

Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 22 August 2016

Additional Information

AGENDA ITEM 5 – DRAFT CABINET MINUTES 17TH AUGUST 2016

Contact: Stuart Figini (Committee Officer) 01793 463612 sfigini@swindon.gov.uk,

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX

**NOTICE OF DRAFT DECISIONS OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, 17TH AUGUST 2016**

37. Community Governance Review

Councillor David Renard, the Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet, Councillor Russell Holland, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services, Councillor Keith Williams, Cabinet Member for Streetsmart, Councillor Mary Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities, and the Corporate Director Resources, and Director of Law and Democratic Services, submitted a joint report on the outcomes of Stage 2 of the Community Governance Review (CGR) and seeking Cabinet's approval to take the draft proposal to formal public consultation in Stage 3 of the Review.

Councillor Martin introduced the report and explained how the recommendations had been developed from the responses to the illustrative maps. She drew Members' attention to paragraph 3.12, which set out the arguments against a single town council as well as referring to the two opposing views over the future of Blunsdon St Andrew Parish. Councillor Martin encouraged Members and residents to respond to the consultation and stated that she would offer a meeting at which those who made submissions would have an opportunity to talk about them to her.

Following her presentation of the report, Councillor Martin responded to questions put by Councillors Jim Grant (JG), Ray Ballman (RB), Des Moffatt (DM), Bob Wright (BW), Chris Watts (CW), Wayne Crabbe (WC) and Jane Milner-Barry (JM-B) on the following issues:

- The view that the introduction of new parishes was a means of raising additional revenue. (JG)
- The potentially adverse effects of any parish precept on the borough's lowest income households (JG).
- Community engagement with the CGR process and concerns about the consultation process utilised by the Council.
 - the opportunity for cross-party input to the content of the information leaflet to be submitted to all households (JG).
- The method of distribution of the information leaflet to households and concerns that previous leaflet drops had omitted some areas of the borough (RB).
- The potentially misleading information in the report regarding the potential precept yield (DM).
- The judgement remaining to be made by the Council with regard to the transfer of parish specific and/or general reserves (DM).
- The commitment of local businesses to meet costs associated with streetsmart services on industrial estates (DM).
- The suggestion that Councillors should be excluded from involvement in the determination of new Parish boundaries (DM).
- Concerns that the proposals would result in the establishment of poorer inner city areas surrounded by richer suburbs (DM and BW).
- The potential conflict of interest arising where Borough Councillors were

voting on matters that might be perceived as benefitting them in their additional capacity, or future capacity, as Parish Councillors (BW).

- The process by which the CGR was “triggered”(BW).
- The suggestion that the CGR might be delayed to allow members to be better informed about the process and in order that they might better articulate the detail of that process to the public (BW).
- Possible mechanisms by which the Council might ensure there is sufficient revenue to maintain effective Streetsmart services in the town centre (CW).
- The relative perceived advantages of a single large parish or a larger number of smaller, community-based parishes (CW).

Resolved – (1) That the feedback received from stage two of the Community Governance Review, summarised in the report, be noted.

(2) That it be agreed that there should be parishes across the entire Borough in order that the identities and interests of communities are reflected and to enable effective and convenient means to provide options for local service provision.

(3) That the draft proposal map, at Appendix Four to the report, showing proposed boundaries of existing and new parishes, be agreed for consultation as Stage 3 of the CGR.

(4) That the Director of Law and Democratic Services be authorised to:

1. prepare all materials, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities, for the proposed consultation, and
2. undertake consultation on the draft proposal and report the results back to Cabinet and Council.

(5) That it be noted that Council will be asked to consider the consultation feedback and agree the final recommendations of the CGR process at its meeting on 10th November 2016.

(6) That it be noted that discussions are on-going with the business community around making a contribution to the cost of street cleaning services in commercial areas of the Borough.

(7) That it be noted that, as areas become developed, there may be requests for a community governance review in a few years to reflect more accurately the new community identity interests and to enable effective and convenient means to provide options for local service provision.

(8) That, with reference to concerns that previous leaflet drops had omitted some areas of the borough, the Chief Executive be asked to review method proposed to be utilised in relation to the distribution of the next CGR information leaflet to all households.

38.

SEQOL - Update

This Item was withdrawn.

Date of Publication of Draft Decisions: 18th August 2016

Issued to Members of the Scrutiny Committee: 18th August 2016