



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of the **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** will be held at the Civic
Offices, Shute End, Wokingham RG40 1BN on **TUESDAY
30 MAY 2017 AT 7.00 PM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andy Couldrick'.

Andy Couldrick
Chief Executive
Published on 19 May 2017

This meeting may be filmed for inclusion on the Council's website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council's control.



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Vision

A great place to live, an even better place to do business

Our Priorities

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

The Underpinning Principles

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

MEMBERSHIP OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Councillors

Keith Baker (Chairman)	Laura Blumenthal (Vice-Chairman)	Parry Batth
Lindsay Ferris	Kate Haines	Pauline Helliar-Symons
Ken Miall	Ian Pittock	Malcolm Richards
Chris Smith	Bill Soane	Shahid Younis

Substitutes

Philip Houldsworth	Abdul Loyes	Beth Rowland
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey		

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
78.		APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for absence.	
79.		MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 March 2017 and the extraordinary meeting held on 3 May 2017.	5 - 22
80.		DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest.	
81.		PUBLIC QUESTION TIME To answer any public questions. A period of 30 minutes will be allowed for members of the public to ask questions submitted under notice. The Council welcomes questions from members of the public about the work of this Committee. Subject to meeting certain timescales, questions can relate to general issues concerned with the work of the Committee or an item which is on the Agenda for this meeting. For full details of the procedure for submitting questions please contact the Democratic Services Section on the numbers given below or go to www.wokingham.gov.uk/publicquestions	
82.		MEMBER QUESTION TIME To answer any Member questions.	
83.	None Specific	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME To consider the 2017/18 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme and an additional Scrutiny request from Councillor Gary Cowan.	23 - 30

84.	None Specific	QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT To consider the Council Plan Quarter 4 Performance Management report, covering the period January-March 2017.	31 - 94
85.	None Specific	HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE UPDATE To consider evidence submitted to the House of Commons Select Committee for Communities and Local Government on the current state of Overview and Scrutiny.	95 - 112
86.	None Specific	COUNCIL MOTION ON OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY To consider a Motion adopted by the Council at its March 2017 meeting relating to the process for appointing Members to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.	113 - 118
87.	None Specific	MEMBER TRAINING SESSION To consider the programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Member Training event, to be held on 19 July 2017.	119 - 124
88.	None Specific	PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS To consider recent Public and Member questions to the Council and Executive and any potential Overview and Scrutiny issues arising.	125 - 130
89.	None Specific	EXECUTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION FORWARD PROGRAMMES To consider the Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programmes and any Overview and Scrutiny issues arising.	131 - 140
90.	None Specific	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING PROGRAMMES 2017/18 To discuss work programme items to be considered at upcoming Overview and Scrutiny meetings.	141 - 156

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent

A Supplementary Agenda will be issued by the Chief Executive if there are any other items to consider under this heading.

CONTACT OFFICER

Neil Carr

Tel

Email

Postal Address

Principal Democratic Services Officer

0118 974 6058

neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk

Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 28 MARCH 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.45 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Simon Weeks (Chairman), John Kaiser (Vice-Chairman), Parry Batth, Lindsay Ferris, Michael Firmager, Pauline Helliar-Symons, Ken Miall and Shahid Younis

Officers Present

Peter Baveystock, Service Manager, Cleaner and Greener Services
Neil Carr, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Julie Holland, Service Manager, Business Improvement
Brendan Troy, Service Manager, Community Infrastructure Delivery

60. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted by Kate Haines, John Jarvis and Philip Mirfin.

61. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24 January 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

In relation to item 66 (Update on Grounds Maintenance Contract) Councillor Parry Batth stated, for information, that in addition to being a member of the Committee he was also Deputy Executive Member for Environment.

63. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

64. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

65. COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

The Committee considered the Quarter 3 Council Plan Performance Monitoring Report 2016/17, set out at Agenda pages 13 to 76. Julie Holland, Service Manager, Business Improvement, introduced the report and answered Member questions.

The report indicated that the breakdown of performance indicators in Quarter 3 was three Red, 13 Amber and 44 Green. The indicators of greatest concern (Red) related to:

- % of children who became subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP) who were subject to a CPP for a second or subsequent time within 24 months;
- % of Care Proceedings completed in 2016/17 within 26 weeks of application;
- % of Looked After Children living within 20 miles of Berkshire West.

Appendix B to the report gave a description of each of the performance indicators and an explanation of the determination of the Red, Amber and Green thresholds.

Members considered performance relating to the key indicators. During the discussion the following points were made:

- Household waste, reused, recycled and composted – Members requested more information on the options under consideration in order for the Council to meet the statutory recycling target of 50% by 2020.
- Number of schools becoming academies – Members considered the issues around schools being “forced” into academisation and noted the recent example of Southfields school which had made significant progress and achieved a “good” Ofsted rating following the appointment of an effective headteacher.
- Timing of performance reports – Members noted that there had been some improvement in the timeliness of performance information reported to the Committee. It was felt that the 21st Century Council programme should be able to deliver further improvements in this regard.
- Number of affordable dwellings completed – Members requested clarification on progress made in relation to the stated Housing Strategy target of facilitating 1,000 affordable homes between 2015 and 2018. Members also requested details on the types of housing which fell within the Council’s definition of “affordable housing”.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Quarter 3 Council Plan Performance Monitoring Report be noted;
- 2) the additional information requested by Members be circulated following the meeting;
- 3) Members on the 21st Century Council steering group raise the issues around the timeliness of performance reports and report back to the Committee on any proposals under consideration to improve the process.

66. UPDATE ON GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

Peter Baveystock, Service Manager, Cleaner and Greener Services, gave a presentation to the Committee on the challenges identified during the 2016 grass cutting season and the improvements to be implemented in 2017.

The presentation explained that there had been a general awareness that starting the new contract in April 2016 would cause problems for the new contractor (ISS). This timing was unavoidable and would not happen in future contract re-lets. The situation in 2016 was exacerbated by the wet and warm winter and the early grass cut in March by the previous Contractor.

ISS did a good job of transferring 100% of the previous staff by 1st April 2016. However, training the staff on new equipment and working practices delayed the start of the grass cutting and work on sight lines and encroaching vegetation. ISS also experienced problems in acquiring appropriate equipment and had to rely on trailers transferring the grass cutting machines to site.

There was also confusion around the interpretation of the long grass regimes which created a significant amount of customer queries and complaints. Most of these challenges were eventually overcome by mid-July 2016 when, in the main, a balance was struck between long grass and regularly cut grass.

ISS had now settled into the contract and it was considered that the 2017 programme would be smoother with less problems and complaints arising. ISS had also taken on grounds maintenance work relating to sheltered housing and was able to take on work for schools and Town and Parish Councils.

During the discussion, Members raised the following questions and issues:

- Members noted the progress made in delivering the contract and welcomed the development of wild flower areas. It was noted that the aim was to develop 10,000 square metres of wild flower areas each year.
- Members welcomed the proactive approach taken in relation to customer complaints with site visits undertaken with residents, Towns and Parishes and Borough Council Members.
- Members stressed the importance of training for new or temporary contractor staff in order to ensure that agreed standards were met.
- Members asked about any additional costs incurred relating to the challenges faced during 2016. It was confirmed that the contract was “fixed price” and any additional works were met within the agreed contract price.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Peter Baveystock be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Member questions;
- 2) the Cleaner and Greener Team and ISS be congratulated on their positive approach to customer service and complaints handling;
- 3) copies of the presentation slides and notes of the WBC/ISS annual review meeting be circulated to Members.

67. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 77 to 102, which gave details of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 List of Infrastructure that could be funded by CIL. Brendan Troy, Service Manager, Community Infrastructure Delivery introduced the report and answered Member questions.

The report stated that the 123 List had originally been adopted by the Council in February 2015. The information set out in the report followed a consultation exercise and had been approved by the Executive on 26 January 2017.

The report also stated that the updated information in the report would help to provide assurance that there was no double counting of CIL and Section 106 planning obligations. The information would also help to ensure that site-specific planning obligations could be secured where they were required by new development. The 123 List was not used for prioritisation of CIL monies. Prioritisation was carried out through the development of the Council’s Capital Programme and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

Members considered the information in the report and raised the following issues and questions:

- Members sought clarification on the difference between CIL and Section 106 funding. It was confirmed that CIL was used for infrastructure projects such as new roads or schools whilst Section 106 related to services, e.g. bus services and travel plans and site specific works such as a new roundabout to facilitate a housing development.
- Members asked for further clarification about the description of Wokingham Road, Crowthorne (set out on Page 91) and whether this, in fact, referred to Lower Wokingham Road.
- Members noted that the Council's approach to facilitating Strategic Development Locations which attracted CIL funding had resulted in a significant increase in the funding available for infrastructure projects. It was also confirmed that 25% of CIL funding would be allocated to the relevant Town and Parish Councils.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Brendan Troy be thanked for attending the meeting and answering Member questions;
- 2) the additional information requested by Members be circulated following the meeting.

68. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORTS 2016/17

The Committee considered the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committees Annual Reports for 2016/17, set out at Agenda pages 103 to 132.

The Annual Reports highlighted the range of issues considered by the Committees during the year and the recommendations made for improvement in 2017/18. The report also referred to the ongoing House of Commons Select Committee Inquiry into Overview and Scrutiny in local government.

In looking forward to 2017/18 the report highlighted the aim of Overview and Scrutiny Members to become more involved in policy development and pre-decision scrutiny of key decisions. Discussions with Executive Members had indicated that this would be a more productive use of Overview and Scrutiny resources and would add value to the work of the Council.

It was noted that the Council had considered and noted the Annual Reports at its meeting on 23 March 2017.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Reports for 2016/17 be approved;
- 2) the dates of Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings in 2017/18, as set out in the reports, be checked and confirmed to Members.

69. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMMES FOR 2017/18

The Committee considered a report, set out on Agenda pages 133 to 148, which set out details of the ongoing work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Management

Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees together with a list of new Scrutiny suggestions for 2017/18.

At its meeting on 24 January 2017, the Committee had received a draft list of Scrutiny items for the next municipal year and agreed that the Council's website and social media be used to invite Members, residents and community groups to submit further suggestions for investigation.

Members were advised that the new Scrutiny suggestions should be assessed using the selection criteria previously agreed by the Committee, viz:

- Whether the issue was of local, and preferably current, concern;
- Whether the undertaking of a Scrutiny review could be linked to the Council's Vision, priorities and underpinning principles or would help achieve these;
- Whether the topic was already being reviewed elsewhere within the Council, e.g. as part of the 21st Century Council programme;
- Whether the topic was one that was capable of being influenced by the Committee;
- Whether the topic was of manageable scope – not too wide-ranging and yet of sufficient size to warrant a scrutiny review;
- Whether sufficient resources were available to support the review and, if so, what priority should be given – high, medium or low;
- Whether the review should be undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee itself, delegated to an Overview and Scrutiny Committee or a Task and Finish Group be established.

Consideration was given to the individual Scrutiny requests as follows.

69.1 Scrutiny Request - Bill Luck

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda pages 149 to 150, which referred to a request from Bill Luck for a review of parking standards relating to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). Mr Luck attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

Mr Luck stated that the request referred to permitted development rights for the conversion of Use Class C3 to a Use Class C4 (HMO) and consideration of an Article 4 Direction to ensure that adequate car parking was provided with such a change of use. Also a review of the parking standards to include a requirement for all types of HMO, both Use Class C4 and sui generis (buildings not falling into a specific use class).

These conversions, within a suburban area, often resulted in a significant increase in car parking demand, given that they usually generated as many cars as bed spaces. With limited on-plot parking they added an unacceptable burden to the local roads to accommodate the overspill parking along with those from the surrounding family homes, particularly when there could be a number in any one street. Many Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) were including such policies in their Local Plans and reviewing their parking standards as a result.

Comments received from local residents about the impacts of parking from such properties and comments upon local social media again highlighted these problems. Bill Luck was personally aware of two such properties where the number of vehicles had exceeded the number of bedrooms, with only one on-plot parking space. He was also aware that a

number of LPAs were adopting Article 4 Directions and planning policies to specifically address the problems of excessive parking associated with HMOs.

It was **agreed** that:

- 1) the Scrutiny review request be referred to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration and inclusion in its work programme for 2017/18;
- 2) the Planning briefing document on HMOs be circulated to Members of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for information.

69.2 Scrutiny request - Catherine Goad

Members considered the suggestion form, on Agenda page 151, which referred to a request from Catherine Goad for a review of household recycling.

The Scrutiny request form stated that Ms Goad had lived in the area for the past 12 months and was disappointed by how little residents were able to actually recycle. Having lived in Taplow where residents could recycle so much, including most plastics, pots, trays as well as bottles, foil, glass as well as all the normal bits it was shocking that the Council didn't want to do more.

Ms Goad appreciated that recycling could be a costly exercise for a Council, but felt that, with neighbouring Councils managing this, was there not some kind of partnership deal that could be done to help with such an important issue.

To be able to recycle more, certainly more plastics and ideally other items too, would make it easy to reduce the amount the amount going to landfill.

It was **agreed** that:

- 1) the request be referred to the existing Member/Officer Working Group on Waste Services for information;
- 2) Ms Goad be thanked for the request and be informed of the Council's current cost/benefit rationale for determining which items are recycled.

69.3 Scrutiny request - Gary Cowan

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda pages 153 to 154, which referred to a request from Councillor Gary Cowan for a review of the Member/Officer/Resident protocol for communicating with each other.

Councillor Cowan stated that this was the biggest drawback to Members being able to fulfil their roles and there needed to be in place very clear guidance on how communications worked that were open and transparent, etc. This would help to address the many cases of a lack of communication which led to distrust.

It was **agreed** that further consideration be given to Councillor Cowan's Scrutiny request and he be invited to attend a future meeting of the Committee for a more detailed discussion.

69.4 Scrutiny request - Jason Sutton

Members considered the suggestion form on Agenda pages 155 to 158, which referred to a request from Jason Sutton relating to responses to a question to the Executive Member

for Children's Services, at the Executive meeting on 26 January 2017, relating to the proposal to expand Aldryngton Primary School.

The review request referred to a supplementary question asked at the Executive meeting which was not considered to be answered. The supplementary question sought clarification on the action to be taken by the Executive in the event that a decision was proven to be based on inaccurate and misleading information, in this case a failure to consider a spatial study, completed in September 2015, which compared Loddon, Radstock and Aldryngton Primary schools.

Members noted that there were several Scrutiny requests relating to aspects of the decision making process around the potential expansion of Aldryngton Primary School. These requests were considered in turn.

Members did not feel that these were suitable matters for inclusion in the Overview and Scrutiny work programme. In reaching this conclusion Members noted the decisions taken at the Executive meeting on 15 March 2017, including the provision for further consultation and consideration of alternative options for growth in the event that expansion of Aldryngton was put forward in the period 2018 to 2020. Members also noted that residents who were dissatisfied by the decision making process relating to Aldryngton could pursue a complaint or complaints through the Council's complaints procedure.

It was **agreed** that the Scrutiny request is not included in the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2017/18.

69.5 Scrutiny request - John Halsall

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda page 159 to 160, which referred to a request from Councillor John Halsall relating to the projected increase in borrowing in the Council's 2017/18 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

The request stated that the MTFP foresaw an increase in borrowing which was several times the annual level of Council Tax receipts and probably the highest level of borrowing ever enjoyed. It was argued that these borrowings would generate new income flows which would repay the borrowings within ten years. These assumptions must be tested and reported upon with the risks associated coupled with the institutions required to ensure that these risks are minimised.

The request asked: should the Council be acting as a speculator? Does it have the necessary skills? Should the Council be putting residents at risk financially or should be it be minimising risk, reducing borrowings and concentrating on optimising services?

It was **agreed** that, as the request related to financial strategy and risk management, it should be referred to the Audit Committee for consideration.

69.6 Scrutiny requests - Paul Counihan

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda pages 161 to 163, which referred to a request from Paul Counihan relating to the context, meeting, and factors that led to the agreement for a decision to recommend Aldryngton School for expansion above other options available.

The request sought clarification about what point, and based on what criteria, Aldryngton was chosen, above ALL other options available, using data and assumptions

independently validated by and against the recommendation and advice of the ERMCA architects? The request stated that there was a serious issue of transparency in this case.

Mr Counihan submitted a further request relating to the decision on Aldryngton expansion relating to the role of Judith Ramsden, Director of People Services and highlighted a potential conflict of interest. The request sought an independent review of the decision making process relating to Aldryngton.

A third request was submitted by Mr Counihan, relating to the operation of a Children's Services Task and Finish Group (2015) which met to consider options for the provision of additional school places in Earley and made recommendations about the allocation of resources to the Executive. The request sought clarification about the operation of the Task and Finish Group and the methodology used to develop recommendations about Aldryngton.

Members considered these Scrutiny requests in association with the request from Jason Sutton (see item 69.4 above) and concluded that they were not suitable for inclusion in the 2017/18 work programme.

It was **agreed** that the three requests from Paul Counihan are not included in the Overview and Scrutiny work programme for 2017/18.

69.7 Scrutiny request - Pauline Jorgensen

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda page 165, which referred to a request from Councillor Pauline Jorgensen relating to the 21st Century Council change programme.

The request stated that it might be useful to carry out a health check of the customer service organisation in advance of 21 Century Council and review the new requirements against this to ensure we are talking the right actions given the importance of the area to the future running of the Council. It would reduce the likelihood of issues but it needs to be done at the right time.

Members noted that the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee was receiving regular update reports on the 21st Century Council change programme.

It was **agreed** that:

- 1) the Scrutiny request be referred to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration and inclusion in its work programme;
- 2) the Committee be asked to discuss the request with Councillor Pauline Jorgensen and the 21st Century Council team to establish the scope and timing of a review and to ensure that there was no duplication of ongoing work.

69.8 Scrutiny request - Roberta (a local resident)

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda page 167, which referred to a request from Roberta (a local resident) relating to transport links to the Oakbank secondary school.

The request stated that, currently, there were no public transport links to Oakbank school and the so-called cycle paths were far too dangerous to use. There was traffic and congestion around school drop-off and pick-up times. Children were having to walk and

cycle great lengths along a very unsafe route (from the school to the Black Boy roundabout) due to the lack of transport links.

The request sought the introduction of a public bus linking Earley, Whitley, Shinfield and Oakbank, potentially running during peak school times.

It was **agreed** that:

- 1) the scrutiny request is not added to the 2017/18 work programme;
- 2) the resident be asked to raise any concerns with the local ward Member;
- 3) the Highways and Transport team be asked to advise on existing public transport links in the area.

69.9 Scrutiny request - Tom Clark

Members were referred to the suggestion form on Agenda page 169, which referred to a request from Tom Clark relating to the efficiency and value for money delivered by the Council's legal services team.

The request sought a review of legal services to carry out benchmarking, identify best practice and identify potential new suppliers.

It was **agreed** that:

- 1) the Scrutiny request is not added to the 2017/18 work programme;
- 2) the resident be notified of the implementation of recent initiatives, such as Shared Legal Services, aimed at improving efficiency and value for money.

70. MONITORING OF PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS

The Committee considered a report, set out on Agenda pages 171 to 194, which gave details of public and Member questions submitted to recent meetings of the Executive and full Council.

Members considered the questions and answers provided and discussed the potential for further investigation and review of the issues raised.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted, with no further action to be taken.

71. CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT EXECUTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION FORWARD PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered a copy of the Executive Forward Programme and the Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programme as set out on Agenda pages 195 to 202.

Members noted the outcome of discussions between the Executive and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen on initiatives to improve the profile and impact of Overview and Scrutiny across the Council. This included agreement in principle that new policies and key service decisions would be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny in draft form. It was felt that the earlier involvement of Overview and Scrutiny would help to strengthen new policies and service changes.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Forward Programmes be noted;
- 2) the proposals aimed at increasing the profile and impact of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be welcomed.

