

# Notice of Meeting

---

## **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission**

**Tuesday, 22nd November, 2011 at 6.30 pm**

in Council Chamber Council Offices  
Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Monday, 14 November 2011

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact David Baker on (01635) 519083  
e-mail: [dbaker@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:dbaker@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at  
[www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



**Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 22 November 2011 (continued)**

- To:** Councillors Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks (Vice-Chairman), Virginia von Celsing, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, David Holtby, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mike Johnston, David Rendel, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb and Emma Webster
- Substitutes:** Councillors Jeff Beck, Adrian Edwards, Alan Macro, Gwen Mason, Graham Pask, Andrew Rowles, Julian Swift-Hook and Keith Woodhams
- Other Officers & Members invited:** Councillor Carol Jackson Doerge, David Appleton, Mark Lewis, Gary Lugg, David Lowe, Nick Carter and David Baker

## Agenda

<b>Part I</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1. <b>Apologies for Absence</b> <i>Purpose: To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any),</i>	
2. <b>Minutes</b> <i>Purpose: To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011.</i>	1 - 8
3. <b>Declarations of Interest</b> <i>Purpose: To receive any Declarations of Interest from Members.</i>	
4. <b>Actions from previous Minutes</b> <i>Purpose: To receive an update on actions following the previous Commission meeting.</i> 1. School Severe Weather Plans: Verbal report agenda Item 8; 2. Planning Performance Data Q1 2011/12: Verbal report agenda Item 11.	
5. <b>Items Called-in following the Executive on 20th October 2011</b> <i>Purpose: To consider any items called-in by the requisite number of Members following the Executive meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011.</i>	
6. <b>Councillor Call for Action</b> <i>Purpose: To consider any items proposed for a Councillor Call for Action.</i>	
7. <b>Petitions</b> <i>Purpose: To receive any petitions requiring an Officer response.</i>	



**Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 22 November 2011 (continued)**

8. **School Severe Weather Plans update report**  
*Purpose: School Severe Weather Plans update report – to receive a verbal update report and discuss and agree any recommendations as necessary.*
9. **Olympic events in 2012** 9 - 10  
*Purpose: To receive a presentation on activities in West Berkshire celebrating the 2012 Olympic Games.*
10. **Methodology of repairing potholes** 11 - 14  
*Purpose: To consider a request to scrutinise the methodology of repairing potholes and attending to sunken drains.*
11. **Planning performance data for Q1 2011/12** 15 - 20  
*Purpose: To scrutinise the planning performance data reported for the quarter one 2011/12.*
12. **Health Scrutiny Panel** 21 - 30  
*Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Health Scrutiny Panel and provide information on the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011.*
13. **Resource Management Working Group** 31 - 42  
*Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Resource Management Working Group and provide information on the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011.*
14. **West Berkshire Forward Plan November 2011 - February 2012** 43 - 50  
*Purpose: To advise the Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from November 2011 - February 2012 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the plan.*
15. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme** 51 - 56  
*Purpose: To receive, agree and prioritise the work programme of the Commission, the Health Scrutiny Panel and the Resource Management Working Group for the remainder of 2011/12.*

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.

**Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Tuesday, 22  
November 2011 (*continued*)**

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 Committee

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON  
TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**Councillors Present:** Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Dominic Boeck, Virginia von Celsing, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, David Holtby, Mike Johnston, Alan Macro (Substitute) (In place of Jeff Brooks), David Rendel, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb and Emma Webster

**Also Present:** Andy Day (Head of Policy and Communication) and Jason Teal (Performance, Research & Consultation Manager), David Baker (Policy Officer) and Councillor Anthony Stansfeld

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Jeff Brooks

**Councillor(s) Absent:**

**PART I**

**45. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Page 6, second paragraph - the following topics had been discussed;

The following was added to the list:

- To understand the arrangements in the East of West Berkshire concerning GP Commissioning;
- To understand and review the changes to the ambulance indicators.

Note: Councillor David Holtby joined the meeting.

**46. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 10, 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.

**47. Actions from previous Minutes**

There was one action followed up from previous Commission meetings:

1. Activities for Teenagers: Examination of the facilities in place for Young People was discussed under agenda Item 9.

**48. Items Called-in following the Executive on 8th September 2011**

There were no items called-in following the last Executive meeting held on the 8 September 2011.

**49. Councillor Call for Action**

There were no Councillor Calls for Action.

50. **Petitions**

There were no petitions to be received at the meeting.

51. **Key accountable measures and activities 2011/12. Update on progress: Q1 outturns.**

*Note: Councillor Emma Webster joined the meeting.*

Jason Teal (Performance, Research and Consultation Manager) introduced agenda Item 8, Key accountable measures and activities 2011/12 – Update on progress: Q1 outturns. The report covered data up to the end of June 2011 and was submitted to the Executive on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011. This was a new look report with new information. The report consisted of 39 key measures or activities that had been drawn from individual service plans and focussed on those measures of particular importance / significance to the work of the Council as a whole. Within the 39 measures, 8 were assessed at a single point in time within the year these were currently coded in blue. Of the remaining 31 measures reported at the end of June, 28 were green, 2 amber and one had no data available as yet.

The 2 amber measures reported were:

- **Children in Care** – Core assessments conducted within 35 working days;
- **Housing** – High priority housing grants approved within 9 weeks of receipt of full grant application.

Councillor Brian Bedwell welcomed the much more sensible approach of using fewer measures than the 109 reported within the previous year. He thought the report was much more suitable and easier for both officers to produce and Members to use.

Councillor Tony Vickers enquired who had determined which measures were to be used and how had the targets been derived or justified. Some of the RAG judgements made in Q1 performance report he had caused to doubt the validity of their assessment. For example – **Planning** – The adoption of the Local Development Framework's Core Strategy by March 2012 and Planning applications determined within Government guidelines appeared to be well below target. Similarly Planning appeals upheld at 40% achievement was failing against the national average target of 35%. He was of the opinion that all of these targets should carry an amber or possibly a red assessment.

Jason Teal explained that the RAG assessment was based on the projected year end performance at 31 March 2012. Some measures had profiled targets for each quarter and the RAG assessment was based on the Q1 achievement against the profiled target for Q1.

Councillor Tony Vickers referred to the definition of amber on page 18 of the report: 'Amber means we are behind schedule, but still expect to achieve or complete the measure / activity by year end'

Jason Teal commented that the measures that Councillor Vickers was referring to were assessed green as the Q1 profiled target had been met.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld (portfolio holder for performance) shared Councillor Vicker's concern and commented that some measures were not linear. A performance plan had been profiled for such measures and the Q1 assessment was based on the performance against the profiled target for that quarter.

Councillor Dominic Boeck commented that shadow portfolio holders had access to the detailed information behind the measures being reported and were given the opportunity to questions heads of service on the performance measures that officers had reported.

Councillor Brian Bedwell agreed with Councillor Vickers that it would be appropriate to call Planning Officers to attend the next OSMC meeting to enable more detailed scrutiny of the Planning performance measures to take place.

Councillor Alan Macro commented on **Planning** – determining minor applications – 25% within 8 weeks and an achievement of just 2% in Q1 looked suspect even against a very low profiled target.

Councillor David Rendel agreed that profiled targets needed to be questioned and highlighted the following measures:

- **Page 21: Supporting schools and young people** – young people 16-19 who are NEET;
- **Page 22: Planning** – The proportion of planning appeals which are upheld compared to the national average;
- **Page 23: Customer Focus** – proportion of customers rating Contact Centre customer care as ‘good’ or ‘excellent’

All of these measures Councillor Rendel regarded as Amber not green.

Councillor Dominic Boeck commented that it was important for Members to understand that the targets set for the performance measures were demanding and were intended to stretch achievement over time.

Councillor Marcus Franks referred Members to **Page 23 Culture** – Number of visits to cultural venues supported by WBC, this measure was reported with a Q1 performance of 399,742 against a year end target of 1,500,000 visits. This was assessed correctly as green but with the very recent closure of the museum the year end target may now be in doubt and he asked that officers should provide more explanation in the supporting commentary.

Councillor Brian Bedwell confirmed that Members would like to see more use made of the supporting commentary and asked Jason Teal to take that request away as an action.

Councillor Alan Macro looked at two measures under **Page 20: Children in Care** – ‘Core assessments conducted within 35 working days’ and ‘The level of commissioned early intervention services in CYP Directorate’, he thought that they both needed an aggressive action plan and a written supporting commentary.

Councillor David Rendel challenged the definition of amber as written on page 18. It needed revision and a clearer definition. He agreed with Councillor Boeck that targets should be stretching performance but questioned why 13 of the measures set for 2011/12 had easier targets than in 2010/11. He understood why the performance measures had been taken from service plans as there was no Council Plan available. He questioned why the OSMC had had no voice or opportunity in scrutinising the selection of service plan measures and the setting of targets. He was of the opinion that the Executive and Officers action to reduce the number of measures from 109 to 39 was far too drastic. For example, there was significant public concern over crime in West Berkshire but the number of measures had been reduced from 7 to 1. The measure chosen was the ‘number of young people entering the Youth Justice System’.

Public concern regarded the number of house burglaries to be too high and to be much more important to West Berkshire residents. He questioned why only 3 of the 28 red measures in 2010/11 had been carried over into 2011/12. This seemed a low proportion if the objective was to use challenging targets.

Finally, **Page 20: Housing** – People presenting as homeless who are prevented from being homeless an achievement of 85% appeared to be a suspicious figure.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld responded to Councillor Rendel concern over crime measures. The Safer Communities Partnership group review all the crime measures in detail. The number of house burglaries that had been reported in West Berkshire had fallen in 2011/12 and was within target. He encouraged all shadow portfolio holders to look at performance data in more detail and discuss any concerns with heads of service.

