

Committee: Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board
Date: Tuesday 10 January 2012
Time: 7.00 pm
Venue: Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA

Membership

Councillor Nicholas Mawer (Chairman)	Councillor Douglas Webb (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Alyas Ahmed	Councillor Maurice Billington
Councillor Patrick Cartledge	Councillor Margaret Cullip
Councillor Andrew Fulljames	Councillor Melanie Magee
Councillor Lawrie Stratford	Councillor Patricia Tompson
Councillor Martin Weir	Councillor Douglas Williamson

Substitutes

Councillor Andrew Beere	Councillor Mrs Diana Edwards
Councillor Tim Emptage	Councillor George Parish
Councillor Alaric Rose	Councillor Leslie F Sibley
Councillor Trevor Stevens	Councillor Rose Stratford

AGENDA

Overview and Scrutiny Members should not normally be subject to the party whip. Where a member is subject to a party whip they must declare this at the beginning of the meeting and it should be recorded in the minutes.

- 1. Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitute Members**
- 2. Declarations of Interest**

Members are asked to declare any interest and the nature of that interest which they may have in any of the items under consideration at this meeting.

3. Urgent Business

The Chairman to advise whether they have agreed to any item of urgent business being admitted to the agenda.

4. Minutes (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 November 2011.

5. Exclusion of the Press and Public

The following report contains exempt information as defined in the following paragraph of Part 1, Schedule 12A of Local Government Act 1972.

3– Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Members are reminded that whilst the following item has been marked as exempt, it is for the meeting to decide whether or not to consider each of them in private or in public. In making the decision, members should balance the interests of individuals or the Council itself in having access to the information. In considering their discretion members should also be mindful of the advice of Council Officers.

Should Members decide not to make a decision in public, they are recommended to pass the following recommendation:

“That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that they could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.”

6. Budget Scrutiny 2012/13 (Pages 9 - 14)

The Council has to adopt a budget for 2012/13 as the basis for calculating its level of Council Tax and has to base that budget on its plans for service delivery during the year, recognising any changes in service demand that may arise in future years.

Between September and December 2011, the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board undertook a review of the budget. The budget scrutiny process for 2012/13 has involved a review of the current budget for 2011/12 of £15.8m with a detailed review of Discretionary areas of spend. Discretionary spend for Cherwell District Council in 2011/12 totalled a net expenditure of £3.1m (27% of the Council's net budget) and the capitals bids received as part of the 2012/13 process. The recommendations and conclusions from the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board, which were agreed by the Board on 22 November 2011 and considered by Executive on 6 December 2011, are attached at Appendix 1 for information.

The Head of Finance will update Members on the outcome of the Executive's consideration of the recommendations and conclusions.

At the Board's November meeting, Members had deferred consideration of the following items:

1. Capital Bids

- i. Cherwell Community Led Housing Project - The Board agreed that in principle the proposal was sound and was minded to recommend the bid for approval but requested additional information be provided.
- ii. Community Intelligence Hub – The Board requested that this bid be re-evaluated and brought back to the Board's January meeting for consideration
- iii. Telephony Development - Members requested that additional information relating to this bid be submitted to the Board's January meeting for consideration

2. Communications – Controllable / Uncontrollable costs

The Board noted that a full review of the service was being undertaken. Members requested that officers bring proposals detailing how the service could save 25% of its controllable budget to the Board's January 2012 meeting for consideration

3. Linked to Communications, Members requested that officers consider savings related to Cherwell Link

An exempt briefing pack on these items will be circulated to Board Members under separate cover.

The final budget will be presented to Council on 22 February 2010.

Recommendations

The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board is recommended:

- (1) To consider the additional information and make recommendations to the Executive accordingly.

7. Re-admittance of the Press and Public

Should Members decide to readmit the press and public, they are recommended to pass the following recommendation:

“That the press and public be readmitted to the meeting.”

8. Review of Budget Scrutiny 2012/13 Process

The Chairman and the Head of Finance and Procurement will lead on a discussion on the Board's scrutiny review of the 2012/13 budget. This will be an opportunity for Members to reflect on the process and consider the approach for budget scrutiny 2013/14.

