

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday 23 November 2010

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Committee Rooms 1 and 2
Harrow Civic Centre

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 4)

Chairman: Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

Sue Anderson
Ann Gate
Bill Phillips
Sachin Shah

Kam Chana
Barry Macleod-Cullinane
Paul Osborn (VC)
Stephen Wright

Representatives of Voluntary Aided Sector: Mrs J Rammelt/Reverend P Reece
Representatives of Parent Governors: 2 Vacancies

(Note: Where there is a matter relating to the Council's education functions, the "church" and parent governor representatives have attendance, speaking and voting rights. They are entitled to speak but not vote on any other matter.)

Reserve Members:

1. Nana Asante
2. Varsha Parmar
3. Krishna Suresh
4. Sasi Suresh
5. Krishna James

1. Stanley Sheinwald
2. Mark Versallion
3. Christine Bednell
4. Susan Hall

Contact: Alison Atherton, Senior Professional - Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8424 1266 E-mail: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee, Sub Committee, Panel or Forum;
- (b) all other Members present in any part of the room or chamber.

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 6)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2010 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions (if any) from local residents/organisations under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive depositions (if any) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B) of the Constitution.

7. REFERENCES FROM COUNCIL/CABINET

- (a) Neighbourhood Champions - Response to Scrutiny Challenge Panel Report (Pages 7 - 16)

8. IMPLICATIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW

Oral report of the Corporate Director of Finance

9. PROJECT SCOPE - LOCAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK
(To Follow)

Report of the Divisional Director of Partnership, Development and Performance

10. REPORT FROM THE SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBERS (To Follow)

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Which the Chairman has decided is urgent and cannot otherwise be dealt with.

AGENDA - PART II

NIL

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES

2 NOVEMBER 2010

Chairman: * Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors:

* Sue Anderson	* Paul Osborn
* Kam Chana	* Bill Phillips
* Ann Gate	* Sachin Shah
* Barry Macleod-Cullinane	* Stephen Wright

Voting Co-opted:

(Voluntary Aided)	(Parent Governors)
Mrs J Rammelt	Mrs D Speel
† Reverend P Reece	

* Denotes Member present
Denote category of Reserve Members
† Denotes apologies received

63. Attendance by Reserve Members

There were no reserve Members.

64. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 8 – Business Transformation Partnership

Councillor Paul Osborn declared a personal interest in that he had been the Portfolio Holder for the business transformation remit and also the Chair of the BTP Panel. He advised that he would remain in the room whilst the matter

was considered and voted upon, unless specific decisions were raised which he might have been responsible for.

Councillor Paul Osborn further declared in respect of the Gifts and Hospitality Register that he had been the recipient of hospitality from Capita as the former Portfolio Holder.

65. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2010, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

66. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 19, 16 and 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution) respectively.

67. References from Council/Cabinet

There were no references.

RECOMMENDED ITEM

68. Draft West London Waste Plan Proposed Sites and Policies Document

The representative of the Corporate Director Place Shaping introduced his report detailing the progress to date in preparing the Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document, a key stage in the preparation of the joint West London Waste Plan. He advised that there were 3 existing sites within Harrow but that he anticipated only one site within Harrow would go forward as consideration for one of the proposed future locations.

The Committee noted that the Plan would be one of the policy documents which would comprise the overall Local Development Framework for the Borough which would eventually replace the Unitary Development Plan. The report had been prepared jointly by the six west London boroughs of Harrow, Brent, Ealing, Hillingdon, Hounslow and Richmond.

A Member referred to the sizing of such sites and also queried whether the performance indicators utilised within the report would continue to be relevant following recent decisions by government. The officer confirmed that the lowest optimum site size was approximately 0.9 hectares and that although he anticipated the Performance Indicators would cease to apply the requirements for such provision remained with LATs.

A Member queried whether the Kodak Site had been considered as a viable option, as part of a larger relocation of civic amenities, including the Civic Centre, on the site. The officer stated that all sites considered were set against a robust methodology criteria and the Kodak Site had not met the

threshold required for consideration to go forward. However, he accepted that this could be a proposal that the Council might seek to revisit in the future.

A Member queried alternative sites not within Harrow and it was confirmed that other sites would come through from the partner authorities for consideration. A decision on a future location would not be made until all such potential sites had been considered.

A Member noted that the content of the consultation was jargonistic and contained numerous acronyms. He queried how officers would make the document more accessible to the public in term of language and content. The officer agreed that the document was comprehensive, noting that it also served as the consultation vehicle with the waste industry. He advised that the Council utilised a specific consultancy partner who undertake a range of consultation measures, including video blogging to ensure the information was understood by the widest possible audience.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet and Council)

That the Draft West London Waste Plan: Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document be approved for the purposes of public consultation.

