evaluation, performance data, lesson observations and meetings with stakeholders:
 - (i) How good are the outcomes
 - (ii) How good is provision
 - (iii) How good are leadership and management
- Judgement on all three questions had been good. An overall judgement on the partnership's current performance had been considered to be good with the prospects for improvement being excellent.
- The Estyn Inspection report had highlighted the levels of ability achieved from learners from different backgrounds and age groups.
- Not enough Welsh speaking learners had utilised their Welsh language skills well enough as a medium for learning or for assessing their progress.
- Most learners improved their confidence through learning and as a result were better able to manage their lives and support their children.
- Teaching had been good or better in most of the sessions observed by the inspection team.

The Partnership's Leadership had provided good leadership with Leaders collaborating well with a broad range of other key Groups. The partnership had good arrangements for self-assessment, with clear objectives and timescales and Estyn had considered that partnership working had been excellent with improved standards being achieved by learners, an improvement in the quality of teaching and in assessment.

The Committee noted Estyn's recommendations that, in order to further improve the partnership would need to:-

- (i) increase the number of classes and learning activities in which learners achieve excellent standards in their work.
- (ii) increase the amount of excellent teaching and assessment.
- (iii) promote a common approach to safeguarding to raise the standard of all partnership members' policies and procedures, and
- (iv) promote and improve the use of Welsh as a medium of communication for learning.

In reply to a question from Ms G. Greenland regarding the monitoring of the collaboration process between Authorities, the School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary explained that the Partnership's Executive Group would receive reports from the Sub-Groups. The Local Authority would monitor progress, the quality of courses and student numbers through Services Level Agreements and Service Groups based at the Colleges.

Councillor W. Mullen-James referred to paragraph 4.6 of the report which highlighted that not enough Welsh speaking learners use their Welsh language skills well enough as a medium for learning or assessing their progress. The School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary expressed the view that there was a need to offer more Welsh medium courses across the Partnership. He also explained that in many cases there was a confidence issue with many students choosing to learn through the medium of English. In reply to a question from

Councillor H.O. Williams, it was explained that it would be difficult to monitor the number of Welsh speaking students attending University outside the locality.

Councillor J.M. Davies referred to Estyn's expectations that the outcomes from the report, which were good, should be transformed into being excellent and questioned how this could be achieved. The School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary explained that Estyn only provide a judgement and would not offer guidance or direction with regard to achieving further improvement. It would be up to the Partnership itself to determine how it would strive to improve further.

The School Effectiveness Performance Officer: Secondary responded to a question from Councillor T.R. Hughes and explained that the merging of Llysfasi Agricultural College and Deeside College had enabled the provision of a wider range of courses available to the public. The Corporate Director: Customers referred to the strategic alliance between Llysfasi, Deeside College and Coleg Llandrillo which had improved the level of service provision in Denbighshire.

The Chair suggested that, in order to progress the improvements already attained, it would be useful if scrutiny saw the action plan detailing the measures and timescales to achieve the improvement from good to excellent. Following further discussion, it was:-

RESOLVED – *that the Communities Scrutiny Committee receive the report and note Members comments.*

At this juncture as the meeting was progressing ahead of schedule the Chair, with the Committee's consent, varied the order of business.

7 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

A copy of a report by the Scrutiny Coordinator, which reviewed the draft Forward Work Programme for the Communities Scrutiny Committee and provided an update on the relevant issues, had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

The Committee's draft forward work programme (FWP), Appendix 1, had been inherited from its predecessor Committee. Members were requested to consider whether the FWP reflected the new Committee's wishes and priorities. Members were informed that details of the FWP for the Partnerships and Performance Scrutiny Committees had been included in the information papers circulated previously.

The Cabinet's FWP had been included at Appendix 3 to the report and a table summarising recent Committee resolutions, advising Members on progress with their implementation, had been attached at Appendix 4.

It was explained that, In performing its role, the Scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs Group could seek individual Scrutiny Committees to take ownership of specific topics. At its last meeting in April, 2012 no specific recommendations were made with respect to Communities Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee considered the draft FWP for future meetings as detailed in Appendix 1, and reference was made to the following issues:-

A completed proposal form from officers for a report to be included on the Committee's forward work programme had been included at Appendix 2. This request related to resource levels and the principles of community engagement with respect to major infrastructure projects that affect the County. Members felt that this important matter merited discussion and the item was included in the Committee's FWP for July, 2012.

Members supported a suggestion by the Corporate Director: Customers that a report be submitted detailing the progress in respect of the recent highway investment programme. Councillor J.M. Davies requested that the report be extended to include the Council's strategic vision with respect to major transport infrastructure developments in Denbighshire. The Committee agreed that a report on progress with highways in Denbighshire, including major infrastructure links within the Highway Network be included in the Work Programme for October, 2012.

Having regard to the optimum number of agenda items to be transacted at a meeting, Members agreed that the reports on Control of Caravan Sites and the Management of allocation of Section 106 Commuted Sums, scheduled for the July, 2012 meeting be rescheduled for a later date.

At the request of Members the following matters were included in the Work Programme, either as information reports or as reports for consideration by the Committee:-

- Winter Maintenance and Gritting
- Grass Cutting
- School Transport Arrangements
- Allotments
- Town Plans

In response to a question from Councillor J.M. Davies relating to Objective 1 funding and a building on Kings Avenue, Prestatyn which had not been let and remained empty, the Committee agreed that an information report be submitted in respect of this matter.

The Scrutiny Coordinator explained that the September meeting of the Scrutiny Committee would be held in Rhyl due to consideration of the three workstreams in the programme which related to the Rhyl Going Forward Project. It was explained that the meeting could examine other issues pertaining to Rhyl, such as the new cycle bridge, and include a tour of the key sites.

The Committee considered the appointment of Committee Representatives on the following Council Groups and Boards:-

Service Performance Challenge Groups - Scrutiny Committees had been invited to appoint a representative to each Group to act as the Committee's contact for each service. The following Members were appointed:-

Housing & Community Development – Councillor R. Murray
Children and family Services – Councillor W. Mullen-James
Adult & Business Services – Councillor R. Murray
Environmental Services – Councillor C.H. Williams
Education and Customers & Education Support – Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts
Communications, Marketing & Leisure – Councillor J Welch
Finance & Assets – Councillor T.R. Hughes
Highways & Infrastructure – Councillor H.O. Williams
Regeneration – Councillor W. Mullen-James
Planning & Public Protection – Councillor H.O. Williams
Strategic Human Resources – Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts

The Scrutiny Coordinator agreed to liaise with Councillor C. Guy-Davies in respect of the Legal & Democratic Services and Business Planning & Performance Service Challenge Groups.

Strategic Investment Group - Members appointed Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts to serve on the Group and Councillor H.O. Williams as the Committee's substitute representative on the Group in the event of the Chair being unable to attend. The Group would meet on a monthly basis to consider the Council's future capital requirements and bids for capital funding and external grants. The terms of reference of the Group had been included in Appendix 6 to the report.

Conwy and Denbighshire Collaboration Programme Board - The report outlined the membership and role of the Board and a copy of the Board's terms of reference had been included in Appendix 7 to the report. The Committee agreed that Councillor W. Mullen-James be appointed to serve as its representative on the Board.

Following further discussion, it was:-

RESOLVED – that:-

- (a) subject to the above, the Partnership Scrutiny Committee approves the Future Work Programme as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.*
- (b) appoints the Members, as stated above, to serve on each of the Service Performance Challenge Groups.*
- (c) appoints Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts to serve on the Council's Strategic Investment Group, and*
- (d) appoints Councillor W. Mullen-James to serve on the Conwy and Denbighshire Collaboration Programme Board*

8 BUS SERVICES AND REDUCTIONS

A copy of a report by the Section Manager: Passenger Transport, which detailed how bus services were organised, changes to Welsh Government (WG) funding for bus and related services and the consequences for the County Council, and proposed mitigation measures had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

The report also started the consultation process on the potential reductions in services.

The Section Manager: Passenger Transport introduced the report and explained that bus services in Denbighshire had improved following an increase in numbers, with passengers travelling free of charge under the Cerdyn Cymru arrangements for people over 60, and those with certain disabilities. This reflected additional County Council and WG funding for newer and more accessible vehicles and improvements in frequency.

The report detailed the three categories of bus services in Wales which include Commercial, Contract and Other services. The status of each bus service in Denbighshire had been summarised in Appendix 1 to the report. The bus network had evolved incrementally over a number of years, particularly since the deregulation of bus services. Denbighshire had enjoyed a relatively stable and growing local bus market and the factors relating to the level of service provision in each respective area had been outlined in the report.

It was explained that the several sources of support for the provision of bus services were changing and would all be affected by recent WG announcements, which had been received too late for consideration under the Council's budget setting process for the current financial year. The changes would include reductions in the Local Transport Services Grant (LTSG) from £396,000 to £288,000, over a full year. Subsequently, the WG had offered a minimum of three months' transitional funding, possibly extending to six or even nine months. The extension would be dependent upon a national, strategic ministerial review of funding which might see radical changes.

Members were informed that despite the potential future funding changes Denbighshire would need to plan for an imminent reduction in WG bus funding. Details of funding arrangements for bus services, and the impact of the WG's changes, had been included in Appendix 2 to the report and suggested possible future changes had been outlined in Appendix 3. Officers suggested that there would be a need to accommodate service pressures for changes to bus services and a modest overspend in 2011/12. Savings of approximately £145,000 would be required over a full year on a combined 2011/12 budget of £911,000. It was felt that most of the proposed changes could prove unpalatable and, for the reasons stated in Appendix 3, consultation had been recommended with stakeholders putting forward alternatives which officers considered to be more acceptable. The officers confirmed that there were no proposals to alter or reduce services which transport school children. Information pertaining to bus services which transport school children and fare paying passengers was provided for the Committee, together with, details relating to the use of single fares, day and rover tickets.

In reply to questions from Councillor J. Butterfield regarding the provision of bus services to hospitals for both patients and visitors, particular reference being made to difficulties in accessing Abergele Hospital. The Section Manager: Passenger Transport explained that nationally between 2% and 5% of passengers use bus services to travel to hospitals. He confirmed that services were provided to all main Hospitals and consultation would continue with Betsi Cadwaladr University Health

Board (BUHB), who was reviewing patient services, and the Ambulance Trust with a view to identifying passenger transport service requirements. In response to a suggestion from Councillor Butterfield it was agreed that the Committee receive an information report on Community Health Transport Scheme Pilot.

