

Notice of Meeting

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Tuesday, 2 November, 2010 at 6.30pm
in Council Chamber Council Offices
Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Monday, 25 October 2010

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Stephen Chard on (01635) 519462
e-mail: schard@westberks.gov.uk

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at
www.westberks.gov.uk



**Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 2
November 2010 (continued)**

To: Councillors Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Jeff Brooks (Vice-Chairman),
Geoff Findlay, Irene Neill, David Rendel, Quentin Webb and
Emma Webster

Agenda

Part I	Page No.
1. Apologies for Absence To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any).	
2. Minutes To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 14 September 2010.	1 - 6
3. Declarations of Interest To receive any Declarations of Interest from Members.	
4. Actions from previous Minutes To receive an update on actions following the previous Commission meeting.	
5. Items Called-in following the Executive on 14 October 2010 To consider any items called-in by the requisite number of Members following the previous Executive meeting.	
6. Councillor Call for Action To consider any items proposed for a Councillor Call for Action.	
7. Petitions To consider any petitions requiring an Officer response.	
8. Severe winter weather <i>Purpose:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>To be informed of the response to the Commission's recommendations following its review into the severe winter weather of 2009/10.</i>• <i>To receive an update on the activity undertaken since the Commission's review.</i>• <i>To examine the preparations in place for the coming winter.</i>	To follow



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 2 November 2010 (continued)

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 9. | Scrutiny review into the Council's Performance Management Framework
<i>Purpose: To outline the results of the investigation into the Council's Performance Management Framework.</i> | 7 - 20 |
| 10. | Scrutiny review into the use of local food
<i>Purpose: To outline the results of the investigation into the use of local food.</i> | 21 - 26 |
| 11. | Scrutiny review into the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings
<i>Purpose: To outline the results of the investigation into the need for a policy for the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.</i> | 27 - 78 |
| 12. | Scrutiny review into Supporting Small Schools
<i>Purpose: To outline the results of the investigation into the support that can be provided to small schools in West Berkshire.</i> | To follow |
| 13. | Greener Select Committee
<i>Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and provide information on the meeting held on 7 September 2010.</i> | 79 - 84 |
| 14. | Healthier Select Committee
<i>Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and provide information on the meetings held on 9 September 2010 and 12 October 2010.</i> | 85 - 98 |
| 15. | Resource Management Select Committee
<i>Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and provide information on the meeting held on 13 September 2010.</i> | 99 - 112 |
| 16. | Safer Select Committee
<i>Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and provide information on the meeting held on 20 September 2010.</i> | 113 - 130 |
| 17. | Stronger Communities Select Committee
<i>Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and provide information on the meeting held on 21 October 2010.</i> | 131 - 132 |
| 18. | West Berkshire Forward Plan - November 2010 - February 2011
<i>Purpose: To advise the Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from November 2010 – February 2011 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the plan.</i> | 133 - 144 |



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 2 November 2010 (continued)

19. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and Select Committee Work Programme** 145 - 154
Purpose: To receive, agree and prioritise the work programme of the Commission and Select Committees for the remainder of 2010/11.

Andy Day
Head of Policy and Communication

West Berkshire Council is committed to equality of opportunity. We will treat everyone with respect, regardless of race, disability, gender, age, religion or sexual orientation.

If you require this information in a different format, such as audio tape, or in another language, please ask an English speaker to contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045, who will be able to help.



Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Commission

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Geoff Findlay, Irene Neill, David Rendel, Tony Vickers (Substitute) (In place of Jeff Brooks), Quentin Webb, Emma Webster

Also Present: Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Jason Teal (Performance, Research & Consultation Manager), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer), David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jeff Brooks

PART I

64. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

65. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Emma Webster declared an interest in Agenda Item 9, and reported that, as her interest was personal and prejudicial, she would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter.

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 9, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

66. Actions from previous Minutes

The Commission received an update on actions following the previous meeting (Agenda Item 4).

It was noted that all monies from the 16 Section 106 accounts which dated back to Berkshire County Council had been spent in their entirety. This information was originally requested by the Resource Management Select Committee. One question remained to be clarified and this would be reported directly to the Select Committee.

The briefing note clarifying the nationally accepted performance level of 35% for upheld planning appeals was noted.

The first meeting of the Performance Management Task Group was due to be held on 16 September 2010.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

67. Items Called-in following the Executive on 2 September 2010

No items were called-in following the last Executive meeting.

68. Councillor Call for Action

No new Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) items were raised for discussion.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

69. Council Plan Outcomes 2010/11 - Quarter 1 Performance Update

The Commission considered the quarter 1 Council Plan outcomes performance report (Agenda Item 7).

Jason Teal advised that of the 110 indicators, 19 were annual indicators and therefore had not been reported. Of the remaining 91 indicators, 82% were reported as green with the remaining 18% reported as amber. Activities were in hand to manage issues relating to the amber indicators.

A concern was raised by Members that a similar position was reported a year ago, but there was a deterioration by year end with a number of indicators being reported as red. It was therefore suggested that greater effort be made to avoid the situation in this financial year, with a particular focus on the amber indicators.

Members queried why some indicators had been reported as no longer valid. Jason Teal explained that in many instances this was due to in-year savings needing to be found following in-year Government budget cuts.

Some of these were national indicators that had not been removed from the national dataset and there was therefore still a need to report on them. There had however been agreement by the Executive that, due to the scale of the cuts, these should be reported as no longer valid and separated from any reds that might be reported for other than financial reasons and where actions could be taken to rectify them.

The Performance Management Task Group was asked to give consideration to this matter as part of their review.

RESOLVED that the quarter 1 performance report would be noted and that the Performance Management Task Group would give consideration to those indicators reported as no longer valid.

70. Greener Select Committee

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 8) on the work of the Greener Select Committee.

Councillor Emma Webster advised that the review of local food was concluded at the last meeting on 7 September 2010. A report, including recommendations, would be presented at the next Commission meeting for approval.

The next piece of work was to review the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and terms of reference would be drafted for the Commission's approval.

RESOLVED that the report would be noted.

71. Healthier Select Committee

(Councillor Emma Webster declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda item 9 by virtue of the fact that her employer was conducting the public relations work for the Underwood Road development. As her interest was personal and prejudicial she left the meeting at 6.50pm and took no part in the debate or voting on the matter).

(Councillor David Rendel declared a personal interest in Agenda item 9 by virtue of the fact that his wife was a GP in West Berkshire. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 9) on the work of the Healthier Select Committee.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

Councillor Geoff Findlay updated the Commission following the meeting held on 9 September 2010 where the proposal that NHS Berkshire West did not replace the GP surgery in Underwood Road, when/if development work was completed, was discussed as part of the consultation process.

This view had been taken by NHS Berkshire West as the surgery was not able to provide a full range of services and was expensive to run.

There was some sympathy among Members that residents would need to attend another surgery, but the need of NHS Berkshire West to utilise their resources was understood and the Select Committee supported the view to not replace the Underwood Road surgery.

Separately, the Committee's next review was to consider the issue of bed blocking at the Royal Berkshire Hospital and West Berkshire Community Hospital.

RESOLVED that the report would be noted.

72. Resource Management Select Committee

(Councillor Emma Webster rejoined the meeting at 6.55pm).

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 10) on the work of the Resource Management Select Committee.

Councillor David Rendel advised of the discussions held at the Select Committee meeting on 13 September 2010:

- Concern was raised regarding the lack of involvement from the Procurement team on contracts valued at under £10k.
- Feedback was provided from Heads of Service who had been involved in Timelord and generally they were content with how this had progressed. There were some concerns, including desk size and privacy when making confidential telephone calls, but the Select Committee was advised that efforts were being made to address these where possible.
- The risk assessment tool to help manage the stress of employees was supported.
- The timeliness with which the Select Committee could receive budget reports was again discussed and it was resolved that the Head of Finance would circulate some suggested dates.
- There was some concern that potentially vital feedback was lost as a result of the low uptake of exit interviews. The Select Committee requested that efforts were made to increase the level of response.

There was a view among Members of the Commission that even though departing employees had the opportunity to comment they might not wish to and anonymised feedback was a suggested alternative.

Nick Carter repeated the view given by the Head of Human Resources on this issue that retention rates were good and turnover was low and indicators suggested that the majority of staff were content to work for the Council. Therefore feedback from exit interviews was not seen as a priority at this time. Any issues raised within service areas were being addressed directly.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

73. **Safer Select Committee**

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 11) on the work of the Safer Select Committee.

Councillor Quentin Webb advised that the fire sprinklers report would hopefully be agreed at the Select Committee's meeting of 20 September 2010, with a likely recommendation being that a policy should be in place for sprinklers in new Council buildings. The Commission asked that information on costs and maintenance be included in the report.

The recommendations produced following the improving public confidence review had been approved by the Executive with some minor amendments.

Work on crime statistics was due to commence at the next meeting.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

74. **Stronger Communities Select Committee**

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 12) on the work of the Stronger Communities Select Committee.

Councillor Irene Neill advised that the first meeting of the Housing Register Task Group had to be postponed and a new date was being arranged. Councillor Tony Vickers, as the Shadow Portfolio Holder for Housing, asked to have the meeting paperwork circulated to him.

The next full meeting of the Select Committee on 21 October 2010 would hopefully consider a report from the task group, as well as to conduct a review of progress with the Playbuilder Programme and to receive a report from the supporting small schools Officer group.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

75. **West Berkshire Forward Plan - September - December 2010**

The Commission considered the West Berkshire Forward Plan (Agenda Item 13) for the period covering September to December 2010.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan would be noted.

76. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and Select Committee Work Programme**

The Commission considered the work programme of the Commission and Select Committees for 2010/11 (Agenda Item 14).

Councillor Brian Bedwell reminded Members to bring any issues to the Commission's attention so attempts could be made to resolve them.

Councillor Bedwell also informed Members that the recommendations produced following the scrutiny review into the severe winter weather of 2009/10 had been accepted in their entirety by the Executive.

It was advised that parish councils had been pleased with the opportunity to maintain their own grit bins and deciding on their locations. The bins were still to be provided by West Berkshire Council.

Members asked if the issue of whether legal action could be taken against members of the public who had cleared, for example, their own footway had been resolved. Nick Carter was aware of a report that contained information on this issue and he agreed to

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 14 SEPTEMBER 2010 -
MINUTES**

forward this to the Commission. Stephen Chard also agreed to discuss this with the Civil Contingencies Manager.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) The work programme would be noted.
- (2) Actions relating to the severe weather review would be followed up.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 7.25pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

Title of Report:	Scrutiny review into the Council's Performance Management Framework
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To outline to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission the draft recommendations arising from a task group review into the operation of the Council's Performance Management Framework.

Recommended Action: To agree the recommendations for the consideration of the Executive.

Task Group Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Irene Neill
Tel. No.:	0118 971 2671
E-mail Address:	ineill@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	David Lowe
Job Title:	Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519817
E-mail Address:	dlowe@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Following a number of developments in the management of performance, nationally and locally, the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) agreed to establish a task group to conduct a review into the operation of the Council's Performance Management Framework.
- 1.2 This report provides the Terms of Reference for the review, sets out how it was conducted and the rationale for undertaking the work. It then outlines the review's findings and the resultant recommendations.

2. Terms of Reference

- 2.1 The Terms of Reference that the task group agreed were to conduct a review into the operation of the Council's Performance Management Framework, and in particular:
- (1) To examine the current operation of the framework and identify ways to make a closer link between the Council Plan and Service Plans;
 - (2) To consider ways in which the Council can meet the agenda for greater openness and transparency in the public sector;
 - (3) To assess Scrutiny's role in monitoring progress at an operational and strategic level; and;
 - (4) Report to the OSMC with draft recommendations for onward submission to the Executive.

3. Membership

- 3.1 The Members of the cross-party working group were Councillors Gwen Mason, Irene Neill and Quentin Webb. Councillor Neill was elected as the Chairman.

4. Review methodology

- 4.1 The review was conducted by a small, cross-party task group, working with officers from the Policy and Communication Service.
- 4.2 The task group held the meetings outlined in the table below.

Srl	Meeting date	Meeting focus
01	Thursday 16 September 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreement of Terms of Reference• Initial fact finding and background brief• Agreement of review approach
02	Thursday 30 September 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council Plan, Service Plan and budget setting processes• Measures and key activities• Public scrutiny
03	Tuesday 5 October 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identification of findings• Initial formulation of recommendations

4.3 The minutes from the meetings of 16 and 30 September are shown at Appendices A and B.

5. Background and context

5.1 The speed and scale with which the new coalition government is reshaping the delivery of local public services – and the systems which support them – is unprecedented.

5.2 One example of this is the national performance framework which is being fundamentally remoulded. The overarching external assessment of public sector working generally in an area, along with specific assessments of individual organisations (CAA), has been abolished, and a number of further national indicators have been deleted, or their collation postponed.

5.3 No firm guidance or indication has been provided as yet as to whether or how comparable independent assessments of councils' or public agencies' performance will be made.

5.4 However, the tone of ministers' discourse at present points to a clear expectation that – in support of the government's localism and transparency agendas – councils need to be actively considering more robustly how they report on how well they are doing to the local communities.

5.5 This is happening at a time when West Berkshire Council's 4 year corporate strategy is coming to an end. As such, the council is now starting on the process of thinking about how to define its role in this landscape of reduced public funding and how it will deliver its responsibilities and achieve its ambitions over the coming 4 years.

5.6 The OSMC has previously expressed concern as to the length of the Executive Cycle and the consequent timeliness with which they are able to review quarterly performance update reports. With it not being possible to bring forward the release of the quarterly performance reports to allow Elected Members to scrutinise individual areas of performance, the review allowed an opportunity to consider the value in the OSMC looking more comprehensively at the council's progress in achieving its aims and objectives overall.

6. Findings of the review

6.1 The Task Groups findings are outlined below.

- (1) The Council Plan, which sets the strategic direction for all the authority's activity, has a life span of 4 years. The current version covers the period 2007 – 2011 and following its initial production has been updated or, colloquially, 'refreshed' annually.
- (2) The content of the Council Plan is structured into 16 themes, of which 3 are designated as priorities, each containing a number of aims that are then supported by a number of key measures and activities. Whilst within the current version of the Plan there are 119 specific measures and key activities against which performance is reported quarterly, it is not clear that in all cases the measures or activities accurately relate to the stated aims.

- (3) The relevance of the measures set within the Council Plan are not routinely subject to challenge, although the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Commission has in previous years examined the setting of the targets, nor are they consistent across annual updates. Consequently the measurement of any particular aim, articulated in one year may not be consistently recorded in the subsequent years. Combined, these weaknesses make tracking of progress over the full period of the Council Plan's existence and comparison between years difficult.
- (4) The project plan to manage the update of the existing Council Plan or the production of a new document is generally well structured and allows for the involvement of senior officers and Executive Members. The process is closely monitored and allows for the production of the finished article in a timely manner to meet the requirement for the key work programme to be approved by the Executive in March annually. There is scope however for the earlier explicit involvement of Executive Members, particularly when drafting and agreeing key measures and activities in the upcoming year's plan.
- (5) Commendably, activities to support delivery of the objectives and measures are, with only one exception, articulated in 'Service Plans' produced annually by Heads of Service. The process for the production of Service Plans tends to be more fluid than that for the Council Plan and output is not generally as closely monitored, although key measures and activities are captured and reported quarterly to Corporate Board. There is no explicit link between the two activities which could create a risk of more measures that are articulated in the Council Plan not being translated into intended actions in Service Plans.
- (6) The operation of a 'golden thread' principle, the process through which the Council's aims and objectives are achieved by actions taken by operational delivery, continues down to team plans and through the annual performance appraisal regime for individual members of staff. However as this was out of scope of the review the application in practice was not examined.
- (7) The Council's annual budget setting process operates independently of and slightly ahead of the Council Plan development or refresh. Closer integration between the two activities would appear to offer the opportunity to ensure that priorities and financial resources are appropriately matched.
- (8) Performance across the authority against Council Plan measures is provided quarterly to the Performance Team in the Policy and Communication Service and then reported to Corporate Board within 1 month of closure of the reporting period. The report then continues to Management Board and thence into the public domain when considered by the Executive. From the time that the reporting period closes to consideration of the data by the Executive can take anything up to 2 months.

- (9) The practice of examination of quarterly performance in public is not usual in local government however the transparency that it provides to the residents of the District is welcomed.
- (10) Following examination by the Executive, the report is then considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC). As a considerable time has by this time usually elapsed (there have been instances when the OSMC has still to consider performance reported at the end of one period when the next has already closed) there has been and continues to be a well documented and valid concern over the value added by the OSMC activity. There is scope for a revision of the role, purpose and value of the OSMC's involvement in scrutinising performance.
- (11) The national agenda for monitoring the performance of councils has moved from one based on inspection by regulators to the holding to account by the public. The Council has historically taken a very open and transparent approach to performance management however it is not clear if what is currently being provided is actually useful or meaningful to the public.

7. Suggested actions for the Executive

7.1 The suggested actions (recommendations) for the Executive are outlined below.

- (1) The Performance, Research and Consultation Manager should critically review the number and relevance of measures in place to evaluate progress against the aims of the Council Plan. Measures should be meaningful and appropriately SMART (Specific, Measurable, Agreed, Realistic and Timebound).
- (2) In order to ensure the appropriate shaping, involvement and ownership of the Council Plan, the Performance, Research and Consultation Manager should ensure that the Plan's production plan timeline explicitly includes Executive Members at an early stage.
- (3) In developing the project plan for the production of the Council Plan and in carrying out its annual updates, the Performance, Research and Consultation Manager should ensure that opportunity is given to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for objective challenge of the relevance of any measures and targets set within it, prior to the Plan's final approval.
- (4) To enable the measurement of progress over time and comparison between years, the Chief Executive should ensure where possible that measures included in the Council Plan are consistent between annual updates.
- (5) Working with the Chief Accountant, the Performance, Research and Consultation Manager should articulate and establish an integrated budget setting and priority identification (Council Plan) process.
- (6) The Corporate Director – Environment, as the Chairman of the Excellent Performance Management Group, should strengthen the

links between the processes for the development of the Council Plan and Service Plans. The objective should be to ensure that actions to achieve the aims of the former are appropriately identified and resourced in the latter.

- (7) The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission should move the focus of the Commission's activity for performance management from the review of performance at the closure of the reporting period to the assessment of the impact of any measures taken to address indicators reported as red or amber. This re-positioning should also allow a forward look at anticipated performance.
- (8) The Performance, Research and Consultation Manager should continue the principle of presenting quarterly performance information into the public domain at the same frequency as present. The precise content of what is reported will be dependent on the future structure of the Council Plan and should be informed by national and pan-local government guidance and best practice.

8. Recommendation for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

- 8.1 It is recommended that the Members of the Commission agree the suggestions outlined in section 7 for the Executive's consideration.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the task group meeting of 16 September 2010

Appendix B – Minutes of the task group meeting of 30 September 2010

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION TASK GROUP

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

MINUTES

16 September 2010

Present: Councillor Irene Neill (Chairman), Councillor Gwen Mason, Councillor Quentin Webb, Jason Teal (Performance, Research and Consultation Manager), David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer)

Apologies: None

1. Election of Chairman

Councillor Irene Neill was nominated and elected as Chairman of the Task Group.

2. Agreement of the Terms of Reference

The Task Group agreed that the Terms of Reference should be slightly amended, as follows:

- (1) To look at the current framework, which was to be reviewed as part of the Council Plan refresh, and identify ways to make a closer link between the Council Plan and Service Plans.
- (2) To consider ways to meet the agenda for greater openness and transparency. WBC already published quarterly performance reports, which was not the case elsewhere, but there was still a need to look at the usefulness of the information provided so it made sense to people in the community.
- (3) To assess Scrutiny's role in monitoring progress at an operational and strategic level.

3. Background briefing

Jason Teal opened this item by making the following points about the purpose of performance monitoring:

- Knowing what we are trying to achieve
- Achieving it effectively
- Knowing that we are achieving it effectively, and
- Looking at how we might do it better

The number of National Indicators (NIs) had reduced over time to 150. This was

likely to reduce further. An important difference between the old Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPs) and the NIs was the increased focus on outcomes, including perception, although this was harder to measure. Whilst this was also the aim of the new Government, many indicators had been removed.

It was likely that the Government would retain a core dataset so that performance could be compared between local authorities, although this was yet to be confirmed.

34 NIs had been identified by Heads of Service to be included in the LAA, with accompanying action. In addition, other NIs and some locally set indicators were included in the Council Plan giving a total of 45 targeted indicators that were directly in the sphere of the Council's activity. Performance was still monitored on the remaining NIs.

The Council Plan had a total of 16 themes, each theme had a number of aims, objectives and measures and these measures and the resulting activity should be captured within service plans. Activity relating to themes should ideally continue down to team plans and to individuals. However there were some disconnects between the Council Plan and service plans, and the process described generally started at service plan rather than Council Plan level.

Service areas reported operational performance back up to their Directorates and performance on Council Plan measures was reported to the Executive via the Performance team.

Work had commenced with the Executive to set aims, objectives and measures for the coming year. They would be based on either national or local requirements and should then be included in service plans to help inform actual activity.

Funding availability was often considered separately and in advance of setting measures. This could limit activity and influence measures.

WBC identified and fed priorities etc to the West Berkshire Partnership.

4. Methodology for the review

The Task Group discussed how it should conduct its work and a number of suggestions were made as follows:

- The cohesion between Council and service plans needed to be improved across the policy framework, this included where strategic and operational measures were captured and how service plan activity was reported and linked to the Council Plan. Looking at a sample of service plans was a suggested approach to this, both those that had activities that were, in the main, under the Council's control and those that had more external input.
- Examining whether the current focus and structure was correct. Potentially looking at themes and their aims for 2010/11 to support this.
- Some analysis of red and amber indicators reported at year end could help

to identify some disconnects and help the task group's considerations.

There was agreement that Officers would put together a methodology and documentation for the review based on the points raised and present this at the next meeting.

5. Future meeting dates

Thursday 30 September, 2-4pm, Members Boardroom

Tuesday 5 October, 4-6pm, Members Boardroom

Members agreed to give consideration to what information would be of benefit and interest to members of the public.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION TASK GROUP

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

MINUTES

30 September 2010

Present: Councillor Irene Neill (Chairman), Councillor Gwen Mason, Councillor Quentin Webb, Jason Teal (Performance, Research and Consultation Manager), David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer)

Apologies: None

6. Minutes of 16 September and matters arising

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2010 were approved as a true and correct record.

7. Reporting timeframes

The purpose of the item was to understand the correlation between the separate processes of agreeing the Council Plan and budget timetables. The key milestones for the Council Plan process were as follows:

- November - detailed work was conducted by theme leads (generally a Head of Service) to review their respective themes.
- December - the Excellent Performance Management Group (EPMG) undertook an exercise to assess how SMART (Specific, Measurable, Agreed, Realistic, Time-bound) the performance indicators (PIs) were.
- January –approval of Portfolio Holders and Directorate Senior Management Teams (SMTs). Indicative targets would be provided at this stage but would not be finalised until year end outturns were available in May.
- March – formal approval by Executive.
- May – targets finally approved based on year end outturns.

The involvement of Portfolio Holders was discussed. There was some assumption that they would be kept informed, at the very least via regular briefing meetings. Members felt that Portfolio Holders should be involved at an early stage (certainly from November) to raise awareness and encourage greater ownership.

The EPMG did not participate in the formation of Service Plans due to the number involved. It was therefore down to respective performance managers to assess their own measures, which were finally approved by the Corporate Director and Portfolio Holder in May/June. This should ideally follow the approval of Council Plan targets and the budget. Members felt there was some scope to investigate whether the timeframe and process for service plans could be more robust and

more closely aligned with the Council Plan.

The linkages to the budget were then discussed and what the driver should be for the process. I.e. the setting of priorities/targets or the budget. The key milestones for the approval of the Council's budget for 2011/12 were as follows:

- December – indicative budgets with Heads of Service.
- February – approval of the Council's budget.

