

Title of Report:	Actions from previous meetings
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission
Date of Meeting:	30 October 2012

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

Recommended Action: To note the report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 942 0196
E-mail Address:	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Elaine Walker
Job Title:	Principal Policy Officer
Tel. No.:	01635 519441
E-mail Address:	ewalker@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

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

2. Resolutions

- 2.1 **Resolution:** Schools and Early Years Setting – Place Strategy 2013-2018 be added to the Commission’s work programme.

Action / response: This action is complete. The item will be included on the December agenda.

- 2.2 **Resolution:** David Lowe to send all Members a copy of the complaints procedure;

Action / response: This action is complete.

- 2.3 **Resolution:** David Lowe to advise the outcome of the previous RMWG meeting discussing the Parkway Development.

- 2.4 **Action / response:** The minutes of the RMWG meeting of 27 September 2011 state that:

It was noted that OSMC had recommended that this work item [Parkway] should be allocated to the Newbury Town Centre Task Group but following Nick Carter’s comment that this may be better served by convening a meeting of RMWG with Nick Carter, David Holling and Mark Edwards to answer Members’ questions on the financial arrangements associated with car parking and affordable housing under the Parkway Development. Members of the Newbury Town Centre Task Group could be invited as observers. Councillor David Rendel was asked to produce a list of Members’ written questions to be submitted to officers. It was also agreed that Newbury Town Centre Task Group should be asked to review and report back on the opening months operation of the Parkway Centre in the Spring 2012.

- 2.5 Members of the RMWG then agreed at their meeting of 17 January 2012 that ‘the Parkway Centre Development progress should be reviewed in one year.’

- 2.6 **Resolution:** The Chairman and David Lowe to update the process for proposing new items for scrutiny.

Action / response: A report has been prepared and is shown at Appendix A, suggesting the criteria against which suggested topics for scrutiny review be assessed. The Commission are asked to review and agree the proposals.

- 2.7 **Resolution:** A link to the Berkshire Youth publication listing youth activities in the area be added to the Council’s website;

Action / response: The link has been added to the Participation page under Children and Young People's Partnership.

- 2.8 **Resolution:** Councillor Neill to circulate information regarding the new home to school transport scheme, and community bus use, to all Members.

Action / response: Councillor Neill is awaiting further information prior to circulation.

- 2.9 **Resolution:** The amended recommendations from the review into the repair of pot holes be submitted to the Executive for approval.

Action / response: The recommendations will be entering the Executive cycle following responses from officers and are expected to be viewed by the Executive on 29 November 2012..

- 2.10 **Resolution:** that Councillor Webb provide and update to the work plan for the Health Scrutiny Panel to indicate the likely completion date of works in progress.

Action / response: The workplan has been updated.

- 2.11 **Resolution:** that Councillor Vickers provide and update to the work plan for the Resource Management Working Group to indicate the likely completion date of works in progress

Action / response: The workplan has been updated.

- 2.12 **Resolution:** An update be provided on activity relating to the transfer of the Council's CCTV;

Action / response: Kevin Griffin (Head of ICT and Corporate Support has provided the following response to the outstanding recommendations:

1. Recommendation: Risk Registers used on projects should consider the implications of projects being delayed and / or failing, and outline the measures that would be taken to maintain existing services until solutions can be found. This would have highlighted the risks posed by the winter weather caused by the delay in starting the project.

Response: The Risk Register Template contains guidance notes on recording risks. An experienced project manager would identify project delays in a risk register and if these delays threaten the projects timeline, or take it outside the project tolerance then an Exception Report should be produced.

2. Recommendation: Project Managers should set out a clear communications plan and agree this with key stakeholders and also maintain a log of communications with key stakeholders. This would provide a clear audit trail of communications.

Response: The Project Initiation Document (PID) template requires a Communications Plan to be included which should ensure all stakeholders are kept aware of any issues or project delays throughout the project lifecycle.

- 2.13 **Resolution** Reasons for rejecting a recommendation be provided in the summary report.

Action / response: A link to the relevant executive agenda and papers has been included for reference as there may be multiple reasons for rejection.

Appendices

Appendix A - Scrutiny topic acceptance criteria.