



# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 26th March, 2013**

**7.00 pm**

**Town Hall, Watford**

**Publication date: 18 March 2013**

## **CONTACT**

If you require further information or you would like a copy of this agenda in another format, e.g. large print, please contact Sandra Hancock in Legal and Property Services on 01923 278377 or by email to [legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk](mailto:legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk) .

Welcome to this meeting. We hope you find these notes useful.

## **ACCESS**

Access to the Town Hall after 5.15 pm is via the entrance to the Customer Service Centre from the visitors' car park.

Visitors may park in the staff car park after 4.00 p.m. and before 7.00 a.m. This is a Pay and Display car park; the current charge is £1.50 per visit.

The Committee Rooms are on the first floor of the Town Hall and a lift is available. Induction loops are available in the Committee Rooms and the Council Chamber.

## **FIRE/EMERGENCY INSTRUCTIONS**

In the event of a fire alarm sounding, vacate the building immediately following the instructions given by the Democratic Services Officer.

- Do not use the lifts
- Do not stop to collect personal belongings
- Go to the assembly point at the Pond and wait for further instructions
- Do not re-enter the building until authorised to do so.

## **MOBILE PHONES**

Please ensure that mobile phones are switched off before the start of the meeting.

# COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor K Collett (Chair)

Councillor A Khan (Vice-Chair)

Councillors J Aron, N Bell, S Greenslade, K Hastrick, M Hofman, R Martins and S Rackett

## AGENDA

### PART A - OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY)**

**3. MINUTES** (Pages 1 - 26)

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 November 2012 and 20 December 2012 to be submitted and signed. *(All minutes are available on the Council's website.)*

**4. MINUTES FROM SCRUTINY PANELS/TASK GROUPS**

To note the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panels and Task Groups which have been published since the last meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee –

- Budget Panel – 27 November 2012, 16 January 2013 and 11 March 2013
- Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel – 26 November 2012 and 5 February 2013
- Community Services Partnership Task Group – 31 January 2013

All minutes are available on the Council's website –

<http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/mgListCommittees.aspx?bcr=1>

**5. CALL-IN**

To consider any Executive decisions which have been called in by the requisite number of Members.

**6. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS AND QUESTIONS** (Pages 27 - 36)

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to review the outstanding actions and questions from previous meetings.

**7. UPDATE ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND MEASURES - THIRD QUARTER (OCTOBER - DECEMBER) 2012/13** (Pages 37 - 58)

This report presents an update on the council's key performance indicators as at the end of quarter 3 2012/13 (October - December) as well as other performance measures identified and agreed by Committee for scrutiny during 2012/13.

**8. EXECUTIVE DECISION PROGRESS REPORT** (Pages 59 - 84)

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to review the latest edition of the Executive Decision Progress Report and consider whether any further information is required.

**9. TASK GROUP UPDATE** (Pages 85 - 88)

This report provides an update on the Management of Disabled Parking Bays Task Group.

**10. WORK PROGRAMME AND NEW SCRUTINY SUGGESTIONS** (Pages 89 - 114)

This report provides the latest version of the rolling work programme and two scrutiny suggestions for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee.

**11. ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2012/13** (Pages 115 - 118)

Members are asked to review the Scrutiny Committee's contribution to the 2011/12 Annual Scrutiny report and consider if there are any changes they would wish to be incorporated into the 2012/13 report.

**12. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

- Monday 22 April 2013 (For call-in only)
- Thursday 27 June 2013
- Thursday 4 July 2013 (For call-in only)

# Agenda Item 3

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

21 November 2012

Present: Councillor Collett (Chair)  
Councillor Khan (Vice-Chair),  
Councillors Aron, Bell, Greenslade, Hastrick, Hofman, Martins and  
Rackett

Also present: Councillor Watkin, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Shared Services  
(for minute numbers 35 to 43)  
Councillor Meerabux  
Eric Fehily, Associate Director of Infrastructure, West Herts Hospital  
NHS Trust (for minute numbers 35 to 39)

Officers: Director of Corporate Resources and Governance, Three Rivers  
District Council (for minute numbers 35 to 43)  
Head of Revenues and Benefits (for minute numbers 35 to 43)  
Partnerships and Performance Section Head (for minute numbers 35  
to 43)  
Committee and Scrutiny Officer

### 35. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

There were no apologies for absence.

### 36. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interest.

### 37. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2012 were submitted and signed.

### 38. **SCRUTINY PANELS/TASK GROUPS**

The Scrutiny Committee was asked to note the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panels and Task Groups which had been published since Overview and Scrutiny Committee's last meeting –

- Budget Panel 11 September and 23 October 2012
- Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel 18 September 2012
- Community Safety Partnership Task Group 10 October 2012

RESOLVED –

that the minutes of the various Scrutiny Panels and Task Group be noted.

39. **PREVIOUS REVIEW UPDATE: HOSPITAL PARKING CHARGES TASK GROUP**

The Chair introduced Eric Fehily, the Associate Director of Infrastructure for West Herts Hospital NHS Trust. She invited him to respond to the Hospital Parking Charges Task Group's recommendations.

Mr Fehily explained his role at the Trust and that he was responsible for services at the three hospitals within the Trust. He confirmed that he would be speaking to the Scrutiny Committee about the Watford site when responding to the Task Group's recommendations. He informed Members that the funds had been confirmed for the new access road to the hospital and that a preferred bidder for the development had been agreed.

Recommendation 1 – Information on concessions to be made clearer and available in an information booklet

Mr Fehily informed the Scrutiny Committee that prior to his attendance at the Task Group he had received complaints from visitors about the information available on concessions. Since that meeting work had been carried out with the Patient and Liaison Services (PALS) to improve the information on the Trust's website. Details were included on noticeboards in the hospital's wards. Staff were aware of the procedures. Since his attendance at the Task Group he had not received any complaints.

Recommendation 2 – Parking charges to start at £2.50 for a two hour stay

Mr Fehily said that there were significant difficulties with this recommendation. The car park was managed by a contractor on behalf of the Trust and the parking charges had been agreed. The contract had a further 18 months to run and it was not possible to change the pricing structure. If the Trust had introduced this lower charge it could not afford to run the car park and NHS funds would have to have been used.

Recommendation 3 – Stakeholders to be surveyed prior to increase in parking charges

Mr Fehily informed the Scrutiny Committee that this was an agreed procedure by the Trust. He added that there were no current plans to increase charges.