RESOLVED ITEM

69. The Business Transformation Partnership

The Committee received a report outlining the background to the Business Transformation Partnership, describing its way of working and detailing past and present aspects of the overall programme.

The Director of Business Transformation and Customer Services advised that the original agreement had been entered into in October 2005 and that there was an option to extend the agreement after 5 years. She explained the operating practice, based on “open book” methodology and a fixed price financial modelling. She outlined the robust processes in place to ensure the Council received full value, noting only upon milestone points within projects were payments released to Capita. She then outlined the inception of a initial business case to the production of a full and viable Business Case for implementation. She further noted that the costs of Business cases were fixed at the initial and full stages and were index linked to control rises in future years.

The Director further explained, with the assistance of her Project Manager, the processes used for project management methodology, noting these were derived from the Prince2 processes and that a completion aspect of “lessons learnt” was an integral part of this delivery.

A Member referred to the IT System uses and queried whether consideration had also been given to systems such as “Sprint for BPR purposes and it was advised that Capita utilised its own BPR system process which officers had examined and were satisfied were of a comparable standard to Sprint.

The issue of process mapping of services was raised and whether this was used across the Council and also revisited after a period of approximately 2-3 years being in operation and whether there were any challenges in making the cultural change required by the proposals both underway and planned. The officer advised that all process maps produced were held by the relevant Service Manager and that at this point in the partnership a revisit of successful implementation had not occurred as the projects were less than 3 years old. She further noted that outside the specific mapping undertaken by Capita very little process mapping had taken place within the Council. She agreed that Capita had faced some challenges in the early days with the Capita project areas. However, officers felt that a depth of understanding and culture change was becoming embedded. To this end training of 16 staff members had been undertaken in the principles of LEAN which it was hoped would contribute to improving service delivery from an internal resourcing across various business responsibilities. If the implementation of such MEAN champions was successful the aim would be to increase the number of staff members with such skills.

A Member noted the costs and opportunities within the contract and asked how officers guaranteed best value against open competition processes and outlined examples in respect of the impacts of IT outsourcing, impact of the voucherising of social care clients and the proposals around meals on wheels outsourcing. The Director responded that the original Capita contract had been let on an open competition basis to allow full comparison against potential strategic partners. The controls on best value were derived from ensuring full completion of the projects initiated and agreed by Capita and the Council and in ensuring a limit was placed on the allowable profit margin of Capita.

A Member noted that the report did not identify any disadvantages of the partnership to Harrow and the Director responded that the entering into the original contract was a Council choice and given the aim was to create a strategic partnership relationship she did not immediately consider there to be any significant disadvantages.

In referring to the table of projects undertaken or underway a Member indicated he would have welcomed a note indicating which projects had attracted fines / other penalties in the course of completion and the Director agreed to provide this to all Members.

A Member raised the issue of the contract threshold of £100million and queried what stage the Council was at against this limit. The Director responded that the completion of the IT Outsourcing would bring the overall contract with the Council very close to the £100 million threshold. The Member further queried if this would result in limits being applied to future projects and the Director confirmed that those projects currently within the Project Plan would be unaffected.

A Member referred to the level of engagement by Council Directorates, in particular that of Children Services and the Director responded that the LEAN Project for the Directorate had been completed successfully. With regard to

other engagement she advised that with exception of the Special Needs Transport Project, Children's Services were not specifically targeted, although they would be a component of the Administration Hubs project.

A Member suggested that the level of involvement by Portfolio Holders / Cabinet etc should be considered at an earlier stage citing a previous occasion when he was a Portfolio Holder.

A Member asked whether exercises were undertaken with other boroughs in terms of lessons learnt to inform potential future projects and decisions and it was advised that there was a structured process in this respect which considered people, process and technology.

A Member asked for and received an explanation of business warehouse and middleware. She then queried how often Director's did not utilise the Capita contract partnership to move projects forward and it was advised that there remained a significant number of projects undertaken which did not involve Capita.

Referring to the previous discontinued HARP 2 project a Member asked for clarification on what the benefits to the customer would have been and it was explained that the benefits lay in the electronic document storage and processes which would have contributed to faster response times.

A Member questioned whether the level of the 11% profit limit on the Capita Contract should be revisited and a reduction in this percentage amount sought. He identified an example in respect of Adult Services which had resulted in a decrease in costs as a result of competitive tendering processes. The Director advised that a robust challenge was applied to projects but, that it remained an option to the Council to market test this issue if it wished. She further noted that the Rate Cards that Capita used in applying costs to projects were available for public examination to allow Councils to confirm whether they felt they received best value.

