

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2015 FROM 7.30 PM TO 9.45 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Michael Firmager (Vice-Chairman), Prue Bray, UllaKarin Clark, Pauline Helliard-Symons, John Jarvis, Norman Jorgensen, Ken Miall, Malcolm Richards and Shahid Younis

Other Councillors Present

Councillor: Angus Ross, Executive Member for Environment

Officers Present

Peter Baveystock, Service Manager, Cleaner and Greener Team
Julie Holland, Service Manager Business Improvement
Kevin Jacob, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Josie Wragg, Head of Community Services

19. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Kate Haines and Dianne King.

20. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman highlighted the following matters arising from the minutes:

- Minute 14 - Balanced Scorecard 2014/2015 Quarter 4. It was noted that answers to the Committee's questions relating to Indicator 2, Staff Turnover and Indicator 59 – Number of dwellings countable within the five year land supply had been supplied to the Committee;
- Minute 15 – Consideration of the Current Executive Forward Programme. It was noted that Executive decision WBC755 – Library Offer had been postponed from September Executive Forward Programme to allow for further consideration. The Committee renewed its request to consider the item prior to an Executive decision.
- Minute 16 – Houses of Multiple Occupation. It was noted that the Executive Member for Planning and Highways had been requested to consider the development of additional local policies on House of Multiple Occupation and invited to attend the 23 November meeting of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

21. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

22. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

23. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

24. BALANCED SCORECARD 2015/2016 QUARTER 1

The Committee considered a report and supporting appendix setting out performance management information in relation to the Council's activities. The report had been published as part of a supplementary Agenda circulated after the publication of the main Agenda.

Julie Holland, Service Manager Business Improvement introduced the report to the Committee. It was noted that the name of the report had now changed from the Balanced Scorecard to the Council Plan Performance Monitoring report and covered Quarter 1 of the 2015/2016 financial year. The Committee was reminded that the report had been substantially redesigned to be more dynamic, easier to monitor and to be more closely linked to the Council's key objectives. It was stressed that although the design of the report was finalised, the list of indicators shown was not set in stone and could be changed if required.

In summary, the report showed a strong performance in Quarter 1 of 2015/2016 as 95% of indicators had been reported as achieving their targets. Three indicators had failed to meet their targets:

- The project to establish a Berkshire West Joint Commissioning Function
- The project for alternative provision for the physical disability day services currently at Westmead Wokingham;
- The assets programme examining options around the Council's land and property holdings.

The Committee was informed that the indicators measured within the report had been set as result of discussion between the relevant Executive Member and Director. The indicators reported within the report were considered to be of a high level strategic nature, but at service level there were more detailed indicators and targets for use within the services at operational level.

The reporting cycle of the report was that once compiled it was considered at Departmental Leadership Team meetings, the Corporate Leadership Team, Executive Members and finally the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

Prior to considering the report in detail, the Chairman invited general comments on the overall look and feel of the new report. A summary of these key points is presented below:

- Members reiterated that they wished to gain a greater general understanding of the rationale of how individual targets had been determined between Executive Members and their Directors in order that the Committee could form a view as to whether the targets were appropriate or sufficiently challenging. It was suggested that the most appropriate way for the Committee to seek assurance on the setting of the indicators was to invite individual Executive Members and Directors to meetings of the Committee to comment;
- Members of the Committee queried whether any feedback had been given on the new report by the Executive. Julie Holland commented that she had received feedback that the members of the Executive had found the report to much clearer to understand than the previous version;
- A number of Members commented that a number of indicators showed as having met their targets with a 'Green' RAG rating, despite the actual quarter 1 data showing that performance was significantly below target. The reason for this was questioned. It

was felt that an 'Amber' or even 'Red' setting would be more accurate. Julie Holland responded that a possible reason for this was that various targets were annual ones where although current performance was not meeting target, the relevant service had a high degree of confidence that performance would improve and meet target over the year. The RAG rating may have been set to green on this basis. She commented that she would feedback to the service department the parameters that should be used for RAG ratings and the service areas should use the comments section of the report to explain any that were unclear. Members of the Committee whilst acknowledging that some indicators might be measured annually felt that it was inaccurate to report a 'Green' RAG when the data at the time did not support that rating. It was felt that the purpose of the quarterly reports was to show actual performance against target at that time, not what it was expected to be. Julie Holland agreed to feed the Committee's reservations back through the appropriate channels;

- Members of the Committee felt that it would be helpful to have an explanation within the report of the target ranges for each indicator. This would set out the range for an indicator to be considered to be on target, and therefore have a Green RAG rating or below target and have an Amber or Red RAG rating. The Committee was informed that that this could be looked at where an indicator was not obvious, but care had to be taken not to include so much information that the report grew in size to the extent that it was no longer concise, which had been a criticism of the old Balanced Scorecard report.

