

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17
SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR INCLUSION**

Suggested by		Topic (to be clearly defined)	FILTER Currently/ recently under review	FILTER Can scrutiny make a difference?	Full Review/ light touch/ policy development	Comments
Councillor Wakeford	(1)	The impact of upper tier authorities on planning matters – subject to the outcome of a scrutiny review being carried out by Lancashire County Council.				
Laneshaw Bridge resident	(2)	Illegal car parking. Parking on pavements. Parking on double yellow lines - I regularly travel through Brierfield, Nelson & Colne and I constantly see cars blatantly ignoring the double yellow lines and/or just parking on the pavements & footpaths. There are absolute hotspots for this even where bollards and other preventative measures have already been implemented.				
Barnoldswick resident	(3)	Solar Panels – All new build in Pendle and all public buildings to have solar panels installed.				
Nelson resident	(4)	The nhs and social care interwork together needs to be scrutinised so that the money spent is used in the best way – REASON - the need for social care is very high and the money available is not. In the nhs beds are being used when there could be freed up with a social care package. The money saved (as the bed space is the nhs is more then the social care package would cost. This would empower people and let more people be cared for.				
Member of staff	(5)	The amount of dog bins and their emptying – REASON - I think the council could save money by reviewing the number				

		of dog bins and the subsequent emptying of these.				
Nelson resident	(6)	Litter especially the streets off Manchester Rd near the takeaways - REASON – It makes the town look dirty and unkempt. Makes the town look a mess and also encourages vermin.				This issue has been dealt with.
Barnoldswick resident	(7)	Access to Letcliffe Park - I have requested on several occasions for Pendle Council to make available a Risk Assessment regarding access to Letcliffe Park .As yet there has been no response, it is in the Public Interest that a copy be made available & published.				Further details will be circulated at the meeting.
Colne resident	(8)	fly tipping – REASON - There is an area of land on Argyle Street that is being used for fly tipping, the perimeter fence is falling / being pulled down and people are dumping their rubbish. This is causing an eyesore and is a health hazard. Furthermore the waste bin on the path between Mason Street and the North Valley Retail Park has been missing for over 12 months, people are throwing their rubbish into the bushes, again causing an eyesore / grot spot not really in keeping with the supposed improvement area designation.				
Barnoldswick resident	(9)	The local parks have become a race track with car drivers and motorcycles - The rubbish they leave is now attracting vermin. The drugs they are taking and then driving is as bad as drinking and driving. All this is happening underneath a security camera that is never manned. REASON - This affects the whole community. Do we have to wait until someone is killed before the council will do anything about this?				
Barrowford and Western Parishes	(10)	Section 106 agreements – the effectiveness of Section 106 agreements. Points to consider:				The Government is currently

Committee

- What is the decision-making process that leads to them being recommended, or imposed, at planning decision meetings? With whom do proposals begin?
- Do Councillors feel confident that they have enough knowledge of them or do they feel they are too reliant on advice from the planning department?
- What consideration is given to proposals coming from statutory consultees? (Proposals from Barrowford Parish Council on Trough Laithe were ignored.)
- When are the recommended funds for S106 agreements made available - immediately, at the beginning of work on a development, or when it is completed?
- Who monitors the agreements and reports the outcomes to Councillors?
- What problems have occurred that held up the completion of agreements, or required them to be amended, say in the last five years?
- In what cases would it have been more beneficial for Pendle Council / Town & Parish Councils if Pendle had introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy rather than continuing with S106 agreements?
- Is the possibility of adopting the Community Infrastructure Levy regularly reviewed by the Council? If so, can Parish & Town Councils take part in the review?

REASON: The S106 process is certainly unclear to the public and investigating the points above might make it clearer.

The Committee could come to a conclusion as to whether the system is working as intended.

S106 seems to have a built-in problem, which is that if Councillors are arguing for refusal of a planning application then they are unlikely to be concerned with S106 agreements.

Equally, if the planning department recommends refusal then they are unlikely to recommend them. By the time an

looking at how Section 106 agreements work and it would therefore be advisable to wait for the findings before undertaking any work.

		application gets to the Development Management Committee, or to an appeal hearing, it can be too late.				
Pendle Disability Forum	(11)	Bus Services (Rural) – Rural bus service is required (No. 65). We are a disabled group and rely upon this service – otherwise members cannot get to the meetings.				
	(12)	Toilet Facilities –Toilets in Market Street, Nelson were up for sale. What is the outcome? Toilet facilities are required ‘out of hours’ so more need to be kept open.				
	(13)	Negotiating very difficult parking particularly outside Barclays Bank – the need for MORE room – Parking near Admiral Centre, Nelson is very ‘tight’, there needs to be more room. Taxis quite often take up places.				
	(14)	ACTIVITIES – more activities required i.e. table tennis, good for the mind and the body. Day centre closed				
	(15)	Vehicles badly parked – There are many vehicles parked on streets half on pavement, half in the road making negotiation difficult for disabled scooters, visually impaired. Vehicles also park over dropped kerbs.				
Barnoldswick Resident	(16)	Domiciliary care in the community – Issues arise when private agencies alter schedules without prior discussion with clients				

The following topics have already been given approval for inclusion in the 2016/17 work programme –

Suggested by	Topic (to be clearly defined)	FILTER Currently/ recently under review	FILTER Can scrutiny make a difference?	Full Review/ light touch/ policy developmen t	Comments
---------------------	---	--	---	--	-----------------

<p>Councillor R. Allen</p>	<p>(17)</p>	<p>Behaviour of Enforcement Officers (formerly known as Bailiffs) – Issues raised by clients of the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). There have been complaints about bad language, intimidation and aggressive behaviour. Request a review regarding the collection of Council Tax and any issues, complaints received etc. Burnley Council picking up the same issue from CAB has carried out a similar review.</p> <p>Some key questions as follows:</p> <p>I understand the council uses Bailiffs to collect on council tax arrears. In how many cases has the council used Bailiffs? How many problems and complaints have been found regarding these cases? Do the complaints and problems relate disproportionately to any specific company? If so which one?</p> <p>Given the increasing financial difficulties that local people in Pendle may face it should be incumbent on councillors to pick up on these issues and assess if action is needed.</p>				<p>At the January, 2016 Scrutiny Management Team meeting it was agreed that this be included in the Team's work programme for 2016/17.</p>
<p>Relative of elderly Nelson resident</p>	<p>(18)</p>	<p>Littering in Nelson Town Centre - I am writing to say that there is a great problem with littering around the streets of Nelson town centre. Albert street in particular has a great problem with littering as it is used by visitors to Nelson as free parking and free disposing of their takeaway leftovers.</p> <p>The street has recently been modernised by the council under the regeneration scheme. Only half the houses are inhabited on the street as the remainder are vacant and up for sale. You would think that with such a huge investment and the need for new property buyers, that the council would take pride in caring for the area.</p>	<p>2009 – review on litter and dog fouling</p> <p>2007 – review on Litter and Detritus in Pendle</p>			<p>A response to some of these issues was reported to the Scrutiny Management Team in January. The Team agreed that, taking into account</p>

		<p>Unfortunately the street is deteriorating faster than it took to modernise it. Residents have come to the point of not bothering to pick up after messy visitors or phoning up the council to clean up and leaving things as they are.</p> <p>Visiting cars are parked up on the pavements making it hard work for pram and wheelchair users to access the pavements. Road sweepers are also unable to access the pavements yet mobile sweepers could be put in place to help with this growing problem.</p> <p>The back streets are being used as dumping grounds because most of the houses are vacant. Other antisocial behaviour is also occurring. On many occasions the police has been informed and the councils antisocial behaviour team been contacted, yet this problem is still occurring.</p> <p>Elderly residents don't feel safe at night.</p> <p>A request to put alley gates in place has been refused which was the initial plan by the council themselves. A request to put signs up to stop littering has been refused as there are signs on litter bins! I don't think the person who is going to throw a takeaway bag out his car window is going to see the sign on a bin ! People are very good at noticing residential parking signs so why can't a sign like that be put in place saying there will be a fine if you drop litter? More bins need to be made available around the area as there is now a school at the other end of the street.</p>				<p>the work of previous panels on litter and detritus, a scrutiny review of littering be included in the Team's work programme for 2016/17.</p>
	(19)	Mental Health in the Community, Care Homes and Mental Health Wards				<p>Ongoing review to be carried</p>

						forward from the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Panel 2015/16 work programme.
	(20)	Drug and alcohol rehabilitation provision in East Lancashire				Ongoing review to be carried forward from the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Panel 2015/16 work programme.