

Notice of Meeting

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

Thursday, 9th June, 2011 at 6.30 pm
in Council Chamber Council Offices
Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Wednesday, 1 June 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

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



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Thursday, 9 June 2011 (continued)

To: Councillors Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks (Vice-Chairman), Virginia von Celsing, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, David Holtby, 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:

Agenda

Part I

| | Page No. |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Minutes To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission held on 1 st March June 2011. To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission held on 17 th May 2011. To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Special Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission held on 18 th June 2011. | 1 - 16 |
| 2. Declarations of Interest To receive any Declarations of Interest from Members. | |
| 3. Apologies for Absence To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any), | |
| 4. Actions from previous Minutes To receive an update on actions following the previous Commission meeting. | 17 - 18 |
| 5. Items Called-in following the Executive on 24 May 2011 <i>Purpose: To consider any items called-in by the requisite number of Members following the previous Executive meeting.</i> | |



Agenda - Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission to be held on Thursday, 9 June 2011 (continued)

6. **Councillor Call for Action**
Purpose: To consider any items proposed for a Councillor Call for Action.

7. **Petitions**
Purpose: To consider any petitions requiring an Officer response.

8. **Transfer of the West Berkshire Council CCTV control room to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead** 19 - 50
Purpose: To review the Council's transfer of the CCTV Control Room Function to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

9. **Health Select Committee Update Report** 51 - 56
Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Healthier Select Committee.

10. **Resource Management Select Committee Update Report** 57 - 70
Purpose: To provide an update on the work of the Resource Management Select Committee.

11. **West Berkshire Forward Plan - June - September 2011** 71 - 80
Purpose: To advise the Commission of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council from June – Sept 2011 and decide whether to review any of the proposed items prior to the meeting indicated in the plan

12. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme** 81 - 86
Purpose: To receive, agree and prioritise the work programme of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for 2011/12 Municipal Year.

Andy Day
Head of Policy and Communication

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

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



This page is intentionally left blank

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, 1 MARCH 2011

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

Also Present: Councillor David Betts, Councillor Roger Hunneman, Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Mark Edwards (Head of Highways and Transport), Mark Lewis (Education Assets Manager), Gary Lugg (Head of Planning and Countryside), Bryan Lyttle (Planning and Transport Policy Manager), Melvyn May (Highway Manager), Carolyn Richardson (Civil Contingencies Manager), David Baker (Principal Policy Officer), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer), David Lowe (Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager)

PART I

126. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

127. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Emma Webster declared an interest in Agenda Item 7, but reported that, as her interest was personal and not prejudicial, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 13, 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.

128. The Council's Response to the Severe Weather of Winter 2010/11

The Commission considered a report describing the Council's response to the severe winter weather experienced during the winter of 2010/11 (Agenda Item 4).

Carolyn Richardson gave a presentation to the Commission and highlighted the following points:

- December 2010 was the coldest December on record across the UK. However, less snowfall was experienced in West Berkshire compared with the winter of 2009/10.
- Heavy snow fell over 17 and 18 December 2010, this was accompanied by very low temperatures which continued into January 2011.
- The Council's Adverse Weather Plan for extreme cold and snow was activated. All parts of the Thames Valley were affected and all agencies had participated in an extensive debrief.
- In addition to having the Adverse Weather Plan in place, a number of specific changes and improvements had been made since 2009/10, these included:
 - Co-ordination of contractors for pavement clearance.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

- 4x4 vehicle use and co-ordination.
- Production of a revised Winter Service Plan by Highways and Transport.
- Additional stocks of salt (5000 tonnes – up from the previous 1400 tonnes).
- An additional 85 salt bins installed across the District.
- Improved website which received positive feedback.
- There was an increase in the number of calls received by the Contact Centre, but this was less than the previous year.
- Although the December 2010 weather was not declared as a major incident for West Berkshire, Civil Contingencies operated on a 24/7 basis to ensure business as usual as far as possible. There was a reduced impact on the Council in comparison to 2009/10.
- Some mutual aid was offered to other local authorities, i.e. 4x4 vehicle support offered to Oxfordshire County Council.

(Councillor Emma Webster joined the meeting at 6.35pm).

- A high percentage of waste collections were achieved during this period with some compliments received from residents.
- School closures were kept to a minimum, this was partly due to the schools being closed during the holiday period.
- Some library closures were necessary, but one of these related to a heating problem and not the snow.
- Community Care activated their Prioritisation Plan and utilised 4x4 vehicle support to reach clients.
- Feedback received from Parish and Town Councils highlighted a need both for themselves and West Berkshire Council to encourage a greater community effort from residents.
- Current projects included:
 - Work with Parish and Town Councils and community groups to encourage local engagement.
 - Work across the Thames Valley and with other neighbouring responders to ensure good practice was shared.
 - Revising the Adverse Weather Plan as necessary.

Members queried whether the additional stocks of salt were adequate. Mark Edwards explained that the salt level remained above the minimum requirement of 1400 tonnes for the Council. The salt was stored in two locations, approximately 1500 tonnes was stored under cover in a barn at Chieveley, the remaining amount was uncovered. Mark Edwards advised that it was the intention to seek an alternative location that would enable all the salt to be covered.

Mark Edwards felt that the engagement of Parish and Town Councils was significant and made a real difference across the District. They were pleased to be involved on issues such as the management of salt bins.

Melvyn May explained that in response to the Commission's recommendations from the review of the previous winter, attempts had been made to engage local farmers to provide assistance in the clearance of roads to help communities. Unfortunately an

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

approach to this had not been agreed. This had been sought through the Thames and Kennet Machinery Ring (TKMR) and while they did offer assistance, this was only possible on an ad hoc basis and came with a charge of £40 per hour. Further complications of such an approach were insurance issues and a need for adequate training. The Council's term contractor for highways, Volker, were willing to train farmers as sub contractors but there was little interest from TKMR in doing so.

Councillor Jeff Brooks was pleased that efforts had been made with farmers and was of the view that these should be continued with the acceptance that this would be on an ad hoc basis. Councillor Irene Neill added to this view by stating that farmers in her ward had indicated they would be willing to provide assistance. The Commission therefore recommended that further efforts should be made.

Members were interested in the number of potholes reported and the success in repairing them. Officers explained that 479 were reported over December 2010/January 2011 this was a decrease from the 678 reported for the same period a year earlier. Melvyn May explained that it was necessary to temporarily plug the potholes as a permanent repair was not possible during the snow and low temperatures. This had failed in some instances and, as a result, work was being undertaken with Volker to identify a separate method of plugging that had more permanence.

The costs of repairing failed plugging work was covered by Volker who were willing to accept this risk during cold weather conditions. Melvyn May offered to identify the number of repeat reports of pot holes to help understand the level of the issue. Members felt this was important as a way of measuring the effectiveness of the contract. Melvyn May advised that further quality checks were prohibited by resource limitations, but added that the Council had one of the best repudiation rates in the country when responding to third party insurance claims.

Councillor David Betts went on to say that a good deal of work to permanently repair the roads was successfully completed during the summer months of 2010. This was the ideal time to undertake this work and as a result the statistics for the number of roads needing attention had reduced dramatically – only 11% of rural roads required attention at this time.

Councillor Emma Webster had received positive comments on the Council's swift response to repair the pot holes.

On the subject of salt bins, Melvyn May advised that both Council and Parish/Town Council bins had labels making it clear that the salt was not for private use. Routine maintenance previously conducted by the Council on an annual basis had ceased, although any repairs etc would be seen to as and when necessary. Some Parish and Town Councils had taken on responsibility for maintenance of the bins themselves.

In response to questions regarding mutual aid to other local authorities, Mark Edwards advised that contact was made by Cumbria County Council regarding a loan of salt and an offer was made to them should this be required. This was not taken up and although low levels of salt were reported elsewhere, none was provided to other local authorities. Mark Edwards added that an agreement had been reached across the Thames Valley should this be necessary and any loan of salt would be returned when the local authority concerned was able to do so.

Members felt that the communication updates were very helpful and the frequent website updates invaluable.

Councillor Brian Bedwell was pleased to note the level of work that had taken place in the last year, with much of it owing to the recommendations of the Commission. This had reduced the number of issues being raised. The issue of pot holes remained an irritant,

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

but the efforts made to repair them were appreciated and Councillor Bedwell felt that the Commission should recommend work to identify alternative methods of repair be undertaken as indicated by Highway Officers.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) The Head of Highways and Transport should ensure that the Council's salt stock was stored in such a way so as to ensure it was entirely covered.
- (2) Further efforts should be made by Highways and Transport to engage local farmers to assist with clearing of roads during adverse weather.
- (3) Melvyn May would identify the number of repeat reports of pot holes to help understand the level of the issue.
- (4) Highways and Transport Officers should continue with their work to identify alternative methods of repairing pot holes.

129. Actions from previous Minutes

The Commission received an update on actions following the previous meeting (Agenda Item 5).

Continuing with the subject of severe winter weather, Members requested an update on whether schools had provided copies of their severe weather plans to the Education Service. Members felt it was important that plans were in place to avoid closures wherever possible. Mark Lewis explained that an action for the current school term was to ascertain that plans were in place and copies would be requested. Mark Lewis pointed out that schools could be encouraged to provide them, but this could not be insisted upon. It was suggested that the interest Members had in this topic should be communicated to schools to further encourage their participation.

Mark Lewis agreed to provide an update to the Commission on the number of schools who had complied with this request.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted and Mark Lewis would provide the Commission with a list of schools who had produced a severe weather plan and provided it to the Education Service.

130. Items Called-in following the Executive on 17 February 2011

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

131. Councillor Call for Action

(Councillor Emma Webster declared a personal interest in Agenda item 7 by virtue of the fact that her employer was conducting the public relations work for the Underwood Road development. As her interest was personal and not prejudicial she was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

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

Councillor Brian Bedwell updated Members on progress with the Underwood Road CCfA. The first planning application submitted by the developer, Bellway Homes, had been refused by the Eastern Area Planning Committee. However, a revised application was being consulted upon and based on the draft proposal it was hoped that a positive outcome would be achieved. Councillor Bedwell felt that the CCfA had been a key element in achieving this.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

132. Petitions

No petitions were brought to the Commission for consideration.

133. Performance Indicator - Affordable Housing Units

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 9) which set out the information requested at the previous meeting on this performance indicator and specifically commenting on the requirement for developers to contribute to affordable housing being waived on some occasions.

Gary Lugg opened the discussion by pointing out that the responsibility for this indicator rested with the Housing and Performance Service. Performance was still believed to be below target. This report sought to cover the planning aspects, such as the impact of the recession.

The number of houses to be built across West Berkshire was covered in a 20 year plan which was broken down into five year cycles. It was up to developers to decide when to build homes and this had been impacted on by the recession.

Councillor Emma Webster referred to a recent announcement made by the Housing Minister to introduce a new homes bonus that would match fund the additional Council Tax income potential from increased housing stock. This included an additional amount for affordable homes. As this funding would match the amount of Council Tax expected to be received, it was suggested that this could lead to an increased number of larger homes being built which would be in a higher Council Tax band. In response, Gary Lugg advised that the bonus had been discussed with the Portfolio Holder and while this funding would be welcomed, provision of affordable housing remained the priority.

Gary Lugg added that pre-recession, performance was high at around 1000 units per annum and permissions were in place for building homes.

Councillor Jeff Brooks proposed that the item should be deferred to the next meeting with Housing Officers also present. The discussion would need to include consideration of the number of residents on the Common Housing Register.

RESOLVED that the issue would be deferred until the next meeting when Housing officers would also be in attendance.

134. CCTV

The Commission considered a proposal for a review into the recent transfer of the Council's CCTV control room to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) (Agenda Item 10).

This request for scrutiny originated with Councillor Roger Hunneman and Councillor Hunneman was asked to introduce the item. He did so by making the following points:

- The review was requested based on the level of public concern, most particularly raised over the Christmas period. He had received many enquiries from retailers and the press in his role as Ward Member for Newbury Town Centre.
- Confusion had been caused by the information circulated on whether or not the cameras were operational. This created a potential risk of an increase in crime. Information was also given out by the RBWM control room to members of the public who had made contact. This gave the impression that there was no clear communications plan for the project.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

- It was hoped that the review would be accepted by the Commission based on the Terms of Reference in the report with an intended outcome that lessons would be learnt from the experience.

Councillor Quentin Webb was in support of the proposal and suggested an addition to the Terms of Reference to include evidence from Newbury Town Centre retailers. Councillor Hunneman was in acceptance of this addition.

Councillor Brian Bedwell informed the Commission that the Portfolio Holder was supportive of the topic being scrutinised. Councillor Bedwell felt that the difficulties encountered had reduced and it would be interesting to identify the key issues associated with the delays encountered as part of the scrutiny process.

RESOLVED that the item would be added to the work programme for discussion at a future meeting(s), with the inclusion of a minor addition to the Terms of Reference.

135. **Scrutiny Review into the Council's Common Housing Register**

The Commission considered the report and draft recommendations following the Stronger Communities Select Committee Task Group review into the Council's Common Housing Register (CHR) (Agenda Item 11).

Councillor Irene Neill, Chairman of the task group, referred Members to the six recommendations for improvement. The potential resource implications for recommendations five and six had been noted by the task group and as such this was commented on in the report. This suggested that detailed cost analysis be undertaken before a response was made to the Executive. For example, if an upgrade of Locata was deemed necessary, and this would be costly, then it could be delayed to a scheduled update of the system.

Members of the Commission supported the view that the recommendations be retained as written. A view was also given that it was important for Members to be able to access housing related data and it was felt that an upgrade of Locata was the most cost effective way of doing this.

A concern was expressed that the inclusion of a caveat could prove necessary for a number of reviews/recommendations. It was the role of scrutiny to make recommendations for the Executive to consider and respond to.

Councillor Neill took the opportunity to thank all the Members and Officers involved in the review.

RESOLVED that the report and its recommendations be approved for the consideration of the Executive.

136. **Greener Select Committee**

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

Councillor Emma Webster advised that the Committee met on 16 February 2011 to confirm their response to the two Council Motions regarding renewable energy. This was agreed together with an amendment to recommendation four to include assistance to community groups undertaking renewable energy projects.

The next meeting scheduled for 8 March 2011 had been cancelled as the business on the work programme had been concluded.

Councillor Brian Bedwell referred to a note in the report which stated that there had been no noticeable change in the level of fly tipping since the new waste management contract was introduced. This was a topic for discussion at the last meeting of the Commission.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

The discussion had resulted in a report in the Reading Chronicle quoting Councillor Bedwell as saying there had been an increase in fly tipping caused by the introduction of a cost for collecting bulky waste items. Councillor Bedwell made it clear that he did not make this statement and as such this was an incorrect report. The Reading Chronicle had subsequently retracted the article. The article was based on a Liberal Democrat press release and Councillor Bedwell requested this inaccuracy be removed from the Liberal Democrat website.

Some disagreement then followed on what was actually discussed and reported at the meeting and Councillor Jeff Brooks offered to discuss the matter within his Group before taking any action. Councillor Bedwell accepted this approach.

The different reporting methods used by the Council and Sovereign Housing were again referred to and questions were asked about what was actually considered to be fly tipping. Councillor Webster advised that Council Officers were liaising with Registered Social Landlords including Sovereign Housing regarding the capture of information. Also the Select Committee were of the view that the principle in relation to fly tipping needed to be about reducing the problem regardless of where it occurred and prosecutions should be sought where possible. She went on to point out that dumping of commercial waste was more of an issue than by private residents.

The matter of paint pots being accepted by recycling centres was then discussed. There was some experience of paint pots not being accepted regardless of whether the paint was solidified and this needed to be clarified. In response to this, Councillor Webster confirmed that recycling centres would accept paint pots if the paint was solidified and it had also been agreed that sand would be available on site for this purpose.

RESOLVED that Councillor Brooks would discuss the Liberal Democrat press release on fly tipping within his Group and take action as necessary.

137. Healthier Select Committee

(Councillor David Rendel declared a personal interest in Agenda item 13 by virtue of the fact that his wife was a GP in West Berkshire. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 13) on the work of the Healthier Select Committee.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

138. Resource Management Select Committee

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 14) on the work of the Resource Management Select Committee.

Councillor Jeff Brooks referred Members to the number of actions identified at the last meeting detailed within the minutes.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

139. Safer Select Committee

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 15) on the work of the Safer Select Committee.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

140. Stronger Communities Select Committee

The Commission considered a report (Agenda Item 16) on the work of the Stronger Communities Select Committee.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 1 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Irene Neill advised that two meetings were being arranged to conduct the review into the effect schools becoming academies would have on the capacity of the Local Education Authority. This would involve Council officers and the Headteacher of Kennet School which was due to become an academy.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted.