A Member then questioned whether a later examination was undertaken after implementation to consider whether the assumptions around what the project was intended to achieve had been fulfilled. The Director advised that upon request this had been carried out, although no general process was in place to undertake. She agreed to circulate information in relation to the MIS Uptake.

A Member then addressed the expenditure to date on the Capita contract as compared to the savings identified with the report. The Director explained that the savings detailed related to a performance target and the actual savings were in the region of £90million.

A Member suggested that consideration be given to putting in place a persistent process rather than simple Service Level Agreements with partners / voluntary organisations and questioned whether this course of action was being considered. The Director responded that this was not currently the practice and that she felt that a better process would be to equip staff with the

skills and undertake this within the skills of the council workforce using the LEAN process.

The Chairman then thanked the Director and her Project Manager for their attendance.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chairman

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 23 NOVEMBER 2010

Reference from Cabinet – 18 October 2010

Subject: Neighbourhood Champions - Response to Scrutiny Challenge Panel Report

The Corporate Director Community and Environment introduced the report, which set out a response to the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Champions Scrutiny Challenge Panel, which had examined the Neighbourhood Champions Scheme prior to submitting its findings. It was noted that the Challenge Panel had made 11 recommendations to which responses had been provided.

The Corporate Director thanked Members of the Challenge Panel for their work and was proud that the Scheme had 600 trained Neighbourhood Champions with a further 400 who had expressed an interest in joining.

RESOLVED: That the response to the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Champions Scrutiny Challenge Panel be endorsed, and a response report be provided to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with the Constitution.

Reasons for Decision: To ensure that the issues identified by the Scrutiny Challenge Panel contribute to the future successful development of the Neighbourhood Champions Scheme. To meet the requirements of the Council's Constitution.

FOR INFORMATION

Contact

Daksha Ghelani, Senior Democratic Services Officer.

Tel: 020 8424 1881 E-mail: daksha.ghelani@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Report on Neighbourhood Champions considered by Cabinet on 18 October 2010
Cabinet Minutes

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT FOR: CABINET

Date of Meeting: 28 October 2010

Subject: Neighbourhood Champions -
Response to Scrutiny Challenge Panel
Report

Key Decision: No

Responsible Officer: Brendon Hills, Corporate Director
Community and Environment

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Phillip O'Dell, Portfolio
Holder for Environment and
Community Safety

Exempt: No

**Decision subject to
Call-in:** Yes

Enclosures: None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out the response to the Neighbourhood Champions scrutiny challenge panel reported to Cabinet on 14 September 2010.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to:

1. Endorse the response to the challenge panel recommendations for the Neighbourhood Champions scheme

Reason:

In order that the issues identified by the scrutiny challenge panel can contribute to the future successful development of the Neighbourhood Champions scheme.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

In February 2010 the Overview and Scrutiny committee commissioned a challenge panel to examine the Neighbourhood Champions scheme. The challenge panel produced a report of its findings which was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny committee later in the same month. At this meeting, the committee was advised that the panel's report did not reflect a consensus of opinion amongst the members of the panel and as such, the committee decided that it could not accept the recommendations and that the panel should reconvene to confirm its findings before the report could again be considered by the committee.

To address this, the original report was again considered by the Overview and Scrutiny committee on 27th July 2010 and was agreed and referred to Cabinet for consideration along with comments from the Safer and Stronger Communities scrutiny lead councillors.

Cabinet received the Neighbourhood Champions Scrutiny Challenge Panel Report at the meeting on 14th September 2010, and resolved that:

- (1) the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Champions Scrutiny Challenge Panel be noted;
- (2) a report in response to the recommendations be submitted to Cabinet by the Corporate Director of Community and Environment.

Response from the Corporate Director of Community and Environment

The Corporate Director for Community and Environment thanks the Challenge Panel for the time and contribution that they have made that has assisted in making the Neighbourhood Champions a successful scheme. The assistance provided to the Challenge Panel by officers from other local authorities is recognised also.

The Neighbourhood Champions challenge panel made the following recommendations:

- 1. That, in order to safeguard the viability of the scheme, formal plans and monitoring processes are put in place which can be subject to review by the council.*

The Neighbourhood Champions was implemented through the work of a project team comprised of officers from a number of sections of the Council (including Community and Environment and Access Harrow), the Metropolitan Police Service, and external consultants. The scheme was launched successfully and now has 600 trained Neighbourhood Champions with a further 400 expressing an interest in being trained. Most of the training sessions have taken place as planned.