Councillor Emma Webster commented it was important to select targets that the Council had direct control over. Crime targets were heavily dependent upon the performance of the police and crime targets continued to be measured and reported in partnership through the Safer Communities Partnership group. It was important that the Council performance measures based on the service delivery plans were selected and set with stretching targets. It was realistic however, for some measures, to set lower targets for example where resources had been reduced or the measure was based on a smaller sample size or pool of activity. Councillor Webster supported the action to bring Planning Officers to the next meeting of OSMC.

Several Members added their comments that the definition of amber on page 18 of the report need reworking and Jason Teal was asked to produce a clearer definition in his next report.

Councillors Vickers and Rendel re-iterated the need for OSMC to have the opportunity to scrutinise and influence both the selection of performance measures / activities and the setting of targets in the future.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld reminded shadow portfolio holders that should they have any concerns on performance data that they did have access to more detailed performance information and they should ask heads of service to provide better commentaries where they thought it was necessary. He reminded all Members that with regard to the selection and setting of performance measures this process always took place each year in the April / May time period.

Councillor Brian Bedwell drew the debate to a close and thanked both Councillor Anthony Stansfeld and Jason Teal for their efforts. He requested that a meeting be set up between the chair and vice chair of the OSMC and the Council's performance portfolio holder and performance officer to follow up on the recommendations and concerns raised by OSMC.

### **RESOLVED that:**

1. Jason Teal was requested to produce a clearer definition of the amber status in his next performance report that addressed the issues raised by OSMC;
2. Heads of Service and performance officers were encouraged to make greater use of the supporting commentary;
3. Planning Officers to be called to the next meeting of the OSMC on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> November to be questioned on planning performance data;



4. A meeting to be scheduled between Jason Teal, Councillor Anthony Stansfeld with Councillors Brian Bedwell and Jeff Brooks to take place before the next OSMC meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2011.

## 52. Examination of the facilities in place for young people

*Note: As this Item 9 was under discussion and the debate moved to include the Greenham project, Councillor Marcus Franks 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 but not to vote on the matter.*

Councillor Brian Bedwell introduced the discussion on Item 9 and commented that he was not satisfied with the presentation made on Activities for Teenagers at the August OSMC meeting. He was of the opinion that it raised more questions than it had answered and the topic required further scrutiny. It was important to look at two or three targeted areas and the views of parish councillors should be included.

Councillor Tony Vickers agreed with a focus on some specific areas but added it was most important to include young people's views and consult with young people's groups.

Councillor Marcus Franks commented that a focus on 3 areas – urban, high deprivation and rural would be useful. He thought it was important to map current provision of facilities and build up details such as average number of attendees, cost of provision, cost of attendance and carry out some general research of need and demand.

Councillor Alan Macro wanted to cover provision in general and not just Council provided or facilitated services.

Councillor David Holtby supported Councillor Macro's view and added that the Task Group should look at young people's needs across an age range of either 9-21 or 11-21 and not just teenagers.

Councillor Brian Bedwell stated that the residents' survey had for many years shown that more facilities for younger people was seen as a top priority.

Councillor David Rendel asked for paragraph 3.1 of the covering report to be reworded by replacing 'teenagers' with 'young people' and that the Task Group was best placed to determine the age range it should cover.

Councillor Brian Bedwell agreed that it should be worded as young people and Julia Waldman's Youth Services report should go into the Task Group for consideration.

Andy Day agreed that Julian Waldman's report should go to the Task Group and it was most important to talk to young people. The Greenham project should be consulted for their views as it had been successful and had resulted in a high level of buy-in by young people. Understanding the role of the 'Big Society' and how it could be successfully delivered was key. Examining other youth projects such as the work at Wired Rock, Hungerford, Clay Hill and Kintbury would be helpful.

Brian Bedwell asked Members to consider volunteering to join the Task Group and asked those interested to register that interest with David Baker. The Task Group could also co-opt volunteers from outside OSMC.

**RESOLVED** that the covering report and the comments made by the OSMC be used as a guide to the Task Group in setting and agreeing their final Terms of Reference.

## 53. Health Scrutiny Panel

*Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 10, 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.*

The Commission considered a verbal report (Agenda Item 10) on the work of the Scrutiny Health Panel (SHP).

Councillor Quentin Webb confirmed that two additional work items had been added to the Health Scrutiny Panel work programme at their last meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2011.

They were as follows:

- To understand the arrangements in the East of West Berkshire concerning GP Commissioning;
- To understand and review the changes to the ambulance indicators.

These work items would be discussed at the next meeting of the Health Scrutiny Panel to be held on Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

**RESOLVED** that the verbal report would be noted.

#### **54. Resource Management Working Group**

The Commission considered a verbal report (Agenda Item 11) on the work of the Resource Management Working Group (RMWG).

Councillor Tony Vickers confirmed that there had been no meeting of the Resource Management Working Group since the last meeting of the OSMC.

The first meeting of RMWG was scheduled for Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September which would be addressing the following work items:

- Quarter 1 Establishment report;
- Legal and Electoral Services Budget;
- Finance Performance Report (Month 4);
- Strategic Risk Register.

The RMWG was also proposing an additional work item to scrutinise part of the Parkway Development in the areas of:

- Car parking fees;
- Commissioning of affordable housing.

Councillor Emma Webster commented that as all the original detailed work on the Parkway Development had been carried out by the Newbury Town Centre Task Group (NTCTG) that the work item should be addressed by that group.

Andy Day (Head of Policy & Communication) commented that he supported the view that Newbury Town Centre Task Group had the expertise and knowledge to address the work item. The OSMC had two Members on the NTCTG in Councillors Mike Johnston and Marcus Franks. Other Councillors on the NTCTG were Paul Bryant, Roger Hunneman, David Allen and Jeff Beck.

Councillor Tony Vickers support the idea that NTCTG should address the Parkway Develop work item.

Councillor David Rendel commented that there were legal and financial areas of the Parkway Development that were important to the whole of West Berkshire and not just

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 20 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES**

Newbury Town Centre and these needed wider discussion and may need to come back to the OSMC.

Councillor Brian Bedwell supported the view that NTCTG should address the Parkway Development work item and any feedback could be brought through the RMWG.

**RESOLVED that** the NTCTG would be requested to review and address the Parkway Development work item.

Councillor Tony Vickers confirmed that the RMWG work programme included the following work items:

- Quarter reports on revenue, capital and establishment;
- Legal and Electoral Services Budget;
- Finance Performance Report (Month 4);
- Strategic Risk Register;
- Highways Asset Management Plan;
- Energy Saving;
- MTFs;
- Timelord;
- Procedures for Blue Badge Holders.

**RESOLVED that** the report would be noted.

**55. West Berkshire Forward Plan September - December 2011**

The Commission considered the West Berkshire Forward Plan (Agenda Item 11) for the period covering September to December 2011.

**RESOLVED that:** The Forward Plan be noted.

**56. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme**

The Commission considered its work programme and that of the Health Scrutiny Panel and Resource Management Working Group for 2011/12.

The changes to the combined OSMC work programme resolved under Items 9, 10 and 11 would be made.

**RESOLVED that:**

The changes to the work programme would be noted.

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 7.42 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 9.

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games from a West Berkshire perspective</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To receive a presentation on activities in West Berkshire celebrating the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

**Recommended Action:** To note the presentation and consider any further action as appropriate.

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

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

<b>Contact Officer Details</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	David Baker
<b>Job Title:</b>	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519083
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbaker@westberks.gov.uk

# Executive Report

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 At their meeting of 2 August 2011, Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission agreed that they would receive a presentation on the planning that was being undertaken across the District to celebrate the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.
- 1.2 In response, David Appleton, Head of Cultural Services, will provide a briefing to the Commission outlining actions to date and planned future activity.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members of the Commission note the presentation and consider any further action as appropriate.

## Appendices

---

There are no appendices to this report.

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Proposed review – dealing with potholes and drain covers</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To outline to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission proposed Terms of Reference for a review into the Council’s approach to filling potholes and attending sunken drain covers.

**Recommended Action:** Amend, if necessary, and approve the Terms of Reference for the review.

<b>Resource Management Working Group Chairman</b>	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 942 0196
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk

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

# Executive Report

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the Council meeting of 22 September 2011, a motion was carried for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) to carry out a review into the way that the Council deals with pot holes. This paper reminds the Commission of the motion and sets out proposed Terms of Reference and a suggested methodology for the review.

## 2. Motion to the Council

- 2.1 At the Council meeting of 22 September 2011, Councillor Woodhams proposed the motion

The Council appreciates that the last two winters have caused damage to our road network across the district.

Nevertheless the Council's approach to filling potholes and attending to sunken drain covers needs urgent investigation. The reputation of the District

is important to all of us but at present some people are questioning the quality of our road surfaces.

Furthermore, as the potholes keep reappearing, there is not only a major risk to the safety of motorists, bikers and cyclists, there is also the high cost of vehicle repairs.

Other Councils use methods and materials in fixing potholes that could provide better value for money. Is the Council achieving best value for taxpayer's money? The Council could be making savings through not having to revisit and re-repair sites, as well as reducing the number of insurance claims received. By examining this issue we can reassure the public that the Council, officers and contractors are carrying out the work to the best of their ability, whilst looking at any room for improvement.

This Council therefore agrees to refer the methodology of repairing potholes and attending to sunken drain covers to the Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission at the earliest opportunity."

- 2.2 The motion was carried.

## 3. Proposed Terms of Reference for the review

- 3.1 It is proposed that the OSMC establishes a time limited task group to review the Council's approach to filling potholes and attending sunken drain covers; and in particular:



- The systems and processes currently in place;
- Alternative operational models and practices in use elsewhere;
- The most effective method of obtaining value for money; and
- Report to the OSMC thence the Executive with recommendations as appropriate.

