REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE **MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL**
3rd APRIL, 2013

At its meeting on 20th March 2013, the Cabinet received a report of the Executive Director, Place, referring to the Council's support for the introduction of digital presentations of planning applications and to the shrinking size of the agendas for the two area Planning and Highways Committees which provided an opportunity to follow national best practice, to enable efficiency savings, and to establish a single Committee that would be better able to take the wider interests of the City into account. The report also contained proposals to share the remit of the Cabinet Highways Committee with the appropriate Cabinet Member and to increase officer delegation.

The Cabinet minute, including the recommendation required to be approved by the Council, is set out below:-

MODERNISATION OF PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS AND CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEES

9.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report referring to the Council's support for the introduction of digital presentations of planning applications and to the shrinking size of the agendas for the two area Planning and Highways Committees which provided an opportunity to follow national best practice, to enable efficiency savings, and to establish a single Committee that would be better able to take the wider interests of the City into account. The report also contained proposals to share the remit of the Cabinet Highways Committee with the appropriate Cabinet Member and to increase officer delegation in order to improve efficiency and to reduce the workload of other Cabinet members. The opportunity for the public to make personal representations would still remain.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) recommends to Council that, from May 2013, the existing two Area Planning and Highways Committees be combined into a single Planning Committee for the whole City;

(b) agrees that the digital presentation of planning application reports with an enhanced format be introduced at the first meeting of the new, modernised Planning Committee, following any pilot testing that officers deem necessary;

(c) adopts Option 1 within the report and recommends to the Leader that she amends her Scheme of delegation to record the fact that decisions reserved to the Cabinet Highways Committee are also reserved to an Individual Cabinet Member and to reflect the proposals in Appendix A regarding increased officer delegations; and

(d) authorises the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Director of Legal Services, to make

the practical arrangements necessary to introduce the new executive transport and highways decision making arrangements following amendment of the Leader's Scheme as proposed at (c) above;

(NOTE: A copy of the report of the Executive Director, Place, has been circulated to all Members of the City Council with the Council Summons.)

John Mothersole
Chief Executive

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL
Cabinet Report

Report of:	Executive Director, Place
Date:	20 March 2013
Subject:	Modernisation of Planning and Highways & Cabinet Highways Committees
Author of Report:	Graham Withers / John Bann

Summary:
Cross party support for the introduction of digital presentations of planning applications has previously been established and the shrinking size of the agendas for the two area committees provides an opportunity to follow national best practice, to enable efficiency savings, and to establish a single committee that will be better able to take the wider interests of the City into account. Proposals are also put forward to share the remit of the Cabinet Highways Committee with the Individual Cabinet Member and to increase officer delegation in order to improve efficiency. The opportunity for the public to make personal representations will remain.

Recommendations:

1. That Cabinet recommend to Council that, from May 2013, the existing two Area Planning and Highways Committees be combined into a single Planning Committee for the whole city.

2. That Cabinet agree that the digital presentation of planning application reports with an enhanced format be introduced at the first meeting of the new, modernised Planning Committee, following any pilot testing that officers deem necessary.

3. That Cabinet adopt Option 1 and recommend to the Leader that she amends her Scheme of delegation to record the fact that decisions reserved to the Cabinet Highways Committee are also reserved to an Individual Cabinet Member and to reflect the proposals in Appendix A regarding increased officer delegations

4. That authority be given for the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Director of Legal Services, to make the practical arrangements necessary to introduce the new executive transport and highways decision making arrangements following amendment of the Leader's Scheme as proposed at 3 above.

Background Papers: None

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial implications
YES Catherine Rodgers
Legal implications
YES Cleared by: Gillian Duckworth / Deborah Eaton
Equality of Opportunity implications
NO Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw
Tackling Health Inequalities implications
NO
Human rights implications
NO
Environmental and Sustainability implications
YES
Economic impact
YES
Community safety implications
NO
Human resources implications
NO
Property implications
NO
Area(s) affected
ALL
Relevant Scrutiny Board if decision called in
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council? YES
Press release
NO

Draft Cabinet report

Date: 20 February 2013

Modernisation of Planning and Highways & Cabinet Highways Committees

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The report identifies two opportunities to modernise the Planning and Highways Committees and in addition to replace the Cabinet Highways Committee:

- Establishes that shorter agendas for the two area planning committees provide an opportunity to move to a single, city-wide planning committee, with consequent efficiency savings for Democratic Services and the Planning Service and the opportunity to provide a strong city view, backed by Councillors with increased expertise in planning, which is likely to be welcomed by local businesses and external investors in Sheffield.

