

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board

Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2011/12

27 March 2012

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 the update on the existing work programme items.
- (3) Consider the proposals for the potential work programme items that arose from the budget scrutiny 2012/13 and determine if these should be included on the work programme for the next municipal year.

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.
- 1.2 At the request of Members, the work programme format is being reviewed and a revised work programme template will be submitted to the Board in 2012/13.

2 Update on Existing Work Programme Items

Partnerships: Bicester Vision

2.1 The Chairman to update on this item.

Partnership Scrutiny: Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership

2.2 In September 2010 the Board met with representatives of the Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership (CSCP) and received a briefing on the CSCP, including CDC's role in the partnership.

2.3 The Board was satisfied with the evidence and submitted a report to the Portfolio Holder Safer Communities, Urban and Rural commending the Cherwell Safer Communities Partnership for its work on addressing crime and community safety matters in the district.

2.4 The Board agreed to retain the item on the work programme for further review. The CSCP is monitored through the Performance Management Framework and remains green.

2.5 *Proposal: As the Partnership remains green on the Performance Management Framework, it is proposed that the CSCP be deleted from the work programme. Should the performance change, this will be evidenced in the performance reports.*

Partnership Scrutiny: Oxfordshire Rural Community Council

2.6 In 2009/10 the Board scrutinised the Council's partnership with Oxfordshire Rural Community Council. All of the Board's recommendations were accepted by the Executive in April 2010.

2.7 Reports updating Members on progress against the recommendations were submitted to the Board's September 2010 and June 2011 meeting.

2.8 The Board to retain the item on the work programme for a further review.

2.9 *Proposal: That a further review of progress against the recommendations be submitted to the Board's June meeting.*

Partnership Scrutiny: Oxfordshire Waste Partnership

2.10 In 2010/11 the Board scrutinised the Council's partnership with Oxfordshire Rural Community Council. All of the Board's recommendations were accepted by the Executive in April 2010.

2.11 The Board agreed to retain the item on the work programme to monitor.

2.12 The financial arrangements of the Partnership are included on the Council's Risk Register which is reported to the Executive and

Accounts, Audit and Risk Committee for monitoring purposes. The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership has been rated as “amber” (net rating) in Quarters 2 and 3. Financial arrangements exist to regulate funds flowing between the collection authorities in Oxfordshire and the disposal authority (Oxfordshire County Council). These are legally binding, however Oxfordshire County Council has indicated that it is not prepared to continue all of the payments in the future which could threaten the partnership.

2.13 Discussions regarding the financial arrangements have commenced involving strategic directors and finance officers.

2.14 *Proposal: That an update be submitted to the Board’s June meeting.*

Contracts Review: Landscape Maintenance

2.15 In January 2011 the Board nominated officers to work with officers on the procurement of a revised landscape maintenance contract. The Board requested to receive an update on the performance of service in light of the award of contract.

2.16 *Proposal: That an update be submitted to the Board’s June meeting*

Disabled Facilities Grants

2.17 In June 2010 the Board received an overview of Disabled Facilities Grants in general and from Cherwell District Council’s perspective. Three Board members subsequently worked with officers to develop a Disabled Facilities Grants Policy which was approved by the Executive in December 2010 who had also endorsed the proposal that Registered Providers should be asked to sign-up to a protocol committing themselves to the principles in the Policy and to making a specified financial contribution towards the cost of adaptations for their tenants.

2.18 The Board agreed that the issue be retained on the work programme to monitor and consider any wider issues related to Disabled Facilities Grants that may emerge.

2.19 During the budget scrutiny 2012/13, the Board recommended that the capital bid for mandatory disabled facilities grants be approved and that this should be considered in more detail as part of the 2013/14 budget scrutiny process.

2.20 *Proposal: That disabled facilities grants be considered as part of the 2013/14 budget scrutiny process.*

The Cost and Use of External Consultants by Cherwell District Council

2.21 The Board considered this issue, which had been suggested by a former Board member, in March 2011 and received an update in September 2011. Members agreed consultancy costs should be monitored through the Finance Scrutiny Working Group.