#### **4. Operation and delivery**

- 4.1 The task group would comprise 3 Conservative Members and 1 Liberal Democrat and be supported by the Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager and Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support). Technical expertise would be provided from officers in Highways and Transport.
- 4.2 Due to staff availability limitations, the task group would not begin its work until the review into activities for young people has concluded and would return to report to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission by April 2012.

#### **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1 It is recommended that Members of the Commission amend, if necessary, and approve the Terms of Reference for the review.

5.2

#### **Appendices**

---

There are no appendices to this report

#### **Consultees**

---

**Local Stakeholders:** None

**Officers Consulted:** Head of Highways and Transport

**Trade Union:** N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Key accountable measures and activities 2011/12. Update on progress: Q1 Outturns</b> <b>An Extract of Planning Performance Data for Q1 20211/12</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	N/A

**Purpose of Report:**

- To enable Members of the OSMC to question Planning Officers on an extract of Planning Performance Data for the quarter 1 outturns progress report on the key accountable measures and activities 2011/12.

**Recommended Action:**

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission is asked to take any further action as appropriate

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

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld - Tel (01488) 658238
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	astansfeld@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	David Baker
<b>Job Title:</b>	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519083
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbaker@westberks.gov.uk

## **Supporting Information**

---

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out an extract of Planning Performance Data for the quarter 1 outturns progress report on the key accountable measures and activities 2011/12.
- 1.2 An at OSMC meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> September Members resolved:  
  
To invite Planning Officers to the next meeting of the OSMC on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> November to be questioned on an extract of Planning Performance Data for Q1 2011/12.

### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission is asked to take any further action as appropriate.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – An Extract of Planning Performance Data for Q1 20211/12



## Appendix A

# Key accountable measures and activities 2011/12

## An Extract of Planning Performance Data for Q1 20211/12

Quarter 1: Apr-Jun 2011

**compiled by:**

Performance, Research & Consultation Team

Policy and Communication

[westberks.gov.uk/performance](http://westberks.gov.uk/performance)

July 2011

For queries contact: Jessica Broom (x2591) or Jason Teal (x2102)

## Purpose of this report

To provide an update on progress against the Council's key accountable measures and activities for quarter 1, 2011/12.

The key measures / activities within this report have been distilled from those routinely monitored and managed through individual service plans to focus more singularly on those which are of particular importance / significance key to the ongoing work of the Council as a whole. This report therefore:

- provides assurance to the Executive that areas of significance / particular importance are performing;
- acts as an early warning system, flagging up areas of significance / particular importance which are not performing - or are not expected to perform - as hoped;
  - and therefore ensures that adequate remedial action is put in place to mitigate the impact of any issues that may arise.

## Conventions used in this report

We have updated this report from previous years, both to take account of our new performance framework and also in response to feedback.

For the purposes of reporting, we monitor projected or expected year end performance for each quarter. That is to say, they report whether or not we expect to achieve the level we set ourselves by the end of the year – rather than simply reporting in-year quarterly performance. This has the advantage of allowing service heads and managers to flag up at an early stage if there are issues or concerns in an area – and to put in place appropriate remedial action - rather than simply waiting for the actual data to reveal that an objective will not be met once it has happened.

Throughout the report we have used a RAG 'traffic light' system to report progress:

- ★ means we have either achieved / exceeded - or expect to achieve / exceed - what we set out to do;
- ◆ means we are behind schedule, but still expect to achieve or complete the measure / activity by year end;
- indicates that we have either not achieved – or do not expect to achieve - the activity or target within the year;

indicators reported as Ⓞ are annual indicators that can only be reported at a particular point in time – i.e. GCSE results or the road condition survey, whilst;

indicators reported as U are where the quarterly data is not yet available.

In total, there are 39 key measures or activities which are appraised by the Executive through this reporting mechanism. These are reported on a thematic basis in order to take account of the core functions of the authority.

The table below presents these in more detail. Along with a description of the measure, the table also provides:

- *Column 2*: an indication of whether or not the Council has direct / complete control over the measure.
- *Column 3*: an indication of the impact on either service users, or the community more generally, should the measure not be achieved.

- *Column 4*: the previous year's outturn.
- *Column 5*: the current year's target, quarterly outturn and RAG rating.
- *Column 6*: any supporting commentary provided.

### **Commentary on performance**

Of the 39 key accountable measures and activities, 8 are annual indicators – i.e. can only be assessed at a single point in time. 5 of these are in the education arena (for example, relating to key stage results). The others relate to land supply for housing (reports Q2), road condition (reports Q4) and user rating of our website (reports Q4).

- Of the remaining 31 key accountable measures and activities, 28 are reported as green.
- Data is unavailable in Q1 for 1 measure (levels of litter – data will be available from Q2).
- 2 key measures are signposted as amber – i.e. behind anticipated performance, but expect to achieve the target by year end. These are:
  - *Children's social care core assessments conducted on time*. Q1 outturn was 52 out of 81 assessments conducted within 35 days (64%, against a target of 80% for the year). This is attributed to work pressures and sickness levels within one team. This is being addressed within the service and in reporting amber, the year end target is expected to be achieved.
  - *High priority housing grants approved within 9 weeks*. Q1 outturn was 11 out of 12 applications approved within the timescale (92% against a target of 95%). This is attributed to staff vacancies. The caseload has been distributed amongst other team members and performance is expected to rise.
- There are no reds being reported in Q1.

This report is available at [westberks.gov.uk/performance](https://westberks.gov.uk/performance).

## 2011/12 West Berkshire Council key accountable measures – Quarter 1

Measure / activity	Direct influence	Community / service Impact	2010/11	2011/12		Supporting commentary	
			Year end outturn	Target	Q1 outturn		
<b>Planning</b>							
A five year land supply of ready to develop housing sites	Y	Medium	Not available	(Units of deliverable housing = 2,625)	---	🎯	2010/11 data available Q3
Adopt the Local Development Framework's core strategy	Y	High	Not adopted	Mar 2012	On target	★	
Average number of days to register a planning application (based on quarterly performance)	Y	High	7.7 days	5 days	21 days	★	Target is profiled for each quarter in order to achieve year end target. Q1 = 25 days.
Planning applications determined within the government guidelines; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'major': 60% within 13 weeks</li> <li>• 'minor': 25% within 8 weeks</li> <li>• 'other': 75% within 8 weeks</li> </ul>	Y	High	'major':46% 'minor':46% 'other':83%	As per indiv. targets	On profiled target for each measure	★	'major': 33% within 13 weeks 'minor': 2% within 8 weeks 'other': 83% within 8 weeks.
The proportion of planning appeals which are upheld compared to the national average	Y	High	38%	35%	40%	★	

End of report



# Agenda Item 12.

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Health Scrutiny Panel Work Programme</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	OSMC
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To provide an update on the work of the Health Scrutiny Panel

**Recommended Action:** To consider the current items and discuss any future areas for scrutiny.

Health Scrutiny Panel Chairman	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Quentin Webb – Tel (01635) 202646
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	qwebb@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Jo Naylor
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Policy Officer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 503019
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	jnaylor@westberks.gov.uk

# Executive Report

---

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Health Scrutiny Panel met for the last time on 4 October 2011 and the draft minutes are attached at Appendix A. A summary of the main discussions held were as follows:

1.2 **Ambulance Service Quality Indicators** - The Panel considered a report regarding changes to the South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) performance reporting targets. Duncan Burke (Director of Communications & Public Engagement, SCAS) described how the Department of Health (DoH) targets had dramatically changed in April 2011. The new system involved greater measures around clinical care and patient experience with performance reports published on the SCAS website every month.

**RESOLVED that** the update on the new performance reporting targets were noted and the South Central Ambulance Service were thanked for their presentation to the Panel.

1.3 **Commissioning of General Practitioner Services** – The Panel considered a presentation by Janet Fitzgerald (Transition Director for the Clinical Commissioning Groups) and described the proposed configuration of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) across Berkshire.

**Resolved that:**

1. The Panel supported the proposed configurations for Clinical Commissioning Groups and the inclusion of the Theale, Mortimer and Pangbourne Surgeries within the North and West Reading Clinical Commissioning Group.
2. The slides of the presentation were to be circulated to all Members of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

1.4 **Care Quality Commission "Dignity, Respect and Nutrition" Reviews** – The Panel considered a verbal report from Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) and Tony Lloyd (Chairman of the West Berkshire Local Involvement Network (LINK)) regarding the scrutiny review of dignity, respect and nutrition in local hospitals.

**RESOLVED that** to note the update.

1.5 **Update on the "Six Lives" Review: The provision of public services to those with Learning Disabilities** - The Panel considered a report which reviewed the Council's learning disability services following the publication of the "Six Lives" report. Mrs Alison Love (Service Manager for Long Term Care) described how the "Six Lives" national review investigated the deaths of six people with learning disabilities, between 2003 and 2005, which were under NHS or local authority care. Significant failures were identified particularly organisations lacking understanding of the law in relation to disability discrimination and human rights. In addition poor appreciation of clients' needs and an inability to communicate adequately with those with learning disabilities. Organisations had also been criticised for the way complaints were handled and some degree of institutional failure had been identified in all six deaths.

**RESOLVED that** the Council's response to the recommendations of the "Six Lives" review was noted

1.6 **Health and Wellbeing Board Update** - Members gave consideration to the Health and Wellbeing Board Update report. Mrs Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care)

drew Members attention to the report and described how pilot arrangements for the Board were being established. It was described how the Board would be operating in shadow form by April 2012 and would assume full functionality by April 2013. At the moment just a task group was formed and had met in August to consolidate the Terms of Reference for the future Board. She described the WebEx learning set and the engagement of the Local Involvement Network (LINK) in the new arrangements. Members noted the progress so far and wished to see a further update in nine to twelve months time.