The Committee then considered each section of the report in turn and the following comments and questions were made in respect of specific indicators. Page numbers refer to the supplementary Agenda:

Community

- Agenda page 8 – Number of WBC Councillors and Social Care Staff who are known to be 'dementia friendly'. Members sought clarification as to the criteria required to regarded as dementia friendly;
- Agenda page 14 – Number of cycle trips on the A329 corridor. Members sought clarification as to how this indicator was measured.

Place

- Agenda page 20 – Kgs of residual household waste per household per annum and Percentage of household waste reuse, recycling and composting. Members noted that the report indicated that the figures quoted were estimated and queried how the estimate was calculated;
- Agenda page 22 – Percentage of Community Infrastructure Levy, (CIL) and S106 funding allocated against schemes. Members queried why the report indicated a target of 90%, but did not have data for quarter 1.

Performance

- Agenda page 28 – Returns on external investment of cash. Members queried. Members queried why the quarter 1 performance was at 0.06% when the target was 0.50%. It was clarified that the target was annual and the performance figure shown was a cumulative percentage;
- Agenda page 27 – Council Tax Collection. Members queried the Council's success rate in recovering Council Tax single person discount where that discount had been

incorrectly claimed and suggested that a possible additional target could be the number of people identified as incorrectly claiming the discount. Kevin Jacob reminded the Committee that it had looked at the Council's performance in this area in November 2014 and had requested a further update in November 2015. He suggested that the relevant Officers should be asked to consider the Committee's latest comments as part of their preparations for the next meeting;

- Agenda page 30 – Percentage of services users satisfied with environmental regulatory services. Members queried the number of respondents on which the percentage data of satisfied respondents had been calculated.

Business

- Agenda page 34 – Number of apprenticeships for NEETs, (Not in Education, Employment or Training). Members comments that this an example of an indicator that was shown with a Green RAG rating when the quarter 1 results showed the target had not yet been achieved.

Workforce

- Agenda page 36 – Average days lost to sickness absence per employee headcount. Councillor Helliar-Symons commented that she felt that the Council's performance of 5.34 days lost to sickness was too high and represented a significant cost to council tax payers. Members of the Committee acknowledged that the Council's rate of sickness absence compared favourably with other local government employers and the NHS, but queried the procedure followed by line managers to reduce sickness absence proactively. It was suggested that one example of such a proactive measure might be through the use of return to work interviews. In addition Members sought clarification as to the impact of long term sickness on the percentages quoted.

After consideration of the report, it was decided to invite individual Executive Members and the relevant Directors to attend each of the remaining Committee meetings in the municipal year as part of the Committee's holding to account function. It was felt that as had taken place earlier in the meeting with the Committee's questioning of Councillor Angus Ross, Executive Member for Environment, this would provide an opportunity for the Committee to investigate and ask questions regarding the performance of the Council within the portfolio of the particular Executive Member including indicators captured in the Council Plan Performance Monitoring Report.

Members of the Committee acknowledged that as the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Children's Overview and Scrutiny Committee had their own areas of oversight it would be a matter for those Committees to consider inviting the attendance of the Executive Member with responsibilities relevant to those Committee's remits. Kevin Jacob was asked to develop a schedule of Executive Member attendance for the remainder of the municipal year.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the Council Plan Performance Monitoring Report Quarter 1 2015/2016 be noted;
- 2) further information in respect of the questions and issues raised by the Committee be circulated outside of the meeting;

- 3) a schedule of Executive Member and Director attendance be developed for the remainder of the municipal year in order for the Committee to be able to discuss the Council's performance in relation to areas within the Executive Members' individual portfolios including consideration of relevant indicators set out in the Council Plan Monitoring Report.

