

Public Document Pack



Date: 05 December 2016
Our ref: Overview & Scrutiny Panel/Agenda
Ask For: Charles Hungwe
Direct Dial: (01843) 577186
Email: charles.hungwe@thanet.gov.uk

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

13 DECEMBER 2016

A meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Panel will be held at **7.00 pm on Tuesday, 13 December 2016** in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Membership:

Councillor D Saunders (Chairman); Councillors: G Coleman-Cooke (Deputy Chair), Bambridge, Campbell, Connor, Curran, Dennis, Dexter, Dixon, Falcon, Grove, Jaye-Jones, Martin, Parsons and Rusiecki

AGENDA

Item
No

Subject

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
To receive any declarations of interest. Members are advised to consider the advice contained within the Declaration of Interest form attached at the back of this agenda. If a Member declares an interest, they should complete that form and hand it to the officer clerking the meeting and then take the prescribed course of action.
3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** (Pages 1 - 4)
To approve the Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 25 October 2016, copy attached.
4. **MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING** (Pages 5 - 10)
To approve the Minutes of the extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 21 November 2016, copy attached.
5. **POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW OF DREAMLAND PHASE ONE - LESSONS LEARNED** (Pages 11 - 34)
6. **REVIEW OF THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS** (Pages 35 - 56)
7. **REPORT BACK ON REJECTED PETITIONS** (Pages 57 - 60)
8. **REVIEW OF OSP WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2016/17** (Pages 61 - 68)
9. **FORWARD PLAN AND EXEMPT CABINET REPORT LIST FOR PERIOD 09 NOVEMBER 2016 - 30 APRIL 2017** (Pages 69 - 82)

Item
No

Subject

Declaration of Interest form - back of agenda



Please scan this barcode for an electronic copy of this agenda

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2016 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: Councillor David Saunders (Chairman); Councillors G Coleman-Cooke, Bayford, Campbell, Curran, Dennis, Dexter, Dixon, Falcon, Hayton, Jaye-Jones, Parsons, Piper, R Potts and Taylor

In Attendance: Councillors: L Fairbrass, Stummer-Schmertzling, K Coleman-Cooke, Taylor-Smith and M Saunders

67. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from the following Members:

Councillor Grove, substituted by Councillor Hayton;
Councillor Rusiecki, substituted by Councillor L. Piper;
Councillor Connor, substituted by R. Potts;
Councillor Martin, substituted by Taylor;
Councillor Bambridge, substituted by Councillor Bayford.

68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

69. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Councillor Campbell proposed, Councillor Falcon seconded and Members agreed the minutes as a correct record of the meeting that was held on 16 August 2016.

70. FULFILLING THANET'S GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Councillor D. Saunders, Chairman of the Panel called upon Ms Ruth Bailey, representing 'Supporters of Manston Airport' to address the Panel. Ms Bailey, spoke under Part 5 of the Council Constitution on Public Speaking Procedure Rules on agenda Item 4, Fulfilling Thanet's growth and development opportunities.

The Chairman thanked Ms Bailey for her contributions and then requested the portfolio holder to lead discussion.

Councillor Stummer-Schmertzling, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise Services introduced the proposed strategy for economic growth in the district. The proposals were aimed at job creation and wealth creation for the district in order to increase prosperity for Thanet residents. The strategy was developed with support from consultants and a presentation on the framework of this strategy was made before the Overview & Scrutiny Panel by the consultants.

The strategy was going to build on the successes made by council over the last two years, which had seen about 400 new entrepreneurs come to set up businesses in the district and 5,000 residents in employment. Some Members were concerned that the proposed strategy dismissed the importance of Manston Airport to the future economic growth of the district and suggested that the wording relating to Manston Airport should reflect a balanced and impartial view.

Councillor Campbell proposed, Councillor Dixon seconded and Members agreed that the strategy should provide additional detail on employment statistics by highlighting the number of individuals employed on 'zero hour' contracts and those individuals employed in more than one job.

Members indicated that the strategy ought to be explicitly linked to the Local Plan. In response to employment statistics issues raised above, Councillor Stummer-Schmertzing agreed to provide the Panel with a response. Member suggested that Thanet District Council should liaise with town/parish councils to coordinate local economic development initiatives. One Member suggested that the proposals should be drafted and presented to form a marketing proposal in order to be attractive to potential investors. Some Members were concerned that the strategy only mentioned Ramsgate and Margate and no other towns.

In response to observations and suggestions from Members, Rob Kenyon, Director of Community Services said that the economic development strategy was a 'live document' that could be updated at any point in time and would evolve over time and took note of the comments from the Panel. Rob Kenyon agreed to review the wording regarding references made to Manston Airport. Chairman said that once officers had made changes to the some of the wording as suggested by the Panel, the Chairman would then consider those updates outside the meeting.

The Panel agreed that subject to the changes as suggested by Members and as highlighted above, the proposed Economic Growth Strategy be recommended to Cabinet for approval.

71. NEW - COMBINED SAFEGUARDING POLICY

Councillor L. Fairbrass, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Community Services led the presentation or the proposals for a new Combined Safeguarding Policy. Council had a duty to protect children and vulnerable adults by raising awareness and reporting any concerns to appropriate authorities, through the Triage.

It was important for council to understand the various roles that councillors and officers ought to play regarding this issue. It was therefore necessary for council to establish robust procedures for recognising victims of abuse when delivering services to residents, hence the need to adopt the policy. Such procedures could also provide a list of indicators of abuse.

Members welcomed the development of the proposed policy. One Member suggested that Council develops and adopts as part of the policy procedure documentation a report form template that enabled a member of the public to report their concerns anonymously. Another Member suggested that female genital mutilation should also be added to the list of domestic abuse. Councillor Fairbrass agreed to take the suggestions on board when finalising the policy proposals.

Penny Button, Head of Safer Neighbourhoods confirmed that councillors and officers will receive appropriate training after the policy had been adopted by Council.

Councillor Parsons proposed, Councillor Bayford seconded and Members agreed that subject to the proposed suggestions being included in the policy, the Combined Safeguarding Policy be recommended to Cabinet for adoption.

72. REVIEW OF OSP WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2016/17

One Member registered their disappointment at the meeting regarding the long standing request made by nine cross party Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel to consider a report on the Dreamland, which had still not been fully addressed. The

Chairman had chased up the issue and Democratic Services had forwarded the request to the Executive.

Councillor Campbell proposed, Councillor Bayford seconded and Members unanimously agreed that the Panel should be given, as a matter of urgency, an opportunity to review the report on Dreamland.

73. **FORWARD PLAN AND EXEMPT CABINET REPORT LIST FOR PERIOD 12 OCTOBER 2016 - 31 MARCH 2017**

Members noted the report.

Meeting concluded: 8.00 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

EXTRAORDINARY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 21 November 2016 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: Councillor David Saunders (Chairman); Councillors G Coleman-Cooke, Campbell, Connor, Curran, Dennis, Dexter, Dixon, Falcon, Grove, Jaye-Jones, Martin, Parsons and Rusiecki

In Attendance: Councillors: Buckley, K Coleman-Cooke, Crow-Brown, J Fairbrass, L Fairbrass, Partington, L Potts, R Potts, M Saunders, Savage, Shonk, Tomlinson and Townend

74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Bambridge, substituted by Councillor Bayford.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

76. THANET LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION

Councillor D. Saunders, Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Panel invited Mr David Stevens to address the Panel. Mr Stevens made his submissions after which the Chairman called upon Councillor Wells, Leader of Council to present the main issues for debate. Councillor Wells introduced the report by initially advised the meeting on a number of amendments to the report. These changes have been attached as Annex 1 to this minute item.

Councillor Wells said that the Local Plan was a statutory document that had to be evidence based and would be assessed by an independent Planning Inspector against a set of government guidelines. The plan would support the key strategies of the Council's corporate priorities in particular as it relates to housing, workforce, infrastructure development and inward investment.

The draft Plan was linked to the public consultation that was conducted on the 'Preferred Options' in January 2015. Key changes that were made as a result that consultation were as follows:

- The identity of additional sites to meet the increased housing requirements;
- The Council's current evidence on the future of the Manston Airport site;
- Identification of key road schemes to be provided alongside development;
- To invite proposals for sites to be considered as local green space;
- Amended location for the proposed Thanet Parkway Station;
- Proposals for adopting new national technical standards for water efficiency, internal space, accessible and adaptable accommodation.

As part of finalising the plan, a sustainability appraisal & strategic, environmental assessment & habitat regulations assessment, draft infrastructure delivery plan and local green space would also be subject to the same public consultation. Councillor Wells said that the Thanet joint transportation strategy would be developed by Thanet District Council and Kent County Council and be subject to a separate report and a later public consultation.

Councillor Wells advised Members that the future of the airport was important. However that it should be noted that the alternative to foregoing the brown fields linked to the airport for housing development would lead to 180 acres of green fields being required for housing development in the district.

Although the draft Plan highlighted the development of 17,140 houses during the Plan period; the existing planning permissions, completed development, windfalls and empty homes accounted for some 7,840 homes, leaving a need for 9,300 homes in this draft Plan.

In concluding his presentation, the Leader then requested the Panel to agree the recommendations in the officer report which were as indicated below:

1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Panel recommends to Cabinet that the proposed revisions to the draft Local Plan, and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitat Regulations assessment reports, be agreed for consultation purposes for a period of 6 weeks; and
2. That Overview and Scrutiny Panel recommend to Cabinet that the appropriate amendments to the Local Development Scheme be agreed.

In response to the submissions by the Leader of Council, Members of the Panel made the following comments:

- Expressed concern that the Panel was not given enough time to study the report which was significantly larger than most reports that were usually presented to the Panel for review;
- Manston airport site ought to be reflected as an important part of the draft Local Plan;
- Amount of consideration for alternative use of Manston Airport site other than housing development in the proposals had been minimal;
- The Panel could establish a working party to review the draft Local Plan in more detail by looking at key issues and contribute to the consultation process;
- The draft Local Plan should not only refer to the views from the Avia Report but to all the reports that had been produced in relation to Manston Airport;
- Suggested that Cabinet give the Panel more time to study the draft proposals;
- The Plan should address what the district had lost;
- The Plan should be linked to the Neighbourhood Plans;
- Proposals should view Ramsgate Port as a marina;
- TDC should look for an investor who had a view for an airport;
- If the Development Consent Order (DCO) was successful and yet Council did not have a provision for the airport in the Plan, how would Council respond to that development;
- Is Council going to re-look at the rejected sites;
- Cabinet should be mindful of the top grade agricultural land in places like Birchington which should be spared from use as housing development land if more appropriate land could be identified elsewhere.

In response Councillor Wells made the following comments:

- Soft market testing had been conducted for Manston Airport but no satisfactory evidence had been submitted by potential investors to show that Manston Airport site could be run as a viable business;
- If there was evidence that there was an investor for a passenger air service, then Council would consider them;
- If there wasn't such evidence, then Council would need to consider other uses/mixed use for the airport site;

- The decision relating to the airport was not an easy one to make but Council had to make such a decision based on evidence;
- The Local Plan was supposed to have been in place since 2011;
- It was reasonable proposals that OSP could ask Cabinet to could look again at the list of rejected sites if necessary to determine if these could be included in proposed sites for housing development.

Adrian Verrall, Strategic Planning Manager advised the meeting that if the DCO was approved, it would take precedence over the Plan provisions as they relate to the Airport.

One Member suggested that the Panel returned the draft Local Plan to Cabinet with no comment because by recommending the draft Local Plan to Cabinet, the Panel would have in a way demonstrated that they had enough time to review the proposals; which according to the Member, the Panel did not have. Some Members agreed with the spirit of the proposal whilst others felt that adopting such a recommendation would be a missed opportunity for the Panel to influence the draft Plan that was due to go out to public consultation.

Nick Hughes, Committee Services Manager advised that the Panel could debate referring the draft Plan to Cabinet without comment. However if that proposal was adopted by the Panel, it would in effect mean that the Panel could no longer proceed thereafter to review the draft Plan any further.

Another Member suggested setting up a working party for the Panel to review in depth the draft Local Plan.

The Chairman reassured Members that the Panel would have opportunities to review the draft Local Plan during the consultation period and could create a working party to carry out more in-depth study of the proposals if that was the Panel's wish. However this should be done in the context of resources available to the Panel and might require Members to re-prioritise the work of the Panel.

A Member raised the concern that RiverOak had publicly alleged that the Council had not responded to correspondence.

The Member then suggested that this be dealt with as a formal complaint and should be investigated.

In response Madeline Homer, CEx made the following comments:

- CEx not aware that the Council is aware that RiverOak submitted correspondence in June 2016;
- Council would welcome the opportunity to be consulted by RiverOak as part of the DCO process and we understand that they are obliged to consult the council;
- Would encourage RiverOak to contact CEx with their consultation plans and any supporting evidence they have as soon as it is available;
- With regards to the deferral of the Lothian and Shelf Appeals, the council copied RiverOak into all its correspondence with the Planning Inspectorate and the Planning Inspectorate have kept them informed in the same fashion;
- Given this transparency, it was not clear what information from either the council or Planning Inspectorate was still outstanding;
- CEx wrote to RiverOak solicitors on 02 November regarding the Local Plan consultation timetable and process;
- If this information was not passed on, a copy of the letter is available on the TDC website;
- The same information was provided to the RiverOak's planning consultants on 12 October which provided the same information;

- In the meantime the council's planning team dealt with numerous emails and telephone calls with RiverOak consultants over the last 6 months;
- Whilst the email sent by RiverOak on 27 October has not been responded to because it related to matters still under consideration and CEx understands that the issue had now been resolved.

In summing up debate on the matter, the Chairman said that Members will have an opportunity to review the proposals in-depth during the consultation period. He then requested that the Panel finalises on the recommendations for the night.

Councillor Bayford proposed and Councillor Curran seconded that the Overview & Scrutiny Panel forward the draft Local Plan to Cabinet without comment due to the inadequate time given to the Panel to review the proposals.

When put to vote the recommendation was LOST.

Councillor Jaye-Jones proposed, Councillor Glenn Coleman-Cooke seconded and when put to vote Members AGREED the following that Cabinet:

1. Includes specific recommendations in the consultation that underline the inclusion of potential aviation use as part of a mixed use scenario;
2. Should explicitly explain that evidence produced during the coming phases of consultation can still be considered between now and examination in public.

Councillor Rusiecki proposed that the RiverOak complaint be treated as a formal complaint. However the Member was advised by the CEx that if they wished for the issue to be treated as a formal complaint then he would need to write to the CEx making that request. The CEx would then consider the request.

Councillor Rusiecki proposed, Councillor Glenn Coleman-Cooke seconded and Members AGREED that further a further review be conducted of the rejected list to find extra space for housing development in order to minimise the use of green fields.