- Summarises previous cross-party findings on the need to introduce the digital presentation of planning application reports with an enhanced format over existing content and proposes that this be introduced at the first meeting of the new committee, following any pilot testing that is deemed necessary.

- Describes the current decision making process for Executive transport and highway decisions and puts forward proposals to share the remit of the Cabinet Highways Committee with Individual Cabinet Members and to increase delegations to officers. The aim of this is to improve efficiency and to reduce the need for non-transport cabinet member involvement. Such a system of decision-making already operates in other core cities and neighbouring authorities and the opportunity for the public to make personal representations will remain.

- Non-executive decision making on highway issues, such as road and footpath closures, will remain with the Planning and Highways Committee.

2. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE?

2.1 In theory, area planning committees can mean local Councillors making planning and highway decisions about their local areas. Each area committee has ten members, of which only four in City Centre, South and East and six in West and North represent wards in the area covered by the Committee. Whilst these proportions will change over time and when substitutes attend, dividing a city as large as Sheffield into two committees makes a limited contribution towards local decision making. Local members can in any case attend the planning committees to represent the views of their constituents without needing to be voting members of the committee. The accessibility of the committee will be unchanged as both area committees meet in the Town Hall, apart from rare exceptions. Neighbourhood planning powers in the Localism Act are in any event creating important new ways for communities to better engage in planning.

2.2 A city-wide committee should find it easier to give proper consideration to the wider interests of the people of Sheffield, particularly in terms of economic development, but also in terms of issues such as climate change and protecting and enhancing the character of Sheffield. Local businesses have suggested in the past that investors and other regeneration partners would have greater confidence in a city-wide planning committee making more informed decisions for Sheffield. Whilst there is no evidence that the area committees could reasonably be accused of failing to do this, any improved perception can only help in attracting new investment and jobs, without weakening the Council's commitment to other issues and outcomes that matter to Sheffield, which are all reflected in our local planning policies.

2.3 In relation to the proposal to share the remit of the Cabinet Highway Committee, the process proposed for Individual Cabinet Member decision-making will be very similar to the current system. This involves Cabinet continuing to take major policy and transport scheme decisions. It is proposed that the monthly Cabinet Highway Committee meetings be replaced by monthly reports to the relevant Cabinet Member with the public able to make representations. Typically, only one or two members of the public attend Cabinet Highways Committee personally to speak on any issue, with a large number of issues receiving written public responses only. Where an occasional issue attracts unusually high public interest there remains the option of calling a Cabinet Highways Committee. Therefore the move to the individual Cabinet Member taking shared responsibility with the Cabinet Highways Committee for the decision making is not considered to have any detrimental impact.

3. MODERNISATION OPTIONS

3.1 Currently, there are considered to be two main options for modernising the Planning Committees at this point in time. These are the introduction of digital presentation of planning application proposals and the opportunity presented by shorter agendas to move to a single planning committee. The benefits and disbenefits of each option are assessed in Section 6.

3.2 There are two options for changing the Executive transport and highways decision making process. These are: Cabinet Highways Committee decisions being shared with the Individual Cabinet Member with or without increased delegation to officers; and full officer delegation. The benefits and disbenefits of each option are assessed in Section 6.

4. PROPOSED MOVE TO SINGLE PLANNING COMMITTEE

4.1 Determining planning applications is the main function of the area planning committees. In the 10 months from January 2012 the number of planning application reports considered has fallen to an average of 7.5 cases for City Centre, South and East and to an average of 6 West and North. These are very low numbers and it is difficult to sustain 2 committees at these levels. One West and North Committee had to be cancelled when there were no reports to consider.