Recommendation 4 – Vouchers to be offered in the event that visitors park for longer than their anticipated stay

Mr Fehily stated that the actual cost to administer a voucher scheme would be too costly. He explained that the Trust took a 'softly softly' approach and that penalty notices were mainly issued to staff for incorrect parking.

#### Recommendation 5 – Pay on exit scheme to be introduced

Mr Fehily explained that as part of Watford Health Campus a new multi storey car park would be built. This would increase the number of spaces for all users. The recommendation would be introduced with the new car park. At the present time it would be too costly to introduce as it would require the installation of four gates and barriers and the required equipment.

#### Recommendation 6 – Signage and information on the free '30 minute' bays to be improved

Mr Fehily confirmed that the signage was in place; however, the spaces were currently available to all users. The reason for this was that due to the increase in activity at the site the car park was regularly full. The signage was being ignored as the spaces were needed in order to be able to run the hospital.

#### Recommendation 7 – Signage and information on parking areas for visitors to be improved

Mr Fehily advised that the signage had been improved throughout the site. The signage was constantly under review. There were proposals for a new surgery ward to be built on the car park and therefore signage would be reviewed.

#### Recommendation 8 – Signs informing on slippery roads to be installed

Mr Fehily said that instead of 'slippery' the signage would state 'car park on slope – caution'. This needed to be completed.

#### Recommendation 9 – Signs to indicate distance to hospital reception to be installed

Mr Fehily informed the Scrutiny Committee that there were car park attendants located in the car park in the morning in order to direct people to the correct entrance. The Acute Admissions Unit had a different entrance to the main hospital. The Renal Unit was located in a different building. The car park attendants were proactive.

In conclusion Mr Fehily stated that the most difficult recommendation was regarding the £2.50 charge. The Trust had a contractual relationship until 2015 and it would be costly to break that contract.

The Chair asked whether, at a later date, the Trust would consider a charging scheme based on the amount of time spent in the car park.

Mr Fehily responded that a business case for the car park had been prepared and would be presented to the Business Case Review Group. If the Review Group agreed to the proposals they would then be presented to the Trust's Board for approval. All parking options for the multi-storey car park would be considered. He added that £150,000 had been invested in the car park, including road repairs, lines, new disabled bays and access.

Councillor Bell questioned whether penalty notices were only issued to staff as he had received complaints from other users. He also asked whether the new multi-storey car park would be large enough to replace the existing car parks.

Mr Fehily advised that if a visitor had parked illegally then they would receive a penalty notice. However, they were mainly issued to staff. He said that the car park was managed as sensitively as possible. The majority of penalty notices were quashed.

With regard to the new multi-storey car park, he explained that consultants had been employed to review the parking arrangements. The consultants felt that the number of spaces needed to be increased to 1,600. It was acknowledged that the Trust needed to work on its Green Travel Plan. Once the new road had been built people would be encouraged to use bicycles. The first 10 minutes and the last 10 minutes of a person's experience at a hospital were important and this was not good if they had problems parking.

Mr Fehily added that car parking providers would be asked for their views on parking arrangements through market testing. The most suitable option for the hospital would be implemented. Stakeholders would be involved in the development.

Councillor Greenslade commented that there had been discussions since the 1980's about a multi-storey car park for the hospital. She asked for assurances that it would definitely be built this time.

Mr Fehily responded that the business case had been written. It would be delivered in partnership with Kier and the development partners. Following a question from Councillor Greenslade about height restrictions, he assured her that all aspects including the height of vehicles would be taken on board.

Councillor Khan referred to a recent visit to the hospital. It had taken him some time to find a space. He asked how long the Associate Director thought the current situation would continue and whether there was anything the Council could do to assist the hospital.

Mr Fehily explained that the current problems were due to the building works. The staff used a car park in Cardiff Road which had been leased from the Council. More space was needed. Activity levels went up in line with the complexity of cases seen at the hospital. More people requested outpatient appointments at Watford. The Trust's website advised people to leave plenty of time to find a parking place. The building works should be completed by Christmas and the parking situation should improve in January. The multi-storey car park would take approximately 12 months to build. Planning approval was likely to be sought in the summer; therefore it would take approximately 18 months to complete it.

Following a further question, Mr Fehily added that once the Trust's Board signed off the business case, the Health Authority would be asked to approve the scheme. Once approved, the Trust could go to the market and select a preferred bidder.



Councillor Martins said that he was disappointed that the recommendation of a £2.50 charge had not been implemented. He asked whether the business case ruled out the £2.50 charge. He commented that he understood the reason for issuing penalty notices for illegal parking and asked about penalty notices for those people who overstayed the time on their ticket.

Mr Fehily advised that he did not have details of the business case available. He assured Members that the parking contractor's role was not to penalise patients and visitors. If people did have an issue they could go to the PALS office. He explained that each complaint would be considered on its own merits. He reiterated that the hospital took a 'softly softly' approach.

Councillor Martins asked for details of the number of penalty notices issued and the number of appeals.

Councillor Hofman asked whether the business plan had taken account of the Croxley Rail Link when assessing the number of spaces required.

Mr Fehily confirmed that the forecast had been based on the future activities at the hospital. It assumed that a number of people would use the train and a number of people would cycle to the site.

Councillor Hofman noted that the overflow car park was not used at the weekends. He suggested that the Trust could open it and charge a fee to those going to the football ground.

Mr Fehily explained that it was not used due to a planning condition imposed by the Council. He said that ideally the Cardiff Road car park would be open for staff thereby freeing spaces in the main car park for visitors.

Councillor Meerabux commented that the charge of £4.00 was too high. He was aware that people passed their unexpired tickets on to other car park users.

The Chair responded that this matter had come out in the review. At the Task Group meeting Mr Fehily had stated that he would take the comments back to the Trust.

Mr Fehily added that the Trust was aware the exchange of tickets occurred but turned a 'blind eye'. The multi-storey car park would have an automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) system and this would mean that people would not be able to transfer tickets. ANPR was a mechanism used to manage car parks.

The Chair thanked Mr Fehily for attending the meeting and updating Members on the Trust's plans for the hospital car park.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed that the Committee and Scrutiny Officer would contact the Associate Director in six months to check on the progress of the plans for the car park which would then be circulated to Members.

RESOLVED –

that a further update on the car park be provided to the Scrutiny Committee in six

months.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer

40. **CALL-IN**  
No Executive decisions had been called in.

41. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS AND QUESTIONS**

The Scrutiny Committee received an update incorporating the outstanding actions and questions raised at previous meetings. Responses were included within the document.