77. BUDGET STRATEGY 2017/18

Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources introduced the report for debate. Mr Willis advised Members that Cabinet had considered the report at their meeting on 17 November 2016 and approved the budget strategy as the basis for setting out the budget proposals submitted to Full Council on 01 December 2016.

One member thanked Mr Willis for conducting one to one Member briefings on the budget, which helped Members understand the budget strategy proposals before they were put before Cabinet. Another Member asked whether the Council liabilities (£250k) that had arisen as a result of the court case brought by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on 18 November would negatively impact on the reserves. In response Mr Willis said that there would be no impact as such costs had been provided for separately.

There being no specific recommendations to make to Cabinet, Members noted the report.

78. FEES AND CHARGES 2017/18

The Panel considered the fees and charges schedule that had been recommended to Full Council by Cabinet. Mr Willis advised that on page 1105 of the agenda pack, the item on 'events/commercial enterprises' percentage should read 75% and not 50%.'

One Member noted that the budget had assumed that Ramsgate Town Council would continue the financial arrangement for a further year which would see free car parking on Saturdays at Leopold Street Car Park. The Member then suggested that it would be a good idea for Thanet District Council to put a press statement on the website acknowledging that arrangement.

Another Member asked why the Council was intending to charge residents for household waste bin replacement and not for the replacement of green (recycling) bins. In response, Madeline Homer, CEx responded, that it was in order to create some incentives for residents to recycle. Officers were going to check and provide a fuller response outside the meeting.

However a member of the Panel advised that residents had to obtain a green bin, hence there was no requirement to pay for the replacements thereafter. Members also said that they hoped that a proper review had been undertaken to the proposed schedule of fees & charges for 2017/18.

There being no specific recommendations to make to Cabinet, Members noted the report.

79. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

Mr Willis led the discussion on this item and reported that the proposed Council Tax Support Scheme had been recommended to Full Council for adoption by Cabinet. It was also reported that government funding of the scheme had been reduced and Council had had to top it up over the years. Although proposals to the scheme would see reductions being introduced, it would still be one of the most generous in the county.

Council would also be considering for adoption in the near future, a Hardship Scheme to support those families that would have been affected most by the changes to the proposed Council Tax Scheme. A Member of the Panel suggested that the details of the Hardship Scheme be brought to the Overview & Scrutiny Panel, before finalisation by Council.

Members requested for clear definitions to the key issues in the hardship scheme. In response Mr Willis advised Members that the Hardship Scheme would need to be in place by 1 April 2017. The proposed scheme would be similar to the one adopted by Canterbury City Council and Dover District Council.

There being no specific recommendations to make to Cabinet, Members noted the report.

Meeting concluded: 8.45 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW-
DREAMLAND PHASE ONE LESSONS LEARNED**

Overview & Scrutiny Panel	13 December 2016
Report Author	Head of Audit
Portfolio Holder	Councillor Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates
Status	For Information
Classification:	Unrestricted
Key Decision	No
Reasons for Key	N/A
<i>Previously Considered by</i>	None
Ward:	Whole District

Executive Summary:

This post implementation review of Dreamland Phase One (the purchase and development of the heritage theme park) was commissioned to pull together the learning from the project, to inform future strategic projects that the Council may wish to undertake.

Recommendation(s):

1. The report is for noting;
2. Annex 1 details the full Post Implementation Review which concludes with an Action Plan containing six recommendations for control improvement for the future, four are classified as high priority and two as medium.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money	This report is a backward look at past events and as such there are no financial implications arising from this report. Section 4.4.4 details the extra funding requirement that was reported to Cabinet on 10 September 2015.
Legal	There are no new legal implications arising from this backward look at the project.
Corporate	<p>Whilst this report summarises events of the past, there are residual corporate risk issues connected with the Dreamland Project and the lessons learned from Phase One are intended to inform Phase Two (and beyond) to reduce the likelihood of current and future project controls failing, resulting in overspend, delay and reputational impact.</p> <p>The risk assessments for the current project are detailed within the Phase Two project files.</p> <p>The Dreamland Project fits strategically with the Council's corporate</p>

	priorities and values in regenerating the town to create inward investment and job creation. Once delivered, the vision is to improve the environment in that part of the town to support the neighbourhood by restoring back into use empty buildings, which are of unique historic value.								
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	<p>Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</p> <p>Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>There are no new equalities implications arising from this backward look at the project.</p>	Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.		Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,		Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it		Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	
Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.									
Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,									
Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it									
Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.									

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	✓
Promoting inward investment and job creation	✓
Supporting neighbourhoods	✓

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	✓
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The Corporate Management Team commissioned a Post Implementation Review regarding the Dreamland Phase One Project (the purchase and development of the heritage theme park) to identify the lessons learned from that project and to pull them together in one document. This would enable the learning to both be captured and acknowledged and further considered, in order to influence Dreamland Project Phase Two, and other strategic projects under consideration.
- 1.2 Having now considered the conclusions of the post implementation review, the Corporate Management Team was keen to share it with the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, to inform their plan of work.
- 1.3 The report is set out at Annex 1, and contains the rationale for setting the scope, to accurately agree what it is and what it is not, in terms of coverage.
- 1.4 The report starts by setting out the vision from the Dreamland Trust Delivery Plan dated 2011, and goes with background history by detailing the Heritage Lottery Fund bid extract and at Appendix 1 to the report, a Chronology of key events going back as far as 1992.

1.5 The purpose of the report is to consider performance (with the benefit of hindsight) under four key areas relating to Dreamland Phase One Project only, namely ;

- Governance Arrangements,
- Project Risk Management,
- Project Management,
- Financial Management.

1.6 The report concludes that there are areas for the Council to consider introducing control improvements to provide greater assurance that future projects will be delivered on time and to budget. Additionally, wider than that operational detail, the report also identifies where the Council must strategically consider which projects it can, and has the capacity, to deliver (considering all of the resources required) encouraging it to be bold enough to reject, or put back those it can't, where the risks are too great to proceed at that time.

2.0 Next Steps

2.1 Corporate Management Team has agreed to the six recommendations in the Action Plan contained within Annex 1, therefore a progress review will be undertaken in six months' time and reported back for noting to this Panel.

Contact Officer:	Christine Parker, Head of Audit, Tel: 01843 577189
Reporting to:	Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Services

Annex List

Annex 1	Dreamland Post Implementation Review- Lessons Learned
---------	---

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
None	N/A

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Ciara Feeney, Head of Legal Services
Legal	Matthew Sanham, Corporate Finance Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT FOR THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL

POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW DREAMLAND PHASE ONE LESSONS LEARNED

Period of Review: 2008/16

Date of Report: 31st August 2016

Author: Christine Parker

Report Number: U509

<u>REPORT CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Executive Summary	2
Scope of the Review	3
Background History	4
Findings	5
Conclusions	12
Distribution list	13
Appendix 1 – Chronology	14
Appendix 2 – Action Plan	17

1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 The vision from the Dreamland Trust Delivery Plan dated 2011

“Dreamland Margate will be a commercial Amusement Park and event location comprising historic rides, classic sideshows, cafés, restaurants, gardens and innovative interpretation to provide an imaginative glimpse into the story of Dreamland’s rich heritage. As the first Amusement Park of thrilling historic rides, Dreamland will create a balance between the romantic nostalgia of Dreamland’s past with the contemporary requirement to meet the needs of 21st century visitors and be a commercially viable operation.”

1.2 The Council has supported the Save Dreamland Campaign that evolved into being the Dreamland Trust and has worked as an enabler alongside them in their efforts to secure sufficient investment to create a viable project. During the period 2006 to 2010 the Council also worked alongside the site owners who had a vision to develop part of the site (49%) and restore (51%) of the site as a Heritage Attraction to incorporate the listed assets.

1.3 As with all major projects, the timescales involved often mean that things do indeed change and evolve; key personnel move on, projects are handed over, and factors outside of anyone’s individual control come into play. Strong Project Management is designed to ensure all foreseeable risks are identified and assessed and mitigating actions put into place – however in this case the top three scoring risks each materialised and this indeed impacted greatly on the original concept and what followed.

1.4 This review was commissioned to pull together the learning from the project, to inform future strategic projects that the Council wishes to undertake.

1.5 The Council recognised the limitations of in-house skills or resources in managing a project of this complex nature and employed external specialists as required. However, the learning reminds us that the task can be delegated; the risk can not. Whilst G&T were engaged to project manage the project, the impact of the project being knocked off course fell on the Council financially.

1.6 The learning areas for improvement in future projects are as follows:

- Governance – whilst the correct authorisations are evidenced throughout the project, the high level turnover of staff and resultant lack of continuity involved has had a detrimental impact. Exercising strong governance includes taking calculated risks.
- Project Risk Management – the Council should ensure mitigating actions are ‘SMART’ and where possible costed at the outset; if they materialise the impact can also be assessed against potential project termination points or break points, creating an opportunity to assess the full consequences of continuing, and whether it can only proceed when sufficient resources are able to be allocated. The Council can over time improve its overall corporate risk appetite, so when a project is knocked off course, it can more confidently take a calculated risk.
- Project Management – the Council has already taken steps to raise the profile of managing Strategic Projects with the Council only committing to the number of projects it has the capacity to focus on and deliver on time and to budget going forward. This would be further enhanced by creating central control and management of project records.

- Financial Management – The Council should seek to control external consultant fees if strategic projects hit major delays, all future projects should therefore build break clauses into their terms of engagement. The Council should also make larger contingency provisions when working on listed structures.
- Overall – the Council should use project management techniques to become proactive in the way it manages its projects. Dreamland Phase One has been reactive. Each time a significant risk materialised, the project was knocked off course, and the Council successfully took it forward in a new direction. However, reacting, has cost a time delay which has in turn caused an overspend. It is a fair assessment that this was a unique challenge, and the remaining officers involved in the project have indeed taken on board a great deal of the learning from Phase One into how to move forward. This learning includes making a stronger link from project risk management to the Council's Corporate Risk Management process, if a matter becomes significant enough within a project it will now be escalated – particularly when the matter is in the media and the risk becomes reputational, financial, social, environmental and 'political'.

- 1.7 Six recommendations have been made within this report of which five have been classified as high priority and one as medium please see the action plan at page 17 for full details.
- 1.8 This piece of work is not an audit and does not attract an assurance opinion as it constitutes consultancy work. Future internal audit work will review the recommendations made when Project Management is next reviewed, as part of the rolling audit plan.

2. **SCOPE OF WORK**

2.1 The work is focused on the following areas relating to Dreamland Phase One (the purchase and development of the heritage theme park) only:

- a. **Governance Arrangements** – assess the strength of the overall arrangements to ensure that the objectives for the project were defined, that funding for the project was correctly authorised and comment on the governance around decision making; to include the governance surrounding how the operator appointment was made.
- b. **Project Risk Management** – review the project risk assessment and challenge how robust this process was managed at both the concept, and throughout the life of the project.
- c. **Project Management** – assess the strength of control measures put in place to support project delivery, including membership of the project team, key milestones and if exit strategies were considered or built in.
- d. **Financial Management** – consider how officers responsible for delivering the programme were held to account by those charged with governance, including quality, performance and financial controls within the project.

2.2 The following areas were agreed to be out of scope:

- This review has not been extended to include Dreamland Phase Two or any future vision for the site.
- This review does not therefore include a review of the controls within the Phase Two contract to monitor or validate the scheme.
- This review does not cover the operator and developments regarding the administrators, and the numerous matters reported by the media since 2015.
- The Council has refreshed its Project Management approach and the opportunity to review this once it is embedded will be considered in a future audit plan.

2.3 **Period of fieldwork**

The review was performed between 04 July 2016 and 30 August 2016. No other work has been performed since then, the report does not take into account matters that have arisen since then; or anything outside of the Scope.

2.4 **Forms of report**

For the Council's convenience, this report may have been made available to the Council in electronic as well as hard copy format, multiple copies and versions of this report may therefore exist in different media and in the case of any discrepancy the final signed hard copy should be regarded as definitive.

2.5 **General**

The report is issued on the understanding that the management of the Council have drawn attention to all matters, financial or otherwise, of which they are aware which may have an impact on the report up to the date of issue. Events and circumstances occurring after the date of the report will, in due course, render the report out of date and, accordingly, EKAP will not accept a duty of care nor assume a responsibility for decisions and actions which are based upon such an out of date report. Additionally, EKAP has no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after this date.

The report's author would like to thank the officers for making themselves available during the course of the review.

3. BACKGROUND HISTORY

(The following was extracted from the HLF Bid Evaluation Tender Document; furthermore Appendix 1 is a Chronology going further back to 1992- both documents have been shared by the Heritage Development Advisor and concisely set the scene).

“Margate was well established as a seaside resort by the mid C18th and has always remained in the public consciousness as a quintessential ‘holiday town’. Dreamland occupies a 7.5 hectare town centre site directly opposite Margate Main Sands. The site has been in amusement park use since the early 1870s when the circus proprietor ‘Lord’ George Sanger opened a dance hall, menagerie and fun fair within and behind a former seafront railway station building. The Grade II listed Menagerie Cages on the site date from this period. The venue changed hands in 1919 and the new owner, JH Iles, Americanised the attraction, naming it Dreamland after one of the Coney Island amusement parks. Iles’ first major investment at Dreamland was the Scenic Railway – which survives is listed Grade II and which was restored as part of the HLF project. An entertainments complex, referred to as Dreamland Cinema, was built at the front of the site between 1933 and 1935. The new building incorporated a pre-existing Ballroom structure and a WW1 timber framed aircraft hangar (which for many years was used as a 2,000 seat restaurant). This group of buildings are also listed at Grade II*.*

In the 1960s and 70s Dreamland, in terms of visitor numbers, was one of the top ten attractions in England and the words ‘Dreamland’ and ‘Margate’ are often said to be synonymous with each other.

In January 2003 the then owner of the attraction announced that it was his intention to close Dreamland and redevelop the site as a retail park. The announcement led to the formation of the Save Dreamland campaign, a group who believed that the site still had an economically viable future as a leisure facility. The Dreamland Trust evolved out of the Save Dreamland campaign, eventually becoming a Registered Charity.

The Park finally closed in September 2006 after several years of under-investment. By 2006 the only fixed ride left on the site was the Scenic Railway; which had been listed in 2002. Both the bingo hall and a two screen cinema within the Dreamland Cinema complex closed in 2007, due to the poor condition of the building’s roof and problems with the electrics. The Ballroom had already closed in 1990 and was derelict.

