REPORT: Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board

DATE: 13th June 2012

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Policy & Resources

SUBJECT: Policy & Performance Board Work Programme 2012/2013

WARDS: Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider possible topics for scrutiny as part of the 2012/13 work programme.

2.0 RECOMMENDED: That

(1) Members of the Policy and Performance Board indicate target topic areas for potential scrutiny in 2012- 2013;

(2) details of topic briefs be agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair of the PPB in conjunction with the Lead Officer for the Board; and

(3) nominations be invited from Members to sit on the existing Waste Management Topic Group to replace those four Members who are no longer on this Board.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

3.1 Each year the PPB has the opportunity to identify topics or work areas that it would like to scrutinise in detail as part of its work programme for the year.

3.2. Good practice, based on experience, suggests that 2/3 Topics is manageable, however the choice lies with the Board depending on its priorities and commitments. The process for scrutiny is that, following their adoption by this Board, the topics selected are worked up as detailed topic briefs and agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the PPB in conjunction with the Lead Officer for this Board.

3.3 In considering which are good topics to include in the work programme Members will need to keep in mind the Overview and Scrutiny Guide/Toolkit. Guidance on Topic Selection is attached as an aide-memoire. In particular, the Board's attention is drawn to paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 which relate to added value, capacity and resources.

3.4 It should be remembered that much of the work of this PPB will be cross-cutting and will impact on or be of relevance to other PPBs.

3.5   It should also be noted that Performance Monitoring of the Reporting
       Departments (Policy, Planning & Transportation; Economy, Enterprise and
       Property; Prevention and Commissioning Services (Housing Strategy); and
       Community and Environment), will in any case be received by this PPB.

4.0   2011/12 Work Programme

4.1   At the meeting of this Board on 16th March 2011 it was agreed that the
       following topic would be included in the 2011/12 work programme:

- A review of the new Household Waste Collection Policy following its
  adoption (approved by Executive Board on 17th March 2011). It was also
  identified that a review of waste collection operations meant that the
  Waste Management Topic Group needed to be re-established. It was
  resolved, therefore, that the Divisional Manager Waste and Environmental
  Improvement, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the
  Environment and Urban Renewal PPB, reconstitute the membership of the
  Waste Management Topic Group to review these two issues.

- The following nominations were received for this Topic Working Group:
  Councillors Hignett, Gerrard, Thompson, Wainwright and Hodgkinson, and
  they were subsequently endorsed.

- On 15 June 2011, the Board were informed of progress with the alternate
  bin collection scheme and it was agreed that the work of this Topic Group
  should continue.

- On 4th January 2012, the Board considered notes of a meeting of the
  Topic Group that took place on 16th November 2011in which it was
  recommended that delegated officers and Members have the discretion to
  waive bin charges not only in cases of hardship but in other exceptional
  circumstances. The Board supported this recommendation.

Because of the nature of this Policy, the work of this Topic Group will remain
on-going and future reports may be brought to this Board for its consideration.

It will however be necessary to review the membership of the Topic Group
following the recent local elections and revisions to the membership of this
Board. Members are now asked to nominate replacements for Councillors R.
Hignett, Thompson, Wainwright and Hodgkinson.

4.2   On the 15 June 2011, the Board also agreed that a Cemeteries Working
       Group should be established and the membership of the Group should
       comprise Councillors Thompson (Chair), J. Bradshaw, E. Cargill, A.
       McInerney and Zygadllo.

The Group's brief was to look at the following:

- Options for creating a new Cemetery for Widnes as the current
  Cemetery one at Birchfield Road had less than a decade of capacity

left within it. The Group was to look at the most suitable location, most suitable design and make recommendations to the Board.

- The current Cemetery Rules, making recommendations for how they might be amended and applied in the new Cemetery.

- The issues surrounding memorials in the existing cemeteries. Many memorials are now over 100 years old and many of them are in poor shape. They present obstacles to cost effective maintenance and many have had to be laid down for safety reasons. The group will make recommendations to the Board on how memorials should be managed in future.

The findings and conclusions of this Group are set out in a separate report on this agenda.

4.3   On 14th March 2012, the Board endorsed that a Working Group be established to review the funding, operations and services provided by Halton Community Transport. The membership, Topic Brief, outline of discussions and conclusions of this Group are contained in a report forming part of this agenda.

4.4   Members are asked whether they would like to suggest other suitable areas for scrutiny during 2012/13 and the Board is, in turn, asked to discuss these in the context of existing workloads.

5.0   POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1   None at this stage.

6.0   OTHER IMPLICATIONS

6.1   None at this stage.

7.0   IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL'S PRIORITIES

7.1   **Children and Young People in Halton**

        None

7.2   **Employment, Learning and Skills in Halton**

        None

7.3   **A Healthy Halton**

        None

7.4   **A Safer Halton**

None

7.5   **Halton's Urban Renewal**

        None

8.0   EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

8.1   None.

**9.0   LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER
        SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

9.1   There are no background papers within the meaning of the Act.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Topic Selection Checklist

This checklist leads the user through a reasoning process to identify a) why a topic should be explored and b) whether it makes sense to examine it through the overview and scrutiny process. More "yeses" indicate a stronger case for selecting the Topic.

#	CRITERION	Yes/No
Why? Evidence for why a topic should be explored and included in the work programme		
1	Is the Topic **directly aligned with and have significant implications for at least 1 of Halton's 5 strategic priorities & related objectives/PIs, and/or a key central government priority?**	
2	Does the Topic **address an identified need** or issue?	
3	Is there a **high level of public interest or concern about the Topic** e.g. apparent from consultation, complaints or the local press	
4	Has the Topic been **identified through performance monitoring** e.g. PIs indicating an area of poor performance with scope for improvement?	
5	Has the Topic been **raised as an issue requiring further examination through a review, inspection or assessment, or by the auditor?**	
6	Is the topic area likely to have a **major impact on resources or be significantly affected by financial or other resource problems** e.g. a pattern of major overspending or persisting staffing difficulties that could undermine performance?	
7	Has some **recent development or change** created a need to look at the Topic e.g. new Government guidance/legislation, or new research findings?	
8	Would there be **significant risks** to the organisation and the community **as a result of <u>not</u> examining this topic.**	
Whether? Reasons affecting whether it makes sense to examine an identified topic		
9	**Scope for impact** – is the Topic something the Council can actually influence, directly or via its partners? Can we make a difference?	
10	**Outcomes** – Are there clear improvement outcomes (not specific answers) in mind from examining the Topic and are they likely to be achievable?	
11	**Cost: benefit** – are the benefits of working on the Topic likely to outweigh the costs of doing so, making investment of time & effort worthwhile.	
12	**Are PPBs the best way to add value** in this Topic area? Can they make a distinctive contribution?	
13	Does the organisation have the **capacity** to progress this Topic? (e.g. is it related to other review or work peaks that would place an unacceptable load on a particular officer or team?)	
14	Can PPBs contribute meaningfully given the **time** available?	