A comparison of the dates suggested to Members that the setting of the budget came first, although preparation work was conducted well advance of the above dates. However, it was difficult to determine whether the budget should drive the Council Plan's priorities or vice versa. The way in which the budget was set was a consideration as part of this, i.e. was it set based on historical allocations or on priorities. Members referred to recent budget discussions which were required as a result of in-year government cuts. The Council's priorities focussed these discussions.

Jason Teal advised that these discussions had yet to have any bearing on the formation of the new Corporate Strategy. This was proposed to be amended to include priorities only, rather than detailing a wide range of Council activity. At this stage in the process, seven aims/objectives had been proposed to Members and feedback was awaited.

Consideration was then given as to whether it was Members or Officers who led the process of agreeing Council Plan aims and targets. Members were felt to be closely involved with the original setting of Council Plan Themes, but less so when the aims and targets were annually refreshed. This should be improved upon.

It was noted that this year's process was about forming the new Corporate Strategy and therefore went wider than an annual refresh.

8. Council Plan aims against measures/key activities

The task group went through some of 2010/11 Council Plan aims and the indicators/measures in place to try and achieve them.

There was a need to ensure that the aims were correct and following that the measures to achieve them. This was the exercise undertaken by the performance managers on EPMG.

It was noted that some aims were very difficult to measure. However, they could still remain as an aim of the Council and efforts to achieve them undertaken via a specific activity or project with milestones attached. Members felt there was a need to record the activities and measures in more detail than was currently the case in the Council Plan. This was captured in service plans.

Monitoring of the PIs was undertaken by scrutiny on a quarterly basis to assess whether aims were being achieved. However, the PIs did not always line up with the aims and therefore this report did not necessarily capture the Corporate Strategy. The quarterly report was the publicly available document, but it was felt that the additional detail contained in service plans would make more sense to the

public.

Members were of the view that there were some disconnects between the aims and the measures to achieve them. This thread needed to be clearly established.

The influence that various inspection regimes had on the Council Plan was queried. Jason Teal advised that comments from inspectors related to whether the document was fit for purpose and whether the achievement of aims were adequately evidenced, rather than on actual content.

9. Council Plan aims against Service Unit Plans

This paper detailed that, in all but one instance, Council Plan aims were explicitly referenced in one or more service plans.

Members were pleased to note this was the case and raised the importance of this continuing in future.

There was also agreement with the recommendation in the report that the one remaining aim should be captured in relevant service plans.

10. Publicly available performance information/information to OSMC

The format and content of publicly available performance reports needed to be considered in line with a requirement for greater openness and transparency, without allowing this to affect the robustness of the target setting process. Frequency of reporting was another factor for consideration.

The task group felt that information made available to the public should demonstrate actual activity to make it more meaningful. However, this could make for an overly long document.

There was a need to establish how scrutiny could add value and the following was suggested:

- In assessing the extent to which targets were appropriately set, the OSMC could identify by how much an indicator had previously been achieved to help understand whether the target was sufficiently challenging. This should form part of an activity to assess whether the Council's aims, targets etc were fit for purpose for the coming year.
- There should be a focus on resolving issues raised by performance monitoring. However, performance reports could not be presented to the OSMC until they had been made public at the Executive. This time delay meant the OSMC could have little influence in helping to address issues at such a late stage, when remedial action was already in place. OSMC Members already had the opportunity to raise any points at this stage at the Executive.

Jason Teal explained that the performance report was actually produced within a very short timescale, reaching Corporate Board within a month of the end of the

previous quarter. This was when issues began to be identified and ways to resolve them discussed. This also gave an opportunity for issues to be raised with Portfolio Holders.

There was a view among Members that for scrutiny to add value to the process and help resolve issues, they should be involved at this earlier stage. A detailed explanation should be provided to the OSMC of the reasons why an indicator was reported red, with the relevant Officer and Portfolio Holder in attendance to discuss ways to improve performance.

11. Future meeting dates and activity

Tuesday 5 October, 4-6pm, Members Boardroom

It was agreed that draft findings would be presented at the next meeting based on the discussions held. This would help to inform any recommendations for the OSMC's consideration.

It was also agreed that clarity should be included in the final report on the actual number of targets owned by the Council, as opposed to nationally set indicators and those within the control of partner organisations. This would show that there was only discretion in removing some of the indicators and this would depend on whether they still contributed to meeting the Council's aims.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10.

Title of Report:	Use of Local Resources – Local Food
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010
Forward Plan Ref:	N/A

Purpose of Report: For the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to consider the recommendations of the Greener Select Commission review into promoting local food.

Recommended Action: That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission recommends the finding of the review into local food be considered by West Berkshire Council's Executive.

Greener Select Committee Chairman Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
Name:	David Cook
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer
Tel. No.:	01635 519475
E-mail Address:	dcook@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Greener Select Committee on 8 December 2009 it was resolved that the Committee would start its review of the use of local resources and that they would initially be concentrating on the use of local food.
- 1.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission agreed the terms of reference for this review at its meeting on 1st December 2009. It was proposed that the Committee would examine the work being proposed by the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in promoting the use of local food.
- 1.3 The Greener Select Committee agreed to conduct the review initially looking at:
- Identifying the work being undertaken by the LSP;
 - Identifying the LSP performance measures and assess meeting these targets;
 - Understanding the barriers to meeting the LSP targets;
 - To look at ways of overcoming barriers to performance; and
 - Report to the Portfolio Holder and the West Berkshire Partnership with recommendations how West Berkshire Council can encourage the use of local resources.
- 1.4 The review would be undertaken during 2010 with evidence being presented to the Greener Select Committee with draft findings being presented at the Select Committee on 14 December 2010 prior to being considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission.

2. West Berkshire Local Strategic Partnership's (LSP) Greener Sub-Partnership

- 2.1 The Committee considered a presentation concerning the work of the West Berkshire Partnership's Greener Partnership in relation to their work promoting local food.
- 2.2 Kelvin Hughes, Chief Executive Newbury Community Resource Centre, informed Members that the West Berkshire Local Strategic Partnership's (LSP) Greener Sub-Partnership had been tasked within The Sustainable Community Strategy ([A Breath of Fresh Air](#)) with a priority outcome to have five percent of all the food consumed within West Berkshire grown within the district.
- 2.3 In order to reach the five percent target by 2026 the current levels of production and consumption needed to be established. The methodology for establishing this baseline figure needed to be replicated in future years without costly specialist input.
- 2.4 In order to meet the LSP target four actions had been established; secure funding from the National Lottery, establish the baseline figure, enlist the support of three organisations as local 'champions' and deliver a publicity campaign to promote the

purchase of local produce. Funding had been secured for the last two objectives; however this could not be used for establishing the baseline figure.

2.5 Reading University were able to undertake this piece of work at a cost of £10,000. £2,500 towards the cost had been secured; however the remaining £7,500 had not been found.

2.6 Recommend that the Council's Corporate Director for Environment secure funding to enable the LSP's Greener sub-partnership establish current level of local food consumption as long as an affordable methodology is in place to undertake future surveys.

2.7 Following the above recommendation made by the Greener Select Committee further work was undertaken with the LSP Greener Sub-Committee, it was recommended that the cost of the base survey be scaled back to a more affordable option. The funding has since been secured from West Berkshire Council and the Atomic Weapons Establishment.

3. The Organic Research Centre

3.1 The Committee considered evidence from Nic Lampkin, Executive Director Organic Research Centre (Elm Farm) and Lawrence Woodward, Co-Director Organic Research Centre (Elm Farm).

3.2 The Organic Research Centre's, aim was to develop and support sustainable land-use, agriculture and food systems, primarily within local economies, which build on organic principles to ensure the health and well-being of soil, plants, animals, people and the environment.

3.3 The Organic Research Centre was established as a "Centre of Excellence" to address the major issues raised by a global economy based on an intensive agricultural system.

3.4 It was the UK's leading research, development and advisory institution for organic agriculture, having played a pivotal role in the development of organic research, policy and standards since 1980.

3.5 The Committee were informed that the Organic Research Centre supported the views raised by Kelvin Hughes regarding the work being undertaken by the Local Strategic Partnership's Greener Sub-Partnership.

3.6 Members were informed that local production was important to assist local economic development by targeting spend on local communities, to help reduce energy used and greenhouse gas emitted by reducing food miles and improving food quality through improved freshness.

3.7 It was felt that people needed to question what quality standards were guaranteed, how energy or carbon efficient the production and transport of the food was, did buying from a local business ensure local production and was local trade necessarily fair and ethical?

3.8 To make sure local production did make a real contribution to sustainability local food should meet environmental standards, meet food quality standards, meet animal welfare standards and be aware of social standards such as Fair Trade.

- 3.9 The sustainable benefit of organic food was recognised across Europe and by Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. The benefits included reduced energy consumption, increased biodiversity, reduced pollution, high animal welfare standards, increased evidence of food quality benefits and positive social impacts such as increased employment.
- 3.10 Recommended that Council via its Corporate Director for Environment voice its support to national initiatives for clear food labelling and standards.
- 3.11 With regards to organic food the committee were informed that organic farms aimed to improve the quality and sustainability of food production that operated to standards that addressed environmental and animal welfare issues. As the term 'organic food' was legally defined and regulated its standards should be more reliable than food labelled as local without any quality assurance.
- 3.12 The committee were also informed that organic food need not be significantly more expensive and the additional costs were usually associated with supermarkets artificially increasing the cost. It was important to challenge the myth that healthy eating has to cost more.
- 3.13 Recommended that the Council via its Corporate Director for Environment works with the Local Strategic Partnership in the promotion of the benefits of locally produced food and promote healthy eating on low incomes.
- 3.14 Members were informed that the Organic Research Centre could help by providing advice on local food issues, advice on standards and regulations, support school education activities and be an active partner with the Local Strategic Partnership. The research centre had also recently opened its conference centre and was keen to work on joint initiatives with the Nature Discovery Centre.
- 3.15 Recommended that the Council via its Corporate Director for Environment works with the Local Strategic Partnership's Greener Sub-Committee, the Nature Discovery Centre and the Organic Research Centre to ascertain what joint initiatives could be undertaken to promote, educate and encourage a greater use of local food and healthy eating.

4. Local Food Groups and Farmers Markets

- 4.1 Tamara Schiopu attended the meeting to inform the work of the Local Food Group and to answer any questions pertinent to the committees review.
- 4.2 The committee were informed that the term 'local' could be very wide or narrow in its definition. As the Local Food Group covered three counties they classed local food as food produced in these counties, they did not wish to introduce barriers to collective working.
- 4.3 Members were informed that there used to be three separate food groups, in 2004 they were merged with the aid of funding from the South East England Development Agency.
- 4.4 This funding ceased on 31 March 2010 and the group were looking for additional support. Since the group were created they had become a support network for local producers and worked at introducing local suppliers to local businesses.

- 4.5 'Meet the buyer' events were held and they also published Local Flavours that promoted locally produced food and drink. If funding could be found they would like to introduce local food walks and a food and drink trade show in West Berkshire.
- 4.6 Recommended that the Council's Economic Development Officer liaise with the Berkshire Food Group to ascertain what funding streams may be available to support the food group and how the Council may be able to promote the organisations work.
- 4.7 Alexander Farrow, Thames Valley Market Co-Operative, informed the committee that the co-operative were a 'not-for-profit' organisation that promoted fresh, seasonal, local food.
- 4.8 Most produce for the Newbury Farmers Market were produced within 30 miles, however they had to be flexible, for example the fish came from Southsea. The idea was to be more local rather than totally local. Farmers markets could be useful as local food hubs and local restaurants have been asked to cook at local markets.
- 4.9 As markets were not always weekly it was difficult to get people to visit them as part of their shopping routine. The Council could help farmers markets by improving signage to make people aware when they were in town.
- 4.10 Recommended that the Council's Head of Highways and Transport and Head of Cultural Services consult with Newbury's Chartered Market and the Farmers Market to discuss possible improvements to road signage advertising the markets and promoting local markets via 'Visit Newbury'.

5. Procurement of Local Food

- 5.1 Leigh Hogan, Team Leader, Legal and Electoral Services and Mike Sullivan, Contracts and Procurement Officer, gave evidence on the Council's procurement process.
- 5.2 Members were informed that under the Council's Contract Rules of Procedure and The Public Contracts Regulations 2006, the authority was not allowed to discriminate when awarding contracts. This meant that they could not offer a contract to a supplier on the grounds of their locality.
- 5.3 The Council did not procure food directly; however there were contracts to supply meals to schools and Council owned care homes. When setting these contracts the authority was able to insert a clause that the contractor would explore the use of local businesses. This was not always possible as consideration to the producers' ability to produce the right quality and quantity was more important than locality.
- 5.4 The Committee felt that although the Council did not procure food directly it was important to encourage contractors to look at using local produce as sustainable food helped:
- Promote good health.
 - Improve access to healthy food.
 - Helps support the local economy.
 - Promotes eating food in season.

- Encourage sustainable farming, involving high environmental standards and reduced energy consumption (food miles).

5.5 Recommended that the Council via the Head of Legal and Electoral Services support sustainable food production provide nutritionally balanced meals in schools, workplace and community facilities by introducing a Sustainable Procurement Impact Assessment integrated within the procurement process, that considered locality as part of this process.

6. Allotments

6.1 Representatives from Newbury Town Council attended the Greener Select Committee to provide information on Newbury Town Council's work in supporting local allotments.

6.2 The Select Committee were informed that Newbury Town Council were undertaking a project called Sustainable Newbury that contained projects looking at local food production. The Town Council was also responsible for managing a number of allotments.

6.3 The Town Council had produced an allotment strategy and were committed to promoting healthy living through the development and management of six allotment sites in Newbury.

6.4 The Greener Select Committee were informed that not all surrounding parish councils provided allotments and they felt it would be helpful if West Berkshire District Council could provide guidance on how parish / town councils could establish allotments.

6.5 Recommended that the Council's Corporate Director for Environment publish, on its website, information to help parish / town councils establish allotments.

6.6 Recommended that a 'Meet the Expert' event be organised by the Head of Policy and Communication to provide information for parish / town councillors on establishing and running allotments.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Title of Report:	Scrutiny review into the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 nd November 2010

Purpose of Report: To outline the results of the investigation into the need for a policy for the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.

Recommended Action: That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission endorses the recommendations for the consideration of the Executive.

Task Group Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Quentin Webb – Tel (01635) 202646
E-mail Address:	qwebb@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Elaine Walker
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity)
Tel. No.:	01635 519441
E-mail Address:	ewalker@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

1.1 In January 2010 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission received a suggested topic for a scrutiny review to discuss whether a policy is needed for the installation of automatic fire suppression systems (fire sprinklers) in Council buildings. The Commission approved the topic for the Safer Select Committee to carry out.

2. Terms of Reference

2.1 The terms of reference were to review the Council's current approach to the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings and to consider whether implementation of a policy to prescribe activity would be beneficial. The review would include investigation of the costs associated with installation, and national advice and practice.

2.2 Advice would be sought from the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service and Council officers in order to inform the review.

3. Background and context

3.1 On 1 March 2007 the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) announced the new policy on sprinklers and their value as a measure against the risk of fire and arson. All new schools would be expected to have automatic fire suppression systems installed except in a few low risk schools. The DCSF expects a risk analysis to always be carried out and new schools being planned that score medium or high risk using the risk analysis tool would have sprinklers fitted.

3.2 Currently, West Berkshire Council undertakes a fire risk assessment on school projects to establish the need to install automatic fire suppression systems. There is no current policy for other Council buildings.

3.3 The fire service encourages the installation of automatic fire suppression systems on the basis that they can detect and extinguish fire, protecting both occupants and property.

3.4 Fire sprinkler systems should be seen in the context of other available fire protection measures.

4. Methodology

4.1 The review was conducted by the Safer Select Committee working with Council officers and representatives of the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service and Authority.

4.2 The Committee held meetings as outlined below:

Meeting date	Meeting focus
6 th April 2010	Agreement of review subject and scope. Information received regarding:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background information explaining the purpose of the review; ▪ Fire Service video viewed.
5 th July 2010	<p>Information received regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current practices • Financial implications • National guidance <p>Consideration of recommendations.</p>
20 th September 2010	Agreement of final recommendations.

4.3 The minutes of each meeting are shown at Appendices A to C respectively.

4.4 A report drafted by West Berkshire Council's Property Development Manager is shown at appendix D.

4.5 The Committee additionally visited two local sites (the Kennet Centre and Sainsbury's supermarket) to view the visible components of an installed automatic fire suppression system in particular the water storage and pumping facilities required.

5. Acknowledgements and thanks

5.1 The Chairman and Members of the Committee would like to acknowledge and thank all those who supported and gave evidence to the review.

6. Findings

6.1 The findings of the task group are outlined below.

Benefits

- a. The role of automatic fire suppression systems in extinguishing a fire was demonstrated to the Committee to be extremely effective in saving both lives and property. A London review of the effectiveness of fire sprinkler systems demonstrated that:
 - (a) 84% of fires were contained or extinguished by sprinklers;
 - (b) Where sprinklers were unsuccessful, this was due to water supply failure, insufficient heat to activate the sprinklers, or fires in unsprinklered areas;
 - (c) In five cases, the sprinklers failed to activate.
- b. Where automatic fire suppression systems are installed, and this decision is taken prior to the building being designed, more freedom is afforded to the design options for the building. For example larger room sizes may be considered, and regulations around exit routes from the building are relaxed.

Risks

- c. It was agreed that automatic fire suppression systems would be particularly beneficial in residential care homes where it is likely that residents would be less able to be evacuated quickly, and so sprinkler systems could play a key role in saving lives as well as property. Schools, in contrast, have effective fire procedures to evacuate pupils so the greatest risk would be to property and continuity of education.
- d. West Berkshire is a low risk area for fires, with just three significant fires in the last seven years.

Costs

- e. There isn't expected to be any financial benefit through a reduction in insurance premiums. The Council has a low premium already, which is offset by a high excess. However the Committee are aware of significant savings achieved by other local authorities.
- f. The cost of installing automatic fire suppression systems varies significantly from project to project and may be anywhere between 2.3% and 15% of the project cost. This is dependent on a number of factors including:
 - (a) The size of the project
 - (b) Local requirements (for example, whether sprinklers can be fed from mains supply or whether water storage is required)
 - (c) Planning constraints (for example where water storage needs to be located)
- g. The maintenance costs for fire sprinkler systems also vary from project to project, and may cost between £500 and £5000 per annum, however good maintenance would enable the system to achieve a life span of up to 50 years.
- h. The Committee rejected the possibility of considering retrofitting automatic fire suppression systems in existing buildings due to the extreme disruption and anticipated significant cost. However if significant refurbishment was taking place then the installation of automatic fire suppression systems should be considered.

7. Conclusions

7.1 The Committee agreed that the benefits of an automatic fire suppression system outweighed other fire detection and suppression systems in the preservation of life and property, and the reduction in disruption after a fire.

7.2 However the Committee acknowledged that the cost of installation is significant and, whilst it should be the presumed course of action, it must also be viewed in conjunction with the risk and effect of a fire occurring.

7.3 The Committee further recognised the example that the Council could set to developers by installing automatic fire suppression systems, and the opportunity that may arise to encourage others to follow the same course of action.

8. Recommendations

8.1 The Select Committee recommends that:

- a. The Head of Property and Public Protection develop a policy in relation to the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in all new buildings and buildings undergoing major refurbishment within the Council's property portfolio.
- b. The basis of establishing the need to install automatic fire suppression systems is to be a fire risk assessment, the same or similar to that currently used for school projects. The risk assessment process should include the ability to recognise the comparative savings that would be achievable with the installation of such a system, for example through altered building design or the use of different materials.
- c. The policy is to indicate an assumption that automatic fire suppression systems will be installed unless the completed risk assessment provides sufficient argument against.
- d. The policy is to state that consideration be given early in the design stages of a project as to where the components of an automatic fire suppression system would be located in order to reduce installation costs.
- e. Further discussion be held with the Council's property insurers with the aim of achieving further savings.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the Safer Select Committee meeting held on 6th April 2010

Appendix B – Minutes of the Safer Select Committee meeting held on 5th July 2010

Appendix C – Minutes of the Safer Select Committee meeting held on 20th September 2010

Appendix D – Report to the Safer Select Committee entitled Sprinklers in Schools and other Council Buildings.

Appendix E - EIA

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack
DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON
TUESDAY, 6 APRIL 2010**

Councillors: Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Adrian Edwards, Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman) and Quentin Webb (Chairman)

Also Present: Councillor Paul Bryant, Andy Day (Head of Policy and Communication), Superintendent Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police), Andrew Garratt (Principal Engineer, Traffic Management and Road Safety), Elaine Vincent (Principal Policy Officer, Equality and Diversity)

PART I

17 Apologies

An apology for inability to attend the meeting was received on behalf of Councillor Keith Woodhams.

18 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1st February 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

19 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Edwards declared an interest in Agenda Item 6, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 6, but reported that as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to present his item.

20 Update on Actions

Further information was requested about the progress of the 'Have Your Say' meetings that were being developed in support of Improving Public Confidence. Superintendent Robin Rickard explained that the concept of 'Have Your Say' encompassed a wide range of interaction with the public, from face to face conversations, to large conferences. The aim of 'Have Your Say' was to strengthen consultation mechanisms appropriately for local areas. The concept required further consideration prior to implementation to avoid consultation fatigue and to ensure real value was gained.

The Public Involvement Board, a sub group of the Local Strategic Partnership with a specific remit to coordinate consultation activity across partner agencies, were

involved in the development of 'Have Your Say' and would be looking at making the best use of existing consultation structures.

Resolved that: this action would remain on the Committee's action plan.

21 Improving Public Confidence

The Committee agreed that Recommendation 2 should be reworded to reflect that 'Have Your Say' was still in development, and that it encompassed a broader aim of strengthening consultation mechanisms to benefit a number of local agencies.

It was requested that the recommendation included reference to the Public Involvement Board and incorporated a definition of this Board.

Resolved that:

- Recommendation 2 of the Improving Public Confidence report would be amended to read 'The Public Involvement Board is a subgroup of the Local Strategic Partnership formed specifically to coordinate consultation activity. The Public Involvement Board of the West Berkshire Partnership be asked to develop a more integrated approach to consultation across the District'.
- The report was agreed by the Committee for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission in May 2010 subject to the above amendment.

22 Installation of Fire Sprinklers Review

Councillor Edwards declared an interest in Agenda Item 6 by virtue of the fact that he is a member of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 6 by virtue of the fact that he is the Chair of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, but reported that as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to present the report.

Councillor Bryant presented an introduction to Agenda Item 6 to the Committee, and explained why this item had been brought for review.

The aims of the Fire Service were to reduce deaths and loss of property as a result of fire. It was noted that in England there was currently no mandatory requirement to install fire sprinklers in new buildings although this requirement was in place in Scotland and Wales. Councillor Bryant was therefore asking for the Council to take the lead in the local area by implementing a policy that would

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES

ensure fire sprinklers would be installed in all new and substantially refurbished Council buildings, including schools.

Councillor Bryant went on to present arguments for the installation of fire sprinklers:

- Fire costed approximately 500 lives per year with an accompanying £7bn financial cost.
- In the UK, no lives had been lost due to fire, in a building fitted with fire sprinklers.
- There was estimated to be an 80% reduction in injuries in buildings fitted with fire sprinklers.
- There was estimated to be an 80% reduction in property damage due to sprinkler systems targeting only the localised area of fire. It was also noted that there was an estimate of just one in 16 million sprinklers operating accidentally.
- There would be potential to reduce insurance premiums by up to 65% for buildings fitted with fire sprinklers.
- The estimated cost of installing fire sprinklers was 1% - 2% of the total build cost which, it was argued, could be recouped in approximately 5 years.
- There would be more flexibility in building design.
- There would be additional environmental benefits from the reduction in CO₂ being released into the atmosphere from a fire and a subsequent rebuild, and a reduction in the water required to control a fire when compared to fire officers using hose pipes.