An arson attack on the Scenic Railway in April 2008 destroyed 25% of the ride, including the trains. Immediately after the fire, Thanet District Council began serving Urgent Works Notices under Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 on the owners so as to protect the listed structures on the site. The Council and The Dreamland Trust engaged the services of the Prince’s Regeneration Trust to advise on the regeneration of the site and both of the Partners subsequently entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the owners. The essence of this Memorandum was that the Council would work with the owners to bring forward a planning application for an ‘enabling’ mixed use development on 49% of the site, provided that the owner transferred 51% of the site, including the listed structures, to the Trust who would then work towards the reopening of the Park. This hybrid proposal was the concept behind a bid made by the Council to the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) for a grant under the Sea Change programme to ‘reimagine’ the site as a Heritage Amusement Park. Both the site owners (the Margate Town Centre Regeneration Company) and The Dreamland Trust were partners in this bid. An earlier small ‘development grant’ under the scheme was awarded, which enabled Save Dreamland to set themselves up as a constituted body, and in November 2009 CABE awarded the project £3.7m, the largest grant given under the Sea Change programme.

In 2010 The Dreamland Trust made an application to the Heritage Lottery Fund seeking support for the Heritage Amusement Park concept and they were awarded £500,000

development funding. At the Second Round submission stage Thanet District Council joined the Trust as co-applicants for the grant. In January 2012 the HLF awarded the project £3m, and this offer was extended to £5.8m in April 2014.

By the end of 2010 it was becoming clear to Thanet District Council that the owners of the Dreamland site were not going to bring forward a realistic planning application for the 'enabling' portion of the site. In May 2011, the Council Cabinet moved to serve a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) on the owners for the entire Dreamland site, on the grounds that it was necessary for the Council to act in the furtherance of the economic wellbeing of the District. The CPO Inquiry was held between January and March 2012 and the Secretary of State upheld the CPO in August 2012.

Appeals by the owners to the High Court in March 2013 and the Court of Appeal in May 2013 were dismissed and the freehold of the Dreamland Site was vested in the Council on 13th September 2013.

The District Council was now in possession of the entire site and the works programme funded under the HLF grant began. The Lottery-funded capital works were managed by Thanet District Council, and those to do with public engagement and the dissemination of heritage information by the Dreamland Trust. The capital works included the rebuilding of the Scenic Railway, the restoration of classic amusement park rides, the rebuilding of the Ballroom and the upgrading of the lower ground floor of the Cinema building (which acts as the principal entrance to the Park). The public engagement works included 'outreach' activities, volunteering and events.

Early in 2015 the Council advertised for expressions of interest in running the Park and Ballroom, and selected Sands Heritage Ltd – a new company with Margate connections set up expressly to manage the running of the Dreamland site.

The Park opened in June 2015 to widespread positive publicity and the Scenic Railway opened in October 2015. Sands Heritage entered Administration in May 2016, although the Park continues to trade.”

4. FINDINGS IN CONTEXT

The scope has been classified into four Detailed Findings headings as follows:-

4.1 Governance

- 4.1.1 It was confirmed by interview with the Committee Services Manager that the appropriate decision making route for the project is Cabinet. A review of the Constitution revealed under Article 4 the type of responsibility / decision assigned to Full Council, the roles of Scrutiny and Cabinet. Section A goes on to list the Council Functions and those delegated to Cabinet. All key decisions are required to be published in the Forward Plan (the Council also includes non-key Cabinet decisions) in order that Overview & Scrutiny have the opportunity to request a report before the decision is going to be taken. Officers will also take a report to Overview & Scrutiny based on good governance for pre-decision scrutiny. Once a matter has been approved by Cabinet, the decision notice is prepared and sent to members of Overview and Scrutiny, who have five clear days to call it in, otherwise the decision is published at 5:30pm on the 5th clear day.
- 4.1.2 The post implementation review set out to determine learning from the decision to proceed with the CPO and how the operator was appointed; consequently these two areas were further examined.

Compulsory Purchase Order

4.1.3 A search through Cabinet reports has identified the following connected with the decision making process for the Compulsory Purchase Order.

- April 2010 – Report Update and Approval to proceed with CPO;
- January 2011 - Cabinet report clarifying the 'whole site' updating the area for CPO (should it become necessary) – Annex 1 is the original plan and Annex 2 the revised plan;
- April 2011 - Following the failure of MTCRC to make a planning application under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding TDC Cabinet move to serve Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) on the entire (T8) Dreamland site (in the Pink).

The 28.04.11 Cabinet report sets out the background and reasons for the recommendation to proceed with the CPO. It does identify six risks that the decision carries, which centre on uncertainties and it does predict the financial 'worst case scenario'. Essentially though, the report does not spell out the implications of an option not to proceed, apart from highlighting that all grant funding required supporting the project would likely be withdrawn as a consequence. The learning from this is to provide Cabinet with options. Especially where there are so very many uncertainties. One option should have been a challenge to why the Council should own this site, and what the long term goal or strategy should be for its continued ownership, setting out how this proposal supported the Council's Corporate Plan Objectives and the long term affordability and consequences of owning a theme park, particularly one containing so many listed structures.

Indeed, given the experience of individual cases over the wider East Kent local government umbrella, the challenge whether CPO as a route on any scale carries so many uncertainties and risks that councils should never do it, or should only proceed in very rare/extreme cases.

A further challenge is whether the external legal advice received is too narrowly specified so that the Council obtains advice on what it asked for only. This may be improved in future if advice is obtained in two parts; firstly to answer a specific question and secondly to broaden the legal view to provide options on the matter under consideration.

Operator Selection Process

4.1.4 The process for the selection of an operator was first approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 29 April 2010. The matter was presented again to Cabinet on 1 May 2014. During the process, advice given by the Council's specialist advisors changed the way that the procurement should proceed; the first was halted and a second then commenced. A report to the Heritage Lottery Fund, seeking their approval to move forward circa March 2015 summarises the procurement process as follows;

"The first procurement

It was agreed that the Council would seek a not for profit organisation to deliver a heritage amusement park. The opportunity was placed on the European procurement portal and Council web site on 2nd June 2014 allowing 50 days for bid submission. The advert was also placed on the Council's web site and there was extensive press coverage.

The invitation to tender stated that the Council may accept variant bids but only if supported by a compliant bid. Various organisations contacted the Council for information, some made site visits. All contacts were recorded. However following the closing date – only one bid was submitted. This was from Sands Heritage Limited (SHL).

Although only one bid was received, the Council followed the usual diligence process including legal, financial and external valuation checks. These all indicated that SHL's bid was viable. However following detailed site condition information becoming available only after ownership of the site was secured, it was realised that the offer would not be a substantially completed amusement park, but that it comprise land and buildings, some in a very poor condition, and any incoming tenant would need to make substantial capital investment to bring the derelict site back into use. Also, the grant fund monies would need to be subject to change control, as more funds would be required to bring the basic specification up to a reasonable standard; this meant that less money was available for the rides. The ride schedule was reduced and no rides were offered as part of the lease. Following legal advice it was agreed they would be loaned under separate licence arrangements.

Therefore following professional advice, it was determined that the Council should re-advertise the offer of a long leasehold interest as the appropriate primary contract, supported by a simple concession to transfer some of the funders' on-going obligations (learning and development, community engagement). The original procurement advert was closed and a new offer advertised buildings and land available on long lease.

The second procurement

The change to procure on a long lease meant that the primary method of procuring a tenant became a leasehold transaction, regulated by the many land laws. Having already secured Cabinet approval to lease the site the Council's Estates team acted as agents for the Council.

The advertisement for the lease was put in the following publications:

- *Estates Gazette Retail & Leisure supplement – 6/9/14*
- *EG online banner – 22/9/14*
- *EG direct mail shot – directed to property professionals in London and the South East – 6th November*
- *Parkworld on line, from June 2014 to 21 November 2014*
- *Worlds Fair – 6 week ad commencing 3/10/14*
- *TDC website early September*
- *To let board on frontage of site*
- *Local media and national media reports on Dreamland*

The Council also wrote to all organisations that had previously registered expressions of interest that had been logged as part of the original procurement exercise, to ensure they were aware of the revised offer.

The new advert for Dreamland asked for expressions of interest in buildings and land offered on a long lease and asked for the following information:

Expressions of interest should be received at estates@thanet.gov.uk no later than 21 November 2014. The Council are seeking parties who have the following attributes:-

- *Proven track record of similar commercial operation, if possible with case studies / examples;*
- *Evidence of sound financial covenant and details of the organisation;*
- *Evidence of the capacity to manage the unit(s) of interest;*
- *Track record of working in partnership with local authorities and other bodies;*
- *Evidence of being able to generate social/economic/environmental benefits to an area.*

At the closing date, the Council had received six bids. The bids were assessed by the agent (TDC Estates Surveyor). As this site is a longer term investment for the Council all information was reviewed with the Cabinet member with delegated

authority (Cabinet member for Finance and Estates), the Procurement Manager and the Head of Economic Development and Asset Management.

*The bids were considered on the answers to the following parts of the submission
Business Plan
Development Appraisal
Regeneration Commitment
Evidence of Successful Operation
Quality Standards.*

We received the expression of interest forms from six candidates, but following legal advice from Trowers and Hamlins, we agreed to consider the previous tender submission from Sands Heritage Limited.

On the whole the written responses we received were poor.

The outcome of the initial screening process and the reviewers agreed with the recommendation made by the Estates Surveyor to proceed with Sands Heritage Ltd who provided comprehensive information, meeting all the requirements, with the only weak area being quality standards. Due Diligence was carried out by the Director of Corporate Services on 27 March 2015. Officers are confident that the correct procurement process has been followed to ensure that an operator who is committed to meeting the needs of this unique site has been found and recommends that the HLF support the decision to award the lease to Sands Heritage Ltd.

The Dreamland Trust has the second highest score on regeneration commitment, but they did not provide information on a business plan, nor on quality standards.

The unsuccessful parties were informed that they would not be taken forward to Heads of Terms stage, SHL's bid was taken forward and they engaged to agree Heads of Terms. The Council has worked with external lawyers to progress the lease. However following some difficulties, the lease negotiations were brought in-house. Due Diligence was carried out by the Director of Corporate Services on 27 March 2015".

- 4.1.5 The evidence reviewed reveals there was a process followed by a team of officers and members which engaged professional advice to reach their objective of selecting a company to move forward with letting the lease. The due diligence checks were carried out by the Council's Finance team and follows the Due diligence Protocol. The outcome of the decision was taken back to the HLF for approval to proceed.
- 4.1.6 The learning though from this, and experiences across the wider East Kent local government umbrella, is that fledgling companies with no track record or accounts, set up for a particular purpose carry a greater risk than is being acknowledged through the due diligence checks being undertaken by these multi-disciplinary groups of officers and members. Sands Heritage Ltd was incorporated on 19th June 2014, and was then financed by a £2m bank loan, shareholders and loan of £800k promised from KCC.

File Management

- 4.1.7 It has been difficult to piece together the management trail for this work due to staff turnover throughout the term of the project. The authors of key reports have since left the Council and there is no clear evidence of handover of files. Consequently, it is suggested that in future all Strategic Projects should have a central filing arrangement with the appropriate restricted access, so that key files are not held on different network areas and are easily retrieved. Good governance includes

employing the right systems and processes to be able to provide the management trail.

4.2 Project Risk Management

4.2.1 A report in April 2010 authored by the consultants appointed as project managers, Gartner and Theobald (G&T), set out the Key Risks. Hindsight shows us that the top three critical risks each materialised. The top two having been assessed and scored by the consultants as 5 x 5 i.e. 'certain to happen' with 'maximum impact' on the project.

Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Product	Financial Implication	Risk Treatment	Owner
Project overrun causing additional costs	5	5	25	Cost of scaffolding at up to £6k per week, additional PM costs	Continued management of Coombs contract and correct PM	Capital Development Manager/ G&T
Affordability / discovery of unforeseen costs	5	5	25	Additional funds would be required to complete works	Adopt any savings suggestions, potentially reduce rides budget and hire in rides	Dreamland Trust / TDC / G&T
Failure to contain CPO costs	5	4	20	Higher cost of CPO may lead to further reduction in capital works budget to make scheme affordable	Ensure accurate estimates are obtained from external legal/counsel and witnesses	Capital Development Manager / A Hills / Head of Legal

When they did occur, the impact was a major delay, which in turn has impacted the costs. For example, their report set out some critical dates listed below, against which the actual dates achieved are now shown;

Action	Critical Date Proposed	Actual Date achieved
HLF Application	August 2009	July 2011
HLF Approval	November 2009	January 2012 Grant increased April 2014
Contractor Appointment	October 2010	October 2014
Start on Site	February 2011	November 2014
Practical Completion	May 2012	July 2016

4.2.2 The CPO delay severely impacted upon the Council's ability to let the construction contract; until they had possession of the site clearly construction could not commence. This had the knock on impact that the winning contractor then could not deliver the build by the date expected, and work awarded under the contract was reassigned. This resulted in three parties with different workforces on site all at the same time. The operator published an opening date (against advice) and this then had to be delivered.

4.2.3 The risks in the project risk register had been thought of at the project outset, and their scores and predictions were reasonable. The Council was aware of the high risk nature of the project, and driven by the overwhelming community support to save Dreamland have adjusted course several times to deal with the impact of each risk. The financial impact is covered at 4.4 below.

- 4.2.4 The robust critical friend challenge (with hindsight) is whether the Council would have taken action to terminate or mothball the project had those been options highlighted and considered through the risk management process? i.e. “was the impact of X so great that the Council should cease to move the project forward at this time”. The period 2010 to 2015 was turbulent for the Council, and whilst this high risk, high profile project was delivered it was later than planned and over budget. The clear objectives defined at the outset, ‘to regenerate an area of Margate that makes a significant contribution to the Council’s Corporate Objectives’ have indeed been delivered in the short term; with the long term viability of the park presently uncertain. The Council was successful in keeping the DCMS, HLF and external funding bodies on board with the delay, ensuring the conditions of grant were complied with. It is not the role of this review to challenge the decisions made in the past, but to learn from how project risk management and project management techniques can be used in future strategic projects to achieve realisable goals on time to budget – or terminate projects that cannot.
- 4.2.5 The Risk Management section of Gartner and Theobald’s report is fairly light touch. The risk treatments listed are weak and passive, for example “continued management of contract and correct PM” against a ‘certain’ score with ‘maximum” impact for “project overrun causing additional costs”. The Council was certainly aware of the high risk nature of the project, however there was no robust challenge through the Risk Management process as to why the Council was undertaking the project at all, swayed by (real or perceived) community support not a challenge that establishing a theme park was too financially risky for it to undertake.
- 4.2.6 In addition, when the project risks did materialise it was a very reactive process, and linked to 4.4.5 below, there was no link or escalation between the Project Risk Management process and the Corporate Risk Management process. The overspend being first reported to Cabinet via the budget monitoring report in July 2015. Strong Risk Management for a project should also seek to identify the deal breakers or exit strategy points if resources are not available to deliver due to unfavourable circumstances affecting the planned delivery.

4.3 Project Management

- 4.3.1 At the outset, it was recognised due to its uniqueness and complexity that external specialist project managers should be appointed to deliver Dreamland Phase One (and it became a grant condition). Gartner and Theobald LLP were appointed and acted in this capacity. Indeed, it is one of the costs which overspent resulting from the delays caused by the lengthy CPO process, which extended the contract with them. Evidence of documents authored by them, has been presented from the time of the beginning of the project. The Masterplan itself, which was further supported by detailed documents comprising:
- Interpretation & Branding Strategy
 - Access Strategy
 - Rides Strategy
 - Activity strategy
 - Business Plan
 - Conservation Management Plan
 - Building services and Sustainability Report.
- 4.3.2 Evidence regarding project team meetings, minutes and action points have not been provided by officers as there has been many handovers within the Council and this in itself is endemic of the story of Phase One. It is not to say Gartner and Theobald could not produce them if asked, but this review has stopped short of doing so to avoid any associated costs that might flow from such a request. Officers who have

been interviewed have concurred that project management could have been stronger over Phase One.

- 4.3.3 The purpose of Project Management is to ensure an appropriate level of control is in place to deliver with quality, on time and to budget. This process is therefore synchronised with the project risk assessment. The risks dictate the controls that are required to mitigate the identified risks. The project risk management process is discussed in 4.2; however, it stopped short of identifying any exit strategies, or project break points which could have been built into the project management process to intervene when time delays and costs exceeded expectations.
- 4.3.4 A strong factor surrounding Phase One is the evolving nature of how it unfolded. It started out with a campaign group who, over 12 years, very successfully obtained investment, with then the awarding bodies specifying that they needed the Council to act as the accountable body to be able to move forward. In this sense, the Council responded to the overwhelming community desire to save Dreamland, and to draw down the grants as it also contributed towards many goals in the Corporate Plan for the regeneration of Margate, and current corporate aims for inward investment and job creation. It was however predicted at the outset that the top three risks would each in turn materialise to impact the project, knocking it off course.
- 4.3.5 In terms of the 'lessons learned' the Council has decided to introduce a refreshed Project Management process for all future strategic projects, based on a new Project Management Toolkit. There is also a reinvigorated desire to create focus, to invest resources in what can be achieved and to park pipeline projects until there is sufficient time and resource to deliver them well. This is a success. There has been a great deal of learning from the Peer Review and former attitudes and working relations have moved on significantly. During this review, at no point was there mention of members behaving inappropriately or pressuring officers to act in any particular way, which is very pleasing to report.
- 4.3.6 Additional learning from this project includes the challenge for Directors to have the capacity to carry on with the day job and deliver strategic projects. The resource required should be quantified in advance and Directors (or responsible staff) should be seconded to the project with back fill arrangements in place to cover their day to day roles for the duration of the project. If the Council is successful in creating focus to only invest the resources in projects it can successfully complete, then imperative to that is recognising and creating the capacity to deliver them, or not to embark on such projects at all.

4.4 **Financial Management**

- 4.4.1 The arrangements for Financial Management have been a very consistent part of the project, with the External Funding Officer from the Finance Team having been part of the project team since 2008. The records maintained are a meticulous account of all the grant monies and drawn down, and the capital and revenue financial account codes used to record the detailed transactions. This information is shared with the Project Team. There have been a number of changes to the s.151 Officer post throughout the life of the project.
- 4.4.2 When searching the Council Intranet there is evidence that reporting to Members has occurred frequently over the life of the project through various committees; particularly featuring regularly in Budget Monitoring reports. In addition to Portfolio Holder briefings, and formal decisions taken to Cabinet, items have been identified in the Forward Plan and have been presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, most notably in March 2014 when it called in a Cabinet Member decision regarding Dreamland Compensation Payments.

4.4.3 The project had been on track financially until several things happened at once, and therefore as part of the budget monitoring report presented to Cabinet on the 30 July 2015 an anticipated overspend to the project totalling £2,225,500 was reported, along with the following text. *“The Dreamland project is one of the largest regeneration schemes the Council has ever undertaken and it has been challenging due to the unique nature of the assets involved. With a budget of just over £18m already approved, split between capital and revenue, it has been the capital budget element that has posed the most challenges. Due to the complex and large scale nature of capital projects, the original budgets have to be based on estimations that often need revising as the project advances. In this instance this is due mainly to unforeseen works on site and the elongation of the project timeline due to the compulsory purchase process. The main works tender came in slightly under budget but there have been additional works where provisional sums calculated in the contract were not sufficient. The main area of project overspend was in relation to the service provision, the Scenic Railway and external areas of the park. Professional fees have risen due to the requirement to maintain a professional team throughout the projects duration. The elongation of the project timeline caused by the compulsory purchase of the site and the inability to undertake works during the park’s first summer season, has led to the increase in professional fee costs. The other main areas of overspend relate to the delivery of works that were in the lease but were not in the tendered works package, additional legal and valuation expert fees required for the sites compulsory purchase and elements of works to be invoiced to the operator”.*

4.4.4 As part of the 10 September 2015 Cabinet Dreamland Progress Update Report the breakdown of the detail of the extra funding requirement was set out as below:

	£000
Urgent Works overspend	16
Current anticipated overspend	
<i>Based on current cost reports and other TDC commitments</i>	
Main works	
<i>Variations to main works contract. Tender returns higher than anticipated.</i>	906
Rides	
<i>Restrictions on rides to ensure value for money</i>	(367)
Professional fees	
<i>Extended duration of project (due to CPO/opening)</i>	396
Activity , Predominantly due to the programme, pre-operations	(149)
<i>And marketing reduction of marketing activities now undertaken by operator</i>	
English Heritage grant	
<i>Due to the timing of the availability of this grant, it has now had to be allocated to the Cinema.</i>	100
Cost of removing contaminated spoil from site	70
Additional legal costs	
<i>Additional legal costs to complete CPO including lands tribunal</i>	200
Agreed additional works list	
<i>Additional works added as a result of variations between lease and contracted works</i>	730
Estimate of cost of works to be funded by operator	200
Contingency	123
	2,225

The proposed funding for the anticipated overspend is set out below.

Funding Source	£000
Dreamland Reserve	9
Car park income 2014/15 (urgent works)	16
Borrowing	2,000
Estimated income from operator	200
	2,225

Based on income projections in relation to the Dreamland car park the cost of the £2m borrowing above can be met. In accordance with the Prudential Code increased borrowing levels will require the Mid-year Treasury Strategy Report to reflect the increase in borrowing.”

- 4.4.5 The Project Manager or responsible Director determines how and when their Portfolio Holder and the Cabinet should be made aware of a project being on or off target. The learning from this is that a method for linking Project Risk Management and Project Financial Management to the Council’s Corporate Risk Management process via escalation needs to be improved. The regular budget monitoring report should not be the first formal communication that a project has overspent.

5. **CONCLUSIONS**

- 5.1 **Governance Arrangements** – The governance around decision making for the project was found to comply with the Constitution and delegated authority therein. The governance surrounding how the operator appointment was made was tested and found to be in accordance with a proper process that accords with the Due Diligence Protocol adopted by the Council in December 2014. Council Officers followed the advice of externally engaged specialists in adopting the procurement methodology. The scoring of submissions was conducted by a cross departmental team of officers and the responsible Cabinet Member. The internal selection process was summarised and details sent to the HLF for approval before proceeding. However, new companies incorporated for a specific function, holding no previous track record in the sector or at least three years trading accounts, carry a very high risk that they will succeed. The learning from this is to take a greater account of the risks presented by fledgling companies. Whilst the governance surrounding the decision to undertake the CPO was sound, the Cabinet paper did not provide alternative options for consideration and the risk and uncertainty surrounding CPO leads to the conclusion that councils should not undertake CPO. The assessment of the overall project arrangements and funding are covered below.
- 5.2. **Project Risk Management** – the learning is for the Council to strengthen Project Risk Management arrangements to include an assessment of what action should ensue if key milestones are not attainable as planned. E.g. put the project on hold and seek alternative funding streams or, terminate and mothball the project, or take the risk and proceed with consequences. The external project managers had correctly identified the project risks, however their mitigating action was not ‘SMART’ nor had they extended this to identify any ‘deal-breaking points’ where significant delays or actions outside the control of the Council might put the project in jeopardy. It is feasible that even had these been considered that the Council would have continued in exactly the same way that it has to deliver the project. However, the consideration of consequences provides the opportunity to re-assess the risks, and determine if the impact (usually financial) can be tolerated.
- 5.3. **Project Management** – the control measures put in place to support Phase One project delivery were hampered by the top three risks materialising, a changeable membership of the project team, failure to reach key milestones on time and the lack of any exit strategies or ‘project pause breaks’ built in. The Council has introduced a new approach for all new strategic projects – a key improvement being to focus on

what can be achieved within the resources available. Future strategic projects should also seek to identify the deal breakers or exit strategy points if resources are not available to deliver, or due to unfavourable circumstances affecting the planned delivery. File storage for strategic projects should be organised centrally, with restricted access, so that if a key member of staff leaves, project files are not held all over the network in 'orphaned' files. Key to future success hinges on the accurate assessment of the resources required to undertake projects, and for the Council to create capacity for Directors (or lead officers) by seconding them to the project and backfilling the day to day role for the duration of the project.

- 5.4 **Financial Management** – strong financial controls within the project existed for the monitoring and reporting for actuals, albeit a reactive process. However the nature of the listed building structures involved led to unprecedented unforeseen works. Time delays meant that some grant conditions could not be met, and funds had to be re-allocated, putting further pressure on the Council. The announcement of the opening date by the operator created a very short timescale to complete the works, which incurred additional costs. The overspend has been reported transparently to Cabinet and through the Quarterly Budget Report. The lessons learned, are to build in bigger contingencies (both in terms of contract duration and budget) for any future works to listed structures. Also, linked to the Risk Management learning above, to estimate the cost of each risk materialising, so the impact can be more transparently measured in quantifiable terms – a contract not being delivered in 30 weeks as planned was the problem – but the cost of the extension just through the prelims had a big affect on the final cost (this was in addition to the unforeseen works). And, to link escalation from Project Financial Management to the Corporate Risk Management process should an overspend occur, not to rely on budget monitoring to report it after the fact.

6. **DISTRIBUTION LIST**

Prepared by: - [Christine Parker]	Date	To
Draft report	25/08/16 17/10/16 21/10/16	Corporate Resources Director
Final report	10/11/16 13/12/16	Corporate Resources Director Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Dreamland Margate – Chronology

- 1992 – Dreamland Cinema listed Grade II
- 1996 – Bembon Brothers sell Dreamland to Dreamland Leisure (Jimmy Godden)
- 1997 – Margate Seafront Conservation Area designated
- 2001-2003 – Most fixed rides removed from site
- 2002 – Scenic Railway listed Grade II
- 2003 – Dreamland Leisure announces that the Park will close and redeveloped as retail and leisure uses
- 2003 – Nos 41-47 Marine Terrace (owned by Dreamland Leisure) destroyed in an arson attack
- 2003 – The Save Dreamland campaign founded. This later evolved to be the Dreamland Trust (DLT)
- 2004 – Power disconnected from the Cinema Organ
- 2004 – Local Plan Inquiry creates Policy ‘T8’, which says that Dreamland must remain an amusement park, except under exceptional circumstances
- 2005 – Dreamland Leisure sells two 30% stakes in Dreamland to the Waterbridge Group and David Schrieber, to form the Margate Town Centre Regeneration Company (MTCRC)
- 2006 – Last year of operation of the Park
- 2007 – The bingo hall and the two screen cinema in the Dreamland Cinema building close
- 2008 – (March) An arson attack destroys 25% of the Scenic Railway (which was not insured)
- 2008 – (April) Listing of Dreamland Cinema upgraded to II*
- 2008 - (April) Roz Kerslake and Rolland Jeffery of the Prince’s Regeneration Trust (PRT) shown around Dreamland. PRT commissioned to produce a scoping report into Dreamland’s future (funded by English Partnerships)
- 2008 – (July) PRT scoping report presented to Margate Renewal Partnership. PRT advocate TDC working with MTCRC to create a new amusement park on 51% of the site (including the 3 listed structures) and a mixed use development on the rest of the site
- 2008 – (August) Thanet District Council (TDC) erect fence to protect the Scenic Railway under a Section 54 Urgent Works Notice
- 2008 – (September) TDC apply for £30,000 development grant from the CABE ‘SeaChange’ fund
- 2008 - (October) Dreamland Cinema inspected by TDC revealing advancing decay to the interior
- 2008 – (October) SeaChange development grant bid of £30,000 successful
- 2009 – (February) Menagerie Cages and Gothick Wall (from the 1870s) listed Grade II
- 2009 – (March) The Waterbridge Group go into administration. David Schrieber buys the Waterbridge 30% stake
- 2009 – (March and December) CABE Urban Panel visit Margate and identify Dreamland as **‘Margate’s crucial regeneration project’**
- 2009 – (April) SeaChange bid submitted with input from PRT, Locum Consulting and Levitt Bernstein Architects. Assembling the bid cost £180,000 of which £55,000 was to be paid by MTCRC
- 2009 – (June) TDC, DLT and MTCRC agree a Memorandum of Understanding to jointly take the project forward
- 2009 – (November) TDC awarded £3.8m for the Dreamland project under the SeaChange Programme
- 2010 - (April) Cabinet report update and approval to proceed with CPO
- 2010 – (November) Conservation Management Plan consulted upon
- 2010 – (December) MTCRC sells the Scenic Railway to ‘Margate Ride Ltd’ and the majority of Dreamland Cinema to ‘Margate Cinema Ltd’
- 2011 – (January) Cabinet report clarifying the ‘whole site’ updating the area for CPO (should it become necessary) – Annex 1 is the original plan and Annex 2 the revised plan
- 2011 – (Onwards) The first of a series of Section 54 Urgent Works Notices are served on the owner relating to the Cinema, Scenic Railway and security. To date, TDC have spent