The following issues were raised and responses provided:-

- The role of the Bus Users Forum was outlined by Councillor H.Ll. Jones. He also raised concerns regarding the X94 Wrexham to Barmouth service and the accuracy of details in respect of the number 50 Uwch y Dre to Ysgol Caer Drewyn service, as detailed in Appendix 3 to the report. Councillor Jones referred to an historic agreement, when Ysgol Caer Drewyn had been established, which permitted pupils attending that school from the Uwch y Dre area to be entitled to free school transport.
- The Section Manager: Passenger Transport provided responses to Members questions relating to the possible extension of services in the Dee Valley, services to Betws Gwerfil Goch, St Asaph Business Park and the number 98 Llangollen to Llantysilio service. He explained that funding issues raised regarding the Clwydian Ranger Service could be discussed with Cadwyn Clwyd.

The Chair explained that he felt it would be important that details pertaining to service usage were provided to members of the public as part of the consultation process. Members noted the need to consult with residents and bus passengers on proposed changes and agreed that a Working Group be convened to consider the findings of the consultation exercise prior to a report on the proposed measures to address the reduction in funding being considered by Cabinet. Councillors P.A. Evans, T.R. Hughes, C.H. Williams and H.O. Williams were appointed to serve on the Working Group. The Committee also nominated and seconded Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts for appointment as Chairman of the Rural Transport Forum.

RESOLVED – *the Communities Scrutiny Committee agree that:-*

- (a) the report be received;*
- (b) officers consult with the wider community as regards potential bus service cuts and, as part of the consultation exercise, the public be provided with information on service usage;*
- (c) a Working Group be convened to consider the findings;*
- (d) the Joint Head of Highways & Infrastructure produces a further report, for Cabinet, summarising the results of the consultation, and views of the Working Group, and proposing specific measures, in line with the timescale demanded by the Welsh Government and the budget available, and*
- (e) Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts be appointed Chairman of the Rural Transport Forum.*

9 EFFECTIVENESS OF ENFORCEMENT ACTION - DOG FOULING

A copy of a report by the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services which detailed the effectiveness of enforcement action regarding dog fouling within Denbighshire, had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

Copies of Appendices were circulated at the meeting, together with, documents relating to:-

The Public Realm and Environment Crime Working Group held on the 5th November, 2008 and 26th January, 2009.

A report to Environment Scrutiny Committee dated 15th October, 2009

A letter from the Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee to the Chief Constable dated the 30th December, 2008.

The report provided information on historical, current and future methods of prevention and detection of dog fouling in Denbighshire. Dog Fouling remained the single most complained about public nuisance in Denbighshire. This type of crime was categorised as “Environmental Crime”, and the offence was dealt with under the provisions of the Dogs Act 1996 and the Environmental Protection and Clean Neighbourhood Act 2005. It was explained that employees of the Authority and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were authorised to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).

The Head of Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services outlined the following salient points contained in the report:-

- issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices as an alternative to prosecution, payment and prosecution procedures.
- a ‘robust enforcement regime’ had been adopted by Denbighshire County Council’s Public Protection Service since 2008.
- details of Enforcement Activities between 2008 and the current date.
- methods employed by Community Safety Enforcement in Denbighshire in preventing and detecting offences dog fouling.
- criteria for classification of stray dogs and details of the Dog Walking Charter.
- use of publicity and CCTV and the investigation of offences.
- lack of participation of Police and PCSOs in issuing FPNs
- communication with the public and encouragement and the use schools pupils to educate parents and the general public with respect to the dangers of dogs fouling
- requests to have dog foul cleared and audits to establish the need for bins and signage.
- engagement of private contractors through employment agencies.
- the conclusions drawn through experience of dealing with the problem of dog fouling.

The Committee viewed a video of a case study undertaken in the Marine Lake area of Rhyl which highlighted the operational aspects of the work undertaken by officers and the effectiveness of surveillance work and evidence gathering leading to the issue of a FPN.

The officers provided the following responses to matters raised by members:

- the issue of replacing and updating dog fouling signs would be addressed.

- agreed to examine the possibility of treating areas where dog fouling had occurred with an appropriate spray substance.
- officers agreed to approach North Wales Police with respect to having a greater emphasis placed on PCSOs issuing FPNs as a method of preventing and reducing crime
- confirmation was provided that Denbighshire had employed contractors to issue Fixed Penalty Notices, but that this approach seemed to have been more effective in relation to litter enforcement than incidences of dog fouling
- details were outlined of the collaborative working between Conwy and Denbighshire, with Denbighshire being the Lead Authority.
- the need to expand on the imitative undertaken at Bodnant School, Prestatyn
- the problems and legal implications which could arise if bans were implemented on the use of school playing fields, and if dog control orders were introduced.

The officers provided details pertaining to the issuing and distribution of dog waste bags and provision of dog waste bins in identified hot spot areas. Members were informed that the provision of dog waste bins came under the remit of the Head of Environment and that there were issues regarding the collection of hazardous waste. Complaints in respect of dog fouling incidents would be received and tracked via the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System.

In response to concerns raised by Councillor T.R. Hughes, the Committee supported the view that a clear stance was required in respect of this matter, taking into consideration any financial implications.

In reply to a question from Councillor J. Butterfield, that the wardens at Brickfields Pond and Nature Reserve area in Rhyl be authorised to issue Fixed Penalty Notices, it was explained this would be a matter for consideration and agreement by the respective officers.

Members requested further information pertaining to statistics on the number of dog fouling incidents reported to the Street Cleaning Team during 2011/12, the number cleaned up within 5 days of receipt of complaint, the number not responded to and the reasons why and how the respective figures compare to previous years.

The Senior Community Safety Enforcement Officer agreed that the following issues highlighted would be raised at the next CSP meeting:-

- examine the possibility of Enforcement Officers periodically wearing polo shirts/jackets/tabards which would identify them as enforcement officers and act as a deterrent for dog owners not clearing up after their dogs.
- signage in areas across the County be reviewed to ensure that the information on them was up to date.
- the importance of PCSOs issuing fixed penalty notices for dog fouling as this helped to keep neighbourhoods neat and tidy and mitigate the risk of other environmental crime and anti-social behaviour.

The Head of Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services referred to the conclusions, and the following recommendations contained in the report:-

- the continuation of the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices.
- emphasis to be placed on intelligence led activity to seek sufficient evidence to justify prosecution and therefore offering an alternative punishment to a Fixed Penalty Notice.
- sustained utilisation of CCTV to obtain evidence of offending.
- a review the level of training of officers to ensure that the investigative skills in respect of the offender's identity and standards of proof were improved.
- review the conditions and requirements of contractors and enforcement officers when dealing in particular with the standards of proof and offenders identity.
- a greater emphasis on education in schools and the community, with members of the community accepting responsibility for enforcement regimes.
- consideration be given for the creation of Dog Walkers Charters and similar Charters with the Local Authority, Housing Associations, businesses and public groups.
- improved communication with the media to report on prosecutions, operations and initiatives.

Following further discussion, it was:-

RESOLVED – *that the Committee:-*

(a) receive the report.

(b) support the recommendations as set out in paragraph 4.5 of the report.

(c) requests that the Senior Community Safety Enforcement Officer informs the next Community Safety Partnership (CSP) meeting of the concerns raised by Members,

(d) supported the view that a clear stance should be adopted with regard to the matter of dog fouling offences, taking into consideration any financial implications; and

(e) that a workshop be arranged for all councillors and relevant Heads of Service in the autumn with a view to adopting and progressing a corporate approach to dealing with the problem of dog fouling in the county

10 SINGLE ACCESS ROUTE TO HOUSING (SARTH)

A copy of a joint report by the Project Officer and Housing Strategy Officer, which outlined the progress made with the Single Access Route to Housing (SARTH) collaborative project and provided an opportunity for the Committee to influence the future direction of the project, had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

The Housing Strategy Manager summarised the report and sought the Committee's views on the draft Common Allocations Framework (CAF) before proceeding to public consultation.

It was explained that SARTH was a partnership project between all the major social landlords in North East Wales, covering the local authority areas of Conwy County Borough, Denbighshire, Flintshire and Wrexham County Borough. The partners included Conwy County Borough, Denbighshire, Flintshire, Wrexham, Cartrefi Conwy, Clwyd Alyn Housing Association, Cymdeithas Tai Clwyd, North Wales Housing and Wales and West Housing.

The overall aim of SARTH would be to provide a common access route to a range of affordable housing options which was transparent, legal, efficient and accessible to all sections of the community. Concerns had been expressed that, when seeking housing, applications would be required on five different lists. The report presented a draft common allocations framework (CAF) which had three points outstanding which would require agreement prior to consultation.

A summary of the key elements of the CAF had been summarised in the report and further detail provided in Appendix A, and the project generally in Appendix B.

The Housing Strategy Manager informed the Committee that a Member training session would be held on the 22nd June, 2012 and outlined the issues to be discussed and considered in terms of allocation issues.

Councillor T.R. Hughes welcomed and expressed his support for the initiative. The Housing Strategy Manager responded to questions from Members in respect of:-

- the presentation of the report to 5 Registered Social Landlord Boards
- the provision of Affordable Housing within the County.
- the availability of agricultural housing in Denbighshire.
- the availability of one bedroom flats within the County.

During the ensuing discussion the Chair noted the progress made and the work undertaken to date and officers undertook to provide the additional information which members had requested to them via the Scrutiny Coordinator. The Committee:

RESOLVED – *to note the contents of the report and endorse the progress made to date with the SARTH project and the draft Common Allocations Framework.*

Meeting ended at 12.40 p.m.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14, 15 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14, 15 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 14, 15 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Report to:	Communities Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	16th July 2012
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Social Care and Children's Services
Lead Officer:	Head of Adults and Business Services
Report Author:	Head of Adults and Business Services
Title:	Review of Day Services in North of County

1. What is the report about?

The report is about the Review of Day Services in the north of the County.

2. What is the reason for making this report?

To provide an update to Members on the review of Day Services in the North of the County and to advise Members on a preferred option for future delivery of services for formal consultation.

3. What are the Recommendations?

That Members support the preferred option for formal consultation with all relevant stakeholders.

4. Report details

4.1 Background

As part of the modernisation of social services there was a need to review the provision of stand-alone day services for older people in Prestatyn & Rhyl to ensure that the service offered was consistent with the policy of reablement.