72. UPDATE REPORTS FROM CHAIRMEN OR NOMINATED MEMBER OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

The Committee considered update reports from the recent meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees as follows:

- Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 8 March 2017 – Councillor Ken Miall submitted a report which highlighted the following issues: community mental health services, learning disability services, meeting the needs of the home care population and an update from Healthwatch Wokingham. Councillor Miall also referred to a special meeting of the Committee, to be held on 27 April 2017, which would consider the potential closure of the hydrotherapy pool at the Royal Berkshire Hospital.
- Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 13 March 2017 – On behalf of the Chairman, Councillor Michael Firmager submitted a report which gave details of the following issues: Right to Buy, new procurement regulations, Civil Parking Enforcement, the Borough's Crime and Safety Partnership and commuter parking.
- Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 21 March 2017 – Councillor Pauline Helliard-Symons gave a verbal update on the meeting which included consideration of children educated at home, three Ofsted reports, the Coombes Task and Finish Group report, the 30 hours of free childcare proposals and a Part II item on local schools causing concern.

RESOLVED: That the update reports from the Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be noted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 3 MAY 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.45 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Simon Weeks (Chairman), John Kaiser (Vice-Chairman), David Chopping, Lindsay Ferris, Michael Firmager, Pauline Helliar-Symons, Ken Miall and Abdul Loyes

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Prue Bray and Pauline Jorgensen

Officers Present

Neil Carr, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Mark Redfearn, Service Manager Libraries and Community Development
Josie Wragg, Interim Director of Environment

73. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillors Parry Bath, Kate Haines, John Jarvis, Philip Mirfin and Shahid Younis.

Councillor Abdul Loyes attended the meeting as a substitute.

74. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

75. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited members of the public to submit questions.

Keith Malvern asked the Chairman the following question:

Question

At the Executive at the end of March I asked a question about the early notice given confidentially to local members and the Town Council about the proposed relocation of the library, and the lack of public consultation. The Executive agreed '...the proposal be publicised as soon as practical to enable feedback on these proposals and subsequently the design'. Two relevant things have happened since then - the proposal has been called in and the Council has proposed further plans for Phase 2 of the Carnival Pool site including the totally unexpected demolition and rebuild of the swimming pool. For this proposal there will be a series of engagement events for people to input into this process (the series of events is 2 3-hour sessions and comments need to be in by the 21st of May).

The Officer response to the call in under consultation attempts to convince us that there is no need for further consultation on the proposed relocation, even though the Executive had already agreed to do just that.

Can the Committee confirm that the Council's intention is to have a public consultation on the proposed library move?

Answer

On the 30th March 2017 the Executive took the following decision in relation to the Library service in Wokingham:

1. it be agreed in principle to relocate Wokingham Library to a new building on the Carnival Phase II site;
2. approval to relocate is subject to a full impact assessment and detailed business case being agreed by the Executive Member for Resident Services;
3. the proposal be publicised as soon as practical to enable feedback on these proposals and subsequently the design.

I understand that, following this meeting a timetable was published showing the range of engagement events that would be happening throughout May 2017 that relate to the proposed relocation of the library service. This includes specific events within Wokingham town centre, including the existing Wokingham Library building.

I also understand that, during this time, people can submit their views on any aspect of the proposed relocation of the library service and can speak directly to Council Officers to share their thoughts and to ask questions on any points they are not clear about.

In relation to your final point, the role of the Committee tonight is limited to reviewing the decision made by the Executive on 30th March.

Supplementary Question

In your response you say some interesting things about the timetable of events involving Wokingham Library. Your answer includes new information which I was not aware of from looking at local newspapers and the WBC website. Hopefully we are going to get clarification in Shute End as I have not been able to visit the Carnival Pool. I have seen the information boards in the Shute End Reception. From the new information available this evening, how serious is the list of events. What is going on?

Answer

I am not responsible for running the library service. However, the Committee will be taking evidence tonight from witnesses who are responsible for the service. This should provide answers to the points you raise.

76. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

77. CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION - RELOCATION OF WOKINGHAM LIBRARY

The Committee considered the Call-In of the decision taken by the Executive, at its meeting on 30 March 2017, relating to the "in principle" relocation of Wokingham Library from its current site to the new Carnival Phase 2 site. The decision had been called in by Councillors Prue Bray, Lindsay Ferris, Clive Jones, Ian Pittock and Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey.

The Executive decision had been called in on the following grounds:

- The proposed action was not proportionate to the desired outcome;
- Due consultation had not taken place;
- A presumption in favour of openness had not been observed;
- Clarity of aims and objectives had not been achieved.

The following witnesses were invited to submit evidence and answer questions in order to assist the Committee in its deliberations:

- Councillor Prue Bray to set out the reasons for the Call-In;
- Josie Wragg (Interim Director of Environment) and Mark Redfearn (Service Manager, Libraries and Community Development) to provide facts and figures relating to the Executive decision;
- Councillor Pauline Jorgensen to represent the views of the Council's Executive.

Councillor Simon Weeks (Chairman) welcomed the witnesses and explained the format of the meeting. The witnesses would be invited to make a short presentation to the Committee followed by a question and answer session. Following the witness session the Committee would consider all the written and oral evidence and decide to either confirm the decision or make appropriate recommendations to the Executive.

Councillor Prue Bray addressed the Committee on the reasons behind the Call-In and made the following statement:

“This call-in is not about whether or not it is a good idea to move Wokingham Library to a new building next to the Carnival Pool. The call-in is purely about process.

I am not going to read out what is on the call-in notice. It's in the agenda. I am going to explain what's behind it.

First, an argument we have rehearsed many times before. The Council has a habit of keeping things secret, so they only pop out into the light at the point where they are already done and dusted, with little chance to change anything. Secrecy not only breeds suspicion but makes life harder for the Council because it prevents external voices being heard, external voices which may well have sensible suggestions to make. The quality of projects is poorer for the lack of timely external input. And has no-one learned from past mistakes that keeping things secret tends to add to public disapproval, not reduce it?

In this case, the first the public and some Councillors knew about the idea of moving Wokingham library was when the Executive agenda was published in late March. Supposedly, the decision made in March was “in principle”, and subject to a full impact assessment and business case. However, last week, the Council announced its plans for the Carnival Pool area. The drawings included a library.

The obvious conclusion is that the decision has already been made that the library is going to move – even though the business case and impact assessment have not been done. The Executive paper reproduced in tonight's agenda makes this clear. In particular, look at page 12, where just below the bullet point “costs of relocating” is the statement “The capital costs of building the new library space are factored into the existing Medium Term Plan allocation for the Carnival Pool Phase II Scheme”.

No doubt some of the Committee are itching to ask me what was wrong with that. Isn't it just being prudent to put some money in place in case you want to make a decision. Well, not quite.

Leaving aside the fact that it makes a mockery of the budget to slide in a few extra million without an explanation, I prefer openness to secrecy – as does the Council's Constitution.

I also prefer a sensible decision-making process. This project has gone: idea, decision to proceed, consult, business case. What should have happened is: idea, consult, business case, decision to proceed. Why? Because you should consult when it makes a difference and make decisions based on evidence of costs and benefits.

Business cases should come before something gets approval to start, not at the end when the Council has already committed to spending money. How on earth can people make a sensible decision about spend if they don't know – to name just one example – what is going to happen to the existing library building. Where is the business case? It should come at the beginning. Money has been allocated in the Medium Term Financial Plan, without any evidence of what the right amount is or whether the spend can be justified.

Consultation should come at the beginning too. Instead it's at the end. And when I say "consultation", that is in the loosest form of the word. The comments from the Interim Director on page 44 make it clear that there is no actual consultation and that the Council only consults if it is compelled to do so. The "consultation" added in the extra Executive recommendation on page 20 refers to publicity and feedback, rather than any formal method of asking people what they think. The very fact that even that had to be added to the recommendations and wasn't there in the first place tells you a lot about whether the decision-makers are actually interested in finding out what the public thinks of this idea.

But of course, the Council can consult if it suits it. There was a general consultation on libraries last year. The related report is reproduced in your agenda. Nowhere does it say anything about moving the library. The matter of co-locating libraries with other community facilities was mentioned at the time, but not in a way that suggested that the Council was considering moving Wokingham library. I challenge the Executive Member to look me in the eye and say that she seriously believes that people were given the opportunity last year to comment on the concept of moving Wokingham library next to Carnival Pool, as she appeared to claim at the March Executive meeting, reported at the top of page 18 of the agenda.

In summary, we have called this item in because the Council has once again hatched up some plans in secret and offered a pretend consultation at the end of the process when it is unlikely to make any difference – and has failed to produce a proper business case before charging ahead. That is not the right way to go about things.

Past experience suggests that, regretfully, we may be banging our heads against a brick wall. This is not the first time that the Lib Dems have made similar points. Occasionally some Conservative Councillors have even appeared to agree with us. But, unfortunately, nothing comes of it. I can understand the difficulty of Conservative members of this Committee criticising the Council Executive, also made up of Conservative Members. But I live in hope that one day you will find your voice and ask for things to be done properly, for the sake of our residents".

In the subsequent question and answer session the following points were made:

- The Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18, agreed at the Budget Council meeting in February 2017, did not include reference to the relocation of Wokingham library.
- One Lib Dem Member, in her role as a Town Councillor, received a confidential briefing on the proposals on 22 February 2017. The remaining Lib Dem Members were not made aware of the proposals until the March Executive agenda was published.

- In relation to the engagement events arranged for May 2017, it was felt that Recommendation 3 at the Executive meeting was added as an afterthought and public engagement should have begun much earlier.
- Members noted that the “in principle” decision to relocate Wokingham library was contingent on a full impact assessment and a detailed business case being agreed by the Executive Member.

Mark Redfearn, Service Manager Libraries and Community Development, addressed the Committee and made the following statement:

“As we begin this examination of the proposed relocation of the Library Service in Wokingham, I think it would be helpful to understand two points about our libraries, specifically the services they offer and how these are delivered.

In recent years our library service has been able to buck the national trend of declining library usage and library closures by successfully increasing visits to our libraries and retaining the ten libraries and home library service for our residents. The way in which we have done this is at the heart of how the Council intends to deliver its library services in the future and, therefore, is central to the proposal to relocate the library service in Wokingham.

Across the borough, we have a strong core of around 25,000 residents who actively make use of our libraries for borrowing books and other items, and in total, there are close to half a million visits to our libraries each year. We believe that the continued popularity of our library service is due to our commitment to retaining a good book stock within our libraries, but is also largely due to offering a range of different activities and services for people of all ages.

Free access to study areas, computers and Wi-Fi continues to attract people into our libraries, and our full calendar of events is consistently well-attended. Our Summer Reading Challenge is one of the most successful in the country; we maintain strong links with our local communities by hosting historical societies, reminiscence events and the Rhyme Time sessions for young children and their parents is always popular.

We are able to offer these services and activities because we try to make our libraries as flexible and adaptable as possible. Our staff are always looking for new ways to offer the types of things our residents want and being creative about how to use the limited available space within our libraries.

Lastly, in terms of delivery, the library service is in constant dialogue with our residents about the services we offer and what things they would like to see in the future. We have a strong following on social media and offer lots of opportunities for people to share their views with us in person.

It is true to say that the current location for Library Services in Wokingham has been largely successful over the past twenty years, but it is also true that as a functional building it has limitations that will continue to restrict the choice and usage of library services within the town. Despite the overall increase in library visits across the borough, we are already seeing a drop in visits to Wokingham Library in the past few years.

In this context it is important to remember that the current location of Wokingham Library is just the building where the Council delivers its library services for the town and that it is the services we offer that are primarily of value to our residents.

We know this because we consulted extensively with our residents last year in developing the Library Offer for the Council, and they told us about what elements of the library service were of most importance to them, and what they would like to see in the future. Specifically, residents told us that they supported the provision of more flexible and adaptable space within our libraries, and that they would welcome them to be co-located with other cultural and leisure activities.

The relocation of the library services in Wokingham has been proposed because of the clear message provided by our residents through the consultation last year and the subsequent agreement of the Library Offer for the Council. It will not alter the services that are available for our residents, but will offer more space and greater flexibility for the library service in Wokingham”.

With the agreement of the Chairman, Mark Redfearn, Josie Wragg and Councillor Pauline Jorgensen answered questions jointly. During the discussion the following points were made:

- It was confirmed that the proposed relocation of Wokingham library had not been discussed during the development of the Council’s Budget in the autumn of 2016.
- It was confirmed that the final decision to relocate the library would only be taken on completion of a satisfactory business case and impact assessment. The Executive Member would also consider any feedback from the public engagement carried out during May 2017. Feedback received after the 21 May deadline would also be fed into the decision making process.
- The 2016 consultation on the Library Offer had set the direction of travel for the service. Officers had moved quickly once the Wokingham library relocation idea had taken shape in early 2017.
- The Executive Forward Programme, including the Wokingham Library item, was published 28 days before the 30 March 2017 Executive meeting.
- The Executive Member did not refer to the proposal at the Budget Council meeting on 23 February 2017. The Medium Term Financial Plan contained a £10m commitment for Carnival Pool. The relevant Capital Vision line did not describe any of the services or facilities to be included in the scheme.
- It was confirmed that social media and press releases would be used to publicise the public engagement activities taking place during May 2017.
- If, and when, the final decision was taken to relocate the library it was noted that the actual move would not happen until 2021. This would allow plenty of time for the service to engage with the public on issues such as the layout of the new library, the potential for flexible usage and improved opening hours.
- In relation to the current library site it was confirmed that the relocation business case would give more details about potential future uses and financial implications.

- It was confirmed that the principle of co-location of libraries with other services applied to each of the ten libraries in the Borough. It was noted that the swift decision making relating to Wokingham library was not replicated in other parts of the Borough.

Following the witness session, a summary session was held to allow witnesses to provide clarification on points raised by other witnesses.

Councillor Prue Bray made the following points:

- The 2016 consultation exercise on the Library Offer did not refer specifically to the relocation of Wokingham library.
- The May 2017 engagement exercise was Jesuitical, in that the decision to relocate had been taken “in principle” but the public engagement brochure did not reflect that position.
- In terms of timing, there was a concern that the library relocation business case would not be completed until after the Carnival Phase 2 planning permission was granted.
- There were opportunities to publicise the proposal earlier, for example at the Budget Council meeting or when the Executive Forward Programme was published.
- The relocation proposals made no mention of the Elevate service which was currently operating successfully in Wokingham library.

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen, Josie Wragg and Mark Redfearn made the following points:

- The Library service had a strong track record in relation to consultation with the public and service users. This was reflected in the improved attendance figures and wide range of popular activities and events held in the Borough’s libraries.
- The major consultation exercise in 2016 on the Library Offer had informed the direction of travel for the service which included maximising the potential from co-location with other services.
- The decision making process had been swift once the opportunity for relocation of Wokingham library had been identified. However, the proposal could deliver real benefits including a larger amount of usable space all on the ground floor, more flexible space for activities and events and the potential for longer opening hours due to co-location with the leisure centre.
- It was confirmed that, at the moment, there was no decision about the location of Elevate within a relocated Wokingham library. The Elevate Hub was funded by time-limited funds from the Government and EU. Work was ongoing to look at longer term options for the service.

Following completion of the witness session, the Committee considered the evidence submitted in relation to the Call-In request. During the discussion the following points were made:

- Members recognised that the Call-In had raised some valid points about the decision making and consultation process relating to the potential relocation of Wokingham library and the timing of the different steps in the process. However, these points had to be balanced against the window of opportunity to deliver an improved library service which could be achieved by moving quickly on this occasion.
- It was noted that the final decision on Wokingham library was contingent on the production of a persuasive business case and impact assessment. It was also confirmed that feedback from residents and service users would be used to inform that decision.
- It was noted that the Council was committed to effective consultation with residents and service users. Consequently, the learning points arising out of the Call-In should be fed back to Officers and Executive Members to inform future decision making and effective consultation.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Executive decision relating to the relocation of Wokingham Library be confirmed;
- 2) the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee recognises that the “in principle” decision to relocate Wokingham Library has been relatively rapid and that the style of consultation is not as detailed or protracted as might otherwise be the case. However, the Committee also recognises that the ambition to improve the Wokingham Library offering via a new location is an opportunity that should be thoroughly investigated. The Committee does not consider that there would be anything significant to gain by delaying matters and referring this back to the Executive for reconsideration;
- 3) the learning points identified during the Call-In be fed back to inform future decision making.

TITLE	Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 30 May 2017
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Overview and Scrutiny is a key part of the checks and balances which ensure that the Council and its partners make and implement effective decisions for all the residents of the Borough. Effective work programming underpins the Overview and Scrutiny process and allows residents to see the range of issues to be considered over the year ahead.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 1) consider the work programme for 2017/18 and make amendments as necessary;
- 2) consider the specific Scrutiny request from Councillor Gary Cowan relating to Member/Officer/resident communications;
- 3) consider any matters arising from the extraordinary Call-In meeting on 3 May 2017.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

Effective work programming is a Member-led process aimed at shortlisting and prioritising issues of community concern together with issues arising out of the Council Plan and major policy or service changes. It aims to:

- reflect local needs and concerns;
- prioritise topics for scrutiny which have the most impact or benefit;
- involve local residents and stakeholders;
- be flexible enough to respond to new or urgent issues.

At its meeting on 28 March 2017 the Committee approved its work programme for the 2017/18 municipal year (Annex A). The work programme is a flexible document and Members may wish to add or remove items as the year progresses. The Committee approved a number of specific Scrutiny requests submitted by Members and residents. Progress on these requests is detailed in the report.

The Committee also held an extraordinary meeting on 3 May 2017 to consider a Call-In of an Executive decision relating to the proposed relocation of Wokingham Library. Members are asked to consider any issues arising out of that meeting

Background

At its meeting on 28 March 2017 the Committee approved its work programme for the 2017/18 municipal year (Annex A). The work programme is a flexible document and, in light of the 21st Century Council programme and other urgent issues, Members may wish to add or remove items as the year progresses.

Scrutiny Requests

The following Scrutiny Requests, considered at the meeting on 28 March 2017, were approved for further consideration, as detailed below.

- **Councillor Gary Cowan - Member/Officer/Resident Protocol for improved communication**

Issue – This is the biggest drawback to Members being able to fulfil their roles. There needs to be in place very clear guidance on how communications work that are open and transparent, etc. There are many cases where lack of communication leads to delay, frustration and distrust.

Outcome - Better communications and openness.

The Committee agreed that this request would be subject to further discussion at tonight's meeting. Councillor Cowan has been invited to attend.

- **Bill Luck – review of parking standards relating to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)**

Referred to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- **Councillor John Halsall – review of the borrowing increase in the 2017/18 Medium Term Financial Plan**

Referred to the Audit Committee for consideration at its meeting on 13 June 2017.

- **Catherine Goad – review of the range of items to be included in household recycling**

Referred to the Member/Officer Working Group on Waste Services.

- **Councillor Pauline Jorgensen – health check of customer service organisation in advance of the changes to be delivered through the 21st Century Council Programme**

Referred to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Committee is receiving regular updates on the 21st Century Council programme.

Performance Management

It is understood that the 21st Century Council change programme will deliver an update on the Council Plan and a new performance management regime. The Committee has

raised a number of concerns about the existing performance management system and may wish to consider the change proposals at an early stage.

Call-In Meeting on 3 May 2017

The Committee held an extraordinary Call-In meeting on 3 May 2017 to consider the Executive decision relating to the proposed relocation of Wokingham Library to the Carnival Phase 2 leisure facility. After hearing evidence from witnesses the Committee decided to uphold the Executive decision. However, it also noted a number of points about the way consultation had been carried out on the proposal and asked for learning points to be fed back to Officers and Members.

The Committee is requested to consider whether there are any wider issues around consultation on Executive decisions which could be addressed through the work programme for 2017/18.

Analysis of Issues

The Committee is requested to consider the latest version of the 2017/18 Work Programme and make any amendments as necessary.