**RESOLVED that** the update report be noted and that a further update is received in nine to twelve months time.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – Health Scrutiny Panel Draft minutes 04/10/2011

## **Consultees**

---

### **Local Stakeholders:**

**Officers Consulted:** Head of Finance, Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager

**Trade Union:** N/A

2.

This page is intentionally left blank

# DRAFT

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

## HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 2011

**Councillors Present:** Howard Bairstow, Dominic Boeck, Sheila Ellison, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Tony Linden, Alan Macro, Gwen Mason (Vice-Chairman) and Quentin Webb (Chairman)

**Also Present:** Duncan Burke (South Central Ambulance Service), Keith Boyes (South Central Ambulance Service), Janet Fitzgerald (Transition Director for the Clinical Commissioning Groups), Dr Iain Rock (Mortimer Surgery), Dr John Winchester (Theale Surgery), Dr Rupert Woolley (Pangbourne Surgery), Beverley Searle (Berkshire NHS), Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care), Alison Love (Service Manager) and Jo Naylor (Principal Policy Officer).

#### PART I

##### 9. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for inability to attend the meeting.

##### 10. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

##### 11. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Carol Jackson-Doerge, Alan Macro, Tony Linden and Quentin Webb all declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6. They reported that, as their interest was personal and non-prejudicial, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

##### 12. Ambulance Service Quality Indicators

The Panel considered a report (Agenda Item 5) regarding changes to the South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) performance reporting targets. Duncan Burke (Director of Communications & Public Engagement, SCAS) described how the Department of Health (DoH) targets had dramatically changed in April 2011. The new system involved greater measures around clinical care and patient experience with performance reports published on the SCAS website every month.

There was now a range of eleven indicators that were monitored under the headings of "Access", "Response", "Treatment", "Disposition" and "Outcomes".

"Access" related to call answering and call abandonment rates. "Response" referred to time to reach life-threatening emergencies with the former "A8" and "A19" targets renamed "Red8" and "Red19". The Trust was no longer required to report on the less urgent Category B calls ("B19").

"Treatment" targets referred to treatment of severe heart attack, cardiac arrest and stroke. "Disposition" monitored how effectively call handlers answered calls and elicited the relevant information from the caller the first time. The "Outcomes" measure reported on the overall success of treatment for cardiac arrest patients.

## HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL - 4 OCTOBER 2011 - MINUTES

The Ambulance Service worked closely with Primary Care Trust (PCT) colleagues to ensure patients received the most appropriate care pathway this was particularly important for dealing with some of the Service's more prolific callers.

Councillor Boeck asked about the timing of call recording and impact on performance reporting. Mr Burke, described how an ambulance would be dispatched as soon as the 999-call was connected via British Telecom. However, a new telephony service was due to be introduced, this was likely to result in an initial drop in performance which was hoped would be back in line with the national averages by the year end.

Mr Burke described how SCAS had the highest rural demand of any Ambulance Service in the Country and therefore the "time to treatment" target was seen as particularly challenging. The stringency of the measure had also been increased as patients had to be treated by a clinician i.e. Technician, Paramedic or Doctor and not a First Responder.

Councillor Macro enquired about the ambulance turnaround times at acute hospitals such as the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital Trust (RBH). Mr Burke reported that they were working closely with all acute hospital trusts to resolve such vehicle delays.

In terms of performance SCAS was top in the Country for "Red8" response times for life-threatening calls and within the top three Ambulance Trusts for stroke care services in the Country.

Members asked about the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system for ambulances and the triage tool used by call handlers to assess life-threatening emergencies. Mr Burke described that the software package identified symptoms which could be life-threatening and this would trigger an emergency response. A new '111' call service was also being introduced as a single point of contact for all non-emergency calls.

The Chairman enquired about the Department of Health (DoH) consultation with SCAS over setting of the new targets. Mr Burke described the dialogue that took place with the DoH and the compromises made when agreeing the targets.

Councillor Mason asked whether staff shortages of previous years were still an issue for the Trust. Mr Burke explained that due to specialist courses offered at two national Universities more newly qualified Paramedics were now available, however recruitment was still difficult due to the high cost of living in the counties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Hampshire and Oxfordshire.

Councillor Jackson-Doerge enquired about pathways of care and ensuring 24-hour care. The Ambulance Service, described the pathway for elderly 'fallers' and how to get them seen and treated appropriately which might stop later demand on the Ambulance Service or National Health Service (NHS). He described how more suitable care pathways were required working more closely with Social Care and Mental Health Services.

Councillor Ellison asked about the proportion of hoax calls. Mr Burke responded by explaining these were only a tiny fraction of all calls received and did not present a problem.

Councillor Linden asked about the challenges of combining with the Hampshire Ambulance Service. Mr Burke confirmed that Hampshire was a previously poor performing Ambulance Trust and had numerous issues associated with the geography and rural nature of this area. He confirmed however that national targets for performance had now been reached across all four counties.

The Chairman thanked the Ambulance Service representatives, Mr Duncan Burke and Mr Keith Boyes for giving up the time to attend the Panel and congratulated them on the current performance.

**RESOLVED** that the update on the new performance reporting targets were noted and the South Central Ambulance Service were thanked for their presentation to the Panel.

**13. Commissioning of General Practitioner Services**

*(Councillor Carol Jackson-Doerge declared a personal interest in Agenda item 6 by virtue of the fact that she was a patient of the Mortimer Surgery. Councillor Alan Macro declared a personal interest as a patient of the Theale Surgery. Councillor Tony Linden as a patient of the Burghfield Surgery and Councillor Quentin Webb as a member of the Chapel Row Patient Panel. As their interests were personal and not prejudicial they were permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

The Panel considered a presentation by Janet Fitzgerald (Transition Director for the Clinical Commissioning Groups) (Agenda Item 6) and described the proposed configuration of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) across Berkshire.

Mrs Fitzgerald introduced the doctors that were present as Dr Iain Rock (Mortimer Surgery), Dr John Winchester (Theale Surgery) and Dr Rupert Woolley (Pangbourne Surgery).

Mrs Fitzgerald described how the establishment of CCGs were part of the wider health reforms of the NHS. These groups would need to be established by April 2013 to replace Primary Care Trusts as the statutory bodies for healthcare commissioning.

She described how there would be a National Commissioning Board established for highly specialised services, e.g. organ transplants, as well as retaining the statutory responsibility for Primary Care commissioning. It was described that without such an overarching Board, General Practitioners (GPs) would have a conflict of interest in commissioning Primary Care Services. GPs would commission community health services such as nursing, midwifery, mental health and acute hospital services, accident and emergency and ambulance services.

Mrs Fitzgerald described the proposals for seven Clinical Commissioning Groups across Berkshire with four covering the Berkshire West area.

Mrs Fitzgerald described the similar sized populations covered by the Newbury and District CCG (113,000 weighted population) and the North and West Reading CCG (106,000 weighted population). She described that often a Practice's registered patient numbers did not always align with political geographical boundaries. It was described how, for example, some patients that attended the Pangbourne Surgery actually lived in South Oxfordshire and not West Berkshire.

Mrs Fitzgerald described how the proposal was for CCGs to be in place by October 2012 and operational by the official final deadline date of April 2013.

Mrs Fitzgerald mentioned how CCGs needed to demonstrate competence to pass the Department of Health (DoH) approval process. All CCGs needed to show strong clinical and professional focus along with proper patient and community engagement. Credible plans needed to be established alongside clear governance structures. She described the links with the West Berkshire Health and Wellbeing Task Group and the consultation that would take place to ensure the CCGs were fully formed and fit for purpose.

The Department of Health (DoH) was responsible for considering the size and the boundaries for the CCGs and ensuring risk assessments were undertaken. Approval was sought from the Local Authority in relation to the proposed boundaries.

Mrs Fitzgerald described the strong endorsement from each of the member GP Practices and approval from the PCT for the current model. She described how the Practices of Pangbourne, Theale and Mortimer wished to remain within the North and West Reading CCG as opposed to aligning with the West Berkshire Council Local Authority boundary.

## HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL - 4 OCTOBER 2011 - MINUTES

Dr Iain Rock (Mortimer Surgery) described the strong working relationships which had been established in recent years and the good background of fund holding and commissioning of services which had developed with the other GP Surgeries in the Reading area. He described how the Mortimer, Theale and Pangbourne Practices tended to sit more naturally with the North and West Reading CCG.

Mrs Searle (Director of Partnerships and Joint Commissioning, Berkshire PCT) added that CCG leads were working alongside the Directors of the outgoing Primary Care Trusts in these federation discussions. She described how there were no patient concerns and the doctors were fully engaged with the Health and Wellbeing Working Group.

Mrs Fitzgerald continued by explaining how the DoH authorisation process was due to begin and this would validate the Organisational Development Plans for the CCGs. A more detailed consultation document on the proposed CCGs would be circulated in the next five weeks.

The Chairman asked about the impact on patients of practices joining different CCGs. Dr Rock (Mortimer Surgery) replied by explaining that there would not be any noticeable difference to the patient in their direct experience of accessing and receiving GP services.

Councillor Jackson-Doerge asked about how the system would impact on the wider health and social care economy. It was described how the commissioning decisions would still be required to reflect the local need and that the overarching responsibility for meeting the strategic health needs would be overseen by the Health and Wellbeing Boards.

### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) The Panel supported the proposed configurations for Clinical Commissioning Groups and the inclusion of the Theale, Mortimer and Pangbourne Surgeries within the North and West Reading Clinical Commissioning Group.
- (ii) The slides of the presentation were to be circulated to all Members of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

## **14. Care Quality Commission "Dignity, Respect and Nutrition" Reviews**

The Panel considered a verbal report (Agenda Item 7) from Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) and Tony Lloyd (Chairman of the West Berkshire Local Involvement Network (LINK)) regarding the scrutiny review of dignity, respect and nutrition in local hospitals.

Tony Lloyd (LINK Chairman) described the discussions with the Princess Royal Trust for Carers (PRT) and the progress made establishing local focus groups to gather opinions on local standards of care. It was hoped the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Hospital's (RBH) services would be covered within this review as the Care Quality Commission had not inspected the RBH as part of its national review programme.

The Health Scrutiny Panel Chairman had wished to see some Council officer time dedicated to reviewing this subject however Jan Evans explained that by using the LINK this enabled an independent review of the subject to take place and brought in additional resources.

Tony Lloyd (LINK Chairman) reported that he had also approached numerous other care groups and a major questionnaire was also being compiled to be circulated as widely as possible.



## HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL - 4 OCTOBER 2011 - MINUTES

It was suggested that the scrutiny review might take several months to complete with an anticipated finish date of July 2012 but Tony Lloyd indicated that he expect to be able to provide an interim report by January 2012. He also informed the Panel that the Wokingham Health Scrutiny Committee was interested in the same subject matter and this opened up the possibility for joint scrutiny activity involving a wider area and the participation of two Local Involvement Networks (LINKs).

Members were pleased to see the work underway but wanted to retain the important qualitative data obtained from focus group activity.

**RESOLVED** to note the update.

### 15. **Update on the "Six Lives" Review: The provision of public services to those with Learning Disabilities**

The Panel considered a report (Agenda Item 8) which reviewed the Council's Learning Disability Services following the publication of the "Six Lives" report.

Mrs Alison Love (Service Manager for Long Term Care) described how the "Six Lives" national review investigated the deaths of six people with learning disabilities, between 2003 and 2005, which were under NHS or local authority care. Significant failures were identified particularly organisations lacking understanding of the law in relation to disability discrimination and human rights. In addition poor appreciation of clients' needs and an inability to communicate adequately with those with learning disabilities were identified. Organisations had also been criticised for the way complaints were handled and some degree of institutional failure had been identified in all six deaths.

Mrs Love described the Council's action plan in response to the "Six Lives" report and stated that most actions had been completed. She described the work done particularly through the Care Quality Board which involved both internal and external providers of care services which had found no local concerns regarding care standards.

Mrs Love, described how contracts were in place to monitor the quality of care as well as a strong integrated Health and Social Care Team that was very effective at addressing the needs of those with learning disabilities.

She also described the role of the Learning Disabilities Partnership Board (LDPB) in contributing towards the Berkshire West Health Self-Assessment in March 2010 and in the production of the Annual Plan.

Work that remained to be done was to contact all providers of all learning disability services to ensure they were fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act.

The Chairman asked about the service providers where complaints had been received and how thoroughly investigated these had been. Mrs Love described the routine work of the Care Quality Officers in ensuring the safeguarding standards were met. She also described the revised Joint Complaints Protocol which had recently been circulated to all health partners as a improved way of investigating complaints.

The Chairman enquired whether adequate resources were in place to investigate specific cases. Mrs Love described the work of the two Care Quality Monitoring Officers who's role it was to review local providers. In addition visits had been made by the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care to thirty learning disability service centres to review individual care plans and ensure high standards of care were being upheld.

Councillor Mason enquired about the training of staff caring for those with learning disabilities. Mrs Love described how staff did have access to the necessary training but there was also a need to work with General Practitioners on this issue.

## HEALTH SCRUTINY PANEL - 4 OCTOBER 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Boeck enquired about the action points that had not yet been completed. Mrs Love described how there was a continual process of improvement with standards being raised all the time. The assurance process needed to be revised to reflect this. She also described some improvements such as the Drop-In Sessions which were specific to West Berkshire which helped ensure and identify local needs.

**RESOLVED** that the Council's response to the recommendations of the "Six Lives" review was noted.

### 16. Health and Wellbeing Board Update

Members gave consideration to the Health and Wellbeing Board Update report (Agenda Item 9) contained on the agenda. Mrs Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) drew Members attention to the report and described how pilot arrangements for the Board were being established. It was described how the Board would be operating in shadow form by April 2012 and would assume full functionality by April 2013. At the moment just a task group was formed and had met in August to consolidate the Terms of Reference for the future Board. She described the WebEx learning set and the engagement of the Local Involvement Network (LINK) in the new arrangements.

Members noted the progress so far and wished to see a further update in nine to twelve months time.

**RESOLVED** that the update report be noted and that a further update is received in nine to twelve months time.

### 17. Health Scrutiny Panel Work Programme

Members considered the current Work Programme (Agenda Item 10) of the work of the Panel. Minor changes to the accuracy of the programme were recorded.

Councillor Alan Macro expressed new ideas for the work programme including how the health service reorganisation would influence the financing of local health service provision and Private Finance Initiatives (PFI). It was agreed this would need to be put before the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission prior to being added to the Work Programme.

**RESOLVED** that the Work Programme be noted and additional work requests be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for consideration.

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.40 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Resource Management Working Group Work Programme</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To provide an update on the work of the Resource Management Work Group

**Recommended Action:** To consider the current items and discuss any future areas for scrutiny.  
1. Managed Vacancy Factor

Resource Management Working Group Chairman	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Tony Vickers – Tel (01635) 230046
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	tvickers@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	David Baker
<b>Job Title:</b>	Policy Officer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519083
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbaker@westberks.gov.uk

# Executive Report

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Resource Management Working Group met for the last time on 27 September 2011 and the draft minutes are attached at Appendix A. A summary of the main discussions held were as follows:
- 1.2 **Matters arising** - Councillor David Rendel raised two questions on Car Park Budgets.  
**Resolved that** Mark Edwards (Head of Highways & Engineering) be requested to produce a written report addressing the questions raised on season tickets and PCN payments and was invited to attend RMWG at its next meeting on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November to present his report.
- 1.3 **Quarter 1 Establishment report** – The Working Group considered a report on the changes to the Council’s Establishment over the first quarter of 2011/12. Robert O’Reilly (Head of Human Resources) introduced his report and reviewed the report’s conclusions.  
**Resolved that:**  
1. That the topic of Managed Vacancies (MVF) was a useful area for scrutiny and it should be taken up to OSMC to determine which body would carry out the work item;  
2. The update report was noted.
- 1.4 **Legal and Electoral Service Budget** – David Holling (Head of Legal & Electorate Services) introduced his report to the meeting and explained the variances between Month 9 Forecasted overspend of £126,265 and the Year End overspend of £27,012. Most of the £99,253 variance could be explained by the impact of external factors that were not part of the Month 9 forecast. Legal Services received additional income in quarter 4 of £61K which was not forecasted. Land charges received a DCLG grant in March for Personal Searches covering expenditure incurred as a result of revocation of Personal Search fees. This grant was not forecasted or anticipated.  
**Resolved that:** the report was noted.
- 1.5 **Finance Performance Report Month 4** – Andy Walker (Head of Finance) presented his report to the meeting. The report covered the latest finance position of the Council as at the end of Month 4 2011/12. There had been a significant increase in the forecasted overspend against the budget at £1.8m. This was mainly in the area of Adult Social Care but there were smaller overspends forecasted by C&YP and Environment directorates. The Executive was already focused on the matter of addressing the overspend and an improving position was expected.  
**Resolved that:** Members would expect to see a more detailed explanation of the overspend in Adult Social Care in the Month 5 report and the management action to be taken. The report was noted.
- 1.6 **Strategic Risk Register** – Ian Priestley (Chief Internal Auditor) presented his report to the meeting. Ian explained that the action plan had been improved and was intended to give greater focus on action planning. The Risk Appetite was intended to guide how impact and likelihood of risk could be consistently assessed and the

treatment programme defined how differing risk scores would be managed in terms of escalation and response processes. The risk register provided more detailed risk information covering the eight categories of risk that were monitored by the Council.

**Resolved that:**

1. The Strategic Risk Register should become a regular monitoring item on the RMWG work programme. It was agreed to review the risk register annually and it was next scheduled for September 2012;
2. Individual risk items had been scrutinised and those risks that addressed areas of finance or resources would be scrutinised on an annual basis

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – Resource Management Working Group Work Draft minutes 27/09/2011

## **Consultees**

---

**Local Stakeholders:**

**Officers Consulted:** Head of Finance, Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager

**Trade Union:** N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

# DRAFT

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

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2011

**Councillors Present:** Jeff Beck, Sheila Ellison (In place of Richard Crumly), John Horton (Substitute) (In place of Roger Croft), David Rendel, Andrew Rowles, Tony Vickers (Chairman), Emma Webster (In place of David Holtby) and Laszlo Zverko

**Also Present:** Nick Carter (Chief Executive), David Holling (Head of Legal & Electoral), Robert O'Reilly (Head of Human Resources), Ian Priestley (Chief Internal Auditor) and Andy Walker (Head of Finance), David Baker (Policy) and Councillor Keith Chopping

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Roger Croft, Councillor Richard Crumly and Councillor David Holtby

**Councillor(s) Absent:**

#### PART I

#### 8. Apologies

#### 9. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### 10. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

#### 11. Matters arising from the previous Resource Management Working Group

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 4) which provided information, and an update on actions arising from the previous Resource Management Working Group held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2011.