Councillor Bryant concluded by showing a short video produced by the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service which demonstrated the effects of fire in a house with fire sprinklers, compared to one without.

The Committee discussed the issues presented and the following points were clarified:

- Business Continuity plans were required to be prepared by the Council to address how services would continue in the event of disaster including a fire.
- A survey showed that 43% of schools had experienced a fire in the last three years, and it was estimated that schools could expect to be subject to a fire every 10 years.

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES

- It was not proposed that fire sprinklers be fitted retrospectively in buildings due to the cost and disruption.

The Committee requested that relevant officers should be invited to the next session of this review topic in order to explain the Council's insurance provision in respect of fire damage, and any implications that might result from changing the insurance provider.

A concise report was requested to be circulated to the Committee to present relevant information and figures.

The Committee discussed whether the scope of this review should be amended to specify that the proposal was to include new and substantially refurbished buildings only. This was rejected so as not to restrict full consideration of the proposal.

The Committee agreed the scope of this review subject to the inclusion of a request for the Head of Finance to be invited to the next session.

Resolved that:

- The scope of the review would be amended to invite the Head of Finance to the next session.
- Councillor Bryant would be invited to attend the next session.
- A representative of the Fire Service would be invited to attend the next session.
- A report would be prepared ahead of the next session which would present relevant information.

23 Killed and Seriously Injured Road Traffic Casualties

Andrew Garratt presented information to the Committee regarding progress against recommendations made following a scrutiny review into killed and seriously injured road traffic casualties. The following points were clarified:

- The content for a Member development session was being investigated to ensure that Members would gain useful information that could then be communicated within their communities to raise awareness.
- National Indicators were expected to be amended after 2010 and it was anticipated that the current measures would be separated into the number of

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES

people killed, the number of serious injuries, and the number of pedestrian injuries.

- Due to the very small numbers involved, an apparently high percentage change might represent a very small change in numbers.
- A number of campaigns had been undertaken including a speed limit review, road safety education, and road safety campaigns. A programme of activity around schools included walking bus information, a considerate car use leaflet aimed at parents parking at schools, and schools booklets which included an overview of the initiatives that schools could request information about.
- Comparative figures were available for other local authority areas in a local area profile report. West Berkshire compared favourably to other areas in this report. Andrew Garratt agreed to circulate the local area profile report to the Committee.
- Speed cameras were still active and a review was underway to identify whether the camera locations were still appropriate. The review was in preparation for digital technology when speed cameras would need to be replaced. There would be a budget implication with this.
- The fire service were currently involved in road safety education alongside the Council, attending events such as the Newbury Show and being involved in campaigns such as 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive'.
- Monitoring of accidents did continue in areas identified as accident black spots. The reason for the accident would be investigated to ensure that the original issue had been resolved.
- The figures presented in the report had not been adjusted to reflect changing traffic volume.
- Civil Enforcement Officers did currently carry out spot checks on parking around schools.
- A review was being carried out into traffic light cameras to assist in enforcing compliance with traffic signals.

The Committee thanked Andrew Garratt for the work undertaken in this area.

Resolved that Andrew Garratt would circulate the local area profile report to the Committee.

24 Work Programme

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES

The Committee agreed the work programme, but requested that completed items be identified clearly.

Resolved that completed review items would be identified in future work programmes.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.15 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature.

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 5 JULY 2010

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Geoff Findlay (Substitute) (In place of Adrian Edwards), Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman), Quentin Webb (Chairman) and Keith Woodhams

Also Present: Councillor Paul Bryant, David Sharp (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service), Andy Day (Head of Policy and Communication), Sean Tye (Property Development Manager), Ian Priestly (Assurance Manager), Elaine Walker (Principal Policy Officer)

Apologies: Councillor Adrian Edwards

PART I

4. Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 6th April 2010 and 11th May 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Andy Day confirmed that 'Have Your Say' was a police initiative and that the Public Involvement Board, which comprised a number of local public sector organisations, would assist in coordinating this activity to gain most benefit and avoid duplication of activity elsewhere.

5. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

6. Matters Arising

The Committee reviewed the status of activities identified at previous meetings. The Committee were content with progress and requested that in future, this item would contain only current and ongoing activities.

RESOLVED that in future, this item would contain only current and ongoing activities.

7. Installation of Fire Sprinklers Review

The Committee considered a report regarding Fire Sprinklers in Schools and Other Buildings presented to the Committee by Sean Tye (Property Development Manager).

Following questioning from the Committee, Sean Tye clarified that costs for installing fire sprinkler systems would vary according to the type and size of the system required. Available indicative costs suggested that the cost of installing fire sprinkler systems in new buildings could account for between 2.3% and 15% of the total project cost.

The Committee requested information regarding dry sprinkler systems and were informed that dry systems worked by forcing an inert gas into the area thereby expelling all oxygen

DRAFT

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 5 JULY 2010 - MINUTES

and extinguishing the fire. They were more suited to use in unpopulated, smaller areas although they could be set up in a number of situations. They have been found to cost approximately 35% more than wet systems although there were clear benefits in some settings, for example electrical rooms.

It was explained that the maintenance cost of any system depended on the size of the system and the components that required maintenance or servicing. There was little available information to quantify these costs, but indications were that they could range from £500 to £5000 per annum.

It was further confirmed that the cost of fitting a system retrospectively to a building could not be defined as it would be dependent on a number of factors including size, construction material of the building and whether there was asbestos present, and the components required for the sprinkler system.

The Committee agreed not to consider developing a policy related to retrospective fitting of fire sprinklers.

David Sharp of the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service presented physical examples of two different types of sprinkler head for the Committee's information. He demonstrated one version, considered suitable for residential premises, where the fitting would be flush with the ceiling, descending and becoming visible only on activation. The second version would be visible at all times. Both versions would be suitable to be fitted with a dry system or a wet system.

He further stated that the normal life span of a sprinkler system was between 30 and 50 years and good maintenance would help to prolong this.

Ian Priestley (Assurance Manager) presented information to the Committee regarding insurance costs. He explained that West Berkshire Council currently benefited from low premiums for buildings cover in exchange for a high excess level. This has been determined by reference to the Council's low level of fire risk, with three significant fires since 2003 totalling approximately £200k in repair costs. No claims had been made to the Council's insurers to date as all had been below the Council's excess level. It was recognised that sprinklers would have reduced the refurbishment costs of the fires that had occurred, however the low numbers of fires would not in themselves justify the cost of installation of sprinklers.

The Committee asked whether the insurance company had been approached to request a reduction in premiums. Ian Priestley replied that negotiations were taking place in relation to St Bartholomew's however there was no expectation of major savings.

Councillor Bryant expressed concern at the lack of savings to be made regarding insurance when his previous source of information, Medway Council, had reported significant savings. Ian Priestley responded that the Council's premiums were already low and savings to these were unlikely to be significant.

Councillor Hunneman suggested that, as insurance savings were likely to be insignificant, savings would need to be made in the cost of installation and required components.

DRAFT

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 5 JULY 2010 - MINUTES

Sean Tye informed the Committee of a current project to install fire sprinklers where planning constraints had required the water tank to be placed underground. This had resulted in increased costs of around £20k. The Committee discussed the requirement for water storage tanks, and questioned whether systems could be run directly from water mains. Sean Tye replied that where the water authority was unable to guarantee adequate water pressure, then tanks would be required. It was suggested that the water board should be approached to amend its practice of reducing water pressure at certain times of day. Sean Tye went on to explain that where a water tank was required, it was regulated that the tank must be of a size that was able to supply the entire system. It was confirmed that where tanks were installed that did not meet the required size, insurance cover would become void. It was noted that planning constraints might limit options for the location of a water tank at any location and this might be due to the size of the area available for construction. It was also noted that adequate space would be required to access and maintain the tank. It was suggested that consideration be given to improving the appearance of water tanks if this would assist in gaining planning consent.

Councillor Bryant clarified that fire officers no longer approved fire safety systems in buildings. Since the Fire Safety Order 2005 was introduced, building owners or occupiers have been responsible for fire safety. A fire officer would only inspect systems if they had reason to believe that fire regulations were not being met.

Councillor Bryant went on to question the appropriateness of the risk assessment currently in use as some items required a judgement from the assessor which could be made inaccurately. He also questioned the costs presented in the report as his previous source of information, Medway Council, had indicated much lower costs of 2.5%. This concern was shared by Councillor Hunneman. However actual figures after having installed a sprinkler system at St Bartholomew's School showed a cost of 4% of the total project cost.

Councillor Bryant further raised the issue that consideration should be given to what was at risk by fire in different buildings. He stated that school practices meant that pupils would be efficiently evacuated from a building therefore the major risk would be to the building itself. However in a residential care home, there would be more difficulty in evacuating residents, therefore the risk would be to both life and property.

Ian Priestley suggested that, should a policy be developed, it should state its aims clearly. In particular, where sleeping accommodation was present, such as in a care home, then sprinklers should be mandatory. Alternatively where the aim was to protect buildings then they should only be installed if there was a clear financial benefit.

The Committee questioned whether the Kennet Centre had fire sprinklers installed and if so, where the water storage tanks were placed. A request was made to make arrangements to visit the Kennet Centre to understand the layout and working arrangements for the system. A further request was made to visit other appropriate locations, St Bartholomew's and Sainsbury's were suggested. The Committee agreed that these visits would be worthwhile.

Councillor Chandler noted that schools were higher risk buildings because of short occupancy hours and asked whether consideration had been given to greater safeguarding of schools particularly in holiday times to reduce the risk of fire further and

DRAFT

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 5 JULY 2010 - MINUTES

avoid the need to install sprinklers. The Committee was reminded that the risk of fire in West Berkshire was very low already.

David Sharp stated that the fire service's preferred option for fire safety was fire sprinklers as they would extinguish fires and save lives and property. This would be particularly relevant in residential care homes. He went on to provide further information to the Committee regarding fire sprinklers in general and specifically a London Study report into fires in sprinklered buildings which showed that:

- 84% of fires were contained or extinguished by sprinklers;
- Where sprinklers were unsuccessful, this was due to water supply failure, insufficient heat to activate the sprinklers, or fires in unsprinklered areas;
- In five cases, the sprinklers failed to activate.

David Sharp indicated that the low levels of installed sprinklers meant that information was not readily available on a large scale. He further explained that where sprinklers were installed, there was a greater freedom over building design as constraints in relation to exit routes and room size would be relaxed. He finally brought to the attention of the Committee that the number of fires in residential care homes was increasing and was expected to continue to increase due to the greater number of care homes required to cater for the ageing population.

The Committee noted that the report presented had focussed on schools with little mention of residential care homes. It was noted that West Berkshire Council's property portfolio contained very few residential care homes (which would not be fitted retrospectively) and a very large number of schools. Additionally, the majority of capital work involved schools. Councillor Bryant suggested that if West Berkshire Council were to install sprinklers as standard, more pressure could be placed on owners of other buildings in which the Council had an interest to also install sprinklers.

Councillor Woodhams requested information to be obtained regarding a new residential care home in Thatcham specifically around the installation of sprinklers.

Councillor Woodhams expressed the difficulty in consolidating all of the available information into a single policy, and suggested that a suitable risk assessment for all projects might be the appropriate approach.

The Committee agreed in principal to developing a policy in relation to the installation of fire sprinklers in new buildings and those undergoing major refurbishment. It was agreed that the stance of the policy should be an expectation that sprinklers would be installed, although a suitable risk assessment would inform this decision. The Committee requested that the Head of Planning and Trading Standards be asked to develop a draft policy for review at the next meeting.

Resolved that:

- The committee would not recommend fitting fire sprinklers retrospectively to buildings.

DRAFT

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 5 JULY 2010 - MINUTES

- Arrangements would be made for the Committee to visit two or three different sites where fire sprinklers were installed.
- Sean Tye would investigate how a decision was reached regarding the installation of sprinklers in the new Thatcham residential care home.
- The Head of Planning and Trading Standards be asked to develop a draft policy in relation to the installation of fire sprinklers.

8. Work Programme

The Committee agreed the work programme and proposed to conclude their review into the need for a policy relating to fire sprinklers at the next meeting. It was further agreed that the next item for consideration by the Committee would be crime statistics and that Thames Valley Police would be invited to the next meeting to provide an update.

Resolved that:

- Thames Valley Police would be invited to the next meeting to provide information regarding crime statistics.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.15 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman), Robert Morgan (Substitute) (In place of Keith Woodhams) and Quentin Webb (Chairman)

Also Present: Rachel Craggs (Community Safety Manager) and Alex O'Connor (Assistant Community Safety Officer), Councillor Paul Bryant, David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager, in place of Andy Day who sent apologies), Supt Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police) and Elaine Walker (Principal Policy Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Keith Woodhams

Councillor(s) Absent: Councillor Adrian Edwards

PART I

9. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th July 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

10. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 5, but reported that, as his interest was not prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate.

11. Matters Arising

The Committee reviewed the status of activities identified at previous meetings. The Committee was content with progress but requested that item two remain until resolved.

RESOLVED that item two in Matters Arising remain until resolved.

12. Installation of Fire Sprinklers

(Councillor Bryant declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5 by virtue of the fact that he was the Chairman of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, appointed to represent the Council on this outside body. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate).

(Councillor Chandler joined the meeting at 6:45pm)

The Chairman expressed thanks for two visits made by the Committee to the Kennet Centre and Sainsbury's to view their automatic fire suppression systems (fire sprinkler systems). The members of the Committee agreed that they would still like to visit a school where an automatic fire suppression system had been installed, and requested that this be taken forward.

The Chairman summarised previous discussions of the Committee in a series of recommendations for the Committee to approve. Following discussion, the Committee agreed the following:

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- The Committee recognised that building regulations were robust and suitable for the evacuation of buildings and protection of occupants;
- The Committee recognised the protection offered to both the fabric of buildings and their occupants by automatic fire suppression systems;
- The Committee accepted that the cost of retrospectively fitting automatic fire suppression systems would be prohibitive except in some cases of substantial refurbishment;
- The Committee concluded that the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in any newly built Council owned or contracted properties should be presumed, and requested that a policy be drafted for approval;
- The Committee was informed of the significant savings in insurance premiums achieved by other local authorities as a result of installing automatic fire suppression systems, and recommended that further discussion be held with the Council's property insurers in order to achieve similar savings.
- The Committee considered that the benefits of installing automatic fire suppression systems included a greater flexibility in building design and a reduction in water damage caused when the fire was being extinguished.
- The Committee was grateful to David Sharp of the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service for the information supplied to the meeting of the 5th July 2010.
- The Committee considered that whilst installation and maintenance costs were a prime concern, they had to be considered in relation to savings in other areas including savings achieved through alternative building design.
- The Committee recommended that consideration be given early in the design stages of a project as to where the components of an automatic fire suppression system would be located in order to reduce installation costs.

Councillor Bryant suggested to the Committee that any assessment of the need for automatic fire suppression systems in a building should reflect the specific issues relating to the use of the building. For example, a school would have strong procedures for, and the ability to, evacuate the building; whereas residents of a residential home would be less able to evacuate the area.

The Committee considered a further suggestion that the Council insist on the installation of an automatic fire suppression system in all suitable planning applications submitted to the Council. The Committee considered that without national backing, this could not be implemented and so would not be recommended.

RESOLVED that:

- A visit to a school where an automatic fire suppression system has been installed be arranged.
- The Committee would make the following recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for endorsement:
 1. That the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in any newly built Council owned or contracted properties should be presumed, and request that a policy to this effect be drafted for approval. The policy should reflect the views of the Committee as noted above.
 2. That further discussion be held with the Council's property insurers with the aim of achieving further savings in premiums.

13. Crime Statistics

The Committee received a presentation by Superintendent Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police), Rachel Craggs (Community Safety Manager) and Alex O'Connor (Assistant Community Safety Officer) concerning crime statistics and the strategic assessment process.

Following questioning, the following points were clarified:

- The strategic assessment process was an annual assessment of crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse trends which resulted in the identification of annual priorities. Corrective action would be taken between reviews if evidence indicated that it was necessary.
- Superintendent Rickard explained that the introduction of the Partnership Intelligence Monitoring and Mapping System (PIMMS) has increased the speed to which incidents could be responded, allowing the rapid movement of resources to resolve a problem or enable a longer term solution to be implemented quickly.
- The Committee was reminded that responding to crime was not limited to police activity, and that partners played a critical role in reducing crime. For example, neighbourhood wardens were able to provide reassurance through visibility; and tackling anti-social behaviour was led by the local authority and housing with the police playing only a minor role in providing evidence.
- As less focus was placed on National Indicators, the strategic assessment process was expected to become more important in order to identify and react to local problems. It was expected that nationally there would remain priority crime categories.
- It was acknowledged that there had been a recent short term spike in reported burglaries, however crime could be seen to follow a series of peaks and troughs over time and the recent figures reflected this pattern. Some changes could also be explained by the changes to national crime recording standards such as an amendment at the end of 2004 allowing arrests to be made of people committing assault with no injury, where previously this had not been possible. However, all crime had been reduced by more than 16% (951 crimes) compared to the same period in 2009 and this was also less than in 2008.
- The number of priority and prolific offenders (PPOs) was determined locally in relation to the number of people who were able to be managed. There were currently 34 people in the PPO category in West Berkshire. The PPO management scheme aimed to identify, manage and remove the motivation to offend. This might involve ensuring they had somewhere to live on leaving prison, or providing assistance to find work.
- It was confirmed that there was no significant increase in crime levels experienced during the 2010 World Cup. However Superintendent Rickard explained that preventative work had been undertaken in preparation, including licensing officer patrols during each match, and more police resources being made available with greater visibility.
- Activity around anti-social behaviour was being led by the Safer Communities Partnership, and it was likely that the Council along with the police would take the lead on this through the Safer Communities Partnership. However responsibility for reporting and addressing anti-social behaviour could not sit with a single organisation and would remain with individual organisations.

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- It was proposed that work be undertaken with schools to address the current issue of robbery committed by youths, where the motivation was bullying rather than the acquisition of particular items. There was a concern that young people were not aware of the implications arising from this (fitting the definition of, and therefore being recorded as, a robbery) and therefore possibly resulting in a sentence of several years in prison for perpetrators.

The Committee enquired whether there were local schemes, as in some other areas, aimed at empowering local people to deal effectively with confrontation or perceived hostile situations such as when faced by large groups. The Committee was informed that no schemes were available in this area, and the Committee agreed that this should be added to the work programme for review.

The Committee was informed that the future of the activities able to be undertaken around crime reduction was uncertain in the current climate. However two areas that should be pursued were the PPO scheme (now known as integrated offender management) and the need for all partners to be aware of the contribution they could make to crime reduction, such as to improving building developments in order to design out crime at the planning stage.

The Committee queried whether it would be appropriate to request comments from the police for planning applications submitted to the Council for larger developments.

It was agreed that the Committee should add to the work programme items to support the integrated offender management programme and designing out crime from the planning stage of a proposed development.

RESOLVED that:

- A review would be undertaken into the possibility of making available activities to empower local communities facing perceived hostile situations.
- The Committee would undertake a review in support of the integrated offender management programme.
- The Committee would undertake a review in support of designing out crime from the planning stage of a proposed development.

14. Work Programme

The Committee reviewed the work programme and agreed to review Gating Orders at their next meeting in December 2010. This review would consider the current position of gating orders and the suitability of the current policy.

The Committee also agreed to add three items to their work programme to review, schemes aimed to empower communities that faced perceived hostile situations; support for the integrated offender management programme; and the planning out crime at the design stage of developments.

RESOLVED that:

- The Committee would undertake a review of gating orders in December 2010.
- The Committee would add the following review items to their work programme:
 - schemes aimed to empower communities that faced perceived hostile situations;
 - support for the integrated offender management programme;
 - planning out crime at the design stage of developments

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

Title of Report: **Sprinklers in Schools and Other Council Buildings**

Report to be considered by: Safer Select Committee

Date of Meeting: 2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: **Review the approach to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings**

Key background documentation: DCSF guidance, Building Regulations & BB100

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Plan Priority(ies):

- CPP1 – Support our communities through the economic downturn** – to alleviate the impact on different communities and individuals who find themselves out of work and/or disadvantaged
- CPP2 – Raise levels of educational achievement** – improving school performance levels
- CPP3 – Reduce crime and the fear of crime**

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Plan Theme(s):

- CPT1 - Better Roads and Transport**
- CPT2 - Thriving Town Centres**
- CPT3 - Affordable Housing**
- CPT4 - High Quality Planning**
- CPT5 - Cleaner and Greener**
- CPT6 - Vibrant Villages**
- CPT7 - Safer and Stronger Communities**
- CPT8 - A Healthier Life**
- CPT9 - Successful Schools and Learning**
- CPT10 - Promoting Independence**
- CPT11 - Protecting Vulnerable People**
- CPT12 - Including Everyone**
- CPT13 - Value for Money**
- CPT14 - Effective People**
- CPT15 - Putting Customers First**
- CPT16 - Excellent Performance Management**

Portfolio Member Details

Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Keith Chopping - (0118) 983 2057
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details

Name:	Sean Tye
Job Title:	Property Development Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519565

E-mail Address:	stye@westberks.gov.uk
------------------------	-----------------------

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the last meeting of the Safer Select Committee, it was agreed to review the approach to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings (new or refurbished and including schools) with consideration to developing a policy around this. The following colleagues were consulted in preparation of this report:

Bill Bagnell	- Manager - Special Projects
Mark Lewis	- Education Assets Manager
Marina Billinge-Jones	- Insurance Officer
Ian Priestley	- Assurance Manager
Andy Green	- Maintenance Manger

2. Proposals

- 2.1 The Committee have requested that the Property Development Manager prepare and present some information to inform the Committee of possible options relating to fire safety systems.
- 2.2 The motion put to Full Council some years ago by Councillor Bryant required the Council to undertake a fire risk assessment to establish whether a sprinkler system was required to mitigate the risk of fire, whether by arson or other causes on projects that met the criteria within the motion.
- 2.3 The report considers the following points that the Committee requested investigation:
- What is the current Council policy regarding fire safety systems?
 - What consideration has been given to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings (new builds or during refurbishment projects)?
 - Were they installed, or were alternative systems installed?
 - How was the decision reached as to the appropriate system to be installed?
 - Are there any relevant risk assessments available?
 - Is there any cost / benefit information that may be of use to the Committee?
 - Is there any other information that may be of use to the Committee?
- 2.4 Council Policy
- 2.5 West Berkshire Council do not currently have a policy to install sprinklers to their buildings, however must comply with current fire precaution regulations. Since 2007 WBC have undertaken Fire Risk Assessments on all school projects (that meet the criteria). This is to establish whether there is a need to install sprinkler systems to reduce the risks to an appropriate level. This means that a Fire Risk

Assessment (FRA) should be carried out for each new project undertaken as appropriate

- 2.6 This does not preclude fitting sprinklers in Council owned buildings, but there is no blanket policy for installing sprinklers. The Council is also responsible for ensuring that staff are adequately trained in basic fire prevention processes. In schools there is joint responsibility for fire safety between the LEA, head teachers and school governors. It is recommended that members consider the implications of adopting the motion as outlined in this report. If Council is minded to adopt the motion they may be requested to consider a policy to install sprinklers in all new school buildings, including extensions built by and on behalf of the Council.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 Any policy adopted should define the criteria to be applied for projects that include extension or refurbishment of existing buildings. It is recommended that a practical application is sought to avoid encumbering smaller projects with disproportionate infrastructure costs.
- 3.2 The policy should also acknowledge that there may be instances where planning constraints prevent the installation of above ground tanks for water based systems.
- 3.3 The current policy of undertaking Fire Risk Assessments is a successful and managed approach which is affordable when assessing whether sprinklers are required in council buildings. A blanket policy to install sprinklers to all new council buildings would financially impact on what can be achieved for capital and corporate projects.