Executive Members have agreed that Overview and Scrutiny can add more value by considering new policies and service changes before they are approved by the Executive. In order to identify items for pre-decision scrutiny it is suggested that the Committee consider the Executive Forward programme in more detail and agree with the relevant Executive Member/s on a timeline for considering the relevant item/s.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

List of Background Papers

None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Governance and Improvement Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 1

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2017/18

1. Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

1.	Co-ordination of the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees
2.	Development and monitoring of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme
3.	Discussion with Executive Members and appropriate Officers to identify priorities and monitor performance against key targets
4.	Monitoring of the Council Plan and the Corporate Peer Review Action Plan
5.	Input into new policies through pre-decision scrutiny of draft proposals
6.	Performance monitoring via the quarterly Council Plan Performance Management report
7.	Monitoring the Executive Forward Programme and the Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programme
8.	Monitoring Strategic Development Location (SDL) delivery and development of the new Local Plan
9.	Reviewing the Council's annual Budget Engagement exercise
10.	Monitoring the operation and performance of Council-owned companies
11.	Monitoring the Council's actions in compliance with its duties under the Equality Act 2010
12.	Approval of the annual Overview and Scrutiny report to Council
13.	Call-In review of Executive decisions
14.	Appointing Task and Finish Groups to investigate specific issues of local interest

2. Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1.	Monitoring the effective delivery of safeguarding services, including social worker recruitment, retention and training
2.	Reviewing services that contribute to the achievement of the Council's Vision and priorities for children and young people
3.	Children's Services performance indicators and major projects
4.	Reviewing school performance indicators and Ofsted reports
5.	Reviewing the impact of the 21 st Century Council reorganisation on Children's Services
6.	Monitoring key strategic initiatives such as the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub and the development of the Wokingham Multi Academy Trust
7.	Considering the annual report of the Corporate Parenting Board
8.	Input into new policies through pre-decision scrutiny of draft proposals relating to Children's Services
9.	Call-In of Executive decisions relating to Children's Services
10.	Appointing Task and Finish Groups as appropriate

3. Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1.	Exercising the Council's crime and disorder responsibilities by reviewing the work of the Community Safety Partnership
2.	Exercising the Council's flood risk management responsibilities by monitoring flood risk activities and partnership working with towns and parishes
3.	Council Budget Monitoring
4.	Reviewing the corporate restructure elements of the 21 st Century Council programme
5.	Reviewing the Council's customer service organisation in advance of 21 st century Council changes
6.	Monitoring the Wokingham Town Centre regeneration project
7.	Reviewing the Council's partnerships with Town and Parish Councils and the voluntary sector
8.	Reviewing highways and transport issues including customer service, car parking and improvements to cycling facilities
9.	Monitoring the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement
10.	Reviewing parking standards in relation to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)
11.	Input into new policies through pre-decision scrutiny of draft proposals
12.	Appointing Task and Finish Groups as appropriate

4. Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1.	Monitoring health and social care outcomes and the performance of the local NHS Foundation Trusts
2.	Reviewing progress on the integration of health and social care services
3.	Monitoring progress relating to the development of community hubs
4.	Considering reports and updates from Wokingham Healthwatch
5.	Reviewing the provision of community mental health services
6.	Considering updates on the work of the Wokingham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
7.	Reviewing access to primary care services within the Strategic Development Locations
8.	Joining West Berkshire, Reading, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Councils in joint scrutiny of the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Sustainability and Transformation Plan
9.	Call-In of Executive decisions relating to adult social care
10.	Input into new policies through pre-decision scrutiny of draft proposals relating to adult social care
11.	Appointing Task and Finish Groups as appropriate

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE Council Plan Performance Monitoring – Q4 2016/17 report

FOR CONSIDERATION BY Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 30 May 2017

WARD None specific

STRATEGIC DIRECTOR Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance & Improvement Services

OUTCOME

Improved performance in those areas of activity that are seen as a priority for the Council.

RECOMMENDATION

To note the latest performance indicators and major projects and agree any corrective action required.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The areas of performance are reported as follows (based on the indicators we have RAG ratings for):

	Q4		Q3		Q2		Q1	
Green	43	83%	32	72%	37	71%	41	77%
Amber	6	12%	10	22%	10	19%	7	13%
Red	3	5%	3	6%	5	10%	5	9%
Total	52		45		52		53	

Indicators with a RED rating are:

- % Children who became subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP) who are subject to a CPP for a second or subsequent time within 24 months.
- % Looked After Children living within 20 miles of “West of Berkshire”
- Number of cycle trips on the A329 corridor (LSTF project investment area)

Indicators with an AMBER rating are:

- % Secondary Schools with a current Ofsted rating of “good” or better.
- Number of affordable dwellings completed (annual)
- Kgs of residual household waste per household per annum
- Percentage of household waste reuse, recycling and composting
- Five year housing supply
- The % of calls answered

Background

Overview and Scrutiny Committee has previously requested further information to explain how the RAG (Red, Amber, Green) ratings for the performance indicators has been determined – this is shown in Appendix B.

Analysis of Issues

As part of the 21st Century Council programme a set of revised, streamlined, performance indicators is being developed for use in 2017/18.

List of Background Papers	
None	
Contact Andrew Moulton	Service Governance & Improvement
Telephone No 07747 777298	Email andrew.moulton@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 2

Community



Look after vulnerable people

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member (as at 31/3/17)	Commentary
% referrals in 16/17 which are repeat referrals within 12 months of a previous referral to Children's Social Care	24% or Less Green: 24% or less Amber: 24.1% to 26% Red: Over 26%	18.96%	16.4% (Q3: 25.9%)	Green	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Repeat referrals are a mechanism for understanding whether services offered to children and their families were appropriately targeted in the first instance. Children may genuinely be needing to re-access services for a different reason. Exploration of every re-referral takes place to monitor effectiveness. The Head of Service is satisfied that all re-referrals in Q4 were unavoidable and appropriate.

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel	Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)
% Children who became subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP) who are subject to a CPP for a second or subsequent time within 24 months.	<p>Less than 8%</p> <p>Green: Less than 8% Amber: 8 – 10% Red: Over 10%</p>	7%	24%	Red	Worse (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	<p>This is regularly monitored to ensure that children’s needs are met and to ensure that a child protection plan has not been ended prematurely beforehand.</p> <p>In Q4, four children came back onto a CPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 children (one family) had a change in family circumstances which resulted in the decision to step up to a Child Protection Plan; and • 1 child has appropriately been taken into pre-proceedings.
% Care Proceedings completed in 16/17 within 26 weeks of application	<p>60%</p> <p>Green: 60% Amber: Between 47% and 59.9% Red: Less than 47%</p>	52.9%	100% (Q3: 0%)	Green	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	<p>This is a national indicator.</p> <p>The data shows strong performance in Q4.</p>
% Looked After Children living within 20 miles of West of Berkshire	<p>70%</p> <p>Green: 70% or more Amber: 64-69.9% Red: Less than 64%</p>	63.9%	61.2% (Q3: 59.3%)	Red	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	<p>This figure will continue to be low until local provision and capacity is developed and new entrants into care are placed locally. We would not move already settled children to local placements in order to meet this target.</p> <p>All of those children living beyond 20 miles are placed through independent fostering agencies or in</p>

Community



							residential settings. Of those children in fostering placements, 75.5% are placed within 20 miles of Berkshire West. Of those children in non-fostering placements, 7.1% are placed within 20 miles of Berkshire West.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
% of children who wait less than 16 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family – 3 year rolling average	55% Green: 55% or above Amber: 50% to 54.9% Red: Less than 50%	2012 – 2015 rolling three year average: 40%	-	N/A	N/A	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	The DfE continue to review the frequency of data releases. The expected December data release did not take place. The next release is now expected in Summer 2017**.
 Suggested alternate indicator in the absence of DfE data: Children placed in the financial year to date – average number of days between entering care and placement (using FfA placement date if applicable) (Source: Adopt Berkshire Steering Group Report, Q3)	487 days Green: 487 days or less Red: More than 487 days	TBC	Not yet available (Q3: 464 days)	N/A	N/A	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Awaiting publication of the Adopt Berkshire Steering Group Report, Q4.
Proportion of adoptive families who are matched to a child who waited more than 3 months from approval to being matched to a child	52% Green: 52% or less Amber: 52% to 60% Red: More than 60%	14/15 Actual: 83%	Not yet available	N/A	N/A	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	The DfE continue to review the frequency of data releases. The expected December data release did not take place. The next release is now expected in Summer 2017***.

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
<p>*** Suggested alternate indicator in the absence of DfE data:</p> <p>Children matched in the financial year to date – average number of days between Placement Order and formal match. (Source: Adopt Berkshire Steering Group Report, Q3)</p>	<p>121 days</p> <p>Green: 121 days or less</p> <p>Red: More than 121 days</p>	TBC	Not yet available (Q3: 78 days)	N/A	N/A	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Awaiting publication of the Adopt Berkshire Steering Group Report, Q4.

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
38 % CP Visits due in the period which were on-time (within 10 days of the previous visit).	82% Green: 82% or more Amber: 78% to 81.9% Red: Less than 78%	80%	84.4% (Q3: 79.7%)	Green	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	<p>This is an improving picture. Visits are reviewed by Team and Service Managers weekly and late reviews are scrutinised by managers with any concerns being escalated as appropriate.</p> <p>98% of all visits took place within 15 working days in Q4 (compared to 94% in Q3), delays between 10 and 15 days mainly relating to attempted unannounced visits taking place where the family were not at home.</p> <p>The Head of Service is assured that we have an account of all the children not seen within 15 working days, and the reasons for this, and that children are seen/safe.</p>
Percentage of reablement packages of care ceased in the period where reablement was successful	Improve compared to 15-16: 60% Green: 60% or more Amber: 55% to 59.9% Red: Less than 55%	60.2%	73.7% (Q3: 71.4%)	Green	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden / Julian McGhee-Sumner	

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Care Governance: Number of providers assessed as Amber or Red or changed from Amber to Red that came onto Wokingham LA's Cautions list in the period 39	To decrease the number of providers compared to 15/16 Green: Less than 12 providers at year end Amber: 12 to 14 providers at year end Red: More than 14 providers at year end	Domiciliary Care: 3 Residential/ Nursing Care: 11 Other: 4	Domiciliary Care: 0 Residential /Nursing Care: 1 Other: 0	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: auto;">Green</div>	Same (as Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Julian McGhee-Sumner	
Care Governance: Number of providers on Wokingham LA's Caution list changing from Red to Amber or removed from the list	To increase the number of providers compared to 15/16 Green: 11 or more providers at year end Amber: 9-10 providers at year end Red: less than 9 providers at year end	Domiciliary Care: 2 Residential/ Nursing Care: 11 Other: 3	Domiciliary Care: 0 Residential /Nursing Care: 3 Other: 0	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: auto;">Green</div>	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Julian McGhee-Sumner	

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr.4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
40 SHINE participants - physical activity programme for adults 60 and over living in the Wokingham Borough.	<p>Increase by 10% to 1980 participants (495 per quarter)</p> <p>Green – 495 and above Amber – 300-495 Red – 300 and under</p> <p>This may change if we meet our target after the first 2 quarters for example.</p>	1800	59	Green	Better	Judith Ramsden / Julian McGhee-Sumner	We have already achieved the 10% increase so this is an increase in total for this original target.
Leisure Centre Attendance Numbers	<p>Increase by 3% to 565,211 (141,303 per quarter)</p> <p>Green – 141,303 or over Amber – 50,000 – 141,303 Red – 50,000 or below</p> <p>This may change if we meet our target after the first 2 quarters for example.</p>	548,749	254,880	Green	Better	Judith Ramsden /Angus Ross	

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
<p>Percentage of housing stock which meets decent homes standard (Percentage of stock that meet the Decent Homes standard - with Gorse Ride South and Tape Lane properties excluded)</p> <p>11</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>90-100% is Green. 70-80% is Amber. <70% is Red.</p>	90%	98%	<p>Green</p>	Worse	Graham Ebers / Julian McGhee-Sumner	<p>The percentage of housing stock that meets the Decent Homes Standard has increased to 98% at the end of the 4th quarter. This means there are 46 properties left in the housing stock that do not meet the standard.</p> <p>At the end of the financial year a number of properties will fall out of the Decent Homes Standard, hence the 1% drop in Decency. This is expected by the Housing Service.</p>

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
% of formal Homelessness decisions (Part VII of the Housing Act 1996) in the quarter that are made within 45 working days and at the snapshot count at the end of each quarter % of initial emergency temporary accommodation placements for families made out of Borough (OBP). 42	70% within 45 days (higher is better) 70-100% is Green 50-70% is Amber <50% is Red	78%	Q4 80% Q3 71% Q2 78%	Green		Graham Ebers / Julian McGhee-Sumner	80% is a reflection of the large effort made during the quarter to conclude applications as swiftly as possible.
	</=60% (OBP) (lower is better) 0-60% = Green 60-70% = Amber 70%+ = Red	50%	37%	Green		Graham Ebers / Julian McGhee-Sumner	The reduction in percentage of Out of Borough placements reflects the continued emphasis on creative solutions together with the ongoing slight increase in available alternatives and are ongoing strategic aim to provide more local temporary accommodation

Community



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Fosters	October 2017	Green	No change	Judith Ramsden/ Julian McGhee- Sumner	
Integration with Health (Better Care Fund) 43	TBC	Green	No change	Judith Ramsden/ Julian McGhee Sumner	31/03/17 31/03/17 -Budget for 17/18 currently under review for sign off. Night Response service has ceased, Changes are being made to the Step Up Step Down programme to reflect learning from the pilot and to better meet need for timely discharges from Hospital. There is a draft PID for a proposal for Step Upp beds within Wokingham Community hospital. 3 rd quarter report still stands - for delayed transfer figures has Wokingham RAG rated green; WISH service progressing well. Reviewed CHASC PID has been agreed in principle by partner agency boards, final amendments are being made prior to submission at HWBB in April/May for final approval and progression of this scheme. Integrated Hub progressing to phase 2 for WBC is a work in progress. Slough are going the Hub as planned, implementation date of April 2017, commencing with GP referrals to the Hub. Review of Step Down beds completed, for consideration by the WISP management board. Awaiting guidance and template for the annual return for BCF, paper for H&WB Board for April

Community



44					<p>2017.meeting.</p> <p>11.01.17 -Budget for 17/19 currently under review for sign off. Night Response service is being recommended to cease at the close of the (extended) pilot period 26.01.17, the need is lower than anticipated and therefore does not provide a cost effective service. Changes are being made to the Step Up Step Down programme to reflect learning from the pilot and to better meet need for timely discharges from Hospital, as well as looking to promote Step Up in a more suitable environment ideally with medical equipment/staff on hand. 3rd quarter report for delayed transfer figures has Wokingham RAG rated green; WISH service progressing well. Reviewed CHASC PID has been agreed in principle by partner agency boards, final amendments are being made prior to submission at HWBB in February for final approval and progression of this scheme. Integrated Hub progressing to phase 2 for WBC (transfer of additional comms – emails, faxes). Slough target implementation date of April 2017, commencing with GP referrals to the Hub.</p> <p>2016-17 BCF plan approved by Department of Health Local 2016-17Section 75 agreement signed with CCG governing pooled funding, progress on key elements of the programme including: Head of Service jointly appointed for the integrated short term team has progressed integration in the short term team. Connected Care IT project tender phase 3 completed</p>
----	--	--	--	--	--

Community



					and WBC implementation plan underway. Integrated Social Care and Health Hub went live early June 16; Night Response service commenced late April 16 and pilot scheme has been reviewed and will be re-commissioned until end of January 17. Positive quarter 1 and 2 performance regarding Delayed Transfers of Care, significantly below target and best performance in Berks West, and gradual improvement in non-elective admissions with improved performance expected in 3 rd and 4 th quarters.
--	--	--	--	--	---

45

Community



Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Number of cycle trips on the A329 corridor (LSTF project investment area) 46	11% => 11% = Green 6%-11% = Amber <= 6% = Red	19%	0.17% Annual Return	Red	Better	Josie Wragg /Malcolm Richards	Cycling on the A329 is measured at 8 sites for a set week during the summer. The same data is collected year on year so that a comparison can be made. The nature of the one week survey and the results are weather dependent. The percentage is the increase in cycle numbers relative to the baseline surveys undertaken in 2013. Unfortunately the weather during the survey period for 16/17 was very inclement and the results are therefore indicative of this, however there is still a slight increase in the total number of cyclists recorded in the 16/17 survey when compared with the baseline in 2013 We are looking at alternative method of collecting data over a longer period to reduce the impact relating to seasonal conditions..

Community



Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
4 % Primary Schools with a Current Ofsted Rating of "Good" or better.	Improvement Green: Improvement or 100% Amber: No Change compared to previous quarter Red: Deterioration compared to previous quarter.	86% (as of 31 March 2016)	92% (Q3: 90%)	Green	Better	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Performance has increased in Q4 by 2% compared to Q3. The inspection outcome for 1 primary school has been published this quarter: Lambs Lane – Good, previously RI

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
48 % Secondary Schools with a current Ofsted rating of "good" or better.	Improvement Green: Improvement or 100% Amber: No Change compared to previous quarter Red: Deterioration compared to previous quarter	89% (as of 31 March 2016)	89% (Q3: 89%)	Amber	No change	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	No change from Q3. No secondary school inspection outcomes released in Q4.

Community



<p>49</p> <p>% Special Schools with a current Ofsted rating of "good" or better.</p>	<p>Improvement Green: Improvement or 100% Amber: No Change compared to previous quarter Red: Deterioration compared to previous quarter</p>	<p>100% (as of 31 March 2016)</p>	<p>100% (Q3: 66%)</p>	<p>Green</p>	<p>Better</p>	<p>Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor</p>	<p>In Q3, performance for this indicator was 66% due to Southfield School being found "inadequate" in Q1.</p> <p>Southfield School has now closed, and Northern House School opened on the same site in January 2017. The figure for Special Schools with an Ofsted rating of "good" or better in Q4 is 100% as Northern House School has yet to be inspected.</p> <p>Addington School currently has an "Outstanding" rating and High Close School is rated "Good".</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	---------------	---	---

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
<p>Children who attend a Wokingham school (Primary, Secondary or Special) who are at a school with an Ofsted rating of “good” or better.</p> <p>50</p>	<p>Improvement</p> <p>Green: Improvement or 100%</p> <p>Amber: No Change compared to previous quarter</p> <p>Red: Deterioration compared to previous quarter</p>	<p>90% (as of 31 March 2016)</p>	<p>89% (Q3:88%)</p>	<p>Green</p>	<p>Better (than Q3)</p>	<p>Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor</p>	<p>Improvement from Q3 by 1%. Inspection outcome for 1 school has been published in this quarter.</p> <p>Lambs Lane – Good, previously RI</p>

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
51 Number of schools causing concern	0 schools	5 schools	5 schools (Q3: 7 schools)	N/A	Better (than Q3)	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	At the end of Q4, there were 4 schools with a “requires improvement (RI)” judgement and 1 school with an “inadequate” Ofsted judgement: RI - Forest, Bearwood, Keep Hatch, Gorse Ride Junior Inadequate – Coombes (Note that Southfield School, which as judged “inadequate” in Q1 has closed, replaced by Northern House School which opened on the same site in January 2017, and has not yet been inspected).

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
52 Number of schools becoming academies	10 schools (expectation at end of 15/16)	1 school	0 schools (Q3: 0 schools)	N/A	N/A	Judith Ramsden/ Charlotte Haitham Taylor	This indicator was introduced because of the expected increase in the rate of academy conversions following the publication of the White Paper “Educational Excellence Everywhere” in March 2016 which set a target that all schools convert to academies by 2022. Since then, however, the government proposals for academy conversion have changed. In Q4 no schools were becoming academies. However, Southfield School, which was found “inadequate” in Q1, has closed, and an Academy, Northern House School, opened on the same site in January 2017.

Community



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
53 Secondary School in the South	September 2017	Green	No Change	Josie Wragg / Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Project on programme and within budget

Community



Provide affordable homes

Key Indicators

Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director/ Executive Member	Commentary
Number of affordable dwellings permitted (including where an offsite contribution received) (annual) 54	Green 200 Amber 180-199 Red less than 180	321	15 (Q4) 171 (Q3) 139 (Q2) 12 (Q1) (total for year = 337)	Green	Better	Josie Wragg / Julian McGhee-Sumner / Mark Ashwell	The target within the new Housing Strategy 2015 – 2018 is to complete 1000 new affordable homes in the next 3 years. Figure is for new permissions granted (i.e. outline and full).