9. **Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme Update** (Pages 15 - 22)

Report of Head of Law and Governance

Summary

To update Members on the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12.

Recommendations

The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board is recommended to:

- (1) Note the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board element of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12 as set out at appendix 1.
- (2) Note that a detailed review of the work programme will be presented to the February meeting of the Board.

Councillors are requested to collect any post from their pigeon hole in the Members Room at the end of the meeting.

Information about this Meeting

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence should be notified to democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk or 01295 221589 prior to the start of the meeting.

Declarations of Interest

Members are asked to declare interests at item 2 on the agenda or if arriving after the start of the meeting, at the start of the relevant agenda item. The definition of personal and prejudicial interests is set out in the constitution. The Democratic Support Officer will have a copy available for inspection at all meetings.

Personal Interest: Members must declare the interest but may stay in the room, debate and vote on the issue.

Prejudicial Interest: Member must withdraw from the meeting room and should inform the Chairman accordingly.

With the exception of the some very specific circumstances, a Member with a personal interest also has a prejudicial interest if it is one which a Member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.

Local Government and Finance Act 1992 – Budget Setting, Contracts & Supplementary Estimates

Members are reminded that any member who is two months in arrears with Council Tax must declare the fact and may speak but not vote on any decision which involves budget setting, extending or agreeing contracts or incurring expenditure not provided for in the agreed budget for a given year and could affect calculations on the level of Council Tax.

Evacuation Procedure

When the continuous alarm sounds you must evacuate the building by the nearest available fire exit. Members and visitors should proceed to the car park as directed by Democratic Services staff and await further instructions.

Access to Meetings

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named below, giving as much notice as possible before the meeting.

Mobile Phones

Please ensure that any device is switched to silent operation or switched off.

Queries Regarding this Agenda

Please contact Natasha Clark, Law and Governance natasha.clark@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221589

Sue Smith
Chief Executive

Published on Friday 30 December 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Cherwell District Council

Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board

Minutes of a meeting of the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board held at Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA, on 22 November 2011 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor Nicholas Mawer (Chairman)
Councillor Douglas Webb (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Alyas Ahmed
Councillor Maurice Billington
Councillor Patrick Cartledge
Councillor Margaret Cullip
Councillor Andrew Fulljames
Councillor Melanie Magee
Councillor Lawrie Stratford
Councillor Patricia Tompson
Councillor Martin Weir
Councillor Douglas Williamson

Officers: Karen Curtin, Head of Finance and Procurement
Karen Muir, Corporate System Accountant
Helen Town, Strategic Housing Officer
Natasha Clark, Senior Democratic and Scrutiny Officer

26 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

27 **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

28 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

29 **Budget Scrutiny 2012/13**

The Chairman opened the discussion with a brief resume of the work that the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board had undertaken to review the 2012/13 budget. The budget scrutiny process for 2012/13 had involved a review of the current budget for 2011/12 of £15.8m with a detailed review of

discretionary areas of spend, a review of staff savings suggestions and the capital bids received as part of the 2012/13 process. The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board then reflected on the areas considered as part of the budget scrutiny process and the draft recommendations, conclusions and comments based on the outcomes of the budget scrutiny working group meetings.

i. Capital Programme 2011/12

Members were satisfied with the evidence for eight of the seventeen bids: Bid 3 Biomass Heating for Bicester Leisure Centre; Bid 4 Recycling Bank Replacement Programme; Bid 5 Environmental Services Vehicle Replacement Programme; Bid 6 Energy Efficiency Projects; Bid 12 Ferriston Roof Repairs; Bid 13 Thorpe Way Roof Repairs; Bid 14 Discretionary Housing Grants; Bid 15 Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs), and agreed that these should be recommended for inclusion in the capital programme 2012/13.

Members agreed that capital Bid 16, Cherwell Community Led Housing Programme, should be recommended for inclusion in the capital programme 2012/13 subject to officers circulating additional information (including the report to Executive in May 2010 and modelling) to Members of the R&PSB and them being satisfied with the additional information. Members agreed that the idea was sound in principle but queried the payback and risks associated with the project. In agreeing to receive supplementary information, the Board agreed not to defer making recommendation on the Bid as they acknowledged that any delay to signing the contract may restrict opportunities for additional funding.