141. West Berkshire Forward Plan - March - June 2011

The Commission considered the West Berkshire Forward Plan (Agenda Item 17) for the period covering March to June 2011.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan would be noted.

142. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and Select Committee Work Programme

The Commission considered its work programme and that of the Select Committees for the remainder of 2010/11 (Agenda Item 18).

Councillor Brian Bedwell proposed that the next meeting scheduled for 12 April 2011 be cancelled as Members would be canvassing in the lead up to local elections. This was agreed by Members.

Councillor Bedwell thanked Members for their work over the previous year. Thanks were also given by the Commission to Stephen Chard, who was moving to a different role in Policy and Communication, for his support of the scrutiny process.

RESOLVED that the work programme would be noted and the meeting scheduled for 12 April 2011 be cancelled.

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

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

DRAFT

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, 17 MAY 2011

Councillors Present: Brian Bedwell, Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks, Virginia von Celsing, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, David Holtby, Mike Johnston, David Rendel, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb and Emma Webster

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: None.

PART I

1. **Election of Chair**

RESOLVED that Councillor Brian Bedwell be elected Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for the 2011/12 Municipal Year.

2. **Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for inability to attend the meeting received.

3. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

RESOLVED that Councillor Jeff Brooks be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for the 2011/12 Municipal Year.

(The meeting commenced at 8.23 pm and closed at 8.24 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

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

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 18 MAY 2011

Councillors Present: Brian Bedwell (Chairman), Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks (Vice-Chairman), Virginia von Celsing, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, Mike Johnston, David Rendel, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb and Emma Webster

Also Present: John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Nick Carter (Chief Executive) and Mark Edwards (Head of Highways and Transport), David Baker (Policy Officer) and David Lowe (Partnerships & Scrutiny Manager)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor David Holtby

Councillor(s) Absent: None

PART I

4. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 4, 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.

5. **Item Called-in following an Individual Decision taken by the Executive Portfolio Holder on 28 April 2011:**

The Three Year Highway Improvement Programme 2011/12 – 2013/14

The Commission considered the call-in of the Individual Decision (ID2266) taken by the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations) and ICT on 28th April 2011 relating to the Three Year Highway Improvement Programme 2011/12 – 2013/14 (agenda Item 3).

Councillor Jeff Brooks, one of the Members that had called the decision in, made the following two main points in support of the reasons for calling-in the Individual Decision:

- He was concerned that the consultation process had not been robust. The consultation period, initially provided only one day to respond and then that period was extended without making all Members aware, which was inappropriate within an election period when Members were necessarily distracted by the campaign itself and unable to give the item the attention it had required. The consultation process did not include any evidence or comments from town and parish councils and had excluded the emergency services.
- The programme did not reflect the requirement to concentrate on the poor state of urban area roads and was unbalanced in favour of rural areas. The programme of repairs in the Highways Improvements Plan as described in Appendix A of the report did not reflect adequately those roads in most need of repair or take into account the volume of traffic that was using the roads in most need of repair.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 18 MAY 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor David Betts (Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations) and ICT) responded by saying the initial consultation period was one week not one day and following the receipt of Councillor Brook's letter, consultation was extended by a further week. All Members had been notified by email. The balance of rural versus urban roads in the report was 1/3 rural to 2/3 urban. There had been no comments received during the consultation process regarding any issues of balance between rural and urban roads in the report.

Mark Edwards (Head of Highways and Transport) confirmed that the consultation process started with an e-mail sent to all Members on 14th April requesting comments by 15th April which was initially extended to 21st April and following a letter from Councillor Brooks was extended again to 28th April. Consultation on the Highways Improvement Plan had taken place in the same period over the last few years. The plan had been on display in the Members room. The main reason the timescale for consultation was at short notice was the delayed publication of the Government settlement of £200m grant for the repairs of potholes which was finally published on the 13th April.

Regarding the balance of rural and urban roads in the Highways Improvement Plan, all roads were assessed by condition. The condition of each road was scored under a consistent methodology used across all councils. The point scoring system was used to generate a list of roads in priority order (worst first) for maintenance and the improvement programme was then determined by drawing a line in the list at a point based on the maintenance budget available in that year.

Councillor David Rendel questioned the basis of the calculation that had shown the balance of rural versus urban roads to be 1/3 rural to 2/3 urban.

Mark Edwards advised that Appendix A listed the 68 roads that were in this year's Highways Improvement Plan, 41 of these roads were classed as urban. If the balance of the programme was viewed by the length of road to be repaired then the rural urban split was approximately a 50:50 split.

Councillor Tony Vickers stated his concern over the methodology used to determine which roads were considered a priority to repair. He observed that the inspection by SCANNER or Course Visual Inspection (CVI), referred to in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.7 in the report, did not appear to highlight the worst cases. He was of the opinion that within his own ward there were roads in much greater need of repair than those listed in Appendix A. This was a view that had also been expressed by a number of his ward residents.

Mark Edwards explained that both SCANNER and CVI were tried and tested methodologies used very widely by local authorities which yielded consistent data regarding the quality of road surfaces.

There was a period of discussion centred on the measures used to compare the balance of rural versus urban roads which confirmed the general view that the balance was 1/3 to 2/3 based on number of roads and 1/2 to 1/2 based on length of road to be repaired. It

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 18 MAY 2011 - MINUTES

was also noted that the total length of rural roads was greater than the total length of urban roads. The relative costs of the three types of road repair - inlay, overlay and surface dressing were explained by the Highways officer.

Councillor Quentin Webb proposed the Commission had reviewed the decision and that it had determined it concurred with the decision and would not be referring the decision back to the Executive for further consideration.

Councillor David Rendel re-stated his reasons as to why the decision should be referred back to the Executive:

- The Highways Improvement Plan did not reflect citizens' view of the roads in most need of repair;
- The consultation period had been inadequate;
- There was a real need to consult more widely with parish and town councils and residents;
- That the methodology used to determine the priority of repairs was not right;
- The balance of rural and urban roads was inappropriate because the methodology used failed to take into account that urban roads carried higher volumes of traffic.

By taking that higher usage into account then greater value for money would be achieved by placing more emphasis on urban roads.

Mark Edwards explained that most rural roads were unclassified or C class, and their construction standard was defined as 'undesigned' whereas most urban roads were built to higher standards of construction to take into account higher traffic volumes. This tended to result in rural roads sustaining greater damage during winter periods. The Council has carried out a lot of careful measurement to confirm that the repair work in recent years had provided value for money. Traffic volumes were part of that assessment and as an authority, internal audit had confirmed that the Council provided good value for money when compared to other authorities and that the overall condition of roads in West Berkshire was better than the average.

Councillor Jeff Brooks was concerned that roads in West Berkshire had deteriorated in recent years following two severe winters. The survey process used to assess those roads in most need of repair was flawed. Residents were angry with the state of roads in West Berkshire. The consultation process followed by the Council was ad hoc and needed to be made more robust. It was essential that parish and town councils and the emergency services were consulted.

Councillor Jeff Brooks proposed that the consultation process should be scrutinised.

The Chairman asked the Highways Officer to set up a training session for Members to provide a greater understanding on the how the road condition was assessed and the process used in determining the annual Highways Improvement Plan.

Councillor Jeff Brooks asked that a similar training session be given to parish and town councils at the next district parish conference.

Councillor Emma Webster was of the opinion that the concern of the balance rural versus urban was unfounded, road users used the road network as a whole, not just in the area where they lived. Residents and Members were able to scrutinise the road network all

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 18 MAY 2011 - MINUTES

year round and issues could be reported to Street Care or raised in the Annual Residents Survey. The Highways Improvement Plan was founded on a solid body of evidence.

Councillor Emma Webster seconded the proposal put forward by Councillor Webb.

In considering the proposal Members voted to concur with the decision and they would not be referring the decision back to the Executive for further consideration.

Councillor Tony Vickers seconded the proposal put forward by Councillor Brook.

In considering the proposal that the consultation process should be scrutinised Members vote against the motion.

RESOLVED that

- (1) The Individual Decision (ID2266) should not be referred back to the Executive
- (2) The Highways Service would arrange and deliver training for District and Parish Councillors on the assessment of road conditions and the process used for the determination of the Highways improvement plan.

6. Membership and Terms of Reference for the Health Scrutiny Panel

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 4, 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.

Terms Of Reference for The Health Scrutiny Panel.

The Chairman confirmed the membership for the Health Scrutiny Panel was as follows:

Panel Members were Councillors Quentin Webb, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Sheila Ellison, Howard Bairstow, Dominic Boeck, Tony Linden, Alan Macro and Gwen Mason.
Substitutes were Councillors George Chandler, Andrew Rowles, Roger Hunneman and Julian Swift-Hook.

Councillor Quentin Webb was proposed and seconded as Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve Councillor Quentin Webb as Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Gwen Mason was proposed and seconded as Vice-chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve Councillor Gwen Mason as Vice-chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

The Chairman asked if Members were in agreement with the Terms Of Reference for the Health Scrutiny Panel.

The Chairman proposed that the Terms of Reference be approved. Councillor Quentin Webb seconded the proposal.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve the Terms Of Reference for the Health Scrutiny Panel.

RESOLVED that

- (1) Councillor Quentin Webb would be appointed as the Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel
- (2) Councillor Gwen Mason would be appointed as the Vice-Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.

7. Membership and Terms of Reference for the Resource Management Working Group

Terms Of Reference for The Resource Management Working Group

The Chairman confirmed the membership for the Resource Management Working Group was as follows:

Group Members were Councillors David Holtby, Laszlo Zverko, Richard Crumly, Jeff Beck, Roger Croft, Andrew Rowles, David Rendel and Tony Vickers.
Substitutes were Councillors John Horton, Garth Simpson, David Allen and Alan Macro.

Councillor Tony Vickers was proposed and seconded as Chairman of the Resource Management Working Group.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve Councillor Tony Vickers as Chairman of the Resource Management Working Group.

Councillor David Holtby was proposed and seconded as Vice-chairman of the Resource Management Working Group.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve Councillor David Holtby as Vice-chairman of the Resource Management Working Group.

The Chairman asked if Members were in agreement with the Terms Of Reference for the Resource Management Working Group.

The following amendments were discussed and agreed:

Paragraph 3.1.1 was re-worded to read – The setting and monitoring of the Council's revenue and capital budgets.

Paragraph 3.1.6 was re-worded to read – The impact of resources on services, clients and performance.

Paragraph 3.1.10 was added to read – The effective use of information.

Paragraph 3.1.11 was added to read – The setting and monitoring of the Council's Timelord programme, asset management and organisational strategy.

Paragraph 4.1.4 was re-worded to read – There has been a pattern of significant budgetary underspend or overspend in service delivery.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION - 18 MAY 2011 - MINUTES

The Chairman proposed that the revised Terms of Reference be approved. Councillor Emma Webster seconded the proposal.

In considering the above proposal Members voted to approve the revised Terms Of Reference for the Resource Management Working Group.

RESOLVED that

- (1) Councillor Tony Vicers would be appointed as the Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel
- (2) Councillor David Hotby would be appointed as the Vice-Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Panel.
- (3) The Terms of Reference would be amended as agreed.

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

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

Agenda Item 4.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Title of Report: | Actions from previous minutes |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

Purpose of Report: To receive an update on actions following the previous Commission meeting.

Recommended Action: To note the update.

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

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

Executive Report

1. Introduction

1.1 At the last Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission further information was requested following some of the discussions held. This report provides an update to Members on the additional information requested.

2. **Performance Indicator – Award 85 new grant loans to bring properties up to a safe and decent standard**

2.1 The exception report discussed at the previous meeting referred to a campaign being launched in November 2010 in an attempt to improve performance against this indicator. Members asked for an update.

2.2 The campaign was launched at the end of January 2011, this was later than planned due to capacity issues. It is hoped that the results of the campaign will begin to be visible by the end of the fourth quarter, but interest has already been expressed by Parish Councils and voluntary organisations who wish to promote it. Work on distributing the publicity is still in progress, but that should be complete by the end of February.

2.3 This item has been carried forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission meeting on Thursday 28 June 2011.

3. **School severe weather plans**

3.1 Mark Lewis would provide the Commission with a list of schools who had produced a severe weather plan and provided it to the Education Service. This item has been carried forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission meeting on Thursday 28 June 2011.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Title of Report: | Transfer of the West Berkshire Council CCTV control room to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

Purpose of Report:

To review the Council's transfer of the CCTV Control Room Function to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

Recommended Action:

It is recommended that the Commission reviews the project to transfer the West Berkshire Council CCTV to RBWM and makes recommendations as appropriate.

Key background documentation:

None

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

| Contact Officer Details | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name: | Ian Priestley |
| Job Title: | Chief Internal Auditor |
| Tel. No.: | 01635 519253 |
| E-mail Address: | ipriestley@westberks.gov.uk |

Executive Report

1. Introduction

1.1 At its meeting on 1 March 2011 the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) approved the terms of reference for a review into the project to transfer the Council's CCTV system to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM), and specifically to examine:

- (1) the project plan
- (2) the way procurement was handled
- (3) the public communications plan
- (4) what level of uptime was expected/planned for during transition
- (5) whether the Council's standard project methodology was used for the project
- (6) evidence from Newbury Town Centre retailers.

1.2 The report outlines the review methodology and provides background on CCTV and the transfer project.

2. Methodology

2.1 The review will be conducted by the full Commission during its meeting of 9 June 2011, to which the following witnesses have been invited:

- | | | |
|------|------------------------------|--|
| (1) | Superintendent Robin Rickard | Local Police Area Commander West Berkshire |
| (2) | Stuart Messum | ICT Manager, RBWM |
| (3) | David Mead | Business Improvement Manager, RBWM |
| (4) | Chris Rice | Facilities Manager, Camp Hopson |
| (5) | John Colclough | Technical Sales Consultant CCTV BT Redcare |
| (6) | Tony Collis | Regional Manager, Chubb Systems Limited |
| (7) | Mark Barrows | Managing Director, Access Infrastructures |
| (8) | Lindsey Jones | Senior Account Manager Public Sector, Virgin Media Business |
| (9) | Councillor Anthony Stansfeld | Executive Member for Strategy, Performance, Community Safety |
| (10) | Andy Day | Head of Policy and Communication |
| (11) | Susan Powell | Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager |

2.2 As the Elected Member proposing the review, Councillor Roger Hunneman has also been invited.

2.3 The Head of Policy and Communication will make a short presentation, the aim of which is to summarise the more detailed report prepared by the Project Manager Susan Powell, and provide Members with an overview of the history of the CCTV service, and the transfer project, which is included at Appendix A.

3. Background summary

- 3.1 The West Berkshire CCTV service was based on old and outdated analogue system that was difficult to maintain and was unable to provide evidence packages of CCTV footage that the Police could use.
- 3.2 The Executive, at its meeting in January 2010 agreed to a new “Operational Model” for CCTV which, following a tender process, involved the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead being responsible for 365 24/7 live monitoring. The outcome of this project is that the Council now has sustainable state of the art CCTV coverage and has cut the running cost of the service by £250,000 per annum.

Integrated Project Plan

- 3.3 An integrated Project Plan was developed by a Project Team made up of key officers from both West Berkshire Council (WBC) and Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and its implementation overseen by a joint Project Board. The Plan adopted the Prince 2 Methodology principles as set out in Paragraph 5.1 of Appendix A. The Project Plan (Appendix B) included the communication proposed to be undertaken with key stakeholders.

Procurement

- 3.4 Work was procured by both WBC and RBWM officers from a number of specialist service providers and their work sequenced to enable the transfer of the monitoring of the public open space CCTV to the Windsor CCTV Control Room. This was a highly technical project involving a complex scheme of works that needed to be efficiently coordinated. The effective implementation of this project required a high level of collaboration between wide range of officers and service providers.

“The Shift”

- 3.5 Following preparatory work the ‘shift’ to the ‘new service’ commenced mid December 2010 with the Transfer and Testing period anticipated to extend for several weeks into 2011. As the ‘shift’ commenced a number of technical ‘problems’ emerged that could not have been anticipated by the Project Team and which took several weeks to resolve. The timescales for the ‘shift’ and Transfer and Testing Period were longer than had been anticipated or desired however all officers and service providers sought to achieve a successful completion of this project as quickly as possible.
- 3.6 The main issue was that the Project Team’s preparatory work had been based on a 1:1 presentation of data circuits from the CCTV cameras for connection to other equipment and at the shift it was found that not all data circuits would be presented in a 1:1 format. Where the circuits were 1:1 (eight of them) these CCTV cameras were quickly connected to the Windsor CCTV Control Room and became operational and where they were not 1:2:1 they could not be connected.
- 3.7 The problem was identified immediately, however the issue took a long time to be resolved as additional work was required and the lead in time for the contractor to complete that work was 90 days. This was the core reason for the delay impacting significantly on the timescale of the ‘shift’.