Community



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director/ Executive Member	Commentary
Number of affordable dwellings completed (annual) 55	230 Green – 230 or above Amber – between 181 to 229 completions Red – below 180 completions	123	Total for year = 212 30 Q4 (92 Q3) (39 Q2) (51 Q1)	Amber	Better	Josie Wragg / Julian McGhee-Sumner	<p>There have been 212 affordable housing completions this year. Whilst this figure is below our target of 230, it is a significant improvement on last year and one of the highest figures achieved in any yearly period.</p> <p>These figures are based on the most up to date information which is provided by RPs, who are in turn informed by developers. Whilst we closely monitor this data and meet with RPs each quarter to discuss development programmes, slippage on several sites has meant that completions which were expected during this financial year, are now likely to take place early 2017/18.</p> <p>Our target within the 2015 – 18 Housing Strategy is for 1000 affordable housing completions. Should there be a number of additional windfall sites coming forward we could still meet this target.</p>

Community



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Phoenix Avenue (formerly Eustace Crescent)	Spring/Summer 2017	Green	No change	Judith Ramsden / Julian McGhee-Sumner	

Place



Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director /Executive Member	Commentary
Kgs of residual household waste per household per annum – <i>The Kgs of residual waste that are NOT sent for recycling eg. Waste to energy</i>	665 = G 680 = A 700 = R	709	698 (e)	Amber	Better	Josie Wragg / Angus Ross	This estimated figure reflects an improvement on 2015/16 and reflects a reduction of residual waste overall.
Percentage of household waste reuse, recycling and composting	42% = G 40% = A 39% = R	38%	40.00% (e)	Amber	Better	Josie Wragg/ Angus Ross	This provisional figure still shows a good improvement on 2015/16 but a slight and expected fall back in Q3 & Q4 due to lower collected garden waste.

Place



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
<p>Street Lighting Upgrade Project: Joint procurement with Slough and Reading BC's to replace approx. 8100 aging WBC street lighting columns and install more than 12,500 low energy LED lanterns, approx. 5200 of which on existing columns. The project also includes approx. 2300 conversions of recently installed lanterns from traditional lamps to LED's. The successful contractor is Volker Highways. The project includes relevant WBC non-highway street lighting assets and the Town and Parish Councils, who own street lighting, are being given the opportunity to be included. 70% of the project will be funded by a DfT Challenge Fund grant - up to £8.12m.</p>	March 2018	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Green</div>	No Change	Josie Wragg / Malcolm Richards	The project is proceeding well with 81% (4186) of Lantern Replacements completed and 27% (2190) of Column Replacements completed. To match resource levels and the works in the other two boroughs, the contractor has "front loaded" the WBC project with lantern replacement work and is expecting to have the majority of these done in the early part of 2017/18. Column replacements will continue to the end of the project in March 2018. Both are currently on target. Heritage style units have now been included in the project. Of the 14 Town & Parish Councils that own street lighting 1 is not likely to be relevant for the project (Remenham), 1 has currently only expressed an interest to participate (Earley) and 12 have confirmed the works they wish to be included. The Comms Plan is being implemented and a project specific web

Place



					page is available on the WBC Web Site.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and are supported by well-designed development

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
59 Five year housing supply	100% 100% = Green 98.5% = Amber 98% and below = Red	112%	Below 98.5%	Amber	Worse	Josie Wragg / Mark Ashwell	In two recent planning appeals (Stanbury House and Park Lane) the Inspectors concluded that housing need was higher than suggested in the Berkshire (Including South Bucks) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and that the deliverable housing land supply was lower. The combined result leading to the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply of deliverable sites. Following legal advice, an oral hearing was made to challenge the Stanbury House decision through the High Court. The oral hearing was made however this matter is still ongoing with a future date to attend the high court to be scheduled.

Place



						<p>The council is currently maintaining the position that it can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply using the SHMA and the latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which indicates the Council has a 5.5 year supply of housing at 31 March 2016.</p> <p>To reflect the end of the last monitoring year, a full update of the land supply position has started. No initial output is currently available but the indicative position is amber.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Place



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
New Homes Survey which is monitored annually - % satisfied with their new home (annual)	80% Amber – 70-79% Red – below 70%	80%	84% (2017 survey)	Green	Better	Josie Wragg / Mark Ashwell	Completed annually. The New Homes Survey is an annual survey used to evaluate the effectiveness of our local planning policies by assessing satisfaction with new homes. The survey covers areas such as storage, parking, both inside and outside space and proximity to local facilities and amenities. The results help to identify where policies are working well and where issues maybe occurring. This helps to inform new housing developments and the development of our planning policies in the future. Overall satisfaction levels have tended to be fairly high. With 80% being achieved in last year’s survey in 2016, we have again experienced high satisfaction levels this year of 84%. The detailed results from this year’s survey should be available over the next couple of months.

Place



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
% of S106 which is allocated against schemes	<p>Green 90% & above</p> <p>Amber 80% to 89%</p> <p>Red Below 80%</p>	90%	98% (Q3 94%)	Green	Better	Josie Wragg / Mark Ashwell	<p>Q4 allocation is improvement on Q3.</p> <p>Q3 = 94%</p>

62

Place



Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel	Strategic Director/ Executive Member	Commentary
Journey times on key routes across the Borough (reported Annually (in arrears)- Q4 only) Average time in minutes to travel one mile in the morning peak period across all chosen routes.	2.96 and less = Green Between 3.60 & 2.96 = Amber 3.60 or more = Red	3.14	N/A <i>Data only available yearly in arrears.</i>	N/A	N/A	Josie Wragg / Malcom Richards	<p><i>The data is only available annually, is a year in arrears, and will cover the period September to August. Data for 15/16 will not be available until the March 2017.</i></p> <p>The benchmark of 2.96 minutes is the average time to travel 1 mile as observed in 2011/12. The indicator is an indication of congestion across the network during the morning peak period (average Tues to Thurs across the year excluding holiday). The longer it takes to travel a mile the more congested the network is, relative to the travel conditions in 2011/12. The 'target' is for this average time to travel 1 mile not to increase. 3.60 minutes equates to an average speed of circa 20mph. This would therefore be the RED RAG, between this and the benchmark would be AMBER. 2.96 or less would be GREEN.</p>

Performance



Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Key Indicators

Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Outturn	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Revenue Budget Monitoring Forecast Position	+/- 1% of £135M Budget inclusive £546k carry forwards from 15-16 (£1.35M) Green +/- 1% Amber +/- 1.5% Red +/- 2%	£454k	£55k underspend	Green	Better	Graham Ebers / Anthony Pollock	As reported to Executive on 25 May 2017.
Capital Budget Monitoring Forecast Position	Break- even (Nil variance) Red = +/- over 2.5% Amber = +/- over 1% to 2.5% Green = +/- 1%	£(1,871)k underspend	£(3,883)k underspend	Green	Better	Graham Ebers / Anthony Pollock	Variance is £ (3,883) k underspend as reported to Executive on 25 May 2017.

Performance



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Outturn	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Council tax collection	98.85% (Annual)	99.51%	99.60%	Green	Better	Graham Ebers/ Anthony Pollock	Exceeded Target
Business Rates collection	98.50% (Annual)	99.09%	99.70%	Green	Better	Graham Ebers/ Anthony Pollock	Exceeded Target
Rents collection	98.50% (Annual)	99.05%	98.79%	Green	Better	Graham Ebers/ Anthony Pollock	Collection rate is improving month on month

Performance



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Outturn	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Returns on investments	0.50% R below 0.30% A 0.30%- 0.5% G 0.5% and above	0.55	Q4 1.19 Q3 0.87 Q2 0.18 Q1 0.52	Green		Graham Ebers/ Anthony Pollock	Interest rate drop to 0.25% and a change in Fund manager deposits resulted in lower interest receipts. This has been more than offset by charges to internal schemes such as WHL. These has led to the target being exceeded by the end of the year.

Performance



67

Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Assets Programme	31/01/2018	Green	No change	Graham Ebers / Mark Ashwell	All Area Wide Reviews have been completed. The Model for Community Asset Transfer is adopted and the principles contained therein are being implemented in transfers to Town and Parish Councils. The principles of MCAT can now be incorporated within the Asset Management Plan for adoption post C21 Council.

Performance



Deliver quality in all that we do, including the statutory services for which we are responsible

Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better /Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
% of successfully defended appeal decisions (dismissed)	65% 65% or more = Green 61.75% - 64.99% = Amber Less than 61.75% = Red	73%	75% (Q3 67%)	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/ Mark Ashwell	Q3 – 67% Q2 = 70% 65% or more = Green 61.75% - 64.99% = Amber Less than 61.75% = Red Appeal decisions - target 5% above likely new Government target.

88

Performance



Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better /Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Proportion of planning breaches resolved by negotiation	50% 50% or more = Green 47.50% - 49.99% = Amber Less than 47.50% = Red	65%	83% (Q3 77%)	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/Mark Ashwell	50% or more = Green 47.50% - 49.99% = Amber Less than 47.50% = Red Q3 = 77% Q2 = 71% Planning enforcement – focus on negotiation to reflect focus of the new Local Planning Enforcement plan but more robust approach to taking action where necessary.

69

Performance



70

Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better /Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
% of service users satisfied with environmental regulatory services (shared service) Annual monitoring	80% 80% or more = Green 76% - 79.99% = Amber Less than 76% = Red	82%	Data not available for Q4 but Q3 rec'd and is 84%.	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/ Pauline Jorgensen	Q4 - Data for Q4 will not be available until the end of May 2017 because of the inherent time lag in submission of responses within each quarter. Q3 = 84% Q2 = 82% Q1 = 84% Data collected and supplied by West Berkshire. Environmental Shared Service – target 5% above standard set for shared service by Joint Strategic Review Panel.

Performance



Improve the customer experience when accessing Council Services							
Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director/ Executive Member	Commentary
% first contact resolution - calls and emails 71	65% 65% or more = Green 60% - 64.99% = Amber Less than 60% = Red	67.3%	70.3% (Q3 64%)	Green	Better	Graham Ebers/ Pauline Jorgensen	Now taking School Admissions calls to assist with high volume calls at peak times with aid of FAQ's. For those processes Customer Services directly control, the first time fix rate is higher at 92.7%.
The % of calls answered	95% 95% or more = Green 90% - 94.99% = Amber Less than 90% = Red	92.4%	94.5% (Q3 94.5%)	Amber	No Change	Graham Ebers/ Pauline Jorgensen	Signposting customers, to the website to undertake transactions has greatly reduced the length of some calls. So although we have had a 8.7% rise in calls from the same period last year our average abandonment rate has fallen by 1.1%.

Business



Invest in regenerating towns and village, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Key Indicators

Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
72 Number of NEET young people, aged 16-24 years, who have been given employment support	92 = G 78 = A > 78 = R	NA	Q1 44 Q2 20 Q3 41 Q4 26 Total 131	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/Stuart Munro	This is a new indicator 16/17. Indicator is based on outcome target for ESF funding for Elevate. Therefore no Actual 15/16 figure available
Number of opportunities (new employment, apprenticeships and graduate posts) negotiated through ESPs	60 = G 51 = A > 51 = R	NA	Q1 16 Q2 4 Q3 25 Q4 30 Total 75	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/Stuart Munro	This is a new indicator 16/17. Indicator based on based on predicted Employment Skills Plan negotiations on planning applications. Therefore no 'actual 15/16 figure available.
Number of new businesses engaged with	70 = G 60 = A > 60 = R	71	Q1 16 Q2 24 Q3 21 Q4 10 Total 71	Green	Better	Josie Wragg/Stuart Munro	Target based on last year's achievement.

Business



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/ Worse/ No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Wokingham Regen: Peach Place	2018	Green	No Change	Andy Couldrick / Mark Ashwell	Dawnus Construction Ltd started on site in January 2017. Work is progressing well with temporary lane closure in place until June 2017 to allow for demolition of buildings adjacent to highway. On target to complete for Christmas trading 2018.
Wokingham Regen: Elms Field	2020	Green	No Change	Andy Couldrick / Mark Ashwell	Process of procuring a build contractor is currently underway. Contractor is expected to be appointed and work to commence on site in summer 2018.
Wokingham Regen: Carnival Pool	2017 Phase 1 2020/21 Phase 2	Green	No Change	Andy Couldrick / Mark Ashwell	Phase 1 works progressing on site with cladding being put up around frame. Car park expected to open to public in May 2017. Design work for Phase 2 progressing in response to Leisure Strategy and Libraries Offer. Proposals to go out for 3 week public engagement end April to early May 2017 with a detailed planning application in early June.

Workforce



Key Indicators							
Indicator	Target (plus target range for RAG)	15/16 Actual	16/17 Qtr. 4 Actual	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
Turnover - Number of people voluntary leaving the service as a percentage of the service headcount	G: 15% - 20% A: 10% - 15% or 20% - 25% R: < 10% or >25%	15.29%	Q4 15.75% Q3 15.21% Q2 14.46% Q1 14.3 %	Green		Graham Ebers / Pauline Jorgensen	Turnover remains within acceptable range but is being monitored due to ongoing uncertainty. There's a +1%/-1% tolerance on this indicator so it remains Green for Q4
Absence - Average days lost to sickness absence per employee (headcount) within the last 12 months	G: <= 6.6 days A: 6.7 - 7.5 days R: > 7.5 days	5.33	Q4 6.47 Q3 5.75 Q2 5.63 Q1 5.43	Green		Graham Ebers / Pauline Jorgensen	
Workforce Satisfaction - Percentage of the workforce that is either satisfied or very satisfied with working for WBC	G: >=80% A: 70% - 80% R: < 70%	83.9%	N/A	Green	N/A	Graham Ebers / Pauline Jorgensen	This is taken from our bi-annual employee satisfaction survey and relates to the question "I enjoy working here and would recommend it to friends & family, either agree or disagree"

Workforce



Major Projects					
Project	Estimated Completion Date	RAG	Direction of Travel (Better/Worse/No change)	Strategic Director / Executive Member	Commentary
75 People Strategy	31 March 2020	Green	No Change	Graham Ebers / Pauline Jorgensen	The people strategy remains on target with key milestones being delivered against initial plans. Work packages and timescales are continually being considered against the developing proposals of the 21C programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Community				
Look after Vulnerable People				
% referrals in 16/17 which are repeat referrals within 12 months of a previous referral to Children’s Social Care	18.96%	24% or Less	Green: 24% or less Amber: 24.1% to 26% Red: Over 26%	Stat Neighbours with a “Good” Ofsted rating under the single inspection framework 14/15 Performance: 24.2% Target chosen with the aim of maintaining the improved performance achieved in 2015-16 and to perform in line with our statistical neighbours who received a “good” judgement at their most recent Ofsted Inspection.
% Children who became subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP) who are subject to a CPP for a second or subsequent time within 24 months	7% Number of Children: 8 of 114	Less than 8%	Green: Less than 8% Amber: 8 – 10% Red: Over 10%	Stat Neighbours 14/15 Performance: 18.53% based on the DfE definition – all children becoming subject of a CPP for a second or subsequent time in their lifetime. We saw a higher number of children becoming subject to a CPP in 2015-16 in WBC area. Although the target percentage is the same as 15-16 performance, due to the predicted lower number of overall children coming on a child protection plan (we estimate that 60 children will come onto plan in 16/17) this target aims to decrease the actual number of children in the year subject to CPP for a second or subsequent time. In 16/17 we expect 8% to equate to approximately 5 children.
% Care Proceedings completed in 15/16 within 26 weeks of application	52.9%	60%	Green: 60% Amber: Between 47% and 59.9% Red: Less than 47%	15/16 South East Performance: 47.4% 15/16 National Performance: 58% National Target is 100%

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
% Looked After Children living within 20 miles of Berkshire West	63.9%	70%	Green: 70% or more Amber: 64-69.9% Red: Less than 64%	Percentage of children placed within 20 miles of home address as at 31 st March 2015: National Performance: 76.9% South East Performance: 68.8% Stat Neighbours Performance:66% “Good” Stat Neighbours Performance: 69.4% Target is set with the aim of continued improvement to perform in line with our statistical neighbours who received a “good” judgement at their most recent Ofsted Inspection.
89 % of children who wait less than 16 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family – 3 year rolling average	40% - 2012-2015 rolling three year average	55%	Green: 55% or above Amber: 50% to 54.9% - Red: Less than 50%	Stat Neighbours with a “Good” Ofsted rating under the single inspection framework:2012-2015 rolling three year average 54.6% Target is set with the aim of continued improvement to perform in line with our statistical neighbours who received a “good” judgement at their most recent Ofsted Inspection.
Proportion of adoptive families who are matched to a child who waited more than 3 months from approval to being matched to a child	Not Yet Available 14/15 Actual: 83%	52%	Green: 52% or less Amber: 52% to 60% Red: More than 60%	52.2% Stat Neighbours with a “Good” Ofsted rating under the single inspection framework 14/15: 52.2% Target is set with the aim of continued improvement to perform in line with our statistical neighbours who received a “good” judgement at their most recent Ofsted Inspection.

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
% CP Visits due in the period which were on-time.	80%	82%	Green: 82% or more Amber: 78% to 81.9% Red: Less than 78%	Local Indicator – No comparative data available nationally or regionally. Target set to ensure that children who are identified as being at significant risk are visited regularly, within prescribed timescales and any delays in visiting timescales only occur up to a maximum of 5 working days with a justifiable reason, approved by Service Managers.
Percentage of reablement packages of care ceased in the period where reablement was successful	New indicator	TBC after Q1	TBC after Q1	This is a local indicator to assess the success of reablement by monitoring the percentage of reablement packages of care that ended in the period where the individual was fully or part reabled.
Care Governance: Number of providers that came onto Wokingham LA's Cautions list assessed as Amber or Red or changed from Amber to Red in the period	Domiciliary Care: 3 Residential/Nursing Care: 11 Other: 4	To decrease the number of providers compared to 15/16	Green: Reduction Amber: No change Red: Increase	This is a local indicator to monitor the improvement in the quality of services and safeguarding in the Local Authority area and aims to maintain high standards of care. No new packages of care will be commissioned with a provider assessed as red and packages of care will be arranged with caution with a provider assessed as amber.
Care Governance: Number of providers on Wokingham LA's Caution list changing from Red to Amber or removed from the list	Domiciliary Care: 2 Residential/Nursing Care: 11 Other: 3	To increase the number of providers compared to 15/16	Green: Increase Amber: No change Red: Decrease	

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
SHINE participants - physical activity programme for adults 60 and over living in the Wokingham Borough lead through the Sport and Leisure Team at WBC.	1800	Increase by 10% to 1980 participants (495 per quarter)	<p>Green – 495 and above</p> <p>Amber – 300-495</p> <p>Red – 300 and under</p> <p>This may change if we meet our target after the first 2 quarters for example.</p>	<p>This is a physical activity programme for adults 60 and over living in the Wokingham Borough lead through the Sport and Leisure Team at WBC, revenue from the classes back to the council.</p> <p>It has been in place since 2000 and is a WBC initiative only.</p>

08

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Leisure Centre Attendance Numbers for-Loddon Valley, Carnival, St Crispin’s and Bulmershe.	548,749	Increase by 3% to 565,211 (141,303 per quarter)	<p>Green – 141,303 or over</p> <p>Amber – 50,000 – 141,303</p> <p>Red – 50,000 or below</p> <p>This may change if we meet our target after the first 2 quarters for example.</p>	All leisure centres bring revenue into the council, managed by 1life with the contract management with sport and leisure.
Percentage of housing stock which meets decent homes standard (Percentage of stock that meet the Decent Homes standard - with Gorse Ride South and Tape Lane properties excluded)	90%	100%	<p>90-100% is Green.</p> <p>70-80% is Amber.</p> <p><70% is Red.</p>	The figure provides a percentage of the social housing stock that meets the Decent Homes Standard; a programme aimed at improving council homes to bring them all up to a minimum standard. There are a large number of components that make up the Decent Standard, which means properties will fall out of the Standard at various points throughout the year. The 90-100% Decency rate is considered a high level of Decency.

