

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

**Name of Committee** Overview And Scrutiny Board

**Date of Committee** 05 October 2010

**Report Title** Proposals for Joint Scrutiny and Overview and Scrutiny Work Programmes in Warwickshire

**Summary** This report sets out those proposals for task and finish groups which might benefit from joint scrutiny.  
  
This report also contains information about the overview and scrutiny work programmes being undertaken by Warwickshire District and Borough Councils to assist the co-ordination of work programmes.

**For further information please contact:** Jane Pollard  
Democratic Services  
Manager  
Tel: 01926 412565  
janepollard@warwickshire.gov.uk  
No.

**Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?**

**Background papers** None

**CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-** Details to be specified

- Other Committees  .....
- Local Member(s)  N/A
- Other Elected Members  Cllr Saint, Cllr Doody, Cllr Caborn, Cllr Tandy, Cllr Whitehouse
- Cabinet Member  .....
- Chief Executive  .....
- Legal  Jane Pollard
- Finance  .....
- Other Strategic Directors  .....

- District Councils  .....
- Health Authority  .....
- Police  .....
- Other Bodies/Individuals  Richard Hood - Stratford District Council, Paul Ansell - Rugby Borough Council, Graeme Leach - Warwick District Council, Shirley Round - Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Emma Humphreys – North Warwickshire Borough Council

**FINAL DECISION YES**

**SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:**

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee  .....
- To Council  .....
- To Cabinet  .....
- To an O & S Committee  .....
- To an Area Committee  .....
- Further Consultation  .....

## Agenda No

### Overview and Scrutiny Board - 05 October 2010.

#### Proposals for Joint Scrutiny and Warwickshire Overview and Scrutiny Work Programmes

#### Report of the Strategic Director of Customers, Workforce and Governance

##### Recommendation

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board considers the proposals for joint scrutiny and whether the proposals for joint scrutiny should be incorporated into its overall work programme.

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board comment on whether there are areas of the county work programme and the work programmes of Warwickshire District or Borough Councils which could benefit from joint working.

#### 1. Proposals for Joint Scrutiny

- 1.1. Attached as an Appendix are 3 draft scopes for proposed joint scrutiny reviews i.e. task and finish groups
  - Public Service Reform
  - Control of Alcohol - Review of Licensing across the County
  - Locality Working
- 1.2 The Board at its meeting on 21 July 2010 commissioned the Public Service Reform task and finish group and appointed the members. However it has yet to confirm the scope of this particular review and confirm the allocation of resources. Locality working was one of the possible topics identified by the Board at its last meeting.
- 1.3 The proposal concerning the Control of Alcohol has been developed by the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee and has not yet been commissioned by the Board. The Communities OSC is suggesting that partners might wish to be engaged in a joint scrutiny exercise in relation to this topic.
- 1.4 Elsewhere on the agenda is the full list of proposals for task and finish groups. The Board will need to consider these proposals in the context of the

overview and scrutiny overall work programme in deciding which reviews to commission.

## **2. Work Programmes of Warwickshire District/Borough Councils**

2.1 One of the roles of the Overview and Scrutiny Board is to liaise with our district/borough council colleagues over our respective overview and scrutiny work programmes. Obviously a key aspect is to share information about each others respective work programmes to enable people to identify where we may be duplicating work our efforts, be able to provide information complementary to the work being undertaken by others or could form the subject of a joint review. District and borough council colleagues have provided information about issues which may form part of their respective work programmes in 2010/11. These are set out in the paragraphs below.