4.2 The economic downturn has significantly reduced the pool of major applications that require committee approval. Improved delegation when the delegation scheme was

modernised to the national best practice model in January 2011 has also contributed Combining the figures of the Committees that have taken place so far in 2012, moving to a single Committee would result in an average of 13.5 planning applications per agenda, which is considered to be a more efficient committee structure, providing a reasonable application workload. It is possible to divide agendas into two halves if a large number of applications fall to one committee, which would avoid members of the public having to wait too long for their item to be considered (45-60% of agenda items attract speakers) and could provide a break for members and officers attending, if necessary.

4.3 The national Planning Advisory Service recommends a single planning committee as the most efficient model for cities and would provide efficiency savings in the administration and clerking of the committees, with an estimated value of £12,000 a year.

Table 1. Savings from move to a Single Planning Committee

Democratic Services- support for committees	£5k
Members' Allowances budget - Special Responsibility Allowance	£6k
Planning Services- 50 hrs G5 Admin Officer	£1k
Total Saving	£12k

4.4 These and other possible advantages and disadvantages of a single committee are summarised below:

Advantages

- **Better visual information** on material planning considerations, helping Members to make well informed decisions
- **Cheaper and more efficient to run** – around £6K a year efficiency savings and valuable help to maintain services at a time whilst already delivering necessary and significant other staff savings, and helping to reduce paper consumption
- **More strategic** - easier to take a city-wide, strategic view on the economic benefits of development
- **More business friendly** – would develop enhanced planning expertise among Members.
- **Greater consistency** – avoids issues about differences between the two area committees.
- **Improved expertise** – easier to develop a smaller core membership of experts on planning issues
- **Less reliance on substitutes** – less call on Members would help avoid current difficulties in finding sufficient substitutes for two area committees
- **Further savings** – a saving of a Special Responsibility Allowance of around £6K a year through the reduction of two committee chairs to one.

Disadvantage

- **Longer meetings** – At present there are two area committees operating on a three weekly cycle. Agendas and Committee meetings would be longer if combined but good chairing would resolve most of these difficulties and the length of meetings has been reducing over the past 12 months in any event.

4.5 If volumes of Committee items increase, as major scheme activity increases for example, a number of actions could be taken to help prevent the Planning Committee becoming so long that its performance was hindered or that might lead to public dissatisfaction. There is no obvious scope to make further changes to the delegation scheme to increase delegation rates (already at around 95%), as the Council is using the most efficient, national best practice model. However, the way the Chair interprets and applies the scheme to marginal agenda items could be reviewed to help prevent agendas getting too crowded.

4.6 With more major schemes, it can be anticipated there will be greater use of pre-application briefings of the Planning Committee, addressing some Member concerns earlier in the process, and this will help contain the length of time spent on these application reports.

4.7 Timed breaks in the meeting could be introduced to manage the arrival of speakers (and officers) if that was felt to be appropriate and it would also be possible to introduce a requirement for public speakers to register in advance, so that a better estimate of timings could be given in order to better manage longer agendas. This could be used to help prevent the public waiting too long for their item. The length of meetings would be kept under review.

4.8 It is recommended that the minimum size of the new committee be 10 Members, as for the existing area committees, but Members may want to consider if 10 remains the optimum number. Each Council AGM will be able to determine the size and membership of the Committee.

5. DIGITAL PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Over 40% of planning applications are now submitted online and all paper documents are scanned and indexed to create a digital or electronic copy of the application file. These are made visible to the public and consultees via the Council web site on Planning Applications Online. 'Digital presentations' means replacing paper drawings displayed on boards prior to the Planning Committee, which are impossible for anyone to see without getting up and standing close to them, with a PowerPoint presentation of screenshots from the digital file.

5.2 The Planning Committee Advisory Group last considered digital presentations on 20 January 2011, following an earlier visit to Leeds, and concluded that we should move to digital presentations in Sheffield as it had the potential to improve the decision making process, by improving the quality of information on which Committee Members make application decisions, providing better opportunities for communicating issues, and illustrating and explaining why decisions are made to applicants and objectors who attend.

5.3 A joint officer assessment by Modern Governance and Planning on how it would be possible to do this, concluded that the best option given the constraints of working within a Grade 1 Listed Town Hall, would be to use two plasma screens on movable stands, linked to a laptop controlled by an officer supporting the planning officer

presenting. Plasma screens offer better screen resolution and legibility than projected images. Two screens would be necessary to enable all present to have sight of a screen.