- 3.8 There was no complete break in service as the 'old' CCTV service remained operational right up to the beginning of the 'shift' to the 'new' service and there were a limited number of CCTV cameras already linked to the Windsor CCTV Control Room before the Newbury Control Room closed. The Windsor CCTV Control Room Operators and Manager have taken over responsibility for monitoring the West Berkshire CCTV system professionally and competently.

Communications Plan

- 3.9 The Project Board agreed that it would be inappropriate for there to be extensive public publicity around this project due to the potential to compromise public safety. Detailed within the integrated Project Plan were briefings to stakeholders and forums to ensure that appropriate information was shared with key individuals and groups as well as Press Releases issued at key times during the project. This communication remained in place during the period when the project was delayed by the technical issues noted in 3.6 above.
- 3.10 What does appear to have happened is that press coverage during the delayed shift highlighted the fact that the CCTV service was not fully operational. This indicates that the attempt to avoid unhelpful publicity had failed.

Benefits of the new Service

- 3.11 The Windsor CCTV Control Room is ensuring 24/7 live monitoring of the West Berkshire CCTV system. The new service provides evidence packages that are of a significantly superior quality to the 'old' CCTV Control Room, and can be used by the Police and positive results are already being seen.
- 3.12 The Windsor CCTV Control Room utilises state of the art equipment and the incorporation of the West Berkshire CCTV system has ensured that there is an efficient, future proofed, cost effective service at a time when other Local Authorities have chosen to 'switch off' their CCTV. The CCTV service, a non statutory service, is now protected for five years and will also save the residents of West Berkshire £1.25M over that period.
- 3.13 The Project Team have delivered the project, transferring the West Berkshire CCTV system into a state of the art service managed by Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Officers from West Berkshire Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead have worked effectively to manage a very complex, technical, project, involving a wide range of stakeholders and service providers.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 It is recommended that the Commission reviews the project to transfer the West Berkshire Council CCTV to RBWM and makes recommendations as appropriate.

Appendices

Appendix A – Narrative and commentary on the CCTV transfer project.

Appendix B – Integrated Project Plan

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission - Review of CCTV
Transfer Project - 9th June 2011**

Project Report

- 1 **Executive Summary**
- 1.1 The CCTV Service transferred into the Safer Communities Partnership Team within Policy and Communication in May 2008 and at that time there was no CCTV Strategy or developmental plans in place to ensure it sustainability
- 1.2 The West Berkshire CCTV service was based on old outdated analogue system that was problematic to maintain and was unable to provide evidence packages of CCTV footage of a satisfactory standard.
- 1.3 Following a review of the CCTV service the Safer Communities Partnership recommended that a 'New Operational Model for CCTV' be adopted and this was agreed by the West Berkshire Council Executive in January 2010.
- 1.4 A detailed Project Plan was developed by a Project Team made up of key officers from both West Berkshire Council (WBC) and Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and its implementation overseen by a joint Project Board.
- 1.5 Work was procured by both WBC and RBWM officers from a number of specialist service providers and their work sequenced to enable the transfer of the monitoring of the public open space CCTV to the Windsor CCTV Control Room. This was a highly technical project involving a complex scheme of works that needed to be efficiently coordinated. The effective implementation of this project required a high level of collaboration between wide range of officers and service providers.
- 1.6 Following preparatory work the 'shift' to the 'new service' commenced mid December 2010 with the Transfer and Testing period anticipated to extend for several weeks into 2011. As the 'shift' commenced a number of technical 'problems' emerged that could not have been anticipated by the Project Team and which took several weeks to resolve. The timescales for the 'shift' and Transfer and Testing Period were longer than had been anticipated or desired however all officers and service providers sought to achieve a successful completion of this project as quickly as possible.

- 1.7 There was never a day when there were no West Berkshire CCTV cameras working; a limited number were already linked to the Windsor CCTV Control Room before the Newbury Control Room closed. The Windsor CCTV Control Room Operators and Manager have taken over responsibility for monitoring the West Berkshire CCTV system professionally and competently.
- 1.8 The Windsor CCTV Control Room is ensuring 24/7 live monitoring of the West Berkshire CCTV system and providing evidence packages that are of a significantly superior quality to the 'old' CCTV Control Room. The Windsor CCTV Control Room utilises state of the art equipment and incorporation of the West Berkshire CCTV system has ensured that there is an efficient, future proofed, cost effective and proportionate service at a time when other Local Authorities have chosen to 'switch off' their CCTV.
- 1.9 The Project Board agreed that it would be inappropriate for there to be extensive publicity around this project due to the potential to compromise public safety. However, detailed within the Project Plan were briefings to stakeholders and forums to ensure that appropriate information was shared with key individuals and groups as well as Press Releases issues at key times during the project. The 'shift' period of this project attracted a high level of interest, particularly when the technical problems emerged that were going to protract the timescale for this challenging part of the project. Information was given as openly as possible and all enquires and requests for information dealt with promptly.
- 1.10 The 'new' service is operating efficiently and importantly is delivering a £250,000 annual saving to West Berkshire Council. The Contract with RBWM to provide this service is closely performance managed and there has been very positive feedback from retailers and Thames Valley Police on the professionalism of the Windsor CCTV Control Room Operators.
- 1.11 There have been lessons learnt from this project and some have been passed to another Local Authority that is considering a similar project.
- 1.12 The Project Team have achieved the Project Aim of transferring the West Berkshire CCTV system into a 3rd party monitoring arrangement with Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

2 Background

- 2.1 The CCTV Service transferred into the Safer Communities Partnership Team within Policy and Communication in May 2008.
- 2.2 At that time there was no CCTV Strategy in place or any development plans to ensure the sustainability and future viability of the service

- however, it was recognised that the CCTV equipment within the Control Room was nearing the end of its functional lifespan and was anticipated to fail at sometime in the near future. It was becoming extremely difficult to maintain the CCTV Control Room equipment as it was effectively obsolete and obtaining spare parts was a real challenge for the maintenance company. In addition because the CCTV service was based on an outdated analogue system obtaining tapes for the recording and storage of data (images) was becoming difficult. The majority of the CCTV cameras were also nearing the end of their operational lifespan, there were frequent faults and cameras required regular repair. The CCTV Control Room Operators and CCTV Manager worked very closely with the maintenance company, within a detailed Maintenance Contract, to ensure that any reported faults were promptly addressed however there would routinely be times when not all cameras were fully operational. Any 'down time' for a camera, or piece of Control Room equipment, would be minimal and the maintenance service was prompt, efficient and effective.
- 2.3 Of significant concern was the poor quality of the 'evidence tapes' being provided to Thames Valley Police. As described above the CCTV service was based on an analogue system and the quality of the taped images of incidents and/or individuals was extremely poor and of limited use to Thames Valley Police or the Crown Prosecution Service.
- 2.4 Responding promptly to this situation, and with a commitment to bringing about an improvement to the CCTV service, in June 2008 the Safer Communities Partnership (SCP) Strategy Group received a presentation from a CCTV consultancy firm describing a potential range of works that could be carried out to replace/upgrade the CCTV Control Room and cameras ensuring the future viability of this service. The options were however extremely expensive and the existing Control Room inappropriate for development so the Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager and CCTV Manager were tasked with identifying alternatives to 'improving' the service.
- 2.5 A review of the CCTV service was carried out and the Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager coordinated a series of meeting involving a number of West Berkshire Council officers and Members, Cllr Stansfeld and Cllr Hunneman, to develop a draft CCTV Strategy including the potential relocation of the Control Room and upgrading to a digital system.
- 2.6 The SCP Strategy Group received this draft CCTV Strategy at their meeting in June 2009. The draft Strategy and the options presented for sustaining and improving were discussed fully and the SCP Strategy Group requested that a range of alternative service models were explored in detail and that a special meeting of the SCP Strategy Group be held in November 2009 to agree a way forward.

- 2.7 There has always been a commitment by West Berkshire Council (WBC) to preserving live 24/7 monitoring of the public open space CCTV cameras in West Berkshire contributing to public reassurance, crime prevention and crime detection. The CCTV service has always been entirely WBC funded and as the work progressed during 2009 to identify how the service would be sustained in the future the need to achieve significant efficiency savings became increasingly important. Achieving both the required efficiency savings and at the same time preserving 24/7 live monitoring meant that a radical change to the service model was required.
- 2.8 The paper received by the SCP Strategy Group at its special meeting in November 2009, attended by Cllr Hunneman and Cllr Stansfeld, detailed a number of options based on extensive analysis of crime data (location, type, time) and investigation of other CCTV services (staffing levels, shift patterns, funding). The paper was also informed by exploratory meeting with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) in respect of the potential for developing 3rd Party 24/7 live monitoring of West Berkshire Council's public open space CCTV cameras.
- 2.9 The paper discussed at the November 2009 meeting of the SCP Strategy Group presented options in respect of alternative shift patterns in order to achieve the required efficiency saving. The most costly element of the CCTV service was a 24/7 manned CCTV Control Room operating with 2 CCTV Operators on shift at all times. One option presented within the discussion paper was to not have the CCTV Control Room staffed 24/7 but the Strategy Group were clear in their discussions and final decision that 24/7 live monitoring of the CCTV cameras in West Berkshire should be sustained.
- 2.10 The SCP Strategy Group agreed to recommend to the WBC Executive a 'New Operational Model for CCTV' and this was agreed on 14th January 2010.
- 2.11 The proposed 'new model' would deliver the required efficiency savings with 3rd Party monitoring of the CCTV cameras replacing the requirement of a staffed CCTV Control Room in Newbury and importantly provide an improved service benefiting from digital technology and other efficient data management technology whilst at the same time preserving 24/7 live monitoring.
- 2.12 In addition the 'new model' would be both proportionate and sustainable, important considerations taking into account national guidance, and like other CCTV systems across the country utilising collaborative working methods.

- 2.13 Following the WBC Executive decision in January 2010 to develop a shared service with RBWM it transpired that this was not permitted in respect of a non-statutory service therefore it was required that an Open Tender Process was conducted. This was completed during April 2010 and RBWM were successfully awarded a 5 year Contract.

3 The 3 Town's CCTV Project

- 3.1 At the time that the decision was taken by the WBC Executive to adopt a 'new model' for the West Berkshire CCTV Service the project to install CCTV cameras within the 3 towns of Pangbourne, Lambourn, and Theale was nearing completion. The final stages of the 3 Towns CCTV Project, achieving the connection of these 'new' cameras to the CCTV Control Room, could have been completed however with the anticipated closure of the CCTV Control Room this costly work would have been almost immediately redundant. In order to therefore avoid unnecessary costs the 3 Towns CCTV Project was 'stalled' until the cameras could be linked to the new 'Data Centre'.
- 3.2 Within the Project Plan for the CCTV project (described in section 5) the 3 Town CCTV cameras would be 'linked' into the service after the existing cameras had been transferred so would 'come on stream' at the end of the Testing and Transfer Period. It was considered appropriate to transfer existing CCTV cameras first to provide continuity of service and then bring 'new' cameras on stream at a later date.
- 3.3 It was acknowledged by the Project Team that 'stalling' the incorporation of the 3 Towns CCTV cameras into the service would cause concern to residents and other stakeholders in those locations but as explained above it was not practical or cost efficient to bring these cameras 'on stream' until the existing cameras has been 'transferred' as part of the larger CCTV project. In order to address these concerns as part of the communication element of the Project Plan briefings to Parish Councils and Ward Members were planned.
- 3.4 The 'new' cameras in the 3 Towns do not utilise data circuits like the existing CCTV cameras but use wireless technology and are linked to the Data Centre via the WBC Information Network. These cameras are effectively a separate system and their incorporation into the CCTV service could therefore be achieved independently to the work required to 'shift' the existing CCTV cameras into the 'new' model.
- 3.5 Once connected to the Data Centre the 3 Towns CCTV cameras are then linked to the Windsor Control Room via the RBWM Information Network and this 'connection' requires careful configuration of a number of elements of data through the data management software installed for the

recording, storage and onward transmission of CCTV data. In addition data has to be 'managed' across both WBC and RBWM corporate firewalls.

- 3.6 As explained above the CCTV cameras within the 3 Towns are 'linked' to the Windsor CCTV Control Room via secure the Internet connections. Achieving this 'link' has been more difficult than anticipated in the planning stages. The 2 council Information Networks operate on a multi-level platform however the data management software between these 2 networks isn't multi-level and the ICT lead officers within the Project Team working with the software provider, Access Infrastructures, have had to develop 'technical solutions' to achieve an uninterrupted flow of data from 'Camera to Control Room'. Despite detailed planning once it was attempted to 'flow the data' from camera to Control Room a number of 'barriers' became apparent and have had to be 'worked around'.
- 3.7 In addition the CCTV cameras in the 3 Towns had been installed for several months prior to being 'activated' and some remedial maintenance work was required which had not been accounted for but was carried out as quickly as possible.

4 Developmental Phase

- 4.1 As described above (paragraph 2.8) there had been exploratory meeting with RBWM during the autumn of 2009 to inform the discussions of the SCP Strategy Group and ultimately the WBC Executive decision.
- 4.2 With confirmation that a 'New Operational Model for CCTV' should be developed a series of meetings were organised between WBC and RBWM officers to develop a Project Plan. It was agreed that the Project Plan would be a shared document between WBC and RBWM and would incorporate all procurement requirements and other essential works to be undertaken. Well established project planning principles were adhered to in both the development and implementation of the Project Plan.
- 4.3 It was acknowledged by the Project Board in the developmental phase that this was going to be technically challenging project so officers with appropriate expertise were included within the Project Team. The potential technical and operational challenges were identified within the Project Plan, risk assessed and closely managed. Significantly the requirement to maintain live 24/7 monitoring of the CCTV cameras in West Berkshire up to and during the transfer, with minimal 'down time', was going to make this an extremely difficult project to manage and deliver. Efficient communication within the Project Team and with contractors was essential in order to mitigate any risks to service and project delivery. Importantly all the WBC and RBWM officers involved with this project gave their full

commitment to it and the Project Team considered that the aim of the project 'to establish a new operation model for CCTV in West Berkshire' has been successfully achieved.

- 4.4 To inform the development of the integrated Project Plan there were a number of meetings, including site visits to the 'old' CCTV Control Room, Newbury Police Station, Data Centre and Windsor CCTV Control Room, to ensure that all required work was efficiently scoped and incorporated.

5 Integrated Project Plan

- 5.1 As mentioned above (paragraphs 4.2, 4.4) officers from RBWM and WBC generated a Project Plan that detailed all the procurement and other works required to successfully achieve the project. The Project Plan was generated and implemented utilising both corporate and nationally recognised project planning principles and the elements covered included:

- Identification of Project Manager and other key officers
- Aim and scope of project clarified and agreed with all partners
- Specific project deliverables and objectives identified
- Measures of success and benefits identified
- Project details including timescales, costs, resources required and risks identified
- External constraints identified
- Technical specifications drawn up

- 5.2 An integrated Project Plan was generated and its implementation was overseen by a Project Board. It was acknowledged by everyone on the Project Board that this would be a dynamic project requiring the coordination of a number of contractors and partners and therefore it was agreed that the Project Plan would be a 'live document' that would be regularly updated and monitored by the Project Board and lead officers from WBC and RBWM..

- 5.3 The Project Board was made up of officers from both WBC and RBWM including Heads of Service, ICT leads and HR representatives. All officers gave commitment to these meetings; the meetings were well attended and were minuted with actions being followed up at subsequent meetings. In addition to ensure efficient project management key officers from WBC and RBWM arranged regular meetings and conference calls.

- 5.4 It was essential that the lead officers from WBC and RBWM worked very closely together on this project to ensure that work involving a wide range of contractors was efficiently coordinated. These officers had in depth knowledge of the existing CCTV services in both WBC and RBWM, expertise in respect of the ICT systems in both councils and importantly existing working relationships with the external contractors who would be

required to carry out essential work. These officers in WBC and RBWM ensured that appropriate Contracts were drawn up, in accordance with corporate procurement procedures and coordinated a critical meeting with all contractors to ensure that all parties involved with this project understood their responsibilities and gave commitment to key tasks/dates. The WBC and RBWM officers also ensured that stakeholders were informed and importantly that technical information was accurately exchanged and that timescales for works up to the 'Transfer and Testing Period' closely adhered to.