91

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
<p>% of formal Homelessness decisions (Part VII of the Housing Act 1996) in the quarter that are made within 45 working days and at the snapshot count at the end of each quarter.</p>	<p>78%</p>	<p>70% (higher is better)</p>	<p>70 -100% - Green 50-70% - Amber <50% - Red</p>	<p>This is a local indicator. Time taken to make a formal decision under Part VII of the Housing Act 1996 has a bearing on the customer experience and also on the council’s finances and use of resources. The target of 70% for 16/17 has been set taking into account the recent increase in homelessness numbers and expected continuation of high numbers.</p>
<p>% of initial emergency temporary accommodation placements for families made out of Borough (OBP).</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>60% (lower is better)</p>	<p>0-60% - Green 60-70% - Amber 70%-100% - Red</p>	<p>This is a local indicator. We seek to avoid placements out of Borough (OBPs) wherever possible due to the disruption to peoples’ lives. OBPs are more expensive than other forms of temporary accommodation and so are minimised wherever possible. Going forward WBC have a strategy for increasing the portfolio of in-Borough provision and so we anticipate that in coming years the need for OBPs will reduce.</p>
<p>Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life</p>				
<p>Number of cycle trips on the A329 corridor (LSTF project investment area)</p>	<p>19%</p>	<p>11%</p>	<p>=> 11% = Green 6%-11% = Amber <= 6% = Red</p>	<p>Cycling on the A329 is measured at 8 sites for a set week during the summer. That same data is collected year on year so that a comparison can be made</p>

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential				
% Primary schools with a current Ofsted Rating of “Good” or better	86% (as of 31 March 2016)	Improve ment	Green: Improvement or 100% Amber: No Change Red: Deterioration	National Performance – 86.5% (as of 31 st March 2016) Target set to promote consistent improvement over time – tending towards 100% Note that performance will depend on schools being inspected and inspection reports being published during the period, over which the LA has no control. The results of schools inspected during the period will be included with the commentary each quarter.
% Secondary Schools with a current Ofsted rating of “good” or better	89% (as of 31 March 2016)	Improve ment	Green: Improvement or 100% Amber: No Change Red: Deterioration	National Performance - 76% (as of 31 March 2016) Target set to promote consistent improvement over time – tending towards 100% Note that performance will depend on schools being inspected and inspection reports being published during the period, over which the LA has no control. The results of schools inspected during the period will be included with the commentary each quarter.

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
<p>% Special Schools with a current Ofsted rating of “good” or better</p>	<p>100% (as of 31 March 2016) – maintained special schools only</p> <p>100% (as of 31 March 2016) – including non-maintained special schools.</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Green: Maintenance of 100% performance</p> <p>Red: Less than 100%</p>	<p>National Performance – 93% (as of 31st March 2016) (Note that this figure includes the non-maintained special schools. No data is available for maintained special schools only).</p> <p>Target set to promote maintenance of 100% performance as at 31 March 2016.</p> <p>Note that performance will depend on schools being inspected and inspection reports being published during the period, over which the LA has no control. The results of schools inspected during the period will be included with the commentary each quarter.</p>
<p>% Children who attend a Wokingham school (Primary, Secondary or Special) who are at a school with an Ofsted rating of “good” or better.</p>	<p>90% (as of 31 March 2016)</p>	<p>Improve ment</p>	<p>Green: Improvement or 100%</p> <p>Amber: No Change</p> <p>Red: Deterioration</p>	<p>National (as at 31 Dec 15 – data published twice yearly in December/January and August/September): 82%</p> <p>Note that this figure includes ALL providers – nursery, pupil referral unit, primary, secondary and special schools – figure for combined primary, secondary and special is not available nationally</p> <p>Target set to promote consistent improvement over time – tending towards 100%</p> <p>Note that performance will depend on schools being inspected and inspection reports being published during the period, over which the LA has no control. The results of schools inspected during the period will be included with the commentary each quarter.</p>
<p>Number of schools causing concern</p>	<p>5 Schools</p>	<p>5 Schools</p>		<p>LA School Improvement work aims to identify and reduce numbers of schools causing concern to achieve overall % in good or better</p>

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Number of schools becoming academies	1 School	10 Schools		Schools in special measures must become academies Coasting schools may be subject to academy orders LA MAT developments could potentially produce a step-change in academy numbers Good or better schools have indicated intentions to convert in 2016-17 (estimated 6) Overall target for 2016-17 is 10.
Provide affordable homes				
Number of affordable dwellings permitted (including where an offsite contribution received) (annual)	321	200	Green 200 or above Amber – 180-199 Red – less than 180	The target within the new Housing Strategy 2015 – 2018 is to complete 1000 new affordable homes in the next 3 years. Figure is for new permissions granted (i.e. outline and full).
Number of affordable dwellings completed (annual)	123	230	Green – 230 or above Amber – between 181 to 229 completions Red – below 180 completions	The target within the Housing Strategy 2015 – 2018 is to complete 1000 new affordable homes within this 3 year period. Whilst the number of completions was lower than expected in 2015/16, as development progresses within the larger SDL sites we are anticipating about 600 completions during 2017/18. There may be further schemes that we are not yet aware of and therefore, the 1,000 target may still be achievable. Predictions are liable to change and are based on the best available information provided by Registered Providers and developers at the beginning of each year. Officers hold quarterly meetings with the RPs to closely monitor the delivery programme.

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Place				
Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency				
Kgs of residual household waste per household per annum	709	665	665 = G 680 = A 700 = R	Residual waste has increased over the last two years. However, we are retaining the existing RAG targets in order to maintain our commitment to reducing residual waste and its financial impact on the Council. The Council’s task and finish group is working through waste collection options that will be brought to the Executive in the Autumn.
Percentage of household waste reuse, recycling and composting	38%	42%	42% = G 40% = A 39% = R	The rate of recycling is declining nationally. The Council has recently adopted a strategy to increase kerbside recycling which will contribute to the 2020 statutory target of 50%. Therefore we have retained the same targets despite last year’s reduction.
Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and are supported by well-designed development				
Five year housing supply - To help with boosting the supply of housing, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to identify and keep up-to-date a deliverable five year housing land supply. Without this, even recently adopted planning policies for the supply of housing will be considered out of date (as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 49).	112%	100%	100% = Green 98.5% = Amber 98% and below = Red	Need to maintain at least a 5 year housing land supply, which currently includes a 20% buffer. Information is published in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (currently published twice a year). Next update to be published by October 2016– numbers are being finalised. As soon as the supply of housing drops below five years it should change to red, however we have a mechanism (where we rely upon ‘reserve’ housing sites) in order to ‘bump’ the supply back up to five years.

88

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
New Homes Survey which is monitored annually - % satisfied with their new home (annual)	80%	80%	Amber – 70-79% Red – below 70%	Completed annually. The New Homes Survey is an annual survey used to evaluate the effectiveness of our local planning policies by assessing satisfaction with new homes. The survey covers areas such as storage, parking, both inside and outside space and proximity to local facilities and amenities. The results help to identify where policies are working well and where issues maybe occurring. This helps to inform new housing developments and the development of our planning policies in the future. Overall satisfaction levels have tended to be fairly high. With 80% being achieved in last year’s survey, we are anticipating a similar result in the next survey. The next survey is due to be undertaken in early 2017.
% of S106 which is allocated against schemes	90%	90%	Green 90% & above Amber 80% to 89% Red Below 80%	The RAG is an ambitious stretch target to focus service areas on delivery of infrastructure projects at an early stage.
Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough				

87

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

<p>Journey times on key routes across the Borough (reported Annually (in arrears)- Q4 only)</p> <p><i>Average time in minutes to travel one mile in the morning peak period across all</i></p>	<p>3.14</p>		<p>2.96 and less = Green Between 3.60 & 2.96 = Amber 3.60 or more = Red</p>	<p><i>The data is only available annually, is a year in arrears, and will cover the period September to August. Data for 15/16 will not be available until the March 2017.</i></p> <p>The benchmark of 2.96 minutes is the average time to travel 1 mile as observed in 2011/12. The indicator is an indication of congestion across the network during the morning peak period (average Tues to Thurs across the year excluding holiday). The longer it takes to travel a mile the more congested the network is, relative to the travel conditions in 2011/12. The 'target' is for this average time to travel 1 mile not to increase. 3.60 minutes equates to an average speed of circa 20mph. This would therefore be the RED RAG, between this and the benchmark would be AMBER. 2.96 or less would be GREEN.</p>
--	--------------------	--	--	--

08

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Performance				
Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Offer excellent value for your Council Tax				
Revenue Budget Monitoring Forecast Position	£454k	+/- 1% of £135M Budget inclusive £546k carry forwards from 15-16 (£1.35M)	Red +/- 2% Amber +/- 1.5% Green +/- 1%	The 1% target was identified as an indicator of how well WBC manages the overall budget. WBC has consistently been within this target but as WBC faces greater financial pressures this will become more challenging. 1% variance is £1.35m (approximately 15% of General Fund Balances); a 2% variance is £2.7m (approximately 30% of General Fund Balances).
Capital Budget Monitoring Forecast Position	£(1,871)k underspend	Break-even (Nil variance)	Red = +/- over 2.5% Amber = +/- over 1% to 2.5% Green = +/- 1%	The 1% target was identified as an indicator of how well WBC manages the overall budget. As WBC faces greater financial pressures in future years this will become more challenging. 1% variance is £1.5m; a 2.5% variance is £3.7m.
Council Tax Collection	99.51%	98.85%	R below 98.80% A 98.80 - 98.84% G 98.85% and above	Level of previous years' performance less contingency for known risks, i.e. changes to Council Tax Reduction Scheme and changing economy

68

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Business Rates Collection	99.09%	98.50%	R below 98.40% A 98.40 – 98.49% G 98.50% and above	Level of previous years’ performance less contingency for known risks, i.e. impact from changing economy
Rents Collection	99.05%	98.50%	R below 98.40% A 98.40 – 98.49% G 98.50% and above	Level of previous years’ performance less contingency for known risks, i.e. impact of universal credit, benefit cap
Returns on external investment of cash	0.55	0.50%	R below 0.30% A 0.30%- 0.5% G 0.5% and above	Thresholds with the reduction of the base rate in Aug 15 – most investments are already locked in for the financial year at higher than base

06

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Deliver quality in all that we do, including the statutory services for which we are responsible				
% of successfully defended appeal decisions (dismissed)	73%	65%	65% or more = Green 61.75% - 64.99% = Amber Less than 61.75% = Red	Appeal decisions - target 5% above likely new Government target.
Proportion of planning breaches resolved by negotiation	65%	50%	50% or more = Green 47.50% - 49.99% = Amber Less than 47.50% = Red	Planning enforcement – focus on negotiation to reflect focus of the new Local Planning Enforcement plan but more robust approach to taking action where necessary.
% of service users satisfied with environmental regulatory services (shared service) Annual monitoring.	82%	80%	80% or more = Green 76% - 79.99% = Amber Less than 76% = Red	Environmental Shared Service – target is set at 5% above standard set for shared service by Joint Strategic Review Panel. Data collected and supplied by West Berkshire.

16

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Improve the customer experience when accessing Council Services				
% first contact resolution - calls and emails	67.3%	65%	65% or more = Green 60% - 64.99% = Amber Less than 60% = Red	Aim to maximise first time resolution, at first point of contact. As technology is developed and 21 st C Council implemented, it is likely that actuals will increase. This will impact on call durations, making them potentially longer at first point, but enhancing experience.
The % of calls answered	92.4%	95%	95% or more = Green 90% - 94.99% = Amber Less than 90% = Red	Within industry standard target range. 3-8% call abandonment is standard; 3-5% is best practice.

92

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Business				
Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Invest in regenerating towns and village, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth				
Number of NEET young people, aged 16-24 years, who have been given employment support	NA	92	92 = G 78 = A >78 = R	Because of changes to external funding streams for Elevate (from Cabinet Office to EU) the skills targets have changed. This is a new indicator based on the targets required for this EU fund. Thresholds been also been devised using tolerances set by the funding body i.e. 15% margin for target shortfall
Number of opportunities (new employment, apprenticeships and graduate posts) negotiated through ESPs	NA	60	60 = G 51 = A >51 = R	This is as new target amalgamating all the employment outcomes negotiated on Employment Skills Plans. Thresholds been also been devised using the same tolerances as above
Number of new businesses engaged with	71	70	70 = G 60 = A >60 = R	Target based on last year's achievement. Thresholds been also been devised using the same tolerances as above

DESCRIPTION OF 16/17 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Appendix B

Workforce				
Indicator Description	15/16 Actual	16/17 Target	RAG (Thresholds)	Commentary
Turnover - Number of people voluntary leaving the service as a percentage of the service headcount	15.29%	15- 20%	G: 15% - 20% A: 10% - 15% or 20% - 25% R: < 10% or >25%	Turnover between 10-20% is seen as healthy, with under 10% seeing as leading to stagnation and over 20% costly. It is likely given the current uncertainty that turnover will be higher than usual hence 15-20% would seem expected. There's a +1%/-1% tolerance on this indicator so it becomes Green for Q1
Absence - Average days lost to sickness absence per employee (headcount) within the last 12 months	5.33	< = 6.6 days	G: < = 6.6 days A: 6.7 – 7.5 days R: > 7.5 days	In 2015, the national combined public & private sector average was 6.6 days and as such the target set for this year. This is much lower than public sector equivalents which have an average of around 8 days, hence the amber banding of 7.5 days as this is approached.
Workforce Satisfaction - Percentage of the workforce that is either satisfied or very satisfied with working for WBC	83.9%	>=80%	G: >=80% A: 70% - 80% R: < 70%	A normal response for such a response would be 70% and above, hence this is the amber level. The target was set higher given the level of achievement from the last survey.

Agenda Item 85.

TITLE	House of Commons Select Committee Update
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 30 May 2017
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Overview and Scrutiny is a key part of the checks and balances which ensure that the Council and its partners make and implement effective decisions for all the residents of the Borough. Effective Overview and Scrutiny helps to build trust in the Council's decision making procedures and engages with local communities and service users.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 1) notes the suspension of the House of Commons Select Committee review of Overview and Scrutiny in Local Government due to the upcoming election;
- 2) consider the evidence submitted to the Select Committee by the Unitary Council Officers Network and the Council's Lib Dem Group.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

Early in 2017, the House of Commons Select Committee for Communities and Local Government launched a review of Overview and Scrutiny in Local Government. The initial part of the review was to invite the submission of written evidence. A number of submissions were submitted, including the submissions at Annex A and Annex B.

The Select Committee review has been curtailed due to the General Election to be held on 8 June. However, the Committee is asked to consider the two written submissions as part of its ongoing dialogue about the strengths and weaknesses of Overview and Scrutiny at the Council.

Background

The House of Commons Select Committee for Communities and Local Government launched a review of Overview and Scrutiny in local government in early 2017. To date the Committee has received a range of evidence including a submission from the Unitary Councils' Overview and Scrutiny Officer Network. As part of its submission the network identified factors which led to effective and ineffective scrutiny, viz:

Where Scrutiny has worked well:

- Timely, quality information
- Political support and senior Officer buy-in
- Member interest and curiosity
- Less formal approaches such as private sessions
- Task and Finish Groups.

Where Scrutiny has not worked so well:

- Lack of access to, or late information
- Wavering commitment from Executive and senior Officers
- Insufficient Member skill or experience
- Formal, public sessions where Member and Officer candour becomes an issue.

The full submission from the Officer Network is attached at Annex A.

The Select Committee also received a written submission from the Council's Lib Dem Group. This is attached at Annex 2.

Analysis of Issues

Members are requested to consider the two submissions and discuss any potential improvements to the Council's Overview and Scrutiny process.

Members are also asked to highlight any issues which may be usefully covered at the Member training event to be held on 19 July 2017.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

List of Background Papers
None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Governance and Improvement Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 1

This page is intentionally left blank

House of Commons - Communities and Local Government Select Committee

Review of Overview and Scrutiny in Local Government - written evidence submitted by the Unitary Councils' Officer Overview and Scrutiny Network

Background to the Network

The network was formed in 2003 as a forum for scrutiny practitioners to meet on a regular basis to exchange practices, thoughts and ideas. It also gave a specific focus group for engagement by government departments and other agencies in order to seek views on working practices and enhancing the engagement of the scrutiny process in local authorities.

It meets on a quarterly basis in London and its agenda is set and owned by scrutiny officers. It enjoys excellent engagement with the Centre for Public Scrutiny and Care Quality Commission. In addition it has been able to have good dialogue with the Department of Health on the health scrutiny function.

This submission has been compiled as the result of comments submitted by scrutiny officers in a number of authorities. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the authorities that they are employed by.

1. Whether Scrutiny Committees in local authorities in England are effective in holding decision-makers to account

- 1.1 This question implies that the sole purpose of scrutiny is to reactively question whether the right decisions have been made. Whilst there is undoubtedly an arm of scrutiny that must hold decision makers responsible, this single focus can miss much of the value of the whole scrutiny function. The wider and more salient question however should be 'does scrutiny ensure robust, evidence-based decisions are made in the public interest?'
- 1.2 This is a much harder question to answer and cannot be measured by arbitrary metrics (How many topics were questioned in public/are decisions changed as a result of scrutiny etc.). A measurement of success would be the quality of decisions over time and would require a more longitudinal study.
- 1.3 Scrutiny in a number of authorities can undoubtedly enable those members not involved in decision making to contribute to policy development, lobby local MPs and central government and conduct evidence-based challenge on behalf of the people that they serve. A good example of this can be seen from Devon County Council where this is particularly the case in task group reviews:
<http://democracy.devon.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13627>
- 1.4 Scrutiny provides the potential opportunity to achieve great things. It continues to have the power to hold to account and review policy detail which in turn leads to the avoidance of bad or unintended consequences that can only come to light through a process of detailed examination. The original reasons for introducing the leader/cabinet model including scrutiny still stand as strong as ever. Indeed, elected Members in one authority have advised their newly elected Members:

“Scrutiny provides one of the best opportunities to understand the detailed workings of the Council which in turn leads to better decision making.”

- 1.5 The increasing complexity of local government, and increasingly restricted budgets, mean that scrutiny *achievements* are harder to gain compared to ten or fifteen years ago. So, whilst the opportunities are present, they are less apparent to many elected Members who have found that the many competing priorities distract from the hard work that scrutiny entails. To achieve great things with scrutiny requires commitment of time and energy by Members which, they often say, they don't have for. To ensure that scrutiny remains a valuable function one solution could lie with encouraging elected Members to make full use of the benefits of effective, time saving community engagement methods that social media, and other tools, offer so as to free up capacity for activities such as scrutiny.
- 1.6 The effectiveness of scrutiny could be undermined by the option for local authorities to adopt a committee system with no return to the executive/scrutiny model. The impression can be given that a committee system is “more democratic” but the valuable role scrutiny can play is often overlooked. In looking at any change the option of improving scrutiny arrangements should be included. Whilst the matter is one for local choice there must be adequate consideration given to the advantages and disadvantages for the scrutiny function against a committee system.
- 1.7 Generally the legislative and procedural mechanisms by which decision-makers are held to account are seen as sufficient, in the sense that the powers available to a scrutiny committee are used (for example, the call-in of decisions, or the power to make recommendations to the Council's Executive).
- 1.8 The experience of this accountability in practice, however, has been variable according to a number of different factors. These include the appetite of individual chairs, the extent to which scrutiny is prioritised by decision-makers, and the degree of political influence individual chairs may have. There are examples of information not being provided, or containing insufficient detail to enable effective scrutiny, however this is also reflective of how budget planning is conducted across local government (for example, final settlements from central government not being known until after the approval of a budget by Council).”
- 1.9 The LGA Peer Review processes could be enhanced to include an element to assess the effectiveness of scrutiny. This could be through either a peer review process that focuses specifically on scrutiny or by increasing the profile of scrutiny in the current review process. A separate scrutiny peer review process would, however, require resourcing. Peer reviews normally include reviewers who are Cabinet Members, Directors/Heads of Services and Service Users – but not scrutiny officers or members. Including these roles with an expectation that the Peer Review letter and recommendations will include specific comments/recommendations on the effectiveness of scrutiny could be a way forward.