Members considered the responses to each of the outstanding actions and questions.

PR 5 Neighbourhood Forums – articles in About Watford

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed the Scrutiny Committee that she had had further discussions with the Communications Team regarding articles in About Watford relating to Neighbourhood Forums. She advised Members that the Communications Team would shortly be contacting all Councillors with details of the publication deadline for the next edition of the Council magazine. Members would be able to have articles highlighting projects in their wards, including pictures, and publicise any forthcoming Neighbourhood Forum meetings.

RESOLVED –

that the outstanding actions and questions' update be noted.

42. **QUARTER 2 2012/13 PERFORMANCE REPORT**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Partnerships and Performance Section Head setting out the Key Performance Indicators and the second quarter performance measures for 2012/13. The Partnerships and Performance Section Head highlighted some of the key aspects of the report. She reminded Members that benchmarking information could be provided if required.

In response to a question from the previous meeting, the Partnerships and Performance Section Head confirmed that Environmental Services took the service lead for all complaints received by the Council. It was no longer covered by Corporate Services as this service no longer existed within the Council. The figures in the report were therefore for the whole of the Council.

ES9 (percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arising which have been recycled)

Following a question from Councillor Bell, the Partnerships and Performance Section Head advised that she understood that due to the poor weather it was

difficult to keep the garden waste down. This was likely to have an impact through the year.

Councillor Khan noted the high level of wastage. He asked whether the Council had considered a weekly collection.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head informed the Scrutiny Committee that the Council needed to collect 40% of recyclables in order to receive recycling credits and it was currently on target.

Councillor Rackett said that it was important that the Council considered the feasibility of a weekly collection and what this would do to the recycling rates and the cost of providing the service. He was aware that in many terraced areas the recycling boxes were full after one week and residents then put their recycling into the household waste instead.

#### CS13 (KPI6) (number of households living in temporary accommodation)

Councillor Bell noted the target and actual data for this measure. He asked whether officers expected this figure to rise due to the impact caused by changes to housing benefits.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head informed the Scrutiny Committee that officers were working with the private sector to find accommodation. The Housing Team's structure had changed during the year. One team concentrated on the supply of accommodation. This included properties with Registered Social Landlords and the private sector.

Councillor Bell said that he was aware of the budget of £150,000 to pay for bed and breakfast accommodation. He asked whether it was likely that more resources could be required.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head advised that she would contact the service for future projections.

#### HR1 (KPI8) (sickness absence – working days lost)

Following a question from Councillor Khan regarding sickness absence, the Partnerships and Performance Section Head advised that the statistics in the report did not separate the short term sickness and the long term sickness. The Council had implemented new management procedures for short term sickness. For example a letter was sent to the employee by their manager on the second day of absence. For those on long term sickness there were other procedures in place including occupational health advice. The overall figure could be broken down further.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed Members that recently a monthly bulletin had been started setting out details of sickness across the Council. It was available on the Intranet and she would forward the information to the Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Meerabux asked whether the sickness level was linked to the possibility

of outsourcing services and the risk of redundancy. For example the officers might be feeling under pressure.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head responded that any organisation going through a period of change had an impact on its staff. Stress was included in the detailed statistics. It was possible to compare data over a period of years.

#### Cor2 (complaints resolved at stage one)

Councillor Martins noted the low level of complaints resolved compared to the target of 90%.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head confirmed that this measure was below target. Response to complaints had to be fitted into the day to day work of services and this was sometimes difficult to achieve. The analysis of complaints included those that had been upheld and those that had not been upheld.

#### CS12 (KPI5) (number of affordable homes delivered)

Councillor Aron referred to actual number of affordable homes delivered in the second quarter compared to the target. She asked whether the 49 properties were on the Cassio Campus site. She also enquired if this would have an impact on the waiting list.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head explained that sometimes targets were based on previous years. It was possible that the service had been too optimistic when setting the target but this could be difficult with an area like the delivery of housing. With regard to the impact on those waiting for a property, the Partnerships and Performance Section Head advised that the service had commented that it was fortunate that a number of premises had become available. There could be an impact at a later date if the supply of new homes coming through were to fall.

The Chair referred to the appendix and the various abbreviations used throughout the document. She asked that in future reports the abbreviations were explained.

RESOLVED –

1. that the Scrutiny Committee's comments on the performance of the council's key performance indicators for 2012/13 at the end of quarter 2 be noted.
2. that the Scrutiny Committee's comments on the additional performance measures at the end of quarter 2 be noted.

ACTION: Partnerships and Performance Section Head

#### 43. **BENEFITS DEPARTMENT UPDATE**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Head of Revenues and Benefits which provided an explanation of the improvement in Performance Indicators for

the Benefits service and the background to the statistics.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits explained the procedures that had been implemented to meet the service's increasing workload. He assured Members that when people were asked for additional information it did not affect the start date of their claim. The claim began from the first date they approached the service.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits informed the Scrutiny Committee that the Shared Services Joint Committee had agreed that external sources could be used to help reduce the backlog of claims. A review was carried out of the external provider's quality of work. In some cases the service made a complaint and some of the external provider's agents were removed from the work. The Council also monitored the workload of its own staff.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits referred Members to paragraph 3.2 of the report and the performance data for each month from April. He advised the Scrutiny Committee that if claimants informed the Council of a change in their circumstances they were allowed one month to provide all the relevant information required. This delay added to the average time taken to process the changes and was reflected in the performance indicator.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits informed the Scrutiny Committee that officers were aware of the request to report on the number of cases outstanding rather than the number of documents. The software had been amended and in the future officers would be able to provide information based on the number of cases.

Councillor Bell acknowledged the improved performance indicators and that help had been provided by two external companies. Additional funding had been granted to carry out this work. He said that external companies did not have face to face contact with the public whereas the Council staff did. He said that he felt this was more stressful for the internal staff and asked whether this was taken into account when monitoring their work. In addition he enquired how the forthcoming benefit changes would affect Watford.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits advised Members that he was aware of the face to face and telephone contact the internal staff had with the public and this was taken into account when monitoring them.

In response to the second part of Councillor Bell's questions, the Head of Revenues and Benefits explained that the changes would begin to be introduced in April 2013. The first change related to a reduction in housing benefit for social housing tenants if their property was deemed to be too large for their needs. Tenants would still be able to claim housing benefit but might not receive the same amount. There was potential for people to be at risk of not paying their full rent. Discussions were taking place with the Housing Team. Officers were working with the Watford Community Housing Trust to try and identify potential clients who may experience problems in the future.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits advised that Universal Credit would begin to be introduced from October 2013, however he was not aware of the exact date it would affect Watford. It was likely to be phased in from October 2013, which

could mean a reduction in caseload from November or December 2013. However, it was not envisaged that initially there would be a large reduction in caseload. He confirmed that officers from different departments were looking at help for vulnerable tenants.

Councillor Aron noted that the officer had stated that many claimants did not provide all the information on making their application. She asked whether they were provided with details setting out the documents required.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits explained that the application form included a checklist of the types of documents that would be required. When claimants came to the Customer Service Centre an officer would go through the form and provide the applicant with a checklist of required documents. When that information was provided the application was then fast tracked.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits added that applications were received from various sources and not only direct from the client. For example, applications could be made at Job Centre Plus. Job Centre Plus would require some information but the Council would require information about the client's application to Job Centre Plus. Officers suggested that applications were submitted as soon as possible rather than waiting for all the information to be available, as this would affect the date of the application. Some applicants brought all their information when making the claim whereas other cases might take longer than 28 days.

Following a question from the Chair, the Head of Revenues and Benefits stated that Job Centre Plus had similar procedures to the Council, the difference being that they would look at applications for Job Seekers Allowance or Income Support. The Council would need to wait for the result of the application to Job Centre Plus before being able to process applications for Housing Benefit.

Councillor Rackett asked for details of the increase in budget for the service and whether the work carried out by the Customer Service Centre was included.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits informed Members that the financial details were presented to the Shared Services Joint Committee in September 2012.

Councillor Khan commented that he was pleased the figures were going down. He said that he had been very critical of the service at the Shared Services Joint Committee. The changes to the benefits system meant that there was a degree of uncertainty. He felt it was a valid point that some families would be stretched.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits responded that the service was placed to meet the changes and the reduction in caseload. The service currently had a backlog of applications but steps had been put in place to reduce this. By April the service should be able to meet the forthcoming changes. The changes included the Council Tax Support Scheme which would be a different scheme to administer. People would have less income and would be making decisions on what they would pay. The service needed to review its enforcement practices and strike a balance between those who paid on time and those who needed assistance. In addition the service would need to identify those who were unable to pay and those people who chose not to pay. It would be necessary to look at debts holistically. People would be encouraged to pay and not penalised.

The Director for Corporate Resources and Governance informed the Scrutiny Committee that the Shared Services Joint Committee had asked officers to look at a soft market test for the service. He added that nationally there had been a 20% increase in Housing Benefit cases, however in Watford the increase had been 29%. In respect of Council Tax Benefit, nationally the increase had been 15% and in Watford it had been 19%. Until the impact of the Universal Credit it was not prudent to employ staff and then have to make cuts at a later date. This had been the reason the authorities had looked at other sources to provide support through the current period.

Councillor Meerabux asked about the length of the application form and the difficulties some people might experience in understanding it, particularly due to language.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits responded that the form was normally between 24 and 28 pages, but not all questions were relevant to all applicants. The form covered all eventualities. The e-claim form was intelligent and bypassed the questions which were inappropriate to the claimant. The service had visiting officers who went out to vulnerable people in their own homes, including those who had difficulty with reading. The officers were busy every day. When the officers returned to the office they then processed the claims.

The Partnerships and Performance Section Head added that the Council used the services of a company called Languageline. Both Housing and the Benefits teams used this service.

The Portfolio Holder said that he wished to acknowledge the work the Head of Revenues and Benefits and Director for Corporate Resources and Governance had done. He had seen improvements over the last six months. When there were fewer claims outstanding there were less people chasing their claim and contacting the office.

The Chair thanked the Director for Corporate Resources and Governance and Head of Revenues and Benefits for the information and responding to Members' questions.

RESOLVED –

1. that the report be noted.
2. that a further update be provided in six months time on progress.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer and Head of Revenues and Benefits

#### 44. **SCRUTINY REVIEW**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Committee and Scrutiny Officer setting out details of a review of the scrutiny structures introduced in May 2011.

Executive Decision Progress Report

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed the Scrutiny Committee of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 and how it affected scrutiny. She explained that the Forward Plan was no longer required and instead the Council had to give 28 days notice of any executive decision. The notices were included in one document, which was similar to the Forward Plan.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that prior to the new regulations she had been working with the Democratic Services Manager on a new way of reporting relevant information about the Forward Plan to Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Following the introduction of the new regulations the new reporting mechanism had been developed further and was attached to the report as Appendix 1. The new document would be built up over a year from May and would form a comprehensive list of decisions which had been proposed and completed or withdrawn. Explanations would be provided as necessary. The document would also highlight where the item had not met the 28 days deadline and that the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been informed. It would also report on items where the Chair had been asked to agree whether a decision could be classed as urgent and then exempt from call-in. Officers were required to provide a reason an item was urgent which would then be explained to the Chair.

As part of the new Regulations, if the Scrutiny Committee believed a non-key decision should have been classed as a key decision it could ask for a report to be submitted to Council. The document would also make it clear whether an item was key or non-key.

Councillor Khan advised that when Members received notification that a new plan had been published, it only referred to the Intranet and not the Internet.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer asked if the Councillor could forward the email to her and she would investigate the matter and amend it as necessary. She assured Members that the notice was published on the Council's website.

The Chair said that she felt the document was much clearer and Councillor Bell said that he was pleased with how it was set up.

### Revised Scrutiny Proposal Form

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed the Scrutiny Committee that the revised Scrutiny Proposal form would become a complete record of a review. She explained that additional information had been included to assist people when putting forward suggestions. It would also record Overview and Scrutiny Committee's decision and the agreed membership.

### General comments

Councillor Rackett stated that scrutiny was the main way other Members could hold the Executive to account. Under the previous structure there had been two main scrutiny committees and various Task Groups. He said that he was frustrated with the way scrutiny was moving. In his view the system was not



working. He was concerned that things would be missed.

Councillor Martins asked the Councillor for an example where there was a deficit in scrutiny.

Councillor Rackett said that he had noted that there was a scrutiny suggestion on the agenda but there were likely to be other suggestions. Officers had said that only one Task Group could be carried out at one time.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that a number of local authorities were reviewing their scrutiny arrangements. She had recently responded to an enquiry from Stevenage Borough Council about the scrutiny structure at Watford. She agreed that officers had stated that only one time limited Task Group could be set up since the introduction of the new Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel. Officers had, however, agreed to monitor the team's workload and if there were capacity for additional Task Groups they could be set up. She reminded Members that she was only able to present scrutiny suggestions to Overview and Scrutiny Committee when suggestions had been proposed.