Councillor David Rendel raised two questions on the report relating to page 8, section 2.3 Car Park Budgets as follows:

- For 2.3.1 Councillor Rendel calculated the value of the season tickets issued to be £172,000, the planned budgeted income from those season tickets was £62,000 and the actual income raised was £134,000. Councillor Rendel asked for the differences to be explained. Were there any free season tickets issued to staff or other groups. Nick Carter (Chief Executive) responded by confirming that no staff were issued with free season tickets. Some free season tickets were issued to voluntary groups;
- For 2.3.3 Councillor Rendel wanted a better explanation on PCN payments. If the PCNs issued had a full payment value of £633,310 with a planned budget income of £316,000 and the actual income raised was £260,182 this also required a more detailed explanation.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor David Rendel confirmed that page 9 Section 3 – Establishment report would be discussed under Agenda Item 5.

### **Resolved that:**

1. Mark Edwards (Head of Highways & Transport) be requested to produce a written report addressing the questions raised on season tickets and PCN payments and was invited to attend RMWG at its next meeting on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November to present his report;
2. The update report was noted.

## **12. Quarter 1 Establishment Report**

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 5) on the changes to the Council's Establishment over the first quarter of 2011/12.

Robert O'Reilly (Head of Human Resources) introduced his report and reviewed the report's conclusions on page 19 Section 6.

Councillor David Rendel raised a question on page 14 Section 7 regarding part time vacancies. There were lots of posts with long term part time vacancies. Carrying these long term vacancies as a credit against managed vacancy target was not a good way of budgeting. The vacancy should be taken out of the staffing budget and a reduced managed vacancy target set. Councillor Rendel requested that RMWG should review the process of managed vacancies (MVF).

Councillor David Rendel referred to the Minutes on page 5 Item 5 Establishment Report for Quarter Four 2010/11. Robert O'Reilly explained that he had held a meeting with Councillor Rendel where a number of detailed examples of long term vacancies had been discussed and information was provided on why the time taken to recruit to some posts could be many months. Robert O'Reilly confirmed that the average recruitment period was 62 days from the point the post was passed to HR and a person was recruited.

Councillor Emma Webster gave an example of long term part time vacancies that were linked to maternity leavers where returnees often did not know what hours of work they wanted in advance of their return to work.

Robert O'Reilly confirmed the latest figures (as at 14/09/11) on vacant FTEs were 173.10 made up of 277 posts: 107 wholly vacant and 170 partially vacant.

Councillor Tony Vickers thanked Robert O'Reilly for a helpful explanation. Councillor Vickers agreed that the topic of managed vacancies factor (MVF) should be considered by OSMC or RMWG.

Councillor Jeff Beck referred to page 18 Section 5.1 of the report and queried the reason for the changes in external and joint funded establishment. Robert O'Reilly confirmed that accounting changes had been made at the start of the new financial year which removed a number of ring fenced posts. Councillor Beck commented that with so much detailed establishment accounting it must take a lot of officer time to manage. Robert O'Reilly confirmed that this was true. Councillor Beck was interested in what the changes meant in financial terms.

### **Resolved that:**



## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

1. That the topic of Managed Vacancies (MVF) was a useful area for scrutiny and it should be taken up to OSMC to determine which body would carry out the work item;
2. The update report was noted.

### 13. Legal and Electoral Services Budget

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 6) that explained the variances between Month 9 and Year End spends for the Legal and Electoral Service.

David Holling (Head of Legal & Electorate Services) introduced his report to the meeting and explained the variances between Month 9 Forecasted overspend of £126,265 and the Year End overspend of £27,012. Most of the £99,253 variance could be explained by the impact of external factors that were not part of the Month 9 forecast. Legal Services received additional income in quarter 4 of £61K which was not forecasted. Land charges received a DCLG grant in March for Personal Searches covering expenditure incurred as a result of revocation of Personal Search fees. This grant was not forecasted or anticipated.

Councillor Emma Webster asked could court actions be profiled. David Holling confirmed that they could to a point but it did assume the Council won its cases and this was always a volatile cost centre to manage.

Councillor Tony Vickers agreed that few management controls were possible and judicial review cases were dependent on external legal advice.

Councillor David Rendel queried the budget set for income from the registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages which was £25k and the actual income raised in year of £77k. David Holling confirmed that the increased income came from the issuing of licenses for approved premises in March which follow a three year cycle and could have been better predicted.

Councillor Andrew Rowles asked was legal fee income set by the Government. David Holling confirmed that for most fee income streams that was the case. The Council did set its own fee level for approved licensed premises each year.

Councillor Tony Vickers thanked David Holling for his report.

**Resolved that:** the report was noted.

### 14. Finance Performance Report (Month 4)

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 7) on the finance performance for (Month 4) 2011/12 and considered any areas of concern.

Andy Walker (Head of Finance) presented his report to the meeting. The report covered the latest finance position of the Council as at the end of Month 4 2011/12. There had been a significant increase in the forecast overspend against the budget at £1.8m. This was mainly in the area of Adult Social Care but there were smaller overspends forecasted by C&YP and Environment directorates. The Executive was already focused on the matter of addressing the overspend and an improving position was expected.

Nick Carter (Chief Executive) commented that it would take a further two or three weeks to fully understand the reasons behind the overspend in Adult Social Care but he

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

expected this to be resolved by the Month 5 report. Actions were already in place to address the small overspends in C&YP and Environment directorates.

Councillor David Rendel was staggered by the Month 4 report as it was only 20 days ago that the Month 3 report showed just a £800k overspend. He was concerned that this cycle occurred each year where the Executive loses financial control and needed to address a large overspend but would end up producing an underspend by the end of the financial year. This had been repeated for a number of years and needed a much better explanation. The monthly financial reports recorded overspend increases but the explanations that had not been changed or failed to provide sufficient detail.

Councillor Rendel listed five areas of specific concerns:

1. P 43 – Adult Social Care, referenced significant pressures from within the Learning Disabilities Service but contained no explanation;
2. P 45 Section 1.3 – stated a reduction in income from car parking of £150k was forecast and this would be managed by a reduction in other budget areas. There was no explanation on what was going to be done;  
P 45 Section 1.4 – Planning and Countryside overspend had increased from £150k at Month 3 to £267k at Month 4 with no explanation;
3. P 46 Section 1.7 - Planning and Countryside overspend was forecasted to be reduced to £50k at year end in Month 3 but had risen to £150k in Month 4. Again no explanation had been provided;
4. P 49 Section 1.9 – dealing with car parking income reported a £56k MVF pressure with no explanation;
5. P 49 Chief Executive's directorate, Section - Management Action – gave no details on what actions were to be carried out or the individual savings identified.

Councillor Emma Webster commented that the finance report was presenting provisional figures and it was a forecast of the expected year end outturn. Remedial action would be taken to address overspends and the actions required would be determined. Councillor Webster was surprised that Councillor Rendel regarded the report as staggering, he should have been aware of some of the major pressures that faced the Council in areas such as Looked After Children (LAC) and Highways where work was being done to address overspend or reductions in income. A small increase in the number of children entering LAC system had a very significant financial impact. Councillor Webster clearly remembered when the Liberal Democrats were in power in 2003 and recorded a large financial year end underspend they still went on to raise council tax by 7.9% in the following year.

Councillor Tony Vickers summarised the general points raised:

1. There was an annual pattern of overspend followed by underspend at year end;
2. There was something significantly wrong with the Adult Social Care budget process that still incurred an overspend of approximately £1m despite being told previously that pressures had been taken into account when the budget was set. It was obvious that the budget monitoring process was inadequate.

Nick Carter addressed the five specific concerns raised by Councillor Rendel. Learning Disabilities was a very expensive area and one individual case could easily arise unexpectedly and involve an additional five figure spend.

Councillor Rendel asked if there had been 18 new individuals with Learning Disabilities identified.

Nick Carter stated that the Month 5 report would provide clarity on the Adult Service overspend and exactly what new costs had arrived.

Councillor Rendel said that the Council needed a better explanation now.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Nick Carter agreed that a better explanation should have been given and that work would be completed by the Month 5 report. Specifics 2, 3 & 4 were directly linked to external economic factors that had led to lower income receipts from car parking and planning applications. The delay in Government legislation had meant the new planning fee structure could not be introduced before January 2012. Nick Carter would ensure that better explanations were provided and greater detail on management actions would be provided.

It was noted that Mark Edwards had already been requested under agenda Item 4 to produce a written report addressing the questions raised on car park season tickets and PCN payments and was invited to attend RMWG at its next meeting on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November to present his report.

Nick Carter agreed that there had been a regular annual pattern (early forecast overspend turning to underspend) in recent years but this had been the result of different underlying factors and the solutions taken each year had been different. It was not a case of poor budgeting but responding to changing factors often from external sources where the Council had no influence or prior knowledge.

Councillor Keith Chopping (Finance portfolio holder) commented that the Month 4 report had forecast an increased overspend but there were still 8 months to work on that overspend. It was a concern but the Council had not lost control, it was working in a business like way to identify and manage the overspend and there were actions in already in place to address CYP and environment directorates overspends.

Councillor Tony Vickers asked were there any other factors related to the economy. Councillor Sheila Ellison responded that she had seen a significant increase in domestic violence and a greater number of children enter the care system as a result.

**Resolved that:** Members would expect to see a more detailed explanation of the overspend in Adult Social Care in the Month 5 report and the management action to be taken. The report was noted.

### 15. Strategic Risk Register

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 8) to scrutinise individual items on the Risk Register.

Ian Priestley (Chief Internal Auditor) presented his report to the meeting. Ian described how the report was split into a number of documents as follows:

- Strategic Risk Register – Action plan update;
  1. Net Red risks;
  2. New emerging / increasing risk areas;
  3. Reducing risk areas;
- Risk Appetite;
- Strategic Risk Register September 2011.

Ian explained that the action plan had been improved and was intended to give greater focus on action planning. The Risk Appetite was intended to guide how impact and likelihood of risk could be consistently assessed and the treatment programme defined how differing risk scores would be managed in terms of escalation and response processes. The risk register provided more detailed risk information covering the eight categories of risk that were monitored by the Council.