- 5.5 It was acknowledged by the Project Board that the expertise and knowledge to develop and deliver a Project Plan to achieve the successful incorporation of the WBC CCTV into the RBWM service existed within the Project Team and the need to appoint an external Project Manager was not considered. An externally appointed Project Manager would have not had the knowledge, expertise and communications mechanisms available as described in paragraph 5.4 and would have had to work with the lead officers to develop and implement a Project Plan. It is important to note that an appointed Project Manager would have added significantly to the cost of this project and that this had not been factored into the proposal presented to the WBC Executive or suggested/requested at any stage prior to the 'Transfer and Testing Period'. It is also important to note that the appointment of an external Project Manager may also have extended the timeline of the project and they would need to carry out a scoping exercise to draw together the information that was already held within the knowledge base of the Project Team officers.

6 Work required to 'shift' from existing to New Model for CCTV Service

- 6.1 In order to achieve the 'shift' from the existing model to the 'new model' a complex scheme of works was required and if 'down time' was to be minimised this work had to be very carefully sequenced.
- 6.2 The existing model was:
- A Control Room with all CCTV Cameras linked via data circuits from Newbury (including Greenham and Clay Hill), Hungerford and Thatcham
 - Ability to record, view and store images facilitated by an analogue matrix and video tapes – the equipment was nearing the end of its operational lifespan and was problematic to maintain
 - Provision for CCTV footage to be viewed by Thames Valley Police (TVP) officers through visits the Control Room and the ability to obtain 'evidence' by 'seizure' of tapes
 - The majority of CCTV cameras being public open space CCTV cameras - there were a small number that were 'dual use'

Community Safety/Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras shared with TVP

- Car Park CCTV cameras also routed via the Control Room – also the Car Park lift alarms
- CCTV cameras that were old analogue/box cameras – again nearing the end of their operational lifespan
- The TVP Airwave Radio system linked to the Control Room - enabling CCTV Operators to communicate with the TVP Control Room
- The Shop Safe and Pub Watch Radio system linked to the Control Room – enabling the CCTV Operators to communicate with these radio users and Neighbourhood Police Officers

6.3 The work required to establish the 'New Model' was:

- Replacement of analogue CCTV cameras with digital dome cameras – RBWM Contract with CHUBB
- Re-routing of a selected number of circuits from Newbury Town Hall to Data Centre – WBC Contract with BT and Virgin Media
- Installation of new circuits and node point for cameras hard wired into Control Room – WBC Contract with CHUBB and BT
- Separation of Car Park CCTV camera circuits, new connection installed in Town Hall Basement and link established for monitoring in Car Park Office – WBC Contract work with CHUBB
- Separation of ANPR cameras and hand over to TVP – TVP and WBC Contract with BT
- Installation of BT equipment in Data Centre – WBC Contract with BT
- Installation of data management software equipment in Data Centre – RBWM Contract with Access Infrastructures (AI)
- Installation of data link between Newbury Data Centre and Windsor CCTV Control Room – RBWM Contract with BT
- Installation of monitoring equipment in Windsor CCTV Control Room – RBWM responsibility
- Re-routing of TVP Airwave radio signal to Windsor Control Room – TVP responsibility
- Installation of equipment at Newbury Police Station to enable 'viewing of CCTV footage' – TVP responsibility
- Establishing a secure courier service to deliver 'evidence packages' to Newbury Police Station – TVP and RBWM responsibility
- Re-routing of Shop Safe and Pub Watch radio signal – WBC Contract with Co-Channel
- Connection of 3 Towns cameras to Data Centre and Windsor CCTV Control Room – RBWM and WBC responsibility
- Transfer of staff under TUPE – WBC and RBWM responsibility

- Redundancy of WBC CCTV Operators not transferring into new service under TUPE – WBC responsibility
- Decommissioning of the existing CCTV Control Room – WBC responsibility
- Decommissioning of the CCTV cameras not incorporated within the new model – WBC responsibility

6.4 It is important to note that in respect of most of the tasks listed above there were a number of 'sub tasks' and of this work needed to be efficiently coordinated by the lead officers and Project Board if the whole project was to be delivered on time and as planned.

6.5 The procurement of works required was influenced by the overall Contract between WBC and RBWM described in paragraph 2.13 i.e. RBWM would be responsible for ensuring that work was carried out to enable the incorporation of the WBC CCTV cameras into the Windsor Control Room and WBC would take responsibility for ensuring that the data from the West Berkshire CCTV cameras was presented in an appropriate way at an agreed location. Where appropriate either WBC or RBWM entered into contract with a service provider and details of each Contract incorporated into the overall Project Plan. With such a complex project incorporating a wide range of technical requirements a number of specialist service providers were required.

7 Maintaining the West Berkshire CCTV Service during the Project

7.1 The Project Team planned for the existing service to remain operational up to the start of the 'shift' although it was identified that this could cause operational difficulties and would limit the amount of preparative work that could be carried out without disrupting the service. The West Berkshire CCTV Service continued uninterrupted throughout the planning and development stages of this project and the service was fully operational right up to the planned closure date of 19th December 2010. Taking into consideration that the CCTV Manager had taken redundancy in March 2010, that one CCTV Operator resigned in March 2010, another CCTV Operator was on sick leave between February and May 2010, that another had retired in August 2010 and the remaining 6 Operators were 'at risk of redundancy' for many months ensuring that there was no break in the 24/7 operation of the CCTV Service demonstrates commitment and professionalism of the CCTV Team.

8 Continuity of service and transfer practicalities

8.1 As described in section 6 above there was a complex sequence of work required to bring about the 'shift' from one model to another and it is important to note that many elements were interdependent. It was

therefore essential that contractors work was timetabled carefully so that disruption to the service was minimised and they were able work collaboratively and this was achieved through close working of the Project Team.

- 8.2 It is important to note that it was known at the start of this project that some of the contractors would be reticent about working so closely together and the Project Team acknowledge during the planning stages that ensuring collaboration was going to be a challenge. The reluctance of contractors to work together is recognised nationally and isn't particular to this locality or the CCTV Project but the Project Team were committed to overcoming this potential problem. The Project Team achieved good collaboration between contractors and this was particularly beneficial when 'problems emerged' during the 'shift' as contractors were prepared to work together to find a solution.
- 8.3 Whilst, as described in paragraph 7.1 above, the 'old' CCTV Control Room remained fully functional right up to the start of the 'shift' it is very important to note that the expectation that the monitors within the West Berkshire Control Room would be switched off sequentially and came on again almost immediately in the Windsor CCTV Control Room was impossible to meet for the reasons that will be described later in this report.
- 8.4 A 'quick switch over' was never going to happen, it wasn't possible and it was never indicated in any briefing given by project officers that the 'shift' would happen like that. The reason why a 'quick switch over' was not possible was due to the fact that the work required involved a number of contractors, it had to happen in a coordinated and sequential manner and some of the work required complicated site work at each CCTV camera pole and within the Data Centre. It was not possible to 'run a parallel system' and there was always going to be a disruption to the CCTV service. What the Project Team sought to achieve was a minimal period of time for a disrupted service.
- 8.5 Key learning from this project has been that there was an expectation of a number of individuals that there would be a 'quick switch over' and anything short of that would be unacceptable. Project Officers acknowledge that expectations may have been more effectively managed if more information about the technical requirements of the project had been shared with stakeholders. However, experience throughout the delivery of this project has been that despite efforts to provide information and to explain the technical requirements the expectation that this project could be achieved 'quickly' persisted. It is regrettable that where expectations differed significantly from operational practicalities that there was considerable frustration. Learning from this project has been that

more emphasis should have been given to the technical aspects of this project to enable those outside the Project Team to understand what was being undertaken. Sadly as result of not managing expectations more effectively there was repeated emphasis on the negative i.e. delays in the 'shift' and diminished focus on what would be achieved i.e. a significantly improved CCTV service.

- 8.6 A crucial element of learning has been that the 'critical phase' of this project would have been much easier to manage if a brief 'shut down' of the service had been permitted rather than attempting the shift whilst maintaining operational functionality. It was clear to the Project Team during the development stages of this project that a 'shut down' would not be acceptable however with hindsight it should have been pursued more robustly. This learning has been passed on to another near Local Authority that is currently planning a similar project.

9 Preparation work

- 9.1 In advance of the 'shift' the following work had been completed:
- The equipment in the Windsor CCTV Control Room had been expanded to be able to have the WBC cameras incorporated
 - The 'link' between the Windsor CCTV Control Room and the Data Centre in Newbury had been installed and tested
 - The data management software equipment that would facilitate the recording, storage and onward transmission of data from the WBC cameras had been installed in the Data Centre
 - The old analogue CCTV cameras had been changed to new digital units
- 9.2 This work was completed well in advance of the 'shift' to minimise the work that needed to be carried out during the critical phase of the project. As described above the 'shift phase' of the project was going to be the most complex to manage so as much preparatory work that could be carried out was undertaken well in advance.
- 9.3 The following work had to be carried out during the critical phase of the 'shift':
- Circuits had to be physically disconnected from equipment in the 'old' Control Room
 - Circuits had to be re-routed via the Telephone Exchange to the Data Centre
 - Circuits had to be physically reconnected to the equipment installed in the Data Centre
 - The circuit termination equipment had to be connected to the data management equipment

- The video and telemetry data feeds needed to be correctly configured with the data management equipment in order to be effectively transmitted to the Windsor CCTV Control Room so that images could be viewed and cameras manipulated
- 9.4 Even with every effort having been given to tightly sequencing contractors site work, constant communication with all parties involved and commitments to key dates the best that could be achieved (with absolutely everything going as planned) was approximately 2 weeks disrupted service and within that for each cameras a few days 'down time'. Also a Testing Period of several weeks would be required.
- 9.5 It was always understood within the Project Team that the Transfer and Testing Period would commence in late December 2010 and would continue for several weeks into 2011 however again this was not understood by others and there was again an expectation that the 'shift' would only take 'a few days'.

10 Critical Contractors Meeting

- 10.1 As described in paragraph 5.4 it was essential for the successful implementation of the Project Plan that all contractors collaborated and very importantly it was crucial that all involved shared the same key technical information.
- 10.2 To facilitate this on 26th October 2010 the Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager coordinated a meeting that was attended by the following:
- West Berkshire Council
 - ICT, Car Park Team, Safer Communities Partnership Team
 - Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
 - ICT
 - BT Redcare
 - Account Manager
 - BT Openreach
 - Planner, Technician
 - CHUBB
 - Planner
 - Access Infrastructures
 - Company Director
- 10.3 At this meeting work sequencing was agreed and essential technical information exchanged. Following this meeting on 28th October 2010 notes of agreed actions and technical specifications were circulated including a Cabinet Diagram.

- 10.4 Importantly at this meeting it was understood by all those present that each camera would be presented in a 1:1 video and data feed format and subsequently Access Infrastructures (AI) built and configured the data management software and equipment in line with that specification.
- 10.5 Virgin Media (VM) were not present at this meeting because following telephone conversations with them prior to the meeting it had been indicated that the Thatcham CCTV camera circuits terminated at a 'hub' in Thatcham and were 'back hauled' to Newbury by BT. Taking this information to be correct it was presumed that BT would be able to connect and re-route the required VM/Thatcham circuits as planned with other BT circuits. It was not until the 'shift' actually started in late December that it was found that the information provided by VM was incorrect and that the circuits from Thatcham terminated in the Control Room in Newbury Town Hall and would therefore need re-routing from there to the new Data Centre. To complicate matters VM do not have coverage where the Data Centre is located in Newbury so it was going to require collaborative work between VM and BT to achieve a solution and this is described later in this paper.
- 10.6 During the planning stages neither BT nor VM could confirm the 'routing' of the 2 circuits from the Greenham cameras and of concern WBC CCTV records did not assist on this matter either. It transpired that these circuits were VM circuits that were again terminated in the old CCTV Control Room and would need to be incorporated into the solution for the Thatcham circuits.
- 10.7 What became apparent during this preparation stage of the project was that both BT and VM held incomplete records of circuits and their routing. In some cases engineers had to carry out time consuming work just to establish which circuits corresponded to which cameras/location at the Telephone Exchange in order to plan re-routing.

11 Planning the Transfer and Testing Period

- 11.1 Between the Critical Contractors Meeting on 26th October 2010 and the beginning of the Transfer and Testing Period (13th December 2010) officers from RBWM and WBC maintained constant contact with all contractors and other parties such as TVP and importantly the series of planned briefings for stakeholders was instigated. These briefings and other communication carried out is detailed later in this report.
- 11.2 As the start date for the Transfer and Testing Period approached there were a number of key meetings and telephone conference calls between WBC and RBWM project officers and contractors to ensure that essential

technical information was shared and that work schedules were coordinated.

- 11.3 It is important to note that this project encompassed a wide range of tasks from the very physical work of disconnection circuits, installation of equipment in the Town Hall Basement and replacement cameras to technically challenging work of configuring 2 data streams (video and telemetry) so that they would 'flow' continuously from camera to Control Room through complex equipment that facilitates the recording and storage of images and onward transmission in such a way to provide clear and detailed images and full mobility of the cameras by the CCTV Operators in Windsor Control Room.
- 11.4 Achieving this 'continuity' should not be underestimated and again it was possibly not fully understood by individuals outside the immediate Project Team how complex this project was. This situation was compounded by the unachievable desire that everything carried on a normal until midnight on 19th December and that the Windsor Control Room was fully operational immediately or very quickly afterwards.

12 The 'shift'

- 12.1 The actual 'shift' from the 'old' system to the 'new model' started on Monday 13th December 2010 (1 week in advance of the Newbury CCTV Control Room being due to close) and was the critical and most complicated phase of the project. As described earlier in this report it was planned that this critical phase would be over as short a period of time as possible however as described above even with everything going according to plan the 'shift' was going to take a minimum of 2 weeks and testing would extend for several weeks into 2011.
- 12.2 There were a number of issues that emerged almost immediately the 'shift' commenced:
- The CCTV cameras that had been changed from old analogue cameras to new digital cameras in advance of the 'shift' had not been set up correctly i.e. the 'speed' of the data from the camera was not as agreed - which meant that even though images could be transmitted to and seen at the Data Centre the cameras could not be 'moved'
 - The circuit presentation i.e. 1:1 in the equipment cabinet in the Data Centre was not delivered as agreed – which meant that most of the cameras could not be successfully connected to the data management equipment installed by Access Infrastructures (AI) – however the first 8 cameras that were 1:1 presentation could be connected and were immediately linked to the Windsor CCTV Control Room

- The VM circuits from Thatcham were not being 'back hauled' by BT as indicated by VM – which meant that the way these circuits were going to be incorporated was going to require additional planning
- 12.3 In order to resolve these problems the following was carried out promptly:
- Engineers were instructed to visit all cameras to adjust data speeds and 'prove' the data feed back to the Data Centre
 - The data management equipment was reconfigured to try and 'get round' the 'grouped' data feeds.
 - Virgin Media were contacted immediately requesting an urgent site meeting
- 12.4 As described in paragraph 10.3 the Cabinet Diagram prepared and circulated following the critical Contractors Meeting on 26th October 2010 showed a 1:1 presentation of data and video circuits and all other technical work was prepared in line with this 'master document'.
- 12.5 Access Infrastructures, working with ICT lead officers within the Project Team, tried repeatedly to reconfigure the data management software and equipment but it became apparent that remedial work would be required to ensure that the data and video feeds were presented 1:1 as agreed during the planning stages of this project.
- 12.6 There were technical difficulties in achieving a 1:1 presentation of some of the circuits due to the way that they were linked (daisy chained) and routed from the CCTV camera/pole to the Data Centre and additional work in respect of these circuits was required. This information had not been shared during the planning stages of the project and the additional work that was going to be required had therefore not been factored into the tightly sequenced scheme of works. This had a significant 'knock on' effect on other contractors work and the timescales of the project as a whole.
- 12.7 All the additional work required in respect of the problems described above impacted significantly in timescale for the 'shift' and could not have been anticipated by the Project Team within the planning stages of this project.
- 12.8 As described in paragraph 12.3 above all cameras had to be visited to carry out remedial work and site work was made more challenging in that the weather conditions were very poor between 13th and 17th December 2011. It is not possible to carry out electrical work safely when it is snowing however all cameras were visited and the data speed issue resolved.
- 12.9 By the end of the first week of the Transfer and Testing Period (17th December 2010) 8 CCTV cameras were linked to the Windsor CCTV

Control Room and a number of other circuits terminated at the Data Centre. The 8 cameras that were able to be immediately linked to the Windsor CCTV Control Room were in locations within Newbury Town Centre, were presented on a 1:2: 1 format and were fully operational.