2.2 Stratford District Council proposals for task and finish groups include

- Tourism Services for Stratford on Avon District
- Orbit Housing –services to tenants
- Promoting Market Towns

2.3 Warwick District Council -possible future items for the Committees from September onwards include

- RSLs: Joint commissioning of affordable housing schemes
- Discretionary Travel Scheme
- Creation of a volunteering policy

2.4 Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council future items on the work programme include

- (a) Sheltered Housing
- (b) Review of Policing in Borough (inc CDRP and Youth Crime)
- (c) Mental Health Service Provision for Children & Young People
- (d) End of Life Care
- (e) Nuneaton & Bedworth Leisure Trust Board (VFM and Provision)
- (f) Increase Public Participation in Overview and Scrutiny Process
- (g) Impact of Licensing Act 2003 (might be relevant as a joint review as WCC have it as an item)
- (h) Joint review on Antenatal and Postnatal Services for Teenage Parents (with WCC and Rugby Borough Council)

2.5 North Warwickshire Borough Council has 2 reviews in progress

- a. Play areas
- b. Recycling

2.6 Rugby Borough Council review work programme includes the following

**(1) Reviews in progress**

- Biodiversity
- Crematorium and Burial Ground Review
- End-to-End Service Reviews and Systems Thinking
- Ken Marriott Leisure Centre
- Public Realm and Works Services Unit
- Joint review on Antenatal and Postnatal Services for Teenage Parents (with WCC and Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council)

**(2) Reviews not yet started**

- (a) Anti-social Behaviour
- (b) Dealing with the Public
- (c) Making full use of council buildings as a resource
- (d) Multi-storey flats
- (e) Neighbourhood Councils
- (f) Planning enforcement and co-ordination of agencies
- (g) Procurement
- (h) Town Hall Customer Services Reception
- (i) How to improve cycling provision –possible joint review

DAVID CARTER  
Strategic Director of  
Customers, Workforce and  
Governance

Shire Hall  
Warwick

07 September 2010

Draft Scrutiny Review Outline

<b>Review Topic</b> (Name of review)	<b>Public Service Reform</b>
<b>Panel/Working Group etc – Members</b>	Cllr John Ross (Chair) ,Janet Smith - PCT , Clive Parsons - Police Authority, Councillor Roodhouse, Councillor Fowler, Councillor Tooth
<b>Key Officer Contacts</b>	Monica Fogarty (Partnerships), Bob Hooper (Children & Young People), Gill Jowers (Adult Social Care), Paul Maubach (PCT), Rachel Pearce (PCT) Oliver Winters (Police Authority), Andy Parker (Police Service)
<b>Scrutiny Officer Support</b>	Jane Pollard Don Hiatt.
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)</b>	Cllr Izzi Seccombe; Cllr Bob Stevens; Cllr Heather Timms; Cllr Richard Hobbs:
<b>Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets</b>	Potentially all depending on the focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising educational attainment and improving the lives of children, young people and families</li> <li>• Maximising independence for older people and people with disabilities</li> <li>• Developing sustainable places and communities</li> <li>• Protecting the community and making Warwickshire a safer places to live</li> </ul>
<b>Timing Issues</b>	The government agenda is moving at a fast pace. The aim is to make some recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Board by January 2011.
<b>Resources</b>	This review is likely to take around 5 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Board. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support depending on the actual methodology used by the review is between 240 to 264 hours or 40-44 days (15 days already taken up at time of writing – averaging out at 8 days per month). This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions and follow up meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
<b>Rationale</b> (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	The government has issued a number of draft structural reform plans which will change the shape of local public services in Warwickshire. These are to be followed by legislation as appropriate. Alongside these are specific White papers and associated consultations. There is a need for the Council to ensure it understands the implications and the opportunities arising out of the proposed changes to help it better prepare to meet the challenges ahead.