- 2.22 *Proposal: That the Finance Scrutiny Working Group monitor consultancy costs.*

Concessions Policy

- 2.23 One of the conclusions of the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board budget scrutiny 2011/12 was that a Concessions Policy for the council should be developed. Members were nominated to work with officers to develop the policy. The budget 2012/13 process has determined that this will now feed into the budget 2013/14 process.
- 2.24 *Proposal: That this form part of the Board's budget scrutiny 2013/14 process.*

3 Potential Work Programme Items Arising from Budget Scrutiny 2012/13

Local Government Resources Review

- 3.1 The Board agreed that Finance Officers be requested to attend the Board's June meeting to give a briefing on the Local Government Resources Review which will impact on the Council and assist the Board in agreeing the approach for the budget scrutiny 2013/14.
- 3.2 *Proposal: That officers be requested to give a briefing on the Local Government Resources Review at the Board's June meeting.*

Spiceball Sports Centre

- 3.3 During the budget scrutiny, the Board agreed to make no recommendation in this area as the contract would be reviewed in 2012/13.
- 3.4 *Proposal: That officers be requested to attend a meeting of the R&PSB at the appropriate time and members of the Board be nominated to work with officers on the procurement process.*

Banbury Museum

- 3.5 During the budget scrutiny, the Board agreed to make no recommendation in this area as it had been subject to a value for money review and implementation of trust status considered. It was agreed that this item should be added to the work programme for 2013/14.
- 3.6 *Proposal: That the item be considered as part of the 2013/14 work programme.*

Economic Development

- 3.7 During the budget scrutiny, the Board agreed 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.

- 3.8 *Proposal: That quarterly updates be submitted to the Finance Scrutiny Working Group and the Group feed any concerns into the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board.*

Support Cost Trends

- 3.9 During the budget scrutiny, the Board agreed to make no recommendation in this area but recognised the reduction in support costs. The Board agreed that they should monitor this annually.
- 3.10 *Proposal: That an annual update be submitted to the Finance Scrutiny Working Group and the Group feed any concerns into the Resources and Performance Scrutiny Board.*

Admin Review

- 3.11 The Board was advised that a review of administrative resources would be undertaken in due course. The Joint Management Team is currently reviewing resources and requirements.
- 3.12 *Proposal: A further update will be provided when available.*

Tourist Information Centres / Courtyard

- 3.13 During the budget scrutiny, the Board agreed to make no recommendation in this area but recognised the reduction in support costs. The Board agreed that this should be added to their 2012/13 work programme to undertake a review.
- 3.14 *Proposal: That the item be considered at an appropriate time as part of the 2012/13 work programme.*

4 Future Meetings Schedule

Resources & Performance Scrutiny Board	12 June 2012, 7.00pm 17 July 2012, 7.00pm 4 September 2012, 7.00pm 9 October 2012, 7.00pm 20 November 2012, 7.00pm 15 January 2013, 7.00pm 5 March 2013, 7.00pm 16 April 2013, 7.00pm
Finance Scrutiny Working Group	3 July 2012, 6.30pm 18 September 2012, 6.30pm

	4 December 2012, 6.30pm 19 February 2013, 6.30pm
Performance Scrutiny Working Group	10 July 2012, 6.30pm 25 September 2012, 6.30pm 1 December 2012, 6.30pm 26 February 2013, 6.30pm
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	19 June 2012, 6.30pm 11 July 2012, 6.30pm 11 September 2012, 6.30pm 16 October 2012, 6.30pm 27 November 2012, 6.30pm 22 January 2013, 6.30pm 12 March 2013, 6.30pm 23 April 2013, 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 Advocate 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 overstretched. 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 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
Background Papers	
None	
Report Author	Natasha Clark, Team Leader, Democratic & Elections
Contact Information	01295 221589 natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk