

# Public Document Pack

**Date of meeting** Monday, 17th June, 2013  
**Time** 7.00 pm  
**Venue** Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, Merrial Street,  
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, ST5 2AG  
**Contact** Martin Stevens ext 2250

## **Active and Cohesive Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

### **AGENDA**

#### **PART 1 – OPEN AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 1 - 4)**  
To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 19 March 2013.
- 3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**  
To receive declarations of interest from Members on items included in the agenda.
- 4 PUBLIC SECTOR COMMISSIONING IN PARTNERSHIP (PSCIP) (Pages 5 - 8)**  
To receive a report on the Public Sector Commissioning in Partnership (PSCiP).
- 5 KEELE GOLF COURSE (Pages 9 - 10)**  
To receive an update report on Keele Golf Course from the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services.
- 6 KIDSGROVE SPORTS CENTRE (Pages 11 - 12)**  
To consider a report on Kidsgrove Sports Centre.
- 7 ALLOTMENTS SERVICE REVIEW SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP - PROGRESS REPORT (Pages 13 - 14)**  
To receive a progress report on the work being undertaken by the Allotments Service Review Scrutiny Working Group.
- 8 WORK PLAN (Pages 15 - 16)**  
To discuss and update the work plan to reflect current scrutiny topics and to discuss and identify topics for scrutiny activity for the 2013/14 municipal year.
- 9 URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any business which is urgent within the meaning of Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Members:** Councillors Bailey (Vice-Chair), Cairns (Chair), Miss Cooper, Mrs Cornes, Mrs Heesom, Miss Olszewski, Plant, Taylor.M, Miss Walklate, Mrs Williams and Mrs Winfield

**Members of the Council: If you identify any personal training/development requirements from any of the items included in this agenda or through issues raised during the meeting, please bring them to the attention of the Democratic Services Officer at the close of the meeting.**

**Meeting Quorum**

**16+= 5 Members; 10-15=4 Members; 5-9=3 Members; 5 or less = 2 Members.**

Officers will be in attendance prior to the meeting for informal discussions on agenda items.

## **ACTIVE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, 19th March, 2013

**Present:-** Councillor George Cairns – in the Chair

Councillors Councillor Reginald Bailey, Councillor James Bannister,  
Councillor Miss Sophie Olszewski, Councillor Glyn Plant,  
Councillor Miss June Walklate, Councillor Mrs Gillian Williams  
and Councillor Mrs Joan Winfield

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs Cornes, Mrs Heesom, Holland and Lawton.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received.

### **3. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2012 be agreed as a correct record.

### **4. LEISURE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS**

The Committee gave consideration to a briefing note from the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services regarding Leisure Management Options.

A Trust had previously been considered to manage all or part of the cultural and leisure services provided by the Council, but the decision had been taken for them to remain in house as the outline business case could not be concluded due to proposed changes to the local government pension scheme at the time, and the difficulty in establishing exact/accurate procurement costs. There were two advantages of moving to a Leisure Trust; savings on non-domestic rates and also some savings on VAT. Furthermore, dependent upon the model of the trust, there would be opportunities for Gift Aid giving and the Trust would be eligible to apply for some grants where statutory authorities were not considered. For these reasons Cabinet agreed that the issue should be kept under review with a future report to be received.

Officers had monitored the sector and noted that Community Interest Companies (CICs) had become more prominent. CICs appeared to address the two issues that prevented the Leisure Trust Option being progressed. CICs were eligible for delegated body status to the local government pension scheme, so there would be no implications for employer contributions with regard to the pension scheme, as with admitted body status that applied to trusts. Furthermore, the Council would not have to conduct a procurement exercise as the CIC would be wholly owned by the Council, and if the CIC was treated like an in-house operation, it would benefit from 'a teckal exemption' in relation to procurement. A CIC would still being eligible for rate relief, but would not benefit from VAT savings in the same way as a Trust.

The officer working group having again reviewed the options for leisure and cultural services now required direction from Elected Members. The Council's Executive Management Team wanted the officer working group to continue to explore the CIC option and to gauge the Committee's views, before reporting back to Cabinet. The Committee were urged to not focus on the potential savings of the different structures, but to consider whether a structure fitted politically or philosophically with the Council, e.g. if it met the Council's corporate priorities. The next stage of the process would be to develop an outline business case, and officers were not asking for a decision at the present time.

