

## OVERVIEW SCRUTINY GROUP – 10TH DECEMBER 2018

### Report of the Cabinet

#### OVERVIEW SCRUTINY GROUP PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY – CABINET RESPONSE

##### Purpose of Report

To set out the Cabinet's responses to the recommendations of the Group on pre-decision scrutiny items.

##### Action Requested

To note the Cabinet's responses to the recommendations submitted by the Group on items considered for pre-decision scrutiny.

##### Policy Context

One of the principles of effective scrutiny, identified by the Centre for Public Scrutiny, is "provide a constructive critical friend challenge to the Executive".

##### Pre-decision Scrutiny

Since the May meeting of the Group, the Cabinet has considered the following items on which the Group undertook pre-decision scrutiny:

##### A. FUTURE CEMETERY PROVISION IN LOUGHBOROUGH

##### B. REVENUE AND BENEFITS SERVICE FUTURE OPTIONS

Details of the Group's consideration of the items as reported to the Cabinet on the 18th October 2018 are set out in the appendix to this report.

The Chair of the Group, Councillor Capleton, attended the Cabinet's meeting on the 18th October 2018 to present the Group's reports to the Cabinet.

##### Cabinet Response

The Cabinet considered the Group's reports and acknowledged the work undertaken and the views of the Group. In particular, the Cabinet responded as follows to the reports:

##### *Future Cemetery Provision in Loughborough*

The Cabinet adopted the officer recommendations, which the Group had supported.

##### *Revenue and Benefits Service Future Options*

The Cabinet adopted the officer recommendations, which the Group had supported.

## Report Implications

The following implications have been identified for this report:

### *Financial Implications*

None.

### *Risk Management*

No risks have been identified in connection with this report.

Background Papers:       None

Officer to contact:       Nadia Ansari  
Democratic Services Officer  
01509 634502  
[nadia.ansari@charnwood.gov.uk](mailto:nadia.ansari@charnwood.gov.uk)

FUTURE CEMETERY PROVISION IN LOUGHBOROUGH

Recommendation of the Overview Scrutiny Group

That the Cabinet be informed that the Group supports the recommendations as set out in the report of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Reason

Having considered the report and asked questions of the Lead Member for Loughborough, the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Community Wellbeing and the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces on the matter, the Group concluded that it would be appropriate for the Cabinet to approve the recommendations set out in the report.

Meeting Discussion

The Lead Member for Loughborough, the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Community Wellbeing and the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces attended the meeting to assist with consideration of the item and gave the following responses to issues raised:

- (i) All the three sites proposed were considered suitable options but Allendale Road was chosen as the preferred site previously as it was the easiest site to bring into action as well as its good location and proximity to the town centre.
- (ii) The Nanpantan site was subsequently chosen as the preferred site due to a number of factors: the strong public support received, the capacity available, good public transport links and not being overlooked. The longevity of the site was referred to as making the site the most viable. The Nanpantan ground could offer more than 200 years capacity. This was thought to be the better option rather than choosing a smaller site and looking for another one in a short space of time.

## REVENUE AND BENEFITS SERVICE FUTURE OPTIONS

### Recommendations of the Overview Scrutiny Group

That the Cabinet be informed that the Group supports the recommendations as set out in the report of the Head of Customer Experience.

### Reason

Having considered the report and asked questions of the Lead Member for Performance of Major Contracts and the Strategic Director of Corporate Services on the matter, the Group concluded that it would be appropriate for the Cabinet to approve the recommendations set out in the report.

### Meeting Discussion

The Lead Member for Performance of Major Contracts and the Strategic Director of Corporate Services attended the meeting to assist with consideration of the item and gave the following responses to issues raised:

- (i) The option of bringing the service back in house would require a significant amount of work and investment. An IT hosting solution would need to be procured whereas Capita already had systems in place and had the resilience in their team to ensure the continuity of the service.
- (ii) The option to join the shared services scheme was discussed and the Group was advised that there was some work to do in understanding the service level agreements in place and the existing agreements between the Councils.
- (iii) Risk and resilience were considered the most important considerations when looking at the future of the service. A larger, shared arrangement was considered the preferred option as that offered flexibility and better opportunities for managing risks and provided a resilient basis for the service delivery.
- (iv) Capita was noted to have made genuine efforts to improve their performance recently and the hope was that would continue. Extending the current contract was perceived to be the lowest risk option which was considered preferable. There was an option to extend the contract for up to 5 years but the shorter period would also be feasible.
- (v) Capita's financial position had improved as they had consolidated some of their assets and raised capital to help the business keep running. Their position was now considered stable. There was also a contingency plan in place as there was for all major contracts to ensure business continuity should the existing contractor become unable to provide the service.

- (vi) The Council would be piloting a flexible working scheme that included home working and would look at the security measures in place to protect data sharing. It was expected that the shared service partnership already had a system in place to meet security requirements and the new General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).