5.4 The Advisory Group liked the enhanced material used in Leeds, which included an aerial photo and prepared location plan of the application site to make site identification better for Members than at present, a selection of site photographs taken by the case officer to illustrate the site context and key issues, as well as a selection of key drawings from the application file. It is not safe to rely on a network connection or practical to expect an officer to navigate through an extensive catalogue of documents to pull out relevant material at the speed required at Committee, so this material has to be prepared in advance and managed at the Committee by a second officer.

5.5 It is calculated, using the Leeds experience, where an IT support officer prepares the Power Point presentation, that the additional resource required in Sheffield would be 0.3 FTE Administrative Officer. This can be met within the current funded establishment. It is also assumed that the additional work for case officers (taking photographs and identifying a selection of drawings to be displayed, for the Area Managers (in preparation and support at Committee), can be absorbed by the Planning Service. There would also be a small cost in purchasing GIS licences for the software necessary to prepare the enhanced location plans.

Table 2. Annual cost of introducing digital presentations

Planning Services - 0.3fte G5 Admin Officer	£9k
Estimated annual hire and committee set up costs	£3-4k
GIS License	£0.2k
Total Cost	£12.2 – £13.2k

5.6 Budget pressures have delayed the introduction of digital presentations, with insufficient administrative support being retained to do the additional preparatory work for each Planning Committee. Its introduction is the logical next step in modernising the Planning Committee. It is likely to have cross party support and be welcomed by all those who attend.

5.7 Every other core city, apart from Manchester, uses digital presentations. They help officers illustrate the key considerations behind their recommendations; help Members make well informed decisions; and help applicants, objectors and the media attending understand why decisions are being made, giving greater confidence in the process.

5.8 A lack of confidence in the Committee process has in the past been a concern of local business leaders, and while the reasons behind those concerns were complex, the introduction of digital presentations would demonstrate our commitment to modernise and improve the planning process.

6. EXECUTIVE TRANSPORT & HIGHWAY DECISION MAKING

6.1 Transport and Highways matters are covered under two Cabinet Member portfolios: Business, Skills and Development and Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (the latter dealing primarily with the Streets Ahead Project). The current system of transport and highway decision-making involves Cabinet dealing with major policy and transport scheme issues (including Compulsory Purchase Orders for schemes), with the Cabinet Highways Committee making most other Executive decisions (including operational policy such as 20mph speed limit strategy; considering objections to Traffic Orders and approving Permit Parking schemes). There is some delegation to officers, namely approving the designs of schemes, which are not controversial and cost under £200,000 and approving advertising of Traffic Orders. Community Assemblies have made Executive decisions on which schemes to take forward as part of annual highways programme and the designs of these schemes. The involvement of Community Assemblies in the transport and highways decision-making process will cease with their abolition. The relevant Planning & Highway Committee undertakes non-Executive decisions, such as highway and footpath closures and cycle path creation orders. The single Planning & Highways Committee will retain this non executive decision making function.

6.2 Any changes in executive decision making for transport and highway schemes need to ensure that:

a) Decisions are made legally and with a clear audited trail of delegated accountability;
b) Decisions are made in an open and transparent way;
c) The work of the Members and officers is conducted in an efficient, effective and timely matter;
d) Clarity is brought to the decision making process so that it is always clear who has authority to make decisions;
e) Important decisions of public interest should continue to be made with input from Members and the public at relevant stages;
f) Decisions are made at the most appropriate level to ensure that Council business is conducted as efficiently and effectively as possible.