The Chair hoped that Members would support the CIC as the Council would still control its facilities whereas, with a Trust, control would be lost. Other Members were in favour of the Leisure Trust option, as the individuals who ran them were usually experts in their field. They felt that if conditions were correct, then the Leisure Trust would be the best option. However, the timing was not right at the moment and the CIC was the right way forward at the present time.

Members noted that Cheshire West and Chester Council had already implemented a CIC, and questioned whether they had encountered any problems. Representatives from Cheshire West and Chester Council would be attending the next officer working group meeting. When Cheshire West and Chester Council had become a unitary authority, they had inherited different operators and a complex situation to unpick to form a Leisure Trust. The difficulties that they had experienced so far had been due to this and would not necessarily be applicable to this Council. The practical running of the CIC for Cheshire West and Chester Council was not problematic; it was the situation that they had inherited.

The Committee supported the CIC proposal, and requested a further report be brought back prior to being considered by Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:** (a) That the information be received.

(b) That the Committee support the Community Interest Company option for leisure management.

## 5. **WORK PLAN**

A report on the Public Sector in Partnership was expected in June. Bateswood Local Nature Reserve remained on the work plan and could be revisited if the situation required it. Meetings of the Allotments Review task and finish group were on-going, with another meeting to be scheduled imminently.

The Head of Leisure and Cultural Services advised that it may be advantageous for the Committee to consider the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Health and Wellbeing Strategy had two action plans: one for health and one for physical activity. Those for health to tackle pre-existing conditions from early onset, and those for physical activity to encourage healthy lifestyles, to prevent the onset of disease or aid recovery. It would be the second of these that would be beneficial for the Committee to look at, with a view to reducing the cost of physical inactivity in the Borough.

The Head of Cultural and Leisure Services urged the Committee to retain Kidsgrove Sports Centre on the work plan. The swimming pool at the centre had been closed for over a year, and had reopened in November following the undertaking of essential repair work. However, other areas continued to deteriorate. The sports facilities

continue to be operated but were at the end of their lifespan. A number of associated risks were therefore being managed on an on-going basis, and there was a recognition that the longer risks were taken the more likely it was to incur problems. Inspections of the centre were being conducted, and through these the Council was aware of the issues to be managed and the costs of repairs that were indicating some capital expenditure was required. The centre's long term future was in hand through 'the Deal Letter' that the Leader of the Council had signed with Staffordshire County Council. However, it could be over a decade before this resulted in a replacement or refurbishment of Kidsgrove Sports Centre. There was a considerable difference in the standards of facility at Kidsgrove Sports Centre and Jubilee 2 and the contrast between the two was noted. The issue for the Committee was whether the risks were being managed adequately, and the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services was happy for the Committee to look at this. With regard to the future of the Sports Centre, Staffordshire County Council had a plan for Kidsgrove Schools, which was largely based on Private Finance Initiatives, but a dialogue would not be opened up by the government until around September 2015. There was a budgeted deficit for Kidsgrove Sports Centre of £250,000, but the centre was running at a loss of a third of a million pounds. The centre was well used by existing members, but could not grow its user base due to the current facilities, and if the centre were to close again public confidence would be lost.

The Chair requested that scrutiny of Keele Golf Course and problems that were being encountered with the management of the course be added to the work plan. Newcastle Borough Council currently leased the golf course to a private operator.

**RESOLVED:** (a) That the information be received and the comments noted.

(b) That scrutiny of Keele Golf Course be added to the work plan.

**COUNCILLOR GEORGE CAIRNS**  
**Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report to Active and Cohesive Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
17 June 2013  
Public Sector Commissioning in Partnership (PSCiP)**