Members agreed that capital Bid 1, Bicester Methodist Church – Redevelopment of Community Treasury Facilities, should not be recommended for inclusion in the capital programme 2012/13. Rather than provide funding through the capital programme, the Board requested that officers investigate other sources of funding that was equitable with the two other churches that have received similar funding.

Members agreed to defer making a recommendation on the remaining bids: Bid 2 Community Intelligence Hub; Bid 7 Disaster Recovery Upgrade – Vmware Site Recovery Manager; Bid 8 Thin Client Rollout Quest Virtual Desktop Infrastructure; Bid 9 IT Core Infrastructure Upgrade – New Virtual Servers, SAN (Storage Area Network) and Network Upgrade; Bid 10 Extension of Microsoft Enterprise Agreement (software licensing); Bid 11 Core Software Architecture; Bid 17 Telephony Development.

With regard to Bids 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, Members noted that these bids related to ICT and agreed that consideration of these bids should be deferred pending a decision being taken by Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire Council on the ICT Insource and Shared Services Business Case.

In considering Bid 2, Community Intelligence Hub, the Board had raised queries regarding potential efficiency savings and whether the bid represented an invest to save opportunity. Members also requested further information on whether there may be any other contributions available for the

Hub. The Board requested that officers rescore the bid taking into account their queries and that the bid be re-presented to the Board's January meeting.

Whilst Members acknowledged that Bid 17, Telephony Development, could potentially play an important role for customer contact in the future, Members agreed that they would like further information on the proposal. Members requested that officers present this information to the Board's January meeting for consideration.

ii. Discretionary Spend

The Head of Finance and Procurement reminded Members that discretionary spend for Cherwell District Council in 2011/12 totalled a net expenditure of £3.1m (27% of the Council's net budget).

During the budget scrutiny working group meetings, which had involved relevant Lead Members and officers, the Board had considered in detail the following areas: Street wardens; communications; community transport; economic development; Woodgreen Leisure; Spiceball Sports Centre; Banbury Museum; Council's Administration Function; Tourist Information Centre/Courtyard; Support Cost Trends; Communications – Controllable/Uncontrollable Costs; and, Distribution of Cherwell Link with Electoral Registration forms / Council Tax Bills (linked to communications)

- **Street Wardens**

In considering this item, the Board learnt about the background to the service and the role that Street Wardens played in the community and the service was considered invaluable for residents. Members noted that there had already been reductions in the team 2011/12. The Board agreed that it was difficult to identify the cost benefit of the service, but it was a highly respected and front line service and therefore it was not appropriate to reduce or remove the service. This was also considered as a staff savings suggestion.

- **Community Transport**

The Board noted that savings had already been generated through building block 14 and agreed that no recommendation be made in this area.

- **Economic Development**

The Lead Member for Economic Development and the Economic Development Officer attended a budget scrutiny working group meeting to discuss the Economic Development budget and to provide Members with further information about the Economic Development Team and the service which was provided and projects the Team was involved with.

The Board noted that a Value for Money review of the service had recently been undertaken, which had identified both good practice and savings.

The Board agreed to make no recommendation in this area but requested that a quarterly report be submitted to the relevant scrutiny committee with regard to inward investment projects detailing expenditure / benefits / successes and future plans.

- **Woodgreen Leisure**

The Board noted that a report on this area was currently being drafted and, on account of this, agreed to make no recommendations at this time.

- Spiceball Sports Centre

In considering this area, the Board was advised that the contract would be reviewed in 2012/13. Members agreed to make no recommendation at this time but agreed that the item should be added to their work programme for 2012/13.

- Banbury Museum

The Board noted that this area had been subject to a Value for Money review and implementation of trust status considered and agreed therefore to make no recommendation. Members agreed that they should add this to their 2013/14 work programme to review/monitor.

- The Council's Administration Function

In considering this item, the Board had been advised that the £1m administration budget covered the function for the whole authority. The existing three administration teams no longer corresponded to the Council structure following the implementation of the Joint Management Team and the Head of Transformation was undertaking a review of administration across both Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire Council. Once this was complete, it would be presented to Members. Members recommended that a 10% saving on controllable costs should be implemented by 1 April 2012.