- in the region of £1.9m on the listed structures, which they are yet to be repaid (and are unlikely to be so)
- 2011 – (March) Conservation Management Plan adopted
 - 2011 – (April) Turner Contemporary opens
 - 2011 – (April) Following the failure of MTCRC to make a planning application under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding TDC Cabinet move to serve Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) on the entire (T8) Dreamland site.
 - 2011 – (July) Listing of the Scenic Railway upgraded to II*
 - 2011 – (July) Dreamland Trust Business Plan
 - 2011 – (July) Letter to HLF 2 confirming Thanet District Council has issued notices for the compulsory purchase of the site and intends to see this process through to its conclusion. It further commits to working with the Dreamland Trust to deliver the project, including the contribution of Officer time, and financial investment by way of a grant and through Thanet's own resources. Specifically, the Council will act as the project managers for the rebuilding of the Scenic Railway.
 - 2011 – (August) Joint bid made to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) by TDC and DLT for funding for the Dreamland project
 - 2011 – (December) HLF award £3m towards the project
 - 2012 – (January to March) CPO Public Inquiry
 - 2012 – (August) Secretary of State upholds CPO on entire T8 site and established Dreamland as a 'single planning unit'
 - 2013 – (March) MTCRC appeals CPO in the High Court
 - 2013 – (May) High Court dismisses appeal
 - 2013 – Preliminary notice of Vesting
 - 2013 – (May) MTCRC lodges appeal to the Court of Appeal
 - 2013 – (August) Vesting process approved by Cabinet
 - 2013 – (September) Transfer of ownership to TDC
 - 2014 – (March) Overview & Scrutiny call in Dreamland Compensation Payment
 - 2014 – (May) Cabinet approval for the Council to seek to procure a suitable third party to operate the amusement park.
 - 2014 – (19 June) Sands Heritage Ltd incorporated at Companies House
 - 2014 – (July) Cabinet approval to seek expressions of interest to lease phase 2 land and buildings- comprising Dreamland Cinema and Ballroom, and gives approval to fund capital costs for the sunshine café.
 - 2014 – (October) Heads of Terms agreed with potential Dreamland Operator
 - 2015 – (May) Sands Heritage Ltd entered into 2 agreements for lease
 - 2015 – (19 May) Dreamland reopens
 - 2015 – (July) Overspend (and how funded) reported to Cabinet £2,225,500
 - 2015 – (July & August) Testing of Scenic Railway trains
 - 2015 – (September) SHL claim for delays of park being fully opened the reason why they can not meet Business Plan targets and achieve income levels predicted
 - 2015 – (September) Update Report to Cabinet
 - 2015 – (October) scenic Railway opens
 - 2015 – (December) SHL enter a Creditors agreement
 - 2016 – (May) SHL go into administration- Administrators Duff & Phelps appointed to take over the running of the park
 - 2016 – (July) tenders for 'HLF grant conditions evaluation review' sought
 - 2016 – (July – August) Post Implementation review of Phase One concluded
 - 2016 – (August) CEO of SHL resigns.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION PLAN FOR MAJOR PROJECTS

Appendix 2

Priority	Main Control Risk	Recommendation to mitigate risk	Proposed Action or Action Taken	Proposed Completion Date & Responsibility
H	Weak project risk management may create a reactive environment where the delivery of the project is continuously reliant on having to reach agreement to alter course – with increased cost and delay. The result will be late and over budget.	1. The Council should ensure each project has a robust system for managing project risks. This must include a full understanding of the consequences of not meeting key milestones – and identifying in advance if any such events will trigger a point at which the project is terminated.	Corporate Project team should implement milestone break point options within project risk management in advance.	31.03.17 CMT
H	Weak project risk management may create a reactive environment where the delivery of the project is continuously reliant on having to reach agreement to alter course – with increased cost and delay. The result will be late and over budget.	2. The impact of each risk identified within the project risk management process should be costed so that it can be measure in a quantified way.	Better planning of the consequences if a risk materialises, understanding whether it may have such a detrimental effect on the project that it should be terminated or put on hold.	31.03.17 CMT
H	Weak project risk management may lead to all control mechanisms with the project failing, resulting in late and over budget outcomes.	3. Project risk management should be carried out throughout the life of the project. It is intended to drive and control the project, not become a reactive ‘fait accompli’.	Monthly updated project risk management returns should be provided to, and challenged by, the Project Sponsors – and if so significant escalated to the Corporate Risk Management process.	31.03.17 CMT

Priority	Main Control Risk	Recommendation to mitigate risk	Proposed Action or Action Taken	Proposed Completion Date & Responsibility
M	Poor handover controls may lead to project files and documents becoming 'orphaned' on the Council's network.	4. The continuity of staff fulfilling a particular role on a project can not be guaranteed, therefore all project files should be stored in a central area, with access only granted to the project team. The files should be organised so that key project documentation is available along with project meetings, minutes and action points, reports to committee for authorisation and links to contracts held with Legal, Procurement and Finance Teams.	Create a filing system on the network, secured to grant authorised access. This will also reduce duplication of files held on different work spaces on the network.	31.03.17 CMT
H	Unforeseen costs may spiral out of control.	5. The Council should build larger contingencies into projects working on listed building structures.	Provision for a 'worst case scenario' should be built in, see the risk assessment process costing in 2 above.	31.03.17 CMT
H	Grant conditions not complied with may trigger a clawback clause.	6. The responsible officer for each project that attracts external funding must ensure they are appraised of the grant conditions so all decisions made during the project are in line with the conditions.	The consequences of triggering a grant clawback must be considered as part of the project risk assessment, as this could impact the Council's Corporate Risks.	31.03.17 CMT

This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSED SCRUTINY APPROACH FOR THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL

Overview & Scrutiny Panel	13 December 2016
Report Author	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Derek Crow-Brown, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance
Status	For Recommendation
Classification:	Unrestricted
Key Decision	No
Previously Considered by	None
Ward:	Thanet wide

Executive Summary:

The Overview & Scrutiny Panel (OSP) is being asked to consider recommendations for adopting a more effective scrutiny process for Thanet District Council (TDC). These proposals are built on the information that was provided to both Members and officers during the Scrutiny training sessions that were conducted by an external facilitator in June 2016 as well as some aspects of the current practice. The external trainer was hired on the strength of the recommendation by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS).

It is hoped that by adopting a new scrutiny approach, the Panel will be able to plan and conduct their work more efficiently. The approach should enable Members to focus on issues that would add value to the decision making process for the council and help improve service delivery to residents by Thanet District Council.

Recommendation(s):

1. Adopt an approach for a work programme made up of:
 - i. Three Working Parties;
 - ii. One Scrutiny Review;
 - iii. Continued one off reports considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (including presentations from Cabinet Members);

2. Adopt the OSP Agenda Item Request Template attached at Annex 1 to the report;

3. Adopt a system for prioritisation of scrutiny review projects that includes a scoring matrix using the template attached as Annex 3 to the report;

4. Adopt the use of Scrutiny Review Project Scoping Form attached at Annex 4.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS	
Financial and Value for Money	There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. However it is worth noting that if Members rejected the proposals outlined within the report any alternative proposals would need to consider that there are no additional resources available to support any additional scrutiny activities above those described within the report. A well planned and properly managed scrutiny process adds value to the council business processes as it contributes to a robust policy development and decision making process by offering a critical friend oversight on executive decisions that council makes.
Legal	There are no legal implications arising directly from this report. A robust scrutiny function would fulfil the legislative requirement under The Local Government Act 2000 and related Regulations.
Corporate	<p>There are no foreseeable risks associated with the proposals for adopting a new scrutiny approach. It is anticipated that a new approach would enhance good governance as the Overview and Scrutiny Panel would be able to engage decision makers (ie Cabinet) in debate which if conducted appropriately would evidence accountability in the Council's decision making and policy development processes.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed recommendations in this report would not impact directly on the corporate priorities, the adoption of these recommendations would enhance the corporate values of TDC, particularly the value on 'Delivering value for money.' A fully fledged scrutiny protocol would help the Panel in its work of acting as a critical friend and sounding board for important decisions that Cabinet intends to make and would help to add value to the decision making process.</p> <p>Whilst Cabinet is not necessarily obliged to seek the view of the Panel in all decisions, a culture of consultation between the Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Panel contributes to improved decision making and greater involvement of non-executive councillors in policy development. A positive scrutiny process that seeks to add value to effective decision making by Cabinet builds the trust and continuous engagement of the scrutiny process by the executive and contributes to a mature decision making process by council.</p>
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	<p>Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</p> <p>Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.</p>

	Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.	
	Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,	
	Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it	
	Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	✓
<p>There are no equity and equalities implications arising directly from this report, but the Council needs to retain a strong focus and understanding on issues of diversity amongst the local community and ensure service delivery matches these.</p> <p>It is important to be aware of the Council's responsibility under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and show evidence that due consideration had been given to the equalities impact that may be brought upon communities by the decisions made by Council.</p> <p>This report aims to improve the way council conducts its scrutiny process in order to contribute to an effective decision making and policy development process within TDC. The report is looking at strengthening the internal corporate processes, albeit councillor contributions to decision making.</p>		

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	
Promoting inward investment and job creation	
Supporting neighbourhoods	

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	✓
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 In preparation for the 2015/16 Annual Panel report to Council, Members gave some feedback that the scrutiny work programme and approach did not lend itself to robust pre-decision scrutiny and as a result they felt that the Panel had a limited role to play in policy development.
- 1.2 Members indicated that the impact of scrutiny in the decision making process had been limited particularly with regards to 'holding decision makers to account' and acting as 'check and balance' to the executive.
- 1.3 In the Peer Review Challenge Report, it was observed that the scrutiny function required improvement. Thereafter, at the first meeting of the Panel for 2016/17 on 24 May, Members agreed the following:
- "That the Chairman engages the Leader of Council and Officers on behalf of the Overview & Scrutiny Panel to explore proposals for alternative scrutiny arrangements that includes decision scrutiny with a view to a report being produced on those proposals for consideration by a future meeting of both the Overview and Scrutiny Panel and Cabinet."
- 1.4 The Panel Chairman has exchanged views with the Leader of Council and they have both agreed on the need to improve the scrutiny process. These discussions were

informed by Scrutiny Training for the Panel and the wider membership of the Council which was run by the Centre for Public Scrutiny. This report outlines what the new proposals are, both the Chairman of the Scrutiny Panel and the Leader of the Council are supportive of the proposals as set out within the report.

2.0 Proposed New Scrutiny Framework

- 2.1 The current operating environment for local Councils is defined by limited financial resources and shrinking central government funding and TDC is no exception to this. This calls for the Council to think, plan and act 'smart' in order to achieve as much as it can with less resources than before. For the Overview & Scrutiny Panel this would mean establishing a 'ruthless' approach to prioritising 'scrutiny work to do' in each municipal year.
- 2.2 On this basis Democratic Services have assessed that there is sufficient support at any one time for:
 - i. Three Working Parties
 - ii. One Scrutiny Review
 - iii. Continued one off reports considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (including presentations from Cabinet Members).
- 2.3 These proposals are informed to a greater extent by the lessons learnt by Members and officers during the Member/Officer Scrutiny training that was facilitated by an external trainer accredited by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS), discussions by Members of the Panel and discussions by Officers in the context of the level of resources available.
- 2.4 Each of the three areas will be outlined within this report, explaining how each of these areas would work, in addition the report will also outline how the ideas that fall within each category can be prioritised.
- 2.5 It is worth noting that in order to manage the scrutiny work load effectively and to ensure that the new approach is successful, there must be ruthless prioritisation of scrutiny work. Scrutiny topics should be about asking questions that the Panel does not have the answers to. The Panel should also avoid undertaking work that is already being undertaken by other parts of the Council; other Council's or partner agencies.

3.0 Requesting items for Scrutiny

- 3.1 As a way of incorporating the principle of ruthless efficiency, Democratic Services are proposing the introduction of a form that will help to scope suggestions for scrutiny work. This would help to assess the feasibility for undertaking a piece of work and to determine whether there is capacity within council to undertake the work through to a successful conclusion.
- 3.2 The OSP Agenda Item Request Form attached at Annex 1 will help those looking to request an item to scope the work being proposed, and identify the key factors that will help shape the content and direction of the item. In addition the form also allows the requestor to identify how the panel should scrutinise the suggested item, whether as an idea for a working party, scrutiny review or a one-off report to the panel.
- 3.3 Any Panel Member can submit a proposal for a topic or an issue for scrutiny to look at using the scoping template. Non Panel councillors could also seek a Panel Member to sponsor an idea for a scrutiny topic. Members of the public could also suggest

issues for consideration as scrutiny project proposals by submitting their suggestions to the Panel Chairman or any Panel Member.

- 3.4 Councillors would still be able to submit “Councillor Calls for Action” as introduced by Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to the Panel, without having to complete the form mentioned above. The detailed protocol for submitting a CCfA is included in the TDC Constitution on the following link:

<http://democracy.thanet.gov.uk/documents/s52016/14Jul2016Constitution.pdf>

4.0 Criteria for rejection of a scrutiny proposal

- 4.1 It is equally important that Members agree a criteria for Democratic Services to use when rejecting scrutiny proposals where there is sufficient evidence that such a proposed piece of work would not add value to the decision making process of the council and/or the work of the Panel. In order to manage a fair process for rejecting proposals deemed not suitable, the Panel ought to adopt a fair and transparent system for vetting the proposals.
- 4.2 A simple key questions test should be applied to disregard scrutiny proposal if the topic being suggested falls within the following categories:
1. The matter is sub-judice or prejudicial to the Council's interests;
 2. The specific case falls within the Council's complaints procedure;
 3. The topic involves an individual disciplinary or grievance matter;
 4. Scrutiny of the proposed topic is unlikely to result in improvements for local people;
 5. The matter has or has had an existing right of appeal;
 6. If a Scrutiny Review is asked for, the subject of the review has already been considered in a scrutiny review in the last two years;
 7. Is solely about the internal performance of another body.
- 4.3 Democratic Services would not reject a request for scrutiny without first contacting the Chairman of the Panel and seeking their agreement. Democratic Services would then inform the Panel and the applicant and this rejection would then be mentioned in the work programming report for the Panel's information.

5.0 Scrutiny through Working Parties

- 5.1 In the main, such issues as corporate performance, budget proposal and the performance of shared services/joint arrangements and any other established council business processes that relate to the delivery of services to residents would best be reviewed through working parties. However this does not preclude the Panel from identifying one off topics that require a different approach for conducting a scrutiny review.
- 5.2 The working parties could be inward looking, i.e. looking at internal corporate arrangements for 'doing business,' and/or they could be outward looking, i.e. reviewing whether the council was delivering services to residents to an acceptable standard. The main part of the work programme for each of the working party would be set out at the first meeting of the sub groups. This level of detail will assist officers in planning the level of support required and where written reports are required, this gives officers reasonable time to draft reports.

- 5.3 Items of business for each of the work programmes are suggested by members of the sub group. However the working party can take suggestions from outside their respective membership and from the non Panel councillors as well as from the public. Suggestions from residents would need to be sponsored by a TDC councillor, who if they do not sit on the sub group, would need to seek the support of a Panel/sub group councillor.
- 5.4 Currently there are three working parties, each with a membership size of seven councillors (some of whom are drawn from outside the Panel). These sub groups are:
1. Community Safety Partnership Working Party;
 2. Corporate Performance Review Working Party;
 3. Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party.
- 5.5 The Community Safety Partnership and Corporate Performance Review working parties maintain oversight over the performance of the Community Safety Partnership for Thanet and Thanet District Council's corporate performance respectively. That largely means the two sub groups receive the routine quarterly performance reports.
- 5.6 However, the Community Safety Partnership Working Party has this year decided that review a single issue topic at a time. The topic would be reviewed to completion before the sub group can move on to another issue. The sub group identified seven such topics to work through on this basis. The Electoral Registration Process Review Working party's main focus has been in relation to the coming up with innovative ideas for improving voter registration in the district.
- 5.7 The Panel could opt to continue with the current structure and work programming approach of the working parties. Each sub group would be reporting on their respective progress at each of the scheduled meetings of the main Panel. And each sub group would be expected to contribute to the Panel's Annual Report to Council. Any progress update comments would be included in the work programme report for each Panel meeting as reflected in Annex 2 to the report.