<p><b>Objectives of Review</b> (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To assess the future implications and opportunities for public services in Warwickshire arising from the central proposals relating to Schools, Health, Adult Social Care, the Police Authority, and the Police Service.</li> <li>➤ To identify what plans the relevant public service agencies either singly or in partnership have in place to address the proposed changes and what issues require further work or could benefit from a partnership approach, and where proposals for one service may impact on others.</li> <li>➤ To identify if there are barriers to progress and what may be necessary to overcome them and if there areas of duplication or lessons we can learn from each other.</li> <li>➤ To understand the financial cost of the public service to local people and the opportunities within the change programmes to reduce those costs, secure value for money, maintain quality and improve outcomes for local people in Warwickshire.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Scope of the Topic</b> (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <p>The future role and impact on local government, other public agencies, and the community and voluntary sectors in relation to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Health</li> <li>• Adult Social Care</li> <li>• Police Authority</li> <li>• Police Service</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outputs</b> (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear picture of the future shape of public services in Warwickshire relating to schools, health, adult social care and the police and their future governance arrangements.</li> <li>• Identifies any outstanding issues which need to be addressed to turn the picture into reality</li> <li>• Recommendations which seek to minimise duplication where it exists, encourages partnership working where beneficial and seeks to break down any barriers to progress.</li> <li>• A review which shares lessons learnt and any innovative approaches to common issues faced by the relevant public services</li> <li>• Identifies the costs of support services for public services in Warwickshire and ideally establishes unit costs.</li> <li>• Identifies the opportunities within the change programmes to secure value for money, maintains quality and benefits for the public.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outcomes</b> (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear vision of the future for relevant public services in Warwickshire shared by partners.</li> <li>• A clear strategy for delivering and communicating the vision</li> <li>• Communication of the vision to the public, staff and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Joint planning and working between partners.</li> <li>• Risks identified and plans in place to address significant risks</li> </ul>

<b>Specify Evidence Sources</b> (Background information and documents to look at)		Draft Structural Reform Plans from Department of Communities and Local Government, Department of Health, Home Office, Schools System. NHS White paper: Liberating the NHS; NHS Consultations – Transparent Outcomes, Commissioning for patients; Local Democratic Legitimacy in Health, Regulating Healthcare providers. Consultation on School Funding 2011-12: Introducing a Pupil Premium. Policing in the 21st century: reconnecting police and the people.	
<b>Specify Witnesses/Experts</b> (Who to see and when)			
<b>Possible Co-Options</b> (Would the review benefit from any co-options e.g. community or voluntary sector representatives?)		None identified	
<b>Specify Site Visits</b> (Where and when)			
<b>Consultation with Stakeholders</b> (Who should we consult?)		Police Authority, Police Service, Primary Care Trust, GPs, Community and Voluntary Sectors, County Council Directorates/Services Children and Young People, Adult Social Care, Partnerships and Performance Unit, Community Safety Partnership.	
<b>Level of Publicity</b> (What level is appropriate and what method should be used?)			
<b>Barriers/Dangers/Risks</b> (Identify any weaknesses or potential pitfalls)		Lose focus/scope too big Miss the obvious Raise expectations to unreasonable levels Sustainability of any new initiatives proposed	
<b>Projected Start Date</b>	27.07.2010	<b>Final Report Deadline</b>	21.12.2010
<b>Meeting Frequency</b>	Monthly	<b>Projected Completion Date</b>	Mid –December 2010
<b>Meetings Dates</b>		27.07.2010; 16.09.2010; 3.11.2010; 30.11.2010; Meetings in December to be confirmed.	
<b>Committee Reporting Date</b>		Overview and Scrutiny Board 12.01.2011	
<b>Cabinet Reporting Date</b>		27.01.2011 or 17.02.2011	
<b>When to Evaluate Impact</b>			
<b>Methods for Tracking and Evaluating</b>			





Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

<b>Review Topic</b> (Name of review)	<b>Alcohol Control – Review of Licensing across the County</b>
<b>Panel/Working Group etc – Members</b>	TBA – It is recommended that this is undertaken as a partnership review
<b>Key Officer Contact</b>	TBA
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)</b>	Cllr Richard Hobbs, Community Safety
<b>Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets</b>	Protecting the community and making Warwickshire a safer place to live NI 15 Most Serious violent crime rate NI 21 Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and the police NI 120 All age all cause mortality NI 139 Alcohol related hospital admissions
<b>Timing Issues</b>	See section on other work being undertaken.  The review will take approx 3-4 months to complete (up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to Committee).
<b>Type of Review</b>	In depth review
<b>Resource Estimate</b>	A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 240 to 264 hours or 40-44 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 3 evidence sessions, evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations and a best practice visit. It includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.
<b>Rationale</b> (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	It is widely recognised that excessive alcohol consumption can lead to number of problematic issues, including poor physical and mental health, violent crime, domestic abuse, risky behaviour and accidents, and anti-social behaviour. Nationally, in 2009/10 there were almost one million alcohol related violent crimes. A fifth of all violent incidents took place in or near a pub or club, and almost two-thirds at night or in the evening. There are 6.6 million alcohol related attendances at Accident and Emergency departments per year, costing £645 million. Additionally, 1.2 million ambulance call outs each year are in relation to alcohol related incidents, costing £372 million. Overall, alcohol related crime and disorder is estimated to cost the taxpayer between £8 billion and £13 billion per year.  Licensing policies and practices are essential to ensure the effective control and regulation of alcohol, in order to reduce negative impacts on individuals, communities and public services.