- Tourist Information Centre/Courtyard

The Board agreed that they would add this to their 2012/13 work programme to undertake a review.

- Support Cost Trends 2007/08 to 2011/12

In considering this item, the Board had noted the reduction in support costs. Members agreed that this should be monitored annually and support model be added to the Board's 2012/13 work programme.

- Communications – Controllable/Uncontrollable Costs

The Head of Transformation and Deputy Leader (whose area of responsibility included communications) met the Board to brief Members on the Communications Team, the work undertaken and the Communications budget, including details of the controllable and uncontrollable costs.

Members were advised that following the appointment of a Joint Communications Manager with South Northamptonshire Council, a full review of the service at both councils was being undertaken. The Board requested that officers bring proposals detailing how the service could save 25% of its controllable budget to the Board's January meeting for consideration.

- Distribution of Cherwell Link with Electoral Registration forms / Council Tax Bills (linked to communications)

The Board had been advised that Electoral Registration forms were sent out by the Electoral Registration Officer (ERO) rather than the council and the Council could not compel the ERO to send anything out with them. There

were a number of practical reasons for not sending Electoral Registration forms out with Cherwell Link, notably the timeframe for issuing the forms and that there was an existing external contract for the forms to be printed and mailed.

With regard to Council tax bills, the Board was advised that it would not be cost effective to circulate with Cherwell Link due to the size of the council tax mailing.

The Board had been advised that the distribution of Cherwell Link would be reviewed to feed into the 2013/14. Members suggested that external advertising could generate income for the Council and savings could be found through shared distribution with South Northamptonshire Council. Members requested officers to explore these options further.

iii. Staff Savings Suggestions

The Chairman reminded Members that staff had submitted a list of 44 money saving suggestions which had been considered during the Budget Scrutiny Working Group meetings. Members recognised the value of the suggestions. In considering the suggestions, Members had concluded that whilst there were some staff suggestions that had already been implemented or were being addressed through other forums, there were nine suggestions they considered in detail:

- **Reduce Stationery Spend**

In considering this suggestion, the Board had been advised that the Council's stationery expenditure had reduced by 20% between 2008/09 and 2011/12. Members recommended that the Council's overall stationery spend be reduced by a further 10%.

- **Cease Distributing Free Dog Waste Bags**

In considering this suggestion, the Board had been advised how and where dog waste bags were distributed and the possible alternatives with regard to issuing them to the public. Members agreed that the Council should not stop issuing the bags because the cost of clearing up the mess could potentially increase. The Board agreed that officers should be requested to investigate making dog waste bags available through other outlets (i.e. vets, animal charity shops) which would release the time of Customer Service Representatives who currently dispensed them at the council's offices.

- **Councillors Blackberry Provision**

In considering this suggestion, the Board had been advised that the return of unused Blackberries would only generate savings of £200 and there was therefore little financial benefit in pursuing this. However, the Board had requested that an email be sent to all Members requesting that any unused Blackberries, laptops and PCs be returned, which would generate a saving in licences. The Chairman confirmed that this email had been sent and some appliances had already been returned.

- **Cease Webcasting**

The Board had been advised that webcasting had been considered as part of the Value for Money Review of Democratic Services and Elections and the

proposal to cease webcasting had not been taken up. Members felt that webcasting provided a valuable service for communicating with the public.

- **Staff Holiday / Pay Freeze / Change in Working Week**

There had been a number of suggestions relating to these areas. The Board had been advised that as the Council was about to start local pay negotiations, it was not an appropriate time to consider these areas. Members requested that the Head of Transformation submit a report to the appropriate committee on the potential of changes to the number of hours in the working week, staff pay freezes and buying/selling holiday.

- **Fast Tracking Licensing Applications**

The Board had been advised that licensing fees were regulated by the Licensing Act 2003 and Gambling Act 2005, which do not allow the grant of licences to be a revenue raising measure. Whilst the Council is able to set its own fees in respect of other types of applications, most licence types have a statutory consultation period so the ability to fast-track would not be available. The council generally endeavoured to issue licences within 10 working days.

