

**Draft response to:  
Strengthening Local Democracy, July 2009, CLG consultation  
paper**

**CHAPTER 1: LOCAL GOVERNMENT AT THE CENTRE OF  
DECISION MAKING**

**1. Do you agree that we should extend scrutiny powers in relation to Local Area Agreement (LAA) partners to cover the range of their activities in an area, not just those limited to specific LAA targets?**

Yes. This would prevent problems of definition and simplify matters significantly.

For scrutiny to enjoy an increased role in 'place shaping' it needs powers to look at all of the actions of agencies delivering services in a locality not just the limited number that relate to LAA targets.

Any new powers/guidance should however ensure that scrutiny focuses on specific issues rather than the running of individual agencies. Scrutiny, whilst local government based, should be seen as having a significant role within the LSP.

**2. Do we need to make scrutiny powers more explicit in relation to local councils' role in scrutinising expenditure on delivery of local public services in an area? If so, what is the best way of achieving this?**

Yes. There should be a power for committees to scrutinise any bodies delivering central and local government services in an area, whether directly or under contract.

It seems odd that scrutiny enjoys different powers in relation to health organisations than to other service providers. There should be standardisation across all sectors.

**3. Do you agree that we should bring all or some of the local public services as set out in this chapter fully under the local authority scrutiny regime? Are there other bodies which would benefit from scrutiny from local government?**

Yes. Local authority scrutiny functions should be given very broad powers to look at any organisation contributing to the wellbeing of an area. This should include local/regional offices of Government departments and agencies; privatised utilities and transport operators, governing bodies of schools, and colleges.

If scrutiny is to be able to really 'place-shape' then private companies e.g. transport/utilities should be under a duty to cooperate. There is also an

argument for placing such a duty on large companies whose actions will have a significant impact on local communities, for example supermarkets, large local employers, and developers.

**4. How far do you agree that we should extend scrutiny powers to enable committees to require attendance by officers or board members of external organisations to give evidence at scrutiny hearings, similar to the powers already in existence for health and police?**

To be effective scrutiny powers need to include the ability to require information and attendance from senior officers. It would seem sensible to extend the requirement to attend to all senior officers in all organisations that fall under the remit of scrutiny.

**5. What more could be done to ensure that councils adequately resource and support the local government scrutiny function to carry out its role to full effect?**

The precise funding arrangements for council's scrutiny functions should be left for local consideration.

However government should make clear its expectation of the role of scrutiny; this can be done by increasing the remit and power of local authority scrutiny functions government.

A scrutiny function that has the power to look in a meaningful way at the actions of other local organisations and really support a council in its partnerships is far more likely to be well resourced than if its powers are primarily internally focused.

**6. How can council leaders ensure that scrutiny is a core function of how their organisations do business and have a full and proper role in scrutinising the full range of local public services?**

There is a slight paradox evident in the question in that part of scrutiny's role is to hold the council leader to account; charging the council leader therefore with ensuring the effectiveness of scrutiny is questionable. This is surely the role of Full Council, Chief Executive or Monitoring Officer.

Scrutiny can be supported by ensuring it has sufficient resources to undertake an appropriate number of detailed policy reviews, that its recommendations are seen to be seriously considered and it enjoys parity of esteem with the executive function.

**7. What more could be done to better connect and promote the important role of local government scrutiny to local communities, for example citizens as expert advisers to committees?**

Scrutiny already enjoys flexibility in its use of expert advisors and co-opted members. Government could usefully explore direct public requests for scrutiny of a topic and area based scrutiny to support elected members ward roles.