- 12.10 On the 17th December 2010 there was a site meeting and telephone calls with contractors to agree a scheme of works for the following week.
- 12.11 The Local Police Area (LPA) Commander, Neighbourhood Inspectors and Neighbourhood Police Teams were briefed on CCTV status throughout the preparation and 'shift' periods including detailed late afternoon briefings on 17th, 24th and 31st December 2010.
- 12.12 On Sunday 19th December 2010 the old CCTV Control Room closed at midnight as planned.
- 12.13 Site works recommenced on Monday 20th December 2010 and continued to late on Friday 24th December 2010 however whilst some progress was made in respect of aligning data and video feeds from some cameras BT had not been installed as planned in the Town Hall Basement to form the new node point for some of the Town Centre cameras.
- 12.14 On Friday 24th December there was a site meeting and telephone calls with contractors to identify what work could be carried out during the Christmas/New Year holiday period given limited access to some buildings and agreement of works to be carried out week beginning 4th January 2011.
- 12.15 All contractors were back in site on Monday 4th January 2011 to seek to resolve persistent problems. It was of concern to the Project Team that at this stage that the new node point equipment had not been installed in the Town Hall basement. Furthermore circuits were still not being presented in the agreed 1:1 formation. The equipment was finally installed in the Town Hall basement in mid January, however it was not until 31st January 2011 that cabling between terminations was completed to create the new node point and enable the re-routing of 6 of the Newbury Town Centre cameras to the Data Centre.
- 12.16 Despite every effort, including work extending late into the night on several occasions, AI could not 'get round' the technical problems presented by not providing 1:1 presentation of data and video circuits so a critical site meeting was called on 10th January 2011.
- 12.17 Despite the commitment on 20th January 2011 to instigate works promptly a Contract for the additional works was not issued by BT until 10th March

2011, received, signed and returned on 15th March 2011 and countersigned by BT on 17th March 2011.

- 12.18 From 17th March 2011 onwards there were numerous telephone calls made to confirm dates for site works and it was reported that equipment had to be imported from Norway which would cause a delay. Finally a date of 18th April 2011 was set for the installation of the additional equipment. This date was set in conjunction with the Director of Partnerships for BT.
- 12.19 With the installation of additional BT equipment in the Data Centre it was possible to present the data circuits in a 1:1 format and with the installation of new equipment in the basement of the Town Hall it was possible to route the VM circuits from Thatcham and Greenham to the Data Centre. Site work at the Town Hall had been carried out by VM on 16th April 2011 (described below).

13 Thatcham and Greenham Circuits

- 13.1 As described in paragraph 12.2 it became apparent at the start of the 'shift' on 13th December 2010 that incorrect information had been provided about the routing of the Thatcham and Greenham camera circuits and immediate contact was made with them requesting an urgent site meeting. Contact was finally made on 5th January 2011. There were a number of telephone conversations but it was only after a telephone conversation with an Engineer on 28th January 2011 that detailed information was finally given in respect of the circuits.
- 13.2 Requests were made that this work be addressed as a matter of urgency however a site meeting to scope the works required could not be scheduled until 14th February 2011. It was at this meeting that it was identified that as VM did not have coverage in the location of the Data Centre and that therefore there would need to be a collaborative solution with BT to link the VM circuits into the system.
- 13.3 This solution required the re-termination of circuits in the basement of the Town Hall and additional equipment installed by BT to enable the routing of these circuits to the Data Centre. This solution was discussed with BT and agreement reached on the installation of additional BT equipment to enable the connection with and re-routing of VM circuits from the Town Hall basement to the Data Centre.
- 13.4 Following the site visit with a VM Planner on 14th February 2011 an initial proposal for work was received from VM on 15th February 2011 and clarification sought by return email on some technical aspects to facilitate connection with BT equipment.

- 13.5 Following confirmation of a number of technical aspects of the proposal it was accepted by WBC and a VM Planning Task (Contract) raised on 14th March 2011. At this stage it was indicated that work could be carried out within 4 weeks however on 28th March 2011 VM notified WBC that some equipment had been placed on special order and the delivery date for the equipment and date for works to be carried out would be 20th April 2011.
- 13.6 Despite delays in the delivery of the required BT and VM equipment and difficulties in setting a date for the work to be completed every effort was made to have both contractors on site at the same time to enable effective linkage of equipment. It is important to note that contractors work under very strict protocols in respect of demarcation points in respect of their equipment/service and it is extremely difficult to get contractors to 'link' equipment.
- 13.7 WBC officers tried to secure commitment to having both contractors on site on the same day and numerous telephone calls were made to both BT and VM to identify and confirm dates. VM were on site on 16th April 2011 to re-terminate circuits in the basement of the Town Hall and BT on site on 18th April 2011 to install new equipment to create the link. This arrangement alone took hours of discussion and necessitated the matter being referred up the management chain in both BT and Virgin Media.
- 13.8 Access Infrastructures (AI) were on site on 6th May 2011 to facilitate the linkage of the Thatcham and Greenham cameras to the Windsor CCTV Control Room and connection was achieved in respect of video however there were problems in respect of telemetry and AI were back on site with BT on 9th May 2011 to seek to resolve these. The telemetry issues were finally resolved on 23 May.
- 13.9 In relation to the Shop Safe and Pub Watch Radios it was agreed that these would not be connected to the Windsor CCTV Control Room until the majority of the Newbury Town Centre CCTV cameras had been transferred. Throughout the Transfer and Testing Period, from 13th December to the beginning of February 2011, the radios continued to work without disruption providing a 'talk group' for all users to share and exchange information about offenders and incidents. The week beginning 14th February 2011 the radio connection to the Windsor CCTV Control Room was installed and all Shop Safe and Pub Watch radio users notified as scheduled

14 Operational Issues

- 14.1 As indicated above one of the WBC CCTV Operators transferred to the 'new' service under TUPE and this transfer was instigated in advance of the old CCTV Control Room closing so that the Operator was already

embedded within the Windsor Team prior to any West Berkshire CCTV cameras transferring. The former WBC CCTV Operator was able to provide peer support and operational knowledge to the Windsor CCTV Team and importantly provide some continuity of service.

- 14.2 Prior to the Transfer and Testing Period all the RBWM CCTV Operators made site visits West Berkshire and familiarised themselves with the locations of CCTV cameras and the towns where they are installed.
- 14.3 The Windsor CCTV Control Room started receiving West Berkshire Local Police Area (LPA) Daily Briefings from November 2010 so that they could familiarise themselves with local offenders etc. and prior to the 'shift' the West Berkshire LPA Thames Valley Police Airwave System was patched through to the Windsor CCTV Control Room.

15 Managing the Transfer and Testing Period

- 15.1 As described above the Project Team had planned for the Transfer and Testing Period to be as short as possible however as also described above once the 'shift' commenced a number of issues arose that had to be 'managed'.
- 15.2 The Project Team sought to deal with all 'issues' as they arose and there was constant communication between Project Officers and contractors. As highlighted above there were regular site meetings and at the end of each week an agreement on what works would be carried out the following week.
- 15.3 As stated above during the preparation period and importantly during the Transfer and Testing Period the Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager briefed the LPA Commander, Neighbourhood Inspectors and neighbourhood Police Team daily on the status of the CCTV service (paragraph 12.12).
- 15.4 The first 'bundle' of CCTV cameras to be 'shifted' to the Windsor CCTV Control Room were located within Newbury Town Centre and as these were in the agreed 1:1 presentation they were linked quickly.
- 15.5 With the heightened media and other interest in the 'shift' once it had commenced and because the greatest concern was around the CCTV coverage of Newbury Town Centre the decision was taken to concentrate work on the 'Newbury Cameras' to try and get them through to Windsor as quickly as possible. Work did continue in respect of the Hungerford, Thatcham, Greenham and 3 Towns circuits/cameras however Newbury Town Centre Cameras became a priority.

- 15.6 There was a very high level of communication required during the initial stages of the 'shift' that added significantly to the workload of Project Officers that had not been anticipated and contributed to making what had become a difficult time even more challenging.

16 Communication

- 16.1 As described in section 5 an integrated Project Plan (including communications) was developed and within this there were a number of crucial communication elements.
- 16.2 It was acknowledged by the Project Team and Project Board that it would not be appropriate for there to be extensive public publicity about the CCTV Transfer Project due to the potential to compromise public security. It was also considered inappropriate to 'promote' to local offenders that the CCTV system wasn't fully operational and therefore increase that potential for more crimes to be committed.
- 16.3 The Project Team acknowledged that it was important however to ensure that stakeholders were made aware of the project and in order to do this a series of stakeholder briefings were planned well in advance of the Testing and Transfer Period to ensure that those individuals and groups who needed to know what was happening with the 'shift' from one model to another were fully informed.
- 16.4 Information to retailers was provided at a Shop Safe Meeting on 2nd December 2010 and Pub Watch members were informed at their meeting on 6th December 2010.
- 16.5 Appropriate information was also given at meetings of the Newbury Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG), by invitation of the NAG Chair Cllr Hunneman, in August and December 2010.
- 16.6 Cllr Hunneman and Cllr Stansfeld were given a detailed briefing on 16th December 2010 and regularly updated during the Testing and Transition Period.
- 16.7 Appropriate information was given at meetings of the following Parish and Town Councils:
- Newbury Town Council – 13th December 2010
 - Thatcham Town Council – 29th November 2010, 13th December 2010, 10th February 2011 and 14th March 2011
 - Hungerford Town Council – 6th December 2010
 - Pangbourne Parish Council – 14th December 2010
 - Theale Parish Council – 7th February 2011
 - Lambourn Parish Council – 16th February 2011

- 16.8 Information was provided at Town Centre Partnership (TCP) meetings and meetings of the TCP Safer Sub Group.
- 16.9 The information given at Town/Parish Council and NAG meetings was provided in the 'public' part of the meeting however the information given at the TCP meetings was 'confidential' and clearly indicated as such. It was of concern to the Project Team that the confidential nature of some information was not being observed and of significant concern that some of this information was being passed to the local media. The local media chose to publish information that could not be considered to be in the public interest and could have potentially compromised public safety. As a minimum it created a perception that Newbury Town Centre was not a safe place to be.

17 The New CCTV Service

- 17.1 As stated above the old CCTV service in West Berkshire was at significant risk of failure in the near future and was unable to provide evidence packages of a quality that could be effectively utilised by Thames Valley Police or the Crown Prosecution Service. The service provided by the RBWM CCTV Control Room delivers quality 24/7 live monitoring of the West Berkshire CCTV system by highly trained CCTV Operators and utilises state of the art technology. The Windsor CCTV Control Room is able to provide to Thames Valley Police evidence packages of CCTV footage that are far superior to those provided by the old Newbury CCTV Control Room.
- 17.2 The Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager closely performance manages the RBWM CCTV Contract, including regular visits to the Windsor CCTV Control Room, and the Windsor CCTV Manager provides monthly performance data including the number of offences captured on CCTV and number of arrests made where the use of CCTV has played a significant part.
- 17.3 The CCTV service continues to contribute to community safety by providing a public reassurance, crime prevention and crime detection service to residents, retailers and others who visit West Berkshire.

| Appendix B West Berkshire CCTV Transfer Project Plan | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Task Name | Duration | Planned Start | Planned Finish | Actual Start | Actual Finish | R/A/G | Organisation responsible | Comments | | |
| Preparation Period | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Formal Initiation Meeting | 2 hours | 19/02/10 | 19/02/10 | 19/02/10 | 19/02/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Technical Project Plan drawn up (owned and managed by RBWM) | | 01/03/10 | 01/03/10 | 01/03/10 | 01/03/10 | Green | RBWM | | | |
| W&M to order 'link' and other equipment | | 01/06/10 | 01/06/10 | 01/06/10 | 01/06/10 | Green | RBWM | | | |
| W&M to draw up contracts with W&M suppliers | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site visit with Car Parks Mgr and CHUBB to agree separation | 2 hours | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | Green | WBC/Chubb | Agreement on separation/retention of cameras | | |
| WBC Contract meeting with BT | 2 hours | 15/07/10 | 15/07/10 | 15/07/10 | 15/07/10 | Green | WBC/BT | | | |
| Communicate with appropriate stakeholders about the proposed works and complexity of the project | | | | | | | WBC | Presentations to be made to the various organisations about the proposed project including its scope. Papers to Safer Communities Partnership Strategy Group September and December 2009, March June September and December 2010. Paper to WBC Executive | | |
| Meetings with Newbury Town Council to brief on schedule of works | 1 hour | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | 01/07/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Thatcham Town Council | 1 hour | 29/11/10 | 29/11/10 | 29/11/10 | 29/11/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Newbury Town Council | 1 hour | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Pangbourne Parish Council | 1 hour | 14/12/10 | 14/12/10 | 14/12/10 | 14/12/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Hungerford Town Council | 1 hour | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Theale Parish Council | 1 hour | 07/02/11 | | | | Amber | WBC | Rarranged from December | | |
| Lambourn Parish Council | 1 hour | 16/02/11 | | | | Amber | WBC | Rearranged from January | | |
| Town Centre Partnership | | 21/01/11 | 21/01/11 | 21/01/11 | 21/01/11 | Green | WBC | | | |
| Newbury NAG | 1 hour | 15/12/10 | 15/12/10 | 15/12/10 | 15/12/10 | Green | WBC | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|---------------|--|
| Shopsafe Meeting | 1hour | 02/12/10 | 02/12/10 | 02/12/10 | 02/12/10 | 02/12/10 | 02/12/10 | Green | WBC/Shopsafe | |
| Pub Watch Meeting | 1 hour | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | Green | WBC/Pub Watch | |
| Members Briefing | 1 hour | 16/12/10 | 16/12/10 | 16/12/10 | 16/12/10 | 16/12/10 | 16/12/10 | Green | WBC | |
| WBC Members Bulletin | | 27/09/10 | | | 27/09/10 | | 27/09/10 | Green | WBC | |
| Briefings to TVP Neighbourhood Teams | | | Ongoing | | | | | Green | WBC | Regular briefing in lead up time and daily from 13/12/10 |
| Press Release | | 24/09/10 | 24/09/10 | 24/09/10 | 24/09/10 | 24/09/10 | 24/09/10 | Green | WBC | |
| Project Board Meeting at W&M | 2 hours | 15/10/10 | 15/10/10 | 15/10/10 | 15/10/10 | 15/10/10 | 15/10/10 | Green | Project Board | |
| Project Board Meeting at W&M | 2 hours | 23/11/10 | 23/11/10 | 23/11/10 | 23/11/10 | 23/11/10 | 23/11/10 | Green | Project Board | |
| Contract with BT signed | | 27/08/10 | 27/08/10 | 27/08/10 | 27/08/10 | 27/08/10 | 27/08/10 | Green | WBC/BT | |
| Site Visits | | July | July | July | July | July | July | Green | All | W&M, TVP |
| Site Visits | | Aug | Aug | Aug | Aug | Aug | Aug | Green | All | W&M, TVP, BT |
| Site Visits | | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Green | All | W&M, TVP, BT, AI |
| Site Visits | | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Green | All | W&M, TVP, BT, AI |
| Site Visits | | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | Green | All | W&M, TVP, BT, AI |
| Site Visits | | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Green | All | W&M, TVP, BT, AI |
| All Contractors Preparation Meeting | 3 hours | 26/10/10 | 26/10/10 | 26/10/10 | 26/10/10 | 26/10/10 | 26/10/10 | Green | All | All works sequenced and key dates agreed |
| Technical information exchange with all Contractors | | 28/10/10 | 28/10/10 | 28/10/10 | 28/10/10 | 28/10/10 | 28/10/10 | Green | All | All works sequenced and key dates agreed |
| Forward Planning meeting with W&M | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCTV Control Room Manager | 2 hours | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Sept | Green | WBC/RBWM | |
| Forward Planning meeting with W&M | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCTV Control Room Manager | 2 hours | Oct | Complete | Complete | Complete | Complete | Complete | Green | WBC/RBWM | |
| Forward Planning meeting with W&M | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCTV Control Room Manager | 2 hours | Nov | Complete | Complete | Complete | Complete | Complete | Green | WBC/RBWM | |
| Forward Planning meeting with W&M | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCTV Control Room Manager | 2 hours | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Dec | Green | WBC/RBWM | |
| Conference Call with CCTV Control Room Manager | 1 hour | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | Green | WBC | |
| CCTV Operator transfers under TUPE | | December | December | December | December | December | December | Green | WBC/RBWM | |
| Exit interviews with CCTV Operators | 1 hour | 13-19/12/10 | 13-19/12/10 | 13-19/12/10 | 13-19/12/10 | 13-19/12/10 | 13-19/12/10 | Green | WBC | |
| Close Down of CCTV Control Room | | 19/12/11 | 19/12/11 | 19/12/11 | 19/12/11 | 19/12/11 | 19/12/11 | Green | WBC | The Control Room was closed down formally on 19 December 2011. |

| Transfer and Testing Period | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|--|
| | | 13/12/10 | 10/01/11 | | | | | | | BT unable to give exact timescales for this work. This was dependent of being able to locate appropriate cables and re-route them to West Street House via the Control Room. An estimated timeframe of 4 weeks was agreed with progress being monitored on a weekly basis. |
| Conference call | | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | 03/12/10 | WBC/ RBWM | To confirm technical and installation information prior to transfer period commencing |
| Conference Call with VM ref circuits Equipment Installation in Data Centre | | 05/01/11 | | | | | | | WBC/VM | Request for urgent site visit |
| CHUBB installation of 'separation' equipment | | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | RBWM | |
| BT installation of circuit re-routing equipment | | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | 06/12/10 | Chubb | |
| Conference call | | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | 09/12/10 | BT | |
| Telephone call to VM | | 13/12/10 | | | | | | | WBC/M | to follow up actions and reconfirm technical and |
| Camera Upgrade to Dome Cameras commences | | 13/12/10 | 10/01/11 | 13/12/11 | 13/12/11 | 13/12/11 | 13/12/11 | 13/12/11 | WBC/VM | Request for urgent response - circuits not linked by BT |
| BT commence circuit transfer commences | | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | 13/12/10 | Chubb | The timetable for this work slipped due to additional work required at some of the lamp columns. Chubb reported that existing cameras were rusted on to the columns which required greater time in changing over to the new |
| AI software installation commences | | 13/12/10 | | | | | | | BT | The timetable for this work slipped due to additional work required in respect of re-routing some of the circuits and difficulty in identifying the routes of some circuits |
| Testing of Cameras 'linked' to Windsor Control Room | | 17/01/10 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | AI | The timetable for this work slipped due to software having to be reconfigured due to incorrect presentation of BT circuits |
| Testing of Cameras 'linked' to Windsor Control Room | | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | 17/01/11 | BT/Chubb/AI | Cameras recording but telemetry issues - cameras set on 'pre-sets' |
| Implementation Meetings and Conference Calls | | December | December | December | December | December | December | December | BT/Chubb/AI | Ongoing Telemetry issues but video confirmed as required |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|-------|---------------------|--|
| Site meetings and Conference Calls with Chubb and BT to resolve Camera and cabling issues | 31/01/11 | 31/01/11 | 31/01/11 | 31/01/11 | 31/01/11 | Green | WBC/BT | Urgent meeting of contractors convened on site to discuss issues around cabling and camera settings. A further camera was successfully transferred across to Windsor. A number of issues were also resolved and a way forward agreed for achieving the last few cameras in |
| Conference Calls to agree works | 01/02/11 | 01/02/11 | 01/02/11 | | | Green | WBC | Persitant problems identified and some resolved. Essential works identified to resolve final problems |
| All contractors site meeting | 02/02/11 | 02/02/11 | 02/02/11 | | | Green | | Video confirmed and some persistent telemetry issues |
| Testing of Cameras 'linked' to Windsor Control Room | 07/02/11 | | Ongoing | | | Amber | BT/Chubb/Al | Confirmation VM do not have coverage at West Street |
| Site Visit by VM Engineer | 14/02/11 | | | | | Green | WBC/VM | |
| Reinstatement of radio links with Control Room | Monday 14 February 2011 | Monday 14 February 2011 | Monday 14 February 2011 | | | Amber | Co Channel/WBC/RBWM | |
| VM Proposal for works received | 15/02/11 | | | | | Green | WBC/VM | Proposal in accordance with requirements |
| VM Contract Raised | 14/03/11 | | | | | Green | WBC/VM | Request made that site works take place as soon as possible |
| Contract for additional work received from BT (meeting with BT on 20-01-11 refers) | 15/03/11 | | | | | Green | WBC | Contract signed and returned the same day. BT would not accept a fax to expedite the delivery of the contract documentation. |
| Contract returned signed to BT | 15/03/11 | | | | | Green | WBC | |
| Contract countersigned by BT | 17/03/11 | | | | | Green | BT | Concern expressed at the significant delays in the procurement of a cabinet to carry out these works. |
| VM notify date of equipment delivery and work date | 28/03/11 | | | | | Green | WBC/VM | Concern raised over delay |
| Virgin Media on site | 16/04/11 | | | | | Green | VM | Concern expressed at VM over their reluctance to provide an engineer to undertake the required work. Head of P and C contacted VM and secured an engineer and splicer on site on Saturday 16 April. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--|--|-------|----------|--|
| BT on site | | 18/04/11 | | | | Green | BT | Images from the Greenham and Thatcham cameras being received by Data Centre and RBWM. No telemetry. |
| Access Infrastructure on site to facilitate linkages. | | 06/05/11 | | | | Green | AI | Further problems being experienced by AI. An urgent meeting with AI and TCT Officers from WBC and RBWM convened. |
| Access Infrastructure on site to facilitate linkages. | | 23/05/11 | | | | Green | AI | Telemetry achieved on all 6 cameras. |
| 3 Towns camera shift | | | | | | | WBC/RBWM | Urgent meeting called with RBWM ICT colleagues to resolve Fire Wall issues. |
| Purchase of new server | | 17/05/11 | | | | Green | RBWM | RBWM agreed to purchase a new server to resolve Fire Wall issues. |
| RBWM installing new server in WBC data centre | | 26/05/11 | | | | Green | RBWM | |
| Site meeting to plan decommissioning of Control Room | | 13/01/11 | | | | Amber | WBC/NTC | Discussions with Newbury Town Council to take place in relation decommissioning the former Control Room. |
| Final Close down of Project | | | | | | Amber | | |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Title of Report: | Healthier Select Committee Final Report |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

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

Recommended Action: To note for information.

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

Executive Report

1. Introduction

1.1 In the last municipal year the Healthier Select Committee met on the 7 April 2011.

2. 7 April 2011 meeting

2.1 The meeting included an update on the delayed transfers of care from the Royal Berkshire Hospital (RBH) which were social care related and the increasing demand for social care placements.

2.2 Members also heard about the changes proposed in the Health and Social Reform Bill and most notably the establishment of Health and Wellbeing Boards. It was recognised however that there was still much uncertainty in relation to the draft Bill and a lot of changes might yet be made.

3. Work Programme

3.1 It was felt that along with completed items the topic of Maternity Services should be removed from the work programme.

3.2 The topics that remain for future consideration by the newly formed Health Scrutiny Panel would be delayed discharges from the Royal Berkshire Hospital and reviewing the strategy for tackling child poverty and deprivation within West Berkshire.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the Healthier Select Committee held on 7 April 2011.

Consultees

Local Stakeholders: Former Chairman – Councillor Geoff Findlay.

Officers Consulted:

Trade Union:

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 7 APRIL 2011

Councillors Present: Geoff Findlay (Chairman), Tony Linden and Gwen Mason

Also Present: Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care), Sam Otorepec (Head of Partnerships, NHS Berkshire West) and Jo Naylor (Principal Policy Officer).

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Andrew Rowles, Councillor Julian Swift-Hook, Teresa Bell (Corporate Director, Community Services) and Bev Searle (Director of Partnerships and Joint Commissioning, NHS Berkshire West).

Councillor(s) Absent: Councillor Paul Hewer

PART I

32. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

33. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Geoff Findlay declared an interest in all agenda items as a Governor of the Royal Berkshire Hospital (RBH) and reported that as his interest was personal and non-prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matters.

34. Delayed Transfers of Care

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4) regarding social care related delayed transfers of care from the Royal Berkshire Hospital (RBH). Mrs Jan Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) introduced this report and explained that this was a major issue the previous summer when it was very difficult to control the number of delayed discharges from the Royal Berkshire Hospital. This had been caused by a lack of available social care resources coupled with very high demand for services.

To help alleviate the problem the NHS Berkshire West provided in-year funding to support 20 care beds outside of the acute hospital setting, of these, 18 beds would remain until the end of March 2011. Provision had been made in the 2011/12 budget to ensure a sufficient number of community placements in the future.

Mrs Evans described how typically people were kept in their own homes for a much longer period and the elderly often became much frailer. In the event of a hospital admission this often resulted in greater concerns about the individual's ability to live independently afterwards and delays resulted when a care home placement needed to be found.

Sam Otorepec (NHS Berkshire West) described how the Primary Care Trust was looking into reablement measures within the hospital setting to allow patients to regain their mobility and independence. It was also explained how new Government money was now

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE - 7 APRIL 2011 - MINUTES

available for measures to prevent inappropriate hospital admissions and to ensure patients were more quickly discharged from hospital.

Mrs Evans described the opportunity to use 'Extra Care Housing' schemes as a genuine alternative to residential care places using the development of the old Waring Court site as an example. However, this type of accommodation was not suitable for those that required frequent nursing support.

It was described how residential care places were at capacity within West Berkshire and further dementia care services were also required. It was acknowledged that the District needed another new-build care home facility to meet future demand and discussions were now commencing to develop this capacity.

The Council was also considering purchasing care home placements out of area, for example in Wiltshire, in order to meet the demand. However, this was not always popular with patients or their families.

It was explained that West Berkshire Council had been fined by the RBH and North Hampshire Hospital as a consequence of delayed transfers of care. Previously, there had been a local agreement not to fine local authorities as the Delayed Discharges Grant was instead invested into community based services. However, this agreement was no longer in place locally. The NHS Berkshire West Primary Care Trust helped this year to provide additional funding to meet the need for community placements to ensure patient care was not compromised.

Currently there were only two delayed discharges at the RBH attributable to social care; one was waiting a nursing home place and the other a care home placement.

Members asked about the views of the other health organisations involved in caring for older people, including the Ambulance Service, Accident and Emergency doctors, General Practitioners, etc. It was explained how the biggest healthcare costs were for provision of services at acute hospitals. A lot of work had been done on modelling doctor referral patterns and considering alternative care pathways to prevent inappropriate hospital admissions.

A discussion took place about the nursing homes and care homes that made the highest number of emergency calls. Work had been done to ensure nursing skills were improved, to provide nurses with greater skills and confidence to deal with end of life patients.

RESOLVED that the update regarding delayed transfers of care at the Royal Berkshire Hospital be noted.

35. **Work Programme and Recommendations for the Future**

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 5) which covered the Committee's Work Programme. The Chairman noted the Executive Committee had already agreed the Child Poverty Strategy in March 2011 for addressing child poverty within the District.

It was discussed how maternity services should be removed from the list of future health scrutiny topics due to the unlikelihood of ever obtaining a midwifery led service from the West Berkshire Community Hospital.

Delayed transfers of care would remain on the work programme and Mrs Evans (Head of Adult Social Care) agreed to attend and update the Committee on a future occasion.

HEALTHIER SELECT COMMITTEE - 7 APRIL 2011 - MINUTES

It was felt that Child Poverty should remain on the work programme for monitoring purposes and that Councillor Joe Mooney's details as Portfolio Holder, should be included alongside this work programme item.

It was resolved that:

- (i) **Maternity services should be removed from the work programme.**
- (ii) **Delayed discharges from the RBH and child poverty remain as future work programme topics to be considered in the subsequent Municipal Year.**

36. Health and Wellbeing Boards

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 6) in relation to Health and Wellbeing Boards. The Chairman described how the Health and Social Reform Bill gave Health and Wellbeing Boards significant power in relation to the planning and commissioning of health and social care services which were distinctly separate from the responsibilities of Health Scrutiny Committees.

The Council, Public Health, Children's Services, Healthwatch representatives and the voluntary sector would all be involved within the local Health and Wellbeing Board. This Board would also be linked to the local GP commissioning groups.

Members discussed how the GP commissioning groups might in the future have broader representation with elected Members, social care officers and nurses included. However, many elements remained somewhat unclear at the present time until the full national consultation process had been completed.

A discussion took place about local GP consortia and their views on the new proposals. It was described that all four local GP consortia had achieved 'Pathfinder' status and had demonstrated their willingness to establish commissioning groups and to work within any proposed new legislation.

Jan Evans updated the Committee on the groups being approached to help develop a 'Healthwatch' organisation locally.

It was resolved that the update be noted and that more information be received when further details on Health and Wellbeing Boards were agreed.

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

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Title of Report: | Resource Management Select Committee |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

Purpose of Report: To provide an update on the work of the Select Committee and propose recommendations for forwarding to the Executive.

Recommended Action: To note the information and give approval to the draft recommendations proposed for the Executive.

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

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

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Committee met for the last time on 15 March 2011 and the draft minutes are attached at Appendix A. A summary of the main discussions held are as follows:

Establishment Report

- 1.2 The response to the Committee's request for Establishment Reports to contain a year end projection for both Council and joint/externally funded posts was discussed. This stated the reasons why this request could not be complied with. However, Members remained of the view that this would benefit the report and a mechanism of doing so should be explored that would involve Heads of Service providing the necessary data to Human Resources. The Commission is therefore asked to approve the following recommendation:

- (1) The Head of Human Resources should establish a mechanism whereby Heads of Service provide the relevant data to Human Resources to enable a forecast to be added to future Establishment Reports for both Council and joint/externally funded posts.

Car Park Budgets

- 1.3 A lengthy debate was held on this issue covering areas including parking availability in Newbury Town Centre, the income generated by ticket sales and enforcement activity of Civil Enforcement Officers, and future income targets.
- 1.4 It was resolved that the Head of Highways and Transport would provide some further information on these and other points in an effort to conduct further analysis and identify any parking trends.

Connectivity and Usage of the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG)

- 1.5 The Committee considered a report outlining the options and costs for connecting all the Council's systems to the LLPG as the source of address information within the authority. As well as detailing the benefits of this approach, the report made clear the cost implications of doing so. The current practice was to avoid the cost of making a system compliant by conducting this when a system was due to be replaced. Members did point out that initial investment could bring longer term savings with less time being spent on manual input/updates.
- 1.6 Members were in support of making a recommendation to the Executive for a project plan to be produced, with the intention of enabling all the Council's systems to be compliant with the LLPG. This would need to include an estimate of the potential costs with reference made to long term cost benefits. The Commission is therefore asked to approve the following recommendation:
- (1) The GIS Projects Analyst should formulate a project plan with the intention of enabling all the Council's systems to be compliant with the LLPG.

Value for Money

- 1.7 An update was provided on the Value for Money (VfM) position of the Council's services and the work of the VfM Group. The mechanism used for assessing VfM is well established and is based on the annual report of the Audit Commission which benchmarks the Council against all other unitary authorities. Information from specific CIPFA benchmarking clubs is also used.
- 1.8 If a service is found to be above average cost at minimum it will be discussed by the VfM Group and potentially added to the work programme. Work is currently in progress for Adult Social Care. The majority of the Council's services are found to be average cost or below.

Financial Performance Report (Month 10)

- 1.9 The month 10 budget position of the Council was noted. An underspend of £537k was predicted which was a £144k increase on the previous month's forecast position.
- 1.10 Discussions related to the benefit felt from the capitalisation of highways expenditure which amounted to a net revenue benefit of approximately £1.4m and the underspend reported for the Chief Executive Directorate.

2. Work Programme

- 2.1 The four remaining items from the Select Committee's work programme are detailed within Appendix A of item 12 of this agenda. These are potential items for the newly formed Resource Management Working Group.

Appendices

None

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

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

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 15 MARCH 2011

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

Also Present: John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Steve Duffin (Head of Benefits and Exchequer), Mark Edwards (Head of Highways and Transport), Phil Parker (GIS Projects Analyst), Andy Walker (Head of Finance), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor David Holtby and Councillor Keith Chopping

PART I

49. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

50. Declarations of Interest

Councillor David Rendel declared an interest in Agenda Item 8, 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.

51. Actions from previous Minutes

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

Economic Development Officer

Concern was again expressed at the loss of this post and that only a proportion of the role would be able to be continued by existing Officers.

It was questioned whether the business sector had been notified as part of the business rate payers consultation process. It was agreed that this point would be clarified.

Corporate Property Asset Management Plan (AMP)

A correction was made to the figure given in paragraph 2.2 (1). This confirmed that the value of properties stated in the accounts as at 31 March 2010 was £297,636k.

John Ashworth confirmed that the AMP would be published on the website alongside the Asset Register and Asset Disposal Register. A version of the Asset Register was being produced for the website.

Youth Service

Clarity was sought on the point made in the report that there would be a greater focus on work with young people rather than the wider community. It was unclear whether this meant disadvantaged young people and it was agreed that Julia Waldman, Acting Head of Youth Services and Commissioning, would be asked to confirm this point.

West Street House and West Point Maintenance Budgets

It was felt that there was an absence of detail on future maintenance work and costs in the report. Andy Walker explained that this was part of the budget proposals for 2011/12 and an ongoing pressure was reflected in the budget.

A concern was raised that a greater understanding of the costs involved was not established at the time of purchase. Although it was noted from the report that this had to be achieved in a very short timeframe and there was not the time to conduct detailed surveys or establish detailed costs for maintenance.

Further detail was requested for next time on future maintenance requirements/costs, and how the value of the properties and their maintenance costs compared with the market rate for similar buildings. A view was given that this needed to be estimated and accepted as a risk due to the timescales involved, but it was also felt that the maintenance history of the buildings should have been analysed to help identify costs.

Andy Walker explained that the estimate was based on the maintenance history of all the buildings previously occupied by Bayer, this was the best estimate available in the short timeframe. Unfortunately this estimate was lower than the reality. John Ashworth added that West Street House was the more costly of the two buildings to run.

Highways and Transport Budgets

Mark Edwards explained that the slowing down of expenditure on some highway maintenance items related to areas including reduced gully emptying and grip cutting which was made possible by the relatively dry start to the year. There were no cut backs to maintenance of, for example, road repairs or pot holes. The street works target had been exceeded which helped to off set overspends.

Discussion then followed on the reasons behind the underspend on concessionary travel including the lower than expected take up of travel tokens and bus passes. Mark Edwards informed Members that approximately 2,000 travel tokens, which were eligible for disabled residents, were claimed compared to the 3,000 budgeted for. It was questioned why analysis from the previous scheme was not undertaken to produce a better estimate and Mark Edwards advised that this was not straightforward as different rules applied between the criteria for the previous and the current scheme. However, he offered to provide further detail to the Committee on the previous uptake from disabled residents.

Mark Edwards added that a government grant had been received for the provision of free bus passes, this enabled a saving to be made. This would again be received in 2011/12, achieving a saving of approximately £100k.

Establishment Report

At the last meeting the Committee resolved to ask Robert O'Reilly, Head of Human Resources, to consider including a year end projection in the report for both Council and joint/externally funded posts. A response had been received which stated the reasons why this request could not be complied with.

Councillor Jeff Brooks was disappointed with this response and felt that the report would benefit from the inclusion of a forecast. It was for Members to make recommendations and Councillor Brooks felt that it was possible to amend the report in this way, he felt that Human Resources should explore the potential to do so rather than say it was not possible. It was accepted that this information would be held within Service Areas and it was felt that this detail should be forwarded by Heads of Service to Human Resources for inclusion in the report.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Brooks asked that these comments be forwarded to the Chief Executive with a request that Heads of Service provide the relevant data to Human Resources to enable a forecast to be added to the report. Councillor David Rendel seconded this proposal which was accepted by the Committee.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) Stephen Chard would confirm whether the business sector had been notified of the loss of the Economic Development Officer post.
- (2) Julia Waldman would be asked to clarify the point made about the work of the Youth Service.
- (3) Steve Broughton would be asked for further detail on the future maintenance requirements/costs of West Street House and West Point, and how the value of the properties and the cost of maintenance compared with the market rate for similar buildings.
- (4) Mark Edwards would provide further detail on the previous uptake of travel tokens from disabled residents. This would help Members understand whether estimates were accurate.
- (5) A letter would be sent to the Chief Executive with a request that Heads of Service provide the relevant data to Human Resources to enable a forecast to be added to future Establishment Reports.

52. Car Park Budgets

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 5) providing the information requested at the previous meeting on Car Park Budgets.

A debate was held in relation to the number of car parking spaces available in Newbury Town Centre over recent years. Mark Edwards pointed out that overall this showed an upward trend. The number of spaces that would be available at Parkway had decreased from a previously reported figure by 35, this was due to the application of John Lewis. Overall the number of spaces at Parkway would increase by 419 from the number available in 2007, with the hope that these would be filled by new shoppers attracted to the town. In total, the Council would receive £300k per year from the developer for car parking at Parkway.

A concern was raised that the hoped for success of Parkway could lead to a decreased level of parking in the Council's car parks, although no reduction had been accounted for. Mark Edwards did not feel this was a particular concern, he accepted that the predicted sale of tickets (largely unchanged from previous years) would prove tight to achieve but the level of income was increasing and a good deal had been struck with the developer with the receipt of the annual fee of £300k. Mark Edwards added that it was difficult to predict ticket sales as a number of different elements needed to be considered, most recently the effects of the recession. Predictions were based on the money received in ticket machines and did not take into account, for example, payments made over the phone.

It was queried how the figure of £300k, which would be received from the start of the contract, had been arrived at. The timing of when this figure was agreed was felt to be important as the ticket prices at the time of the agreement would have been used to identify the figure to be received from the developer. If this had been agreed prior to a particular price increase then a higher figure could be negotiated in line with the most recent charges. Mark Edwards explained that 2005/06 was used as a baseline for this

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

figure which was considered to be a successful year for car parking income and was prior to the recession. However, Mark Edwards agreed to investigate what ticket prices the £300k was based on in the original agreement and whether price increases could be considered.

Of the two largest Council owned car parks, Kennet Centre and Northbrook, the Kennet Centre was largely full and had high sales in comparison to Northbrook. It was suggested that a mixed economy approach could be employed for short term ticket sales with a lower price perhaps encouraging shoppers to use Northbrook. It was noted that longer term parking prices were already variable.

The disabled parking provision was discussed. Mark Edwards confirmed that no payment was required for disabled parking, as in some other local authorities, other than a nominal fee for the blue parking badge. It was legally required that 2% of the parking provision be allocated for disabled parking and this was slightly exceeded across Newbury Town Centre. This differed between car parks based on their location in relation to the town centre. Requests were often made for increased provision, for example from the Disability Equality Scheme Board. The level of disabled parking provision was not found to have an implication on the availability of spaces. This was borne out by the findings of a two month audit conducted at the end of 2010 which identified that approximately 35% of spaces were available across the Town Centre on average.

Discussion then turned to the income generated since the Council had employed Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's). Although income had increased by £530k in 2009/10 it was not sufficient to meet the income target. Mark Edwards explained that precise detail could be provided from the original Executive report when management of CEO's was agreed. The original agreement was for 20 CEO's but this had since reduced to 16. The income target was still not being met, but this was improving and the pressure was therefore reducing.

It was commented that the enforcement income obtained made comparisons with previous (non CEO) years difficult. If it was assumed that the £530k increase in income related solely to the activity of the CEOs and this was deducted from the expected total income for 2010/11 of £2,390k, then the result, approximately £1,860k, was only a minor increase in income from 2005/06. Mark Edwards explained that income included season ticket sales and there was also some income for the car parking enforcement that the Council had always conducted for its car parks.

Mark Edwards advised that the income generated from CEO enforcement activity met CEO staffing costs as well as achieving some additional income. The failure to meet income targets came as a result of less off street parking and it was felt that these ticket sales were down due to the recession and, potentially, car parking price increases. It had been reported at a recent meeting of Car Parks Managers that car park income was down by 10% across the country.

Members felt that some cost analysis was required for CEO's. This needed to include their employment costs, number of fines issued, the cost of the fines and the income received. Mark Edwards was asked to provide this in advance of the elections before any changes could be made to the Governance structures associated with this Committee.

A number of factors were referred to which could help with making a fair analysis and comparison with previous years to help identify any trends. It seemed highly likely that price increases deterred shoppers with the result that hoped for income increases were not achieved, it would also be useful to understand whether usage of public transport had

increased at the same time to assess whether the number of people coming to the town had been affected. Mark Edwards was asked to provide further detail covering these points. A breakdown of income for the major car parks was also requested as part of this, as well as a reflection of the income obtained from the introduction of evening charges.

The level of market research conducted with Newbury's shoppers was queried to help to understand their reasons for shopping in Newbury or elsewhere. Mark Edwards was not aware of this being conducted formally, views provided on this matter were often anecdotal. Councillor Jeff Brooks commented on this basis that he was aware of a number of shoppers who came from outside West Berkshire.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) In advance of the local elections, Mark Edwards would:
 - investigate what ticket prices the £300k developer payment was based on in the original Parkway agreement and whether price increases could be considered in future;
 - provide some cost analysis for the CEO's. Covering areas including employment costs, number of fines issued, the cost of the fines and the income received;
 - provide further detail covering the areas described to aid comparisons and help to identify parking trends.

53. Connectivity and Usage of the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 6) outlining the options and costs for connecting systems to the LLPG as the source of address information within the authority.

The report made clear the benefits of using the LLPG as the sole source of addresses for all systems used across the Council, but it also raised the affordability issues of doing so. Phil Parker explained that this was done were practicable and without cost, i.e. when a system was replaced, as recommended in the report. It had been ICT policy since 2004 for all new systems to be compliant.

The costs involved in upgrading existing systems to use LLPG data could be significant. Generally, an upgrade of a larger system would incur a larger cost. The estimated cost of upgrading the system used, for example, by Revenues and Benefits would be around £25k-£30k. This cost was felt to be unjustified by the service.

The time taken for the alternative approach of conducting manual input/updates between systems was questioned and it was suggested that there could be hidden costs of doing so which had not been considered. It was suggested that investigations should be conducted into whether an investment of capital expenditure to enable systems to link to the LLPG could bring cost benefits over time.

As far as the Revenues and Benefits system was concerned, Steve Duffin advised that he was alerted to different upgrades that could be made from time to time and if a business case was made for doing so this would be looked into alongside the cost. Steve Duffin felt the existing records, which were based on information from the Valuation Office, were accurate and stood up well to routine testing. In addition, it was possible to access LLPG data for cross referencing purposes by sharing an extract of

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

property references. On the basis of these points a significant amount of expenditure was felt to be unnecessary to link to the LLPG.

Phil Parker commented that an upgrade was due to the Electoral Registration system to enable it to link to the LLPG, but this did not take place as the software provider, Northgate, had gone out of business. Northgate had offered the Council money to help fund an alternative system, this had been accepted and investigations were underway to find an alternative with Uniform, a system already well used in the Council, being considered. Some manual updating was currently required, but this was more of a maintenance role and not an extensive time pressure as once an address was recorded it was retained. Any input required was in relation to a change of resident at the address, which was the case for many systems. The level of manual updating required across the Council was unclear. Data held on the Electoral Register in relation to residents could not be shared for data protection reasons, unless a resident had given permission for their data to be shared.

The public sector mapping agreement which provided Office for National Statistics data was due to be replaced from 1 April 2011 by GeoPlace. This was a government led initiative which would create a definitive national address database for England and Wales. This would be provided at zero cost to local authorities based on the expectation that they would continue to manage the LLPG.

Phil Parker went on to say that there were some databases and systems outside the Council's development and control (approximately six). In these cases there was reliance on local authority wide user groups to exert pressure for system upgrades.

There was a view amongst the Committee that a project plan should be put together to make all systems complaint and put to Members to approve investment. This would remove the cost of manual updates. It was felt that the plan should detail the options on what was possible for each system and the potential costs.

Phil Parker advised that a project plan was originally put together ten years ago and work was conducted on tidying up/removing some of the systems inherited from Berkshire County Council, but further work had since stalled.

The Committee was in support of making a recommendation to the Executive for a project plan to be produced that would enable all the Council's systems to be compliant with the LLPG. This needed to include an estimate of the potential cost of doing so with reference made to long term cost benefits. This would be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission and, subject to approval, sent to the Executive.

RESOLVED that a draft recommendation would be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission requesting that a project plan be produced that would enable all the Council's systems to be compliant with the LLPG. If agreed this would be forwarded for the consideration of the Executive.

54. Value for Money

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 7) providing an update on the Value for Money (VfM) position of the Council's services and the work of the VfM Group.

Steve Duffin introduced the report by making the following points:

- The VfM Group had been in existence for four years. Its work was based on the annual report published by the Audit Commission benchmarking the Council against all other unitary authorities (46 in total). This was well established and helped to achieve a level of consistency.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

- Information from specific CIPFA benchmarking clubs was also considered. This helped to ensure that support services, such as those in the Chief Executive Directorate, were covered as these were not included in the Audit Commission's work.
- The cost of services was measured by the Audit Commission per head of population. However, a factor taken into consideration by the VfM Group for some of the Council's services was the large geographical area of West Berkshire. Highways and Waste were two examples given.
- If a service was found to be above average cost at minimum then it would be discussed at the VfM Group and added to the work programme if appropriate. Work was currently in progress for Adult Social Care. The majority of the Council's services were found to be average cost or below.
- There was an expectation in the coming few years that the costs and VfM of services would fluctuate in the light of budget cuts.
- The VfM Statement was reported as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy presented to Executive and to Council. A significant level of further detail was available if required.

The question was asked as to whether the level of affluence was a consideration in the work of the VfM Group as, despite having some pockets of deprivation, West Berkshire was a relatively prosperous area. Steve Duffin advised that this was a factor for some services and was considered for elements of Adult Social Care. Members suggested that a smaller benchmarking group of more like authorities would benefit this work. In response, Steve Duffin informed Members that after receiving data from the Audit Commission and CIPFA the Council would, for some services, conduct further analysis taking into account issues such as prosperity, salaries etc to ensure the VfM measure was as fair as possible in comparison to other parts of the country. For example, West Berkshire's Planning Service was above average for VfM compared to some other local authorities but there was some expectation that this would be the case due to the affluence of the area. Evidence would be required by the VfM Group before deciding whether different factors should be considered. Another potential factor was the difference in salary costs across the country

Steve Duffin pointed out that the way in which the Audit Commission grouped services differed with the Council structure and this also needed to be taken into account.

(Councillor David Goff left the meeting at 8pm).

Not all the Council's support services were detailed in the graphs provided and Steve Duffin advised that smaller services were not necessarily recorded individually. Many were grouped together by the Audit Commission under the heading of Home Office Services. The work of public relations and asset management teams were to be added to CIPFA's benchmarking for 2011/12.

The positive position of Accountancy, which was a fully centralised service, was noted in comparison to elsewhere. Indeed, each of the support services covered in the graphs showed a positive comparison. It was added that some service areas were not centralised and this should be taken into account.

The graphs showed extremely high and low VfM for some unitary authorities. Steve Duffin was of the view that these extremes were likely to be due to poor returns and were not felt to be a sound base for comparison.

RESOLVED that the update would be noted, with a comment from the Committee that the VfM work should continue.

55. Financial Performance Report (Month 10)

(Councillor David Rendel declared a personal interest in Agenda item 8 by virtue of the fact that his wife was a GP in West Berkshire and health related budget issues might be discussed as part of the item. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

The Committee considered the month 10 financial performance report (Agenda Item 8).

Andy Walker introduced the report by making the following points:

- The predicted revenue underspend at month 10 was £537k. This was an increase on the previous month's position of £144k.
- The Council had submitted a claim to the Department for Communities and Local Government requesting the ability to capitalise the costs set against the Economic Downturn Provision for redundancy payments over a longer term period. Unfortunately this application had been rejected and a formal response was awaited that would provide further detail on the reasons why. Therefore the Economic Downturn Provision would need to be used as initially planned.

The benefit felt from the capitalisation of highways expenditure was discussed. This amounted to a net revenue benefit of approximately £1.4m. A view was given that this was a major windfall for the Council. It was added that, in its absence, the Council would still be forecasting a significant overspend due to the pressures in Adult Social Care and this improvement was not achieved by the efforts of the Council. Andy Walker commented that the interpretation of recently revised accounting guidance by Accountancy allowed for highway maintenance funds, previously classed as revenue, to be considered as capital expenditure. This was positive news for the current financial year and beyond. It removed the expenditure from the revenue budget, but created additional costs in the capital budgets. These costs were financed through additional borrowing, with interest needing to be paid over a ten year period.

The increased underspend reported for the Chief Executive Directorate was referred to and a view was given that, although the reasons for the underspend was clearly documented, this was a reoccurring theme and it was suggested that this Directorate's budget was used as a contingency fund. It was felt likely that the underspend would increase beyond month ten as previously experienced. A problem associated with this, year on year, was the fact that the budget for the coming financial year was set based on the position at month nine. This could potentially mean that the Council was overcharging for some of its services and more accurate budget forecasts at an earlier point in the year would enable greater accuracy when setting the budget for the forthcoming year.

