

**DEMOCRACY COMMITTEE****16 November 2016**

Is the final decision on the recommendations in this report to be made at this meeting?

**Yes****Outside Bodies Follow Up Report**

<b>Final Decision-Maker</b>	Council
<b>Lead Head of Service</b>	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Lead Officer and Report Author</b>	Angela Woodhouse
<b>Classification</b>	Public
<b>Wards affected</b>	

**This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:**

1. To revisit the decision made on outside bodies on 8 September in light of the information in this report.
2. Create a working group to review the appointments to outside bodies in detail, giving consideration to the Overview and Scrutiny review in 2008-09 as part of that review.

**This report relates to the following corporate priorities:**

- Keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all
- Securing a successful economy for Maidstone Borough

**Timetable**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>
Committee	16 November 2016
Council (note for original recommendations made on 8 September)	7 December 2016

# Outside Bodies Follow Up Report

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Democracy Committee on 8 September considered a report on the appointments to outside bodies in order to identify which appointments should continue and how those that remain should be appointed in the future. This report provides information on options to take the work on outside bodies forward.

---

## 2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 2.1 It has come to light following the Committee's meeting in September that whilst the Committee was given a complete list of outside bodies the main report had information missing which would have been pertinent to the Committee's decision making on this matter.
- 2.2 A number of outside bodies listed at Appendix B to the original report, attached at Appendix A of this report for information were not included in the main report either at all or in sufficient detail. As a result these bodies were not reviewed in detail by the Committee as no information as to their status and reasons for appointment were provided. Those bodies omitted include:
- Age UK
  - Bentliff Wing Trust
  - Brenchley Charity
  - Cutbush and Corral
  - Hayle Park Nature Reserve
  - Kent Community Rail Partnership
  - Maidstone Beauvais Twinning Association
  - Maidstone Mind
  - Maidstone Sea Cadets
  - Mid Kent Downs Steering Group
  - Rochester Bridge Trust
  - Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board
- 2.3 In addition it was not clear in the original report whether outside body appointments had been requested by Service Committees. It also wasn't considered how long the council had been appointing to the outside body, some that were recommended for removal have only recently been appointed to. Whilst Committee Chairmen and Vice Chairmen were consulted, consultation did not extend to which outside bodies they would value being linked to the committees going forward.
- 2.4 It has been agreed with the Democracy Committee Chairman following legal advice that the Committee should review the original recommendations to consider if they were still appropriate.

### 3. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 3.1 The Committee can decide to continue with the original recommendations and submit these to Council in December or it can decide to conduct a more in-depth review in light of the information in this report.
- 

### 4. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 As the Committee did not consider a full and detailed review in September it would be pertinent to carry out a more in-depth review, to include Councillors involvement prior, to making recommendations to Council on which outside bodies we will continue to appoint to.
- 

### 5. CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

- 5.1 The purpose of this report is to alert the Committee to the omissions in the first report and allow consideration of whether to withdraw the original recommendations and review the matter in more detail.
- 

### 6. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 6.1 The Committee is asked to agree whether to proceed with or withdraw the recommendations made in September.
- 

### 7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Implications</b>	<b>Sign-off</b>
<b>Impact on Corporate Priorities</b>	The link to corporate priorities should be considered as part of reviewing the nomination as included at Appendix A	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Risk Management</b>	There is reputational risk associated with any decision to cease support of an outside body.	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Financial</b>	Expenses are claimed in relation to outside bodies as set out in the original report.	
<b>Staffing</b>	There may be implications	Head of Policy

	for Democratic services Staff in terms of administrative burden	and Communications
<b>Legal</b>	For those outside bodies set up as a charity or trust there may be a legal basis for the appointment which needs to be looked at in detail before any decision is made to cease appointing to such bodies.	Interim Deputy Head of Legal Partnership
<b>Equality Impact Needs Assessment</b>	No detrimental impact on the protected characteristics of individuals identified	Equalities and Corporate Policy Officer
<b>Environmental/Sustainable Development</b>	Some appointments will be to organisations who have an impact in these areas	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Community Safety</b>	Some appointments will be to organisations who have an impact in these areas	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Human Rights Act</b>	N/A	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Procurement</b>	N/A	Head of Policy and Communications
<b>Asset Management</b>	Some appointments will be to organisations who have an impact in these areas	Head of Policy and Communications

## **8. REPORT APPENDICES**

The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix A – Table of Outside Body Appointments

---

## **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

***Report on Outside Bodies, Democracy Committee 8 September 2016***