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Sprinklers have the outstanding advantage of attacking, rather than containing a fire, and do so quickly, locally and effectively. Sprinklers should be seen in context; other fire protection measures, many of them mandatory, minimise fires and fire-damage.
- 1.2 Fires in schools and other public buildings are an emotive issue. The damage and distress that can be caused by fires cannot be underestimated. For this reason, it is essential that the public have confidence in the measures put in place to prevent and deal with fire in public buildings.
- 1.3 The Fire Service is currently urging local authorities to consider installation of sprinklers in schools as part of its wider strategy to develop a pro-active approach to fire prevention as set out in the White Paper *Our Fire and Rescue Service*. The Local Government Association has also published a series of booklets, *Automatic Fire Sprinklers – Toolkits for Local Authorities, Schools and Domestic Properties*, in February 2004.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Fire Service supports the installation of sprinklers for the following reasons. Because they:
 - detect fire
 - extinguish fire
 - raise the alarm (both in the building and linked directly to Fire Brigade)
 - protect occupants (the spray reduced the harmful effects of large particles in smoke)
 - protect the building
 - provide additional safety for fire fighters
 - are reliable
 - tackle a fire far sooner than the Fire Brigade could usually arrive;
- 2.2 The Fire Service also emphasise the distress caused by fire and argued that the ensuing educational disruption, sense of loss and psychological damage should be taken into account when considering what preventive measure to put in place.
- 2.3 Property has found that 'end users' had concerns raised about the water damage caused by sprinklers due to the high volumes of water they use. Apparently firemen's hoses can cause more water damage than sprinklers. Modern sprinklers have a localised action and often only one or two sprinklers directly above a fire would be activated. It is also extremely rare for sprinklers to cause water damage through faulty mechanisms.

3. Education buildings - DCSF policy regarding sprinklers Systems.

- 3.1 Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the degree of damage caused by fire and can reduce the risk to life, however sprinklers should not be considered to be an essential feature to assure the life safety of occupants. On 1 March 2007, DCSF announced the new policy on sprinklers and their value as a measure against the risk of fire and arson. All new schools i.e. a new site (not standalone new buildings) should have fire sprinklers installed except in a few low risk schools.
- 3.2 Although the provision of sprinklers is not a requirement of the Building Regulations, DCSF expects that the Education Authority, Funding Body or overall 'client' of the scheme, should request, as part of the Employer's Requirements, that a risk assessment be undertaken to assess the validity of providing sprinklers in the scheme. Formal requirements for life safety are covered by national legislation (Building Regulations) and supporting technical guidance with respect to fire. The relevant building regulation is Approved Document B.
- 3.3 To help clients, local authorities and design teams assess the level of risk and make the right decisions; the DCSF has developed two new practical aids. The first is an interactive fire risk assessment tool. DCSF expects that this risk analysis will always be carried out and new schools being planned that score medium or high risk using the risk analysis tool will have sprinklers fitted.
- 3.4 In the recent past the Council have had very few instances of fire damage in the Council's schools, and none have been major. However, many school sites are in areas not served by retained fire crews, and hence the impact of a fire could be much greater due to the resulting response times.
- 3.5 The risk in schools, as a building type, is considered higher than other types due to a number of factors, notably the hours of use, holiday periods during which they remain largely vacant, and a lack of natural surveillance.
- 3.6 Without fire sprinklers installed, the impact of a significant fire at a school would be significant, and would extend far beyond the financial impact of making good the damage caused. Such an event would inevitably result in the loss of teaching material and student's coursework, but would also cause significant disruption with the school or parts of it shut down, and teaching taking place from temporary classroom facilities.
- 3.7 It is important to note, that the Building Regulations provide a framework whereby safe operation and evacuation of the building is assured through robust fire engineering. Where buildings are designed to meet the Building Regulations Approved Document B the installation of sprinklers would improve the level of protection afforded to the building itself, limiting the ability of a fire to spread and thus vastly reducing the impact of making good fire damage.
- 3.8 Where specialist space is affected e.g. science or sports facilities, this accommodation may not be easily or quickly replaced leading to a compromise in standards at the affected school while fire damage is made good.

4. The use of fire sprinklers for Council buildings (new builds or during refurbishment projects)

- 4.1 Property Services & Special Projects project officers act as the Councils'/Schools expert construction representative. The projects officers provide advice and guidance on the regulation pertaining to each individual school or project; coordinates, consultant services, ensuring interaction between sponsors and end users. However we are not experts in sprinkler or fire systems and therefore buy in advice as required through consultants.
- 4.2 To date very few projects have required the installation of sprinklers. An example project where sprinklers have been a requirement is the St.Bart's Redevelopment Project. The driver for the requirement was the then DCSF who stated that central government funded school's projects will require sprinklers unless an independent assessment can state why there is no benefit in terms of property protection.
- 4.3 Parts B of the Building Regulations are due to change again whereby buildings of a certain size and occupancy rate must have sprinklers and thus regardless of DCSF requirements, the St. Bart's project would have required sprinklers to satisfy new regulations. The driver in this instance is human safety and associated with the large assembly of people in different key areas of the new school; the main (internal) assembly hall, the sports hall and central atrium spaces within each house block.
- 4.4 The new sixth form extension proposed for Theale Green School has been found to require sprinklers. NIFES Consulting Group was commissioned to carry out a sprinkler risk assessment in accordance with Building Bulletin 100 (BB100). All assessments are undertaken with a consistent approach as follows:
- 4.5 A visit to the school is made by a specialist consultant, carried out along with liaison with the fire service and West Berkshire Council. This allows for all drawings, visual surveys and interviews with the relevant people to be carried out. This allows all the relevant data required to carry out the sprinkler risk assessment to be obtained.
- 4.6 Using the data and information provided, the sprinkler risk assessment is carried out. The sprinkler assessment is produced based upon the frozen layout and implementation of recommendations. See Appendix A.

5. Sprinkler system's installed

- 5.1 Recently the findings of a sprinkler risk assessment for the proposed sixth form extension at Theale Green School produced a score of 56. This equates to the school being at an average risk with sprinklers being recommended. The project is at 'Design Stage' and therefore details are ongoing.

6. St. Barts

- 6.1 A wet sprinkler system was installed at St. Bart's. Without sprinklers, the proposed school and community occupancy rates/usage of key school areas would not have all been approved by the Fire Officer unless the school could prove that mitigating school management procedures would make up for the lack of sprinklers. Such management procedures would not have been universally practical and thus in turn Building Control would not be prepared to issue 'Certificate of Occupation'.

6.2 Property Services are carrying out fire risk assessments for most Council buildings. A programme of fire risk assessments in all WBC properties has recently been completed by NIFES Consulting. From the fire risk assessments a 5 year programme of remedial works has been prepared and approved by Corporate Board to enable the Council to meet its obligations under the RRO; the programme of remedial commenced 2008. For further details see Appendix B.

6.3 The following measures are incorporated to minimise fires and fire damage.

- Compartmentalisation of a building, with fire doors and fire walls and fire resistant materials. These localise the fire and stop it spreading
- Fire Risk Assessments to enable improved observance of fire-avoidance procedures
- Automatic Fire Alarm systems which alert the brigade to fires automatically
- Emergency Lighting systems

7. Conclusion as to the system that should be installed

7.1 To date only one WBC project has incorporated sprinklers and therefore we can only refer to the example below:

7.2 St. Barts

A wet sprinkler system was installed at St. Barts at a cost of approximately £800K. By the time the cost of servicing the main internal hall, sports hall and the atriums of each of the house blocks had been accounted for, it made sense to service the whole school with sprinklers. The new St. Barts is an IT rich building and thus there is an argument for installing a dry/gas sprinkler system. This has planning (and cost) advantages since an area for large water storage does not need to be found.

Risk assessments available?

7.3 Theale Green 6th form project (See Appendix C)

8. Cost/benefit information that may be of use to the Committee

8.1 Generally, the cost burden of sprinklers to a project increases as project size decreases. For example, the St. Barts costs of £800K should be set against a total building construction project cost of £32M, whereas the Theale Green project of £1.5M includes a comparable sprinkler coverage to St. Barts (relative to size) at a cost of £200K (This is an initial indicative cost)

8.2 There are project scenarios where building use, in addition to safety measures, will dictate which type of system will be considered – wet or dry (gas). An example of a building being better serviced by a dry system would be a Public Library. However, it must be remembered that dry sprinkler systems on average cost 35% more than a traditional wet sprinkler system.

8.3 DCSF funding models do not include an allocation for sprinklers. It therefore falls on the Local Authority to either fund the installation themselves or to fund it from within defined funding envelopes.

9. Insurance

- 9.1 The projects that have been progressed to date with sprinklers installed have enabled Council officers, together with their design teams to work closely with the Council's insurers.
- 9.2 At design stage, WBC insurer Aspen, via DLJ (Brokers), were informed that the new St. Barts School would be fully sprinklered. The brokers confirmed the new school would be covered by the Council's existing blanket cover with Aspen for all Council buildings, that the costs of full replacement would be noted and that the inclusion of sprinklers would not beneficially affect the Council's total cover premium for its portfolio of buildings. Generally there is evidence of insurers requiring new buildings which have long periods of non occupancy (some schools during summer holidays) to have sprinklers, but this course of action does not appear to result in more generous insurance terms.
- 9.3 The Fire Service believes that installing sprinklers would reduce insurance premiums or result in lower excess payments.
- 9.4 The impact on the Council's insurance policy of installing sprinklers is minimal due to the size of the Council's property portfolio, the impact on the insurable risk by installing sprinklers on relatively few new build schools is negligible, and does not therefore result in a reduction to the premium.
- 9.5 Insurers are unlikely to seek significant input on the protection if only a minority of the site is protected as the site is classified as un-sprinklered. According to our insurance team our deductible has not been breached in this respect (i.e. any claims that we have had were under the excess of £250,000 however sprinklers may have reduced the costs to the Council) see Appendix D for arson data & Appendix E for other fire.

10. Sprinkler Costs – Retro-fit

- 10.1 Sprinkler systems are expensive to install within existing buildings since they require a network of pipes throughout the building to provide adequate sprinkler cover. This is very disruptive to the building fabric with installation work above ceiling and may involve asbestos removal prior to installation.
- 10.2 Costs are dependent on the building structure and type of system to be fitted and are therefore hard to accurately estimate. Worcestershire County Council carried out a survey at a medium-size school (1500m²) to ascertain the cost of installing a system complete with all the necessary controls and water storage. The price quoted was £83,500, i.e. about £55 per square metre. In addition there would be costs to remove and reinstate ceilings, and possibly remove asbestos. They concluded that the costs of installing sprinklers in all existing schools is too expensive for the County to bear and do not recommend installation in existing schools.

11. Sprinkler Costs – New Build

- 11.1 It is more cost effective i.e. economy by scale when installing sprinkler systems to new sites because the services such as water supply, tanks, pumps etc will be serving all of its buildings compared with say one building e.g. new sixth form

building Theale Green School. In other words the set up infrastructure costs are similar.

- 11.2 On the question of actual costs, Worcestershire County Council sought examples from authorities that had fitted sprinklers and found that the average cost was higher than 1.8%. Warwickshire's pilot project, building a new Special School for Nuneaton and Bedworth, is currently being planned. The total project cost is about £7m and the architect has estimated that £350,000 (5%) approx is the cost of installing sprinklers.
- 11.3 The installation of sprinkler systems in two Wiltshire Council projects has enabled costs to be tested for typical school project types. This leads to indicative costs as below, which compare with benchmark costs from other sources:
- 1350 pupil Secondary School - £550,000, equivalent to 2.3% of construction cost
 - 210 pupil Primary School - £70,000, equivalent to 2.5% of construction cost
 - 420 pupil Primary School - £125,000, equivalent to 2.8% of construction
- 11.4 Our findings for the new sixth form extension proposed for Theale Green School, a relatively small project based on actual current figures, are that outline costs for this are coming in at around 200k. This would suggest an increase of project cost of between 12 to 15%. There is no separate funding to finance the inclusion of sprinklers in our projects therefore they are a project cost. Clearly this will have a major impact on this and other projects.
- 11.5 We accept the possibility that a low cost system (where no storage tanks or pumps are required) may be possible. In most cases though, it is likely that pumps and storage tanks are needed and therefore the cost of installing a fire sprinkler system is based upon the following criteria:
- A separate water supply from the mains within the road is required as it cannot be taken off of the school supply as the water board will not guarantee the mains pressure necessary to facilitate the system. To overcome this issue they require a fairly large water storage capacity, pumps and controls on site, as in many cases the mains water supplies to the site are inadequate to cope with the demands of a sprinkler system. A large storage tank is may create planning, location and financial issues.
 - A new electrical feed to plant room & pump motors must come from the incoming supply prior to the Meter. If power supply is unreliable as can be experienced in rural areas then a back up generator must be included.
 - Regular maintenance is required. Reading University have undertaken research into sprinkler systems, apparently there is an issue over corrosion to steel pipe work due to use of oxygenated water.

12. Maintenance Costs

- 12.1 If a sprinkler system is installed, it is important that it is monitored closely and properly maintained. Routine maintenance should include checks for Legionella (a risk in any static water system). Worcestershire County Council Maintenance Department advised that actual costs would vary dependent on the size of the property, but an average estimate would be £1000 pa. The maintenance costs are incurred by the 'end user'. For Schools this is idea is unpopular.
- 12.2 Stuart Blackie of 'Education Leeds' confirmed that they had just agreed a new maintenance contract on a sprinkler installation at a large high school (approx. two thirds sprinklered) and the annual cost is £1280+vat.
- 12.3 Wiltshire Council indicate the annual maintenance cost of fire sprinklers could be £5,000-10,000 for a secondary school, depending on the extent to which routine inspections can be carried out by the school, and the scale of the system. This is a significant cost for any school, but particularly a primary school, where the cost could reach £5,000 per annum. It is recommended that the views of the Council in respect of a policy be discussed at the Schools Forum to raise awareness of the potential maintenance and servicing responsibility and associated financial burden.
- 12.4 We conclude that at this stage it is too early to quantify on going maintenance costs due to the wide scope of buildings and their arrangement to each other.

13. Other information of use to the Committee

13.1 Options Considered

- 13.2 An alternative to introducing a sprinkler policy would be to continue designing and building schools without sprinklers. This would continue to deliver well designed schools that comply with the relevant building regulations, and are therefore safe for their occupants. There is not considered to be adverse risk to pupils, staff and other users of school buildings if this option were to be taken.
- 13.3 However, the ongoing risk of a serious fire in one of the Council's schools clearly remains, and the impact of such a fire to the operation of a school would be significant.
- 13.4 The reputational impact to the Council of a newly built school being severely damaged by fire without the mitigation of a fire sprinkler system should be considered.
- 13.5 There appears to be 3 categories WBC buildings/sites fall into:
- Older building stock seem to be most at risk, due to lack of adequate fire protection and detection however are the most expensive to fit out. A maintenance program is in place to upgrade buildings to cover detection and compartmentation.
 - New Buildings on existing sites to include sprinkler systems are very costly due to the economy of scale and necessary infrastructure works/costs. Also no insurance premium can be demonstrated.

- New build sites demonstrate the most cost effective and successful solution for introducing sprinkler systems because the infrastructure costs are incorporated into the scheme as a whole.

Appendices

Appendix A – Sprinkler Risk Assessment

Appendix B – Fire Risk Assessment

Appendix C – Schools Risk Assessment Template

Appendix D – Arson data

Appendix E – Other fire data

APPENDIX A

- Part 1 – Incidence of arson and fire
- Part 2 – Environment and buildings
- Part 3 – Effectiveness of fire safety and fire protection measures
- Part 4 – The consequences of a fire

2.7 A score of 0-5 is assigned to each question with 0 being low risk and 5 being high risk. The four main sections are then split into two main categories: parts 1 and 2 combined and parts 3 and 4 combined. The scores from the two categories are then added together to gain the overall risk. The risk levels are as set out in the table below:-

Proposed overall scoring		<i>Proposed scoring Parts 1 and 2</i>		<i>Proposed scoring Parts 3 and 4</i>	
Low risk	0 – 40	<i>Low risk</i>	<i>0 – 20</i>	<i>Low risk</i>	<i>0 – 20</i>
Average risk	41 – 100	<i>Average risk</i>	<i>21 – 60</i>	<i>Average risk</i>	<i>21 – 50</i>
High risk	101 – 230	<i>High risk</i>	<i>61 – 85</i>	<i>High risk</i>	<i>51 – 145</i>

2.8 Once the overall score has been established the risk assessment tool makes the following recommendations:

Low Risk - The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at a low level of risk. Sprinklers may be beneficial.

Average Risk –The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at an average risk. A sprinkler system is recommended.

High Risk - The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at a high risk. Sprinklers should be provided.

APPENDIX B

The criteria for completing works under the fire remedial programme are project specific and based on a technical evaluation of the complexities generated by each scenario in accordance with the design and usage of the buildings as detailed below

1.	Risk Assessment Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of concern requiring action or urgent action with in residential/multi storey building to comply with fire legislation and to ensure risk of injury/death and damage to property is reduced.
2.	Project Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works above £10 K considered
3.	Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All WBC properties
4.	Strategic Importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits relate to a Corporate Priority • Impacts large part of Council and/or Public • Benefits relate to legislation
5.	Timetable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate objective dependent • Medium to long term projects

Applying the above criteria has meant that the focus of the programme for the initial years has been on residential homes, secondary schools and leisure centres.

There is an annual provision of £450k to support the fire remedial programme. The available budget for 2010/11 and 2011/12 has been increased to £675k per year.

Fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment - Existing site

Part 1 - Incidence of fire

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

1.1. Arson / deliberate fire (in the last 10 years)

No cases of arson / deliberate fire within school grounds	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Arson / deliberate fire common within school grounds
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

1.2. Vandalism (in the last 5 years)

No cases of vandalism within school grounds	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Vandalism common within school grounds
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

1.3. History of fires

No major fires in the school in the last 10 years	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	One or more major fires in last 10 years
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

1.4. Incidence of arson in the locality

Locality has low arson rate (as reported to police)	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Locality has high arson rate (as reported to police)
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	--

1.5. Fires in other schools in the locality (in the last 5 years)

Few cases of fire in other schools in the locality	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Frequent cases of fire in locality
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

Part 2 - Environment and buildings

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

2.1. Security measures - buildings

Good security measures provided for school building	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Few security measures
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

2.2. Security measures - school grounds

Good security measures provided for school grounds	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	No security measures
--	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

2.3. Opportunities for arson

Few opportunities for arson	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Many opportunities for arson
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

2.4. Buildings state

Buildings well maintained with no damaged safety systems (e.g. fire doors)	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Buildings in disrepair and vandalised
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

2.5. Building height

Single storey)	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	High-rise
----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

2.6. Building construction

Traditional	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Lightweight
-------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

2.7. Building design and routes for fire spread

Few	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Many

2.8. Building size (total floor area)

Small building	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Very large building

2.9. Building distribution (separation)

Distributed buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Single building

2.10. Risk of fire from school activity

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

2.11. Out-of-hours use of school facilities (by the public)

None or low out-of-hours use	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Frequent out-of-hours use

2.12. Building users at risk

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

Part 3 Fire safety and fire protection measures

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

3.1. Passive fire protection measures

Buildings have adequate fire compartmentalisation and fire/smoke barriers and doors	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Overly large fire compartments and lack of fire/smoke barriers and doors
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

3.2. Design relaxations of passive measures (for education reasons)

None	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Atrium or open-plan areas
------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

3.3. Fire detection and warning system

Automated and linked to central control room	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Human detection and hand bell
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

3.4. Means of escape (and emergency lighting and signage)

Many exits, short escape routes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Few exits, long escape routes
---------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

3.5. Occupancy density

Few people, in small groups	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Large numbers in a single compartment
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

3.6. Training and drills

Good training of staff, frequent drills	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	No training, no drills
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

3.7. Management (of fire safety)

Good	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0 <input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	Poor

3.8. Fire Service notification

Automatic	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input type="radio"/> 1 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	None

3.9. Fire Service location

Very close	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	Very distant

Part 4 Consequences/ impact of fire (Weight = 4)

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

4.1. Impact of fire on users (injury)

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High (risk of death)

4.2. Impact of fire on learning

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High

4.3. Impact on community

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High

4.4. Potential cost

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

4.5. Environmental impact

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

SCORE

Part 1	Incidence of arson (fire)	9	
Part 2	Environment and buildings	18	27
Part 3	Fire safety or fire protection measures	5	
Part 4	Consequences of a fire	24	29
TOTAL		56	

Scoring

Proposed overall scoring		Proposed scoring Parts 1 and 2		Proposed scoring Parts 3 and 4	
Low risk	0 – 40	Low risk	0 – 20	Low risk	0 – 20
Average risk	41 – 100	Average risk	21 – 60	Average risk	21 – 50
High risk	101 – 230	High risk	61 – 85	High risk	51 – 145

Overall score

Low risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk. Sprinklers may be beneficial.

Average risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk. A sprinkler system is recommended.

High Risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk. Sprinklers should be provided.

The tables below list the type of fire safety and fire protection measures that might be appropriate for your school.

Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of fire

Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of fire (Parts 1 and 2)

Low risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

Sprinklers may be beneficial. You may also wish to consider:

- Improved building security measures
- Improved site security measures
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Further control of activities likely to cause a fire

Average risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

A sprinkler system is recommended. You may also wish to consider:

- Improved building security measures
- Improved site security measures
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Improved control of activities likely to cause a fire
- Improved procedures to ensure that buildings are cleared of materials that can be used for arson

(Note: a sprinkler system may act as a deterrent to arsonists, but primarily acts to prevent a small fire growing)

High Risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

Sprinklers should be provided. You may also wish to consider:

- More building security measures
- More site security measures
- Security measures include;
- good window locks,
- intruder detection
- CCTV
- Security staff / guards
- good perimeter fencing
- Car parks well lit and overlooked etc
- Doors secure against all but the most determined intruders
- Windows and roof-lights protected against intruders etc
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Control of activities likely to cause a fire
- Buildings cleared of materials that can be used for arson

(Note: a sprinkler system may act as a deterrent to arsonists, but primarily acts to prevent a small fire growing)

Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur) (Part 3 and 4)

Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur) (Part 3 and 4)

Low risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

Sprinklers may be beneficial. You may also wish to consider:

- An improved automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Improved procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans, for example for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills

Average risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

A sprinkler system is recommended. You may also wish to consider:

- An improved automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Additional fire compartmentalization
- Procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans put in place for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills

High Risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

Sprinklers should be provided. You should also consider:

- An automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Additional fire compartmentalization
- Procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans put in place for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills
- Controls on the number of people using the building

For more information on types of fire safety and fire protection measures refer to BB100: "Designing against the risk of fire in schools"

Default List

Loss Number	Exposure Long Name	Loss date of occurrence	Loss Type	Cover name	Policy number	Loss cause	Paid
F/07/2178	Thatcham Nature Discovery Centre	21/10/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/1388	Kintbury St Mary's C of E Primary School	15/07/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	11,984.60
F/07/1388	Kintbury St Mary's C of E Primary School	15/07/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	8,197.80
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	42,681.80
F/04/0470	Bucklebury C of E Primary School	06/03/04	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/03/0749	Lambourn C of E Primary School	28/02/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	169.36

Default List

Loss Number	Exposure Long Name	Loss date of occurrence	Loss Type	Cover name	Policy number	Loss cause	Paid
F/09/1229	Northcroft Leisure Centre	16/06/09	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	370
F/09/1229	Northcroft Leisure Centre	16/06/09	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	0
F/07/2675	Adventure Dolphin	18/12/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N02836106AOY(06/07)	FIRE	0
F/07/2669	Kennet School	18/12/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	108,379.55
F/06/1498	Kennet School	20/07/06	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	3,781
F/06/1144	Highfield Ave 3,3A,4,,5,6, & 7 (Homeless Fami	09/06/06	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	0
F/05/0050	Greenham Community Centre	11/01/05	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	47,783.04
F/04/0765	Birch Copse Primary School	17/04/04	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	2,350
F/03/2193	Parsons Down Junior School	14/11/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	5,340.98
F/03/2193	Parsons Down Junior School	14/11/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	3,141.14

Equality Impact Assessment Template – Stage Two

Name of item being assessed:	Scrutiny review into the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.
Version and release date of item:	
Owner of the item being assessed:	Safer Select Committee
Name of assessor:	Elaine Walker
Date of assessment:	22/09/10

1 What are the main aims of the item?

To review whether the Council should implement a policy for the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.