6.3 Two options for changing the current transport and highways Executive decision making process have been considered. These are: Cabinet Highways Committee decisions being shared with the Individual Cabinet Member with or without increased delegation to officers; and full officer delegation. The benefits and dis-benefits of each option are assessed below:

6.4 Option 1: Cabinet Highways Committee decisions being shared with the Individual Cabinet Member with or without increased delegation to officers. Delegation to Individual Cabinet Members is a model adopted by several of the Core Cities (including Birmingham and Nottingham). Rotherham MBC also use Individual Cabinet Member decision making and do this by way of regular and programmed Cabinet Member decision making meetings. These would be in the diary as per Cabinet Highway Committee with Committee Secretariat support. Minutes would be formally recorded and published. In Rotherham, the Cabinet Member is advised by a group of Councillors but they do not make the decision. Reports are prepared in advance by officers. The meetings are not open, but members of the public etc can apply to put their case direct to the Cabinet Member before making his / her decision and written representations would be invited from the public and be presented as part of the report to the Cabinet Member. Sheffield could adopt a

similar method of dealing with Individual Cabinet Member decision making, however as Sheffield intends to retain its Cabinet Highways Committee the proposal is that there would be the normal arrangements for consulting with the public and stake holders on schemes and policies. Officers would make people aware of how they could make representations to the Individual Cabinet Member who would then decide whether there was sufficient public interest to refer the matter to the Cabinet Highways Committee. If written representations are sufficient for the Cabinet member to make a decision or there are no representations, the decision will be made by the Individual Cabinet Member. It is also proposed that the relevant Cabinet advisor on traffic, transport and parking issues would advise the Individual Cabinet Member prior to the decision being taken, thereby increasing the input of Member expertise in the relevant area.

This option could increase the workload of the Cabinet Member – depending on the level of delegation and the frequency of decision making. If decisions were made on a monthly basis and the delegation remained the same then the workload should be the same. Having the option of the Individual Cabinet Member making the decision would make it easier to diary decision making.

6.5 Option 2: A significant proportion of planning decisions are already delegated to officers. The amount of decisions delegated for transport and highways matters could be increased by:

- Increasing the value of schemes that officers could approve the design of (from say £200k to £1m;
- This could include schemes with some controversial elements;
- Deciding on objections to minor schemes such as local parking restrictions;

All decisions would be in written report format and would be recorded and published. The Cabinet Member and Ward Members (for local schemes) would be involved in the discussions about the decisions. Reasons for the decisions would be clear so that public can understand why and how officers have chosen a particular course of action. There will therefore be a clear and audited trail of accountable decision making.

The advantage of this option is that it would reduce the workload for the Individual Cabinet Member. It would also speed up the decision making process. This is particularly important when schemes are being planned to fit in with the Streets Ahead Core Maintenance works. However, it would reduce the public's involvement in the decision making process by not allowing direct representations at a public decision making forum.

6.6 Option 1 could involve increased officer delegation (a proposed scheme for approval is attached as Appendix A), to reduce Cabinet Member workload, to speed up the decision making and delivery times, and improve efficiency. Essentially the Individual Cabinet Member and the Cabinet Highways Committee would each have reserved to them, within the Leader's Scheme of delegation all of the Council's executive functions arising from the Council's roles as the Highway Authority and Road Traffic Authority (other than those specifically reserved to Cabinet and those delegated to officers in accordance with Appendix A). These will include transport and parking matters, where these relate to:

a) The Capital Programme;

b) Policy statements;
c) Matters that have drawn substantial objections from the public;
d) Approval of designs of schemes costing in excess of £250,000.

It is also worth noting that the leader's proposed new scheme provides that any decision that can be taken by an officer can also be taken by an Individual Cabinet Member. Therefore even where a matter falls to an officer the Individual cabinet Member can choose to make that decision if they so wish.

7. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no equality of opportunity implications to the proposals for Planning & Highway Committee. Public input will still be maintained during scheme consultation, policy development and by written representations to the Individual Cabinet Member or personal attendance at a Cabinet Highway Committee.

8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The total saving in administration, clerking and Chair's allowances from moving to a single planning committee is estimated at £12,000 a year. The total cost of introducing digital presentations is estimated at £12,200 – £13,200 a year. The Planning Service will absorb the additional work required to prepare digital presentations, partly offset by small efficiencies from preparing the agenda for a single committee.

8.2 The recommended Option will not change the administrative support for and cost of transport and highway executive decision making.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The determination of planning applications is a function reserved to Full Council in accordance with the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000. Section 102 Local Government Act 1972 provides for the Council to discharge its functions via a committee or committees. The number of committees is not prescribed therefore there is no legal requirement for there to be two committees and the Council can lawfully discharge its function via a single committee.

