

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**SUMMARY OF OUTCOME – TOPIC SCORING EXERCISE**  
**1 SEPTEMBER 2016**

**Reject Topics - Score 1 - 4**

<b>Topic Ref No.</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>1</b>	Parish Clerk, Bickerstaffe Parish Council	<b>‘Bickerstaffe Cycle Trails’ (Phase 2 of the Trails 2016/17</b>	<p>It was concluded that there was good evidence that linked the topic to the Council’s key aims and priorities and in relation to impact, minor potential benefits or benefits affecting only one client group. It was noted that the first part of this project had been supported and undertaken by Bickerstaffe Parish Council.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Suggestions on a possible funding stream to be forwarded to the Parish Clerk.</p>
<b>2</b>	A member of the public	<b>‘Speeding Traffic (Firwood Road)</b>	<p>It was concluded that there was no evidence that the topic is related to the Council’s current key aims and priorities resulting in only minor potential benefits / benefits affecting only one ward. It was noted speeding traffic, particular near schools, had been the subject of a previous in-depth review and that traffic calming measures were a responsibility of Lancashire County Council (LCC).</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Details to be passed to the County Councillor (West Lancs South) and referred on to Highways at LCC.</p>

Topic Ref. No.	Source	Topic	Outcome
4	A member of the public	<b>‘Highway issues – Cottage Lane/Halsall Lane, Ormskirk</b>	<p>It was concluded that traffic calming was already being addressed as it was understood that LCC are proposing a consultation on various options for traffic calming in the County.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Details to be referred to the County Councillor (Ormskirk West) for response.</p>
6	A member of the public	<b>‘Waste disposal – Methods of collection’</b>	<p>It was concluded that whilst the observations on the subject were welcomed, changes were unlikely to result in improvements for local people.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Comments to be referred to the Director of Street Scene for response.</p>
6a	A member of the public.	<b>‘Pot holes. Hazards for cyclists’</b>	<p>It was concluded that matters related to potholes were already being addressed and that potholes on the highway were the responsibility of LCC.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Comments to be referred on to LCC Highways.</p>
7	A member of the public	<b>‘Mowing of verges and road islands’</b>	<p>It was concluded that these matters were already being addressed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject.</b> Comments to be referred to referred to the Director of Street Scene for response.</p>
9	Councillor Kay	<b>‘What has become of the operational Police Officers in West Lancashire?’</b>	<p>It was concluded that there was some evidence that the topic linked to the Council’s key aims and priorities but only indirectly and in relation to impact, minor potential benefits affecting more than one ward, customer and client groups.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Reject. Comments to be referred to the Director of Leisure and Wellbeing Services for response.</p>

**Possible Topics – 5 – 6**

<b>Topic Ref. No.</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>5</b>	A member of the public	<b>‘Improved Planting – Skelmersdale Town Centre’</b>	<p>It was concluded that there was good evidence linking the topic to the Council’s key aims and priorities that could lead to substantial potential benefits affecting one or more wards/customer and client group. However, it was felt that although the topic did not warrant a substantial review it could be the subject of a ‘one off’ presentation to the Committee.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That the topic be the subject of a ‘one-off’ presentation at a future meeting of the Committee.</p>
<b>3</b>	A member of the public	<b>‘Cycles in Ormskirk Bus Station’</b>	<p>It was concluded that there is good evidence linking the topic to the Council’s key aims and priorities and some potential benefits affecting two or more wards/customer/client groups. However, it was noted that cycling in the Borough had been the subject of a previous in-depth review and that although the topic did not warrant another substantial review it could be a subject for a ‘one off’ presentation to the Committee.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That the topic be the subject of a ‘one-off’ presentation at a future meeting of the Committee.</p>

**Priority Topics 7- 8**

<b>Topic Ref. No</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>8</b>	Councillor Pritchard	<b>‘Tourism’</b>	<p>It was concluded that there is strong evidence linking the topic to the Council’s key aims and priorities and substantial potential benefits community wide ,for a significant proportion or section of the community. Although it was noted that the topic had been the subject of a previous in-depth review, this was several years ago and it could be worthwhile to the Borough as a whole, to undertake the subject at this time.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> That ‘Tourism’ be recommended as the choice for an in-depth study to be undertaken by the Committee in 2016-17 and to assist the decision of the Committee that a presentation be arranged for the October 2016 meeting.</p>