2 What research will you undertake to inform this assessment?

(for example, who, how and when will you consult? What existing information is available either internally or externally? Are there complaints, comments received that will inform this assessment? Are there any local groups you can talk to? Etc)

Use this space to set out your activity.

Information received during the review process did not indicate a need to look further at this stage. There may be benefit in undertaking further consultation in relation to individual projects as they are undertaken.

3 What are the results of your research?

Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this.

(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Age	Younger age group – The Council's property portfolio includes schools. Installation of automatic fire suppression systems will benefit those of school age through avoiding disruption to their continued education. Although there will also be benefits to	Information received during the review process

	<p>protection of life, the evacuation procedures in schools make this less significant.</p> <p>Older age group – The Council's property portfolio includes residential homes. Installation of automatic fire suppression systems will benefit older people living in residential homes through protection of life as fire procedures for these premises are less focussed on evacuation.</p>	Information received during the review process
Disability	<p>The Council's property portfolio includes residential homes. Installation of automatic fire suppression systems will benefit people living in residential homes through protection of life as fire procedures for these premises are less focussed on evacuation.</p>	Information received during the review process
Further Comments relating to the item:		

4 What actions will be taken to address any negative effects?			
Action	Owner	By When?	Outcome

5 What was the final outcome and why was this agreed?
(Was the item adjusted, rewritten or unchanged?)
The recommendations remain unchanged as the key outcomes benefit all people including equality groups.

6 What arrangements have you put in place to monitor the impact of this decision?
Assessment should be made on a project by project basis.

7 What date is the Equality Impact Assessment due for Review?
29/09/13

Signed: Elaine Walker

Date: 29/09/10

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 13.

Title of Report:	Greener Select Committee
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee.

Recommended Action: To note the information.

Greener Select Committee Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster – Tel (0118) 9411676
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
Name:	David Cook
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer
Tel. No.:	01635 519475
E-mail Address:	dcook@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the work undertaken by the Greener Select Committee since the report made at the last OSMC meeting.

2. Progress made

- 2.1 The Greener Select Committee has been undertaking a review into the use of local resources, initially focusing on the use of local food.
- 2.2 At the meeting on 7 September 2010 the Select Committee considered evidence from Newbury Town Council with regards to the work they do managing allotments.
- 2.3 The evidence given formed part of the review. The draft recommendations were approved by the Select Committee and passed to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for approval at its meeting on 2 November 2010 (agenda item 10).
- 2.4 The Committee also considered evidence from Andrew Deacon, Waste Manager, regarding assisted waste collection and fly tipping.
- 2.5 The Public Transport Task Group met on 1 October 2010 and considered evidence from John Blacker (Mobility and Inclusion Manager, First Great Western).

3. Discussion items scheduled for the next meeting

- 3.1 The next meeting of the Greener Select Committee is scheduled to take place on 14 December 2010.
- 3.2 The Committee will be reviewing the Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan.
- 3.3 The Committee will also consider a report in response to two petitions submitted to Council regarding the Council's obligations to stimulate renewable electricity generation within West Berkshire and if the Council could generate environmentally sustainable green energy on the Council's offices, schools, leisure centres and other properties.

4. Work Programme

- 4.1 The latest work programme for the Select Committee is contained within Appendix A of item 19 of this agenda.

Appendices

Appendix A – Greener Select Committee Minutes 7 September 2010.

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

GREENER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Peter Argyle, Howard Bairstow, Tim Metcalfe, Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman) and Emma Webster (Chairman).

Also Present: John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment) and Andrew Deacon (Waste Manager), David Cook and Martha Vickers (Newbury Town Council).

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Roger Hunneman

PART I

11. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

13. Use of Local Resources - Local Food

Representatives from Newbury Town Council attended the meeting to inform the Greener Select Committee's review into local food production by providing information on allotments.

Members were informed that Newbury Town Council was undertaking a project called Sustainable Newbury that contained elements looking at local food production. As well as this project the Town Council also ran a number of allotments.

The Town Council had produced an allotment strategy and were committed to promoting healthy living through the development and management of six allotment sites in Newbury. The Town Council worked to improve the allotment sites and their management.

Members were informed that there used to be a large waiting list for allotments but this had dropped over the past few months, although the waiting list had begun to rise again. There were two main factors that could have been the cause of the fall in the waiting list: a number of the allotment plots had been reduced in size that resulted in more plots being available and there had been an increase in the cost of renting a plot.

The Town Council felt that allotment owners got good value for money from the rent and there had recently been improvements to the security of sites. The recent increase in the rent had not prevented people getting an allotment and although payments could be spread over a year most people paid their annual rent in full in one go.

As well as renting allotments to residents the Town Council also worked with local schools, people with mental health conditions and people on drug rehabilitation courses.

Members were also informed how the South Newbury Allotments Tenants Association was the largest in the area and worked together to bulk-buy materials and share produce.

Newbury Town Council had also established the Growing in the Community initiative to alleviate concern that some of the allotments were becoming run down. The initiative allowed local tenant associations to take over the management and maintenance of

GREENER SELECT COMMITTEE - 7 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

allotments if it was felt that the Town Council was not meeting its obligations; to date no association had taken up this offer.

Members were informed that not all surrounding parish councils had allotments and thus some allotment tenants come from outside the ward area. Members felt that other town and parish councils should be encouraged to introduce allotments. It was acknowledged that the cost in purchasing land was a hindrance.

As the produce from allotments could not be sold tenants usually traded excess produce or gave food away.

Whilst discussing the presentation the following points were raised:

- The current waiting list had 73 people from within the parish and about 98 people including people from outside the parish. It was acknowledged that there might be a number of people on both lists.
- Some people had more than one plot and that over the six sites there were 560 plots.
- The Town Council helped people make better use of their allotments and if a tenant was finding it difficult to manage a full plot other tenants would either help or the site may be split into a number of smaller plots.
- Sustainable Newbury was a mixture of people who were interested in sustainability. They organised a competition on how to be more sustainable; the winner suggested planting fruit trees on public land to be harvested by the community. The Town Council were considering a pilot in Victoria Park.
- Members asked if it was known how many allotments there were in West Berkshire. It was suggested that the 2001 census might contain this information or parish / town councils might know.
- Historically houses had large gardens to allow residents to grow their own food.
- It was suggested that Newbury Town Council could look at having a charitable stall at the market where people could donate surplus produce to be sold with the proceeds going to local charities. It was noted that current market stall holders would need to be consulted and a side benefit might be that it attracted more customers to the market.
- It was recommended that West Berkshire Council should produce guidance for parish / town councils on how to introduce allotments.
- It was recommended that a District Parish Conference should discuss sustainability which would also include a discussion on allotments.
- It was noted that if 6 people petitioned for an allotment the local council would have to provide one.

Members considered the draft findings of the review into local food and recommended that the report progress to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee with the addition of the recommendations from the presentation on allotments being added.

GREENER SELECT COMMITTEE - 7 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

John Ashworth informed that following the Greener Select Committees meeting with Kelvin Hughes, West Berkshire Local Strategic Partnership Greener Sub-Committee Chair, it had been recommended that the cost of the local food base survey be scaled back to a more affordable option with the funding coming from West Berkshire Council and the Atomic Weapons Establishment.

RESOLVED that the draft recommendations be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission.

14. Waste Collection and Fly Tipping

Andrew Deacon, Waste Manager, attended the meeting to update Members on statistics regarding assisted collections, wheeled recycling boxes and fly tipping.

Members were informed that the Council provided an assisted collection service. There were approximately 64,000 weekly waste collections and approximately 32,000 fortnightly green waste collections and approximately 32,000 fortnightly recyclable waste collections.

At the start of the new waste contract in 2008 there were about 641 assisted collections; in January 2010 this had increased to about 888.

Members were informed that the majority of people who had assisted waste collection had contacted streetcare enquiring about help. The service was there to help residents who were unable to get their recycling boxes to the street for collection.

With regards to wheeled boxes for recycling containers Members were informed that a number of different types of wheeled containers were available to assist residents in placing waste containers at the curb side for collection. The Council had highlighted a particular type of wheeled box through its waste newsletter; so far the supplier had sold 30 units. Through a future waste news letter further boxes would be highlighted.

Members were also shown a graph highlighting the level of fly tipping since the start of the integrated waste management contract. The graph highlighted the amount of fly tipping and the number of incidents that were collected by Veolia under the contract. Not all incidents of fly tipping were collected as they might have occurred on private land, in these instances the owner would be contacted and advised on the best course of action.

The committee were informed that if private data was found in material fly tipped then action would be taken against those concerned. In certain instances the Environment Agency would be called in to take action and prosecute offenders. Members were informed that incidents had occurred where households had hired house clearing companies who had then flytipped belongings, when evidence was available legal action would be undertaken.

Members questioned how many households put out the green recycling bins and what percentage used the green recycling boxes. Andrew Deacon said he would see if it was possible to produce more detailed recycling statistics.

Concern was raised about landowners having to be responsible for removing waste that had been dumped on their land. Members also discussed how in the USA local authorities were more proactive when the owner of land could not be identified and legal action was undertaken to acquire and sell the land.

15. Work Programme

Members noted the Greener Select Committee's work programme.

GREENER SELECT COMMITTEE - 7 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.45 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

Title of Report:	Healthier Select Committee Update
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Healthier Select Committee.

Recommended Action: To note for information.

Greener Select Committee Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Geoff Findlay – Tel: (01635)871992
E-mail Address:	gfindlay@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Jo Naylor
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer
Tel. No.:	(01635) 503019
E-mail Address:	jnaylor@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Healthier Select Committee (HSC) has met twice recently on 9th September and 12th October.
- 1.2 The NHS Berkshire West proposal to close the GP branch surgery at Underwood Road, Calcot was considered at the September meeting. Members considered the rationale for closure and the potential impact on patients. Overall Members voted to support the position of the NHS Berkshire West.
- 1.3 At the last meeting Members considered the Council's approach to tackling family poverty within the District. Members wished to revisit progress on this topic when a Needs Assessment Tool had been developed.
- 1.4 A briefing regarding 'Care for the Future', a developing vision of healthcare for Berkshire and Buckinghamshire, also was considered at the last meeting. Detailed comments were made which will be submitted as part of the current consultation process.

2. Work Programme

- 2.1 The latest work programme for the Select Committee is contained within Appendix A of Item 19 of this agenda.
- 2.2 The Select Committee was concerned about reports of increased numbers of patients being delayed from leaving hospital ('bed-blocking') due to a shortage of social care placements being available. It was felt this issue needed to be priority on the work programme. It is therefore asked that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission approve this new work programme item and allow for this to be scrutinised at the next scheduled meeting.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Healthier Select Committee held on 9th September.

Appendix B – Minutes of the Healthier Select Committee meeting held on 12th October 2010.

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 9TH SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors: Geoff Findlay (*Chairman*) (P), Julian Swift-Hook (*Vice-Chairman*) (P), Gwen Mason (P), Andrew Rowles (AP), Tony Linden (P), Paul Hewer (AP)

Substitutes: George Chandler, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards (P), Alan Macro

Also present: Helen MacKenzie (Deputy Chief Executive, NHS Berkshire West), Bev Searle (Director of Partnerships and Commissioning, NHS Berkshire West), David Buckle (Medical Director, NHS Berkshire West) and Jo Naylor (WBC Principal Policy Officer).

Other Councillors present: Brian Bedwell

PART I

12. APOLOGIES.

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received on behalf of Councillors Paul Hewer and Andrew Rowles. Councillor Adrian Edwards substituted for Councillor Rowles.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillors Tony Linden and Julian Swift-Hook declared an interest in Agenda Item 3, but reported that, as their interest was personal and not prejudicial, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

14. UNDERWOOD ROAD GP BRANCH SURGERY

(Councillor Tony Linden declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 3 by virtue of the fact that he was a patient of the Dr. Swami & Partners Surgery. Councillor Julian Swift-Hook declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 3 by virtue of the fact that he was Chairman of West Berkshire Mencap. As their interest was personal and not prejudicial they were permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

Helen MacKenzie (Deputy Chief Executive, NHS Berkshire West) described the Underwood Road Surgery as a branch surgery of the Abbey Medical Centre, Russell Street, Reading. She explained that the doctor was present at the branch surgery 8 hours a week with the Surgery premises open a total of 16 hours per week. Outside of the opening hours the surgery was locked and not in use. Mrs MacKenzie described the Primary Care Trust's view which was not to support a GP surgery at the Underwood Road location. She described how GP commissioning groups would purchase care on behalf of patients in the future. She also described that GP practices with more than one GP resulted in better clinical outcomes for the patient, due to GP peer support and better development of clinical expertise.

SPECIAL HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 9th SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

She described that 9000 patients were registered at the Circuit Lane and Theale Medical Centre practices and there was the capacity to accept patients from the Underwood Road branch.

Mrs MacKenzie described how local clinicians (GP commissioning leads) supported the NHS Berkshire West position as a step towards providing services which were fit for purpose in the future.

Mrs MacKenzie described the proximity of five other GP practices to the Underwood Road site: Circuit Lane (1 mile), Calcot Surgery (1.8 miles), the Abbey Medical Centre (2.2 miles), Western Elms Surgery (2.1 miles) and Dr Swami & Partners (2.2 miles).

Mrs MacKenzie then described the National Patient Survey findings (2009/10) which focused on patients satisfaction and compared the Abbey Medical Centre to the practices at Circuit Lane and Theale Medical Centre. Members wished to see the data broken down to the Underwood Road branch level however this was not possible as the data was only collected at GP surgery level.

Members queried whether the Abbey Medical Practice had come out more favourably on any of the indicators in relation to access to GP services when compared to Circuit Lane and Theale Medical Centre. Mrs MacKenzie confirmed it fell below the levels of the other two surgeries on all measures in relation to GP access.

Members confirmed some of the difficulties in relation to access and parking at the Abbey Medical Centre at Russell Street and reported occasions where there had been long waits for appointments.

Members enquired of the levels of deprivation in the Underwood Road area and patients' ability to reach alternative surgeries if they had financial and/or physical disabilities. The NHS Berkshire West reported that they did not have this type of personal information about patients but indicated that the Underwood Road branch patients would already need to travel to access the Abbey Medical Centre on all other days outside the 8 hours a week a GP was present at the branch surgery.

Members scrutinised the financial information presented which showed that Underwood Road costs were £80.30 per registered patient per square metre, whilst Circuit Lane was only £6.64 and Theale Medical Centre £2.38 per registered patient per square metre. Members queried what other comparator figures were available. Mrs MacKenzie responded by explaining the Berkshire West average figure was approximately £10 per registered patient per square metre for a GP surgery.

Members asked about levels of deprivation around Underwood Road and the support for facilities such as David Smith Court (elderly care) and the Walled Gardens (centre for those with learning disabilities). Helen MacKenzie described the deprivation in the Underwood Road area as no different to levels seen in the Southwood area for example.

Members queried the use of the designated space within the Bellwood Homes redevelopment of Underwood Road, should it not be used as a Medical Centre. It was unclear whether the additional space would be used for social housing, shared

SPECIAL HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 9th SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

ownership or some other mixed-use purpose. Members enquired of the potential financial gain to the developer and the ability for the developer to contribute to healthcare facilities in the locality.

Mr David Buckle (Medical Director) informed the Committee that in his opinion he was convinced that a single GP in a branch surgery was not a viable proposition and would not be able to provide the quality of GP care required by today's standards. As a General Practitioner himself, he stressed he would not advise a branch arrangement such as Underwood Road and said that it would compromise the quality of the service offered to patients.

Mrs MacKenzie described the PCT's view that in their opinion this change did not represent a "substantial variation" to services in health overview and scrutiny terms.

Members discussed the options for the elderly and infirm and what access to services might exist for them should the practice at Underwood Road close. Mrs MacKenzie described that some doctors might make provision for home visits and that in fact this was more likely in practices where there was a team of doctors.

Mrs MacKenzie described the detailed consultation underway with the public which was due to close on 4th October and the findings would then be reported to the PCT Board.

In accordance with paragraph 6.8.2 of the Council's Constitution Standing Orders were suspended in order to allow Councillor Brian Bedwell (Ward Member for the Calcot Ward) the opportunity to relay his concerns about closure of the Underwood Road branch surgery. He described the practice as being open Monday – Friday (3 hours a day) and the branch surgery open for a total of 18 hours a week. He reported that a petition to keep the doctor's surgery in Underwood Road open had been drawn up and which had to date attracted 250 signatures. Councillor Bedwell expressed disappointment that Mrs Nirgude, the Underwood Road Practice Manager, had not been invited to attend this meeting.

Councillor Bedwell described the high levels of deprivation within the area including the 20% of Ford's Farm Primary School children having Special Educational Needs (SEN) and the proximity of the Older Peoples residential home at David Smith Court.

Councillor Bedwell described the potential access difficulties for patients if they attended the Calcot practice at Royal Avenue due to the uphill gradient. He felt this would be particularly difficult for mothers with prams and those without cars. He equally added that there was no bus service to this practice. He explained that the Calcot Surgery at Royal Avenue was also a branch surgery with only one doctor and in a similar position to Underwood Road. Equally, Councillor Bedwell also described his experience of delays to get a doctor's appointment at the Theale Medical Centre.

Councillor Bedwell argued that the new Bellwood development of 60-65 housing units would increase the population living within the Underwood Road area and provide an increased requirement for GP services in this location.

SPECIAL HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 9th SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

Councillor Bedwell stated that high numbers (one third of all patients in this area) were using the Calcot (Royal Avenue) branch and that registering additional patients could lead to greater delays receiving a doctor's appointment. He suggested that the Underwood Road surgery should be used as a third satellite service for the Theale branch.

Mrs MacKenzie described how the PCT had explored all options but that the contract for Underwood Road was held by Mrs Nirgude and it was not possible to pass this on to other GP surgery without undergoing strict rules of procurement and competition.

Mrs MacKenzie also added that of the 500 patients registered at the Underwood Road branch surgery 400 of these were aged 20-70 years and many would be able-bodied. It was also reported that the majority of patients drove to their appointments at the Underwood Road branch surgery.

Mrs Beverley Searle (Director for Partnerships and Commissioning) described the targeted pieces of work which had been done within the Underwood Road area to reduce health inequalities. She described the weight loss services and targeted interventions such as the 'Healthchecks'. She described the efforts made to improve public health and how the Council in future was due to have a greater responsibility for public health under the recent White Paper proposals.

The Chairman of the Committee described the need to balance the consideration of the residents with the issues in terms of cost and clinical care.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook (Vice-Chairman) described how in areas of deprivation high quality health care services were essential and that this supported the argument for multiple GPs operating from a single surgery. Equally the figures had shown that even if patient numbers at the Underwood Road branch had increased by 25% that the cost was still almost ten times more expensive than the cheaper alternative. Councillor Swift-Hook argued money would be better spent providing quality outcomes in other surgeries within this locality. He described how doctor's appointments were usually available if the patient showed flexibility in relation to which doctor was seen.

Councillor Swift-Hook highlighted the statistics presented by the PCT which reflected patients concern that they were waiting too long for an appointment more often at the Abbey Medical Centre than either Circuit Lane or Theale Medical practices. He also described the higher risk of a single GP led practice and the disruption to services that would result, for example, if this GP should resign. He summarised that in his opinion the best outcome was not to replace the Underwood Road surgery but to reallocate funding to the other neighbouring surgeries.

RESOLVED that:

- (1). The Committee supports the NHS Berkshire West's proposal to close the Underwood Road GP branch surgery based on the evidence presented and that the cost savings realised should be reinvested into surgeries with multiple GP teams within this geographical area.**

SPECIAL HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 9th SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

The proposal and recommendation was voted on and carried with a majority with the exception of Councillor Adrian Edwards who abstained from voting.

15. CHAIRMAN’S UPDATE.

The Chairman briefed the Committee on the new White Paper “Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS”. He highlighted the changes in terms of Public Boards, scrutiny of clinical outcomes and empowering GPs in their greater commissioning role. He explained the timetable of establishing Independent Commissioning Boards by 2012 as well as the transferring of public health functions to Local Authorities.

He also explained to the Committee the high volume of NHS consultations on service changes he was receiving as Chairman of the Select Committee. Members expressed an interest in receiving copies of the information in order to determine what items should be added to the work programme. Changes to Children’s Heart Surgery and Berkshire Healthcare Trust reconfigurations were mentioned as potential items for future scrutiny.

RESOLVED that the update be noted and that Members receive copies of all consultations on future service reconfigurations.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 7.25pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature:

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 12th OCTOBER 2010

Councillors: Geoff Findlay (*Chairman*) (AP), Paul Hewer (P), Gwen Mason (P), Tony Linden (P), Andrew Rowles (AP) and Julian Swift-Hook (*Vice-Chairman*) (P).

Substitutes: George Chandler (P), Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Alan Macro

Also present: Julia Waldman (WBC Service Manager) and April Peberdy (Head of Partnerships – West Berkshire, NHS Berkshire West) and Jo Naylor (WBC Principal Policy Officer).

PART I

17. APOLOGIES.

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were received on behalf of Councillors Geoff Findlay and Andrew Rowles. Councillor George Chandler substituted for Councillor Rowles.

18. MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6th July and 9th September 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook declared an interest in relation to all items on the Agenda but reported that as the interest was personal and non prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matters.

20. URGENT ITEMS.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook declared a personal interest in all Agenda Items by virtue of the fact that he was Chairman of West Berkshire Mencap, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook (Vice-Chairman) as the Chairman for this meeting requested that Members consider a proposal to look at delayed discharges from the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital and the West Berkshire Community Hospital as an urgent item at the next meeting.

Members of the Select Committee were supplied with the background on this issue including a copy of Councillor Swift-Hook's question to Council on 23rd September and the detailed response provided by Councillor Joe Mooney (Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care) which clarified the numbers and extent of delayed discharges.

Members relayed concerns about fines that were being reported in other neighbouring local authority areas and considered this an important item.

RESOLVED that:

- (1). **The issue of delayed hospital discharges affecting residents within West Berkshire be considered as a priority for this Select Committee at the next meeting.**

21. SCRUTINY OF DEPRIVATION AND FAMILY POVERTY IN WEST BERKSHIRE.

Mrs Julia Waldman (WBC, Service Manager) introduced Item 5 (Agenda Item 5) and gave an overview of the work underway to tackle deprivation and family poverty in West Berkshire. She described specifically the statutory duty placed on the local authority in relation the Child Poverty Act and how a Needs Assessment must be completed by March 2011.

The focus for the current work on family poverty only addressed families with children under 19 years of age and not the entire population. Work was being undertaken by the Prevention and Early Intervention sub-group of the West Berkshire Children's Trust. Mrs Waldman described the Government's stance to allow local authorities the flexibility to develop appropriate strategies according to their own local needs.

Mrs Waldman described the requirement for a robust Needs Assessment Tool that would highlight what poverty actually means and welcomed the toolkit supplied by the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA). She explained the complex process of using a wide range of data; e.g. Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and local data, etc. She explained that Lambourn and Greenham were both identified as 'place based' areas of deprivation within the District. She described how both 'place based' and 'people based' research methods would need to be used to identify families at risk.