Councillor Aron said that she was pleased that officers had attended the meeting and updated officers on the progress of the Housing Benefits Team. She asked that when Task Groups were established they should be party to all information. It was frustrating when Members were not provided with information as they could not make a decision. Councillor Hastrick agreed with these comments.

Councillor Bell said that he agreed with Councillor Rackett. The agenda for this meeting had been very heavy. He understood the officer's comments, but previously there had been an officer working solely on scrutiny.

RESOLVED –

1. that the Executive Decision Progress Report, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be approved and included as a regular report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
2. that the revised Scrutiny Proposal Form, attached as Appendix 2 to the report, be approved and used with immediate effect.
3. that the report be noted.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer

#### 45. **PREVIOUS REVIEW UPDATE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Committee and Scrutiny Officer including an update on the second recommendation of the Affordable Housing Review. The recommendation had last been reviewed in July 2011.

RESOLVED –

that the latest update be noted and that it be further reviewed in October 2014.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer

46. **PREVIOUS REVIEW UPDATE: CHOICE BASED LETTINGS**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Committee and Scrutiny Officer which provided an update on Cabinet's response to the recommendations originally agreed by Call-in and Performance Scrutiny Committee in February 2011.

Cabinet's response and its minutes were attached to the report.

RESOLVED –

that the latest update be noted.

47. **VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR COMMISSIONING FRAMEWORK TASK GROUP**

The Scrutiny Committee received a report of the Committee and Scrutiny Officer including Cabinet's minutes from the meeting on 8 October 2012.

Councillor Aron informed Members that, as Chair of the Task Group, she would be working with the Portfolio Holder and Head of Community Services on the criteria for the small grants fund. She agreed to report back to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the outcome.

It was agreed that an update report would be presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in June 2013.

RESOLVED –

1. that the Cabinet's decision be noted.
2. that an update be provided in June 2013.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer

48. **TASK GROUP SUGGESTIONS**

The Scrutiny Committee received a scrutiny suggestion from Councillor Martins to review the management of disabled parking bays and parking by Blue Badge holders.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed the Scrutiny Committee that she had received a response from the Head of Planning, a copy of which was circulated to the Members.

Councillor Martins explained why he had put forward the suggestion. He felt that the Head of Planning assumed that there was not a problem that needed to be resolved. He said that he was aware of problems related to local residents' disabled bays.

Councillor Rackett said that he supported this suggestion. He would also like to suggest that a Task Group could be set up to look at the Property Review. Previously Members had been told not to commission a Task Group. He had been told that the review was under way. He felt that there was some work for scrutiny to do. Councillor Bell agreed that this review needed to be carried out.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that a scrutiny proposal form had never been completed for the Property Review. She added that Budget Panel would be receiving a presentation on the subject of Property at its meeting in February.

Councillor Rackett returned to Councillor Martins' suggestion and the Head of Planning's response. He felt the Head of Service was stating that there was no evidence of any problems. He received complaints from residents. It had also been commented on how long it took to get bays removed when they were no longer required. He agreed that this was a topic to be done.

Councillors Hastrick and Khan agreed that Councillor Martins' concern was valid.

Councillor Khan said that he would also like to propose a topic for review on the Housing Trust. He commented that between 40% and 50% of his casework related to the Housing Trust.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer stated that she would forward the new scrutiny proposal form to Members for completion.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer informed the Scrutiny Committee that only one non-executive Member had responded to her email asking for volunteers for the Task Group should it be agreed. Councillor Brandon had expressed an interest in taking part in the review.

Councillors Bell, Collett, Martins and Greenslade said that they were interested in taking part in the Task Group to look at disabled parking bays.

The Committee and Scrutiny Officer advised that she would transfer the proposal on to the new template and circulate it to all those interested in taking part. The first meeting would be arranged as soon as possible.

RESOLVED –

1. that a Task Group be established to review the management of disabled bays and parking by Blue Badge holders.
2. that Councillors Bell, Brandon, Collett, Greenslade and Martins be appointed to the Task Group.
3. that the Committee and Scrutiny Officer circulates the Scrutiny Proposal form

to those Councillors interested in putting forward topics for future review.

ACTION: Committee and Scrutiny Officer

49. **DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

- Thursday 20 December 2012 (For call-in only)
- Tuesday 15 January 2013 (For call-in only)
- Wednesday 23 January 2013

Chair  
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting started at 7.00 p.m.  
and finished at 9.25 p.m.

F- 30/11/12

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

20 December 2012

Present: Councillor Khan (Chair)  
Councillors Aron, Bell, Collett, Derbyshire, Hastrick, Jeffree and Rackett

Also present: Councillor Crout (Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Community Services)  
Councillor Sharpe (on behalf of Cabinet and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services)  
Councillors Connal and Dhindsa  
Councillor Mills (for minute numbers 50 - 52)  
Louise Gaffney, Director of Strategy and Infrastructure, West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust

Officers: Managing Director  
Head of Legal and Property Services  
Head of Community Services  
Partnerships and Performance Section Head  
Committee and Scrutiny Officer  
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer

### 50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were changes to Committee Membership for this meeting: Councillor Derbyshire replaced Councillor Greenslade and Councillor Jeffree replaced Councillor Hofman.

Apologies were received from Councillor Martins

### 51. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

### 52. CALL-IN: AN UPDATE REPORT ON THE WATFORD HEALTH CAMPUS

The Chair asked the Head of Legal and Property to explain the process for the Call-in meeting.

Councillor Bell then addressed the meeting. He drew attention to the reasons for the Call-in of Cabinet's decision of 3 December 2012 and explained that many people were concerned that the Farm Terrace Allotments would be included in the plans for the New Health Campus. He said that the allotment holders were not convinced of the reasons for this inclusion although they approved the intention to build a new hospital; they considered the hospital to

be a necessity for Watford and the wider community. It was not clear, however, why the allotment land was needed.

Councillor Bell noted section 3.7.9 of the report and specifically the extract which stated that

‘Without the allotments our advisors believe that the scheme is viable. However . . . there is not a significant level of comfort’.

He advised that the area at Willow Lane should be considered more seriously as a viable alternative.