- **Fast Tracking Planning Applications**

The Board had been advised that fast tracking for planning applications was virtually untested in the UK and in some cases where it had been considered, it had been discounted for fear of the Local Authority being accused of buying planning permission. Additionally, there were imminent national changes to the planning fees regime. Members agreed that it was not the appropriate time to consider this proposal.

- **Remove Street Warden Service**

This suggestion had been considered as part of the discretionary spend review.

- **Review CCTV Operation and Costs**

In considering this suggestion, the Board had learnt about the background to CCTV scheme, how it worked with Oxfordshire County Council and Thames Valley Police and the costs of the service. Members noted that Thames Valley Police was undertaking a review of CCTV and agreed that the Council should await the outcome of this review and then undertake a further review within Cherwell District Council in 2012/13.

- **Review Opening Hours of Link Point**

The Board had been advised that a reduction in the opening hours of Link Point had already been considered and approved by Executive.

iv. Council Tax Comparison Figures

The Board considered the council tax figures for Cherwell District Council and compared them to West Oxfordshire District Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council and South Northamptonshire Council. The comparative data included a breakdown of the cost of services and the split between statutory services and discretionary services. The Board had noted that each Local Authority structured their accounts and cost centres differently. Members agreed that the comparative figures with other authorities was very important and useful information. The Board requested that when 2012/13 information was available it be circulated to all Members.

The Board thanked the Finance Team for their hard work in providing all information requested and Lead Members and officers for attending the budget scrutiny working group meetings.

Resolved

- (1) That the recommendations, conclusions and comments as set out at appendix 1 to these minutes be submitted to the Executive for consideration as part of draft 1 of the 2012/13 budget at their meeting on 6 December 2011.

30

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

The Board considered a report of the Head of Law and Governance which updated Members on the overview and scrutiny work programme 2011/12.

The Board agreed that the January 2012 meeting would focus on the following outstanding matters arising from the budget scrutiny 2012/13 process where Members had requested additional information: Communications – controllable/uncontrollable costs; Capital bids – Community Intelligence Hub and Telephony Development. Other items scheduled for January 2012 would be deferred to February.

Members noted that a number of items had been added to the work programme following the budget scrutiny 2012/13 process and agreed to request the Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager and the Chairman to liaise with lead officers to agree the appropriate timescale for the issues to be added to the work programme.

Resolved

- (1) That the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board element of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12 be noted.
- (2) That the update on work programme items be noted.
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, to update the Board's work programme to incorporate for consideration items raised during the budget scrutiny process.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

Chairman:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

**2012/13 Budget Scrutiny Outstanding Actions,
Recommendations and Conclusions**

Recommendations	Reasons and Comments	Projected additional income/savings 2012/13
<p>Recommendations</p> <p>The budget scrutiny process for 2012/13 has involved a review of the current budget for 2011/12 of £15.8m with a detailed review of Discretionary areas of spend. Discretionary spend for Cherwell District Council in 2011/12 totalled a net expenditure of £3.1m (27% of the Council's net budget). and the capitals bids received as part of the 2012/13 process, the Executive is recommended to consider the following recommendations from the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board:</p>		
<p>Capital Programme 2012/13</p> <p>1. That the following capital bids be included in the capital programme 2012/13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Biomass Heating for Bicester Leisure Centre ii. Recycling Bank Replacement Programme iii. Environmental Services Vehicle Replacement Programme iv. Energy Efficiency Projects v. Ferriston Roof Repairs vi. Thorpe Way Roof Repairs 	<p>Bid i. The Board noted that no money had been spent on heating during the refurbishment of Bicester Leisure Centre. Biomass heating would save £56k per annum and payback would be achieved in 8.6 years.</p> <p>Bids ii – vi. The Board agreed that it was better to invest in replacement equipment rather than face potentially expensive repair bills.</p> <p>Bids vii and viii. The Board noted that the Discretionary Housing Grants remained static in 2010/11 and 2011/12 but that CDC had cut its contribution for Disabled Facilities Grants by 15% in 2011/12. It was anticipated Government funding would remain static and the Board agreed that the Bids should be recommended for approval but they would look at</p>	<p>-</p> <p>£56,000</p>