Members asked about whether the Family Poverty Strategy should also consider the needs of the elderly living in poverty. Mrs Waldman explained the specific remit of the existing work was with families with children under 19 years of age. Mrs Peberdy described how data sampling methods could be revised to collect this type of information from local General Practitioners (GPs).

Members enquired as to the role of the Select Committee assisting in this agenda. Mrs Waldman replied that it would be helpful for the Select Committee to comment upon the Needs Assessment tool once this had been developed.

A question was asked about the extent to which health issues cause family poverty or whether health related complaints were more a consequence of poverty? It was explained how substance misuse issues, mental health or physical disabilities were all often associated with a decline into poverty.

Members enquired about the differences between family poverty in rural areas and more urban areas. It was explained that typically in rural areas, the major risk factors for poverty included lack of transport, lack of employment opportunities, lack of training for jobs, affordable housing availability and accessibility of West Berkshire Council services. In the urban areas, it was more likely that the factors were those associated with disadvantaged communities such as crime, being a victim of crime, antisocial behaviour, etc.

Members discussed the large divide between those living in poverty and the general affluence of the rest of the District. It was also mentioned how even in some urban housing estates there can be a large degree of isolation and detachment from basic shops and services.

Members also discussed poverty in rural Lambourn and the low wages that are often associated with jobs in the racing community. Equally an attainment gap

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 12TH OCTOBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

exists within West Berkshire, with deprivation linked to poorer outcomes in academic achievement.

It was suggested that the Family Poverty Strategy must include intelligence from Ward Councillors to receive their perspective on the issues in their communities.

Equally some Members enquired whether Greenham Common Trust grants may be available for the most deprived families to ensure children that attend school have the necessary PE kit to undertake physical activities at school.

Members felt that the approach and Family Poverty Strategy should come back to the Select Committee for further consideration.

RESOLVED that a progress report be received in the new year on the Needs Assessment Tool and work underway to develop a Family Poverty Strategy for the District.

22. CARE FOR THE FUTURE: A DEVELOPING VISION OF HEALTHCARE FOR BERKSHIRE AND BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

April Peberdy (Head of Partnerships for West Berkshire, NHS Berkshire West) attended as a substitute for Beverley Searle (Director of Partnerships and Joint Commissioning) she described that “Care for the Future” was a transformational programme to reform service and enable the NHS to keep up with the increased demand on health services, whilst still improving quality and driving down costs.

The changes included transferring hospital care to the community setting wherever possible and she explained that comments were being sought by 31st October. Mrs Peberdy explained how generally patients preferred receiving care closer to home as this prevented the need to journey to acute hospitals.

Mrs Peberdy described that Specialist Services would be delivered in particular hospitals as centres of excellence. She described that patient choice was a significant consideration as well as educational measures to allow patients the ability to manage their own conditions better. This was particularly important for those with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) in order to prevent frequent hospital admissions.

Members asked about the “Choose and Book” policy of the NHS and how this might influence services in relation to “Care for the Future”.

Members welcomed the introduction of the Community Matron role but enquired about the timescales, the need for training of staff and the risk to patients unless all agencies involved in health and social care were working efficiently together and provided a seamless service. It was noted that the system sometimes fails the patient and that the changes presented a particular challenge to achieve joint working by 2012.

Mrs Peberdy described the work underway mapping patient pathways in order to improve the patient experience and make clear all the constituent parts of the healthcare system that must be identified and work properly together.

Members asked whether there would be greater investment within community services, including small General Practitioner (GP) surgeries in the rural areas. It was described how preventing acute hospital admissions should save a significant sum of money as costs of an acute hospital beds were in the region of £2-3k per

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE – 12TH OCTOBER 2010 - MINUTES
DRAFT

patient per week. It was further explained that GPs in the future would have a far greater service commissioning role and would receive money to support this service delivery.

Treatment at local GP surgeries was also seen as advantageous in terms of preventing the need to travel and causing less stress for the patient.

Members described certain hospital centres which were already acknowledged for their specialist services; including Royal Berkshire Foundation Trust for cardiology services and the John Radcliffe in Oxford for burns, neurology and cancer care.

Members discussed the need for large enough GP surgeries to be available to undertake additional treatment procedures. A concern was raised that delays that may occur associated with the planning application process.

Mrs Peberdy explained that although the overall money to the NHS was increasing this was not keeping up with the increase in demand for services.

Members raised a point about how the new GP commissioning arrangements might work and if former NHS Berkshire West employees would be employed to undertake the commissioning functions. Mrs Peberdy explained it was not clear how the new structures would work, as yet, but that within a set allocation of money it was still possible to drive up performance.

Members also were concerned about the natural linkages with Buckinghamshire area as they argued there were quite different urban and rural areas within this geographical boundary.

A point was also made in relation to previous mergers with Buckinghamshire for example when South Central Ambulance Trust formed. This resulted in an overall drop in performance than when Berkshire was a separate Ambulance Trust. Concerns were raised as to the potential risk of the same negative impact on performance occurring.

It was requested that in the new year there is a progress report to keep abreast of the key milestones.

RESOLVED that:

- (1). The “Care for the Future” debate at this meeting becomes the basis of the Healthier Select Committee’s submission to the NHS Berkshire West.**
- (2). An update be provided in the new year on the progress of the “Care for the Future” proposals.**

23. WORK PROGRAMME.

The Vice-Chairman introduced the Work Programme (Agenda Item 7) which outlined the existing work items agreed for the municipal year.

It was recommended that the item on Local Area Agreement targets be renamed but some progress against existing health related performance indicators was still required.

Members felt further scrutiny of maternity services was needed to determine if the number of births was putting pressure on the maternity unit at the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital. A written report was requested for the next meeting.

Members felt that the issue of adult social care was still an important issue. Some felt this was broader than just exploring criteria for eligibility but understanding the preventative nature of services and the impact of the Putting People First transformation programme. It was agreed that Mrs Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) be invited to attend the next meeting to update on the current position.

Members were aware that some patients were experiencing technical problems with booking system of consultant appointments at the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital Trust. It was requested that an investigation occurs to determine if the problem still existed and depending on the outcome, this may become an item for the next agenda.

RESOLVED that:

- (1). Delayed hospital discharges of patients from West Berkshire is explored as an urgent item at the next meeting.
- (2). West Berkshire health performance indicator information is received at the next meeting.
- (3). An update is provided at the next meeting as to the current position in relation to Adult Social Care in West Berkshire, including access to care, prevention and the impact of the National Care Review findings.
- (4). The Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital (RBH) will be asked to confirm data on the current number of deliveries at the maternity unit and describe if the maternity unit is suitable for meeting the current and future demands.
- (5). Investigations are made to determine whether reported problems with the electronic booking system for consultant appointments at the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital (RBH) had now been resolved.

(The meeting commenced at 6.05pm and closed at 8.06pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature:

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 15.

Title of Report:	Resource Management Select Committee
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee.

Recommended Action: To note the information.

Resource Management Select Committee Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Jeff Brooks – Tel (01635) 47391
E-mail Address:	jbrooks@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Stephen Chard
Job Title:	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
Tel. No.:	01635 519462
E-mail Address:	schard@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Select Committee met on 13 September 2010 and the draft minutes are attached at Appendix A. A summary of the main discussions held are as follows:

Procurement

- 1.2 A detailed report was received on the procurement processes in place across the Council. There was some concern among Members that the Procurement Unit did not have enough involvement in much of the procurement undertaken across the Council, including the fact that there was no involvement below a £10k threshold. Although Members were informed that this was in line with best practice.
- 1.3 Members were also informed that based on experience and best practice a greater level of savings could be achieved with the decentralised model that was in place.
- 1.4 Work was also being undertaken across Berkshire to seek to identify greater value for money and a report on this will be presented to a future Select Committee. The report following the Improvement and Efficient South East audit will also be shared with the Select Committee.

Timelord

- 1.5 Extensive feedback, both positive and negative, was received from Heads of Service who were working in a Timelord environment.
- 1.6 Members had particular concerns regarding the issues raised in relation to reduced desk sizes, a difficulty with conducting confidential conversations and a loss of team identity. Both Heads of Service and Jackie Jordan, the Timelord Programme Co-ordinator, described the activity that had been and was being put in place to try and address concerns, which were difficult to resolve. Senior managers were therefore asked to keep the issues raised under close review.

HR related issues

- 1.7 Information provided on the stress management risk assessment toolkit and the work within service areas in response to the Employee Attitude Survey 2009 was noted.
- 1.8 A progress report was also provided on the exit interview process. It was reported that there was not a focus on encouraging a greater response rate as retention rates were currently good and turnover low. However, Members asked Robert O'Reilly, Head of HR, to give consideration to improving processes in order to collect more, potentially crucial, information.

Budget

- 1.9 The matter of the timeliness of budget reporting was returned to and it was resolved that the Portfolio Holder for Finance would be asked to reconsider whether quarterly budget reports could be considered by the Select Committee in advance of the

Executive. This would enable any comments/recommendations to be fed through to the Executive.

- 1.10 Members noted with concern that the revenue overspend forecast had increased by approximately £250k between months 3 and 4. This was almost solely related to pressures within Adult Social Care. It was reported by Nick Carter, Chief Executive, that finding the necessary savings from the budget in order to meet this deficit would be a significant challenge. Discussion then followed on the possible need to use general fund balances.

2. Discussion items scheduled for the next meeting

- 2.1 The next meeting of the Select Committee is scheduled for 11 November 2010 and the draft agenda items are as follows:

- (1) To continue the review of the efficiency and effectiveness of Property Services in relation to work conducted within schools.
- (2) Month 5 revenue budget report. There will also be a focus on the Chief Executive Directorate budget.

3. Work Programme

- 3.1 The latest work programme for the Select Committee is contained within Appendix A of item 19 of this agenda.

Appendices

Appendix A – Resource Management Select Committee minutes from 13 September 2010.

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Jeff Brooks (Chairman), Richard Crumly, Dave Goff, David Holtby, David Rendel, Laszlo Zverko (Vice-Chairman)

Also Present: Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care), David Hogg (Head of Youth Services and Commissioning), Jackie Jordan (Timelord Programme Co-ordinator), Robert O'Reilly (Head of Human Resources), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service), Shiraz Sheikh (Solicitor), Mike Sullivan (Contracts and Procurement Officer), Andy Walker (Head of Finance), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer)

PART I

17. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

18. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

19. Actions from previous Minutes

The Committee considered a report providing the information requested at the last meeting (Agenda Item 4).

Newbury Cinema Subsidy

Andy Walker advised that it had yet to be confirmed by the operators whether the £16k saved from the 2009/10 financial year would need to be contributed within 2010/11. The Chief Executive was due to meet the operators later in September 2010 and an update would be reported at November's Select Committee.

Quarterly Budget Reports

At the last meeting, Members requested that the potential for quarterly reports to come to the Select Committee prior to the Executive, in order to make recommendations for improvement and comments etc, be given consideration. Andy Walker had since discussed this with Councillor Keith Chopping, the Portfolio Holder for Finance, and Councillor Chopping's view was that quarterly reports should be presented to the Executive prior to scrutiny.

This was felt to be inconsistent as the monthly reports were not seen by the Executive, although they did go through Management Board, and as a result it was agreed that the Portfolio Holder would be asked to reconsider his decision based on this fact.

Andy Walker was asked to recirculate budget reporting dates for the remainder of the year.

Section 106 (S106) Contributions

It was noted that all 16 S106 accounts which dated back to Berkshire County Council had been spent in their entirety within the last 3 years. However, Councillor David Rendel, a Member of the S106 task group, recalled alternative information being provided to the task group to suggest this was not the case at the time of the review. Andy Walker offered to clarify this point with the S106 Special Projects Officer.

RESOLVED that Andy Walker would:

- (1) provide an update on the Newbury Cinema subsidy at the next meeting;
- (2) ask the Portfolio Holder for Finance, on behalf of the Select Committee, to reconsider his decision on whether quarterly reports could be considered by the Select Committee in advance of the Executive;
- (3) recirculate budget reporting dates for the remainder of the year;
- (4) confirm the dates that the Berkshire County Council S106 agreements had been spent with the S106 Special Projects Officer.

20. Procurement processes

The Committee considered a report in continuation of the review into the procurement processes in place across the Council (Agenda Item 5).

Mike Sullivan introduced the item by making the following points:

- The Corporate Contracts and Procurement Unit worked within the rules outlined within the Contract Rules of Procedure (CRoP) (Part 12 of the Council's Constitution), which was updated in January 2010, the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Public Contracts Regulations (Amendment) 2009.
- There was clear guidance in the CRoP on financial thresholds and the procurement processes that applied to each threshold. The Procurement Unit would always be involved with contracts valued above £50k and those above £156k would need to be advertised through the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU).
- The Procurement Unit had less of an involvement for contracts valued at lower than £50k and the use of the Quick Quote facility was promoted for all contracts valued below this amount. 44 contracts had been awarded in this way for contracts valued at between £10k and £50k. It was noted that this left a number of contracts unaccounted for and Mike Sullivan advised that the majority of these were for contracts valued at less than £10k, which were often for small one off purchases that did not require the involvement of the Procurement Unit or were grant funded. However, he believed there was scope to increase the usage of Quick Quote. Efforts had been made to do so via an article in Reporter, discussions held with service areas and by developing training for Officers and Members.

Concern was expressed, as at the last meeting, that the procurement process was very delegated and the Procurement Unit had little involvement in much of the procurement undertaken across the Council. There had been no involvement in any contracts lower than £10k and this was particularly concerning for Members as the Coalition Government had announced a requirement for local authorities to publish all spend over £500.

The £10k threshold was felt to be too high as the contracts below this amount could total a large sum when combined, even when omitting those below £500.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

Shiraz Sheikh informed the Committee that the £10k threshold had been approved by Council in January 2010 as part of the revision of the CRoP. This raised the threshold in line with best practice.

There was a framework in place to support more strategic procurement, for example with neighbouring local authorities. It was suggested by a Member that there was scope to do this and make savings, for example on stationery orders which totalled approximately £700k for non school staff.

Andy Walker confirmed there were around 200 budget managers across the Council. While budget managers could be cleared to authorise expenditure of up to £50k and service managers up to £100k, these permissions varied and it was up to Heads of Service to set an appropriate restriction.

A question was then put to the Chief Executive as to whether there should be a more rigorous sign off process in place for contracts valued at between £1k and £10k.

In response, Nick Carter made the following points:

- He had not seen evidence to suggest there was an issue or that contracts were not achieving value for money. This was supported by extensive work undertaken across Berkshire to assess whether improvements could be made to achieve greater value for money. This showed that West Berkshire's existing processes worked well and other Berkshire Local Authorities had indicated they would be looking to incorporate West Berkshire's methods into their arrangements. A report was being produced following this work and this was offered to the Select Committee.
- This benchmark work had not been widened to include private sector organisations as they were required to operate under different regulations.
- Although there was always room for improvement, there was no evidence to suggest that the £10k threshold should be reduced. It was important that available resources were focused on priorities.

Progress with the Improvement and Efficiency South East (IESE) audit was queried. This was to conduct a review of areas including current activity, best practice and value for money. The Select Committee felt it would be of benefit to see the audit report once finalised and Nick Carter agreed to arrange this.

There was a view among Members at the previous meeting that the Procurement Unit needed to at least have an awareness of all contracts. It was therefore queried whether there was the potential for this to happen via a more centralised model and for the Procurement Unit to offer more advice and support for certain categories of expenditure.

In response, Nick Carter gave his view that West Berkshire's model was not centralised based on experience and best practice. It was found that greater savings could be achieved with a decentralised model, as Officers within service areas had a better understanding of their requirements and could therefore achieve better value for money.

RESOLVED that the reports produced as a result of the cross Berkshire work on procurement and the IESE audit would be circulated to the Select Committee once finalised.

21. Timelord

The Committee considered feedback from Heads of Service on their experience of the Timelord process and that of their staff (Agenda Item 6).

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

This was in follow up to the last meeting of the Select Committee where concern was raised as a result of staff feedback that the introduction of Timelord was having a negative impact on team working, was causing isolation for staff and conducting confidential conversations was a difficulty due to the office layout and availability of meeting rooms.

It was however noted at the last meeting that efforts were being made to ensure lessons were learnt and issues would be addressed in future. Jackie Jordan reminded Members that Management Board had accepted the recommendations for improvement and these were being actively pursued.

Heads of Service based in West Street House, who had experienced the Timelord process, had been invited to attend this meeting to share their views and those of their staff, particularly on the issues listed above. Ian Pearson read through feedback from a range of staff based at West Street House, this was based on both the new working style and the new building. Firstly the positive aspects:

- The new working style meant that disruption during the severe winter weather was minimised with more staff able to work from home.
- The issuing of Blackberries to some staff was extremely useful.
- Work/life balance had improved.
- Working from home reduced travel time and cost, allowed for more uninterrupted and concentrated work and gave staff a feeling of being trusted and valued.
- West Street House was ready for staff's immediate use, minimising the disruption caused by the office move.

Negatives:

- Desk areas were too small, this had partly been addressed in phase 2 and for phase 3. One amendment was for Heads of Service to have a fixed desk and therefore a larger desk irrespective of their workstyle.
- Initial IT problems had been experienced, but good support had been provided by IT staff. Citrix had been reported as being occasionally slow by 2 teams, but this had not been the experience of others present.
- A limited number of printers and photocopiers in busy periods caused congestion.
- On the subject of team working, there was felt to be a loss of identity, informal information sharing/support and an inability to hold unplanned meetings.
- The reduced office space and the close proximity of colleagues caused distractions. This was particularly an issue when making confidential telephone calls and it was often necessary to try and find a more private space for these, but room availability was an issue. A working protocol to cover issues created by a more open plan environment, such as noise levels, had been produced. Room availability was also an issue when trying to hold a confidential discussion with a member of staff. The number of meeting rooms was partly constrained by the size of West Street House.
- The removal of offices for Heads of Service was not only a loss of space for confidential discussions, but was also a loss of an additional meeting room. This was only compensated for in part by the communal meeting rooms available on each floor.
- Space for collating meeting papers etc was limited.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- There was a lack of flexibility on the allocation of IT/telecoms equipment, which was strictly based on workstyles. Blackberries, for instance, were only available for free staff. Although Jackie Jordan advised that free staff amounted to around 60% of the workforce for phase 3.
- A small number of staff had reported problems with carrying heavy equipment and paperwork between different locations. This was partly a need due to reduced storage space. Use of trolleys was being promoted to resolve this issue.

Additional comments:

- Full awareness was needed of staff whereabouts to ensure maximum staff numbers were not exceeded and there were enough desks available. Although staff could work in different parts of the building if necessary and not be limited to their service area.
- Greater electronic storage was necessary for service managers.

Despite the concerns raised by some members of staff, it was acknowledged by the vast majority that Timelord was a sensible approach and there were significant benefits. Staff remained committed to their work and were adaptable to change.

Heads of Service were then asked to comment on whether they felt issues such as reduced desk space and a loss of team identity could disconnect people from the organisation.

David Hogg felt that a greater effort was required by managers to ensure that issues were understood and, where necessary, addressed in order to support staff. For example, individuals might feel more isolated either working from home or because of the numbers potentially absent from the office as they benefited from interaction with colleagues during the day. A number of options were being actively explored to resolve this and that included use of team meetings, social events and a social area at work.

It was queried whether use of instant messaging had been explored which was perhaps a more informal form of communication than e-mail. Jackie Jordan advised of a pilot project for Unified Communications which included instant messaging. This was currently running within Housing and Performance and would be rolled out more widely by the end of the year. The Presence element of Unified Communications was a good way of ascertaining the whereabouts of staff. Unified Communications also provided conferencing functionality – another way of staying in touch without requiring physical presence in the office.

Members were interested in whether there had been an impact on staff morale and productivity. Ian Pearson advised that an improved building, new equipment etc had boosted morale. A more negative impact on morale was caused by uncertainty surrounding budget cuts and job losses rather than the introduction of Timelord. A reduction in productivity was not felt to be a major cause for concern and staff needed to be performance managed as was normally the case.

Jackie Jordan then described some of the activity being put in place to try and address concerns, as follows:

- In response to concerns regarding desk size, desk occupancy had been monitored. The occupancy levels varied between teams, but on average showed that while up to 70% of staff could be in the office at some point during the day, actual desk use was around 50%. So as a minimum 30% of desks were currently available at West Street House and staff were encouraged to spread out by sitting at every other desk when possible. This monitoring also identified spatial pressure

points during the day which were reported to Directorate Management Teams on a monthly basis to try and resolve. It was felt that occupancy could reduce as staff became more confident with Timelord as was experienced at Turnhams Green. Because West Street House used bench desking, it should be perfectly possible to increase the desk size at the expense of numbers of desks but Jackie Jordan would take her lead from Directorate Management Teams on this.

- It was hoped that creating more space in this way would help to resolve issues of confidentiality and apart from Heads of Service, staff had always worked in an open plan office. There were a minimum of 3 meeting rooms per floor and any increase would mean a loss of desk space.
- Evidence from acoustic studies showed that providing screening for Heads of Service would not be a benefit.
- Concerns had been raised by Unions which, in addition to some of those already mentioned, related to health and safety concerns for staff working from home. These concerns had been partially addressed at the Joint Consultative Panel by the Health and Safety Manager.
- A visit to West Street House was being arranged for members of the Joint Consultative Panel to try and alleviate their remaining concerns. In addition, it was felt that staff were developing greater self reliance when working from home.
- Evidence showed that IT availability via Citrix was faster than in the office and there was not a large number of calls being made to the IT Helpdesk.

Robert O'Reilly then made the following points from an HR perspective:

- This was felt to be the right way forward for the Council and was in line with the practices of other large organisations. It was felt that staff would continue to feel the benefits over time.
- There was some concern among staff and with the Unions, but in terms of morale, sickness figures were down for the service areas concerned as was turnover. West Berkshire's overall retention figures were higher than the Local Authority average.

In summing up the item, the actions being undertaken to address concerns were noted. However, some concerns did remain for Members i.e. lack of confidential space and loss of team identity. These were accepted as being difficult to resolve and senior managers were therefore asked to continue to keep these issues under review.

As a final point, Jackie Jordan gave the view that Timelord was achieving its overall objectives, i.e. the triple win to staff, the Council and its customers. This was confirmed by the review of phase 2. The speed of response to customers had greatly improved since Timelord's introduction.

RESOLVED that the information would be noted and that senior managers would be asked to continue to keep the issues raised under review.

22. **Stress Management**

The Committee considered a report detailing a risk assessment toolkit designed to undertake stress risk assessments and help reduce stress in the workplace (Agenda Item 7).

Robert O'Reilly explained that the toolkit, which was designed by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), had been piloted in Legal and Electoral Services with some success. A

presentation had also been made to the Corporate Management Team to raise awareness of its benefits.

This was a helpful addition to the existing practices of managing sickness absence, such as individuals being referred to Occupational Health and being offered a phased return to their duties.

18% of the sickness absence recorded in the Annual Employment Report was reported as stress related, this could be as a result of personal issues as well as work pressures. The Local Authority average was 17%. However, overall sickness absence was showing a reduction.

The risk assessment would be undertaken anonymously across a service area and contained 35 questions. Results were benchmarked against other organisations and if it was found that urgent action was required, then it was recommended that a focus group be formed to try and find solutions which would be forwarded to senior management teams. The focus group would be led by HR and would not be represented by senior management.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

23. Employee Attitude Survey 2009 - update on action planning

The Committee considered an update on the actions that have taken place within service areas to address issues identified in the Employee Attitude Survey (EAS) 2009 results (Agenda Item 8).

Robert O'Reilly highlighted the following points from the report:

- It was not felt necessary to produce a corporate action plan as overall there was a positive response in comparison to other local authorities. Only two service areas scored lower than the local authority benchmark.
- Results had improved since the survey was previously conducted in 2007.
- Individual service areas had been asked to produce an action plan where results deemed this necessary.
- A number of recommendations for good practice had been identified for service areas to implement. In some cases this was about ensuring that existing policy was adhered to.
- The next survey was due in 2011 and it would be a significant challenge to improve upon the very positive 2009 results.