2. The extent to which Scrutiny Committees operate with political impartiality and independence from Executives

- 2.1 The answer to this question can vary significantly within authorities and during different times. In the run up to an election, politics comes into play much more than

at other times. Experience indicates that scrutiny operates most effectively when its challenge comes from a need to understand the evidence base upon which decisions are made and the systems in place to improve people's lives.

- 2.2 Scrutiny in local government however lacks the advantages of independence that is enjoyed by the parliamentary select committee system. Creating wholly independent, self-managing scrutiny secretariats in local authorities is impractical and unaffordable in the current financial climate. Statutory Scrutiny Officers undoubtedly keep scrutiny's profile higher than it would otherwise be where they exist. But being one is not easy in practice. It requires a skilful balance between encouraging and enabling elected Members to be effective scrutineers which is not always welcomed in practice by senior officers including, occasionally, your own boss.
- 2.3 Scrutiny is part of the democratic process and therefore unlikely to be fully impartial and independent. Having a chairman from political group that does not hold the control of the council help demonstrate a willingness for challenge but the effectiveness of this is reliant upon the political composition of the rest of the committee. This option could also be viewed as making the chairman's post a political one whereas the key element is good chairing and communication skills.
- 2.4 In any Council environment with a clear political majority for the most part, individual committee members and chairs will operate independently of the Executive. This can be demonstrated by examples where scrutiny chairs have taken an assertive approach to scrutinising key topics, particularly where there is a public pressure being applied by residents or key advocacy groups. There can be occasions where items have been deferred, or councillors have shown a certain reluctance to pursue an item due to its political sensitivity. This can have a positive impact as well, where councillors may work to pursue the interests of scrutiny more informally through their political groups, rather than reverting to formal mechanisms.

3. Whether scrutiny officers are independent of and separate from those being scrutinised

- 3.1 Independence is crucial to the successful operation of scrutiny. There is a wide range of practice in the actual departmental location of scrutiny officers. In many these form part of the overall staffing for the whole democratic services function. In others the function is within a policy team.
- 3.2 Strengthening the Statutory Scrutiny Officer's role and offering it some protection may assist with retaining a visible point of support for scrutiny in a small number of authorities where such a spotlight would be perceived as positive. However, for many, whether scrutiny succeeds or fails depends more upon the senior management/leadership culture than the presence of an effective Statutory Scrutiny Officer.
- 3.3 Individuals can find themselves working closely with officers across the local authority, and this is required to develop the professional relationships and networks necessary to ensure things are being scrutinised appropriately. While it is conceivable that this may influence how scrutiny is conducted, it must be set against the fact that work primarily is led by committee members, and not officers. There have been few cases where there has been a clear conflict of interests, for

example scrutiny of democratic services budgets, and these have been led by committee members with minimum risk of influence from officers.

- 3.4 From work carried out by the West Midlands Scrutiny Network it was shown that the separation between the Executive and Select Committees in Parliament is much greater than in Local Government Scrutiny, e.g. the Ministers and Secretary of State would not see a draft of the report before it was published and this separation of power and roles is also apparent through the process to appoint Select Committee chairs which is covered in the response to the following question.

4. How Chairs and Members are selected

- 4.1 Chairs of the 19 Departmental and 3 other Parliamentary Select Committees are elected by secret ballot of the House and this could be seen to strengthen the independence of the Committees and result in a much higher profile for their work. (The Chairs of the remaining 5 Committees are elected by the Committee members who are appointed by the House).
- 4.2 This election process was introduced after Local Government Scrutiny was introduced in the early 2000s. The CfPS Annual Survey of Local Government Overview and Scrutiny (2013/14) reported that 19.2 % of Councils assign their Chair and Vice Chair politically proportionally. The CfPS report does not report the process through which the Chairs are nominated and selected. The Select Committee inquiry provides an opportunity to consider if Local Government Scrutiny Committee Chair's should be elected in a similar manner to Select Committee chairs. Much of the literature about effective scrutiny has focused on the culture within the authority and between the executive, officers and scrutiny function. Culture is important but a more structured framework that clarifies and demonstrates the independence of scrutiny could help.
- 4.3 In one unitary authority the constitution states that the chairman must not come from the controlling group. This appointment is made by the full council and not just non executive members. This approach could be viewed as making the chairman's post a political one whereas the key element is good chairing and communication skills. Members on scrutiny committees are appointed by group leaders – often on basis of who can attend the meetings and not skills, knowledge or expertise. Additionally there is no longer a restriction on executive members taking a position on a scrutiny committee when they no longer fulfil an executive role.
- 4.4 There is a disparity between Combined Authorities, Police Panels and Fire Authorities. Members that take a lead role in the scrutiny function of fire and police bodies receive remuneration in recognition of the time it takes to perform their duties. A Combined Authority offers no remuneration for any of its lead roles, e.g. Chair or Vice Chair of its overview and scrutiny committee.
- 4.5 Members may become overloaded if they accept a special responsibility position at their substantive authority, then undertake a Combined Authority role. Taken on top of the role as a local councillor there must be a question as to them having the time to undertake all these effectively in the interest of the community that they represent. Scrutiny of a combined authority is new and developing and as such takes time and commitment both to develop the function and to form the necessary

relationships to ensure that it fulfils its role of being open and transparent in holding the Executive function to account.

4.6 With regard to member confidence and skills many do not appreciate the potential that scrutiny has. They often believe that they lack the support or motivation to develop the skills and confidence to make it work for them. It is important that members are given every opportunity to obtain the knowledge and experience so to offer a real challenge and press witnesses on difficult questions thereby not missing real opportunities to have a positive impact.

4.7 Members can change when they realise they are able take control and turn scrutiny into an effective tool. A scrutiny committee, with the right support and motivation, works superbly as a team to explore a complex or important issue and generate new insights and solutions to the benefit of the community.

4.8 A way of helping make this happen is to:-

- encourage local authorities to recruit scrutiny support staff with the right combination of skills, experience and understanding as to what can be achieved, and how;
- make sure that the commitment to scrutiny emanates from the top: for example, require the senior management team of each authority to publish annually the specific initiatives that they have introduced to encourage a positive scrutiny culture; this may stimulate debate within the authority as to what those measures ought to be;
- encourage good practice that works well for parliamentary select committees through such mechanisms as the reporting of scrutiny reports and findings in the media.

4.9 Another major issue that requires consideration is that of Parent Governor Representatives on education related scrutiny bodies. Councils are currently required under legislation to co-opt these as voting members on the appropriate committee. With increasing 'acadamisation' this regulation should be urgently reviewed as in some areas it is impossible to fill the positions available.

5. Whether powers to summon witnesses are adequate

5.1 The powers to summon local witnesses appear to be adequate. That would include officers of the local authority itself as well as local NHS bodies (CCGs/Providers). Where additional powers would be most useful is in requiring National Bodies that would not otherwise be compelled to attend to attend.

5.2 The way that Council's deliver services is changing, with a greater emphasis on commissioning and enabling, and less direct service delivery. Scrutiny has no real teeth to summon Council service providers to committee, although in practice providers tend to be willing to co-operate.

5.3 Best practice is for officers and Executive Members to prioritise attendance over other engagements. It is also helpful if the leader also sets an expectation about

attendance to the Executive Members at the beginning of the Council, and this remains the case for the majority of meetings.

- 5.4 There are greater challenges in summoning external partners, for example in the case of Local Economic Partnerships, private sector and Local Authority Trading Companies. This can be dependent on the willingness of these partners to engage with the political process, and their understanding of the role of scrutiny. The Council's constitution can often set out procedures around the scrutiny of contract arrangements, and this has been used where difficulties are encountered.
- 5.5 Health scrutiny committees find in the main that NHS partners have a greater clarity around the role of scrutiny and their responsibilities, compared to other external partners. In part, this has been supported by the Department of Health and DCLG guidance around health scrutiny and partners are often keen to demonstrate how they have engaged with local scrutiny mechanisms.

6. The potential for local authority Scrutiny to act as a voice for local service users

- 6.1 'Service users' is not a term that is universally applicable and scrutiny should be seen as acting as a voice for the whole community. The individuals and groups are often not passive recipients of services and may not even use Council Services.
- 6.2 Scrutiny serves as almost the only bastion of opportunity for local people to voice an opinion on changes to a wide range of services, not just those provided by the Council. Scrutiny can look at national issues that have a significant local manifestation.
- 6.3 Scrutiny is not always an adequate vehicle to represent the frustrations of people who do not feel listened to. On many issues consultation has become a necessary step to take but the consultation is on the detail not the principle of the issue. Often the principle has been decided, it is simply the how that local people can have a say over. In some authorities this has included health consultations, where the decision has been taken and the consultation relates to the detail after the change. Complaints by local people do not always have the impact that local people would like if dealt with by scrutiny.
- 6.4 Many authorities believe that there is potential for scrutiny to act as a voice for residents and service users, though the practice and experience of this is variable. Successful examples require the buy-in of the chair, services and public. The chairs, for the most part, have demonstrated that they are keen to provide a platform for service user voices where there is scope to do so. Certain key issues have seen significant public engagement, for example where a consultation is underway to change services, though this does depend on public awareness and interest. Chairs have occasionally opted to host meetings in different formats and locations in order to support wider community engagement.
- 6.5 Public engagement tends to reflect certain demographic groups over others, for example vulnerable or disadvantaged groups are less likely to have an awareness of how they can input into scrutiny, unless they do so through specific advocacy groups. This tends to see the same individuals engaging frequently, while a wider range of views are not always taken into consideration. There is also limited scope

to engage those who work or attend education provisions, as the majority of the committee meetings are held during the day. There is scope to co-opt service users, or seek to work collaboratively with advocacy groups to capture views on specific items, and the team would be keen to consider how it can widen public participation in the future.

7. How topics for Scrutiny are selected

- 7.1 A scrutiny committee should have a well balanced workplan comprising of the pre-decision items taken from the forward plan, policy development/review (based upon a published plan of policies and plans and when these were approved and date for review) and performance management to assess services that are over or underperforming.
- 7.2 The value of pre-decision scrutiny is a tool that has been recognised by the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, Meg Hillier MP, in helping ensure that decisions are more transparent. In local authorities it is seen to strengthen accountability, provide a firmer evidence base and demonstrate that value for money is being achieved with public funds. Scrutiny can be more effective if it is proactive in decision making rather than reactive.
- 7.3 Workplans are generally at the discretion of the members of the scrutiny committees who prioritise and determine what should be included. Knowing what would be fruitful topics to examine partly comes from senior officers highlighting upcoming issues.
- 7.4 Briefing sessions can also give Members more detailed background information on a topic, which then could lead to further work on a specific element of that topic.
- 7.5 The majority of council constitutions enable Members to request items being placed on an agenda. Additionally members of the public can be encouraged to suggest topics.
- 7.6 The development of a mechanism through which information from local authority scrutiny can inform the work of Parliamentary Select Committees is something that has been raised but not progressed to an agreed process.

8. The support given to the Scrutiny function by political leaders and senior officers, including the resources allocated (for example whether there is a designated officer team)

- 8.1 In a declining number of authorities there is a dedicated officer team for the scrutiny function. This can demonstrate that scrutiny is largely well thought of and given support and credence by leaders. In some smaller authorities the scrutiny function forms part of the duties of democratic services officers. There is the statutory requirement to have a named scrutiny officer and this is seen as providing a protected mandate in respect to the scrutiny function in all upper tier local authorities. We believe that this should be extended to all authorities. There is a danger that with the role of a scrutiny officer being combined with other roles within an authority this can dilute the focus on scrutiny to the overall detriment of the democratic function.

- 8.2 Attendance, support and reporting from senior officers and senior leaders can be variable in some instances. Although protocols can be in place on working arrangements this does not replace the need for effective working two way communication between the executive and scrutiny functions.
- 8.3 The budget planning process highlights this variance, as the information provided by some services will be more comprehensive than others. There are instances where information is not provided, or the role of scrutiny in the political process is seen as secondary to engaging with the Executive.
- 8.4 In summary, engagement varies, and depends on the extent to which political buy-in will benefit the outcomes for a particular service initiative or policy. The political commitments given to scrutiny will sometimes not be sustained or reflected in practice.
- 8.5 It is understood that that the budget for Parliamentary Select Committees are set separately from other Departmental and Government expenditure. Resourcing for Local Government Scrutiny is an issue and the resourcing for scrutiny is not always transparent as in many cases it will be incorporated into budget for wider council services. Having a clear understanding of the resources that are available within a council for scrutiny and being able to bench mark this effectively could be helpful. There is some benchmarking undertaken by CIPFA as part of its corporate governance benchmarking club. Comparisons can be difficult particularly where officers carry out scrutiny alongside other roles, but providing this information to Members will enable them to decide if this is an effective use of resources. The inclusion of the budget for scrutiny as a separate section in the Council Budget would provide further clarity and accountability.
- 8.6 The development and implementation of Sustainability and Transformation Plans are likely to increase the work for the Health Scrutiny function in Local Government as will be the need to establish Joint Health Scrutiny Committees as service reconfigurations are proposed and consulted upon. There may be an argument for the Select Committee inquiry to look at the resources and capacity within local government and the NHS to enable a constructive health scrutiny process which is capable of delivering effective integrated health and adult social care service.

9. What use is made of specialist external advisers

- 9.1 Unlike the House of Commons Select Committee it is very unlikely that specialist external advisers are willing to become involved in local scrutiny enquiries just on the basis of it being of significance on a cv.
- 9.2 Several authorities have employed external Specialist Advisors where it was felt that Members would benefit from independent support to help them discharge their scrutiny function.
- 9.3 Such specialist assistance can help equip members with the appropriate knowledge to advise and support their work monitoring and challenging service delivery.
- 9.4 Training is one area where external advisers can assist in filling a gap in member development. The service recognises, however, that pressures of public sector

resources mean it is harder to justify the expense of external advisors unless there is a clearly defined benefit to the council”

9.5 There is also scope for scrutiny committees to co-opt advisers.

10. The effectiveness and importance of local authority scrutiny of external organisations

10.1 The effectiveness of scrutiny can be variable. The health scrutiny function is often well regarded by health partners and given a good level of support and attention. It is vital that health scrutiny, Healthwatch and Health and Wellbeing Boards co-operate fully to avoid duplication, confusion and ineffective use of resources.

10.2 In the case of the Police and Crime Commissioner and health services, there are clearly embedded powers, roles and responsibilities in respect to local authority scrutiny. In one respect, having responsibilities defined in guidance positively influences the level of commitment given by external organisations, and there are well defined relationships and a desire to work collaboratively to demonstrate effective working. These powers, however, in the case of the Police and Crime Panel, are limited in practice, and can make it difficult to hold the PCC to account.

10.3 In other areas, the effectiveness of holding external partners to account is difficult to define. There remain questions about the changing relationship of scrutiny to the education sector, and whether educational performance can be scrutinised effectively in a mixed economy of local authority schools and academies. Whilst local authorities retain oversight for a range of education issues the delivery of this is in the hands of others and unlike health scrutiny there is no guidance on how this should be successfully achieved.

10.4 There also remains a question about how best to hold private sector partners, or Local Authority Trading Companies, to account. As more services are commissioned externally processes should be included enabling scrutiny to have a role in reviewing the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery. One major problem surrounds what is deemed to be commercial confidential against the task of public accountability and transparency.

11. The role of Scrutiny in devolution deals and the scrutiny models used in combined authorities

11.1 The Parliamentary Order makes it a requirement that the Combined Authority appoints a scrutiny officer, although the Department for Communities and Local Government has indicated that a seconded officer from a local authority would fulfil requirements. For any scrutiny function to be effective it needs to be resourced properly.

11.2 The Fire function could be part of the Combined Authority in 2018, with the Police potentially by 2020. The disparity across these areas needs to be addressed to assist in the facilitation of a smooth transfer.

11.3 Deals appear to be discussed behind closed doors involving only the leader and Chief Executive. Scrutiny is an afterthought. Scrutiny is therefore unable to

challenge the basis upon which deals are agreed and is not one that involves the whole council membership or the wider community.

- 11.4 Where there has been some effort to scrutinise proposals for devolution there appears to be a general reluctance on the part of political leaders and senior officers in this respect. There is a tension evident where things are still subject to negotiation, and witnesses are reluctant to commit publicly when options are still being discussed.
- 11.5 In the case of health devolution there are questions emerging regarding the complex governance arrangements in the NHS, and how this is likely to change as result of Sustainability and Transformation Plans. While the questions of democratic accountability within these new structures still require clarification, external organisations have been keen to engage with the scrutiny function. Joint health scrutiny committees are a consideration in this respect, though it should be recognised that these come with additional resource considerations for the local authorities in question.
- 11.6 For the large part, the governance models by which devolution could happen are being developed without direct input from scrutiny. It is the case that there is a gap that could be addressed in better defining the extent to which scrutiny should be participating in discussions.

12. Examples where Scrutiny has worked well and not so well

12.1 What has worked well?

- 12.2 The Centre of Public Scrutiny has a range of examples of best practice as the result of its annual Good Scrutiny Awards. This demonstrates specific instances where scrutiny has delivered tangible outcomes for the local community and ensured that value for money is being obtained.
- 12.3 Often this work is as the result of utilising Members in task and finish groups. This approach allows the relevant evidence to be collated and key stakeholders to be actively engaged so that their views are at the core of the process. Each inquiry can be tailored made to suit the individual circumstances of the topic provided basic principles of transparency and accountability are followed.

12.4 What hasn't worked so well?

- 12.5 There are examples where scrutiny can be asked to look at a particular issue by officers or lead Members. This sometimes can be more of a tick box exercise so that officers or lead Members can claim that a change has been through scrutiny despite insufficient time or information being allowed for a more in depth look.
- 12.6 Difficulties are encountered in the field of finance scrutiny. Often despite prior agreement with Executive Members timely provision of quality budgetary information has been variable. In some cases information has not been shared. This exposes the lack of powers currently available to scrutiny to secure witnesses and evidence.

12.7 Good productive working relations have been developed over a number of years between the scrutiny network and the Care Quality Commission. This unfortunately has not been the case with Ofsted which often criticises the involvement of scrutiny in school improvement and safeguarding but does not engage with it at any stage in an inspection. There is much that scrutiny could do in advance of any inspection if there is an agreed line of basic challenge. At present scrutiny is trying to react to the results of an inspection that it had no connection with.

12.8 In summary the factors are:

Where scrutiny has worked well

- Timely, quality information
- Political support and senior officer buy-in
- Member interest and curiosity
- Less formal approaches, such as private sessions
- Task & Finish Group

Where scrutiny has not worked so well

- Lack of access to information, or being provided late
- Wavering commitment on the part of the executive and senior officers
- Insufficient Member skill or experience
- Formal, public sessions where councillor and officer candour becomes an issue “

13 **Overall summary**

13.1 The scrutiny function has minimal legislative requirements when compared with executive functions. This has enabled local authorities to develop its approach according to local choice. This has led to innovative approaches being taken together with the ability to act quickly when the need arises. It is an opportunity for members to put political differences aside and be independent, objective and evidence based.

13.2 In a speech made by the Queen referring to 1992 “Annus horribilis” she stated:

“There is no doubt that criticism is good for people and institutions that are part of public life. No institution – city, monarchy, whatever – should expect to be free from the scrutiny of those who give it their loyalty and support, not to mention those who don’t. But we are all part of the same fabric of our national society, and that scrutiny, by one part of another, can be just as effective if it is made with a touch of gentleness, good humour and understanding.”

13.3 Scrutiny should be expected by all those who are responsible for delivering public services. To have its processes made too prescriptive could dilute its ability to deliver what is expected of it.

March 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Written evidence submitted by the Liberal Democrats on Wokingham Borough Council [OSG 125]

I am Leader of the opposition on Wokingham Borough Council. This submission is based on the personal experiences of this Group including myself.

Qu 1 Is the Scrutiny Committee at Wokingham Borough Council effective in holding decision-making to account?