There are 2 centres providing day services, Hafan Deg in Rhyl and Llys Nant in Prestatyn. The former is in a purpose built community building with easy access which is Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant. The latter used to be in the former residential home in Prestatyn but was moved to a temporary base in the centre of town. This is not purpose built and, while staff have made the best of the accommodation, it is nonetheless former office accommodation which is not easily accessible.

A review of the services was commissioned in July 2011 and a number of recommendations made. These included that: the service should focus on time-limited reablement intervention to support independence using a single base; people should continue to receive a service suitable for their assessed needs in an appropriate environment; commissioning and contracting functions should be strengthened to support day service development. A savings requirement of £180,000 was identified by the service and approved by Members as part of the medium term financial planning process.

As part of the financial planning for 2012/13, the savings requirement was reduced to £90,000. £30,000 from this financial year has been achieved through the retirement of one of the managers and a reorganisation of the remaining management functions. This leaves £60,000 to be found from the proposals below in 2013/14.

4.2 Consultation To Date

As part of the review, staff, users and carers of the 2 centres were given an opportunity to meet with the reviewer and give their own perspective on the services provided. This demonstrated that the services were highly valued and the staff were committed to meeting the needs of the people attending. Carers, in particular, noted the importance of the respite offered to them through the service.

The Assembly Member and MP arranged 2 public meetings in October 2011 to discuss the review of the service, attended by senior managers from the Council. The feedback from these echoed the sentiment of users and carers to the reviewer but also explored wider community use of the facilities in Hafan Deg and opportunities for the development of alternative activities across Rhyl and Prestatyn.

A stakeholder reference group has met twice, once to explore options for the development of the service and once to finalise the principles involved in any future service model. These principles are:

- Local Authority services need to ensure that they are able to evidence added value in service provision – this will be a focus on time-limited intervention to support individuals to maintain their place in the community as independently as possible. This is already beginning to happen in day services in the south of the County.
- There is a need for longer term care for older people in both Prestatyn and Rhyl to ensure respite is available for carers and social activities are available for isolated individuals. This does not need to be provided by the Local Authority directly or in our premises.
- The use of Hafan Deg, the building in Rhyl, should be maximised to enable it to be sustainable and to offer community facilities to other groups, including the tenants of War Memorial Court and other organisations currently using the building.

4.3 Preferred Option for Consultation

- Explore alternative community facilities for the provision of longer term care and respite in both Prestatyn and Rhyl, including use of the independent and 3rd sectors.
- Focus time limited reablement activity within one site at Hafan Deg, pending discussions and consultation with the Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board (BCU) on a health & social care community facility for North Denbighshire.
- Develop a charging model for community use of the facilities in Hafan Deg and explore the marketing potential for this, allowing for the reablement activity within it.

5. Lead Member Comment

It would be helpful if local members and other interested parties would come on board and explore alternative, and probably better, ways of providing day care which could incorporate other useful services to help both the cared for and carers. We are now all looking at a far greater life expectancy and Denbighshire is right to explore new ways to cope with this prospect. Policies such as reablement and investment in Extra Care are showing people, myself included, that there is a different way to lead longer, healthier lives. Many Councillors themselves are extremely good examples of how to carry on living useful and fulfilling lives, still working hard helping others at an age when others have retired.

I hope the Committee Members will adopt the recommendation to continue exploring other options as I believe that to be the best way forward.

6. How does the decision contribute to the Corporate Priorities?

The proposal enables services to continue to be provided to older people in a sustainable way, thereby managing some of the effects of the demographic changes affecting the County.

It also provides an opportunity for more people to benefit from the facilities in Hafan Deg, by opening it up to wider community use, as well as stimulating the provision of services within the independent and third sector.

7. What will it cost and how will it affect other services?

There will need to be additional reviewing time to ensure that any changes to services are managed as sensitively as possible. In addition, Day Services Staff will need further training on reablement. Both of these will be managed within existing resources.

As part of the consultation, an Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken.

8. What consultations have been carried out?

As above (item 4).

9. Chief Finance Officer Statement

The Medium Term Financial Plan contains a saving for this and it is important that the review identifies the most efficient way of delivering an appropriate service. If it cannot identify the savings, alternatives will need to be found within the service.

10. What risks are there and is there anything we can do to reduce them?

Until the outcome of formal consultation is known it is not possible to be specific about risks but they may include:

Potential risks to existing posts within the service – this would be managed through the usual HR processes.

Complaints from existing users and carers if any changes in care arrangements result from the proposals – this would be managed through sensitive reviewing and communication.

11. Power to make the Decision

The NHS and Community Care Act 1990 places a duty on Local Authorities to assess social care needs. The National Assistance Act 1948 and Chronically Sick and Disabled Act 1970 provides for the provision of services to meet any eligible needs. This can be through 3rd party arrangements as currently exist with domiciliary care and residential services.

Article 6.3.1 of the Council's Constitution

Contact Officer:

Head of Adults and Business Services

Tel: 01824 706581

Report to:	Communities Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	16 July 2012
Lead Officer: Regulatory Services	Head of Planning, Regeneration and
Report Author:	Planning Officer (Renewable Energy Schemes)
Title:	Major Infrastructure Projects: Resource Allocation and Community Engagement

1. What is the report about?

Major infrastructure projects are very large scale developments proposals such as large windfarms, which require a type of consent known as 'development consent' under procedures governed by the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011). Any developer wishing to build a major infrastructure project must apply to the Planning Inspectorate and Local Authorities are statutory consultees. A Report setting out the planning context for major infrastructure projects was reported to Planning Committee on 30 May 2012; a copy of this report is contained in **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2** contains a summary of the role of the Local Authority in the planning process for major infrastructure projects.

There are a number of major infrastructure projects that are within or directly affect Denbighshire. There is no statutory obligation placed on the Local Authority to participate in the process of assessment for such schemes, however, some major infrastructure projects will have significant social, economic and environmental impacts on the County. Given the scale of certain development proposals in Denbighshire and the impact this will have on our local communities, Officers feel it is incumbent on us to ensure a collective response is provided to the Inspectorate and we participate, to some degree, in the process.

2. What is the reason for making this report?

The aim of this report is to seek Member guidance on the resource commitment and level of community engagement the Council should dedicate to major infrastructure projects.

3. What are the Recommendations?

That the Committee recommends that the:

- 3.1 Council complies with the provisions set out in the Planning Act 2008 and dedicate sufficient resources to ensure the Council can fully respond to major infrastructure projects. Officers are therefore

recommending **Resource Allocation Option 3** (please refer to section 4.1 below); and

- 3.2 in accordance with the Council's aspirations of becoming closer to the community, that the Council engage with the local community to ensure the Council's response to major infrastructure projects takes into account local opinion. However Officers are mindful that the right balance needs to be struck between what is aspirational and what is deliverable. Officers are therefore recommending **Community Engagement Option B** (please refer to section 4.2 below).

4. Report details.

The report is broken down into two areas; we are seeking Members input on level of resource allocation and the extent of community engagement which should be assigned to major infrastructure projects. The options are set out in the sub-sections below:

4.1 Resource allocation:

The Local Authority is a statutory consultee on major infrastructure projects and has an important role to play should they choose to engage in the process. However, unlike planning applications submitted directly to the Council there is no planning fee associated with such schemes which could be used by the Authority to cover our administrative and assessment costs.

Key requirements within this process include responding to pre-application consultation, reviewing draft environmental information, commenting on the developer's approach to community consultation and producing a 'Local Impact Report'. Where major infrastructure projects fall within more than one administrative boundary, the Council will endeavour to collaborate with neighbouring authorities and streamline resources wherever possible.

It is important to stress that applications will include complex, lengthy documents that require a significant amount of time to assess before a consultation response can be formulated. It is also important to note that consultation timescales are set out in statute, and therefore consultation responses will need to be produced in a timely manner. Having regard to this the Council may not have the necessary internal technical expertise to fully consider all the potential impacts associated with the development proposal.

Local Authorities are one of many statutory consultees. Other consultees include Town and Community Councils, Countryside Council for Wales, Environment Agency, etc. who will also be assessing the development proposal and providing comments on their specific area of expertise.

The planning fee received by the Planning Inspectorate is likely to be a six figure sum; the Examination Body of the Inspectorate is likely to have extensive internal expertise and they are able to appoint an external assessor where issues raised cannot be adequately assessed by the Inspector(s) alone.

As such, the following table sets out some options for the Council in terms of the way it **responds** to major infrastructure projects:-

<p>Option 1: The Council does not dedicate any resource to responding to major infrastructure projects.</p> <p><u>Interpretation:</u> Where the Council receives an invitation to respond to a major infrastructure project or a developer requests a meeting, advice or information, the Council declines to respond.</p>
<p>Option 2. The Council utilises existing internal resources to respond to major infrastructure projects.</p> <p><u>Interpretation:</u> The Council has appointed a temporary renewable energy planning officer to handle the increased volume of work relating to renewable energy schemes. The Officer can coordinate the major infrastructure project caseload (officer in post until August 2013) and other internal officers can be utilised to provide a technical input. However, the Council no longer has a landscape officer, a tree officer or a contaminated land officer and there may be limited expertise / capacity in other technical disciplines.</p>
<p>Option 3. The Council utilises existing internal resources and allocates a budget from central funds to ensure sufficient additional internal and external resources can be dedicated to respond to major infrastructure projects.</p> <p><u>Interpretation:</u> Additional internal and external resources may be required to fully respond to major infrastructure projects (e.g. additional officer resources and / or external consultants); to ensure these resources can be deployed, a budget will need to be allocated from central funds.</p> <p>However there are funding streams that might be available to recover some or all of the costs associated with responding to major infrastructure projects. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Funding from the Welsh Government (e.g. funding for work associated with onshore windfarm projects over 50MW is available through the Planning Improvement Fund Theme 3 for 2012/13).• Entering into a legal agreement with project developers to secure a financial contribution towards the costs incurred by the Council when carrying out certain project specific activities (e.g. to produce a Local Impact Report). <p>Indicative project costs are set out in Appendix 4.</p>

4.2 Community engagement:

There is an established consultation process for major infrastructure projects. The Planning Act 2008 places a duty on the developer to undertake extensive consultation with statutory consultees and local communities before submitting an application to the Planning Inspectorate.

Once an application has been submitted, comments should be directed to the Planning Inspectorate. At this stage the Planning Inspectorate will usually hold a series of public 'outreach' sessions in local venues to explain how members

of the public and interested parties can register their interest and make representations on the project.