In response to the final point, the importance of comparing performance with other local authorities was raised as a way of assessing progress.

It was noted that the results for Legal and Electoral Services were low and Robert O'Reilly advised that it was for this reason that they participated in the pilot of the stress management toolkit. A focus group was also formed in an attempt to resolve issues within the service.

RESOLVED that the report would be noted.

24. Exit Interview

The Committee considered a report providing an update on progress with the exit interview process (Agenda Item 9).

Members noted that 23.3% of staff who completed an exit interview questionnaire did not specify their reason for leaving. Robert O'Reilly informed Members that staff had the

opportunity to provide further feedback as part of their exit interview and would check if staff had the opportunity to elaborate further within the questionnaire.

As the Council's retention rates were good and turnover was currently low, it was not deemed necessary to have a more significant focus on ensuring a greater number of exit interviews were completed.

There was however a view among Members that greater effort should be given to ensure exit interviews were held as a matter of course, as this could provide vital information for the Council.

The current process was for EC4 forms (which informed HR that an employee was leaving) to be sent to HR and exit interview forms were then sent to employees to complete. However, this sometimes caused a delay meaning that exit interviews did not always take place. It was therefore suggested that line managers should access forms direct to allow more time for exit interviews to be completed. Departing employees should have the option of discussing their reasons for leaving with someone other than their line manager if they wished.

RESOLVED that Robert O'Reilly would be asked to give consideration to making improvements to processes in order to provide more robust data.

25. Financial Performance Report

The Committee considered the month 4 revenue budget and quarter 1 capital budget as part of the financial performance report (Agenda Item 10).

Andy Walker advised that the Council's revenue overspend forecast had increased by approximately £250k between month 3 and month 4.

Nick Carter explained that measures had already been taken as a result of the Government's in year budget cuts to find savings, including a recruitment freeze, and the ability to find further savings was therefore limited. Indeed the recruitment freeze was having a limited impact as turnover was low.

The most significant pressure, which could increase, was within Adult Social Care and it was difficult to reduce the demand for these services. The underspend experienced in Children and Young People budgets in 2009/10, which helped with the budget position in that year, had not materialised in this financial year. Similarly, budgets in the Chief Executive Directorate were not seeing significant underspends at this stage.

The risk fund included a sum of £600k allocated to Adult Social Care, but a significant overspend would still remain even if this funding was drawn down.

Andy Walker explained that the remaining overspend could be covered by general fund balances, but meeting the forecasted overspend would mean that balances would be approximately £1m lower than the ideal level of £6.5m. This amount was based on guidance from CIPFA (the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy). A view would have to be taken on whether the remaining reserves would be sufficient if this action were to be taken.

It was queried whether more could be done in placing a charge against an individual's property to help contribute or pay for their care, a particular concern was a property being signed over to a family member to avoid this charge. Andy Walker agreed to discuss this further with the team responsible for this function.

The actual budget for Adult Social Care had reduced by around £334k since month 3, this was as a result of changes to a joint arrangement with the NHS. This caused both expenditure and income to reduce by this amount.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

Further clarity was sought on the number of capital depleters that had been budgeted for in comparison to the number coming through. Also whether a budget existed to allow for new care packages for people with a learning disability (3 new care packages had come through in year for clients previously unknown to the Council). Andy Walker agreed to provide this information.

It was noted that although a £156k overspend was reported for the Children and Young People Directorate budget, it was expected that the budget would balance by year end as a result of management action. It was therefore queried why this did not show in the accounts as with other Directorates, which was felt to be a preferable approach by the Select Committee. Nick Carter acknowledged that there were differing approaches and a need for consistency would be discussed at Corporate Board.

In the Environment Directorate, a reduction in car park income was forecasted. The street lighting contract, which was another budget pressure, was in its second year and Nick Carter explained that this was an example of where centralised procurement was less successful than the previous arrangement where Officers in Street Lighting negotiated a less expensive contract directly. Andy Walker agreed to raise concerns of the Select Committee regarding the street lighting contract with relevant Officers.

Another concern was the higher than budgeted running costs of West Street House and West Point and whether the purchase of these properties was based on a lower prediction of running costs. Andy Walker agreed to investigate this issue.

The forecast underspend in the Chief Executive Directorate had reduced due to a new pressure in land charges income. The Government had taken a view that fees could no longer be charged for personal searches of the local land charges register and the fee was revoked from 17 August 2010. A reduction in income was forecast of £49k for the year. Members had some queries around whether any individuals should be refunded for charges incorrectly made and how the pressure had been calculated. Nick Carter agreed to provide further detail on this issue.

Andy Walker explained that a decision had been taken by Corporate Board and the Executive to only produce capital reports on a quarterly basis. This was felt appropriate as capital budgets moved more slowly and there was less variance from month to month. The Select Committee raised the importance of continuing to closely monitor capital expenditure, including consideration of any capital budget implications on revenue budgets.

The capital summary for the Community Services Directorate stated that the majority of the capital budget would be spent by year end. However, this differed from the information in the budget table and Andy Walker agreed to establish why this was the case.

Discussion then returned to the timeliness of budget reporting. Members were advised that they had the most up to date budget position for their consideration, which had been approved by Executive Members at Management Board on 2 September 2010. The quarter 1 report was formally approved by Executive later in the same day and there was suggestion by some Members that the latest month 4 position could have at least been referred to at Executive, so that any alternative action could have been considered based on the worsening situation.

In response, Nick Carter gave his view that it would not be sufficient notice to prepare and table a budget report in the timeframe referred to and it was for the Executive Leader to decide whether or not to introduce new material.

RESOLVED that:

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- (1) Andy Walker would:
 - forward the Select Committee’s views regarding placing a charge against an individual’s property to the appropriate team;
 - provide information on capital depleters;
 - confirm whether a budget existed for new and unexpected care packages for clients with a learning disability;
 - raise concerns regarding the cost of the street lighting contract with relevant Officers;
 - investigate the running costs of West Street House and West Point and the ongoing impact to the budget;
 - establish why the information on capital expenditure in the Community Services Directorate differed within the report.
- (2) Nick Carter would provide further detail on the reduction in land charges income.

26. Work Programme

The Committee considered the Resource Management Select Committee Work Programme (Agenda Item 11).

It was agreed that the next meeting, scheduled for 22 November, would be rearranged to ensure that the Asset Management Plan was on the agenda. Further agenda items were noted as follows:

- A focus on the Chief Executive Directorate budget
- Continuation of the review into the work of Property Services and its contractors within schools.
- Value for money.

RESOLVED that the work programme would be noted and the next meeting rearranged to ensure that the Asset Management Plan was on the agenda for discussion.

27. Establishment Report Quarter 1 2010/11

The Committee considered the Quarter 1 Establish Report (Agenda Item 12).

RESOLVED that the report would be noted.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 9.35pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

Title of Report:	Safer Select Committee
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 nd November 2010

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Safer Select Committee.

Recommended Action:

- To note for information;
- To approve the proposals for three new review subjects to be added to the Committee's work programme.

Safer Select Committee Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Quentin Webb – Tel (01635) 202646
E-mail Address:	qwebb@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Elaine Walker
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity)
Tel. No.:	01635 519441
E-mail Address:	ewalker@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the work undertaken by the Safer Select Committee since the report made at the last OSMC meeting.
- 1.2 The Committee last met on September 20th 2010. The minutes of this meeting are shown at Appendix A.

2. Improving Public Confidence

- 2.1 The Safer Select Committee completed their review into Improving Public Confidence in April 2010, producing recommendations that were subsequently submitted to, and approved by, the OSMC and were further submitted to, and approved by, Corporate Board, Management Board and the Executive.
- 2.2 At the request of Management Board, the title of this review was amended to 'Tackling the Perception of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour'
- 2.3 The Council's response to the recommendations is shown at Appendix B.
- 2.4 The response provided by Thames Valley Police to the recommendations is shown at Appendix C.

3. Installation of Automatic Fire Suppression Systems

- 3.1 The Committee concluded its review into whether the Council should develop and adopt a policy in relation to the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in Council buildings.
- 3.2 The recommendations developed by the Committee are attached at Agenda item 11.
- 3.3 The Committee have requested that a third visit to view an installed automatic fire suppression system be progressed in order that members can view an installation in a school.

4. Crime Statistics

- 4.1 The Committee received information from Thames Valley Police and the Safer Communities Partnership Team regarding crime statistics and the strategic assessment process. The Committee were content with the information received.

5. Work Programme

- 5.1 The Committee will receive information regarding the implementation of gating orders at their next meeting in December 2010 in response to the work programme item 'Gating Orders'.
- 5.2 In response to the information received relating to 'Crime Statistics' the Committee identified three new items to be added to its work programme and ask the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to approve these items:

- (1) To investigate schemes aimed to empower communities that face perceived hostile situations:
 - (a) To consider whether it would be appropriate to introduce schemes aiming to empower individuals within their own communities.
 - (b) To recommend a suitable scheme for introduction if applicable.
- (2) To support the integrated offender management scheme;
 - (a) To receive further information in relation to the Integrated Offender Management scheme;
 - (b) To consider what actions the Council is able to take in support of the scheme.
- (3) To support the process of designing out crime from new developments:
 - (a) To consider what influence the Council is able to exert in supporting planning applications that demonstrate crime reduction strategies;
 - (b) To consider what actions the Council is able to take in order to increase consideration of crime reduction in planning applications.

5.3 The latest work programme for the Select Committee is contained within Appendix A of item 19 of this agenda.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the Safer Select Committee meeting held on 20th September 2010

Appendix B – The Council's response to the recommendations made by the Safer Select Committee into Improving Public Confidence.

Appendix C – Thames Valley Police response to the recommendations made by the Safer Select Committee into Improving Public Confidence.

This page is intentionally left blank

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman), Robert Morgan (Substitute) (In place of Keith Woodhams) and Quentin Webb (Chairman)

Also Present: Rachel Craggs (Community Safety Manager) and Alex O'Connor (Assistant Community Safety Officer), Councillor Paul Bryant, David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager, in place of Andy Day who sent apologies), Supt Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police) and Elaine Walker (Principal Policy Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Keith Woodhams

Councillor(s) Absent: Councillor Adrian Edwards

PART I

9. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th July 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

10. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 5, but reported that, as his interest was not prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate.

11. Matters Arising

The Committee reviewed the status of activities identified at previous meetings. The Committee was content with progress but requested that item two remain until resolved.

RESOLVED that item two in Matters Arising remain until resolved.

12. Installation of Fire Sprinklers

(Councillor Bryant declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5 by virtue of the fact that he was the Chairman of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, appointed to represent the Council on this outside body. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate).

(Councillor Chandler joined the meeting at 6:45pm)

The Chairman expressed thanks for two visits made by the Committee to the Kennet Centre and Sainsbury's to view their automatic fire suppression systems (fire sprinkler systems). The members of the Committee agreed that they would still like to visit a school where an automatic fire suppression system had been installed, and requested that this be taken forward.

The Chairman summarised previous discussions of the Committee in a series of recommendations for the Committee to approve. Following discussion, the Committee agreed the following:

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- The Committee recognised that building regulations were robust and suitable for the evacuation of buildings and protection of occupants;
- The Committee recognised the protection offered to both the fabric of buildings and their occupants by automatic fire suppression systems;
- The Committee accepted that the cost of retrospectively fitting automatic fire suppression systems would be prohibitive except in some cases of substantial refurbishment;
- The Committee concluded that the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in any newly built Council owned or contracted properties should be presumed, and requested that a policy be drafted for approval;
- The Committee was informed of the significant savings in insurance premiums achieved by other local authorities as a result of installing automatic fire suppression systems, and recommended that further discussion be held with the Council's property insurers in order to achieve similar savings.
- The Committee considered that the benefits of installing automatic fire suppression systems included a greater flexibility in building design and a reduction in water damage caused when the fire was being extinguished.
- The Committee was grateful to David Sharp of the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service for the information supplied to the meeting of the 5th July 2010.
- The Committee considered that whilst installation and maintenance costs were a prime concern, they had to be considered in relation to savings in other areas including savings achieved through alternative building design.
- The Committee recommended that consideration be given early in the design stages of a project as to where the components of an automatic fire suppression system would be located in order to reduce installation costs.

Councillor Bryant suggested to the Committee that any assessment of the need for automatic fire suppression systems in a building should reflect the specific issues relating to the use of the building. For example, a school would have strong procedures for, and the ability to, evacuate the building; whereas residents of a residential home would be less able to evacuate the area.

The Committee considered a further suggestion that the Council insist on the installation of an automatic fire suppression system in all suitable planning applications submitted to the Council. The Committee considered that without national backing, this could not be implemented and so would not be recommended.

RESOLVED that:

- A visit to a school where an automatic fire suppression system has been installed be arranged.
- The Committee would make the following recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for endorsement:
 1. That the installation of automatic fire suppression systems in any newly built Council owned or contracted properties should be presumed, and request that a policy to this effect be drafted for approval. The policy should reflect the views of the Committee as noted above.
 2. That further discussion be held with the Council's property insurers with the aim of achieving further savings in premiums.

13. Crime Statistics

The Committee received a presentation by Superintendent Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police), Rachel Craggs (Community Safety Manager) and Alex O'Connor (Assistant Community Safety Officer) concerning crime statistics and the strategic assessment process.

Following questioning, the following points were clarified:

- The strategic assessment process was an annual assessment of crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse trends which resulted in the identification of annual priorities. Corrective action would be taken between reviews if evidence indicated that it was necessary.
- Superintendent Rickard explained that the introduction of the Partnership Intelligence Monitoring and Mapping System (PIMMS) has increased the speed to which incidents could be responded, allowing the rapid movement of resources to resolve a problem or enable a longer term solution to be implemented quickly.
- The Committee was reminded that responding to crime was not limited to police activity, and that partners played a critical role in reducing crime. For example, neighbourhood wardens were able to provide reassurance through visibility; and tackling anti-social behaviour was led by the local authority and housing with the police playing only a minor role in providing evidence.
- As less focus was placed on National Indicators, the strategic assessment process was expected to become more important in order to identify and react to local problems. It was expected that nationally there would remain priority crime categories.
- It was acknowledged that there had been a recent short term spike in reported burglaries, however crime could be seen to follow a series of peaks and troughs over time and the recent figures reflected this pattern. Some changes could also be explained by the changes to national crime recording standards such as an amendment at the end of 2004 allowing arrests to be made of people committing assault with no injury, where previously this had not been possible. However, all crime had been reduced by more than 16% (951 crimes) compared to the same period in 2009 and this was also less than in 2008.
- The number of priority and prolific offenders (PPOs) was determined locally in relation to the number of people who were able to be managed. There were currently 34 people in the PPO category in West Berkshire. The PPO management scheme aimed to identify, manage and remove the motivation to offend. This might involve ensuring they had somewhere to live on leaving prison, or providing assistance to find work.
- It was confirmed that there was no significant increase in crime levels experienced during the 2010 World Cup. However Superintendent Rickard explained that preventative work had been undertaken in preparation, including licensing officer patrols during each match, and more police resources being made available with greater visibility.
- Activity around anti-social behaviour was being led by the Safer Communities Partnership, and it was likely that the Council along with the police would take the lead on this through the Safer Communities Partnership. However responsibility for reporting and addressing anti-social behaviour could not sit with a single organisation and would remain with individual organisations.

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- It was proposed that work be undertaken with schools to address the current issue of robbery committed by youths, where the motivation was bullying rather than the acquisition of particular items. There was a concern that young people were not aware of the implications arising from this (fitting the definition of, and therefore being recorded as, a robbery) and therefore possibly resulting in a sentence of several years in prison for perpetrators.

The Committee enquired whether there were local schemes, as in some other areas, aimed at empowering local people to deal effectively with confrontation or perceived hostile situations such as when faced by large groups. The Committee was informed that no schemes were available in this area, and the Committee agreed that this should be added to the work programme for review.

The Committee was informed that the future of the activities able to be undertaken around crime reduction was uncertain in the current climate. However two areas that should be pursued were the PPO scheme (now known as integrated offender management) and the need for all partners to be aware of the contribution they could make to crime reduction, such as to improving building developments in order to design out crime at the planning stage.

The Committee queried whether it would be appropriate to request comments from the police for planning applications submitted to the Council for larger developments.

It was agreed that the Committee should add to the work programme items to support the integrated offender management programme and designing out crime from the planning stage of a proposed development.

RESOLVED that:

- A review would be undertaken into the possibility of making available activities to empower local communities facing perceived hostile situations.
- The Committee would undertake a review in support of the integrated offender management programme.
- The Committee would undertake a review in support of designing out crime from the planning stage of a proposed development.

14. Work Programme

The Committee reviewed the work programme and agreed to review Gating Orders at their next meeting in December 2010. This review would consider the current position of gating orders and the suitability of the current policy.

The Committee also agreed to add three items to their work programme to review, schemes aimed to empower communities that faced perceived hostile situations; support for the integrated offender management programme; and the planning out crime at the design stage of developments.

RESOLVED that:

- The Committee would undertake a review of gating orders in December 2010.
- The Committee would add the following review items to their work programme:
 - schemes aimed to empower communities that faced perceived hostile situations;
 - support for the integrated offender management programme;
 - planning out crime at the design stage of developments

SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 20 SEPTEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

Title of Report: **Scrutiny Review of Tackling the Perception of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour**

Report to be considered by: Executive

Date of Meeting:

Forward Plan Ref:

Purpose of Report: To respond to the recommendations of the Safer Select Committee Review into Tackling the Perception of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

Recommended Action: That the Executive consider and if appropriate agree the recommendations in the Scrutiny review

Reason for decision to be taken: To consider the findings of a scrutiny review

Other options considered: None

Key background documentation:

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Plan Priority(ies):

- CPP1 – Support our communities through the economic downturn** – to alleviate the impact on different communities and individuals who find themselves out of work and/or disadvantaged
- CPP2 – Raise levels of educational achievement** – improving school performance levels
- CPP3 – Reduce crime and the fear of crime**

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Plan Theme(s):

- CPT1 - Better Roads and Transport**
- CPT2 - Thriving Town Centres**
- CPT3 - Affordable Housing**
- CPT4 - High Quality Planning**
- CPT5 - Cleaner and Greener**
- CPT6 - Vibrant Villages**
- CPT7 - Safer and Stronger Communities**
- CPT8 - A Healthier Life**
- CPT9 - Successful Schools and Learning**
- CPT10 - Promoting Independence**
- CPT11 - Protecting Vulnerable People**
- CPT12 - Including Everyone**
- CPT13 - Value for Money**
- CPT14 - Effective People**

- CPT15 - Putting Customers First**
 CPT16 - Excellent Performance Management

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Plan Priorities and Themes by:

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld – Tel (01488) 658238
E-mail Address:	astansfeld@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	24/08/10

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Susan Powell
Job Title:	Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 264703
E-mail Address:	spowell@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy: None
Financial: None
Personnel: None
Legal/Procurement: None
Property: None
Risk Management: None
Equalities Impact Assessment: None

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Executive Summary and Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 During 2009, the Safer Select Committee undertook a review into Tackling the Perception of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour. Recommendations formed from this review were approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission on 29th June 2010.
- 1.2 The details of the report are shown at Appendix A.

2. Response to the Recommendations

- 2.1 The Council's response to the recommendations made by the Safer Select Committee are set out below.

- (1) Recommendation 1: The Council's Community Safety Team to continue regular meetings with Thames Valley Police and press officers to recommend activity aimed at increasing resident confidence, including consideration of whether it would be appropriate to target particular areas subject to appropriate funding being identified.

Response: Accepted. Regular meetings are held between the Council's Safer Communities Partnership Team, Thames Valley Police and press officers to develop communications in support of increasing resident awareness and confidence. Consideration will continue to be given to targeting activity in identified areas subject to available resources.

- (2) Recommendation 2: The Public Involvement Board is a subgroup of the Local Strategic Partnership formed specifically to coordinate consultation activity. The Public Involvement Board of the West Berkshire Partnership be asked to develop a more integrated approach to consultation across the District.

Response: Accepted. The purpose of the Public Involvement Board is to coordinate consultation activity between agencies across West Berkshire. This activity will continue to be undertaken, but a review of structures recently agreed by the LSP may require different management of the activity.

- (3) Recommendation 3: Thames Valley Police review of Neighbourhood Action Groups to be considered and implemented by Thames Valley Police. This review should consider altering the governance arrangements for Neighbourhood Action Groups to require reporting of outcomes to the community.

Response: Accepted. Thames Valley Police are implementing new Neighbourhood Tasking Arrangements which incorporates providing feedback to the community of outcomes achieved.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The Council accepts each of the recommendations made by the Safer Select Committee regarding Tackling Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour and sets out our responses above.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Consultees

Local Stakeholders: -

Officers Consulted: -

Trade Union: -

This page is intentionally left blank

20 JUL 2010

WEST BERKSHIRE COUNCIL

Reading Police Station
Castle Street
Reading RG1 7TH
Tel. 0118 953 6001
Fax. 0118 953 6003
Email: christopher.shead@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk

Ms. Elaine Walker, Principal Policy Officer
West Berkshire Council
Council Offices
Market Street
Newbury
Berkshire RG14 5LD

15 July 2010

Dear Ms. Walker,

Improving Public Confidence – recommendations of the Safer Select Committee

Thank you for your letter dated 30 June 2010 which included the recommendations from the Safer Select Committee that were endorsed by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission. I can now provide you with the following information in relation to the recommendations:

Recommendation 9.1 a

The West Berkshire Community Safety Team have developed an action plan to increase the confidence of the West Berkshire communities in the Police and West Berkshire Council in dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour. This plan was implemented in 2009 and is regularly reviewed and refined. The plan includes monthly meetings between partners and monthly press and media briefings. Confidence is measured by both the Police and West Berkshire Council using different methodologies however over the last 12 months confidence has improved in West Berkshire.

Recommendation 9.1 c

A full review of neighbourhood Action Groups was carried out across Thames Valley Police in 2009. One of the recommendations from that review was that Local Police Areas should ensure that appropriate governance arrangements exist that meet the needs of the local community and allow the development of processes and initiatives that positively impact on the identified crime and disorder priorities for the respective locality. This recommendation has been fully implemented in West Berkshire and has resulted in appropriate changes being made based on the needs of the local communities.

On a monthly basis each neighbourhood policing team produces an update that is distributed widely and is available on the Thames Valley Police internet site. The update provides updates on the local priorities and the outcomes of activity to reduce crime and disorder.

If you need any more information, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,



Chris Shead
Chief Superintendent
BCU Commander
Berkshire West BCU

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 17.

Title of Report:	Stronger Communities Select Committee
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee.

Recommended Action: To note the information.

Stronger Communities Select Committee Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Irene Neill – Tel (0118) 9712671
E-mail Address:	ineill@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Stephen Chard
Job Title:	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
Tel. No.:	01635 519462
E-mail Address:	schard@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Select Committee met on 21 October 2010 and the draft minutes will be tabled at the meeting. A summary of the discussions held are as follows:
- 1.2 An update was received on progress with the Playbuilder Programme. There had been concern that the funding for 2010/11 would be cut or reduced, impacting on the projects planned across West Berkshire. However, Members were pleased to note the good news that this funding would be honoured in full.
- 1.3 A comprehensive report was received from the supporting small schools group and this is provided under agenda item 12.

2. Task Group update

- 2.1 The Housing Register task group has held its first meeting and is due to meet again on 5 November 2010.

3. Discussion items scheduled for the next meeting

- 3.1 The next meeting of the Select Committee is taking place on 27 January 2011. Draft agenda items are as follows:
 - (1) To monitor changes introduced to the Youth Service
 - (2) To consider any issues with primary school admissions in West Berkshire

4. New items for consideration

- 4.1 Members supported adding an item to the work programme to explore the Big Society initiative. It was felt to be opportune to look at enabling people and encouraging them to take responsibility in their own communities. The Commission is asked to approve this addition to the work programme.