Unfortunately not. Too many of the ruling Group are not prepared to even consider to scrutinise the Executive Members. When they do ask questions they are not searching enough. I am not sure of the reasons for this reluctance to question the Exec Members. Perhaps they feel threatened, I am not sure.

At the last Call-In held by this Committee no one from the ruling group even asked me a question and I was the lead witness. It was clear they had made their mind up before the meeting started and did not want to know.

For an O&SC Meeting to work, it is necessary for the Councillors to have a significant degree of autonomy and a willingness to investigate, even if it meant the senior members (colleagues) had a rough time. The Chairman & vice-Chairman were put in place by the Leader of the Council and no one felt able to ask questions. It is I believe currently a waste of time. No more than a talking shop.

Qu 2 Political Impartiality & independence from Executive.

Absolutely not. It is totally under the thumb of the Senior Ruling Group members.

Qu 3. Appointment of Chairman and committee members & effectiveness of committee

The Leader of the Ruling Group appoints their members, I appoint the opposition member(s).

The senior members of the ruling group see the O&SC process as a nuisance and do their best to minimise its independence. The odd useful bit of information does however come out on occasions. I am aware that some of the ruling group councillors are unhappy how the process is being run and want greater autonomy and independence from the senior members of their group. The opposition is all but ignored, often ridiculed for daring to raise an issue of concern. How dare we is the attitude of many (but not all) of the ruling group. There is a minority who feel the system is currently being abused. I would concur.

Our Group believes that the O&SC committee should be selected by all members of their group, independent of the Leader & Exec Members. We would like to see the Committee choose the Chairman & vice-Chairman. I see no reason why the Chairman could not be from the opposition party or parties. If the committee choose the chairman then they are more likely to have the respect of the committee.

In addition the committee should be given a free hand in deciding what is to be included on the agenda. It currently does to some extent, but I do not feel there is sufficient independence of the committee to really to go through a thorough scrutiny of an Exec Member. They are asked questions, but not really the difficult ones. As opposition councillors we only have a limited ability to delve into more detail, or different areas.

One particular concern is the position where a Husband & Wife (one of whom is an Exec member) are involved in a Scrutiny activity. It should not be possible for either party to Scrutinise their spouse (or partner). There needs to be in-built restrictions to prevent this.

The current system is ineffective and needs a major overhaul.

Yours Sincerely

Lindsay Ferris

Leader of the Liberal Democrats on Wokingham Borough Council

April 2017

Agenda Item 86.

TITLE	Council Motion on Overview and Scrutiny
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 30 May 2017
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Overview and Scrutiny is a key part of the checks and balances which ensure that the Council and its partners make and implement effective decisions for all the residents of the Borough. Effective Overview and Scrutiny is strengthened when the process is seen to be independent from the Council's Executive function.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider the Motion approved by the Council at its meeting on 23 March 2017 and make appropriate recommendations to the Constitution Review Working Group.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

At its meeting on 23 March 2017, the Council considered a Motion submitted by Councillor Ian Pittock relating to the appointment of Overview and Scrutiny Members, Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen. The Motion sought to improve public perception of the Overview and Scrutiny process by enabling non-Executive Members to control the procedure for the allocation of places on Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the election of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen.

The Council supported the principles underpinning the Motion and resolved that it be referred to the Constitution Review Working Group to review the proposal and recommend a way forward. The proposer and seconder of the Motion (Councillors Pittock and Ferris) were also invited to provide more detail to the Working Group on their view of the practical implementation of the changes.

Background

At its meeting on March 2017, the Council considered the following Notice of Motion, submitted by Councillor Ian Pittock and seconded by Councillor Lindsay Ferris:

“Whitehall requires that where the Executive System is used each Executive Member shall be subject to a scrutiny committee. This Council believes that it is essential to demonstrate avoidance of clear conflicts of interest and over-centralisation of power through patronage provided by the Special Responsibility Allowance system. Therefore, the Council Leader, who appoints the Executive Members and such Executive Members themselves, should in no way be involved in the pre-Council and Council processes used to appoint Members to scrutiny and audit committees, nor the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of such.

This Council resolves that non-Executive Members themselves shall pre-appoint Members to scrutiny and audit committees, ensuring political balance, and the Members of each Committee shall themselves pre-appoint their own Chair and Vice-Chair with these names then being sent to Council for formal appointment, with Executive Members declaring an interest and abstaining in the vote.”

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Pauline Helliard-Symons and seconded by Councillor Norman Jorgensen: the Motion be amended by adding the following words:

“This Council also resolves that the matter should be referred to the Constitution Review Working Group to review in more detail and to recommend a way forward, and that the proposer and seconder of the Motion should be invited to provide more detail on their view of the practical implementation of this change.”

The amendment to the Motion was not accepted by the proposer of the original Motion (Councillor Pittock).

Following debate and upon being put to the vote, the amended Motion was declared by the Mayor to be carried. The Council resolved as follows:

RESOLVED:

Whitehall requires that where the Executive System is used each Executive Member shall be subject to a scrutiny committee. This Council believes that it is essential to demonstrate avoidance of clear conflicts of interest and over centralisation of power through patronage provided by the Special Responsibility Allowance system. Therefore, the Council Leader, who appoints the Executive Members and such Executive Members themselves, should in no way be involved in the pre-Council and Council processes used to appoint Members to scrutiny and audit committees, nor the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of such.

This Council resolves that non-Executive Members themselves shall pre-appoint Members to scrutiny and audit committees, ensuring political balance, and the Members of each committee shall themselves pre-appoint their own Chair and Vice-Chair with these names then being sent to Council for formal appointment, with Executive Members declaring an interest and abstaining in the vote.

This Council also resolves that the matter should be referred to the Constitution Review Working Group to review in more detail and to recommend a way forward, and that the proposer and seconder of the Motion should be invited to provide more detail on their view of the practical implementation of this change.

Analysis of Issues

In line with the Council resolution, the Motion will be considered by the Constitution Review Working Group at its meeting on 21 June 2017.

Another report on the Committee's agenda (House of Commons Select Committee Update) includes evidence of the way Scrutiny Members and Chairmen are appointed. The evidence states:

"In relation to the House of Commons, Chairmen of the 19 Departmental and three other Parliamentary Select Committees are elected by secret ballot of the House and this could be seen to strengthen the independence of the Committees and result in a much higher profile for their work. (The Chairs of the remaining 5 Committees are elected by the Committee members who are appointed by the House).

This election process was introduced after Local Government Scrutiny was introduced in the early 2000s. The Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) Annual Survey of Local Government Overview and Scrutiny (2013/14) reported that 19.2 % of Council's assign their Chair and Vice Chair politically proportionally. The CfPS report does not report the process through which the Chairs are nominated and selected. The Select Committee inquiry provides an opportunity to consider if Local Government Scrutiny Committee Chair's should be elected in a similar manner to Select Committee chairs. Much of the literature about effective scrutiny has focused on the culture within the authority and between the executive, officers and scrutiny function. Culture is important but a more structured framework that clarifies and demonstrates the independence of scrutiny could help".

In support of the Council Motion, Councillor Pittock circulated an example of how the proposed new arrangement could work. This is set out at Annex A.

In addition to the example set out in Annex A, there are other potential changes which could be considered. These include:

- Allocating one or more Overview and Scrutiny Chairs to Opposition Members.
- Executive Members to abstain from voting at the annual Council meeting when appointments to Overview and Scrutiny Committees are considered.
- Election of Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen to be delegated to each Committee at its first meeting.
- Other ideas which Members may wish to put forward.

The Committee is asked to consider the various options contained in the report and make recommendations to the Constitution Review Working Group as appropriate.

Deputy Executive Members

Internet research indicates a fairly consistent approach to the appointment of Overview and Scrutiny Members. All the Council procedures viewed included a clause to the effect that:

“No Member may be involved in scrutinising a decision in which he/she has been directly involved”.

This has implications for the role of Deputy Executive Member. Deputies are currently allowed to be members of the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The Committee may wish to consider this position in light of the evidence gathered from other Councils.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

List of Background Papers

None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Governance and Improvement Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 1

Example of Revised Procedure for Appointing O&S Members

Note that this is only an example to illustrate a potential mechanism

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

- a. A box exists for each scrutiny and audit committee.
- b. Each backbencher has 3 strips of paper, each of which includes their name and a preference number (1- top, 2, 3). Members place their preference numbered strips into the boxes of the scrutiny and audit committees in which they are interested.
- c. These are drawn and a running order is created for each box.
- d. Starting from the top of a runners list, those with a 1st preference strip are the Members until each group's part of the quota of Members is complete. This process is carried out for each of the boxes.
- e. 1st preferences left over have first stab at filling up that committee's reserve slots (if the Member wishes this) or shortfalls on other committee runners lists where their 2nd preference exists.
- f. Where there are still shortfalls (usually the case now) then all remaining second preferences come into play (as per process at d. above) and so on until all slots are filled.
- g. Reserve slots are filled using remaining 2nd preferences (as per the process at e. above).
- h. 3rd preference slips on the runners list only come into use if essential.

It is possible to include factors to cater for male-female and ethnic minority ratios if desired (it is not obvious that we do this now)

CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS

Chairs and Vice Chairs can be chosen in the time-honoured fashion of proposed, seconded and voted on by a show of hands – no secrecy is needed. Any changes that are needed mid-year can be sensibly worked out by Members with one rule applying which is that a 'recently retired' Executive/Deputy Executive may not sit on Audit, Scrutiny Management nor the scrutiny committee covering the area of responsibility they have just vacated.

There should be no need to codify this in depth since it is not part of the Council Constitution itself.

TIMING

Elections usually occur in the first week of May and the Annual Council meeting then occurs towards the end of May. In some years, as in 2017 with no elections, timings can be different and the mechanism timings needs to take this into account or the Annual Council meeting date needs to harmonised to the end of May.

After the annual election or the beginning of May – the majority Group has 8 days to appoint a Leader who then also becomes the Council Leader (Group AGMs are usually arranged months in advance to cater for this)

The Leader has 4 days in which to pre-appoint Executives and Deputy Executives (they will already have Members in mind before this time)___

Backbenchers then have 6 days to pre-appoint Members to committees and for committees to pre-appoint Chairs and Vice Chairs. This can be done in about 1 hour in an evening, the date for which will be in the Council calendar.

Ian Pittock
22 March 2017

Agenda Item 87.

TITLE	Member Training Session
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 30 May 2017
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Overview and Scrutiny is a key part of the checks and balances which ensure that the Council and its partners make and implement effective decisions for all the residents of the Borough. Training for Members enables them to carry out the Overview and Scrutiny role more effectively.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider the details of the Member training event, to be held on 19 July 2017, and indicate any specific issues or themes to be highlighted at the event.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

An annual training event is held to enable Members to understand the fundamentals of Overview and Scrutiny and to discuss examples of best practice from other authorities.

This year's event will be held on Wednesday 19 July 2017, commencing at 7pm.

The range of issues to be covered includes the role of Overview and Scrutiny in holding the Executive and partner organisations to account, supporting policy development and engaging with local communities. The training will also consider specific skills such as effective chairing and questioning skills.

Background

The Council holds an annual training event for Members on the fundamentals of Overview and Scrutiny. The event will focus on essential information and skills that Members need to carry out Overview and Scrutiny to best effect.

The event will be held on Wednesday 19 July 2017 at the Shute End offices. It will focus on the following range of issues:

- effective work programming
- providing 'critical friend' challenge to the Executive and partners
- enabling the voice and concerns of local communities to be heard
- driving improvement in services and helping to identify efficiencies
- handling specific "Call-In" reviews of Executive decisions
- specific skill sets such as effective chairing and questioning techniques.

The session will focus on how Overview and Scrutiny is organised and carried out at Wokingham Borough Council, with examples from other parts of the country illustrating best practice and how other authorities are using Overview and Scrutiny to tackle a range of pressing issues.

The overall aim is to help provide Members with the knowledge and confidence to make a real difference to the lives of people in the Borough through their Overview and Scrutiny work.

The draft programme for the training event is set out at Annex A.

Analysis of Issues

In light of experience over the past year and other issues raised on the agenda, Members are asked to highlight any issues or discussion points that they wish to see included in the training event.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

List of Background Papers
None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Governance and Improvement Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 1

Overview and Scrutiny: introduction and refresh

**Wokingham Borough Council
7pm to 9pm on 19 July 2017**

This is an introductory session to Overview and Scrutiny delivered by Tim Young, an experienced scrutiny trainer who works with Members and Officers on most aspects of local government. It will focus on essential information and some useful skills that scrutiny Members need to carry out Overview and Scrutiny to best effect. Effective work programming is the bedrock of a successful Overview and Scrutiny function, so the session will explore this in some detail.

The session will be grounded in the four principles of good scrutiny (developed originally by the Centre for Public Scrutiny), which see effective scrutiny as:

- providing 'critical friend' challenge to the Executive and partners
- reflecting and enabling the voice and concerns of the public and its communities
- being carried out by 'independently-minded governors' who lead and own the scrutiny process
- driving improvement in public services and helping to find efficiencies and new ways of delivering services.

The session will focus on how Overview and Scrutiny is organised and carried out at Wokingham Borough Council, with examples from other parts of the country illustrating best practice and how other authorities are using overview and scrutiny to tackle a range of pressing issues.

The overall aim is to help provide Members with the knowledge and confidence to make a real difference to the lives of people in Wokingham through their Overview and Scrutiny work.

After each block in the session there will be a pause for Members' discussion, as well as there being time during the presentations for Members to raise any queries about the material or Overview and Scrutiny generally.

Methods used are group discussion, teaching and handouts.

Please see overleaf for the programme for the evening, with approximate timings.

Programme

7.00 Introduction and the Programme

7.10 Introductory Exercise

7.20 Overview and Scrutiny – what is it and what does it do? (*and discussion*)

7.50 Overview and Scrutiny in Action: chairing and team working (*and discussion*)

8.10 Preparing for Overview and Scrutiny Sessions (*followed by table discussion*)

8.50 Capturing the Outcomes from the Session

9.00 Evaluation and Close

(times are approximate)

Tim Young
Scrutiny and Policy Adviser

07985 072979
020 8904 2815

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 88.

TITLE	Public and Member Questions
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 30 May 2017
WARD	None Specific
DIRECTOR	Andrew Moulton, Head of Governance and Improvement Services

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Overview and Scrutiny is a key part of the checks and balances which ensure that the Council and its partners make and implement effective decisions for all the residents of the Borough. Questions submitted to the Executive and Council give an indication of issues of interest and concern. These issues may generate review topics for the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider the list of questions set out at Annex A and determine whether any of the issues raised should be considered for inclusion in the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2017/18.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

At its meeting on 31 May 2016, the Committee considered a report containing suggestions for improving the Overview and Scrutiny process. One of the suggestions related to the monitoring of questions submitted to the Council's Executive and Council.

Members agreed that regular monitoring reports be submitted to the Management Committee. Details of questions submitted to recent meetings are set out in the report.

Background

At its meeting on 31 May 2016, the Committee considered a report containing a number of suggestions aimed at improving the Overview and Scrutiny process and developing greater public interest and involvement. One of the suggestions related to the monitoring of questions submitted to the Executive and full Council meetings.

Members and residents regularly ask questions at the Executive and Council meetings. These questions indicate areas of interest and concern and may generate ideas for Overview and Scrutiny investigation. The Committee agreed to consider regular monitoring reports on the questions submitted. Annex A contains details of the public and Member questions raised at recent meetings.

Analysis of Issues

Members are requested to consider the questions set out in Annex A and to determine whether it contains issues requiring further consideration and inclusion in the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2017/18.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

None

List of Background Papers

None

Contact Neil Carr	Service Governance and Improvement Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6058	Email neil.carr@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 18 May 2017	Version No. 1

Executive Meeting on 30 March 2017

- **Question from Prue Bray to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question

Why the lack of consultation with residents on the proposed relocation of Wokingham Library?

- **Question from Imogen Shepherd-Dubey to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question re Wokingham Library

Why was this proposal kept secret from many Wokingham Borough Members until now?

- **Question from Clive Jones to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question

How much have you just spent on updating the existing Wokingham Library?

- **Question from Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question

Will the Elevate Hub be included in the proposal for the New Library site?

- **Question from Guy Grandison to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

One of the major issues that has been raised with me again recently has been inconsiderate and sometimes illegal parking around our local schools such as Loddon and Hawkedon with yellow lines being ignored. Could you explain how Civil Parking enforcement will help put a stop to inconsiderate parking around our local Schools?

- **Question from Michael Jones to the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing**

Question

Regarding the re-development of Gorse Ride South, given that Council documentation shows major concern for residents for the lack of certainty of this project, why is there no firm commitment for the ability to continue the project after phase one and the monies required for completion should surely be allocated before commencement?

- **Question from Peter Must to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question

Since the proposed relocation of Wokingham Library, probably the major public community facility in the town, is posited on an improved service for residents, is it not vital to consult local people to discover their views on the proposal, a measure that

could be achieved by for example amending the Recommendation to read: 1) that a public consultation be held about the proposal to relocate Wokingham Library to a new building on the Carnival Phase II site: 2) that any proposal to relocate the Library be then submitted to the Executive by the Executive Member for Resident Services, with a summary of the responses to the consultation, together with a full impact assessment and detailed business case?

- **Question from Keith Malvern to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question re Proposed Relocation of Wokingham Library

The first time I was aware of this proposal was when the Executive agenda was published last Wednesday although the Town Council and local Members were made aware of this on the 22nd of February - more than a month ago. Have you had any response from the Town Council or local Members to give support to the view expressed at the start of the report that this proposal will offer better access and parking to existing users of the library, and will allow them to combine visits with other activities.

Council Meeting on 18 May 2017

- **Question from Shahid Younis to the Executive Member for Children's Services**

Question

Could the Executive Member update the Council on her work to secure fairer funding for the Borough's schools?

- **Question from Charles Margetts to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

Could the Executive Member provide an update on the start of the Northern Distributor Road at Coppid Beech?

- **Question from UllaKarin Clark to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

Could the Executive Member tell me what is being done to produce a parking strategy for Wokingham Borough?

- **Question from Tim Holton to the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development**

Question

What steps is the Executive Member taking to ensure that the Borough's businesses are not unduly affected by the proposed changes to business rates?

- **Question from Philip Mirfin to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

Could the Executive Member provide an update on the development of the Winnersh Relief Road and its junction with the Northern Distributor Road at Reading Road?

- **Question from John Jarvis to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

Could the Executive Member tell me whether the Council's application for Civil Parking Enforcement has been received by the Department for Transport?

- **Question from Michael Firmager to the Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance**

Question

Could the Executive Member explain the implications for Wokingham Borough of the Government's Industrial Strategy Green Paper?

- **Question from Chris Smith to the Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance**

Question

Could the Executive Member for Finance explain what the negative revenue support grant is and how it is affecting this Council?

- **Question from Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

What is the reason for the delay in delivering the Winnersh Relief Road (and all of its ancillary bits (such as Lower Earley Way Expansion) which is sorely needed for relief of the Reading Road and Winnersh Crossroads Chaos (which seems to be almost a car park at times) and the increase in cost of the project (which seems to be not included as a separate budget lines of the MTFP)?

- **Question from Imogen Shepherd-DuBey to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport**

Question

At the moment, the volunteers who give up their time and skills to be School Governors are expected to attend meetings at training at Shute End and pay for parking. While they have the option to claim the parking charges off the schools, most will not as our schools are already being starved of funding. This seems utterly wrong to ask these volunteers to pay for the privilege of being a school governor. Why are we charging these parking fees to these volunteers and surely it is within the Council's ability to provide 'one-off' permits for those attending these kinds of meetings or volunteer training at Shute End?

- **Clive Jones has asked the Executive Member for Planning and Regeneration the following question:**

Question

Can the Executive Member responsible please advise what is the current status of the WBC Grazeley Garden Village Submission for 15,000 Houses in that area?

- **Question from Guy Grandison to the Executive Member for Resident Services**

Question

I went into Lower Earley Library last weekend and was impressed by the new facilities that had been installed, could you tell me if this has increased usage at Lower Earley Library and our other borough libraries?

