

Title of Report:	Actions from previous meetings
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	10 December 2013

Purpose of Report: To advise the Commission of the actions arising from previous meetings

Recommended Action: To note the report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 942 0196
E-mail Address:	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Charlene Myers
Job Title:	Strategic Support Service
Tel. No.:	01635 519695
E-mail Address:	cmyers@westberks.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission with an update on the actions arising from its previous meeting.

2. Actions

- 2.1 **Resolution:** Neighbourhood Action Groups would receive the contact details for RBFRS staff to enable them to contribute to fire safety and fire safety risk assessment training.

Action/ response: A member of Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service (RBFRS) Prevention Department has liaised directly with the Neighbourhood Action Groups to carry out meetings.

- 2.2 **Resolution:** It was agreed that the Homelessness Strategy would be offered as an item at the next District Parish Conference

Action/Response: complete.

- 2.3 **Resolution:** Rachael Wardell would investigate how long residents had to wait before receiving an assessment and report back to the Commission.

Action/Response: response distributed to the Commission on 8th November 2013 - Appendix A.

- 2.4 **Resolution:** The Commission were unable to provide their comments in the Revenue and Capital budget report because the Commission could not see the Financial Performance report before submission to the Executive. Councillor Bedwell agreed to write a letter raising the concern.

Action/Response: The Portfolio Holder has advised that although he could not agree to supplying such information to OSMC for questioning and debate (his emphasis) before the Executive had the opportunity to do so, he had no problem in principle supplying such information *provided* it was not debated on the night and that the opposition at the Executive supplied their questions based on this advanced information 2 days in advance of the Executive meeting. At the Executive no new questions would be asked, only supplementary ones to the submitted questions.

- 2.5 **Resolution:** Homes to school transport would be added to the OSMC work programme.

Action/ Response: complete.

- 2.6 **Resolution:** Highways and Transport would be asked to explain the reason behind Network Rail agreeing to fund the extension of only one side of the footpath alongside the Aldermaston Wharf.

Action/Response: As part of their electrification programme, Network Rail were obliged only to provide a like for like replacement of any structure they had to carry out works to.

As such they were under no obligation to widen any of the footways on the approach to the A340 bridge.

Due to the engineering difficulties encountered on the bridge, the length of the closure was significantly extended. Due to the extended disruption to local residents and businesses, Highways and Transport officers suggested to Network Rail that it was a good idea to provide some betterment on the structure within the area they were working. The betterment took the form of widening the footways on the southern side of the bridge and across the bridge itself.

The work was conducted with relative ease as the land required was within West Berkshire Council's control. Network Rail paid all the construction costs.

Network Rail refused to widen the footpath on the northern side as the land was privately owned and the works would not be within their site. Network Rail concluded that the additional works they undertook to the south side were fair recompense for the disruption caused (that is difficult to quantify, but as they were under no obligation to do any additional works it was impossible to argue against).

- 2.7 **Resolution:** David Lowe would revisit the correspondence received from the Newbury Town Council in connection to the recommendation to provide lockers for the homeless.

Action/required: In line with the recommendation, the Portfolio Holder for Housing (Councillor Roger Croft) requested that Newbury Town Council (NTC) considered the provision of lockers. NTC was of the view that it was for the District Council to lead and co-ordinate the actions required to make the required provision. Councillor Croft has advised NTC that as the provision of lockers does not form part of the District Council's homelessness strategy no further action will be taken.

- 2.8 **Resolution:** The work programme would be updated to include an examination into the reasons why West Berkshire appeared to have a disproportionate amount of young families facing homelessness would.

Action/required: complete.

- 2.9 **Resolution:** Members were asked to consider the prioritisation of items of the WP.

Action/Required: To be discussed at the meeting.

- 2.10 **Resolution:** The CCG scorecard would be circulated to the commission.

Action/required: attached appendix B.

- 2.11 **Resolution:** The OSMC Magistrates Court meeting would be cancelled.

Action/required: complete.

- 2.12 **Resolution:** The Chairman would be asked if the response received from the Court Clerk could be circulated to the Commission for completeness

Action/required: The letter was provided to the members of the Commission by e-mail on 30 October 2013.

Appendices

Appendix A – Waiting times for care assessments

Appendix B – Berkshire West Quality Scorecard – October