The progress of the scheme has monitored through monthly reports to the portfolio holder and Community and Environment Senior Management Team and quarterly reports to the Improvement Board.

- 2. That proper financial planning, costings and controls are demonstrated and put in place.*

These arrangements are in place and monitored.

- 3. That in future, the Overview and Scrutiny committee's responsibilities for policy oversight are recognised and scrutiny councillors are given early opportunity to contribute to policy development.*

Agreed, potential future projects are discussed with Overview and Scrutiny officers and members.

- 4. That further thought is given to how the scheme can involve ward councillors and that this is incorporated in a revised mission statement for the scheme.*

Agreed. In addition ward members are invited to become Neighbourhood Champions or to attend the training sessions.

- 5. That contracts and codes of conduct incorporate safeguards for volunteers and residents particularly in regard to the roll out of Phase Two.*

A code of conduct was always a key feature of the scheme, and has been in place from the start. The Phase 2 envisioned in the original Cabinet report

was described as dependant on the experience to be obtained from the practical roll out, and would be subject to further Cabinet approval if likely to proceed. It is not anticipated that the Phase 2 described will take place.

6. *That clarification of the scope of the Phase Two roll out be provided to Cabinet and the Overview and Scrutiny committee. In the absence of such clarification as was provided to the panel by the portfolio holder, the Overview and Scrutiny committee recommends that the roll out is not pursued.*

Please see the response above.

7. *That the assertion that the test of success of the scheme will be to ensure that the scheme reflects the community of Harrow is amended to state that it should be a long term objective of the scheme that the scheme reflects the demography of the borough.*

This recommendation was made on the basis that similar schemes in other authorities had experienced great difficulty in encouraging volunteers from a cross section of the public. The recommendation suggests a less onerous target than the original ambition of the scheme. In the event, the work in implementing the Harrow Neighbourhood Champions scheme has to date produced a volunteer group reflecting the community.

8. *That training on the scheme is provided for councillors*

Agreed. About one third of Councillors have attended the training sessions for Neighbourhood Champions.

9. *That an update report is prepared for Cabinet which addresses the issues raised by the challenge panel. In particular the report should incorporate:*
- *An enhanced mission statement*
 - *Clarification that the longer term ambition of the scheme is to ensure that it is representative of the diversity of the borough*
 - *Detailed explanation of the roll out of Phase Two of the scheme as discussed with the panel*

Please see the response above. Significant changes to the Neighbourhood Champions scheme will be reported to Cabinet for decision. The assistance of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be sought in the development of a revised mission statement.

10. *That consideration is given to the development of a reported incidents flagging process.*

This recommendation referred to the placing of notices for example in the vicinity of a fly tip, broken street light etc to indicate that the Council was aware of the problem and would be dealing with it. This suggestion has been considered, but as a general principle it has not been adopted. Instead the development of the reporting and feed back facilities for Neighbourhood Champions through the web site arrangement will be developed to ensure that there is wider knowledge of issues and their solutions.

11. That further updates on the Neighbourhood Champions scheme are provide to the Scrutiny Lead Members for Safer and Stronger Communities.

Agreed

Options considered

None

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report as it offers comments on an existing scheme.

Performance Issues

The performance issues to be impacted by the Neighbourhood Champions scheme were considered during its original development and agreed by Cabinet. The purpose of this report is to support Cabinet in the further development of the scheme assisted by the findings of the scrutiny challenge panel

Environmental Impact

There are no environmental issues associated specifically with this report

Risk Management Implications

There are no risk management implications associated specifically with this report.

Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No

If yes, summarise findings, any adverse impact and proposed actions to mitigate / remove these below:

If no, state why an EqIA was not carried out below:

An Equalities Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as the report refers to the existing Neighbourhood Champions scheme Any significant change to the scheme in the future will necessitate that an Equalities Impact Assessment is carried out.

Corporate Priorities

Please identify which corporate priority the report incorporates and how:

- Deliver cleaner and safer streets √
- Improve support for vulnerable people √
- Build stronger communities √

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 5/10/2010		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 6/10/2010		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: David Harrington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director Partnership, Development and Performance
Date: 11/10/2010		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: Andrew Baker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 5/10/2010		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: John Edwards Divisional Director Environmental Services,
Tel: 020 8736 7699

Background Papers:

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Neighbourhood Champions Report from the Challenge Panel – February 2010

Cabinet 14th September 2010: Neighbourhood Champions Scrutiny Challenge Panel Report

**Call-In Waived by the
Chairman of Overview
and Scrutiny
Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

This page is intentionally left blank