**1. Background:**

- 1.1 The initial concept of the PSCiP programme at the outset was initiated by Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council's (NuLBC) Chief Executive at the time recognising the potential of significant savings for all partners involved in the collaboration process when commissioning from the voluntary/third sector.
- 1.2 At the time NuLBC had already launched and were successfully working within its own protocols and procedures linked to its 'third sector commissioning framework' a framework that was shared and adopted by a number of public sector organisations.
- 1.3 NuLBC in collaborating with the County Council and PCT's as part of the PSCiP programme have been the only district to identify the benefits of such work, with a number of like authorities monitoring outcomes as the work develops and contracts are let.
- 1.4 NuLBC as part of the work retain the responsibility for needs analysis, priority setting, determining the service they want and will be involved in shaping the service specifications to make sure they meet their needs. NuLBC officers are an integral part of the commissioning/tender process, they will also have a voice as part of the ongoing monitoring process following mobilisation of new contracts ensuring any issues linked to performance with the successful service provider are reviewed and appropriately responded to.
- 1.5 Officers at NuLBC continue to contribute, support and maintain a profile as part of the work of PSCiP programme, albeit the focus for Newcastle has been linked to two specific service areas: Infrastructure Support and Volunteering Service and Debt, Benefits and Consumer Advice.

**2. Benefits from the programme:**

- 2.1 It is believed that shared commissioning will create efficiencies for public sector organisations through backoffice rationalisation including finance, legal, admin, commissioning, procurement and performance management departments. Whilst these efficiencies would be significant for larger PSO's in terms of staff resource District Councils with smaller investment levels should also see a reduction of staff time currently committed to all elements of the commissioning/grant process although on a smaller scale. There may also be possibilities to deliver additionality in some areas of the service outlines.
- 2.2 The economies of scale and collective bargaining power of a shared approach should improve value for money e.g. same level of service at a reduced contract value or increased service levels for the same contract value. This will be particularly important in the current climate of budget reductions.

- 2.3 Robust performance management will improve accountability ensuring services are delivered that meet organisational priorities and community need and this will also provide evidence to support future strategic planning e.g. identifying groups/areas for differential targeted delivery.
- 2.4 The commitment to a partnership approach will bring significant benefits including removing duplication of services and sharing expertise and best practice. More than that it will define the commitment to transparency and equity in commissioning and show a readiness to adapt in a changing environment to continue to secure essential services.
- 2.5 Shared commissioning will also create opportunities for backoffice efficiencies for third sector organisations particularly the larger organisations. Shared processes will make it easier and less resource intensive to identify opportunities, complete the application process and the performance management returns required. It could also offer real opportunities to work collaboratively.

### **3. Commissioned Services:**

- 3.1 As indicated in para 1.5 (above) NuLBC's focus as part of the ongoing engagement process has been linked to two specific service areas:
  - **Infrastructure Support and Volunteering Service**
  - **Debt, Benefits and Consumer Advice**

- 3.2 **Infrastructure Support and Volunteering Service:**

NuLBC has over the past 4 years funded infrastructure service support at an amount of £12,000pa agreeing as part of the PSCiP programme to transfer such funds to the County as part of the collaborative delivery of the service.

3.2.1 Officers of the Council at the outset of the collaborative process worked with commissioning colleagues at the County as part of needs analysis, priority setting and determining service needs, developing the service specification before this went out to market.

3.2.2 The opportunity advertised through the County Council's electronic procurement platform generated considerable interest with a high number of infrastructure organisations viewing the service outline, albeit on the closing date for completed submissions, only two responses were received from Staffordshire & Stoke-on-Trent Consortium of Infrastructure Organisations (SCIO) and Voluntary Action Stoke-on-Trent (VAST).

3.2.3 The two submissions were evaluated by a panel of five officers, inclusive of an officer from NuLBC; supported by a representative from the County procurement department who also facilitated moderation with the group on completion of the initial evaluation.

3.2.4 As part of the evaluation process both tenderers were invited and delivered presentations on their proposals to the evaluation team.

3.2.5 On announcement of the result, the unsuccessful provider as part of a standstill period was offered and requested feedback, subsequently requesting further review and clarification following this process.



3.2.6 The successful provider VAST commenced delivery of the contract on the 1<sup>st</sup> May, mobilisation having commenced with the provider with a number of meetings having taken place with NuLBC officers where the needs within the borough have been communicated.