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Tony Vickers wanted to check that net red risks in the risk register on page 65 of the report were reflected through to Section 1 Net Red Risks on P 55. Ian confirmed that was the case and explained how the cross reference numbering worked. Councillor Vickers asked did the Risk Register come to both the Governance and Audit and the Resource Management Working Groups. This was confirmed by Ian Priestley. It was agreed that RMWG should focus on the resource implications of risks. Councillor Vickers thought it was a useful tool and it was important to recognise that, as it covered fast moving areas, the report could never be fully up to date.

Councillor Jeff Beck (Chair of Governance and Audit) agreed that the risk register was never 100% accurate and highlighted P 65 Reference Risk 1.5 on school academies and P 75 Risk 6.1 were both in need of update.

Councillor Emma Webster commented that the reports were much improved.

Councillor Tony Vickers supported the view that the report was useful and it was agreed to bring the Strategic Risk Register to RMWG each year to allow regular monitoring to take place.

Nick Carter encouraged Members to concentrate on those risks that carried resource implications and where external changes carried financial risk for the Council.

Councillor Tony Vickers agreed citing changes in legislation or the economy that might have impact on the Council's tax base. Councillor Vickers referenced P 58 Risk 2.3 was a good example.

It was confirmed that Steve Duffin (Head of Service) was developing a report on revenue modelling.

Councillor Tony Vickers noted that RMWG was reviewing the MTFs at the meeting planned for 8th November 2011.

### **Resolved that:**

1. The Strategic Risk Register should become a regular monitoring item on the RMWG work programme. It was agreed to review the risk register annually and it was next scheduled for September 2012;
2. Individual risk items had been scrutinised and those risks that addressed areas of finance or resources would be scrutinised on an annual basis.

## **16. Work Programme**

The Working Group considered a report (Agenda Item 9) and prioritised the work programme for the municipal year 2011/12.

A number of minor adjustments were made to the work programme and the following new work items were added to the programme:

- Review of managed vacancies (MVF) starting in January 2012 by RMWG subject to agreement with OSMC;
- RMWG to receive a report from Mark Edwards on car park season tickets and PCN income and the shortfall in car parking income at the 8<sup>th</sup> November meeting.

OSMC/11/16 Parkway work item was discussed. It was noted that OSMC had recommended that this work item should be allocated to the Newbury Town Centre Task Group but following Nick Carter's comment that this may be better served by convening a

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP - 27 SEPTEMBER 2011 - MINUTES**

meeting of RMWG with Nick Carter, David Holling and Mark Edwards to answer Members' questions on the financial arrangements associated with car parking and affordable housing under the Parkway Development. Members of the Newbury Town Centre Task Group could be invited as observers. Councillor David Rendel was asked to produce a list of Members' written questions to be submitted to officers. It was also agreed that Newbury Town Centre Task Group should be asked to review and report back on the opening months operation of the Parkway Centre in the Spring 2012.

**Resolved that:**

1. A meeting of Officers and Members to be convened to review the financial arrangements associated with car parking and affordable housing under the Parkway Development;
2. Councillor David Rendel to produce a list of Members' written questions to be submitted to officers;
3. Newbury Town Centre Task Group to be invited to review and report back on the opening months operation of the Parkway Centre by April 2012;
4. The changes to the work programme would be noted.

**17. Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the Resource Management Working Group was decided for Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.30 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>West Berkshire Forward Plan</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To advise the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from November to February 2012 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 to February 2012 and recommends further action as appropriate

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

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

<b>Contact Officer Details</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	David Baker
<b>Job Title:</b>	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519083
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbaker@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 to February 2012, 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 to February 2012



# West Berkshire Council Forward Plan - November 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
<b>NOVEMBER 2011</b>											
PC2362	<b>Amendments to Apprenticeships Policy</b> <i>To seek a change in pay policy to allow payment on the National Minimum Wage in some circumstances to young apprentices extra to establishment.</i>	PC	PC - TBC	Chief Executive	Jane Milone	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety					01 November 2011
ID2245	<b>Adoption of Parish Plans</b> <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/11/11	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 November 2011
ID2247	<b>West Berkshire Forward Plan - December 2011 to March 2012</b> <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	10/11/11	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of Council		02/11/11	All Members, published on website for local residents	Not subject to call in.	01 November 2011
ID2381	<b>Appointment to Outside Body (Downlands Joint Advisory Committee)</b> <i>To appoint a replacement substitute following the resignation of the current appointee.</i>	ID	17/11/11	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser	Leader of Council		09/11/11			01 November 2011
<b>DECEMBER 2011</b>											
ID2248	<b>Adoption of Parish Plans</b> <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/12/11	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 December 2011
ID2249	<b>Approval of Village Design Statements</b> <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/12/11	Environment	Paula Amorelli	Planning, Transport Policy, Housing, Economic Development		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 December 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](mailto: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 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
ID2250	<b>West Berkshire Forward Plan - January 2012 to April 2012</b> <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	15/12/11	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of Council		07/12/11	All Members, published on website for local residents	Not subject to call in.	01 December 2011
EX2367	<b>Winter Service Plan 2011/12</b>	EX	15/12/11	Environment	Melvyn May			07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2356	<b>Superfast Broadband for Berkshire</b> <i>To seek approval for the Council being a part of the Superfast Broadband initiative across Berkshire.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Kevin Griffin	Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT, Customer Services		07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2351	<b>Options for Delivering Private Sector Renewal</b> (Paragraph 3 - information relating to the financial/business affairs of a particular person) <i>To outline the options for delivering the home improvement services.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Community Services	Mel Brain	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy and Economic Development	Yes	07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2284	<b>Equalities Report - including Public Sector Equality Duty</b> <i>To set out the requirements that the Public Sector Equality Duty will place on West Berkshire Council. To make recommendations as to future methods for involving people, including the eight protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	David Baker/ Jane Milone	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2289	<b>Finance Report - Quarter 2</b>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Joseph Holmes	Finance, Property, Health and Safety		07/12/11			01 December 2011

**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](mailto: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 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
EX2308	<b>Community Planning Q2 2011/12</b> <i>To provide Members with an update on parish planning activity during the final quarter of 2011/12 Financial Year.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2329	<b>Establishment Report Q2 11/12</b> <i>To note changes to the WBC Establishment</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Robert O'Reilly	Strategy, Performance, Community Safety		07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2352	<b>Market Street Redevelopment</b>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Nick Carter			07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2350	<b>Redevelopment of Taceham House</b> <b>(Paragraph 3 - information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person)</b> <i>To consider the options for Taceham House and agree best course of action.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Community Services	Mel Brain	Planning, Housing, Transport Policy and Economic Development	Yes	07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2364	<b>Support in Sheltered Accommodation (Paragraph 3 - Information relating to the financial/business affairs of a particular person)</b> <i>To outline the current arrangements for support into sheltered schemes and consider proposals for change in the context of pressures created by an increasingly ageing population</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Community Services	Tandra Forster	Community Care, Pensions, Insurance	Yes	07/12/11	Meetings to be held with key providers and consultation with service providers and users		01 December 2011

**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](mailto: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 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for ...)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
EX2357	<b>Staffing Implications of the Budget proposals for 2012/13</b> (Part 1 - information relating to an individual) (Part 2 - information identifying an individual) <i>To seek approval to make redundancy and premature retirements payments to staff at risk of redundancy with effect from 31 March 2012.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Chief Executive	Nick Carter/ Robert O'Reilly	Leader of the Council	Yes	07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2353	<b>Environmental Health and Licensing Joint Service Delivery</b> <i>To outline the potential of creating a new Environmental Health and Licensing Service with Wokingham Borough Council.</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Environment	Paul Anstey	Environment, "Cleaner Greener", Public Protection, Culture and Leisure		07/12/11	Officers		01 December 2011
EX2371	<b>Building Control Consultancy re-structuring</b>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Environment	Roger Paine	Planning, Transport Policy, Housing, Economic Development		07/12/11			01 December 2011
EX2375	<b>Asset Management Plan</b> <i>To seek approval to the Asset Management Plan</i>	EX	15/12/11 EX	Environment	Amanda Dennis	Finance, Property, Health & Safety		07/12/11			01 December 2011
C2314	<b>Review of Polling Places Stations</b>	C	06/12/11 C	Chief Executive	David Holling	Leader of Council		29/11/11			01 December 2011
C2349	<b>Amendments to Parts 7,8 and 12 of the Constitution.</b> <i>To consider potential amendments to the Constitution.</i>	C	06/12/11 C 21/11/11 GA	Chief Executive	Maira Fraser	Leader of Council		11/11/11 GA 29/11/11 C	Finance and Governance Group		01 December 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](mailto: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.