<p>vii. Discretionary Housing Grants viii. Mandatory Disabled Facilities Grants</p>	<p>these areas in more detail as part of the 2013/14 budget scrutiny process.</p>	
<p>2. That the following capital bid be included in the capital programme 2012/13 subject to officers circulating additional information, including the report to Executive in May 2010 and modelling, to Members and Members being satisfied with the additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cherwell Community Led Housing Programme 	<p>The Board agreed that in principle the proposal was sound and was minded to recommend the bid for approval but requested additional information be provided via email.</p>	
<p>3. That the following capital bid not be included in the capital programme 2012/13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Bicester Methodist Church – Redevelopment of Community Facilities 	<p>The Board agreed that funding for this proposal should not be provided through the Capital Programme and requested that officers investigate other sources of funding and equitable with the 2 other churches who have received similar funding.</p>	
<p>4. That recommendations on the following capital bids be deferred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Community Intelligence Hub ii. Disaster Recovery Upgrade – Vmware Site Recovery Manager iii. Thin Client Rollout – Quest Virtual Desktop Infrastructure iv. IT Core Infrastructure Upgrade – New Virtual Servers, SAN (Storage Area Network) and Network Upgrade 	<p>Bid i. The Board requested that this bid be re-evaluated and brought back to the Board's January meeting for consideration.</p> <p>Bids ii – vi. These bids relate to ICT. The Board agreed that consideration of these bids should be deferred pending the ICT Insource and Shared Service Business Case.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>v. Extension of Microsoft Enterprise Agreement (Software licensing) vi. Core Software Architecture vii. Telephony Development</p>	<p>Members requested that additional information relating to this bid be submitted to the Board's January meeting for consideration.</p>	
<p>Discretionary Spend >£200k</p>		
<p>5. Administration Function: That a 10% saving on the controllable costs be implemented by 1 April 2012.</p>	<p>This would generate savings of approx. £99,540.</p>	<p>£99,540</p>
<p>Staff Think Tank Savings</p>		
<p>6. That the Council's overall stationery spend should be reduced by 10%</p>	<p>A 10% reduction would save £5,000</p>	<p>£5,000</p>
<p>7. That free dog waste bags be removed from Customer Service desks</p>	<p>Officers should be requested to investigate making dog waste bags available through other outlets (i.e. vets, animal charity shops) which would release the time of Customer Service Representatives</p>	
<p>Deferred Items</p>		
<p>The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board deferred making recommendations on the following items and requested that further information be submitted to the Board's January meeting</p>		
<p>Discretionary Spend >£200k</p>		
<p>1. Communications – Controllable / Uncontrollable costs</p>	<p>The Board noted that a full review of the service was being undertaken. Members requested that officers bring proposals detailing how the service could save 25% of its controllable budget to the Board's January 2012 meeting for consideration</p>	
<p>2. Distribution of Cherwell Link with Electoral Registration / Council Tax Bills (Linked to</p>	<p>The Board requested that officers consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further adverts / flyers be included with Cherwell Link to fund 	

Communications above)	<p>distribution costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the potential of sharing distribution costs with South Northamptonshire Council
<p>Conclusions</p> <p>In addition to the recommendations detailed above, during the budget scrutiny process the Resources and Performance Scrutiny considered the areas below for which there are no recommendations. Members reached the following comments/conclusions and are chose to submit them to the Executive for information and, where appropriate, consideration during their budget discussions.</p>	
Service Area / Issue	Conclusion / Comments
Discretionary Spend >£200k	
1. Street Wardens	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area. This is considered an invaluable service by residents and Members agreed it was not appropriate to reduce or remove the service. The Board noted that the Team had already reduced from 4 to 3 in 2011/12. (Also considered as a Staff Think Tank Saving)
2. Community Transport	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area as savings had already been generated through building block 14
3. Woodgreen Leisure	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area as a report considering management arrangements was being drafted
4. Spiceball Sports Centre	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area as the contract would be reviewed in 2012/13. The Board agreed to add this to their work programme for 2012/13.
5. Banbury Museum	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area as it had been subject to a Value for Money review and implementation of trust status considered. The Board agreed to add this to their work programme for 2013/14.
6. Economic Development	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area. Members requested that a quarterly report be submitted to the relevant scrutiny committee with regard to inward investment