Councillor Bell then addressed the subject of the consultation. He advised that at the consultation stage for planning consent the allotments had not been included in the plans as the proposal for houses on the site had not been added until later in the process. He referred to the Government’s Autumn Statement of 5 December 2012 and asked why PFI 2 could not be used to finance the hospital rather than Watford Borough Council doing so.

Councillor Bell advised that he had asked two residents to attend as witnesses to personally explain the views of the allotment holders.

Mrs Marion Harvey, from the Allotment Stakeholder Group, was then invited to address the meeting.

Mrs Harvey said that whilst she fully supported the construction of the Health Campus she could see no valid reason for the inclusion of the Farm Terrace Allotments within the site. She advised that, at the public meeting she had attended, it had been unclear what would happen to the allotments and that the Farm Terrace Group had consequently been formed.

Mrs Harvey considered that there had been a lack of involvement for the wider community and advised that local residents had not been included in the consultation meetings. She asked in what way the inclusion of the allotments would comply with the Council’s green infrastructure policy.

Mrs Harvey then referred to the latest meeting of allotment holders where it had been acknowledged that the Health Campus could be built without the allotment site.

Mrs Harvey pointed out that, since neither plans nor finance for the hospital were yet determined, it would be wise to leave the decision regarding the allotments until the final plans had been completed. She reiterated that she had no objections to the building of a new hospital but that the decision on the allotments should be left until later in the process.

Mrs Mary Reid, from the Farm Terrace Allotment Action Group, then addressed the meeting.

Mrs Reid said that green infrastructure was important to the town as a whole and noted that the allotment tenants spent many hours a week on their plots. She considered that the consultations had been helpful with much useful

information disseminated but that tenants felt that the plans to include the allotments in the scheme had been a 'done deal' from the beginning.

At the joint meeting of the Farm Terrace and Allotment Stakeholder Groups on 7 November 2012 a list of sites for future investment had been considered. Mrs Reid noted that at this meeting Farm Terrace had not been included.

Mrs Reid then referred to the Cabinet meeting of 3 December 2012 where it had been agreed to include the Farm Terrace site; she said that it was clear that the intention to build houses on the allotments had been in place from the start of the process. She further advised that at this meeting Professor Hanahoe had confirmed that it would be possible to build the hospital without using the allotment land.

Mrs Reid then spoke of the consultation which, she considered, had addressed neither the loss of the allotments nor the addition of houses to the neighbourhood. She gave a brief history of the allotments and advised that they were of historical significance and should consequently be preserved.

Mrs Reid referred to the suggestion that the allotment holders be granted new plots at the Paddock Road site. She noted that a considerable amount of funding would be required and that, since these would not be within walking distance for many of the tenants, some of the current plot holders might not take up the offer. She advised that, in many cases, long years of work had gone into the plots' development and that it would not be easy for the tenants to move.

Mrs Reid then addressed the issue of the new access road and the effect of increased traffic on the local community. She noted the options for the new hospital buildings and questioned how a potential emergency at the football stadium would be dealt with. Mrs Reid referred to the Mayor's statement that there would be more community green space under the new plans; she considered, however, that there would be additional parkland with or without the inclusion of the allotments. She suggested that the allotments could form part of the community space.

Mrs Reid noted that the Council's decision must be presented to the Secretary of State for Community and Local Government and concluded by asking what would be the contingency plans were the Secretary of State to decide that the allotments should not be brought into the Health Campus site.

Mrs Harvey questioned the number of homes to be built on the Farm Terrace site and noted that the Development Director of Watford Health Campus had stated that the new plans for this area would incorporate community space. She concluded that there would consequently be less than 66 homes on this site. Mrs Harvey also noted community based ideas which the action group had raised but which had not been fully explored.

Mrs Reid then referred to the Corporate Plan, Priority 3. She advised that the Action Group had given its views which had not been considered. She concluded by advising that the allotments were part of the town's open space.

The Chair thanked Mrs Harvey and Mrs Reid for their presentations and then invited the Committee Members to question Councillor Bell.

Councillor Rackett thanked the speakers and said that he was mostly in agreement with them. He questioned Councillor Bell on the reason for the proposal to 'ask that PFI 2 be investigated for funding for the Health Campus'. Councillor Rackett noted that many hospitals had gone into serious debt through the use of PFI monies.

Councillor Bell replied that at the present time six other hospitals were using PFI funding and that this initiative could be a way of financing the hospital.

Louise Gaffney advised that the Hospital Trust was not asking for the Council to fund the building of the new hospital and that PFI had not, in general, produced good schemes and many had experienced problems. She noted that PFI 2 was essentially different to PFI 1 and it would be sensible to be wary of commitment in this arena. The relevant legislation was not yet in place. It was something that could be considered but it would not be the Trust's first option. She added that the Trust would not be in a position to take out another large loan.

Councillor Bell considered that it was expected that the Council would invest in the Health Campus project and thought it relevant that the new funding scheme should be considered.

Councillor Derbyshire advised that PFI 2 would ensure that the public element derived greater benefit from financing projects. He asked Councillor Bell to explain what benefits he considered the Council would derive from PFI 2 which they would not receive from the Local Asset Backed Vehicle (LABV).

Councillor Bell responded that the project was a risky venture and that the Council should seriously consider different forms of finance for this scheme.

The Managing Director advised that the Council had looked at all the current information on PFI 2 and that the Government would need to consult with various bodies and to introduce the new legislation prior to the funding initiative being explored further. He explained that PFI 2 had altered the harshness of the original PFI and that the benefits would be split between the public and private elements of projects. There would be joint equity, joint governance and joint benefits for the partners. He advised that all sources of funding should be considered. PFI 2 had been configured essentially as a priority for new schools although consideration would be given to hospital development. He noted, however, that due to the time-frame involved, PFI 2 was not the solution for the Health Campus.

Councillor Jeffree drew attention to point 3.11.3 in the report and noted that the viability of the scheme without the allotments was not strong. He advised that at the Cabinet meeting Professor Hanahoe had clearly stated that it would be virtually impossible to manage construction without the use of the Farm Terrace land. He considered that, based on the information provided to the Scrutiny Committee, the consultation had been very thorough.



Councillor Bell countered by referring to point 3.7.9 in the report which noted that the Part B Cabinet report had stated that the advisors considered the scheme to be viable without the allotments. Professor Hanahoe had said that there were no current alternative plans but that it was not the case that the allotments were necessary to the successful viability of the scheme.

Mrs Harvey noted that in a conversation with Professor Hanahoe he had stated that without the allotment land construction of the hospital would be expensive but not impossible.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Community Services said that he felt the Secretary of State for Health would be in a stronger position to grant hospital development if it had the support of the local council.