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

# West Berkshire Council Forward Plan - November 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
C2358	<b>2012/13 West Berkshire Council Timetable of Public Meetings</b> <i>To agree the timetable of public meetings for the year 2012/13.</i>	C	06/12/11 C	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser	Leader of Council		29/11/11	Both political groups,		01 December 2011
	<b>Junior Citizen of the Year Award 2011</b>	C	06/12/11 C	Chief Executive	Jo Watt	Chairman of Council		29/11/11			01 December 2011
C2365	<b>Member Development Programme 2012/13</b> <i>To ask Council to agree the Member Development Programme for 2012/13</i>	C	06/12/11 C	Chief Executive	Jo Watt	Leader of Council		29/11/11	Members		01 December 2011
C2376	<b>Leisure Centre and Shaw House Fees and Charges Review 2012/13 and proposed new charge to non residents for Library PC use</b>	C	06/12/11 C	Community Services	Chris Jones	Environment, "Cleaner Greener", Public Protection, Culture and Leisure		29/11/11			01 December 2011

## JANUARY 2012

ID2251	<b>Adoption of Parish Plans</b> <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/01/12	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 January 2012
ID2252	<b>Approval of Village Design Statements</b> <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/01/12	Environment	Paula Amorelli	Planning, Transport Policy, Housing, Economic Development		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 January 2012
ID2253	<b>West Berkshire Forward Plan - February 2012 to May 2012</b> <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	12/01/12	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of Council		04/01/12	All Members, published on website for local residents	Not subject to call in.	01 January 2012

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

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](mailto: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 2011 to February 2012

Reference	Decision and Purpose	Decision Body	Decision Path	Directorate	Contact	Lead Member (Portfolio Holder for . . .)	Part II	Date Report Published	Consultee(s)	Notes	Decision Month
ID2372	<b>Audrey's Meadow</b> <i>Agreement to protect Audrey's Meadow under the Greenham and Crookham Commons Act</i>	ID	12/01/12	Environment	Zoe Campbell	Environment, "Cleaner Greener", Public Protection, Culture and Leisure		04/01/12			01 January 2012
<b>FEBRUARY 2012</b>											
ID2254	<b>Adoption of Parish Plans</b> <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i>	ID	01/02/12	Chief Executive	Jo Naylor	Partnerships, Equality, The Visions, Communities		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 February 2012
ID2255	<b>Approval of Village Design Statements</b> <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i>	ID	01/02/12	Environment	Paula Amorelli	Planning, Transport Policy, Housing, Economic Development		TBC	Local Members and Stakeholders		01 February 2012
ID2324	<b>Speed Limit Review January 2012 (&amp; response to petition regarding Clayhill Road, Burghfield)</b> <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	01/02/12	Environment	Andrew Garratt	Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT, Customer Services		TBC	Local ward members		01 February 2012
ID2256	<b>West Berkshire Forward Plan - March 2012 to June 2012</b> <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i>	ID	16/02/12	Chief Executive	Moira Fraser (2045)	Leader of Council		08/02/12	All Members, published on website for local residents	Not subject to call in.	01 February 2012
EX2290	<b>Finance Report - Quarter 3</b>	EX	09/02/12 EX	Chief Executive	Joseph Holmes	Finance, Property, Health and Safety		01/02/12			01 February 2012

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](mailto: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.

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

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	22 November 2011

**Purpose of Report:** To review the Work Programme of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for 2011/12 Municipal Year

**Recommended Action:** To consider the current items and any future areas for scrutiny.

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

<b>Contact Officer Details</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	David Baker
<b>Job Title:</b>	Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support)
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519083
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbaker@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 Work Programme 2011/12

## Consultees

---

**Officers Consulted:** Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager, Principal Policy Officers



# OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION: COMBINED WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12

Reference	Subject/purpose	Methodology	Expected outcome	Review Body	Dates	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area	Portfolio Holder(s)	Status: In Progress Completed	Comments
OSMC/09/02	<b>Performance Report for Level One Indicators</b> 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: each Q End: OSMC 01/11/11	Jason Teal – 2102 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	In Progress	Quarterly item.
OSMC/10/78	<b>Examination of facilities in place for younger people</b>	By Task Group - Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.		OSMC	Start: 20/09/11 End: 21/02/12 OSMC 21/02/12	Julia Waldman – 2815 Children and Young People	Councillor Irene Neill	In Progress	
OSMC/09/57	<b>Revenue and capital budget reports</b> To receive the latest period revenue and capital budget reports To consider any areas of concern.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review	Monitoring item	RMWG	Start: 13/09/10 End: Each Quarter	Andy Walker – 2433 Finance	Councillor Keith Chopping	In Progress	May lead to areas for in depth review.
OSMC/09/63	<b>Establishment Reports</b> 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	RMWG	Start: 13/09/10 End: Each Quarter	Robert O'Reilly – 2358 Human Resources	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	In Progress	May lead to areas for in depth review.
OSMC/11/99	<b>Highways Asset Management Plan</b> To review the AMP and the highways land contained within it.	In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers.		RMWG	Start: Jan 2012 End: TBC	Mark Edwards – 2208 Highways & Transport	Councillor David Betts	To be scheduled	Member training will take place before Jan 2012 date tbc.
OSMC/11/102	<b>Day Centres</b> To examine the provision of day centres across the District.	Task group review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers and external partners.		HSP	Start: 20/09/11 End: TBD	Jan Evans – 2736 Adult Social Care	Councillor Joe Mooney	To be scheduled	Invite officers to September meeting of OSMC User experiences 01/11/11
OSMC/11/103	<b>Olympics and Diamond Jubilee Events 2012.</b> To review and monitor events in West Berkshire	In meeting review.		OSMC	Start Date 01/11/11	David Appleton 2578 Culture & Youth	Carol Jackson-Doerge		
OSMC/11/104	<b>Anti-Child Poverty Strategy</b>	To monitor the strategy	Monitoring item	HSP	Start: On-going End: April 2012	Julia Waldman – 2815 Children and Young People	Cllr Irene Neill	In Progress	

# OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION: COMBINED WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12

Reference	Subject/purpose	Methodology	Expected outcome	Review Body	Dates	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area	Portfolio Holder(s)	Status: In Progress Completed	Comments
OSMC/11/105	<b>Dignity and Nutrition – Hospitals</b> To review the Care Quality Commission report on Dignity and Nutrition - Hospitals	To survey and hold focus groups detailing information		HSP	Start: July 2011 End: 2012	Nigel Owen, West Berkshire LINK, Age UK	Cllr Joe Mooney	In Progress	
OSMC/11/106	<b>Update on the Health and Wellbeing Board</b> To receive updates from the Health and Wellbeing Board	To update members on Health and Wellbeing Board	Monitoring item	HSP	Ongoing	Teresa Bell/June Graves	Cllr Joe Mooney	In Progress	
OSMC/11/107	<b>Update on the Health Service in West Berkshire</b>	To update members on the changes to Health Service in West Berkshire	Monitoring item	HSP	Ongoing	Bev Searle - Director Joint Partnerships and Commissioning	Cllr Joe Mooney	In Progress	
OSMC/11/108	<b>Six lives report</b> To receive updates on progress of Six Lives report	Investigate NHS improvements since the six lives report		HSP	Start: Oct 2011 End: 2012	Alison Love, Nigel Owen, Teresa Bell	Cllr Joe Mooney	In Progress	
OSMC/11/109	<b>Timelord</b> To receive an update on the Timelord changes following Phase 3 post implementation.	In meeting review and update Members of the Timelord Phase 3 development		RMWG	Start: Jan 2012 End:	Jackie Jordan	Councillor Pam Bale	In Progress	the Closure Report to Timelord Programme Board in late November
OSMC/11/110	<b>Energy Saving</b> To review the Council's policies and procedures for Energy Saving.	In a meeting review the Council's procedures to Energy Saving		RMWG	Start: July 2011 End: Nov 2011	Adrian Slaughter	Councillor Hilary Cole	In Progress	Requested by RMWG on 26 July 2011.
OSMC/11/111	<b>Risk Register</b> To scrutinise individual items on the Risk Register on an annual basis.	In meeting review and scrutinise individual items on Risk Register.	Monitoring item	RMWG	Ongoing	Ian Priestley	Councillor David Betts	In Progress	Next request Sept 2012
OSMC/11/112	<b>Medium Term Financial Strategy</b> To review the MTFS	In meeting review of the MTFS		RMWG	Start: July 2011 End: Nov 2011	Andy Walker	Councillor Keith Chopping	In Progress	Requested by RMWG on 26 July 2011
OSMC/11/113	<b>Procedures for Blue Badge Holder</b> To review the procedures, criteria and rules of use for Blue Badge holders.	In meeting review.		RMWG	Start: July 2011 End: Nov 2011	Mark Edwards	Councillor David Betts	In Progress	Requested by RMWG on 26 July 2011

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION: COMBINED WORK PROGRAMME 2011/12

Reference	Subject/purpose	Methodology	Expected outcome	Review Body	Dates	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area	Portfolio Holder(s)	Status: In Progress Completed	Comments
OSMC/11/114	<b>GP Commissioning</b> To scrutinise the arrangements in the East of West Berkshire concerning GP Commissioning	In meeting review.		HSP	Start: Oct 2011 End:	June Graves, Bev Searle	Cllr Joe Mooney	In Progress	
OSMC/11/116	<b>Parkway</b> To scrutinise the financial arrangements for car parking and affordable housing allocated under the Parkway development	In meeting review.		RMWG	Start Nov 2011 End TBC	Nick Carter CEO David Holling Legal & Electoral Services Andy Walker Finance	Cllr Pam Bale		Newbury Town Centre Task Group to be asked to review and report back on the opening months operation of Parkway Centre by April 2012
OSMC/11/117	<b>Managed Vacany Factor (MVF)</b>	In meeting review.		RMWG	Start Jan 2012 End TBC	Robert O'Reilly HR	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld		
OSMC/11/118	<b>Methodology of repairing potholes</b> To scrutinise the methodology of repairing potholes and attending to sunken drain covers	In meeting review.		OSMC	Start Nov 2011 End TBC	Mark Edwards – 2208 Highways & Transport	Councillor David Betts		Training for Councillors planned in December 2011. Work to commence in January 2012

**Key:** **Scheduled Meetings Dates**

OSMC	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission	20/09/11	01/11/11	10/01/12	21/02/12	17/04/12	29/05/12
HSP	Health Scrutiny Panel	04/10/11	17/01/12	27/03/12			
RMWG	Resource Management Working Group	27/09/11	08/11/11	17/01/12	28/02/12	24/04/12	

This page is intentionally left blank