9.2 The exercise of executive functions concerning the approval of Traffic Regulation Orders, designated traffic management matters, controlled parking zones and other orders in respect of major transport scheme designs are made under the application of the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

9.3 <u>Legal Implications - How decisions can be made by a local authority</u>
The Local Government Act 2000 introduced a duty for most local authorities to adopt 'Executive Arrangements' to make its decisions. Sheffield adopted the model of Leader and Cabinet and subsequently Strong Leader and Cabinet. The legislation determines which functions are executive functions and specifies where those functions can be discharged. The Act divided Local Authority functions into three types:

- Council

- Local Choice
- Executive Functions

The focus of this report is in respect of both the exercise of executive functions and non-executive functions. Executive powers can be exercised by:-

1 The Leader
2 Cabinet
3 A committee of the executive (including Cabinet Highways Committee)
4 Individual Cabinet Member Decision
5 An officer
6 Community Assemblies

9.4 Non-executive functions of the Council as planning and highways authority are set out in Part A, 5-31, Part B, 41 and 46A-55 and Part I, 1-34, 46 and 47 of Part 3 Responsibility for Functions of the Constitution and have been delegated to the Planning and Highways Committees in accordance with their terms of reference (except those matters delegated to officers in accordance with the Constitution). Section 278, Highways Act 1980 is a local choice function which has also been delegated to the Committees in accordance with their terms of reference.

9.5 Changes will be made to the Leader's Scheme of Delegation to reflect the changes proposed here and agreed with the Leader to ensure continued robust open and transparent decision making.

10. HR IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no HR implications.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Sheffield has a clear vision of a low carbon, sustainable city with a strong renewable energy sector. Whilst the impact may be imperceptible, a city-wide committee should find it easier to give appropriate weight to policies that support this vision.

11.2 Appropriate and efficient decision making is vital in the effective delivery of sustainable transport and highway schemes. Such schemes play a fundamental part in improving the environment, reducing carbon emissions and improving air quality.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1. That Cabinet recommend to Council that, from May 2013, the existing two Area Planning and Highways Committees be combined into a single Planning Committee for the whole city.

12.2 That Cabinet agree that the digital presentation of planning application reports with an enhanced format be introduced at the first meeting of the new, modernised Planning Committee, following any pilot testing that officers deem necessary.

12.3. That Cabinet adopt Option 1 and recommend to the Leader that she amends her Scheme of delegation to record the fact that decisions reserved to the Cabinet Highways Committee are also reserved to an Individual Cabinet Member and to reflect the proposals in Appendix A regarding increased officer delegations.

12.4. That authority be given for the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Director of Legal Services, to make the practical arrangements necessary to introduce the new executive transport and highways decision making arrangements following amendment of the Leader's Scheme as proposed at 12.3 above.

Les Sturch, Director of Development Services

APPENDIX 1. SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) FORM

PART 1: Details and purpose of function/policy/procedure/ procurement/strategy/project (to be referred to collectively as "policy or project" in this form)

This section must be completed

Please describe your policy or project: Modernisation of the Planning and Highways & Cabinet Highways Committees	Directorate/s: Place
Is this policy or project: New ☑ Existing ☐	
Service Area/s: Planning Service, Transport, Traffic And Parking Services & Democratic Services	
Person responsible for the policy or project Graham Withers / John Bann	
Person responsible for completing a full EIA if appropriate: Graham Withers / John Bann	
Are there any other people involved in the EIA – for example, as part of peer review/external challenge? Ian Oldershaw	
What are the main aims, purpose and outcomes of the policy or project and how do these fit in with the wider aims of the organisation? To ensure that the Planning and Highway Committee structure and processes are efficient and effective, taking into account national best practice and the Council's need to make budget savings and involve all stakeholders in the planning application process.	
Will this policy or project have any implications on other procedures/projects/strategies etc of the City Council? It may help free up some Member time for constituency business. Changes to CHC will free up some Cabinet Member time. **Are there any implications on our statutory duties? (e.g. social care or homeless eligibility criteria)** There are no implications for the statutory duties of the Council as Local Planning Authority or as Highway and Parking Authority.	