Councillor Collett asked Councillor Bell which other land in the borough he could suggest to sell in order to save the allotments.

Councillor Bell replied that there were alternative sites on the Campus area which could be used as well as other areas across the town. He named Willow Lane and the Wiggenghall depot in addition to other parts of Watford.

Councillor Dhindsa objected that Councillor Collett's question to Councillor Bell was unfair. He noted that Rembrandt House (in Holywell ward) had already been developed and that parts of Wiggenghall Road could also be used. He said it was up to the Portfolio Holder to identify alternative sites, not Councillor Bell.

Councillor Derbyshire noted that ultimately it would not be the Council who would make the decision to include the allotments in the Campus site but the Secretary of State for Community and Local Government. He asked whether the committee considered this to be fair.

In reply to a comment from Mrs Harvey, the Head of Legal and Property Services explained that the Council must make an application to the Secretary of State in order to decommission allotment land. The decision of Cabinet on 3 December 2012 was to take this step since the allotment site was needed for the hospital. She confirmed Councillor Derbyshire's point that the decision would ultimately be that of the Secretary of State.

Councillor Dhindsa commented that if Cabinet had not made its decision it would not be necessary to apply to the Secretary of State.

The Chair then invited the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services to present his case.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the allotments were vital as part of the wider regeneration of the Health Campus site which would include the new infrastructure and access road. He explained that the scheme was financially marginal and that there was a danger that it would go into deficit. He counselled that it was necessary to generate income in order to provide for expenditure; the houses would make the access road affordable and would reduce the cost margin.

The Portfolio Holder further explained that to postpone the decision on the allotments would compromise the viability of construction. He said that it was imperative that a high quality hospital be provided and asked what was to be considered most important and where the weight of decision should be balanced. He reminded the meeting that Professor Hanahoe had advised that the scheme would be more expensive to manage without the use of the allotment land. Construction was already difficult and expensive and, with less land for manoeuvre, problems would increase. He advised that whilst Professor Hanahoe had said that without Farm Terrace the scheme would be 'not impossible' he had also noted that it would be 'not very good'.

In referring to the land at Willow Lane, the Portfolio Holder explained that this had originally been looked at for the hospital but due to the building of the surge wards this was no longer practical. The land was needed for housing to help the viability.

He added that the bridge for the new Metropolitan rail link must be built before construction of the access road; if the deadline for construction of the bridge were missed this would result in huge additional expenditure and 'on costs'.

The Portfolio Holder then addressed the question of alternative sites for housing across the borough. He advised that the Core Strategy had recently looked at areas in the town and that there were no other potential housing sites available. Referring to the suggestion to use Wiggshall depot, he advised that this was still in operational use and that the whole site would be needed. This would then mean additional land would need to be found for the depot. Similarly, the Irish Club site had been earmarked for a school; if this site were consumed by housing a new school would still be needed with no site available.

The Portfolio Holder concluded by advising that even were PFI 2 to be used this would not solve problems for the hospital in terms of the space it would need.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Community Services advised on the question of consultation. He said that meetings had been held and questions from the allotment holder groups had been answered. He confirmed that it was not possible to give all information requested as some was commercially sensitive. He confirmed, however, that Cabinet members had had all relevant information when they had made their decision.

Councillor Rackett questioned the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services' concerns regarding the viability of the entire scheme and asked whether he were certain that even with the addition of the allotment land the finances would be sufficient.

The Portfolio Holder advised that it was impossible to foresee all changes in economic circumstances but that the decisions rested on assessment of risk. There was evidence that the scheme was barely viable but the business case appeared to be viable with the inclusion of the allotment land. He advised that the Council was obliged to provide housing in the future and that this site offered potential. The decision not to go ahead would remove a major housing site for Watford.

Louise Gaffney told the meeting that there was great support for a hospital at the site. She advised that a grant of £7 million was available from the Department of Health to go towards the construction of the access road; this must be spent, however, within the following two years. If the money were not used there would be no further funding. Ms Gaffney explained that the road and infrastructure for the Campus would cost in the region of £16 million; permission for building the surge wards and the Acute Admissions Unit had been granted on condition that the access road was built. Were this not to be built then the funding for clinical services would need to be sought elsewhere. This was a key point in the decision-making process.

Ms Gaffney agreed that there were currently no firm construction plans for the hospital but that this work was now being considered. She advised that the key consideration was: what was best for the hospital and what was best for the patients; this included clinical connectivity. She said that construction would necessarily be a phased approach; it was imperative that the hospital remained operational at all times and that all departments allowed for physical connection once the hospital were completed. Inclusion of the allotment land would allow sufficient space for full access between departments whilst building was in progress. Without the allotments this would be very difficult to deliver.

Councillor Dhindsa said that he had attended the majority of the meetings with the allotment holders and plans had been only slowly made available. He advised that in August 2012 there had been no plans for developments on the allotments; the first indication had been the Cabinet meeting. He asked what arrangements would be made were the Secretary of State not to agree to use of the allotment land for the campus.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services said that in that case it would be necessary to revert to a scheme without the allotments. He reiterated that the scheme was already barely viable and that there was a serious risk of deficit. If the scheme did go into deficit a way of balancing out the costs would need to be sought. He suggested that methods could include making additional money from the site. More homes could be built on Willow Lane although these would of necessity be very crammed. This would have a detrimental effect on the site.

The Head of Community Services advised that the engagement that had taken place with allotment holders had not been formal consultation as that was not required at this very early stage in developing proposals. She confirmed that she had been present at all engagement meetings as the allotments came within her area of responsibility. At the July 2012 meeting the two potential development partners had produced plans for the Council to consider which were on display at the meeting. She confirmed that as many tenants of Farm Terrace as possible had been invited to participate as it was the Council's wish that interested tenants should engage in the process. The Head of Community Services noted that at the second consultation meeting attendees had discussed the constraints inherent in the site by examining maps of the site and models of the requirements. That feedback from the engagement process was given to Kier to enable them to understand the broad range of views when developing their final proposals for presentation to Cabinet. Kier's plans to

include the allotments had also been included in their presentation to allotment holders? on the 7<sup>th</sup> November, before being reported to Cabinet.

In response to a question from Councillor Hastrick, the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services advised that the LABV was only permissible if it were for regeneration purposes and was not intended to be a commercial profit making venture. He added, however, that it was intended that it would be adequately funded and that there would be a surplus at the end of the process. He explained that the Council would be an equal partner in the LABV and would consequently accrue 50% of the benefit of the scheme.