25. OPEN GREEN SPACES - UPDATE

The Committee received a presentation and update on the Borough's open spaces from Josie Wragg, Head of Community Services, Pete Baveystock, Services Manager, Cleaner and Greener Services and Councillor Angus Ross, Executive Member for Environment. A copy of the slides used during the presentation was set out in the Agenda on pages 13 to 22. The presentation followed a series of previous updates to the Committee following an investigation by the Committee into the Council's grass cutting arrangements in June 2014 following concerns expressed by residents at that time.

In introducing the presentation, Josie Wragg referred back to suggestions made by Members of the Committee relating to changes to the future specification of the Council's grass cutting contracts. She commented that these had been very helpful in the drafting of the next grass cutting contract arrangements and had also assisted in the management of the Council's incumbent contractor.

A summary of the key points arising from the presentation is set out below:

- The current grass cutting contract specified a total of eight cuts per annum, but the Council had worked with the incumbent contractor to increase flexibility as much as possible within the terms of the present contract. The incumbent contractor had displayed a willingness to redirect their resources in response to different circumstances;
- The current grass cutting contract expired at the end of March 2016;
- Where variable cutting regimes had been trialled consultation had been undertaken first and every effort made to reflect the outcome of the consultation in the final cutting regime;
- A partnership approach to the management of public open spaces would be developed as part of the new contract through a 'Friends of Scheme' for particular areas which would build on the existing 'Adopt a Street' litter picking scheme. There were some issues around insurance that needed to be worked through, but work was continuing. The concept of facilitating residents to be able to assist in looking after areas of public open space had been included within the future contract arrangements;
- Grass collection would form part of the new contract arrangement in some areas to prevent unsightly accumulations of grass and the blocking of drains, but it was not felt that it would be appropriate to seek to require specific contract machinery within the contract arrangements given the expense of this equipment. This was also consistent with the overall approach taken in drafting the new contract arrangements that the contract should not be prescriptive and instead focus on outcomes based measures;
- In March 2015 the Cleaner and Greener Team had been created under the management of Pete Baveystock. This team comprised Officers with experience of the management of open spaces and waste collection. The new team had proved to be very successful with a key improvement being an increase in the overall resilience of the team;
- The Council was working in partnership with sports pitch users to develop a better working relationship and ensure the quality of the surface did not affect usage and therefore income;

- Particular successes since the last update had been the variable cutting regime, an increased focus by the incumbent contractor on sports pitches, and the bio-diversity of wild flower meadows;
- The procurement of the future contract arrangements had been developed around an outcome based approach and the contractor in place at that time would be judged on the outcome of 21 key tasks. Direct resident feedback, surveys and independent inspection would be used as part of the monitoring of the contract and performance management would be split into three geographical areas overseen by Council Officers from the Cleaner and Greener Team;
- The new contractual arrangements would be pro-active in the management of low level vegetation;
- There would be closer work with Town and Parish Council's , residents groups, tenants and Property Services
- A joint competitive tendering and procurement process with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, (RBWM) was being followed with an upper price cap, but there would remain two separate contracts, (it was not a combined contract);
- The new contract was due to start on 1 April 2016 and run for a period of 10.5 years so that at its expiry any potentially new contractor would not be taking over at the start of the growing season;
- The day to day operation and management of the new contract would use the Microsoft Dynamic customer management software system which would allow for customer enquiries to be sent direct to the contractor and responses given to the customer from the contractor automatically;
- Future challenges included managing possible devolution of open space management to other organisations such as Town and Parish Councils, partnership working and management of resources.

A summary of the Committee's discussion following the presentation is set out below:

- Members queried whether the new contract would contain any penalty clauses. It was indicated that rather than penalties, the approach had been to build in incentives to deliver the desired outcomes. The Council would monitor the contract using a variety of approaches as outlined in the presentation including customer feedback. Members' assistance was requested in identifying residents who could act as champions for their areas and it was anticipated that an approach similar to that used as part of the 'Adopt a Street' scheme would be used;
- Members commented that they were very pleased with the success of wildflower meadows planted on a number of verges and open spaces;
- It was confirmed that although grass collection following cutting could not be undertaken in all areas, areas would be prioritised where there was a particular need, such as where there was a risk of flooding or paths were slippery;
- Members noted that the period of the contract was 10.5 years and it sought reassurance that the new contract arrangements would contain appropriate break clauses. The Committee was informed that standard break clauses would be included;
- Members reiterated the point that if sports pitches could be maintained to a higher quality, the amount of use would be higher generating more income for the Council. Officers responded that this was fully recognised and effort had been put into maintenance of sports pitches, particularly in preparation for autumn and winter. However, it needed to be understood that there were not sufficient resources to undertake all the measures that might otherwise be desirable;