6.0 One off Scrutiny Review

- 6.1 Members could conduct one in-depth scrutiny review at any one time in addition to the on-going work by the three working parties. A system for prioritisation of scrutiny reviews to be carried out has been developed at Annex 3 of the report. This creates the rationale for managing the OSP Work Programme throughout the year as it sets out the criteria for selecting what scrutiny projects to carry-out and when.
- 6.2 The system for prioritisation of scrutiny reviews would be further managed using a scoring matrix to ensure a fair, objective and transparent approach for selecting scrutiny projects and determining the timing for undertaking these reviews. A scoring matrix with weighted values is included in Annex 3. Members would need to agree the weighted value assigned to key factors identified in the matrix.
- 6.3 The scoring will be conducted by Democratic Services based upon the questions outlined in Annex 3. The completed score matrix will then be forwarded to the Corporate Management Team (CMT) for approval and to assist in the planning of resource allocation to the suggestions made. The list will then be sent to the Chairman for his information and will then be ready for implementation on the work programming sheet.
- 6.4 It is hoped that the Member(s) who successfully propose a scrutiny review project, would volunteer to take part as in that review (unless this would be considered

inappropriate). This was cited during the scrutiny training to be a good scrutiny practice.

7.0 How will the scrutiny review project work?

7.1 Once a scrutiny review has been approved and membership of that review agreed by the Panel, the following key tasks must be carried out by the review panel at its first meeting:

- a) Project scoping (to ensure that the work to be carried out falls within the terms of reference of the project);
- b) Work programming to ascertain the timetable for completing the review;
- c) Identifying witnesses to be interviewed by reviewers as part of the partners public participation process);
- d) Work out the method of evidence gathering (that will enable the reviewers to collect information required to draw appropriate conclusions and recommendations This could include one or a combination of the following:
 - i) Desk research;
 - ii) Oral Question and answer session(s) with witnesses or groups of witnesses (as is appropriate);
 - iii) Site visit.
- e) Agree an approach for questioning witnesses and listening (roles are assigned to individual members of the sub group in order to manage the process more efficiently. This could include drafting before-hand key questions to be asked).

To assist the Scrutiny Review to accomplish the above list, Democratic Services have created Scrutiny Review Project Scoping Form, which is attached at Annex 4.

Doing the review

Use key lines of inquiry;

- a) Report writing (it might be that there are instances when members of the review would like to write up the report themselves or in other instances they may require an officer to do the write up) Evaluate the evidence and draw evidence-based conclusions;
- b) Presenting the SMART recommendations to the appropriate body of council (decision maker) for consideration (in most instances it would be presenting the recommendations to Cabinet through the main Panel);
- c) Decision tracking (if the recommendations are adopted, there is a need for the Overview & Scrutiny Panel to track the implementation of the decision in question);
- d) Evaluation (in some cases it might be necessary to assess the impact of the decision and determine there is a need for further Panel action).
- e) Evaluate each review to ascertain the resources used, impact made and outcomes delivered against the corporate Plan (in relation to Priorities and Values).

7.2 It is envisaged that scrutiny reviews will be private meetings not open to the public. This might be seen as a somewhat controversial proposition to some, however there are a number of reasons why this might be the case. Firstly it is important to make clear that the final report of the review will always (unless it contains material exempt under schedule 12A of the Local Government Act) be open to the public.

7.3 If all elements of process were open to the public in the run up to getting to the point of publishing the report then in order to get a complete picture of the review the public

would have to attend every session – attending some sessions might give an out of context impression of the work being undertaken by the review, this could also mean that some could choose to try and predict the results of a review based on this out of context information which would be deeply unhelpful.

7.4 Also on a purely practical note some elements of a review might involve Councillors visiting an area and conducting surveys or carrying out some other tasks in order to gather information. If the review was classed as an official meeting agendas and minutes of these ad-hoc activities would need to be produced – this would not be practical to do and could restrict the ability of Members to act independently.

7.5 Despite this, it is important to stress that elements of the review process will heavily involve the public, this will especially be the case at the evidence gathering stage, where the public would potentially get the chance to attend an organised session of the review to put forward their views on the subject.

8.0 Continued one off reports considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Panel and Cabinet Members presentations

8.1 In addition to all of the above work activities of the Panel, Members could also still continue to request and consider one off reports on topical issues of interest to the Panel. These reports could be on issues on the Forward Plan or any other issues on a matter that affects the local residents that could arise during the course of the year.

8.2 In order to manage that work stream, a request for a one off report should be submitted on the OSP Agenda Item Request Form that is attached as Annex 1 to the report.

8.3 Cabinet Member presentations to the Overview & Scrutiny Panel should continue to be another route available to Members when they want to engage any Cabinet Member on a subject of interest that would enhance the way council delivers services to residents.

8.4 Panel Members would continue to request through the Chairman for a Cabinet Member to be in attendance to discuss a topic of interest to scrutiny and this debate will be on the basis of questions submitted to the Cabinet Member in question, in reasonable time in advance of the OSP meeting.

9.0 Options

The Panel is asked to consider agreeing the following:

9.1 Adopt an approach for a work programme made up of:

1. Three Working Parties;
2. One Scrutiny Review;
3. Continued one off reports considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (including presentations from Cabinet Members).

9.2 Adopt the OSP Agenda Item Request Template attached at Annex 1 to the report.

9.3 Adopt a system for prioritisation of scrutiny review projects that includes a scoring matrix using the template attached as Annex 3 to the report.

9.4 Adopt the use of Scrutiny Review Project Scoping Form attached at Annex 4.

or

- 9.5 Members may opt to come up with an alternative approach for scrutiny arrangements for the council.

Contact Officer:	Charles Hungwe, Senior Democratic Services Officer, ext 7186
Reporting to:	Nick Hughes, Committee Services Manager, ext 7208

Annex List

Annex 1	OSP Agenda Item Request Form
Annex 2	Progress update reporting Table of current working parties 2016/17
Annex 3	Scrutiny Programme Monitoring Sheet with Scoring Matrix
Annex 4	Scrutiny Review Project Scoping Form

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
None	N/A

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Matt Sanham, Financial Services Manager
Legal	Ciara Feeney, Head of Legal Services & Deputy Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft

**REQUEST FOR A FUTURE AGENDA ITEM AT THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
PANEL MEETING**

MEETING DATE:.....

TITLE OF REQUEST:
.....
.....
.....

CABINET PORTFOLIO/CORPORATE SERVICES AREA:
.....

BRIEF SUMMARY/CONTEXT OF REQUEST:
(Consideration should be given to how the issue addresses the key questions
in the criteria for suggesting scrutiny review projects)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

REASONS FOR REQUEST/JUSTIFICATION:
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

EXPECTED OUTCOME:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

HOW DO YOU SUGGEST THE PANEL WOULD PROGRESS THE PROPOSED WORK:

(Tick as appropriate)

ONE-OFF OFFICER REPORT

ESTABLISH A TASK & FINISH GROUP

SCRUTINY REVIEW

INQUIRY DAY (1 DAY)

SHORT TERM REVIEW (UP TO 3 MONTHS)

MEDIUM TERM REVIEW (MORE THAN 3 MONTHS)

MEMBER SPONSOR:.....

SPONSOR SIGNATURE:..... **DATE:**.....

PLEASE NOTE

KEY CRITERIA QUESTIONS FOR PROPOSING NEW SCRUTINY REVIEW PROJECTS

1. Does the request relate to one of the Council priorities?
2. Is the request regarding a policy of or a service provided by the Council?
3. Does the issue affect the well-being of people in Thanet?

4. Does the request relate to a service offered by the Council that is performing less well than expected (identified by Audit reports, quarterly internal and joint arrangements/partnerships corporate performance reports)
5. Does the request relate to the activities of an organisation the Council is working in partnership with?
6. When was the request first made?

ADDITIONAL NOTES

RATIONALE FOR SCRUTINY REVIEW PROJECT PROPOSAL

Before the Overview & Scrutiny Panel establishes a scrutiny review, Members ought to first consider an officer report that details the rationale for the proposed review. In doing so the Panel needs to satisfy itself that the following questions are addressed:

- Rationale:** Why should the review be undertaken?
How would the topic link to the Council's key vision, aims and priorities?
What benefits could result from the scrutiny review?
- Evidence:** What evidence exists to support the rationale and need for scrutiny?
What are the facts?
- Desired Outcome:** What outcomes are sought by undertaking the scrutiny review?
Is the desired outcome likely to be achieved and why?

This page is intentionally left blank

Table 2 – Current Sub-Group Progress and Watching Briefs Updates for 2016/17				
Sub Group/Issue	Composition/ Members	Lead Officer	Comment on Progress	Status
Date of Establishment 01.10.09 Community Safety Partnership Working Party	Cllr Curran (Chairman) Cllr Campbell Cllr Dixon Cllr Falcon Cllr Hayton Cllr Martin Cllr M. Saunders	Penny Button; Jessica Bailey		On going
Date of Establishment: 28.05.08 Corporate Performance Review Working Party	Cllr Campbell (Chairman) Cllr Connor Cllr Curran Cllr Dennis Cllr Dexter Cllr Jaye-Jones Cllr Rusiecki	Tim Willis		On going
Date of Establishment: 29.05.12 Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party	Cllr K. Gregory (Chairman) Cllr Campbell Cllr Connor Cllr Dawson Cllr Falcon Cllr Grove Cllr Jaye-Jones	Claire Hawken		On going
Presentations				
2015/16 Presentations by Portfolio Holders and Directors of Services	N/A	All Portfolio Holders and Directors		
Watching Brief Items				
05 December 2013: Full Council Referral of a Petition to OSP - QEQM Hospital A&E	OSP	Penny Button	OSP forwarded the response from the Chairman of the KCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee to Full Council on 15 October 2015 and Members noted the report. The Panel also agreed to keep a watchful brief to monitor the progress by EKHUFT towards developing the new clinical strategy for the region whilst maintaining a	OSP keeping a watching brief on the issue

Table 2 – Current Sub-Group Progress and Watching Briefs Updates for 2016/17

Sub Group/Issue	Composition/ Members	Lead Officer	Comment on Progress	Status
			<p>special interest on its implications for Thanet District.</p> <p>The cross-party QEQM Hospital Cabinet Advisory Group met for their first meeting on 21 April 2016 and agreed their terms of reference. They agreed to keep a watching brief until there were some developments at EKHUFT. A meeting has been arranged for 13 December to consider the documents of the initial public consultation, whose deadline is 23 December 2016.</p>	
Proposed review of the Winter Gardens as a major events venue	OSP	Head of Economic Development & Asset Management	<p>On 18 August 2015, Panel Members agreed to maintain a watching brief on the issue and to await the completion of the current tenancy agreements review being conducted by the Executive. Members may wish to note that an item on 'Asset Management Plan' is coming to the Panel on 26 January 2017 and thereafter will be taken to Cabinet on 31 January 2017. A decision to adopt an Asset Management Plan will be taken at Cabinet.</p>	OSP keeping a watching brief on the issue

Prioritising Scrutiny Review Topics – Scoring Matrix

It is anticipated that there will be many topics suggested to be the subject of Scrutiny reviews and to the people that suggested them they will be the most important subject to be considered, however this cannot be a way to prioritise review topics. In order to manage the work load more effectively, there can only be one scrutiny review to be run concurrently with the working party activities at any one time.

In order to ensure fairness Democratic Services have created a framework that all suggested topics should be scored against. This will ensure that all topics are treated fairly and make the reasoning behind the order in which Scrutiny Reviews are undertaken clear and transparent.

The framework contains six criteria that each topic suggestion will be scored against. Democratic Services in conjunction with the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel will then score the topic on each of these criteria out of 20 giving a total score out of 120. The scores are then forwarded to the Corporate Management Team (CMT) for approval and to assist them in the planning of resource allocation to the suggestions made. The list will then be sent to the Chairman for his information.

The five criteria will be:

- Is the topic related to a priority or value within the Council's Corporate Plan?
Yes – The topic directly relates to one of the three Priorities or three Values – 20 points;
Partially – The topic can be related to one of the three Priorities or three Values – 10 points;
No – The topic doesn't relate to the one of the three Priorities or three Values – 0 points.
- Is the topic of high public concern?
Yes – the matter is of high public concern, it is a public facing service and it has been the subject of questions/petitions at Council in the last two months and/or a group or representative group have been in touch with the Chairman of the Panel regarding this issue. – 20 points;
Partially – The matter is of some public concern, it is a public facing service, but hasn't been the subject of questions/petitions at Council in the last two months and/or a member of the public has been in touch with the Chairman of the Panel regarding this issue. – 10 points;
No – The matter is not of public concern, it relates to back office function and has not been the subject of recent public comment – 0 points.
- Is the topic currently underperforming as per the Council's quarterly performance monitoring?
Yes – the performance indicator is currently red – 20 points;
Partially – the performance indicator is currently orange – 10 points;
No – the performance indicator is currently green – 0 points.
- Will the topic result in recommendations that save that Council money or generate income?
Yes – There is definitely scope for recommendations as a result of the review for the Council to save money or generate income – 20 points;

Maybe – There is potentially scope for recommendations as a result of the review for the Council to save money or generate income;

No – The suggested topic is not about a topic that could result in monetary savings or income generation – 0 points.

- How long has the suggestion been on the list?

More than 12 months – 20 points;
 Between six and 12 months – 10 points;
 Less than six months – 0 points.

- Review Type: What are the officer resource implications?

1 Day – 4 weeks Review: **limited officer resource allocations required** for a successful review – 20 points;
 More than 4 weeks and up to 3 months – **significant officer resource allocations required** for a successful review – 10 points;
 More than 3 months: **very significant officer resource allocation required** for a successful review – 5 points.

The Scoring Table

Each suggested topic will then be entered into a table with their score, the higher the score the higher up the table that topic will be and the sooner that topic will be undertaken. This table will be included in the work programming report at every Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting to allow the panel to see what topics will be considered next. Democratic Services will also recheck the scores each time the work programming report is created in order to ensure that the scores reflect the time each suggestion has been on the list.

A copy of the scoring table is shown on the following page.

In addition to the scoring table Democratic Services will also include the following summary table in each work programming report. This allows the Panel to see the progress of the current scrutiny review.