3.2.7 Additionality as part of the contract has been obtained for the borough and a number of officers have in the early stages of mobilisation received a presentation and overview of the intended service to infrastructure organisations in the borough which will include:

- **Events** – minimum of 1 dedicated Newcastle event p.a.;
- **Information Dissemination** – Disseminate information from Borough Council to the VCS with a minimum of 50 ebulletins/6 newsletters p.a.
- **Support** – Minimum of 3 hours per day x 4 days per week;
- **Volunteering** – Weekly drop in session;
- **Website** – Dedicated Newcastle section;
- **Social Media** – Live Blog & discussion forum;
- **1-2-1 Development Support** – outreach at groups preferred venue;
- **VCS Representation** – Represent the VCS at strategic borough meetings.

Should members of the Active and Cohesive Overview & Scrutiny Committee wish to receive a presentation from VAST linked to the delivery of the service to the borough, officers would be willing to facilitate this.

3.2.8 VAST following the recent announcements from Newcastle CVS (NCVS) has commenced an engagement process with the organisation utilising the services of a number of members of the NCVS team.

### 3.3 **Debt, Benefits and Consumer Advice:**

NuLBC has over the past 4 years funded Debt, Benefits and Consumer Advice at an amount of £151,386 pa. The service previously delivered under separate contracts by Age UK and CAB is now being delivered collaboratively by the two organisations with CAB acting as the lead organisation until the re-commissioning of the service is completed as part of the PSCiP programme.

3.3.1 Officers of the Council have again at the outset of the collaborative process worked with commissioning colleagues at the County as part of needs analysis, priority setting and determining service needs, developing the service specification to reflect the needs within the borough.

3.3.2 An Officer from the borough council has been invited and will be included as part of the evaluation and moderation panel.

3.3.3 The budget for the service is being reviewed linked to the potential of delivering savings from the collaborative work, which should release monies to be utilised on commissioning other separate service needs for the authority.

3.3.4 The service outline and evaluation criteria have been established and agreed and the opportunity is ready to be advertised through the County Council's electronic procurement platform. This said and following a recent re-

structuring of staff at the County Council a new lead officer has been appointed taking on responsibility for this work and as such has resulted in a delay in the commissioning opportunity being advertised.

**4. Issues:**

- 4.1 The current contract linked to the delivery of Debt, Benefits and Consumer Advice is due to expire in September 2013 in anticipation of a new contract commencing from the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013 as part of the PSCiP programme. Due to the delays indicated in para 3.3.4 NuLBC's existing collaborative contract with CAB/Age UK will be extended the provider having been informed of this decision.

**Simon Sowerby**  
Business Improvement Manager  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
[simon.sowerby@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](mailto:simon.sowerby@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk)  
**01782 742756**

## **Report to Active and Cohesive Overview & Scrutiny Committee 17 June 2013 - Keele Golf Course**

### **Background**

On 21 March 2013 the operating company at Keele Golf Course went into voluntary liquidation but continued to operate as trespassers until the liquidator passed back the lease to the Council on 1 May 2013. The trespass was permitted to ensure a continuation of service and prevent the course closing prior to the lease being disclaimed and new interim arrangements being put in place while another operator was secured.

Glendale Managed Services were asked to quote for grounds maintenance at the course and also separately for managing the golf course. As existing grounds maintenance contractor to the Council a variation to their existing contract was approved following evaluation of their quote. In relation to the golf course management, two quotes were obtained, and following evaluation the work was awarded to Glendale. Both contracts are for an initial 4 months with the option to extend monthly for a further two months. These arrangements commenced on 2 May 2013. On 1 May 2013 the course was staffed by Council senior officers to ensure a continuation of service and give the opportunity to audit the operation prior to the interim contractor starting.

### **Issues**

Under the term of the current interim arrangements the Council retain all income from the course but are responsible for the costs of operation. The intention is to manage costs so that they are covered where possible by income. Income is generated from green fees and ancillary sales and the associated costs, which include National Non Domestic Rates, Utility Charges, Repairs and Maintenance (including statutory inspections), Grounds Maintenance Contract, Management Fee, and other direct costs (including golf shop staff, golf buggy leases, insurance etc.)

In terms of the longer term operation of the course the intention is to lease the course to an operator, with an agreement/ specification for golf management underpinning the lease to ensure the continued operation of a municipal golf course. In order to procure the next operator a pre-qualification questionnaire (PQQ) is being developed to capture market interest in the opportunity and give organisations the opportunity to comment on how they would like to see a lease structured in order to maximise their investment in the site and/or the return to the Council. It is envisaged that the results of the PQQ exercise will be known by mid July and these will then inform the next stage of the procurement process. In the meantime draft leases and specifications are being prepared.