It is important to stress that there is **no** statutory obligation on the Local Authority to engage the public or other stakeholders with respect to major infrastructure projects.

However, the Council is committed to bringing the Council closer to the community. Major infrastructure projects are very large development proposals which will impact significantly on local communities and the Council may wish to take a more proactive role. Local communities can also play a key role in assisting the Council to identify localised impacts, and it may be beneficial to establish a dialogue with local communities to ensure evidence and information can be gathered to inform the Council's response to major infrastructure projects.

As such, it would appear that the Council could choose one of the following options in terms of **Community Engagement** relating to major infrastructure projects:-

Option A: The Council does not proactively carry out community engagement on major infrastructure projects.

Interpretation: The Council will not proactively engage with the local community. Publicity, consultation and community engagement activities will be restricted to the activities which the developer is legally obliged to carry out.

Option B: The Council utilises internal resources to raise awareness and carry out community engagement activities to inform the Council's consultation response.

Interpretation: This option assumes the Council will dedicate a level of resource to responding to major infrastructure projects and there will be some budget available to cover officer resources and administrative costs.

The Council will endeavour to raise awareness of major infrastructure projects within local communities and commit to engage with the local community (e.g. via Town and Community Councils) to canvas local opinion and gather information to inform the Council's consultation response.

Given that the Council's opinion may differ from the views of other interested parties, should the Council choose to engage the local community, it will be important to stress that the Council is not the decision making body, and that any comments submitted to the Council during engagement activities will be used to inform the Council's consultation response only, and does not constitute a representation to the Examination Body.

Option C: Option B plus the Council dedicates additional internal resources to pro-actively support third party organisations and help local communities understand, engage and respond to major infrastructure projects.

Interpretation: In addition to the provisions set out in Option B, the Council will commit additional internal resources to provide direct support to local communities to enable them to understand, engage and respond to major

infrastructure projects. This will include attending community meetings, responding to requests for information, providing advice to local communities etc.

Additional internal resources would be required to deliver this option.

5. How does the decision contribute to the Corporate Priorities?

The Council has a Strategic Aim of bringing the Council closer to the community.

6. What will it cost and how will it affect other services?

Each of the options set out in Section 4 will have varying financial and resource implications for the Council. The tables contained in **Appendix 3** summarise the financial and resource implications together with the potential impacts / risks associated with each of the options presented.

7. What consultations have been carried out?

No formal consultation has been carried out on the proposals set out above.

8. Chief Finance Officer Statement

Resource implications arising from the council's response to consultation on major infrastructure projects, particularly if there is potential for bids for additional internal resources, would have to be made through the service challenge and budget setting process.

9. What risks are there and is there anything we can do to reduce them?

Risks / potential impacts are set out in the tables in **Appendix 3**.

10. Power to make the Decision

The Planning Act 2008 places no statutory obligation on the Local Authority to participate in the planning process or engage the local community on major infrastructure projects. However, Part 8 of the Act confers an enforcement function on the Local Authority; the Council will therefore have the power to take enforcement action post consent should the development be in breach of the provisions set out in the Development Consent Order.

Contact Officer:

Planning Officer (Renewable Energy Schemes)

Tel: 01824 706724

This page is intentionally left blank

INFORMATION ITEM

REPORT BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING, REGENERATION AND REGULATORY SERVICES

**MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS
UPDATE REPORT**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 Members will recall previous reports focusing on major infrastructure projects in Denbighshire.

1.2 This report seeks to update Members on:

- changes to the planning process for major infrastructure projects introduced by the Localism Act 2011;
- the statutory framework for major infrastructure projects; and
- the current status of major infrastructure projects in Denbighshire.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Major infrastructure projects are large scale developments such as new harbours, power stations (including wind farms), and electricity transmission lines, which require a type of consent known as 'development consent' under procedures governed by the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

2.2 Previously major infrastructure projects were dealt with by the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). Under the Localism Act 2011, the IPC was abolished and from the 1 April 2012 the Planning Inspectorate became the agency responsible for operating the planning process for major infrastructure projects. In Wales the Planning Inspectorate examines applications for energy and harbour development, subject to detailed provisions in the Planning Act 2008 (the '2008 Act').

2.3 The 2008 Act sets out thresholds above which certain types of infrastructure development are considered to be nationally significant and require development consent. For energy projects in England and Wales, it includes:

- Electricity generation power stations with an installed capacity over 50 megawatts onshore and 100 megawatts offshore. This includes generation from fossil fuels, wind farms, biomass, energy from waste and nuclear; and
- High voltage electricity power lines at or above 132,000 Volts.

2.4 Any developer wishing to construct a major infrastructure project must first apply for consent to do so. For such projects, the Planning Inspectorate examines the application and will make a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State, who will make the decision on whether to grant or to refuse development consent.

2.5 The 2008 Act places a duty on the project developer to undertake extensive consultation with prescribed consultees and local communities before submitting an application for development consent to the Planning Inspectorate. The prescribed list of consultees is contained in Schedule 1 to The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009; Local Authorities and relevant Town and Community Councils are defined as prescribed consultees.

2.6 There is no statutory obligation placed on the Local Authority to respond to pre-application consultation or participate in the examination process.

2.7 However, Part 8 of the 2008 Act confers an enforcement function on the Local Authority; the Council will therefore have the power to take enforcement action post consent should the development be in breach of the provisions set out in the Development Consent Order.

2.8 When making a recommendation or a decision on an application for development consent, the Inspector(s) appointed to examine the application must have regard to any relevant National Policy Statement; any Local Impact Report submitted by a relevant Local Authority; and any other matter which the Inspector(s) consider important or relevant.

2.9 Welsh Government policy and local planning policy are material considerations, however it is for the Local Authority or other interested parties to identify relevant policies and put forward a case during the examination of the application to demonstrate why weight should be apportioned to a particular policy.

2.10. Given the scale of development in Denbighshire and the impact this will have on our local communities, Officers feel it is incumbent to fully participate in the process; in this respect key activities include responding to pre-application consultations, submitting written representations and producing a Local Impact Report. A report will be put to the Communities Scrutiny Committee (date to be confirmed) to ratify the level of involvement the Council should have with regards to major infrastructure projects.

2.11 Appendix 1 summarises the statutory stages in the planning process for major infrastructure projects which affect the Local Authority and the local community.

3. MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN DENBIGHSHIRE

3.1 There are five major infrastructure projects currently in the pre-application stages which affect Denbighshire. This includes offshore and onshore windfarms and new high voltage electricity power lines. In addition, the Gwynt y Mor offshore windfarm is currently under construction. Details of all major infrastructure projects affecting Denbighshire are detailed below:

Offshore major infrastructure projects

3.2 The offshore windfarm developments off the North Wales coast are classed as major infrastructure developments and affect Denbighshire in terms of visual, landscape and seascape impact. Offshore windfarms also need an onshore connection point to feed the power generated into the electricity grid. Onshore grid connection works are likely to be subject to a separate planning application, where the determination body is the relevant local planning authority rather than the Planning Inspectorate.

3.2.1 Gwynt y Mor offshore windfarm

- The applicant for the project is RWE Renewables Ltd.
- The proposal is for a 576 megawatt (MW) offshore windfarm in Liverpool Bay, around 18km off the North Wales coast.
- The development will consist of 160 no. 3.6MW turbines each with a tip height of 150m.
- The offshore windfarm will have a grid connection point at St Asaph.
- The Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) granted consent for the windfarm in December 2008 and Denbighshire County Council granted planning permission for the onshore grid connection works in early 2009.
- The development is currently under construction.

3.2.2 Burbo Bank Extension offshore windfarm

- The applicant for the project is Dong Energy.
- The proposal is to extend the existing Burbo Bank offshore windfarm in Liverpool Bay, approximately 7km north of Hoylake on the Wirral and 12.2km from the Point of Ayr in Flintshire.

- The proposed installed capacity will be approximately 250MW and the windfarm will consist of a maximum of 75 turbines with a maximum tip height of 225m.
- The windfarm extension has been offered a grid connection point at St Asaph. and the onshore grid connection works will require planning permission from Denbighshire County Council. The onshore grid connection route is yet to be finalised. None of the current route options require overhead lines. All the cabling from the shoreline to St Asaph will be underground, however a new substation will be required.
- The development is in the pre-application stages. Statutory pre-application consultation commenced on 16 April 2012 and will run until 1 June 2012.
- The developer intends to submit the applications to the Planning Inspectorate and Denbighshire County Council in early 2013.

3.2.3 Irish Sea Zone offshore windfarms

- In 2008 the Crown Estate began a competitive tender process to develop offshore windfarms in nine specified zones around Britain in its third round of offshore windfarm leasing (known as Round 3). This included the Irish Sea Zone.
- The Crown Estates awarded Centrica the development rights to the Irish Sea Zone in January 2010. In March 2012, Centric and Dong Energy announced the creation of a joint venture partnership to develop, construct and operate windfarms in the Irish Sea Zone.
- A Zonal Appraisal and Planning programme has been completed which identifies three Potential Development Areas where windfarm development could be located within the Irish Sea Zone.
- The scheme is in the early pre-application stages and the development programme is currently being devised.

Onshore major infrastructure projects

3.3 The following onshore developments affecting Denbighshire are classed as major infrastructure developments:

3.3.1 Clocaenog Forest windfarm

- The applicant for the project is RWE Npower Ltd.
- The proposal is for a 32 turbine windfarm and associated infrastructure in the Clocaenog Forest. Each turbine would have a generating capacity of between 2 – 3MW and would have a maximum tip height of 145 metres.
- The site is wholly within the Clocaenog Forest Strategic Search Area identified in Welsh Government Technical Advice Note 8. The Welsh Government seeks to direct large scale wind farm development to within Strategic Search Areas.
- The development is in the pre-application stages. Statutory pre-application consultation was carried out in September 2011 and the application is expected to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in summer 2012.

3.3.2 Mynydd Mynyllod windfarm

- The applicant for the project is Scottish Power Renewables Ltd.
- The proposal is for a windfarm of up to 25 turbines and associated infrastructure on Mynydd Mynyllod, approximately 5km south west of Corwen. Each turbine would have a generating capacity of 2 -3MW and would have a maximum tip height of 145 metres.
- The site is outside of the Clocaenog Forest Strategic Search Area identified in Welsh Government Technical Advice Note 8. The Welsh Government seeks to direct large scale wind farm development to within Strategic Search Areas.
- The development in the pre-application stages. Consultation on preliminary environmental information was carried out in Autumn 2011 and formal pre-application consultation is expected to commence in June 2012 (the consultation period will last 42 days).

3.3.3 North Wales wind farm Connections

- The applicant for the project is Scottish Power Energy Networks (Scottish Power MANWEB) who are the distribution network operator for the North Wales area.
- The electricity grid connection infrastructure to connect the consented windfarms in the Clocaenog Forest Strategic Search Area and the proposed Clocaenog Forest windfarm is classed as a major infrastructure development as it will include new 132,000 Volt power lines from Clocaenog Forest to St Asaph. The exact route and type of infrastructure is yet to be defined but it is envisaged that overhead lines will be required.
- Any new substations would require planning permission from Denbighshire County Council.
- The development is in the early pre-application stages. Early consultation with local communities is expected to be carried out in spring / summer 2012 to help the developer refine the route options. Once the preferred route is identified, the developer will consult with the Council on the provisions of the Statement of Common Ground and formal pre-application consultation is expected in Summer 2012.

3.3.4 National Grid North Wales grid connection

- The applicant for the project is the National Grid.
- The National Grid North Wales grid connection project is classed as a major infrastructure development and will affect the whole of North Wales. This is a separate development from the North Wales wind farm connections project being progressed by Scottish Power Energy Networks.
- The proposal is to upgrade the existing North Wales National Grid electricity power lines to increase the capacity on the transmission network (this is the existing very high voltage lines on large pylons which stretches across North Wales). All North Wales local authorities will be affected by this project, however the current options are only proposing to re-power the existing lines which cross through Denbighshire; no new infrastructure is proposed in the county (however new power lines and infrastructure are proposed in other North Wales counties).
- The development is in the early pre-application stages and is yet to be registered as a project with the Planning Inspectorate.

3.4 The lead officer within the planning section for major infrastructure projects is Denise Shaw, who is the Renewable Energy Schemes Planning Officer based in the Caledfryn office, and would be please to answer any questions relating to these matters..

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The report is mainly for information purposes, but Members are requested to note the key dates identified in Section 3 of this report. Useful advice notes and further information can be found on the Planning Inspectorate's dedicated National Infrastructure Planning website:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/>

GRAHAM H. BOASE

HEAD OF PLANNING, REGENERATION AND REGULATORY SERVICES

APPENDIX 2:

THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY IN THE PLANNING PROCESS FOR MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

The tables below set out the statutory stages which relate to Local Authorities in the planning process for major infrastructure projects. Relevant non-statutory stages which affect Local Authorities have also been included and are shown in italics.

A1. PRE-APPLICATION STAGE		
Pre-application Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
EIA scoping opinion consultation (EIA Regs)	Where the developer requests an EIA scoping opinion from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), the Inspectorate will consult with Local Authorities and other consultation bodies prior to issuing their opinion.	Minimum of 28 days
Draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) consultation (Section 47)	Prior to undertaking formal consultation with the local community, the developer is required to prepare a Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), setting out how they are going to carry out their consultation. The Local Authority will be invited to comment on the provisions of the draft SoCC before it is published.	28 days
Statutory consultation (Section 42)	Developer is required to formally consult prescribed consultees at pre-application stage (this includes Local Authorities and relevant Town and Community Councils).	Minimum of 28 days
Community Consultation (Section 47)	The developer is required to engage with the local community in accordance with the proposals set out in the SoCC	No statutory timescale
Publicity (Section 48)	The developer is required to advertise the project in national and local newspapers at specified stages in the process	No statutory timescale
<i>Pre-submission discussions</i>	<i>Best practice recommends developers enter into discussions with the Local Authority prior to submitting their application. This may include commenting on the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) provisions, requirements and planning obligations and agreeing a Statement of Common Ground.</i>	<i>No statutory timescale</i>

A2. SUBMISSION / ACCEPTANCE STAGE		
Submission / Acceptance Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
Comment on the adequacy of community consultation (Section 55)	The Planning Inspectorate has 28 days to decide whether or not to accept an application. During this time the Local Authority will be invited to comment on the adequacy of the consultation carried out by the applicant.	Less than 28 days (2 weeks is most likely)

A3. PRE-EXAMINATION STAGE		
Pre-examination Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
Registration of Interest / Initial Representation (Section 56 & 57)	Once an application is accepted, the developer must give notice of the application to prescribed consultees, Local Authorities and any other person who is within one of more of the categories set out in Section 57. The developer must also publicise the application in the prescribed manner and allow a minimum of 28 days for interested parties to register their interest. The deadline for expressions of interest to be clearly stated. As a prescribed consultee, Local Authorities are automatically an 'interested party'. The Planning Inspectorate encourage prescribed consultees to make a representation at this stage to set out their initial views on the application.	Approx. 3 month Pre-application stage. Minimum 28 days must be given for interested parties to register their interest
Local Impact Report (Section 60)	The Local Authority will be invited to submit a Local Impact Report. The Local Impact Report is a vital document that will help to inform the Inspectors recommendations. The aim of the LIR is to give details of the likely effects of the proposed development on the authority's area, or any part of it. The Planning Inspectorate must have regard to any Local Impact Report during the examination of an application for development consent.	Timescale for submission of LIR will be set by Planning Inspectorate
<i>Agree a Statement of Common Ground</i>	<i>The developer may approach the Local Authority to negotiate and agree a Statement of Common Ground and seek to agree heads of terms for any necessary legal agreements (Section 174 of the 2008 Act amends section 106 of the TCPA 1990 to enable legal agreements to be entered into)</i>	<i>No statutory time limit</i>

A4. EXAMINATION STAGE		
Examination Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
Preliminary Meeting (Section 88)	The Local Authority will be invited to attend a preliminary meeting.	6 month Examination stage
Submit Written Representation (Section 90)	The Local Authority will be invited to submit written representations..	Timescale for written reps will be set by Planning Inspectorate
Attend / speak at Hearing (Section 91 – 96)	The Local Authority will be invited to attend Hearing sessions and make oral representations where necessary.	Timescale for oral reps will be set by Planning Inspectorate

A5. DECISION STAGE		
Decision Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
Decision Statement (Section 103-117)	The Decision make must prepare a statement of its reasons for deciding to grant of refuse development consent. A copy of the statement should be provided to prescribed consultees and interested parties.	Planning Inspectorate has 3 months to make Decision / Recommendation Secretary of State will have an additional 3 months
Legal Challenge (Section 118)	A court may entertain proceeding for questioning an order granted development consent only if a) The proceedings are brought by a claim for judicial review and b) The claim form is filed during the period of 6 weeks	6 weeks

A6. POST DECISION STAGE		
Post- decision Stage	Activity	Statutory timescale
Post consent monitoring and enforcement (Section 160-173)	Part 8 of the 2008 Act sets out the enforcement powers relating to development consent orders and confers an enforcement function on the local planning authority.	As defined in the DCO

Glossary of abbreviations:

DCO = Development Consent Order

EIA = Environmental Impact Assessment

EIA Regs = Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009

LIR = Local Impact Report

SoCC = Statement of Community Consultation

TCPA 1990 = Town and County Planning Act 1990

2008 Act = Planning Act 2008

FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS/ RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OPTION

Table A3.1: Resource allocation options		
Option	Financial / resource implications	Potential impacts / risks
Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No financial or resource implications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local impacts may not be given significant weight in decision making process, unless other consultees / interested parties have raised the issue.
Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct financial implications. Significant Officer time will need to be dedicated to ensure application documents can be adequately assessed. Input will be required from Officers within the following departments: Planning and Public Protection, Highways and Infrastructure, Environmental Services, Regeneration and other departments as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be capacity constraints and statutory consultation deadlines may not be met. Renewable energy planning officer post only funded until August 2013. Other service delivery may be compromised as resources are diverted to major infrastructure projects. The Council may not have all the necessary technical expertise to fully consider the impacts (e.g. landscape impact).
Option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A budget will need to be allocated and the Council will incur financial costs. Appendix B sets out indicative costs. Some or all of the financial costs can be recovered through different methods. Officer time still required, however impact on service delivery and officers will be alleviated by the use of additional internal and external resources. Will need to monitor officer time and expenditure per 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Authority receives no planning fee for major infrastructure projects, therefore cannot be resourced from existing planning budget. May lead to a budget reduction for other service provision. Welsh Government funding may not apply to all projects and may not be available in perpetuity (e.g. 2012/13 Theme 3 funding only applies to onshore windfarms over 50MW). There is no statutory obligation on the project developer to

	<p>project (accurate cost breakdowns will be required to recover costs from Welsh Government / developer).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Officer time will be required to draft legal agreements. 	<p>provide a financial contribution. The Council will be required to negotiate with the developer on a case by case basis; contributions are not guaranteed and may vary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where costs can be recovered, payment will be retrospective.
--	---	--

Table A3.2: Community engagement options

Option	Financial / resource implications	Potential impacts / risks
Option A	No financial or resource implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community does not feel empowered to engage in the process. • Community may feel the Council's response to the application does not adequately reflect public opinion.
Option B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some financial implications to cover administration (e.g. postage, public notices etc.). • Internal resource will need to be deployed to develop a communication strategy for major infrastructure projects. Officer time will be required from Planning, Corporate Communications and Business Planning and Performance (Partnerships and Communities) • Sufficient Officer time will be required to engage with community representatives (e.g. Town and Community Councils) and collate and assess written community responses in advance of major infrastructure projects being submitted to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk that additional engagement activities will lead to confusion and formal consultation responses from the public are submitted to the Council instead of the Planning Inspectorate. • Community expectations may not be fulfilled. • The Council's formal consultation response may not accord with the views and opinions raised by community representatives during the engagement exercise.

	the Planning Inspectorate.	
Option B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial implications to cover administration and increased staffing costs. • Significant additional resources will be required to fully resource this option. Significant Officer time will be spent at public meetings and providing in-depth support and advice to local communities. • Additional staffing may be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will impact upon statutory planning function; renewable energy planning officer will need to be deployed to major infrastructure projects 100% of time (currently role is split between major infrastructure projects and development control / planning policy functions). • May inhibit the Council fulfilling its role as statutory consultee as resources are diverted away from casework towards community engagement. • Community expectations may not be fulfilled. • May hinder communities rather than empower them to engage as communities may expect Council to object to the project on their behalf. • Communities may expect to receive the same in-depth support to assist them respond to standard planning applications, which cannot be resourced.