- **Question from Susan Tyldesley to the Executive Member for Planning and Regeneration**

Question

Under what circumstances can Wokingham Borough Council officers agree at the pre-planning stage to a planning application for a quarry and cement factory to proceed in advance of the new Central & Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals & Waste Plan that is currently being considered?

I ask the question because one of the stated aims of the new Minerals and Waste Plan is that... 'all the sites will be considered holistically across the whole Plan area to ensure the best strategy can be achieved.'... I am unclear as to how this could actually be achieved if agreement has already been given in principle to an individual planning application that should evidently be part of the bigger regional consideration.

WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME

THIS DOCUMENT IS A "NOTICE" IN ACCORDANCE WITH
THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS)(MEETINGS AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION)(ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012

Executive Forward Programme May to August 2017

Updated 18 May 2017

Ref No.	Subject for Decision	Decision to be taken by	List of Documents to be submitted to the Decision Maker for consideration and Background Documents	Contact Details (Director/ Author)	Responsible Lead Member	Statement as to whether the item is likely to be considered in private and if so the reasons why / Explanation for any deferment of item
Executive Meeting 25 May 2017						
¹ WBC928	Council Owned Companies' Business Purpose: To consider various items related to the business of the Council owned companies, including their trading position	Executive		Graham Ebers/ Emma Lyons	Keith Baker	N/A
WBC929	21st Century Council - Update Purpose: To provide an update on the 21st Century Council Project	Executive		Andy Couldrick/	Keith Baker, Pauline Jorgensen	N/A
WBC939	Revenue Outturn 2016/17 Purpose: To consider the Revenue Monitoring Outturn Report, including Treasury Management Indicators, to the end of the financial year and any carry forward requests	Executive		Graham Ebers/ John Ogden	Anthony Pollock	N/A
WBC940	Capital Outturn 2016/17 Purpose: To consider the Capital Monitoring Outturn Report to the end of the financial year and any carry forward requests	Executive		Graham Ebers/ John Ogden	Anthony Pollock	N/A

WBC893	<p>Acquisition of Property (The Lodge) due to the Provision of the Arborfield Cross Relief Road</p> <p>Purpose: To consider the voluntary acquisition of The Lodge due to the delivery of the Arborfield Cross Relief Road</p>	Executive		Josie Wragg/ Ian Haller	Malcolm Richards	Yes - it is likely that part of the report will be considered at a private meeting of the Executive. This is because it is likely that the report will contain information which is commercially sensitive and relates to the financial and business affairs of a person. This item was deferred from the November meeting because additional work was required to understand the strategic impact of property acquisitions for infrastructure delivery for the capital programme.
WBC942 132	<p>The Acquisition of Land or Property to Support Infrastructure Delivery</p> <p>Purpose: To consider the acquisition of land or property in order to facilitate delivery of SDL and major scheme infrastructure</p>	Executive		Josie Wragg/ Ian Haller	Malcolm Richards	Yes - it is likely that part of the report will be considered at a private meeting of the Executive. This is because it is likely that the report will contain information which is commercially sensitive and relates to the financial and business affairs of a person
WBC943	<p>Bus Services - 19a/c</p> <p>Purpose: To consider the future bus service support for the 19a/c routes</p>	Executive		Josie Wragg/ Rebecca Brooks	Malcolm Richards	Yes - it is likely that part of the report will be considered at a private meeting of the Executive. This is because it is likely that the report will contain information which is commercially sensitive and relates to the financial and business affairs of a person
WBC935	<p>Proposed Shared Emergency Planning Service</p> <p>Purpose: To set out a proposal for a shared emergency planning service across Berkshire</p>	Executive		Graham Ebers/ 	Pauline Jorgensen	N/A This item was deferred from the March meeting in order for the Council to carry out further deliberations in the light of

						decisions made by other Berkshire Authorities.
WBC947	Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Issues and Options Consultation Purpose: To approve for public consultation the Issues and Options stage of the Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan	Executive		Josie Wragg/ Vanessa Rowell	Mark Ashwell	N/A
133 WBC932	Peach Place Residential Purpose: To agree the long-term arrangements for the residential units at Peach Place in Wokingham	Executive		Graham Ebers/ Louise Strongitharm, Bernie Pich	Julian McGhee-Sumner, Mark Ashwell	Yes - it is likely that part of the report will be considered at a private meeting of the Executive. This is because it is likely that the report will contain information which is commercially sensitive and relates to the financial and business affairs of a person. This item was deferred from the March meeting as some points of detail needed to be investigated.
Executive Meeting 29 June 2017						
WBC913	Map-Based Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) Purpose: To approve the conversion of the existing TROs into a map-based format	Executive		Josie Wragg/ Michael Horton	Malcolm Richards	N/A
WBC938	Council Owned Companies' Business Purpose: To consider various items related to the business of the Council owned companies, including their trading position	Executive		Graham Ebers/ Emma Lyons	Keith Baker	N/A

Executive Meeting 27 July 2017

WBC944	Council Owned Companies' Business Purpose: To consider various items related to the business of the Council owned companies, including their trading position	Executive		Graham Ebers/ John Ogden	Keith Baker	N/A
WBC945	Revenue Monitoring 2017/18 - end of June 2017 Purpose: To consider the Revenue Monitoring Report, including Treasury Management Indicators, to the end of December 2016	Executive		Graham Ebers/ John Ogden	Anthony Pollock	N/A
WBC946 134	Capital Monitoring 2017/18 - end of June 2017 Purpose: To consider the Capital Monitoring Report to the end of June 2017	Executive		Graham Ebers/ John Ogden	Anthony Pollock	N/A

The Executive will not be holding a meeting in August therefore there are no items programmed for this month

EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME CHANGES MADE TO PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED VERSIONS

Ref No.	Subject for Decision	Decision to be taken by	Original Schedule Date	Contact Details (Director/ Author)	Responsible Lead Member	Explanatory notes
WBC949	Local Plan Update (LPU) Preferred Options Consultation Purpose: To approve for public consultation the preferred options stage of the Local Plan Update	Executive	25 May 2017	Josie Wragg/ John Spurling	Mark Ashwell	Decision due date for Executive changed from 25/05/2017 to 29/06/2017. Reason: to allow further time for the consideration of infrastructure

Members of the Executive:-

Keith Baker	Leader of Council
Mark Ashwell	Planning and Regeneration
Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Children's Services
Pauline Jorgensen	Resident Services
Julian McGhee-Sumner	Deputy Leader and Health and Wellbeing
Anthony Pollock	Economic Development and Finance
Malcolm Richards	Highways and Transport
Angus Ross	Environment

Note:

Unless the matter has been listed as being likely to be discussed in private, copies of the reports associated with the above decisions will be available no earlier than five days before the meeting at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham; on the Council's website; by contacting a member of the Democratic Services Team on 0118 974 6053 or by emailing democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISIONS FORWARD PROGRAMME**

THIS DOCUMENT IS A “NOTICE” IN ACCORDANCE WITH
THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS)(MEETINGS AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION)(ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012

Individual Executive Member Forward Programme - May 2017

Updated 16 May 2017

Ref No.	Subject for Decision	Decision to be taken by	List of documents to be submitted to the Decision maker for consideration and Background documents	Contact Details (Director/ Author)	Responsible Lead Member	Statement as to whether the item is likely to be considered in private and if so the reasons why/ Explanation for any deferment of item
137 IMD 2017/15	<p>Consultation Response to the Draft Airports National Policy Statement That the Executive Member for Highways and Transport</p> <p>1) approves the Council response to the Consultation on the Draft Airports National Policy Statement</p> <p>Date 16 May 2017 at 11.00 am</p>	<p>Executive - Individual Member Decisions</p> <p>Executive Member for Highways and Transport - Malcolm Richards</p>	<p>Draft Airports National Policy Statement Consultation Executive Summary</p>	<p>Josie Wragg/ David Wilby</p>	<p>Malcolm Richards</p>	<p>N/A</p>
IMD 2017/16	<p>Proposal to Dispose of Three HRA Homes That the Executive Member for</p> <p>1) approves the disposal of 21 Glebe Lane, Sonning, Berkshire, RG4 6XH; 2 The Crescent, Crazieshill, Berkshire, RG10 8LW, and 20 Trowes Lane, Swallowfield, Berkshire, RG7 1RJ</p> <p>Date 19 May 2017 at 9:00 am</p>	<p>Executive - Individual Member Decisions</p> <p>Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing - Julian McGhee-Sumner</p>		<p>Graham Ebers/ Simon Price</p>	<p>Julian McGhee-Sumner</p>	<p>N/A</p>

IMD 2017/17	Wokingham Borough Council response to the consultation Hart District Council Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites Purpose: To provide a response to Hart District Council on the consultation on the Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites Date 7 Jun 2017 at: 12.00 pm	Executive Member for Planning and Regeneration - Mark Ashwell		Josie Wragg/ Vanessa Rowell	Mark Ashwell	N/A
----------------	--	---	--	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

CHANGES MADE TO PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED VERSIONS

IMD 2017/12	Consultation Response on the Housing White Paper Purpose: To approve the Council response to the Government Consultation on the Housing White Paper	Executive Member for Planning and Regeneration - Mark Ashwell	28 Apr 2017	Josie Wragg/ Louise Strongitharm	Mark Ashwell	Further Consultation is needed on a response. Date tba
IMD 2017/13 7 08	Discretionary Housing Payments Policy Purpose: To ensure DHPs are awarded to applicants in line with our corporate policy and guidelines.	Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance - Anthony Pollock	28 Apr 2017	Graham Ebers/ Nicky Thomas	Anthony Pollock	Following the late notification of increased government funding allocation, it was felt that further discussion is required to ensure the policy takes account of this, whilst supporting those residents most in need
IMD 2017/14	Local Welfare Provision Policy Purpose: To ensure LWP awarded to applicants in line with our corporate policy and guidelines.	Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance - Anthony Pollock	28 Apr 2017	Graham Ebers/ Nicky Thomas	Anthony Pollock	Following the late notification of increased government funding allocation, it was felt that further discussion is required to ensure the policy takes account of this, whilst supporting those residents most in need

Members of the Executive:-

Keith Baker	Leader of Council
Julian McGhee-Sumner	Deputy Leader and Health and Wellbeing
Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Children's Services

Anthony Pollock	Economic Development and Finance
Angus Ross	Environment
Mark Ashwell	Planning and Regeneration
Malcolm Richards	Highways and Transport
Pauline Jorgensen	Resident Services

Note:

Unless the matter has been listed as being likely to be discussed in private, copies of the reports associated with the above decisions will be available no earlier than five days before the meeting at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham; on the Council's website; by contacting a member of the Democratic Services Team on 0118 974 6054 or by emailing democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT O&S MEETINGS PROGRAMME 2017/2018

Attached are details of specific Work Programme items to be considered at upcoming Overview and Scrutiny meetings. Please note that the Work Programme is a 'live' document and subject to change at short notice. The information in the Work Programme, including report titles is draft and is subject to approval by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

11 July 2017	Waste Strategy	To consider draft items for developing the Council's Waste Strategy prior to submission to the Executive	Consideration of policy changes	Pete Baveystock
	Discussion with Executive Member	To discuss performance issues and priorities for 2017/18 with an Executive Member (TBC)	Standing Item	Neil Carr
142	WBC Consultation Policy	To consider the Council's approach to consultation and the supporting guidelines	To ensure a consistent approach to consultation	Neil Carr
	Monitoring of Public and Member Questions	To review the public and Member questions submitted to the Executive and full Council meetings	Request by the Committee – 31 May 2016	Neil Carr
	Executive Forward Programme and IEMD Forward programme	To consider upcoming Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision items	Standing Item	Democratic Services
	Reports from O&S Chairmen	Standing Item	Coordination between the Committees	Committee Chairmen
	Work Programmes	To consider the Work Programmes for the Management Committee and the three Overview and Scrutiny Committees	Coordination between the O & S Committees	Democratic Services

20 September 2017	Budget Engagement Process	To consider the Council's public Budget Engagement Exercise for 2017	Annual update	Graham Ebers
	Monitoring of Public and Member Questions	To review the public and Member questions submitted to the Executive and full Council meetings	Request by the Committee – 31 May 2016	Neil Carr
	Executive Forward Programme and IEMD Forward programme	To consider upcoming Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision items	Standing Item	Democratic Services
	Reports from O&S Chairmen	Standing Item	Coordination between the Committees	Committee Chairmen
	Work Programmes	To consider the Work Programmes for the Management Committee and the three Overview and Scrutiny Committees	Coordination between the O & S Committees	Democratic Services

Items to be Confirmed:

Delivery Options for Highways and Transport	To receive a report once the service review process is complete	Requested - 11 January 2016	Alex Deans
Asset Management Review Programme	To receive a further update as the review progresses	Requested - 7 March 2016	Chris Gillett

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

2017/ 2018 WORK PROGRAMME

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
20 June	Children's Services Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive an update and monitor Children's Services performance measured by local indicators 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Children's Services Performance & Information Team
	School Performance Indicators and Ofsted Reports, School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information on schools' performance, and to review recent Ofsted Report Narrowing the gap – progress report 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Head of Learning & Achievement
	Schools causing concern – Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information about any school(s) causing concern 	Standing item to give an early indication of any school(s) in danger of underachieving	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Children's Services O&S Committee Forward Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider the forward programme of the Committee 	Standing item	Democratic Services / Luciane Bowker

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
12 September	Children's Services Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive an update and monitor Children's Services performance measured by local indicators 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Children's Services Performance & Information Team
	School Performance Indicators and Ofsted Reports, School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information on schools' performance, and to review recent Ofsted Report Narrowing the gap – progress report 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Schools causing concern – Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information about any school(s) causing concern 	Standing item to give an early indication of any school(s) in danger of underachieving	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Children's Services O&S Committee Forward Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider the forward programme of the Committee 	Standing item	Democratic Services / Luciane Bowker
14 November	Children's Services Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive an update and monitor Children's Services performance measured by local indicators 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Children's Services Performance & Information Team

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
	School Performance Indicators and Ofsted Reports, School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information on schools' performance, and to review recent Ofsted Report Narrowing the gap – progress report 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Schools causing concern – Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information about any school(s) causing concern 	Standing item to give an early indication of any school(s) in danger of underachieving	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Children's Services O&S Committee Forward Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider the forward programme of the Committee 	Standing item	Democratic Services / Luciane Bowker
23 January	Children's Services Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive an update and monitor Children's Services performance measured by local indicators 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Children's Services Performance & Information Team
	School Performance Indicators and Ofsted Reports, School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information on schools' performance, and to review recent Ofsted Report Narrowing the gap – progress report 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Head of Learning and Achievement

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
	Schools causing concern – Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information about any school(s) causing concern 	Standing item to give an early indication of any school(s) in danger of underachieving	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Children’s Services O&S Committee Forward Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider the forward programme of the Committee 	Standing item	Democratic Services / Luciane Bowker
20 March	Children’s Services Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive an update and monitor Children’s Services performance measured by local indicators 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Children’s Services Performance & Information Team
	School Performance Indicators and Ofsted Reports, School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information on schools’ performance, and to review recent Ofsted Report Narrowing the gap – progress report 	Standing item to enable the Committee to assess performance and identify areas of concern	Head of Learning and Achievement
	Schools causing concern – Part 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To receive information about any school(s) causing concern 	Standing item to give an early indication of any school(s) in danger of underachieving	Head of Learning and Achievement

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
	Children's Services O&S Committee Forward Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider the forward programme of the Committee 	Standing item	Democratic Services / Luciane Bowker

Possible items:

- Workforce Strategy 2014-16
- Children and Young People's Plan – refresh
- Early Years Strategy (this will look among other things of the impact of the 30 free hours for 3-4 year olds)
- Sufficiency Strategy for Children in Care and Care Leavers- refresh 2017-19
- Secondary School place planning
- Engagement Plan 2017-18 (how we get feedback from young people and their families)
- Disability Strategy 2016-18
- Children Missing Education Strategy 2015-18 (including children educated at home)
- Primary Strategy 2016-18
- Market Position statement, and Statement purpose of education.

COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2017/2018

149

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
19 June 2017	Flood Risk Update Report	To consider a report of local flooding issues arising during the winter of 2016/17	Statutory requirement	Francesca Hobson
	Car Parking Strategy Update and CPE	To consider the pricing of parking in Wokingham, how it has been formulated and the possible impact on town centre users, including Carnival Park and to update on the progress towards the introduction of CPE	Requested by the Chairman Jan 2017	Alison Dray
	Review of the Voluntary Sector	To consider an update on the Review and what is being proposed in regard to moving forward against Council priorities.	Requested at the meeting in March 2016	Paul Feven
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the committee for 2017/18 so that the resources of the committee can be used as effectively as possible.	Standing Item	Democratic Services
4 September 2017	Cycling Lanes	To consider the impact of new cycle lanes across the Borough and cycling safety issues including an update on the extension of new cycle lanes after the completion of Phase 4	Requested by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman at Jan 9 2017 meeting	Alex Deans/David Wilby
	Highway & Transport Service Initiatives 2017	General update on improvements and initiatives including improved programming and co-ordination of all planned works including the major distribution roads, and an update on highway maintenance repairs in 2017 and an update on the sound proof barriers along the M4.	Requested by the Committee 21 November 2016	Alex Deans

	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the committee for 2017/2018 so that the resources of the committee can be used as effectively as possible.	Standing Item	Democratic Services
9 November 2017	To review the potential impact of changes to the Right to Buy policy	To consider an update on the Government's Right to Buy proposals included in the Housing and Planning Act 2016, including levies	Requested by the Committee on 13 March 2017	Simon Price
	21st Century Council	To consider an update presentation/report on the 21 st Century Council Change Programme	Requested by the Committee on 9 Jan 2017	Andy Couldrick/ Heather Thwaites
	Unauthorised encampments	To consider an update on Unauthorised Encampments in the Borough in 2017 and the response to the ideas and feedback from Members. A comparison to the previous year with explanation for differences	Requested by the Committee 21 November 2016	Jude Whyte
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the committee for 2017/2018 so that the resources of the committee can be used as effectively as possible.	Standing Item	Democratic Services

Upcoming Items:

- Community Safety Partnership & Policing
- Public Budget Discussions

HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2017/2018

DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Monday 5 June 2017	Accessing GP appointments and Primary care facilities at the Arborfield SDL	To be informed of plans for primary care for the Arborfield SDL and to be updated around GP capacity and accessing GP appointments to determine if there are any areas of concern.	To determine if there are any areas of concern.	Darrell Gale, Consultant in Public Health/ Mark Cupit, Delivery Programme Director/ CCG
	Healthwatch – Extra Care Project	To update the Committee on Healthwatch Wokingham Borough's Extra Care Project	For information	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough
	Wokingham Safeguarding Adults annual report 2015-2016 and the Safeguarding Adults Board Annual report	To present the Wokingham Safeguarding Adults annual report 2015-2016 and the Safeguarding Adults Board Annual report to the Committee.	For information	Judith Ramsden, Director of People Services
	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Monday 10 July 2017	Update from Health and Wellbeing Board	To be updated on the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board	To be updated on the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board	Chairman of Health and Wellbeing Board
	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough
DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Monday 11 September 2017	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Wednesday 15 November 2017	Impact of the 21st Century Council project on health and social care services	To be informed of the potential Impact of the 21st Century Council project on health and social care services	To be informed of the potential Impact of the 21st Century Council project on health and social care services	Judith Ramsden, Director of People Services/ Andy Couldrick, Chief Executive
	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Monday 22 January	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	

DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
2018				
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough
DATE OF MEETING	ITEMS	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER / CONTACT OFFICER
Wednesday 7 March 2018	Performance Outcomes Report	To monitor performance and identify any areas of concern	Challenge item	
	Health Consultation Report	Challenge item	Challenge item	Democratic Services
	Healthwatch update	Challenge item	Challenge item	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

Currently unscheduled topics:

- Draft Quality Accounts (April 2018)
 - Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
 - Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
 - South Central Ambulance NHS Foundation Trust

- Update on work of Clinical Commissioning Group
- Weekend 'bed blocking'

This page is intentionally left blank