### **Robert Foster**

Head of Leisure and Cultural Services  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
Robert.Foster@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk  
**01782 742636**



## Report to Active and Cohesive Overview and Scrutiny Committee 17 June 2013 - Kidsgrove Sports Centre

### **Background**

Given the age and condition of Kidsgrove Sports Centre and the resultant closure of swimming pool from October 2011 to November 2012, officers have done an amount of work to mitigate the risks of further failure in order to keep the centre open while a longer term solution is sought. Whilst there have been a number of short term closures, primarily due to plant failure, the building is at the end of its lifespan (40 years) for this type of construction. It is becoming increasingly costly to operate and maintain and at the same time more difficult to market and attract significant usage. The operating deficit this year is likely to be in the order of £400,000. In recognising this the Council has already done considerable work, particularly in relation to a refurbishment solution, but as the funding for this solution is not available we are in the process of reviewing and challenging the business case for a refurbishment solution compared to a new build solution.

We have little confidence in the medium to long term viability of the current facilities and any pressure to reduce the operating deficit, without investment, would result in a reduction in service, which in turn would likely transfer some of our costs to the school and threaten the basis of our agreement with them.

### **The approach**

In order to advise Members further on available options we need to understand whether a refurbishment or new build facility is the most appropriate course of action. We will therefore need to take into account the following factors:

- Appropriateness of the facility mix compared to local need (using Sport England FPM data, which the Council has requested directly from Sport England, plus developing our understanding of local competition)
- Capital costs associated with each option
- Revenue costs and incomes
- Risk profiles – for example in relation to the age of the existing facility versus a new build, relationship with the school etc.
- Site availability for any new build and potential land acquisition costs
- Planning constraints
- Disruption to existing customers / users
- Availability of capital funding and external grant monies.

We will use the work already undertaken in relation to the refurbishment and our experience of developing Jubilee2 as a basis for our assessment. In relation to the refurbishment, the refurbishment plans, costs and facility mix, have been estimated by our quantity surveyors, whilst for the new build we will need to utilise industry knowledge of recently costed new facilities (including Jubilee2) to provide a cost estimate and building footprint for the new build.

The approach is to ensure a full understanding of local aspirations to inform an initial desk-top assessment. The output from our work will be a short report, comparing the key aspects for each option, namely:

- 'fit' with local need
- Affordability (capital and revenue)
- Risk
- Deliverability (for example, site availability / disruption to existing customers).

In order that the assessments are as accurate as possible, we are currently researching the following information to support our work:

- √ income and expenditure figures for the existing Kidsgrove SC, covering the last 3 financial years and broken down between income / cost categories;
- √ usage figures, including any NBS (National Benchmarking Survey) reports or other KPI analysis;
- √ any condition survey data on the existing building;
- √ staffing structures for the site;
- √ Current VAT treatment of income by the Council;
- √ results of any consultation carried out on future plans for facility provision;
- √ FPM (Facilities Planning Model) modelling from Sport England, covering swimming pools and sports halls (this will need to be requested by the Council from Sport England).

Once completed our report will be passed to the Executive Management Team and Cabinet for their consideration and advice on 'next steps'.

**Robert Foster**

Head of Leisure and Cultural Services  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council  
Robert.Foster@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk  
**01782 742636**

## **Report to Active and Cohesive Overview & Scrutiny Committee Allotments Service Review Scrutiny Working Group Progress Report**

The Allotments Service Review Scrutiny Working Group (comprised of 6 members and chaired by Cllr George Cairns, Chairman of the Active and Cohesive Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee) held it's first meeting on 30th January 2013.

At the meeting, the group agreed it's work plan in relation to the allotments service review, comprising a series of themed meetings over the course of this calendar year to consider 3 key lines of enquiry: Local Management, Meeting Future Demand, Reducing Future Costs.

To date the group has received presentations and information on the following areas:

- Legal framework and implications
- Current costs and charging options
- Tenancy agreements

Future meetings will cover the following topics:

- Demand and provision options
- Consultation
- Site visits
- Local management
- Meeting future demand
- Reducing current costs
- Review and analysis

It is intended to produce a draft policy by December 2013/January 2014.