Current Scrutiny Review

Review	
Chairman	
Membership	
Lead Officer	
Administrator	Senior DSO
Scope	
Present position	
Expected completion date	

Scrutiny Review Prioritisation Table

Title of the Scrutiny Review & Review Type (resource implications)		Date added to the scoring table	Membership	Is the topic related to a priority or value within the Council's Corporate Plan?	Is the topic of high public concern?	Is the topic currently under-performing as per the Council's quarterly performance monitoring?	Will the topic result in recommendations that save that Council money or generate income?	Time on the list?	Implications for officer resource allocation	Total	Rank
Title	Review Type										
Example topic 1	+3 months review	21/07/16		20	20	10	10	0	5	65	1 st
Example topic 2	1 day review	16/07/26		10	0	0	20	0	20	50	2 nd

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Review Project Scoping

Review Title	
Objective(s) <i>(What do you want to see the review do? – remember the objective should be Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Time related)</i>	
Intended outcomes <i>(What changes, benefits, or other effects would you like to happen as a result of the recommendations of the review.)</i>	
Terms of reference of the review	
Ways of gathering evidence	

Witnesses and method of contact	
Timescale	
Intended recipient of the report and recommendations	
Success measurement of the review	

Other items for inclusion in the project scope

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

REPORT BACK ON REJECTED PETITIONS

Overview and Scrutiny Panel	13 December 2016
Report Author	Committee Services Manager
Portfolio Holder	Cllr Crow-Brown, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Governance Services
Status	For Information
Classification:	Unrestricted
Key Decision	No
Ward:	All wards

Executive Summary:

This report informs the Overview and Scrutiny Panel of two petitions rejected by the Council's Monitoring Officer in accordance with the Council's petition scheme.

Recommendation(s):

This report is for information only.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money	There are no direct financial implications to this report.									
Legal	There are no legal implications directly rising from this report.									
Corporate	The Council must abide by its constitution, of which the petition scheme is an integral part.									
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	<p>Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</p> <p>Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,</td> <td style="width: 50px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>It is the author's opinion that the Public Sector Equality Duty is not engaged by the subject matter</p>		Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.		Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,		Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it		Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	
Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.										
Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,										
Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it										
Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.										

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	
Promoting inward investment and job creation	
Supporting neighbourhoods	

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 When the Petition Scheme was reviewed in light of the Localism Act 2011, a new clause was introduced to require the Council's Monitoring Officer to report to the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Panel when a petition was rejected.
- 1.2 The Council has recently received two petitions that have been rejected by the Council's Monitoring Officer, this report outlines them and the reasons they have been rejected.

2.0 Petition regarding a new bus stop on Station Approach, Birchington

- 2.1 The Council received a petition on 25 August 2016 entitled: "We the undersigned petition the Council to say no to a bus stop on station approach for inconvenience and congestion".
- 2.2 The Monitoring Officer rejected this petition as the Council's petition scheme says: "The Monitoring Officer will also reject a petition if the matter has already been or is currently subject to an existing consultation exercise. In such a case the petition will be forwarded to the officer responsible for that consultation exercise and considered as part of that process."
- 2.3 The Civil Enforcement Manager confirmed that the decision regarding the bus stop mentioned in the petition was subject to an ongoing consultation that ended on Tuesday 30 August, therefore it fell under the paragraph shown above and hence was rejected.
- 2.4 The petition was passed to the Civil Enforcement Manager and was included in the wider consultation.

3.0 Petition regarding objection to planning application F/TH/16/1414

- 3.1 The Council received a petition on 7 November 2016 entitled "We the community of Harbour Street object to the above numbered application due to the anti-social behaviour caused by the late night operation of the taxi business. This creates an environmental health hazard with violence, noise, human waste and rubbish which lowers the quality of life for residents on the street at night, and pollutes and destroys the quality of life on the street during the day. It also creates traffic problems late at night, with parked cars, engines revving, doors slamming and pollution."
- 3.2 The petitioner was advised that the petition had been rejected in accordance with paragraph 12.1 of the Council's Constitution because it related to the Council's Planning or Licensing functions and there were separate statutory processes in place for dealing with such matters.

3.3 The petition was passed to the Planning Department to be included as correspondence regarding the planning application.

Contact Officer:	Nicholas Hughes, Committee Services Manager
Reporting to:	Tim Howes, Director of Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer

Annex List

None	N/A
------	-----

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
None	N/A

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Matt Sanham, Corporate Finance Manager
Legal	Ciara Feeney, Head of Legal Services & Deputy Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

**REVIEW OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL WORK
PROGRAMME FOR 2016/17**

Overview and Scrutiny Panel **13 December 2016**

Report Author **Senior Democratic Services Officer**

Portfolio Holder **Councillor Crow-Brown, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance**

Status **For Decision**

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Key Decision **No**

Reasons for Key **N/A**

Previously Considered by **None**

Ward: **Thanet Wide**

Executive Summary:

The purpose of this report is to update Panel Members on the progress regarding the work of the Panel, most of which is undertaken through three working parties. This report reviews the work programme for 2016/17.

Recommendation(s):

Members are recommended to note the report.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money	There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.
Legal	There are no legal issues arising directly from this report.
Corporate	The work programme should help to deliver effective scrutiny. An active Scrutiny programme is part of good governance and will, ultimately, underpin the Council's use of resources assessment.
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation,

	gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.	
	Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.	
	Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,	✓
	Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it	
	Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	✓
There no equity and equalities issues arising directly from this report but the Council needs to retain a strong focus and understanding on issues of diversity amongst the local community and ensure service delivery matches these. It should also be noted that a review to be conducted by one of the working parties focuses on protecting vulnerable individuals of the local community from violence.		

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	
Promoting inward investment and job creation	
Supporting neighbourhoods	✓

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	✓
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 This report allows Members to review the Overview and Scrutiny Panel work programme agreed at the Annual Panel meeting on 24 May 2016. The Panel reconstituted the Community Safety Partnership Working Party, Corporate Performance Review Working Party and Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party. This is an update of the work programme since the previous meeting held on 25 October 2016.
- 1.2 Brief progress comments for each sub group are in subsequent sections, including Table 2 of the report. Chairmen and other Members of the working parties could provide additional comments during the debate of this item at the Panel meeting.

2.0 Community Safety Partnership Working Party

- 2.1 The working party will be meeting on 12 December and verbal updates on the activities of the sub group will be will have to be brought to the Panel meeting.

3.0 Corporate Performance Review Working Party

- 3.1 Members met on 22 November and received performance reports for the second quarter of the year.

4.0 Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party

- 4.1 The working party met on 17 October. Members agreed a work programme that included receiving an officer report on 'current process for increasing voter awareness, registration and participation in the electoral process.'

- 4.2 The Electoral Services Manager's report indicated that the response rate to canvassing was 70.3% as at 20 September 2016 and this was an increase on the previous year for the same period. Data available as at 17 October was 78.43%.
- 4.3 The Electoral Services Team had faced some challenges particularly considering that they had to make data entry changes to 9200 properties to date. Members noted that the Council was in the process of making improved changes to the Council's website, which will also see improvements to the web pages for information regarding voter registration. The referendum provided useful information that is now being used to improve the registration.
- 4.4 Council was now receiving citizenship ceremonies from Kent County Council, which could be used to update the register. The team receives service feedback from residents through Feedback and Twitter, which is used to improve the service. The team intends to use email correspondence to send out reminders to residents, where such information exists. It was hoped that all this would help improve the registration rate of electors in the district.
- 4.5 Members also suggested that TDC could try and employ different canvassing approaches for different wards, as some residents in some areas were less likely to register to vote; particularly in deprived areas. They also suggested that Council could combine the offer of services to residents to maximum uptake of voter registration. This would include setting up desks at the Gateway so that when residents walk in for help with say council tax, benefits claims, and debt support, the Elections Team could canvass at that point.
- 4.6 It is hoped that the working party will make formal recommendations to the Panel on the above suggestions in order for the Panel to consider and perhaps forward them to Cabinet for consideration.

5.0 Key Agenda Items for Future Overview & Scrutiny Panel Meetings

- 5.1 Table 1 highlights some of the key agenda items for future Overview & Scrutiny Panel meetings for 2016/17. The items are sourced from the Forward Plan, whilst others are standing items or would have been requested by Panel or non-Panel Members. Table 2 reports on progress to date on the activities of all the sub groups set up by the Panel in 2016/17.

Thanet Local Plan – Consultation

- 5.2 The Panel considered the report on the draft Local Plan ahead of a public consultation. One of the key comments that came out of the meeting on 21 November was that it had been difficult to review all the information in the draft Plan and related documents as they were very large given the timescales.
- 5.3 Members suggested that the Panel could hold further meetings to look at specific topics within the documentation in more depth. This would be with a view to formulating a formal response to the consultation from the panel and could be done as a whole panel or as a working party or task and finish group.
- 5.4 There are implications for setting up a sub group. Establishing a task & finish group would mean the Panel would need to re-prioritise its work programme, set aside work of one of its working parties in order to re-direct resources to review the draft Local Plan proposals.

5.5 Members would need to advise Democratic Services on their preferred course of action regarding this issue.

5.6 Terms of reference of each of the current sub groups are set out at the end of the report for ease of reference by Members during Panel discussions.

6.0 The Sub Group Activities and Watching Briefs Report Updates Table 2

6.1 The table is sub-divided in order to illustrate the suggested nature of the work involved:

- a) **Standing Working Party** – a formal sub-committee which will report its findings back to the Panel for recommendation onto the executive.
- b) **Presentations** – these are presentations to the Panel that will allow the Panel to consider whether any further work should be undertaken and a specific item included in the Panel’s work programme.

Table 1 – Current OSP Work Programme for 2016/17		
Overview & Scrutiny Panel Meeting Date	Indicative Agenda Items	Issue Source
13 December 2016	Cabinet Member Presentation	
	Dreamland Report	Financial Services
	Review of Thanet District Council Scrutiny Arrangements	Corporate Governance
	Review OSP Work Programme for 2016/17	Standing Agenda Item
	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Report List	Standing Agenda Item
26 January 2017	Budget and Medium Financial Plan 2017-2021	Financial Services item on the Forward Plan
	Review OSP Work Programme for 2016/17	Standing Agenda Item
	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Report List	Standing Agenda Item
14 February 2017	Cabinet Member Presentation	
	Review OSP Work Programme for 2016/17	Standing Agenda Item
	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Report List	Standing Agenda Item
25 April 2017	Cabinet Member Presentation	
	Review OSP Work Programme for 2016/17	Standing Agenda Item
	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Report List	Standing Agenda Item
23 May 2017	Review OSP Work Programme for 2016/17	Standing Agenda Item
	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Report List	Standing Agenda Item

- c) **Watching briefs** – possible additions to the work programme dependent upon any changes in the status of these items.

Table 2 – Current Sub-Group Progress and Watching Briefs Updates for 2016/17				
Sub Group/Issue	Composition/ Members	Lead Officer	Comment on Progress	Status
Date of Establishment 01.10.09 Community Safety Partnership Working Party	Cllr Curran (Chairman) Cllr Campbell Cllr Dixon Cllr Falcon Cllr Hayton Cllr Martin Cllr M. Saunders	Penny Button; Jessica Bailey	The group met on 03 October 2016 and received a presentation on support service for victims of rape in Thanet' from Kent Police and will get a follow-up presentation from EK Rape Line and Victim Support on 12 December before Members decide on how to conclude the investigation which could lead to suggestions being made to the Police Crimes Panel on how to improve the service.	On going
Date of Establishment: 28.05.08 Corporate Performance Review Working Party	Cllr Campbell (Chairman) Cllr Connor Cllr Curran Cllr Dennis Cllr Dexter Cllr Jaye-Jones Vacant (Independent Group)*	Tim Willis	The working party met on 22 November 2016 and received Qtr.2 performance reports from TDC, EK Services (including EKHR) and EK Housing.	On going
Date of Establishment: 29.05.12 Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party	Cllr K. Gregory (Chairman) Cllr Campbell Cllr Connor Cllr Dawson Cllr Falcon Cllr Grove Cllr Jaye-Jones	Claire Hawken	The sub-group received reports regarding voter registration updates from the Electoral Services Manager on 17 October 2016.	On going
Presentations				
2015/16 Presentations by Portfolio Holders and Directors of Services	N/A	All Portfolio Holders and Directors		
Watching Brief Items				
05 December 2013: Full Council Referral of a Petition to OSP - QEQM Hospital A&E	OSP	Penny Button	OSP forwarded the response from the Chairman of the KCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee to	OSP keeping a watching brief on the issue

Table 2 – Current Sub-Group Progress and Watching Briefs Updates for 2016/17				
Sub Group/Issue	Composition/ Members	Lead Officer	Comment on Progress	Status
			<p>Full Council on 15 October 2015 and Members noted the report.</p> <p>The Panel also agreed to keep a watchful brief to monitor the progress by EKHUFT towards developing the new clinical strategy for the region whilst maintaining a special interest on its implications for Thanet District.</p> <p>The cross-party QEQM Hospital Cabinet Advisory Group met for their first meeting on 21 April 2016 and agreed their terms of reference. They agreed to keep a watching brief until there were some developments at EKHUFT.</p> <p>The public consultation for a Health and Social Care Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) was launched by EKHUFT, social care and public partners in Kent and Medway on 13 October 2016 to run until 23 December.</p>	
Proposed review of the Winter Gardens as a major events venue	OSP	Head of Economic Development & Asset Management	On 18 August 2015, Panel Members agreed to maintain a watching brief on the issue and to await the completion of the current tenancy	OSP keeping a watching brief on the issue

Table 2 – Current Sub-Group Progress and Watching Briefs Updates for 2016/17				
Sub Group/Issue	Composition/ Members	Lead Officer	Comment on Progress	Status
			agreements review being conducted by the Executive. Members may wish to note that an item on 'Asset Management Plan' is due to come to the Panel is coming to the Panel on 26 January 2017 and thereafter will be taken to Cabinet on 31 January 2017. A decision to adopt an Asset Management Plan will be taken at Cabinet.	

***NB:** The Independent Group has been unable to assign a member from their Group to the Corporate Performance Review Working Party.

Contact Officer:	Charles Hungwe, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Ext 7186
Reporting to:	Nick Hughes, Committee Services Manager, Ext: 7208

Annex List

None	N/A
------	-----

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
None	N/A

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Matt Sanham, Financial Services Manager
Legal	Ciara Feeney, Head of Legal Services & Deputy Monitoring Officer

Community Safety Partnership Working Party Terms of Reference

1. Reducing Re-offending;
2. Safeguarding our most vulnerable people;
3. Community Confidence and Agency Collaboration.

Corporate Performance Review Working Party Terms of Reference

1. To monitor half-yearly, the performance of the shared services or outsourced arrangements against set targets and conduct annual review of agreements for these arrangements to ensure value for money and savings; and propose action points for improvement;
2. To monitor the performance of the Medium Term Financial Plan;
3. To maintain an overview of the major projects Council is involved in, using the project management tool kit;
4. To review the 2015-19 Corporate Plan to determine progress;
5. To review the strategies of Council to overcome the impact of lack of income and other revenue shortfalls in forward budget, debt management strategies and provision of services to residents;
6. To review the Council's progress against the Corporate Improvement Plan produced and monitored by the Strategic Development Group.