INDICATIVE EXTERNAL COSTS TO RESPOND TO MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

The current major infrastructure projects in Denbighshire are energy projects; namely onshore and offshore windfarms and new overhead high voltage electricity power lines.

A breakdown of costs incurred by the Council when assessing previous onshore windfarm planning applications through the Town and County Planning Act 1990 regime are set out below:

Wern Ddu windfarm planning application & planning Appeal:

Discipline	Cost
Consultants to defend the SSA refinement exercise at Appeal	£10,610
Landscape Consultants	£18,270
Legal Counsel	£5,400
Total	£34,280

Derwydd Bach windfarm planning application

Discipline	Cost
Planning Consultants to assess the application on behalf of the Council	£9,955
Total	£9,955

In addition, the Welsh Government has established a Wales-wide Technical Consultancy Services Procurement Framework. All consultancies on the Framework have met the public sector pre-qualification criteria. Local Authorities are party to the Framework and have the option of appointing a consultant from the Framework Agreement rather than having to formally go out to tender in accordance with public sector procurement guidelines.

The framework includes a range of technical services including environmental consultancy services. Hourly rates are set out for each consultancy ranging from Administration Assistant to Director. For comparison, rates for Chartered Professionals from relevant consultancies are set out on the page below:

Landscape Consultants

Consultancy	Chartered Professional hourly rate
Atkins	£60.60
Gillespies LLP	£42.50
Halcrow Group Ltd	£42.77
Lingard Styles Ltd	£45.00
TACP	£59.33

Ecological Consultants

Consultancy	Chartered Professional hourly rate
AECOM	£50.00
Capita Symonds	£35.00
Halcrow Group Ltd	£46.96
Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd	£64.00
Jacobs	£37.00
Lingard Styles Ltd	£45.00
Opus Int. Cons (UK) Ltd	£42.00
Parsons Brinckerhoff	£46.17
TACP	£42.38

Hydrology and Hydrogeology Consultants (Contamination)

Consultancy	Chartered Professional hourly rate
AECOM	£50.00
Capita Symonds	£40.00
Halcrow Group Ltd	£50.13
Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd	£42.00
Mott Macdonald	£48.00
Parsons Brinckerhoff	£46.17
Smith Grant LLP	£48.00

Acoustic, Noise & Vibration Consultants

Consultancy	Chartered Professional hourly rate
AECOM	£50.00
Atkins	£50.50
Capita Symonds	£45.00
Halcrow Group Ltd	£55.29
Jacobs	£37.00
Mott MacDonald	£46.00
Parsons Brinckerhoff	£46.17

This page is intentionally left blank

Report To: Communities Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 16 July 2012

Lead Officer: Head of Business Planning and Performance

Report Author: Community Engagement Manager

Title: Allocation of the Member Area Fund

1. What is the report about?

To provide an overview on the funding allocated to enable Member Area Groups to support priority projects in their areas and review its success.

2. What is the reason for making this report?

Scrutiny received a report in its March meeting on the allocation of £50,000 to each of the six Member Area Groups (MAGs) with a reminder of the criteria under which the money was allocated and how the money was utilised for the benefit of the communities.

As many of the projects had not yet been completed when the report was discussed it was agreed a further report would be submitted with an analysis of the benefits accrued.

3. What are the Recommendations?

Members consider the recommendations made in 6.1.

4. Report details

4.1 Background to the allocation

4.1.1 At the end of each financial year the final budget position is reported to Cabinet and then full Council who approve all allocations of under or over spends and transfers to/from reserves and provisions.

4.1.2 At the end of 2010/11 the Council had an under spend. An option was proposed of using £300k of this to support the Council's priority of getting closer to the community. This was supported at Cabinet on 21 June and approved at Council on 5 July. It was proposed that this could be done through the recently reconvened Member Area Groups (MAGs). This would allow the MAGs to have direct access to funds to address issues in their area and allow the Council to address local issues.

4.1.3 All Elected Members were notified of the MAG allocation with a guidance note explaining the principles behind the allocation, how the process would be

managed and the likely timetable for its distribution. Accompanying the guidance was a project proposal form for use by Members. (Appendix 1)

4.1.4 Further guidance was given at each subsequent MAG meeting and it remained a standard agenda item.

4.2 Distribution of the funds

4.2.1 All six MAGs discussed how they would approach the distribution of funds and although Officers highlighted the guidelines stipulating a minimum expenditure of £10,000 per project some MAGs had difficulty agreeing large projects which would equally benefit all wards / geographic areas. The six MAGs subsequently decided their allocation in the following manner:

Dee Valley

The £50,000 would be distributed equally between Llangollen and Corwen (including Cynwyd / Llandrillo).

Denbigh

Allocated the funds on a ward basis.

Elwy

Allocated the funds on an individual Member basis

Prestatyn

Allocated the funds on several large projects which would benefit the town as a whole.

Rhyl

Allocated the funds on a ward basis

Ruthin

Allocation on one or two large projects which would benefit the town and its hinterland.

4.2.2 Members used the Project Proposal Form which was presented to Corporate Executive Team (CET) for its approval with the appropriate costing and approval of Services.

5. Review of the process

5.1 All of the £50k has now been spent or is in a holding account ready for release (some projects are awaiting external match funding and the sums will not be released until these are in place).

- 5.2 As outlined in 4.2.1 it was envisaged the distribution of the Funds would be a relatively straightforward allocation to one of two large projects per MAGs.

Due to the geographic makeup of some of the MAG the guidance given to concentrating on two or three large projects has not been adopted resulting in smaller projects which will obviously have less impact on the community. As different MAGs decided on adopting different criteria the number of schemes eventually mushroomed to over 70 individual projects.

- 5.3 Although the benefits to some of the submitted schemes i.e. computers to schools is self explanatory others such as the reduced town centre car parking charges entails further analysis over a significant period. Reports are being presented to the Ruthin MAG specifically on the subsidised car parking. Furthermore some of the schemes are very small contributions to community organisations for amounts less than £200.

- 5.4 From an administrative perspective the process has been time consuming for Officers particularly when several projects may have been submitted just in one ward.

5.5 **Benefits accrued from the process:**

a) Members have been able to resolve local issues which would not have been funded from other sources e.g. lower car park charges, new signage etc.

b) Members who have used the funds creatively have attracted substantial match funding ensuring that maximum benefit has resulted from the initial contribution.

Rhyl Wards in particular attracted significant amounts of external funding such as:

- the East Parade improvements have attracted match funding in excess of £9000 through the SRA fund
- South West Rhyl Marsh Tracks / Glan Morfa / Botanical Gardens attracted over £11k from other sources
- the Rhyl High School re-engagement project attracted ESF funding of £30k.

Rural areas have also benefited from Members accessing Cadwyn Clwyd funds such as the Corwen scheme attracting a total of £16,600 from an allocation of £6k from the Members Fund.

Many of the other projects throughout the County also attracted perhaps more modest contributions particularly schemes in partnership with Community Councils and Not For Profit Organisations such as the Scala.

c) Some funds allocated have been instrumental in allowing Members to engage with their community. The allocation of £14k to Henllan for a new play area attracted a further £18k through the Participatory Budgeting process which gave the residents control over which play equipment should be purchased.

d) many of the contributions to small local voluntary organisations have been particularly important to them in delivering projects which would have been beyond their financial resources e.g. the purchase of a trailer for Scouts across the county to benefit from kayak canoeing and the ongoing financial support for a parish lengthsman.

5.6 Lessons learnt from the process

Reference has already been made to the number of schemes that were eventually submitted which caused lengthy administrative procedures particularly in making a large number of small payments to external groups. Some Members allocated in excess of 12 individual payments to different community organisations in their Ward and although they no doubt made a significant difference to each organisation they did not meet the requirements of the guiding 'terms of reference'.

The funding to each MAG became available in September 2011 with each subsequent MAG meeting being reminded to submit projects. Many Members, however, did not submit projects until February / March 2012 prolonging the process well beyond the timescale envisaged.

Members have broadly welcomed the allocation of funds and the benefits they have derived to their Wards and have indicated support for a similar initiative in the future should funds be available

6. Recommendations for future distribution of funds

6.1 Members were made aware that the £50k was a one-off allocation of funds with no commitment that the process would be repeated. No decision has yet been made for a similar exercise and it would be dependent on the availability of funds in future years. If however, a similar funding initiative was to become available Officers recommend the following guidance in its distribution.

- Any suggested scheme must be submitted to a MAG meeting and fully endorsed at the meeting rather than devolved to individual Ward Members.
- All schemes in future should be aligned to and support the delivery of the Town Plans / Rhyl Going Forward or rural projects agreed by the MAG.

Contact Officer:
Community Engagement Manager
Tel 01824 706146

Allocation of Community Based Funding to Member Area Groups

Guidance for Proposals

The Council has allocated £50k to each of the Member Area Groups. The purpose of the funding is to support the Council's priority of 'Getting Closer to the Community'. This document provides members with guidance on the proper expenditure of those funds.

Principals

- Should support local projects
- Can be used to grant fund other bodies, spend directly on new projects, or to enhance or improve existing Council services
- Can be used for revenue or capital projects but cannot create an ongoing liability for expenditure by the Council
- Projects should be of sufficient size to make an impact in the local area – minimum expenditure of £10k per project
- Projects should be supported by evidence of their need and what benefit / outcome they will achieve for the local community
- Projects must be formally agreed by each Member Area Group. No individual member can commit expenditure. Where possible multiple projects per ward should be avoided

Process

- A Project Proposal must be completed for each proposal
- Any project must be agreed by the relevant Head of Service within the Council to ensure it is affordable and feasible
- Final approval for the projects will be given by CET to ensure the projects do not contravene any regulations etc or conflict with any other proposals. This brings an auditable independent check to ensure there are no issues with probity and that expenditure is authorised in line with the constitution.

Timetable

- The next round of Member Area Group meetings is in October and it is assumed that proposals will be put to these meetings with decisions taken either at these meetings or the following meeting early in the new year.

Member Area Group Project Proposal	
What is the name of the project?	
How much will it cost?	
Is there any match funding? If Yes state amount and source	
How long do you think it will take to deliver?	
Who will manage the project? (Council dept, external etc)	
What will the project do?	
Why do you think the project is required? What evidence do you have?	
How will this project bring the Council closer to the community?	
How will you know if it has been successful?	