	projects detailing expenditure / benefits/ success and future plans
7. Support Cost Trends 2007/08 to 2011/12	The R&PSB recognised the reduction in support costs. Members agreed that the Board should monitor this annually and add support model to their 2012/13 work programme
8. Tourist Information Centres / Courtyard	The R&PSB agreed that they would add this to their 2012/13 work programme to undertake a review
Staff Think Tank Savings	
1. Councillors Blackberry provision	The return of unused Blackberries would only generate savings of £200 and there was therefore no financial benefit in pursuing this. At the request of the R&PSB an email had been sent to all Members requesting that any unused Blackberries, laptops and PC's be returned. This would generate a saving in licences etc. A further request to be sent from the Leader of the Council.
2. Cease webcasting	Members agreed that webcasting of meetings was a valuable communication tool and suggested more meetings should be webcast
3. Staff holiday / pay freeze / change in working week	The R&PSB recognise the value of staff suggestions and request that the Head of Transformation submit a report to the appropriate Committee on the potential of changes to the number of hours in the working week, staff pay freezes and buying/selling holiday
4. Fast Tracking Licence/Planning Applications	No further action to be taken in this area
5. Remove Street Warden Service	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area. This is considered an invaluable service by residents and Members agreed it was not appropriate to reduce or remove the service. The Board noted that the Team had already reduced from 4 to 3 in 2011/12
6. Review CCTV Operation and Costs	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area at this time. It was agreed that the Council should await the outcome of the Thames Valley Police review and then undertake a further review within CDC in 2012/13

7. Review Opening Hours of Link Point	The R&PSB agreed that to make no recommendation in this area. A reduction in Link Point opening times was already included in building block 5 and had been approved by Executive
Other	
Council Tax Comparisons	The R&PSB considered council tax figures for Cherwell District Council and neighbouring/local councils and requested that when 2012/13 information was available it be circulated to all Members.

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

10 January 2011

Report of Head of Law and Governance

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update Members on the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12.

This report is public

Recommendations

The Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board is recommended to:

- (1) Note the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board element of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12 as set out at appendix 1.
- (2) Note that a detailed review of the work programme will be presented to the February meeting of the Board.

Details

1 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

- 1.1 Appendix 1 sets out the existing work programme for both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board.

2 Review of Work Programme

- 2.1 The last scheduled meeting of the R&SPB in 2011/12 is on 28 February 2012. It would seem that this is an appropriate time to review

the work programme.

- 2.2 There are a number of items on the work programme that have been retained for monitoring. It is proposed that a detailed update on as many items as possible be presented to the Board's February meeting for information.
- 2.3 During the 2012/13 budget scrutiny process, the Board raised a number of areas that they would like to add to the work programme. At the December 2011 meeting, it was agreed that that authority be delegated to the Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, to liaise with the relevant officers to ensure that these items are added to the work programme for consideration at the relevant and appropriate meeting.
- 2.4 The Board will understand that in reviewing their work programme and determining whether or not to retain items on the work programme, they will need to consider the resources available from the Democratic Services team and the individual service areas to support the work and the timescales involved

3 Agenda for 28 February 2012

- 3.1 This is the draft agenda for the meeting in February:
 1. Bicester Vision Scoping Document
 2. Detailed Review of Work Programme and Update on Work Programme Items
 3. Feedback from Finance Scrutiny Working Group and Performance Scrutiny Working Group meetings

4 Future Meetings Schedule

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board	28 February 2012, 7.00pm
Finance Scrutiny Working Group	21 February 2012, 6.30pm
Performance Scrutiny Working Group	14 February 2012, 6.30pm
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	31 January 2012, 6.30pm 13 March 2012, 6.30pm