### **Roger Tait**

Head of Operations

Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council

**01782 742706**

Roger.Tait@newcastle-staffs.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



## ACTIVE AND COHESIVE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Title	Forward Plan Item?	Scrutiny Method	Progress to Date	Expected Completion Date	Expected Outcomes/Date for Progress to be Assessed
Review of Grants & Third Sector Commissioning Framework (AMBER)	Yes – previously considered by Cabinet	Full Committee	Agreed on 14.06.2012 that Cabinet be informed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee positive re recs.</li> <li>• Needs of Borough residents be given top priority with regards to tendering exercise.</li> <li>• Further reports be received when bidding process complete</li> </ul> Cabinet agreed in principle, A & C will be consulted further before final decision made. A & C to revisit later in year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern raised 06.09.12 re funding for Coalfield Alliance mining wards. Assurance requested that coalfield regen money would go to these areas &amp; not in collective pot at SCC. Appears to go directly to CAB, not through NBC.</li> <li>• Report re Public Sector in Partnership expected March or June 2013</li> </ul>		
Bateswood Consultation Process (GREEN)	Yes – previously considered by Cabinet	Working Group: Cllrs Cairns, J. Cooper, Lawton, Wilkes, G. Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Visit 11.05.2013. WG met 23.05.12.</li> <li>• Meeting with interested parties 27.06.2012.</li> <li>• A &amp; C considered &amp; agreed wg recs 06.09.12.</li> <li>• Cabinet resolved 17.10.12 to adopt committee recs.</li> </ul>	Cabinet Adopted Recs 17.10.2012	Would the Committee like to assess the progress for this 12 months after the Cabinet decision?
Draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy (AMBER)		Currently with Health Scrutiny	Coord resolved strategy should remain with Health. Small wg at SCC incl Cllr Eastwood. Special meeting at SCC to discuss		
Leisure Trust Options (AMBER)		TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline business case being established, models being investigated. May be community interest company rather than leisure trust option.</li> <li>• Report received by Scrutiny on 14.03.2013.</li> <li>• Report on Community Interest Companies (CIC) requested to be received by Scrutiny prior to consideration by Cabinet.</li> </ul>		
Allotments Service (AMBER)	Yes – previously considered by Cabinet	Working Group: Cllrs Bailey, Cairns, J. Cooper, Walklate Winfield, G. Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report to Cabinet 30.11.11 agreed review be carried out.</li> <li>• Cabinet considered 14.11.12. A &amp; C to undertake review of identified issues.</li> <li>• A &amp; C considered 13.12.12. Working group established, their next meeting is on 04.03.2013.</li> <li>• Status report requested by Chairman for meeting on 17.06.13.</li> </ul>	Working group expect to conclude Dec 2013	
Community Centre Review (AMBER)	Yes – previously considered by Cabinet	Working Group set up by Coord	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet request Coord set up wg to shadow officer wg.</li> <li>• Wg set up with first meeting 31.10.2012.</li> </ul>	Coordinating working group expect to conclude July 2013	

Keele Golf Course (AMBER)		Full Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Scrutiny meeting on the 19.03.13 requested that Keele Golf Course be added to the work programme. Report to be received at Scrutiny meeting on 17.16.13.</li> </ul>		
Kosgrove Sports Centre (AMBER)	Yes – previously considered by Cabinet	Full Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guarantee to be requested that regular inspections will be carried out in future.</li> <li>More unexpected closures can't be ruled out due to condition of building.</li> <li>Cabinet had update 14.11.12, centre to re-open 17.11.12</li> <li>Added to Scrutiny Agenda for 17.06.2013 at the recommendation of the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services at the meeting on 19.03.13.</li> </ul>		
Local Sporting Opportunities & Achievements	No	TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed as possible topic at Sept meeting.</li> <li>Report of current sports development activities in Borough received 13.12.12. A &amp; C impressed with work already being undertaken. Resolved to consider how to involve more young people in sport at a future date.</li> <li>A 'virtual school of sports' could be the way forward.</li> </ul>		

**MEMBERS SUGGESTIONS FOR SCRUTINY TOPICS**

<b>Suggested by:</b>	<b>Suggestion for Scrutiny Topic:</b>