

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16 November 2023

Report of the Chief Executive

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet

1 REVIEW OF OUTSIDE BODIES

1.1 Background

1.1.1 On 14 September 2023 the Committee received a scoping report to review the Council's list of Appointments to Outside Bodies (attached at Annex 1). A summary of the scope of the review is as follows:

- Gain a better understanding of the aims and objectives of the organisations.
- Explore the role of the nominated Borough Councillor/representative.
- To hear from some of the organisations on the list, to ask questions and consider any value for money issues.

1.1.2 A short survey was distributed to the organisations on the list, with 9 organisations responding. Whilst this is a relatively low response rate, those that did reply all felt that the representatives were beneficial to their organisation. When asked: "What form should feedback from the organisation to the Council take?" the responses were as follows:

We provide updates and reports and have meetings but it would be helpful if a local councillor could attend our board meetings on a regular basis if possible. Thank you

N/A

The Council should request reports from appointed Board member after each full meeting to stay abreast of the Boards dealings.

n/a

Tonbridge and Malling benefits from collective voice and joint action for a very small subscription. Current feedback is through Officers in the form of a Quarterly Update Report (QUR) and monthly strategic meetings. The QUR is shared with the Leader and relevant Cabinet Member. No mechanism appears to exist for direct feedback via the LA Board members.

The council would be placed on the circulation of the meeting minutes.

Through the Council's representative.

Through the Councillor representative or relevant officers.

1.1.3 The respondents summarised the perceived benefits of local authority representation as follows:

We are very grateful for the funding that we receive from the Local Authority. This helps us to provide advice to those who need help. It is really helpful for the Council appointee to give us feedback and advice about issues in the community but also for them to hear about the work that we are doing and how we are spending the funds we receive.

Councillor nomination to the JC is mandatory as per the Memorandum of Participation/Agreement entered into by your authority that allows the operation of civil parking / moving traffic enforcement schemes

The Land Drainage Act requires that collecting authorities have a seat on the board equivalent to the amount they collect on our behalf.

There are no council appointees to the ICB Board.

However, there are four elected members on the Integrated Care Partnership (1 from each of the four local health and care partnerships);

and there are also officers on each of the health and care partnerships (numbers vary depending on HCP - I think there is one district CEO on the West Kent HCP)

To provide a representative cross party cohort of elected representatives of communities from across the region to engage government, parliament, media and others on matters of common interest and/or shared concern.

To provide Council representation on the Board of Trustees that govern the Trust in accordance with the Trust's Articles of Association. Representation has to be below 20% to ensure the Trust may not be considered a connected entity.

To represent the local community at this forum which sits on the boundary between T&MBC and MBC.

The PCP is established as a formal joint committee of KCC, Medway Council and all 12 District Councils in Kent. IT will also include two independent members.

The County Council may arrange Borough/District Council representatives

1.1.4 As the groups all operate very differently, with varied requirements from their nominated representative, it is difficult to draw any fixed conclusions from the responses above. There was consensus that the perceived benefits of local authority representation are being achieved, but it is apparent that there is a lack of any consistent reporting method back to the Council.

1.2 Feedback from Outside Bodies

1.2.1 As suggested in the scoping report, two organisations have been invited to present to this Committee (the Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board and the Lower Medway Internal Drainage Board). This will allow members to gain a greater understanding of the organisations and to ask any questions.

1.2.2 It is impractical to invite all outside bodies to provide presentations in this way, but one suggested way forward would be for the list of annual appointments to outside bodies be distributed between Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the relevant Scrutiny Select Committees. Each individual Committee can then decide on the

best way to gain feedback from the organisations. This could be via an annual report or a presentation from the organisation.

- 1.2.3 If Members agree with the approach of dividing up the list of outside bodies, then the table below indicates what this distribution could look like, the list focuses on the list of outside bodies with annual appointments:

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Communities & Environment SSC	Finance, Regeneration & Property SSC	Housing & Planning SSC
Citizens Advice in North and West Kent	Allington Community Liaison Group	Lower Medway IDB	Gatwick Airport Noise Management Board Community Forum
KCC Health Overview and Scrutiny	Kent and Medway Police and Crime Panel	Rochester Airport Delivery Board	Kent Flood Risk Management Committee
LGA General Assembly	Maidstone Mediation Scheme	Upper Medway IDB	High Weald AONB
South East England Councils (Leaders Forum)	Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London Adjudication Joint Committee	West Kent Partnership	Kent Downs AONB Joint Advisory Committee
WK Health Integrated Care Partnership Elected Members Forum	Snodland Partnership		
	Tonbridge and Malling Leisure Trust		
	Youth and Community Centres/Project Management Committees		

- 1.2.4 The above table is a suggestion only and Members who represent these groups may feel that the group would be better suited to a different Committee. Due to the nature of many of the groups, there was a disproportionate amount that fitted with CESSC, however, where possible groups have been divided across the Committees.

- 1.2.5 The Policy, Scrutiny and Communities Manager will liaise with the Chair of each Committee, to establish the best method to receive feedback from the organisation and will contact each group accordingly to explain how feedback will be sought going forward.

1.3 Legal Implications

1.3.1 None

1.4 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.4.1 As set out in the Scoping Report on 14 September 2023

1.5 Risk Assessment

1.5.1 Partnerships are included on the Council's Strategic Risk Register. Where outside bodies are appointed to deliver services, formal agreements or Service Level Agreements are in Place.

1.6 Equality Impact Assessment

1.6.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

1.7 Policy Considerations

1.7.1 Business Continuity/Resilience

1.7.2 Communications

1.7.3 Community

1.8 Recommendations

1.8.1 That Members **ENDORSE** the approach of distributing the annual appointments to outside bodies list between Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Select Committee's (as set out in 1.2.3) and;

1.8.2 Each Committee to **CONSIDER**, how they would like to receive feedback from the outside body.

Background papers:

contact: Gill Fox

Nil

Julie Beilby
Chief Executive