5. Work Programme

- 5.1 The latest work programme for the Select Committee is contained within Appendix A of item 19 of this agenda.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Title of Report:	West Berkshire Forward Plan
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To advise the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from November 2010 to February 2011 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the plan.

Recommended Action: That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission considers the West Berkshire Council Forward Plan for November 2010 to February 2011 and recommends further action as appropriate.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 9420196
E-mail Address:	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Graham Jones – Tel (01235) 762744
E-mail Address:	gjones@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Stephen Chard
Job Title:	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
Tel. No.:	01635 519462
E-mail Address:	schard@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Forward Plan attempts to cover all decisions, not just those made by the Executive, which the Authority intends to take over the next 4 months. The Forward Plan, attached at Appendix A, for the months of November 2010 to February 2011, also shows the decision path of each item including Council, Executive and Individual Decisions.
- 1.2 In order to hold the Executive to account, Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Members are asked to identify any forthcoming decisions which may be appropriate for scrutiny.

Appendices

Appendix A – West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
NOVEMBER 2010											
	Update on HR Policies and Procedures	PC	12/11/10PC	Chief Executive	Jane Milone	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		04/11/10			01 November 2010
	Demonstration of the HR System	PC	12/11/10PC	Chief Executive	Jane Milone	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		04/11/10			01 November 2010
ID2069	Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2148	Dorneywood Way area, Newbury - Proposed 20mph speed limit zone <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2151	Wickham Village - Proposed 30mph and 40mph speed limits <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2153	A340 Tidmarsh Road - 40mph speed limit <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2158	Response to Petition on the Proposed Closure of the Taxi Rank in the Market Place, Newbury <i>To respond to the petition.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Mark Cole	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
ID2167	Newbury Racecourse - Proposed waiting restrictions <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC	Statutory consultees, general public, Parish Council and Ward Members		01 November 2010
ID2070	Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Chief Executive	Paula Amorelli (2233)	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2171	Cultural Activity Supported by Greenham Common Trust <i>To agree the proposed method that allows Greenham Common Trust to discharge its obligations from an agreement dated 20th September 2007.</i>	ID	01/11/10	Community Services	David Appleton	Children & Families, Youth Service, Culture & Leisure		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2152	Lamtarra Way, Greenham <i>To approve the statutory consultation and advertisement for a road closure</i>	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2050	A338, Great Shefford, Chaddleworth and Fawley, 50mph and 30mph Speed Limit	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010
ID2051	West Berkshire District Council Order – Various Roads, Ashampstead – 30mph Speed Limit	ID	01/11/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
ID2168	Single Equality Scheme 2010-2013 <i>To present the first West Berkshire Council Single Equality Scheme and request agreement to adopt the scheme.</i>	ID	02/11/10	Chief Executive	Elaine Walker	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions		25/10/10	All residents and employees, specific consultation with DES Board and WBMEF.		01 November 2010
ID2176	2010/11 Highways and Transport Winter Service and Adverse Weather Plan <i>To approve the Weather Plan.</i>	ID	04/11/10	Environment	Mark Edwards	Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT		27/10/10	The report takes into account the recommendations of the OSC review into the 2009/10 winter. The review involved widespread consultation with parish and town councils as well as other key stakeholders such as the emergency services. All parish and town councils were subsequently consulted specifically on the grit bin policy		01 November 2010
ID2159	West Berkshire Admission Arrangements 2012-13 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Admission Scheme <i>To set out the Admission arrangements being considered for 2012-13.</i>	ID	08/11/10	Children and Young People	Malcolm Berry	Education		29/10/10			01 November 2010
ID2068	West Berkshire Forward Plan - December 2010 to March 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	11/11/10	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of the Council		03/11/10		Not subject to call in.	01 November 2010

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
GAC2169	Arrangements for Working Group Considering Future Governance Arrangements <i>To agree the terms of reference and associated timescales for the working group tasked with considering the merits and demerits and cost analysis of various governance models the Council could introduce following the implementation of revised legislation.</i>	GAC	15/11/10 GA	Chief Executive	David Holling	Leader of the Council		05/11/10			01 November 2010
EX2047	Financial Report Q2 2010/11	EX	25/11/10 EX	Chief Executive	Andy Walker	Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health and Safety		17/11/10			01 November 2010
EX2017	Corporate Property Asset Management Plan <i>To seek approval to the West Berkshire Council's Asset Management Plan.</i>	EX	25/11/10 EX	Environment	Amanda Dennis	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		17/11/10	Heads of Service		01 November 2010
EX2175	Leisure Centre Core Price Review 2011/12 – Parkwood Leisure <i>To consider a request from Parkwood Leisure to bring forward the implementation of an annual price review to 1st January in each year.</i>	EX	25/11/10 EX	Community Services	David Appleton	Children & Families, Youth Service, Culture & Leisure		17/11/10			

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:	Individual Executive Member Decision
ID =	Executive
EX =	Council
C =	GA = Governance & Audit Committee
GA =	S = Standards Committee
S =	PC = Personnel Committee
PC =	

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
DECEMBER 2010											
ID2069	Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/12/10	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions		TBC			01 December 2010
ID2070	Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/12/10	Chief Executive	Paula Amorelli (2233)	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy		TBC			01 December 2010
ID2165	Westridge Green, Aldworth - Proposed 30mph speed limit <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/12/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC	Statutory consultees, general public, Parish Council and Ward Members		01 December 2010
ID2071	West Berkshire Forward Plan - January 2011 to April 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	16/12/10	Chief Executive	Moirra Fraser (2045)	Leader of the Council		08/12/10		Not subject to call in.	01 December 2010
ID2053	West Berkshire District Council Order, Station Road, Kintbury, 40mph speed limit	ID	01/12/10	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 December 2010
C1982	West Berkshire Council Timetable of Public Meetings <i>To agree the timetable of public meetings for the year 2011/12.</i>	C	09/12/10 C	Chief Executive	Moirra Fraser	Leader of the Council		01/12/10			01 December 2010
C2003	Stronger Leader and Cabinet Model - Outcomes of Consultation <i>To consider adopting new style leader and cabinet arrangements following consultation exercise.</i>	C	15/11/10 GA 09/12/10 C	Chief Executive	David Holling	Leader of the Council		05/11/10 GA 01/12/10 C			01 December 2010

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
C2164	Appointment of Designated Scrutiny Officer <i>A Statutory Requirement to appoint someone to the role of Scrutiny Officer.</i>	C	15/11/10 GA 09/10/10 C	Democratic Services	Moira Fraser	Leader of the Council		05/11/10 GA 01/12/10 C			01 December 2010
C1886	Amendments to the Constitution - Scheme of Delegation <i>To include Part 10 of the Town and Country Planning Act to the Head of Planning and Trading Standards.</i>	C	15/11/10 GA 09/12/10 C	Chief Executive	Andy Day	Leader of the Council		05/11/10 GA 01/12/10 C		Moved from May Council cycle	01 December 2010
C	Junior Citizen of the Year Award 2010	C	09/12/10 C	Chief Executive	Jo Watt	Chairman of the Council		01/12/10			01 December 2010
JANUARY 2011											
ID2075	Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/01/11	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions		TBC			01 January 2011
ID2076	Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/01/11	Chief Executive	Paula Amorelli (2233)	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy		TBC			01 January 2011
ID2166	Hampstead Norreys - Proposed 40mph speed limit <i>To consider the responses received during statutory consultation.</i>	ID	01/01/11	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC	Statutory consultees, general public, Parish Council and Ward Members		01 January 2011
ID2144	Speed Limit Review - October 2010 <i>To approve the statutory consultation for altering the speed limit on a number of roads following a meeting of the speed limit task group.</i>	ID	01/01/11	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		TBC			01 November 2010

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
ID2074	West Berkshire Forward Plan - February 2011 to May 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	13/01/11	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of the Council		05/01/11		Not subject to call in.	01 January 2011
EX2107	Council Plan Outcomes 2010/11: Quarterly Performance Update - Q2 <i>To report quarterly performance against each of the outcomes identified in the 2010/11 Council Plan and to report remedial action being taken, where targets were not projected to be met.</i>	EX	13/01/11 EX	Chief Executive	David Cook	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		06/01/11	Performance officers, EPMG/IPG		01 January 2011
EX2119	Establishment Report Q2 2010/11	EX	13/01/11 EX	Chief Executive	Robert O'Reilly	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		06/01/11			01 January 2011
EX2028	Empowering West Berkshire	EX	13/01/11 EX	Chief Executive	Andy Day	Portfolio Holders for Leisure & Culture and Community Care		06/01/11			01 January 2011
EX2157	Response to the Scrutiny Review into the Performance of Schools in West Berkshire <i>To respond to the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission following the investigations into the performance of schools in West Berkshire.</i>	EX	13/01/11 EX	Children and Young People	Andy Tubbs	Education		06/01/11			01 January 2011

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. **Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.**

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
EX2170	Newbury Town Centre Traffic Management Issues - Second Report <i>For the Executive to consider the feedback received from the various interest groups and organisations consulted on the Council's proposals for revised traffic management in the town centre and to seek authority to proceed as recommended.</i>	EX	13/01/11 EX	Environment	Mark Cole	Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT		06/01/11	Interest groups and organisations listed in first report dated 18/02/10 already consulted. Individual stakeholders to be advised on proposals when approved by Executive. Statutory advertisement and consultation on required Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's)		01 January 2011
FEBRUARY 2011											
ID2078	Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/02/11	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions		TBC			01 February 2011
ID2079	Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/02/11	Chief Executive	Paula Amorelli (2233)	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy		TBC			01 February 2011
ID2077	West Berkshire Forward Plan - March 2011 to June 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	10/02/11	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of the Council		02/02/11		Not subject to call in.	01 February 2011

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:
 ID = Individual Executive Member Decision
 EX = Executive
 C = Council
 GA = Governance & Audit Committee
 S = Standards Committee
 PC = Personnel Committee

West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – November 2010 to February 2011

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact & Ext. No.	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
GAC1905	Anti Fraud Strategy <i>To put in place an Anti Fraud Strategy for the Council that meets best practice.</i>	GA	14/02/11 GA	Chief Executive	Ian Priestley	Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health and Safety		04/02/11	Corporate Board, External Auditors		01 February 2011
GAC2114	Internal Audit Q2 2010/11	GA	14/02/11 GA	Chief Executive	Ian Priestley	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		04/02/11			01 February 2011
GAC2117	Strategic Risk Register Q2 2010/11	GA	14/02/11 GA	Chief Executive	Ian Priestley	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		04/02/11			01 February 2011
EX2160	West Berkshire Admission Arrangements 2012-13 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Admission Scheme <i>To determine the West Berkshire Admission Arrangements for Community and voluntary Controlled Schools and the Co-ordinated Admissions Scheme.</i>	EX	17/02/11 EX	Children and Young People	Malcolm Berry	Education		09/02/11			01 February 2011
EX2048	Financial Report Q3 2010/11	EX	17/02/11 EX	Chief Executive	Andy Walker	Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health and Safety		09/02/11			01 February 2011

The items included in the Forward Plan were correct at the time of publication. The Forward Plan may, however, change and you are advised to contact Moira Fraser – Tel: 01635 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk to confirm the contents of any agenda before attending a meeting. Executive decisions may be taken by the Executive acting as a collective body or by officers acting under delegated powers.

KEY:	Individual Executive Member Decision
ID =	Executive
EX =	Council
C =	GA = Governance & Audit Committee
GA =	S = Standards Committee
S =	PC = Personnel Committee
PC =	

This page is intentionally left blank

Title of Report:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and Select Committee Work Programme
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	2 November 2010

Purpose of Report: To receive, agree and prioritise the Work Programme of the Commission and Select Committees for the remainder of the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

Recommended Action: To consider the current items and any future areas for scrutiny.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 9420196
E-mail Address:	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Stephen Chard
Job Title:	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
Tel. No.:	01635 519462
E-mail Address:	schard@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 An updated version of the Work Programme is attached at Appendix A for the Commission's consideration. Members are also asked to consider any future areas for scrutiny.

Appendices

Appendix A – Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and Select Committee Work Programme

Consultees

Officers Consulted: Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager, Principal Policy Officers

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/09/21	Rights of Way Improvement Plan To review the WB ROWIP and make recommendations on delivery.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Make recommendations to improve delivery.	GSC	Start: 14/12/10 End: 14/12/10	Paul Hendry - 2858 Countryside & Environment	Councillor Hilary Cole	A review will be undertaken after the Local Access Forum has made its recommendations.
OSMC/09/26	Use of local resources For the Select Committee to discuss.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	To be identified.	GSC	Start: 19/01/10 End: 07/09/10	Countryside & Environment	Councillor Pamela Bale	The review will start by looking at use of local food.
OSMC/09/27	Equality and amenity of the local environment For the Select Committee to discuss.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	To be identified.	GSC	Start: 14/12/10 End: 14/12/10	Countryside & Environment	Councillor Hilary Cole	Review will be undertaken as part of the review of the Right of Way Improvement Plan.
OSMC/10/79	Council motion on renewable energy To consider action required to stimulate renewable electricity generation within West Berkshire and related targets.			GSC	Start: 14/12/10 End: 14/12/10	Adrian Slaughter - 2424 Property	Councillor Hilary Cole	Agreed Council Motion - 4/3/10
OSMC/10/84	Fly Tipping Cllr Vickers requested the topic be added due to concerns over the rise in fly tipping.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	To be identified.	GSC	Start: TBC End: 07/09/10	TBC Countryside & Environment	Councillor Hilary Cole	Rational behind the review to be considered.
OSMC/10/94	Council Motion on generating environmentally sustainable green energy on the Council's offices, schools, leisure centres and other property That the Council generates environmentally sustainable green energy on the Council's offices, schools, leisure centres and other property.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Green energy sold back to the national grid.	GSC	Start: 14/12/10 End: 14/12/10	Adrian Slaughter - 2424 Property	Councillor Hilary Cole	Agreed Council Motion - 23/09/10

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/09/24	Accessibility of public transport Review accessibility of public transport in West Berkshire for all residents.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers, and external partners.	For review.	GSC/SC SC	Start: 19/01/10 End:	Bryan Lytle - 2638 and Mark Edwards - 2208 Planning & Trading Standards and Highways & Transport	Councillor Alan Law & Councillor David Betts	Joint work between GSC and SCSC to review accessibility of public transport and contribute to the work on Local Transport Plan 3. Item 68 merged with this item
OSMC/09/16	Local Area Agreement Targets (LAA) Monitoring of progress of Health and Wellbeing LAA targets.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Monitoring item	HSC	Start: 06/07/10 End:	Bev Searle - Director of Partnerships & Joint Commissioning - 0118 982 2760 NHS Berkshire West	Councillor Pamela Bale	Monitoring of LAA activity.
OSMC/09/17	Capacity of maternity services at the Royal Berkshire Foundation Hospital. Fact finding report to establish the current capacity to meet demand for services.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Monitoring item	HSC	Start: TBC End:	Chief Executive and Chairman of the Royal Berkshire Hospital. Royal Berkshire Hospital Foundation Trust	Councillor Joe Mooney	Investigation of the reported pressures on the maternity unit.
OSMC/09/12	Review of the Council's eligibility criteria for social care. To review the existing criteria for accessing social care in light of the findings of the National Care Enquiry.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Investigate how the national changes will influence access to local social care, and make recommendations.	HSC	Start: TBC End:	Jan Evans - 2736 Community Services	Councillor Joe Mooney	Review of how national changes may need to influence local criteria for accessing social care.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/10/85	Investigation deprivation and child poverty in the ten most deprived wards in the District. To investigate what work is being done to tackle deprivation and how this can be applied to improve the quality of life across the District's most deprived wards.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Investigate ways to improve outcomes, and make recommendations to partner agencies.	HSC	Start: 12/10/10 End:	Julia Waldman - Children & Young People	Councillor Gordon Lundie	
OSMC/10/86	Electronic booking system for consultant appointments at the Royal Berkshire Foundation Hospital To determine ways to rectify problems being experienced by patients using the electronic booking system.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Investigate ways to improve the current system, and improve patient experience.	HSC	Start: TBC End:	Chief Executive and Chairman of the Royal Berkshire Hospital. Royal Berkshire Hospital Foundation Trust	Councillor Joe Mooney	
OSMC/10/88	"Care for the Future" - service redesign proposals for urgent care needs, planned procedures, appointments, long-term conditions, end of life care, maternity and paediatrics. To determine the nature of the service redesign proposals and make representation to the NHS Berkshire West.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	A review of proposals and formal submission to the NHS Berkshire West.	HSC	Start: 12/10/10 End:	Bev Searle - Director of Partnerships & Joint Commissioning - 0118 982 2760 NHS Berkshire West	Councillor Joe Mooney	
OSMC/09/02	Performance Report for Level One Indicators To monitor quarterly the performance levels across the Council and to consider, where appropriate, any remedial action.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	Monitoring item	OSMC	Start: 14/09/10 End:	Jason Teal - 2102 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Quarterly item.
OSMC/09/04	Representation of the Council on outside bodies To assess the value of the representation of Councillors on outside bodies	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers, and external partners.	To understand the benefits.	OSMC	Start: End:	Moir Fraser - 2045 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Will allow a critical evaluation of where Councillors can have most effect when dealing with outside bodies.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/09/58	Communications Strategy refresh To consider the refresh of the Strategy.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer.	To consider the Strategy and make suggestions for improvement.	OSMC	Start: End:	Keith Ulyatt - 2125 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Following discussion at OSMC on 28th July and the item to consider the Place Survey results on 15th September.
OSMC/09/59	Scrutiny method of operation To review the new scrutiny system after a 6 month period.	In meeting review.	To review the new scrutiny system to assess its benefits.	OSMC	Start: End:	David Lowe - 2817 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	As requested by OSMC on 16th June 2009.
OSMC/09/67	West Berkshire Partnership performance report To monitor quarterly the performance levels across the Partnership and to consider, where appropriate, any remedial action.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers and partners via in meeting review	Monitoring item	OSMC	Start: 26/01/10 End:	Sam Shepherd - 3041 Policy & Communication	Councillor Pamela Bale	Quarterly item.
OSMC/10/76	Shared service arrangements To receive further detail on shared services, the work ongoing to review shared service arrangements and progress with the production of a register of shared services.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer.	To be identified.	OSMC	Start: 29/06/10 End: 18/01/11	Steve Duffin - 2594 Benefits and Exchequer		As requested by OSMC on 26th January 2010.
OSMC/10/78	Activities for teenagers To identify the work undertaken and future action planned in the Children and Young People Directorate to improve activities for teenagers, following its identification as the top priority for improvement in the annual resident survey.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.		OSMC	Start: 25/05/10 End: 07/12/10	David Hogg - 2815 Children and Young People	Councillor Gordon Lundie	As requested by OSMC on 2nd March 2010.
OSMC/10/89	The Council's Performance Management framework To review how the Council defines, manages and monitors strategic performance.	Task Group review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.	To feed comments into the strategic planning round for 2011/12.	OSMC	Start: 03/08/10 End: 02/11/10	Jason Teal - 2102 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Terms of reference approved by OSMC on 3/8/10. Task Group to be formed.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/09/49	Property contracts and contractors in schools Review of the efficiency and effectiveness of Property Services in relation to contracts and the use of contractors in schools.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers and other expert witnesses via in meeting review	To suggest improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of Property Services within schools.	RMSC	Start: 30/06/09 End: 11/11/10	Steve Broughton - 2837 Property	Councillor Keith Chopping	This was discussed at the last meeting and will be reviewed in further depth at the October meeting with additional witnesses invited, including Headteachers.
OSMC/09/53	Accommodation Strategy/Asset Management Plan To receive and consider the Strategy and Plan and give particular consideration to issues surrounding Council properties and accommodation moves.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers via in meeting review	To understand more fully the plans in place in respect of Council accommodation.	RMSC	Start: 22/09/09 End:	Steve Broughton - 2837 Property	Councillor Keith Chopping	To incorporate issues surrounding Council properties and accommodation moves.
OSMC/09/55	Value for Money Consideration of the work undertaken by the Council and the methodology in place to assess and ensure value for money.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	Consider work undertaken to assess and ensure value for money and make suggestions for improvement.	RMSC	Start: 15/03/11 End: 15/03/11	John Ashworth - 2870 Environment	Councillor Keith Chopping	An appropriate subject that meets the acceptance criteria. Previously undertaken in April 2009.
OSMC/09/57	Revenue and capital budget reports To receive the latest period revenue and capital budget reports and consider any areas of concern.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	Monitoring item	RMSC	Start: 13/09/10 End:	Andy Walker - 2433 Finance	Councillor Keith Chopping	May lead to areas for in depth review.
OSMC/09/63	Establishment Reports To receive the latest report on the changes to the Council's establishment.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	Monitoring item	RMSC	Start: 13/09/10 End:	Robert O'Reilly - 2358 Human Resources	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	May lead to areas for in depth review.
OSMC/09/70	Chief Executive Directorate budget monitoring To discuss the current position and ways to resolve any overspends within the budget	Information supplied by, and questioning of lead officer.	Identify improvements to processes.	RMSC	Start: 19/01/10 End: 11/11/10	Nick Carter - 2101 Chief Executive	Councillor Keith Chopping	Requested by RMSC on 24th November.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/10/82	Procurement processes To receive a briefing on the procurement processes in place within the Council to inform a potential review	Information supplied by, and questioning of lead officer.	To gain an understanding of the processes in place to assess whether further work is required by the Select Committee.	RMSC	Start: 12/07/10 End: 13/09/10	Mike Sullivan - 2415 Legal & Electoral Services (Procurement team)	Councillor Keith Chopping	Accepted onto the work programme by OSMC on 25/5
OSMC/09/37	Partnership activity in response to the recession. Assessment of the impact of the measures taken by the West Berkshire Partnership to mitigate the local effects of the recession.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers, and external partners.	Monitoring item	SCSC	Start: End:	Policy & Communication	Councillor Pamela Bale & Councillor Keith Chopping	High profile activity that is very topical that will give visibility to the work that the Council and its partners are doing on behalf of residents and businesses.
OSMC/09/47	Monitor changes introduced to the Youth Service To monitor annually the progress of the changes being introduced to the Youth Service and the impact that they make on an annual basis until 1 year after all changes have been fully introduced.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	Monitoring item	SCSC	Start: 27/01/11 End: 27/01/11	Mark Vernon - 2552 Children & Youth Services	Councillor Gordon Lundie	This was a recommendation of the facilities for young people task group that was endorsed by the OSC.
OSMC/10/77	Housing register To consider the workings of the register, reviews, communication with those on the waiting list.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	To be identified.	SCSC	Start: 08/07/10 End:	June Graves - 2733 Housing & Performance	Councillor Alan Law	As requested by OSMC on 26th January 2010. Agreement to form a working group by SCSC. First meeting 27/9/10.
OSMC/10/83	Primary school admissions To identify whether the difficulties reported by a number of local authorities with primary school placements had an effect in West Berkshire.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	To gain an understanding of the issue.	SCSC	Start: 27/01/11 End: 27/01/11	Malcolm Berry - 2770 Education	Councillor Barbara Alexander	Accepted onto the work programme by OSMC on 25/5
OSMC/09/34	Gating orders To review protocol for gating orders adopted in October 2008.			SSC	Start: 06/12/10 End:	Alex O'Connor - 264608 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Specified in original review of 2008 to be reviewed after one year.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AND SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)
OSMC/10/74	Policy for the installation of fire sprinklers in Council buildings To review the requirement for a policy for the implementation of fire sprinklers in Council buildings.	Interview with relevant officers and review of available research information.	To identify whether there is a need for a policy regarding fire sprinkler systems in Council buildings (including schools).	SSC	Start: 06/04/10 End: 20/09/10	Steve Broughton - 2837 Health and Safety and Property.	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Investigations to include whether a return on the investment of installing sprinklers could bring a reduction in insurance costs

This page is intentionally left blank