Report to: Communities Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 16 July 2012

Report Author: Scrutiny Coordinator

Title: Scrutiny Work Programme

1. What is the report about?

The report presents the Communities Scrutiny Committee with its draft forward work programme for members' consideration.

2. What is the reason for making this report?

To seek the Committee to review and agree on its programme of future work, and to update members on relevant issues.

3. What are the recommendations?

That the Committee:

- 3.1 considers the information provided and approves, revises or amends its forward work programme as it deems appropriate; and
- 3.2 nominates a representative to fill the Committee's vacancy on the Business Planning and Performance Service Challenge Group.

4. Report details.

- 4.1 Article 6 of the Council's Constitution sets out each Scrutiny Committee's terms of reference, functions and membership, whilst the rules of procedure for scrutiny committees are laid out in Part 4 of the Constitution.
- 4.2 Denbighshire County Council's Constitution requires scrutiny committees to prepare and keep under review a programme for their future work. By reviewing and prioritising issues, members are able to ensure that the work programme delivers a member-led agenda.
- 4.3 For a number of years it has been an adopted practice in Denbighshire for scrutiny committees to limit the number of reports considered at any one meeting to a maximum of four plus the Committee's own work programme report. The objective of this approach is to facilitate detailed and effective debate on each topic.
- 4.4 The Committee is requested to consider its draft work programme for future meetings as detailed in appendix 1 and approve, revise or amend it as it deems appropriate. This draft work programme reflects the topics and issues suggested by members at the Committee's first

meeting.

When deciding on the work programme members are asked to take into consideration:

- issues raised by members of the Committee
- matters referred to it by the Scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs Group
- relevance to the Committee's/Council's/community priorities
- the Council's Corporate Plan and the Director of Social Services' Annual Report
- meeting workload
- timeliness
- outcomes
- key issues and information to be included in reports
- officers and/or lead Cabinet members who should be invited (having regard to whether their attendance is necessary or would add value)
- questions to be put to officers/lead Cabinet members

4.5 In addition, when considering items for inclusion on the future forward work programme members may also find it helpful to have regard to the following questions when determining a subject's suitability for inclusion:

- what is the issue?
- who are the stakeholders?
- what is being looked at elsewhere
- what does scrutiny need to know? and
- who may be able to assist?

4.6 As mentioned in paragraph 4.2 the Constitution of Denbighshire County Council requires scrutiny committees to prepare and keep under review a programme for their future work. To assist the process of prioritising reports, if officers are of the view that a subject merits time for discussion on the Committee's business agenda they have to formally request the Committee to consider receiving a report on that topic. This is done via the submission of a 'proposal form' which clarifies the purpose, importance and potential outcomes of suggested topics. No proposal forms have been received for consideration by the Committee at the current meeting.

4.7 Cabinet Forward Work Programme

When deciding on their programme of future work it is useful for scrutiny committees to have regard to Cabinet's scheduled programme of future work. For this purpose a copy of the Cabinet's forward work programme is attached at Appendix 2.

4.8 Progress on Committee Resolutions

A table summarising recent Committee resolutions and advising members on progress with their implementation is attached at Appendix 3 to this report.

5. Scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs Group

5.1 Under the Council's scrutiny arrangements the Scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs Group (SCVCG) performs the role of a coordinating committee.

5.2 At its first meeting on 5 July 2012 the Group considered the work programmes of the three scrutiny committees in conjunction with those of Cabinet and the Corporate Governance Committee. It also considered a couple of requests from officers for scrutiny to consider reports on certain topics. One of these requests related to the establishment of service standards for consultation and community engagement with respect to the planning process. Having considered this request the SCVCG concluded that this item did merit scrutiny and therefore recommended that Communities Scrutiny Committee consider the proposals at its October meeting.

5.3 The item has provisionally been scheduled into the Committee's work programme as item 7 for its meeting on 25 October. Members are asked to discuss this request and the potential pressure on the October meeting's business agenda.

6. Appointment of Committee Representatives on Council Groups and Boards

6.1 Periodically the Committee may be asked to appoint representatives from amongst its membership to serve on various Council Boards and Groups.

6.2 Members will recall that, at the Committee's first meeting, they nominated a number of representatives to serve on the Council's Service Performance Challenge Groups as well as a representative to serve on the Council's Strategic Investment Group (SIG) and the Conwy and Denbighshire Collaboration Programme Board.

6.3 In line with the Committee's request members who were not able to attend the last meeting were contacted with a view to establishing whether they would like to serve on any of the vacant Service Performance Challenge Groups. This exercise proved successful. Consequently, only one vacancy now exists for a Committee representative on the Service Performance Challenge Groups, which is for a representative to serve on the Business Planning and Performance Service Challenge Group. The Committee is requested to fill this vacancy. A copy of the latest list of scrutiny representatives

on the Service Performance Challenge Groups can be seen at Appendix 4.

7. How does the decision contribute to the Corporate Priorities?

Effective scrutiny will assist the Council to deliver its corporate priorities in line with community needs and residents' wishes. Continual development and review of a coordinated work programme will assist the Council in monitoring and reviewing policy issues.

8. What will it cost and how will it affect other services?

Services may need to allocate officer time to assist the Committee with the activities identified in the forward work programme, and with any actions that may result following consideration of those items.

9. What consultations have been carried out?

None required for this report. However, the report itself and the consideration of the forward work programme represent a consultation process with the Committee with respect to its programme of future work.

10. What risks are there and is there anything we can do to reduce them?

No risks have been identified with respect to the consideration of the Committee's forward work programme. However, by regularly reviewing its forward work programme the Committee can ensure that areas of risk are considered and examined as and when they are identified, and recommendations are made with a view to addressing those risks.

11. Power to make the decision

Article 6.3.7 of the Council's Constitution stipulates that the Council's scrutiny committees must prepare and keep under review a programme for their future work.

Contact Officer: Scrutiny Coordinator
Tel No: (01824) 712554
Email: dcc_admin@denbighshire.gov.uk

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

Note: Items entered in italics have not been approved for submission by the Committee. Such reports are listed here for information, pending formal approval.

Meeting	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
13 September (Russell House, Rhyl) Subject: Rhyl Going Forward Programme (* this meeting to include a tour of the key sites included in the Programme)	1 West Rhyl Strategy	To outline the aims and objectives of the Strategy, its budget allocation and financial implications, the progress to date in implementing the Strategy and the benefits realised so far from completed projects	Assurances that the Strategy is being delivered on time and within budget and is achieving the expected outcomes for the communities in the area and complementing the wider regeneration programme for Rhyl	Tom Booty	By SCVCG February 2012
	2 Retail and Town Centre Workstream	To outline the progress to date in delivering the projects allocated to this workstream including any slippages against timescales and budget	An assessment of whether the Council has sufficient capacity, resources and commitment to achieve the ambitions it shares with partners for the town and contribute towards the delivery of its corporate priority of regeneration. Identification of any slippages and their causes in order to assist with the delivery of this ambitious programme	Tom Booty	March 2012
	3 Tourism and Coastal Strip Workstream (including the cycle bridge)	To outline the progress to date in delivering the projects allocated to this workstream including any slippages against	An assessment of whether the Council has sufficient capacity, resources and commitment to achieve the ambitions it shares	Tom Booty	March 2012

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

Meeting	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
		timescales and budget	with partners for the town and surrounding areas and to deliver its corporate priority of regeneration. Identification of any slippages and their causes in order to assist with the delivery of this ambitious programme		
25 October	1	Etape Cymru 2012	To provide a detailed analysis of the impact of the 2012 event on the local community, local businesses and participants along with the benefits realised/impact on the wider local economy and Denbighshire as a whole	Ruth Williams/Mark Dixon	March 2012
	2	Getting Closer to the Community Programme	Presentation of draft proposals on alternative forums and methods for engaging and consulting with residents to replace the former Community Forum meetings	Hywyn Williams/David Davies/Amanda Brookes	April 2012
	3	Flood Risk Areas within Denbighshire (follow-up report to the one presented in June 2011)	Information on all areas within the County which are at risk from any type of flooding incidents and the plans in place to address the identified risks	Wayne Hope	June 2011
	4	Winter Maintenance 2012/13	To examine the winter maintenance programme for 2012/13	Stuart Davies/Tim Towers/ Mike Hitchings	June 2012

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

Meeting	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
	5 Review of Highway Grass Verge Cutting 2012	To review the grass cutting programme for 2012 and assess whether the recommendations put forward by the Committee for the 2012 season were effective	An assessment of the effectiveness of this year's grass cutting programme and the contractor's compliance with requirements of the contract will enable the committee to formulate recommendations with respect to next year's programme and ensure that Denbighshire's communities are tidy and safe for residents, businesses and visitors	Stuart Davies/Tim Towers/ Mike Hitchings	June 2012
	6 Progress with Highways Maintenance Work and details of proposed Major Transport Infrastructure Work	To present details of the progress to date with the highways maintenance programme, the programme of future works including details of the Council's involvement and vision with respect to major transport infrastructure developments	Improved transport links and accessibility to aid regeneration and economic development and improve citizens day to day lives by creating sustainable communities	Stuart Davies	June 2012
	7 <i>Bringing Planning Closer to the Community</i>	<i>To present proposals to establish service standards for planning consultation and community engagement in the planning process</i>	<i>The development of a an affordable, satisfactory and easily understood set of service standards in relation to consultation and community engagement with respect to the Council's Planning Service</i>	<i>Paul Mead</i>	<i>By SCVCG July 2012</i>
6 December	1 Review of Heritage and Arts Assets	To consider the progress to date in realising efficiencies with respect to the County's Heritage and Arts assets and the strategies developed with a	Arts and heritage assets that deliver the maximum benefits for local residents, communities, tourists and the Council	Steve Parker/Jamie Groves/Paul McGrady	May 2011