Implications

- Financial:** There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. The report of the individual scrutiny reviews will address any specific financial issues.
Comments checked by Sarah Best, Service Accountant, 01295 221982
- Legal:** There are no legal implications arising directly from this report. The report of the individual scrutiny reviews will address any specific financial issues.
Comments checked by Paul Manning, Solicitor 01295 221691
- Risk Management:** If too many items are included on the work programme there is a risk that scrutiny agendas become overloaded. This undermines effective scrutiny because Members are unable to concentrate on the key issues and officer resources are over-stretched. It may be necessary to hold further meetings during the year if the risk of not achieving the work programme becomes apparent. The report of the individual scrutiny reviews will address any specific risk issues.
Comments checked by James Doble, Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager, 01295 221587

Wards Affected

Each scrutiny review will identify the wards affected

Corporate Plan Themes

Each scrutiny review will identify the relevant corporate plan themes

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
Appendix 1	Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12
Background Papers	
None	
Report Author	Natasha Clark, Senior Democratic & Scrutiny Officer
Contact Information	01295 221589 Natasha.Clark@Cherwell-dc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12

Title	Sub-committee	Comments	Meeting		
			Jan	Mar	Later
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE					
Scheduling – to identify and agree potential topics for scrutiny					
Scrutiny – agreed topics for consideration at committee meetings					
Local Development Framework	OSC	For pre-decision scrutiny prior to submission to Executive. Agenda item for 13 March 2012.	✓		
Empty Homes Policy	OSC	For policy development review by Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to submission to Executive. To include consideration of a loan fund to bring empty properties back into use. Agenda item for 31 January 2012.	✓		
Task & Finish Groups – agreed topics for review outside committee meetings					
None					
Monitoring – to examine responses to scrutiny reports and to check on progress on implementation of recommendations					
Youth Services	OSC	Monitor developments in OCC and CDC Youth Services.			✓

Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12

Title	Sub-committee	Comments	Meeting			
			Jan	Feb	Mar	Later
RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY BOARD						
Scheduling – to identify and agree potential topics for scrutiny						
Partnerships: Bicester Vision	R&PSB	Agenda item for February meeting. Chairman to submit a scoping document for consideration.		✓		
Scrutiny – agreed topics for consideration at committee meetings						
Budget Scrutiny 2012/13	R&PSB	Consideration of items deferred from November 2011 meeting to agree recommendations to Executive in February 2012.	✓			
Contracts review – Landscape Maintenance	R&PSB	2 Members nominated to work with officers regarding the Landscape Maintenance contract. Update to be provided on the contract review process and performance in light of the reduction in service.	→	→	→	✓
Concessions Policy	R&PSB	Cllrs Cullip and Tompson to work with officers to develop the policy which will feed into the 2012/13 budget.	→	→	→	✓
Planning Applications Charges	R&PSB	To consider changes to charges for planning applications in line with government guidance and CDC policy – timescale dependent on Government issuing guidance				✓?
Task & Finish Groups – agreed topics for review outside committee meetings						
None						
Monitoring – to examine responses to scrutiny reports and to check on progress on implementation of recommendations						
Partnerships: ORCC	R&PSB	Progress against recommendations accepted by Executive in April 2010				✓

OSC: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
T&FG: Task & Finish Group

R&PSB: Resources & Performance Board

FSWG: Finance Scrutiny Working Group
PSWG: Performance Scrutiny Working Group

Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12

Title	Sub-committee	Comments	Meeting			
			Jan	Feb	Mar	Later
RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY BOARD						
		reviewed in September 2010 and June 2011. Retain on work programme in light of budget position, to review again				
Partnerships: Cherwell Safer Communities	R&PSB	To receive an update on the partnership and to consider the impact of funding cuts and how the CSCP is preparing for these cuts from the Local Police Area Commander. To include impact of budget reductions on crime and anti-social behaviour.				✓
Partnership Scrutiny: Oxfordshire Waste Partnership	R&PSB	Monitor OWP review of Joint Municipal Waste Strategy and financial arrangements				✓
Disabled Facilities Grants	R&PSB	Progress against implementation of policy and any wider implications in light of budget position				✓
The cost and use of external consultants by Cherwell District Council	FSWG	Monitor consultancy costs through the information provided to the Finance Scrutiny Working Group				✓
Budget 2012/13	R&PSB	Request during budget scrutiny that once the 2012/13 budget is finalised, reissue analysis with bullet point analysis				✓

This page is intentionally left blank