- Members questioned whether other local authorities had been approached to establish if they wished to take part in the joint procurement exercise in addition to the RBWM. It was confirmed that this was depended on the expiry date of those Council's grass cutting contracts. Within Berkshire only the RBWM had a contract expiry date compatible with the Council;
- Members queried the scale by which other organisations might take on the delivery of grass cutting and open public space management in the future. The Committee was informed that currently it was felt likely that relatively small areas would be devolved and this change would enhance or complement the Council's activities rather than take over from it. Residents would play an important role in being 'eyes and ears' of the Council on the ground;
- The Committee was informed that robust arrangements for the management of the new contract and the delivery of the 21 contract outcomes would remain within the Council. This represented an advantage over those Councils who had decided to completely outsource their contracts which could cause monitoring problems;
- Members of the Committee suggested that the Committee should receive a report on the implementation of the new contract a reasonable period after it had commences so that it could assure itself that the expected outcomes were being delivered. Councillor Ross and the Officers indicated that they would be comfortable with this;
- It was explained to the Committee that because every growing season was different there had to be flexibility around priority outcomes. Success could not be assessed on the basis of simple measures such as the number of contractors hours spent in a particular area or Ward alone because the conditions and therefore need might be very different, for example rural vs urban areas, areas with more a higher proportion of highways verges etc. The example was given that if an area had a relatively high number of complaints despite a high number of contractor hours it might trigger further investigation, but each circumstance would be different;
- Members expressed concern that in some instances following development it was unclear who had responsibility for the maintenance of fragments of open space. The Committee was informed that every effort was taken to avoid such circumstances occurring and this issue was under particular scrutiny as part of the planning and delivery of the Strategic Development Locations, (SDLs);
- The Committee was informed that other potential areas of focus within the new contract as a result of common complaints from residents would include more proactive maintenance of shrubs on open space near properties so that there was less encroachment of growth, trees blocking light and knee high fences;
- The Committee was reminded that the Council was at the start of what would be a new era in the management of open public spaces. There were potentially many positive opportunities from this, but it also needed to be taken into consideration that the Council's resources were limited by the budget available;
- The decision to undertaken a joint procurement exercise had already produced some economies of scale and reduced costs.

Following the discussion, Members of the Committee unanimously commented that they felt that the maintenance of public open space had significantly improved over the last year and especially since the creation of the Cleaner and Greener Team. Member wished to place on record their congratulations and thanks to Pete Baveystock for his management of the service. An update report to the Committee on the introduction of the new contract in November 2016 was supported.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the presentation and key points arising from its discussion be noted;

- 2) the Executive Member for Environment and relevant Officers be requested to provide an update in the introduction and operation of the new grass cutting contract in November 2016.

26. DISCUSSION WITH COUNCILLOR ROSS - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

The Chairman commented that as part of its role of holding the Executive to account for the delivery of Council services it had decided to invite Councillor Ross to speak to the activities within his portfolio and take questions from the Committee.

The Committee was referred to the list of Councillor Ross's responsibilities on Agenda page 23. Councillor Ross provided the Committee with a brief update on each area of responsibility and answered the Committee's questions in turn. A summary of the key points arising from this discussion is set out below:

- **5.2.10.1 (Environmental Services)** – Councillor Ross commented that work was in place to develop a plan for the Countryside Service to become self-funding. In addition the Council's Tree Service had been reorganised and work undertaken at Southlake lake;
- Prue Bray suggested that in her opinion the heading of environmental services logically included areas of Council services including environmental health functions related to air quality. Councillor Ross responded that consideration had been given to this point as part of the process of determining Executive Member portfolios, but a decision made that issues such as air quality would fall within the remit of Executive Member for Resident Services, Councillor Pauline Jorgensen;
- **5.2.10.2/3 (Flooding and Production of a Flooding Strategy)** – Councillor Ross informed the Committee that a joint Officer/Cross Party Task and Finish Group was working on the production of the Local Flood Management Strategy although production of the strategy had been impacted by a shortage of Officer resources. With regards to flood alleviation, work had been completed along the A327, ditches cleared and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, (SUDS) installed;
- Members queried whether the Flooding Strategy included proposed measures to mitigate against existing flooding problems or if it was focussed towards addressing future issues. Councillor Ross responded that the strategy included recorded problems and incidents as well as anticipated ones. Whilst the Council would never be able to give the assurance that flooding risks could always be mitigated and finance would remain constrained, the issue was considered to be adequately managed. In terms of future development in the Borough the Council was doing everything within its power to prevent development increasing the risk of flooding. An example of this was the embedding of an Officer from the flooding team within the Development Management Service. However, it also had to act on the advice of statutory agencies such as the Environment Agency;
- Members queried Officer recruitment and Councillor Ross accepted that Officer recruitment within the Flooding Team was a recognised issue, but when necessary expertise was accessed from the Council's contractor WSP;

- **5.2.10.4/6 (Waste Collection and Recycling/Re3)** – Councillor Ross informed the Committee that the existing waste collection contract was due to expire at the end 2017. He commented that the Borough’s rate of recycling was good whereas sometimes the recycling rates of some local authorities reporting higher rates of recycling did not prove to be accurate on closer examination. The Council was working with Reading Borough Council and Bracknell Forest Borough Council through the Re3 Joint Partnership Board to further improve rates of recycling and where markets existed, expand the range of materials that could be recycled;
- Referring to the possible expansion of the range of materials that could be recycled through kerb side collection, Members asked if there were any plans being considered to collect glass, a wider range of plastics, food waste and small electrical appliances as they were aware of neighbouring authorities whose kerbside schemes included these items. With regard to glass recycling, Councillor Ross responded that the present arrangement of bottle banks with glass being sorted by colour represented the best option as this glass had a bigger market. The issue with kerbside glass collection was that the glass was mixed together and the market for this was limited to road building aggregate. Given the Re3 partnership arrangement the Council had to engage with the other Councils and could not act unilaterally. Expansion of the range of materials would involve alterations at the Smallmead Household Waste Recycling Centre and would also involve changes as part of the new waste collection contract. In order to collect food waste the collection vehicles used would need to have separate compartments or dedicated vehicles would need to be provided by the contractor;
- **5.2.10.5 (Development of a Carbon Reduction Plan)** – The Committee was informed by Councillor Ross that the Council was considering the implications of the Government’s recent national policy changes to the rates of renewable subsidies on the development of the Carbon Reduction Plan. Councillor Prue Bray suggested that the Council should make representations to the Government in opposition to the changes;
- **5.2.10.7 (Playground Provision)** – Councillor Ross informed the Committee that the Council was undertaking a critical review of playground provision looking at the issues of size, location and modernisation, being especially mindful of future provision within the SDLs and the most effective use of Section 106 funding;
- The Chairman referred to the development of the Country Parks Vision and queried progress as he felt it had been delayed for a significant time. Councillor Ross indicated options for future income generation were being considered as well as potential works and improvements at California Country Park;
- **5.2.10.8 (Partnerships)** – Councillor Ross referred to the update he had given earlier regarding measures to alleviate against flooding and the partnership working that this involved. A flood catchment area group had been established for the River Loddon. In addition, the Council was active within the Mid and West Berks Local Countryside Access Forum and had as had been commented upon earlier, worked with the Royal Borough Windsor and Maidenhead on open space maintenance procurement. With regards to Minerals and Waste joint work with other Councils was also in progress. Finally, the Council was working with Hampshire County Council regarding the retention of a contractors bridge across the River Blackwater which would allow public rights of way access on both sides of the river and county boundary;