Electoral Registration Process Review Working Party Terms of Reference

1. To review the annual Canvass for 2015/16 in order to inform the electoral registration process for 2016/17;
2. Receive the findings of any internal post-election review of the arrangements and administration of the May 2016 Police & Crime Commissioner Elections and the EU Referendum;
3. To contribute ideas for consideration by the Council's Electoral Registration Officer (through the Overview & Scrutiny Panel) on options for increasing public awareness of, and participation in, voter registration.

FORWARD PLAN AND EXEMPT CABINET REPORTS LIST

Overview and Scrutiny Panel	13 December 2016
Report Author	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Portfolio Holder	Councillor Crow-Brown, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance
Status	For Information
Classification:	Unrestricted
Key Decision	No
Reasons for Key	N/A
Previously Considered by	None
Ward:	Thanet Wide

Executive Summary:

To update Panel Members on the revised Forward Plan and Exempt Cabinet Reports List (hereby referred to as the Forward Plan) of key decisions and allow the Panel to consider whether it wishes to be consulted upon any of the items.

Recommendation(s):

Members' instructions are invited.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money	There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.
Legal	There are no legal implications arising directly from this report.
Corporate	The Forward Plan is a publication of key decisions, policy framework.
Equalities Act 2010 & Public Sector Equality Duty	Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to the aims of the Duty at the time the decision is taken. The aims of the Duty are: (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and (iii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics: age, gender, disability, race, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy & maternity. Only aim (i) of the Duty applies to Marriage & civil partnership.

	Please indicate which aim is relevant to the report.	
	Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,	
	Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it	
	Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.	✓
There no equity and equalities issues arising directly from this report but the Council needs to retain a strong focus and understanding on issues of diversity amongst the local community and ensure that policy decisions being made and service delivery to residents match these.		

CORPORATE PRIORITIES (tick those relevant)✓	
A clean and welcoming Environment	
Promoting inward investment and job creation	
Supporting neighbourhoods	✓

CORPORATE VALUES (tick those relevant)✓	
Delivering value for money	✓
Supporting the Workforce	
Promoting open communications	✓

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The law requires that the Council regularly publish a Forward Plan of Key Decisions. Thanet's Forward Plan and Exempt Cabinet Report List is updated monthly and published on the Council's internet site www.thanet.gov.uk
- 1.2 The aim of the Forward Plan is to allow the general public and Council Members to see what decisions are coming up over the next few months and how they will be handled i.e. whether a decision will be taken by Cabinet or Council, and whether there will be input from Overview & Scrutiny during the process.
- 1.3 Overview & Scrutiny receives an updated copy of the Forward Plan at each Panel meeting. The Panel can identify any item on the Forward Plan to be added to the Overview and Scrutiny work programme in order to be scrutinised further. A copy of the latest version of the Forward Plan is attached at Annex 1 to the report.
- 1.4 Members may wish to note that the new The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that the Council gives 28 clear days' notice of any key decision or of any reports which the Cabinet intends to consider in private session.

Contact Officer:	Charles Hungwe, Senior Democratic Services Officer, Ext 7186
Reporting to:	Nick Hughes, Committee Services Manager, Ext 7208

Annex List

Annex 1	Forward Plan & Exempt Cabinet Reports List
---------	--

Background Papers

Title	Details of where to access copy
None	N/A

Corporate Consultation

Finance	Ciara Feeney, Head of Legal Services & Deputy Monitoring Officer
Legal	Matt Sanham, Financial Services Manager

This page is intentionally left blank



FORWARD PLAN AND EXEMPT CABINET REPORT LIST

09 NOVEMBER 2016 TO 30 APRIL 2017

The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 requires the Council to give 28 clear days' notice of any key decision or of any reports which the Cabinet intends to consider in private session.

Key decisions

A key decision is an executive decision (taken by Cabinet or by officers on Cabinet's behalf) that is likely:

- a) To result in the Council spending or saving significantly against the Council's budget; or
- b) To be significant in terms of the effect on communities living or working in the district, in an area comprising two or more wards. However, decisions that impact on communities living or working in one ward will be treated as "key" if the impact is likely to be very significant

To help clarify what should be included as a key decision in this document, Thanet District Council has set the following thresholds:

Type of Decision	Threshold	Key Decision?
(a) Decisions involving expenditure within relevant budget approved by Council.	None.	No, unless significant effect on communities (i.e. it affects two or more wards or has a major impact within one ward)
(b) Decisions involving expenditure in excess of relevant budget approved by Council.	Any excess which exceeds the FPR virement rules.	Yes, if above threshold. If at or below threshold, a key decision if significant effect on communities (as above).
(c) Decisions on cash flow, investments and borrowings.	None.	No, unless significant effect on communities (as above).
(d) Decisions to make savings.	None.	No, unless significant effect on communities (as above).

If an executive decision does not fall into any of the above categories, it is included as non-key. Thanet District Council also includes in its published Forward Plan decisions affecting Policy Framework and Budget Setting. Other Council decisions may also be included if they have a significant impact on communities. In such cases, the decision type will be denoted as "other".

Reports to be considered in private session

The second last column of the Plan indicates where a report is likely to contain exempt information and result in the public and press being asked to leave the meeting for the consideration of the whole or part of the item.

If you wish to make any representations relating to a proposal to hold part of a meeting in private due to the potential disclosure of exempt information, please contact Nicholas Hughes, Committee Services Manager, PO Box 9, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent CT9 1XZ, nicholas.hughes@thanet.gov.uk, telephone number 01843 577208, at least 14 calendar days before the date of that meeting.

At least 5 clear (working) days before the meeting, the Council will publish on its website a notice giving details of representations received about why the meeting should be open to the public and a statement of its response.

The Plan represents a snapshot of decisions in the system as at the date of publication. It is updated 28 clear days before each meeting of Cabinet. The Plan is available for inspection at all reasonable hours free of charge at Thanet Gateway Plus, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent CT9 1RE.

Availability of documents

Subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure, copies of, or extracts from, any document listed in the Plan will be available from Thanet Gateway Plus, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent CT 9 1RE. Other documents relevant to those matters may be submitted to the decision makers; if that is the case, details of the documents as they become available can be requested by telephoning Democratic Services on 01843 577500 or by emailing committee@thanet.gov.uk.

The documents listed in the Plan will be published on the Council's website at least five clear (working) days before the decision date. Other documents will be published at the same time or as soon as they become available.

The Cabinet comprises the following Members who have responsibility for the portfolio areas shown:

Councillor Chris Wells

Leader of the Council

Councillor Lin Fairbrass

Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services

Councillor Derek Crow-Brown

Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance

Councillor John Townend

Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates

Councillor Suzanne Brimm

Cabinet Member for Operational Services

Councillor Hunter Stummer-Schmertzing

Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise Services

09 November 2016 to 30 April 2017

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Agreement of Council Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Policy	This ensures that the Council meets its statutory obligations around safeguarding.	1. Overview & Scrutiny Panel 2. Penny Button, Head of Safer Neighbourhoods	Councillor Lin Fairbrass, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services	25 Oct 16 17 Nov 16	Non-Key		Overview & Scrutiny Panel report Cabinet report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Council Tax Support Scheme	Changes to the current Council Tax Support Scheme - the new scheme will be implemented 1 April 2017	1.Cabinet Overview & Scrutiny Panel Council 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Nov 16 21 Nov 16 1 Dec 16	Non-Key		Cabinet report Overview & Scrutiny Panel report Council report
Fulfilling Thanet's growth and development opportunities	Creation of jobs and economic growth	1.Overview & Scrutiny Panel Cabinet 2.Louise Askew, Economic Development Manager	Councillor Hunter Stummer-Schmertzling, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise Services	25 Oct 16 17 Nov 16	Key		OSP report Cabinet report
Budget Strategy 2017/18	Cabinet to agree the budget strategy for 2017/18 budget	1.Cabinet Extraordinary Overview & Scrutiny Panel 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Nov 16 21 Nov 16	Non-Key		Cabinet report Extraordinary OSP report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Fees and Charges 2017/18	Council to agree the fees and charge 2017/18	1.Cabinet Extraordinary Overview & Scrutiny Panel Council 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Nov 16 21 Nov 16 1 Dec 16	Budget setting		Cabinet report Extraordinary OSP report Council report
Budget Monitoring Qtr2	Update on Qtr2 Budget Monitoring	1.Cabinet 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Nov 16	Non-Key		Cabinet report
Thanet Local Plan Preferred Options Revisions	focused consultation on significant changes to the Council's preferred options for the future development plan for the district	1. Extraordinary Overview & Scrutiny Panel Cabinet 2.Adrian Verrall, Strategic Planning Manager	Councillor Lin Fairbrass, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Community Services	21 Nov 16 8 Dec 16	Key		Extraordinary OSP report Cabinet report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Performance Report Qtr 2	Update on Qtr 2 Performance Report	1. Corporate Performance Review Working Party Cabinet 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor Derek Crow-Brown, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance Services	22 Nov 16 8 Dec 16	Non-Key		CPRWP report Cabinet report
Asset Management Plan	Adoption of the Asset Management Plan	1. Overview & Scrutiny Panel Cabinet 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	13 Dec 16 17 Jan 17	Non-Key		Overview & Scrutiny Panel report Cabinet report
Treasury Management Strategy 2017/18	To agree the Councils Treasury Management Strategy	1. Governance and Audit Committee Cabinet Council 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	7 Dec 16 17 Jan 17 9 Feb 17	Non-Key		G&A Committee report Cabinet report Council report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Appointment of Council's External Auditor for 2018-19 and onwards		1.Governance and Audit Committee Council 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	7 Dec 16 9 Feb 17	Non-Key		G&A Committee report Council report
Budget and Medium financial Plan 2017-2021	To agree the draft budget 2017-2021	1.Cabinet Overview & Scrutiny Panel Cabinet Council 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Jan 17 26 Jan 17 31 Jan 17 9 Feb 17	Budget setting		Cabinet report OSP report Cabinet No.2 report Council report
General Fund Capital Programme Monitoring Report	To agree the revised capital programme	1.Cabinet 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Jan 17	Key		Cabinet report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Westcliffe Hall	The decision would be to proceed to market the site.	1.Cabinet 2.Mike Humber, Engineering and Technical Services Manager	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Jan 17	Non-Key	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).	Cabinet report
Mid Year Treasury Report 2016-17	Update on Treasury Performance for Mid year	1.Governance and Audit Committee Cabinet Council 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	7 Dec 16 17 Jan 17 9 Feb 17	Non-Key		G&A Committee report Cabinet report Council report
Budget Monitoring Qtr3	Update on Qtr 3 monitoring	1.Cabinet 2.Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	31 Jan 17	Non-Key		Cabinet report

Decision to be Considered	What the Decision will mean	1. Decision Path/ 2. Lead Officer	Lead Cabinet Member	For Decision by (in case of O & S, consultation date)	Decision Type	Details of any information likely to be considered in private under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972	Documents submitted to the Decision Maker
Performance Report Qtr3	Update on Qtr3 monitoring	1. Corporate Performance Review Working Party Cabinet 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor Derek Crow-Brown, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance Services	Before 13 Jan 17 31 Jan 17	Non-Key		CPRWP report Cabinet report
Council Tax Base 2017/18	To agree the Council Tax Base	1. Cabinet 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	17 Jan 17	Budget setting		Cabinet report
Council Tax - Statutory Resolution	To agree the Statutory Resolution	1. Council 2. Tim Willis, Director of Corporate Resources and S151 Officer	Councillor John Townend, Cabinet Member for Financial Services and Estates	23 Feb 17	Budget setting		Council report

This page is intentionally left blank

THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL DECLARATION OF INTEREST FORM

Do I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and if so what action should I take?

Your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI) are those interests that are, or should be, listed on your Register of Interest Form.

If you are at a meeting and the subject relating to one of your DPIs is to be discussed, in so far as you are aware of the DPI, you **must** declare the existence **and** explain the nature of the DPI during the declarations of interest agenda item, at the commencement of the item under discussion, or when the interest has become apparent

Once you have declared that you have a DPI (unless you have been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee or the Monitoring Officer, for which you will have applied to the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting) you **must**:-

1. Not speak or vote on the matter;
2. Withdraw from the meeting room during the consideration of the matter;
3. Not seek to improperly influence the decision on the matter.

Do I have a significant interest and if so what action should I take?

A significant interest is an interest (other than a DPI or an interest in an Authority Function) which:

1. Affects the financial position of yourself and/or an associated person; or Relates to the determination of your application for any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration made by, or on your behalf of, you and/or an associated person;
2. And which, in either case, a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as being so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interest.

An associated person is defined as:

- A family member or any other person with whom you have a close association, including your spouse, civil partner, or somebody with whom you are living as a husband or wife, or as if you are civil partners; or
- Any person or body who employs or has appointed such persons, any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are directors; or
- Any person or body in whom such persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000;
- Any body of which you are in a position of general control or management and to which you are appointed or nominated by the Authority; or
- any body in respect of which you are in a position of general control or management and which:
 - exercises functions of a public nature; or
 - is directed to charitable purposes; or
 - has as its principal purpose or one of its principal purposes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)

An Authority Function is defined as: -

- Housing - where you are a tenant of the Council provided that those functions do not relate particularly to your tenancy or lease; or
- Any allowance, payment or indemnity given to members of the Council;
- Any ceremonial honour given to members of the Council
- Setting the Council Tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992

If you are at a meeting and you think that you have a significant interest then you **must** declare the existence **and** nature of the significant interest at the commencement of the

matter, or when the interest has become apparent, or the declarations of interest agenda item.

Once you have declared that you have a significant interest (unless you have been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee or the Monitoring Officer, for which you will have applied to the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting) you **must**:-

1. Not speak or vote (unless the public have speaking rights, or you are present to make representations, answer questions or to give evidence relating to the business being discussed in which case you can speak only)
2. Withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the matter or immediately after speaking.
3. Not seek to improperly influence the decision.

Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality

Councillors must declare at meetings any gift, benefit or hospitality with an estimated value (or cumulative value if a series of gifts etc.) of £25 or more. You **must**, at the commencement of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, disclose the existence and nature of the gift, benefit or hospitality, the identity of the donor and how the business under consideration relates to that person or body. However you can stay in the meeting unless it constitutes a significant interest, in which case it should be declared as outlined above.

What if I am unsure?

If you are in any doubt, Members are strongly advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or the Committee Services Manager well in advance of the meeting.

DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, SIGNIFICANT INTERESTS AND GIFTS, BENEFITS AND HOSPITALITY

MEETING

DATE..... **AGENDA ITEM**

DISCRETIONARY PECUNIARY INTEREST

SIGNIFICANT INTEREST

GIFTS, BENEFITS AND HOSPITALITY

THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST, GIFT, BENEFITS OR HOSPITALITY:

.....
.....
.....

NAME (PRINT):

SIGNATURE:

Please detach and hand this form to the Democratic Services Officer when you are asked to declare any interests.