PART 2: Initial Impact Assessment
Complete this part to evaluate whether you should proceed to a full EIA. If you know your policy or project will have an impact on certain groups, please go straight to Part 3.

A. Will the aims identified in Part 1 affect our statutory equality or human rights duties to:	
a) Promote equality of opportunity?	e) Promote positive equality attitudes?
b) Encourage participation for all *	f) Eliminate discrimination?
c) Consider reasonable adjustments for disabled people?	g) Eliminate harassment?
d) Promote and protect human rights?	h) Promote good community relations?
l) Include measures to promote equal pay, ensure fair promotion, development opportunities and tackle occupational segregation	
*** Note b)** must include disabled people under the Disability Duty. **If so, please comment**: No impact re any of the above	

B. Are the particular communities or groups below likely to have different needs, experiences and attitudes in relation to the project? Are there any significant cohesion or social inclusion issues for the project?
Black Minority Ethnic ☐ Disabled ☐ Gender ☐ People of different ages ☐ Religion/ Belief ☐ Sexual Orientation ☐ Carers ☐ Community Cohesion ☐ Social Inclusion ☐ Other ☐ No impact re any of the above. Fundamentally, the modernisation of the Planning and Highways Committees is equality neutral affecting all those involved equally regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, sexuality, etc. No negative equality impacts have been identified.
If the EIA is not being done at the start of the policy or project please give reasons for the delay: N/A
Date for review: N/A

If you have identified any significant impacts under sections 2A or 2B then you will need to proceed to a full EIA in PART 3.

If you have not identified any significant impact you do not need to conduct a full EIA.
Please note - this decision still needs to be cleared (signed off) by the officer in your directorate responsible for signing off EIAs.

I have now considered the equality implications of my policy or project and **/ will not** proceed to carry out a Full Impact Assessment. **Date of EIA form (Parts 1 and 2) completed:** 11 February 2013 Signed (Officer completing the form): Graham Withers / John Bann **Date:** 11 February 2013 **Signed (EIA Responsible Officer): Ian Oldershaw Date: 12/02/13**

Appendix A

Proposed Delegations relating to Highways and Transport and Traffic to be incorporated within the Leader's and the Executive Director (Place)'s Schemes of Delegation

1. The 'Streets Ahead' Project (Highways PFI) and other Highways Related Issues

1.1 The Head of Highway Maintenance is authorised to make decisions on behalf of the Council as the 'Authority Representative' under the Highways Maintenance PFI Contract dated 31st July 2012 and including any subsequent revisions between (1) the Council and (2) Amey Hallam Highways Limited ('the Streets Ahead Contract'), including authorising the making of call-off contracts (as deeds and in the agreed contractual form) for the provision of non-core services pursuant to the Streets Ahead Contract', provided that this authority:-

1.1.1 Does not extend to making a decision in relation to:-
(a) Termination of the Streets Ahead Contract;
(b) The final approval of the making of High Value Changes (as defined in the Streets Ahead Contract); or
(c) Step-in by the taking of any Required Action (as defined in the Streets Ahead Contract).

1.1.2 Is subject to any further restrictions which may be imposed on it from time to time by the Cabinet or by an individual Cabinet member with a relevant portfolio; and

1.1.3 Is without prejudice to the authority of any other persons to make decisions under any other provisions of this Scheme.

1.2 Any functions of the executive in relation to the Council's roles as Highways Authority and Road Traffic Authority, including transport and parking (except any function that relates to highways maintenance and street naming and numbering and Section 278, Highways Act 1980 (power to erect barriers in streets in cases of emergency)) may be discharged by the Chief Executive, by the Executive Director, Place, by the Director of Development Services and by the Head of Transport Traffic and Parking Services in each case acting individually.

1.3 Any functions of the Executive in relation to the Council's role as Highways Authority in so far as they relate to highways maintenance and street naming and numbering and Section 278, Highways Act 1980 (power to erect barriers in streets in cases of emergency) may be discharged by the Chief Executive, by the Executive Director, Place, by the Director of Development Services and by the Head of Highways Maintenance in each case acting individually.

This page is intentionally left blank