<p><b>Objectives of Review</b> (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To review the effectiveness of licensing policies and practices across the County</li> <li>▪ To identify examples of best practice locally and nationally</li> <li>▪ To identify opportunities for partnership working</li> <li>▪ To identify how a common approach can be achieved across the county, particularly in relation to any changes resulting from current Government consultation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Scope of the Topic</b> (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Licensing policy and practice</li> <li>▪ Licensing enforcement</li> <li>▪ Public Houses</li> <li>▪ Retail sales</li> </ul> <p><u>Exclude</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact of excessive alcohol consumption – health, crime and disorder etc</li> <li>▪ Services and support to address to excessive alcohol consumption and its associated problems</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outputs</b> (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outcomes</b> (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recognisable improvements in the control of alcohol across the County,</li> <li>▪ Recognisable improvements in violent crime, anti-social behaviour and alcohol related hospital admissions.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Other Work Being Undertaken</b> (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	<p><u>Nationally</u></p> <p>The Government is currently consulting around proposed changes to the current licensing framework, which seeks to give more power and flexibility to local authorities and the police to address local issues. The consultation period ends on 8<sup>th</sup> September. It would seem sensible to delay the commencement of the review until the outcome of the consultation is known, so that the review can consider how any changes can be implemented in Warwickshire.</p> <p><u>Locally</u></p> <p>Warwickshire Safer Communities Partnership (WSCP) has been discussing licensing policies and practices across the county. A sub-group of WSCP, the Drug and Alcohol Management Group (DAMG) has been tasked with exploring the current position in the County and identifying how licensing activity can be better co-ordinated across the County. The DAMG is expected to report back to WSCP in October. Again it seems sensible to delay the commencement of the review until the WSCP has considered the outcomes of DAMG work.</p> <p>Licensing is a Strategic Aim within the Warwickshire Alcohol Implementation Plan, which includes a number of actions to ensure licensing practices protect young people and effectively address irresponsible premises.</p> <p>Licensing has been suggested as a potential Scrutiny review within Nuneaton and Bedworth BC, following any changes to licensing framework following current government consultation.</p>
---	---

## Proposed Scrutiny Review Outline

<b>Review Topic</b> (Name of review)	<b>Locality Working</b>
<b>Panel/Working Group etc – Members</b>	Partnership Scrutiny
<b>Key Officer Contact</b>	Nick Gower-Johnson
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)</b>	Cllr Hayfield
<b>Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets</b>	Potentially all corporate priorities are engaged
<b>Timing Issues</b>	No particular timing requirements
<b>Type of Review</b>	<p>As well as taking a broad overview across the county say through a couple of roundtables/evidence sessions at county level. This review could look at 2/3 localities based on community forum areas and examine in more detail how public services are developing in those areas and hold local evidence sessions in those areas.</p> <p>We should seek some geographical balance across this sample and also consider looking discretely at issues arising in urban, and rural areas. One of the areas selected should comprise a set of communities affected by multiple issues of disadvantage / deprivation.</p> <p>We should ensure that this review deliberately considers matters from the perspective of communities and citizens rather than the agencies that serve them</p>