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

Meeting	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
		view to ensuring their future viability			
	2 Disposal of Council Buildings, Property and Land	Consideration of the Council's asset management/disposal strategy and the procedures/guidelines in place for disposing of Council assets	Assurances that due consideration is given to alternative uses, including community use, in all asset disposals, and that all asset disposal transactions are open/transparent and are undertaken in the taxpayers' interest	Paul McGrady/Chris Davies	January 2012 (by SCVCG)
	3 Town Plans	To review the effectiveness of town plans in beginning to deliver their objectives	The development of economically viable and sustainable towns that will boost the local economy and improve outcomes for local businesses and resident and attract visitors to the area	Mark Dixon	June 2012
17 January 2013	1 Management of allocation of Section 106 Commuted Sums for open space provision and Community Infrastructure Levy(CIL)	To monitor the effectiveness of the management arrangements and funds received and committed (report to include the time limits applicable to each commuted sum)	Effective management of the commuted sums and CIL schemes will assist with the Council to deliver the regeneration priority and to bring the Council closer to the community	Graham Boase/Angela Loftus	July 2011 (rescheduled June 2012)
	2 Control of Caravan Sites	To present the proposed standard conditions and procedures developed by the Working Group for the purpose of controlling and monitoring caravan sites in both Denbighshire and Conwy as	The development of a robust and collaborative approach to ensure that tourist sites contribute to the local economy and the delivery of the regeneration corporate priority	Graham Boase/Neil Jones (CCBC)	July 2011 (rescheduled June 2012)

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

Meeting	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
		well as the feedback received at the Operators' Seminar			
28 February					
18 April					

Future Issues

Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Expected Outcomes	Author	Date Entered
The Quality and Provision of Community and Education Facilities	To outline the extent and quality of community and education facilities across the county (including sports grounds and village halls and the assistance the Council can give local groups/communities to maintain and access community facilities)	That all residents have access to good quality and affordable community/education facilities within a reasonable distance of their local community	Hywyn Williams/Jamie Groves/Diane Hesketh	May 2011
Community Sustainability	To detail actions being taken by the Council with a view ensuring the sustainability of Denbighshire's urban and rural areas	Identification of measures and actions to improve the quality of life of local citizens by ensuring the viability of the County's diverse communities which will contribute to the regeneration of communities and the area and assist the local economy	Hywyn Williams/Bethan Jones/Mark Dixon	May 2011
Waste Management Provision for Business and Schools	To detail the provision available to businesses and schools in the County with respect to waste management/recycling	To ensure that the majority of schools and businesses in the County are accessing the recycling services available with respect to the disposal of waste and are not incurring excessive costs in their attempt to recycle their waste	Steve Parker/Ken Thompson	May 2011

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

<i>Access to the Countryside</i>	<i>New Committee post May to decide whether to proceed with this subject and to scope the purpose and expected outcomes</i>		<i>Mark Dixon/Huw Rees</i>	<i>May 2011</i>
<i>Transfer of Services to Town Councils</i>	<i>New Committee post May to decide whether to proceed with this subject and to scope the purpose and expected outcomes</i>		<i>Hywyn Williams /Paul Mead</i>	<i>May 2011</i>
<i>Wind Farms</i>	<i>New Committee post May to decide whether to proceed with this subject and to scope the purpose and expected outcomes</i>		<i>Graham Boase/Paul Mead</i>	<i>May 2011</i>

For future years

Information/Consultation Reports

Information / Consultation	Item (description / title)	Purpose of report	Author	Date Entered
Information (July 2012)	Objective 1 Funding for building in King's Avenue, Prestatyn	To outline the cost and use of the Council's money, Objective 1 funding and other financial and human resources to refurbish the building. The report also to detail the use and income to date realised from the building's use and potential future use for the premises, and to specify any risk of clawback of grant funding	Graham Boase/Mark Dixon	June 2012
Information (July 2012)	School Transport [to be shared with education coopted members]	Information on the costs of school transport in Denbighshire, number of bus/taxi routes operated, number of pupils on each hired bus/taxi, any services under utilised and any services carrying children to schools which are not the nearest school (unless they are Welsh medium or faith-based schools) and which are not recharged to	Peter Daniels	June 2012

Communities Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Plan

		parents		
Information (July 2012)	Allotments in Denbighshire	Details of the number and locations of Council owned allotments in Denbighshire, maintenance costs and rental charges, uptake, waiting lists etc. and whether any work is being undertaken with town and community councils, private landowners or the voluntary sector with respect to increasing the number of allotments available	Steve Parker	June 2012

05/07/2012

Note for officers – Committee Report Deadlines

Meeting	Deadline	Meeting	Deadline	Meeting	Deadline
13 September	30 August	25 October	11 October	6 December	22 November

Communities Scrutiny Work Programme.doc

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET: FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

JULY 2012	
Mental Health Measure	Lead Member / Sally Ellis
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Ruthin Leisure Centre Development Proposal	Cllr Huw Jones / Jamie Groves
Denbigh Hospital	Graham Boase
Appraisal Meliden Reema	Peter McHugh
Economic Ambition Strategy for North Wales	Lead Member / Mark Dixon / Peter McHugh
Contract Award – Housing Improvement	Peter McHugh
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
4 SEPTEMBER 2012	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Regional CCTV	Cllr D Smith / Graham Boase
Child Protection Family Support Project – Contract Exemption Report	Cllr Bobby Feeley / Katie Newe
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
West Rhyl Housing Improvement Project – Compulsory Purchase Order	Cllr Hugh Evans / Gerald Thomas
West Rhyl Housing Improvement Project – Confirmation of the Project Brief	Cllr Hugh Evans Peter McDermott / Gerald Thomas
25 SEPTEMBER 2012	
Regional Collaborative Committees	Lead Member / Sally Ellis / Jenny Elliot
Review of Faith Based Education Provision	Jackie Walley Cllr Eryl Williams
Ruthin Schools Review	Jackie Walley
Treasury Management Review	Paul McGrady
Vulnerable Families Generic Floating Support Project - Contract Award Report	Cllr Bobby Feeley / Katie Newe
Mental Health Homeless Supported Housing Project - Contract Award Report	Cllr Bobby Feeley / Katie Newe
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator

23 OCTOBER 2012	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Highways and Infrastructure Collaboration	Lead Member / Stuart Davies
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
20 NOVEMBER 2012	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
18 DECEMBER 2012	
Welsh Housing Quality Standards	Lead Member / Peter McHugh
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
15 JANUARY 2013	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
19 FEBRUARY 2013	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
19 MARCH 2013	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator
16 APRIL 2013	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator

14 MAY 2013	
Financial Update Report	Cllr J Thompson-Hill / Paul McGrady
Items from Scrutiny Committees	Scrutiny Coordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

Progress with Committee Resolutions

Date of Meeting	Item number and title	Resolution	Progress
14 June 2012	7. Scrutiny Work Programme	<p>RESOLVED – that:-</p> <p>(a) subject to the above, the Partnerships Scrutiny Committee approves the Future Work Programme as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.</p> <p>(b) appoints the Members, as stated above, to serve on each of the Service Performance Challenge Groups.</p> <p>(c) appoints Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts to serve on the Council’s Strategic Investment Group, and</p> <p>(d) appoints Councillor W. Mullen-James to serve on the Conwy and Denbighshire Collaboration Programme Board</p>	Names of appointed members forwarded to relevant officers who coordinate meetings of the groups/boards
	8. Public Transport in the County	<p>RESOLVED – the Communities Scrutiny Committee agree that:-</p> <p>(a) the report be received;</p> <p>(b) officers consult with the wider community as regards potential bus service cuts and, as part of the consultation exercise, the public be provided with information on service usage;</p> <p>(c) a Working Group be convened to consider the findings;</p> <p>(d) the Joint Head of Highways & Infrastructure produces a further report, for Cabinet, summarising</p>	<p>Consultation process has commenced and will come to an end in mid July.</p> <p>A Working Group meeting will be convened between mid-July and mid-August to consider the findings prior to proposals being</p>

		<p><i>the results of the consultation, and views of the Working Group, and proposing specific measures, in line with the timescale demanded by the Welsh Government and the budget available, and</i></p> <p><i>(e) Councillor H. Hilditch-Roberts be appointed Chairman of the Rural Transport Forum.</i></p>	<p>presented to Cabinet</p> <p><i>Appointment forwarded to relevant officer</i></p>
	<p>9. Effectiveness of Enforcement Action – Dog Fouling</p>	<p><i>RESOLVED</i> – <i>that the Committee:-</i></p> <p><i>(a) receive the report.</i></p> <p><i>(b) support the recommendations as set out in paragraph 4.5 of the report.</i></p> <p><i>(c) requests that the Senior Community Safety Enforcement Officer informs the next Community Safety Partnership (CSP) meeting of the concerns raised by Members,</i></p> <p><i>(d) supported the view that a clear stance should be adopted with regard to the matter of dog fouling offences, taking into consideration any financial implications; and</i></p> <p><i>(e) that a workshop be arranged for all councillors and relevant Heads of Service in the autumn with a view to adopting and progressing a corporate approach to dealing with the problem of dog fouling in the county</i></p>	<p>Actions are being progressed by the Community Safety Enforcement Team</p>

Service:	Communities	Partnerships	Performance
Housing & Community Development – Peter McHugh	Cllr Bob Murray	Cllr Dewi Owens	Cllr Colin Hughes
Children & Family Services – Leighton Rees	Cllr Win Mullen-James	Cllr Dewi Owens	Cllr. Peter Owen
Adult & Business Services – Phil Gilroy	Cllr Bob Murray	tba	Cllr Colin Hughes
Environmental Services – Steve Parker	Cllr Cefyn Williams	Cllr Dewi Owens	Cllr. Richard Davies
Legal & Democratic Services – Gary Williams	Cllr. James Davies	Cllr Brian Blakeley	Cllr. Bill Cowie
Business Planning & Performance – Alan Smith	tba	tba	Cllr Colin Hughes
Education and Customers & Education Support – Karen Evans & Jackie Walley	Cllr Huw Hilditch-Roberts	Cllr Brian Blakeley	Cllr Arwel Roberts
Communications, Marketing & Leisure – Jamie Groves	Cllr Joseph Welch	Cllr Brian Blakeley	Cllr. Geraint Lloyd Williams
Finance & Assets – Paul McGrady	Cllr Rhys Hughes	tba	Cllr. Ian Armstong
Highways & Infrastructure – Stuart Davies	Cllr Huw O Williams	Cllr Merfyn Parry	Cllr Arwel Roberts
Regeneration – Steve Parker, Graham Boase, and Peter McHugh	Cllr Win Mullen-James	Cllr. Margaret McCarroll	Cllr. Gareth Sandilands
Planning & Public Protection – Graham Boase	Cllr. Huw O Williams	Cllr. Meirick LI Davies	Cllr. Meirick LI Davies
Strategic Human Resources – Linda Atkin	Cllr. Huw Hilditch-Roberts	tba	Cllr. Huw Hilditch-Roberts

This page is intentionally left blank