John Ashworth responded by saying that the level of movement by Directorate between months three and ten was not significant. This included the Chief Executive Directorate and this looked likely to continue into month eleven. The perceived trend of an increased underspend was certainly less marked than in previous years.

A further comment was made that in recent years the Council's budgets saw an improvement of approximately £0.5m, on average, between month nine and year end. Although it was added that this pattern was likely to be found in many organisations with expenditure being tightened towards the end of the financial year.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2011 - MINUTES

The reduction to the forecast overspend for Highways and Transport of £25k was noted but there was a lack of clarity on how this was achieved. John Ashworth accepted this point and offered to ensure this type of detail was included in future reports.

RESOLVED that the report would be noted.

56. Work Programme

The Committee considered the Resource Management Select Committee Work Programme (Agenda Item 9).

RESOLVED that the work programme would be noted.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.25pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Title of Report: | West Berkshire Forward Plan |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

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

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

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

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

| Contact Officer Details | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name: | David Baker |
| Job Title: | Policy Officer (Scrutiny Support) |
| Tel. No.: | 01635 519083 |
| E-mail Address: | 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 June to September 2011, also shows the decision path of each item including Council, Executive and Individual Decisions.
- 1.2 In order to hold the Executive to account, Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Members are asked to identify any forthcoming decisions which may be appropriate for scrutiny.

Appendices

Appendix A – West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June to September 2011

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|------------------|---|---------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
| June 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ID2266(a) | Three Year Highway Improvement Programme 2011/12 - 2013/14 To consider the recommendations, if any, from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission following the call-in of this item. | ID | 01/06/11 | Environment | Melvyn May | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2221 | West Berkshire Council Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment <i>To gain approval of the West Berkshire Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment for submission to the Environment Agency in June 2011.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Environment | Stuart Clark | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2229 | Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Chief Executive | Jo Naylor | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2216 | Petition for HGV Ban on Mill Lane and Boundary Road, Newbury <i>To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Environment | Andrew Garratt | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2298 | Purley-on-Thames One Way System <i>To consider the responses received during the consultation process whether to make the experimental one way system permanent.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Environment | Andrew Garratt | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2305 | Amendments to the ICT Policy <i>To consider any amendments required to the ICT Policy and associated protocols.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Chief Executive | Kevin Griffin | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | TBC | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2299 | Refresh of Adult Social Care Strategy 2011-12 <i>To approve the Adult Social Care Strategy update for 2011/12.</i> | ID | 01/06/11 | Community Services | Teresa Bell | Community Care, Pensions, Insurance | | TBC | | | 01 June 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 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.**

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| ID2301 | Representations on Outside Bodies – Royal Berkshire Fire Authority and Thames Valley Policy Authority <i>To consider nominations from all political groups for representation on these two Outside Bodies.</i> | ID | 02/06/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 24/05/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2302 | Representations on Outside Bodies <i>To consider nominations from all political groups for representation on Outside Bodies.</i> | ID | 02/06/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 24/05/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| PC2279 | Casual Workers <i>To consider the implications of using casual workers.</i> | PC | 03/06/11 | Chief Executive | Robert O'Reilly | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 25/05/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| ID2232 | West Berkshire Forward Plan - July 2011 to October 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i> | ID | 16/06/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 08/06/11 | | Not subject to call in. | 01 June 2011 |
| GA2056 | Internal Audit Q4 2010/11 <i>To update Members on the update of the work undertaken by Internal Audit.</i> | GA | 27/06/11 GA | Chief Executive | Ian Priestley | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 17/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| GA2118 | Strategic Risk Register Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide members with an update on the Council's Strategic Risk Register.</i> | GA | 27/06/11 GA | Chief Executive | Ian Priestley | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 17/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| GA2218 | Financial Statements 2009-10 | GA | 27/06/11 GA | Chief Executive | Joseph Holmes | Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health & Safety | | 17/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |

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

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

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|--|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| EX2287 | Response to the Scrutiny Review into the Council's Common Housing Register <i>To respond to the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission following the investigation into the operation of the Council's Common Housing Register</i> | EX | 16/06/11 EX | Community Services | Mel Brain | Planning, Housing and Transport Policy | | 08/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| EX2116 | Financial Report Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with information in respect of the Council's Capital and Revenue Budgets for the final quarter of the Financial Year 2010/11.</i> | EX | 16/06/11 EX | Chief Executive | Andy Walker | Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health and Safety | | 08/06/11 | Budget Managers | | 01 June 2011 |
| EX2109 | Council Plan Outcomes 2010/11: Quarterly Performance Update - Q4 <i>To report quarterly performance against each of the outcomes identified in the 2010/11 Council Plan and to report remedial action being taken, where targets were not projected to be met.</i> | EX | 16/06/11 EX | Chief Executive | Jessica Broom | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 08/06/11 | Performance officers, EPMG/IPG | | 01 June 2011 |
| EX2291 | Safeguarding Adults Annual Report <i>To provide members with an update on work undertaken to ensure the safeguarding of vulnerable adults.</i> | EX | 16/06/11 EX | Community Services | Jackie Bennett | Community Care, Pensions, Insurance | | 08/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |
| EX2300 | Faraday Plaza Report | EX | 16/06/11 EX | Chief Executive | Les Gaulton | Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health & Safety | | 08/06/11 | | | 01 June 2011 |

July 2011

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

KEY:

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

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| ID2233 | Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i> | ID | 01/07/11 | Chief Executive | Jo Naylor | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | TBC | | | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2234 | Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i> | ID | 01/07/11 | Environment | Paula Amorelli | Planning, Housing, Transport Policy | | TBC | | | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2293 | Petition Reducing Speed, Traffic and Parking Problems Along Church Street, Theale <i>To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.</i> | ID | 01/07/11 | Environment | Andrew Garratt | Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT | | TBC | | | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2272 | Petition: Reducing Volume and Speed of traffic along Englefield Road, Theale <i>To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.</i> | ID | 08/07/11 | Environment | Andrew Garratt | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | 29/06/11 | Local Ward Member/ Petition Organiser | | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2273 | Petition: Reducing Speed Limit along Clayhill Road, Burghfield <i>To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.</i> | ID | 08/07/11 | Environment | Andrew Garratt | Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT | | 29/06/11 | Local Ward Member/ Petition Organiser | | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2235 | West Berkshire Forward Plan - August 2011 to November 2011 <i>To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months.</i> | ID | 14/07/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 06/07/11 | | Not subject to call in. | 01 July 2011 |
| ID2297 | Home to School and College Transport Policy 2012-13 <i>To consult and agree a home to school and college transport policy for 2012-13</i> | ID | 01/07/11 | Children and Young People | Mwazwita Mwandang eptuoftu | Education | | TBC | | | 01 July 2011 |

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

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

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
| EX2292 | Annual Report for Adult Social Care Complaints <i>To provide members with information pertaining to the number and nature of complaints and compliments received in respect of Adult Social Care.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Community Services | Jackie Bennett | Community Care, Pensions, Insurance | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2284 | Equalities Report | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | Robert O'Reilly | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2227 | Establishment Report Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with an update on information pertaining to the Council's establishment.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | Robert O'Reilly | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2228 | Annual Employment Report 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with information pertaining to the Council's workforce for the previous Financial Year.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | Robert O'Reilly | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2271 | Referral and Assessment Team <i>To provide an update for Members on the increasing pressures on the Referral and Assessment Team</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Children and Young People | Sue Adamantos | Children & Families, Youth Service, Culture & Leisure | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2058 | Civil Contingencies Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with an update on the activities undertaken in respect of Civil Contingency during the final quarter of the 2010/11 Financial Year.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | Carolyn Richardson | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2296 | Castle Gate Statement of Purpose and Short Break Statement <i>To Present Members with a copy of the Castle Gate's annual revision of its statement of purpose as required by the Children's Home regulations 2001.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Children and Young People | Lorna Hunt | Children & Families, Youth Service, Culture & Leisure | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 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 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.**

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|--|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
| EX2295 | Annual Report on Children subject to Child Protection Plans <i>To update Members on recent activity in relations to children subject to child protection plans</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Children and Young People | Lorna Hunt | Children & Families, Youth Service, Culture & Leisure | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2306 | Accessibility Strategy | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Children and Young People | Jane Seymore | Education | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2123 | Scrutiny Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with an update on the Scrutiny activity undertaken during the 2010/11 Financial Year.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | David Lowe | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2126 | Community Planning Q4 2010/11 <i>To provide Members with an update on parish planning activity during the final quarter of 2010/11 Financial Year.</i> | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Chief Executive | Jo Naylor | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| EX2128 | Rights of Way Programme | EX | 21/07/11 EX | Environment | Elaine L Cox | Environment, 'Cleaner Greener', Public Protection, Customer Services | | 13/07/11 | | | 01 July 2011 |
| August 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ID2236 | Adoption of Parish Plans <i>To adopt Parish Plans.</i> | ID | 01/08/11 | Chief Executive | Jo Naylor | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | TBC | | | 01 August 2011 |
| ID2237 | Approval of Village Design Statements <i>To approve Village Design Statements.</i> | ID | 01/08/11 | Environment | Paula Amorelli | Planning, Housing, Transport Policy | | TBC | | | 01 August 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 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.**

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| ID2238 | West Berkshire Forward Plan - September 2011 to December 2011 To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months. | ID | 11/08/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 03/08/11 | | Not subject to call in. | 01 August 2011 |
| September 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ID2239 | Adoption of Parish Plans To adopt Parish Plans | ID | 01/09/11 | Chief Executive | Jo Naylor | Partnerships, Equality, The Visions | | TBC | | | 01 September 2011 |
| ID2240 | Approval of Village Design Statements To approve Village Design Statements | ID | 01/09/11 | Environment | Paula Amorelli | Planning, Housing, Transport Policy | | TBC | | | 01 September 2011 |
| ID2241 | West Berkshire Forward Plan – October 2011 to January 2012 To advise Members of items to be considered by West Berkshire Council over the next four months | ID | 15/09/11 | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 07/09/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |
| EX2288 | Finance Report – Quarter 1 To provide Members with information in respect of the Council's Capital and Revenue Budgets for the first quarter of the Financial Year 2011/12. | EX | 08/09/11 EX | Chief Executive | Joseph Holmes | Finance, Economic Development, Property, Health & Safety | | 31/08/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |
| EX2274 | Q1 Performance Update To report quarterly performance against each of the outcomes identified in the 2011/12 Council Plan and to report remedial action being taken, where targets were not projected to be met. | EX | 08/09/11 EX | Chief Executive | Jessica Broom | Strategy, Performance, Community Safety | | 31/08/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |
| C2303 | Changes to the Constitution Part 4 To consider any changes required to the Council's Constitution. | GA C | 05/09/11 GA 22/09/11 C | Chief Executive | Moira Fraser | Leader of the Council | | 26/08/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |

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

KEY:

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

Appendix: A West Berkshire Council Forward Plan – June 2011 to September 2011

| 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 |
|-----------|--|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|-------------------|
| C2304 | Changes to the Constitution Scheme of Delegation: Reservoir Act <i>To consider any changes required to this act in the Council's Constitution.</i> | GA C | 05/09/11 GA 22/09/11 C | Chief Executive | Mark Edwards | Leader of the Council | | 26/08/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |
| C2155 | Report to Consider the Recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel <i>To consider any changes required to the scheme following the March 2011 Council meeting where the Governance Structures of the Council were discussed.</i> | C | 22/09/11 C | Chief Executive | Jo Watt | Leader of the Council | | 15/09/11 | | | 01 September 2011 |

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

KEY:

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

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Title of Report: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Work Programme |
| Report to be considered by: | Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission |
| Date of Meeting: | 9 June 2011 |

Purpose of Report: To review, agree and prioritise 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.

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

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

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The list of items on the work programme has recently been reviewed and as a result the number of items has reduced.
- 1.2 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

Consultees

Officers Consulted: Scrutiny and Partnerships Manager, Principal Policy Officers

Appendix A OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

| Reference (a) | Subject/purpose (b) | Methodology (c) | Expected outcome (d) | Review Body (e) | Dates (f) | Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g) | Portfolio Holder(s) (h) | Comments (h) |
|---------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--|---|------------------------------|--|
| OSMC/09/17 | Capacity of maternity services at the Royal Berkshire Foundation Hospital. Fact finding report to establish the current capacity to meet demand for services. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | Monitoring item | HSP | Start: 17/11/10 End: | Chief Executive and Chairman of the Royal Berkshire Hospital. Royal Berkshire Hospital Foundation Trust | Councillor Joe Mooney | Investigation of the reported pressures on the maternity unit. |
| OSMC/ | Delayed discharges from hospital To determine the causes of delayed discharges from hospitals affecting West Berkshire residents. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | Investigate ways to improve the current system, and improve patient experience. | HSP | Start: TBC End: | Chief Executive of the Royal Berkshire NHS Trust and Bev Searle - NHS Berkshire West. Royal Berkshire NHS Trust & NHS Berkshire West | Councillor Joe Mooney | |
| OSMC/09/02 | Performance Report for Level One Indicators To monitor quarterly the performance levels across the Council and to consider, where appropriate, any remedial action. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | Monitoring item | OSMC | Start: 14/09/10 End: OSMC 28/6/11 | Jason Teal - 2102 Policy & Communication | Councillor Anthony Stansfeld | Quarterly item. |
| OSMC/10/78 | Activities for teenagers To identify the work undertaken and future action planned in the Children and Young People Directorate to improve activities for teenagers, following its identification as the top priority for improvement in the annual resident survey. | Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | | OSMC | Start: 25/05/10 End: 09/06/11 OSMC 28/6/11 | Julia Waidman - 2815 Children and Young People | Councillor Gordon Lundie | As requested by OSMC on 2nd March 2010. |

Appendix A OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

| Reference (a) | Subject/purpose (b) | Methodology (c) | Expected outcome (d) | Review Body (e) | Dates (f) | Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g) | Portfolio Holder(s) (h) | Comments (h) |
|---------------|---|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------------|--|
| OSMC/11/102 | Planning Performance Indicator - affordable housing units To explore factors causing this indicator to be reported as red, including the impact of the recession, and the remedial action being taken. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | | OSMC | Start: 01/03/11 End: 09/06/11 OSMC 28/6/11 | Gary Lugg - 2617 Planning and Countryside | Councillor Alan Law | Requested as part of the discussion on the Q2 performance report. |
| OSMC/11/104 | CCTV To review the transfer of the CCTV system to RBWM | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | | OSMC | Start: 09/06/11 End: OSMC 09/06/11 | Andy Day - 2459 Policy & Communication | Councillor Anthony Stansfeld | Agreed by OSMC on 010311 |
| OSMC/09/57 | Revenue and capital budget reports To receive the latest period revenue and capital budget reports and consider any areas of concern. | Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review | Monitoring item | RMWVG | Start: 13/09/10 End: | Andy Walker - 2433 Finance | Councillor Keith Chopping | May lead to areas for in depth review. |
| OSMC/09/63 | Establishment Reports To receive the latest report on the changes to the Council's establishment. | Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer via in meeting review | Monitoring item | RMWVG | Start: 13/09/10 End: | Robert O'Reilly - 2358 Human Resources | Councillor Anthony Stansfeld | May lead to areas for in depth review. |
| OSMC/11/98 | Legal and Electoral Services Budget To discuss budget pressures within this service area. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | | RMWVG | Start: End: | David Holling - Legal & Electoral Services | | Requested by RMSC on 14 December 2010. |
| OSMC/11/99 | Highways Asset Management Plan To review the AMP and the highways land contained within it. | In meeting review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers. | | RMWVG | Start: End: | Mark Edwards - 2208 Highways & Transport | Councillor David Betts | Requested by RMSC on 14 December 2010. |
| OSMC/10/95 | Big Society To explore the initiative as a way of enabling people and encouraging them to take responsibility for their own communities. | Initial briefing followed by in meeting review. | | OSMC | Start: End: | Andy Day - 2459 Policy & Communication | | Item to be scheduled at a later date once further detail known. Work ongoing at LSP level. |

Appendix A OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

| Reference (a) | Subject/purpose (b) | Methodology (c) | Expected outcome (d) | Review Body (e) | Dates (f) | Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g) | Portfolio Holder(s) (h) | Comments (h) |
|---------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| OSMC/11/100 | School Academies To review the effect of schools becoming Academies on the capacity of the LEA. | Task group review with information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers and external partners. | | Task Group | Start: 07/02/11 End: | Ian Pearson - 2729 Education | Councillor Barbara Alexander | Terms of Reference approved by OSMC on 18/01/11 |

This page is intentionally left blank