<p><b>Resource Estimate</b></p>	<p>This review if commissioned is likely to take somewhere between 3-4 months to complete i.e. up to having an agreed final report ready for submission to committee. This is potentially a complex review and again the level of support required will depend on the exact methodology adopted by the review. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 252 to 264 hours or 42-44 days depending on the actual methodology used by the review. This assumes a review planning meeting, 4/5 evidence sessions (including sessions in the 2/3 localities), evidence review meeting, meeting to develop conclusions and recommendations, it includes arrangements for meetings, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses and write up of evidence and the final report.</p> <p>In planning and scoping the review and in order to ensure efficiencies, we should be very careful not to repeat work recently completed in respect of the Review of Locality Working undertaken by Nick Gower Johnson. The report has been widely distributed for comment and many comments and suggestions have been received, the overwhelming majority of which are constructive and helpful.</p> <p>A comprehensive improvement plan will result from the Review of Locality Working and this work should not be scrutinised or repeated.</p>
<p><b>Rationale</b> (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)</p>	<p>Work is already underway in relation to the role, operation and effectiveness of community forums and area committees.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that any scrutiny review should explore locality working in the broader sense in terms of a) Establishing an approach to shaping the delivery of services that are locally relevant &amp; locally sensitive and b) Should focus on ways in which our Locality Working arrangements can and should support communities and citizens to take control of the key issues that affect them and c) Should explore ways in which the costs of resourcing the work can be shared more equitably across the Public and 3<sup>rd</sup> Sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Localisation is primarily about tailoring services to meet local needs; about improving access to services; engaging and empowering the community to be fully involved in providing solutions and improving confidence. In progressing towards localisation we will need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identify at which level our services are best delivered;</li> <li>- decide with partners the extent to which they are prepared to be part of a 'coalition' to take this forward;</li> <li>- consider how shifts in power to a local level can be facilitated by councillors and officers and how this impacts on our organisational structures, skills and culture</li> <li>- review how we deliver services with the intention of reducing accommodation numbers through modern flexible and IT developments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Objectives of Review</b> (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the effectiveness of the localities strategy?</li> <li>• Identify factors/barriers that prevent localisation?</li> <li>• What progress has been made to deliver against this vision of localisation?</li> <li>• How is the localisation agenda being developed and driven across directorates and partners and is there consistency?</li> <li>• To what extent are service/transformation developments governed by the localities agenda?</li> <li>• To identify ways in which Locality Working can and should support communities to take greater control</li> <li>• To identify improved arrangements for resourcing locality working collaboratively across the public and 3<sup>rd</sup> Sectors</li> </ul>
<p><b>Scope of the Topic</b> (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBC</li> </ul> <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBC</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outputs</b> (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations accepted and implemented</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Success – Outcomes</b> (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-ordinated approach to the delivery of services in localities</li> <li>• Service delivery models are appropriate/adapted to take account of the different needs of localities</li> <li>• Recognisable improvements in delivery of services and/or cost effectiveness of services</li> <li>• Improved arrangements for citizens and communities to take greater control over issues affecting their communities</li> </ul>

**Other Work Being Undertaken**

(What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)

***Current activity***

Operation and effectiveness of community forums and area committees

- A localities review has been conducted and a final report circulated for comment in advance of it being considered by the Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership Group later this month. Once the recommendations included within the review have been agreed by the Partnership, this will be considered formally by each partner organisation. WCC Cabinet will be considering the recommendations from the review on 14<sup>th</sup> October.
- The review is primarily concerned with the effectiveness of community forums however, there are some recommendations regarding wider localisation considerations. Suggestions are made that consideration should be given to the transfer of some functions from area committee to community forums, but the review has not sought to provide comprehensive proposals regarding the future role of area committees.
- A Scrutiny review proposed in respect of the Big Society – currently in its formative stages
- The Scrutiny Review currently being undertaken in respect of Public Engagement
- Currently, work is being carried out regarding partnership structures and ways of working, and the future role of Area Committees

Wider locality working

- The localities review does cover wider considerations regarding neighbourhood management but this is not the primary focus on the report and therefore is not detailed.