- **5.2.10.9 (Sports Development Strategy)** – Members of the Committee were informed of progress in the development of a new Sports Hub at Ryeish Green and that this project would involve a significant amount of consultation to move forward. The Committee also had plans to reopen the Ryeish Green Leisure Centre;
- With regards to health, the Council was also making a significant contribution towards the improvement of health and wellbeing through greater exercise. Two long term condition gyms had been opened and a Multi-Use Games Area, (MUGA) planned for Finchampstead. The Committee was informed that new flood lighting was being installed at Cantely Park;
- Members of the Committee asked a number of questions regarding specific sports facilities and also asked if partnership working was taking place with Towns and Parish Councils regarding sports. Councillor Ross responded that the Council was working on an ongoing basis with Towns and Parish Councils relating to sports and Laurel Park in Earley was a good example of such a partnership arrangement. Other potential opportunities for partnership working were also being explored with Charvil Parish Council;
- **5.2.10.10 (Public Rights of Way)** – Councillor Ross referred to the work of the West and Mid-Berks Local Access and commented that unlike many local authorities who were having to cope with the challenge of simply seeking to maintain their existing public rights of way network within reduced resources, Wokingham was in the fortunate position currently of extending its network of public rights of way. The Council had also worked with other local authorities on issues such as the implications of the widening of the M4 on rights of way including footbridges. The Council was working to put in place ‘Greenways’ in and out of the SDL locations through working with the local landowners and local interest groups;
- Councillor Prue Bray referred to issues for horse riders when bridleways crossed roads and Councillor Ross commented upon the installation of Pegasus Crossings which were specifically designed for horse riders.
- Councillor Ken Miall referred to instances of public rights of way access not being adhered to following development and highlighted an example of this. Councillor Ross acknowledged that there could be difficulties in that the legislation around public rights of way could be complex and often there were land ownership legal issues to overcome as well.

In a response to a question, Councillor Ross commented that the numbers of indicators relating to his portfolio shown within the Council’s Performance Plan Report reflected the indicators that had been considered to be most helpful, but if the Committee was minded to suggest other indicators for inclusion it was welcome to do so.

27. HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE REVIEW - UPDATE

The Chairman referred to the update report on the Highways and Transport Service as set out on Agenda pages 25 to 28 and highlighted that a further report would be brought to the Committee’s November meeting. Due to time constraints he suggested not discussing the report further on that occasion, but that Members of the Committee should give consideration to possible questions and lines of enquiry and send these to Kevin Jacob in advance of the November meeting.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) The progress report on the review of the Highways and Transport Service be noted;
- 2) Members of the Committee consider lines of enquiry or requests for further information from Officers and send these to Kevin Jacob in advance of the November meeting.

28. CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME

The Committee considered a copy of the published Executive Forward Programme as set on Agenda pages 29 to 37.

In respect of WBC801 – Four-Way Building Control Service, Councillor Prue Bray queried which other local authorities were potentially partners with the Council in the proposed new service. Kevin Jacob indicated he would request an answer to this question and circulate it to the Committee outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Forward Programme be noted.

29. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered its forward work programme and that of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as set out on Agenda pages 39 to 66.

The Chairman referred the Committee to a new overview and scrutiny review request form submitted by Councillor Prue Bray which asked for a scrutiny review of the services currently delivered by the Council or which the Council was in the process of moving to deliver with other local authorities as shared services. This had been circulated to the Committee by way on a Supplementary Agenda.

In introducing the review, Councillor Bray commented that the restrained financial circumstances the Council and other local authorities faced had acted as driver for the delivery of services as efficiently as possible. One model of service delivery that was becoming more and more common within the Council and nationally was joint service delivery with other Councils. She commented that the arrangements by which a number of the Council's shared services had been established varied and it was an opportune time to review which shared service arrangements had been more successful and those that had been less successful in order that the Council could continuously improve as it entered into new shared service arrangements.

Members of the Committee supported the undertaking of the review and commented that that they did feel that there were lessons to be learnt from the experience of services already jointly delivered.

Kevin Jacob commented conveyed the comments of Andy Couldrick, the Chief Executive that such a review would be useful if it was properly scoped, and framed. However, Kevin Jacob drew attention to the resource requirements of the review and commented that in light of the existing scrutiny reviews in progress or about to start, the Officer resource to support a new review would be unlikely to be available until December 2015.

It was decided to review the situation again at the November meeting, but that the review should be placed on the Committee's work programme and progressed at the earliest opportunity.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the current Work Programme of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be noted, subject to the addition to the work programme of a review of the Council's shared services.
- 2) the start date of the review be reconsidered at the November Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting.

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

RESOLVED: That the report of the Chairman of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted.

31. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

The Chairman informed the Committee that Kevin Jacob, the Committee's Clerk would be leaving the Council at the end of September to take up a position at another local authority. He and other Members of the Committee thanked Kevin for his support to the Committee over the years and wished him well in his new role.