Councillor Jeffree noted comments that rather than build on the allotment site, homes should be built elsewhere in the Borough. He asked how figures for new housing in West Watford compared to other areas in the town.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services replied that within the previous 10 years 6.4% of new housing in the borough had been developed in Vicarage ward compared to 20% in Park ward and 22% in Central ward. He explained that development depended on sites which were proposed.

In reply to a further question from Councillor Jeffree, Councillor Derbyshire advised that 350 new homes had been built on the Cassio Metro site.

Councillor Bell noted that most of West Watford was already very congested. He agreed that housing was needed in this area but advised that the optimum which could be accommodated on the Farm Terrace site would be 66 homes. In response to the question raised by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services regarding other sites to be utilised, Councillor Bell suggested use of the proposed Morrison's site in Ascot Road. Referring to the need for additional new homes to be built in the borough in future years he said that they did not all need to be built in West Watford, he was certain that other sites could be found.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services responded that no funding from Morrisons would be accrued for some time and that it was imperative that the infrastructure be supported financially. He reiterated the importance of the Health Campus being economically viable and again noted that income from housing would fund part of the infrastructure and the access road.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services then addressed the subject of other development sites in the borough. He noted the possibility of using the Avenue Car Park but advised that this was next to a conservation area and that consultation with conservation experts would need to be sought and then permission to proceed granted. This would in all likelihood take three years and the deadline for constructing the rail bridge would then have been missed resulting in doubling the cost of the access road. He advised that the addition of 60 houses on Farm Terrace would make sufficient difference to move the scheme from 'non-viable' to 'viable'.

The Managing Director confirmed that the impact of including the houses in the campus would make significant difference to the viability of the whole scheme.

He also drew attention to the map of the flood plain provided for the Committee. He advised that the Council was engaging with the Environment Agency to determine what could be delivered on the site in view of the presence of the flood plain; he noted the inherent risks. He advised that since Willow Lane and Farm Terrace were not in the area of the flood plain these parts of the site could be developed at an early stage in the process to underpin viability.

Councillor Dhindsa referred to the earlier discussion on the Cassio Metro and noted that this site was in close proximity to the open spaces of Cassiobury Park whereas houses in Vicarage ward had very small gardens and needed the space which the allotments provided. He also noted earlier reference to the fact that the hospital would be used by patients from a wide area. He suggested that land for houses be sought in other towns. Councillor Dhindsa concluded by stating that the report to Cabinet had not been written objectively.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Legal and Property Services replied that Hemel Hempstead and St Albans had agreed their own housing allocations. He added that the proposed development also involved the generation of funding and that there was a finite length of time in which to complete the project. With regard to the report he advised that the officer had given his professional opinion in the document.

Councillor Rackett MOVED that

‘This decision be referred back to Cabinet.’

On being put to the Committee the Motion was LOST.

Councillor Derbyshire MOVED that

‘This Committee endorses the decision taken by Cabinet on 3 December 2012 in relation to Watford Health Campus’

On being put to the Committee the Motion was CARRIED

The Chair thanked all those who had attended.

RESOLVED –

that this Committee endorses the decision taken by Cabinet on 3 December 2012 in relation to Watford Health Campus

### 53. **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 (For call-in only)
- Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2013
- Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2013 (For call-in only)

Chair  
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting started at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 9.35 pm

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Outstanding Actions and questions

Action to be carried out	Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer	
<b>Performance Report</b>					
PI 27	Contact the Housing Service for future projections regarding CS13 (KPI 6), the number of households living in temporary accommodation, including budgets	Partnerships and Performance Section Head	21 November 2012	14/01/13	Response attached as Appendix 1
PI 28	Forward a copy of the monthly Absence News to the Scrutiny Committee	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	24/12/12	The September and October editions were forwarded to the Scrutiny Committee on 14 December 2012.
PI 29	Abbreviations to be explained in future reports	Partnerships and Performance Section Head	21 November 2012	27/02/13	To be included in future reports.
<b>Housing Benefit update</b>					
HB 1	Provide details of the increase in budget for the benefits service and whether the work carried out by the CSC is included within that budget	Head of Revenues and Benefits	21 November 2012	14/01/13	The Head of Revenues and Benefits has advised that the information was included in the report to the Joint Shared Services Committee in September 2012. The report can be found on the Council's website – <a href="http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s3409/12%2009%2024%20JSS%20i%20-%2006%20benefits%20update.pdf">http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s3409/12%2009%2024%20JSS%20i%20-%2006%20benefits%20update.pdf</a>

Action to be carried out		Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer
HB 2	Further update to be provided to the Scrutiny Committee	Head of Revenues and Benefits	21 November 2012	May/June 2013	Added to the rolling work programme
<b>Scrutiny Review</b>					
SR 1	Check why the email referring to the newly published Notice of Executive Decisions does not provide the link to the internet version.	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	14/01/13	This has been amended and the latest message refers to both the Intranet and Internet.
SR 2	The Executive Decision Progress Report agreed and to be introduced with immediate effect	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	-	Included on this agenda
SR 3	New Scrutiny Proposal Form to be used with immediate effect	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	-	This form is now being used for scrutiny suggestions.



Action to be carried out	Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer	
<b>Affordable Housing Review</b>					
AHR 1	<p><u>Recommendation 1 – Affordable Housing threshold</u> – The status of the Core Strategy to be reviewed in 12 months.</p> <p>The original recommendations was –</p> <p>“ That the reduction of the affordable housing threshold from 15 units to 10 units proposed by the Planning Policy Advisory Group be implemented and be reviewed after 18 months to see if it has resulted in additional affordable homes or deterred some developers from investing in Watford.”</p>	OSC Committee	26 July 2011	March 2013	The response is attached as Appendix 2.
AHR 7	Review the first and second quarters' performance of the new Nomination Policy	Committee and Scrutiny Officer/ Housing Section Head	19 September 2012	November 2013	Added to rolling work programme

Action to be carried out		Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer
AHR 8	Recommendation 2 – piecemeal developments and Section 106 obligations – to be further reviewed in two year’s time	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	October 2014	Added to rolling work programme
<b>Work Programme and Task Groups</b>					
WP 8	Community Safety Partnership Task Group to be asked to review the provision of drug treatment in the borough	Committee and Scrutiny Officer and Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer	24 November 2011	1 December 2011  Revised date TBC	Referred to the Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer supporting the Community Safety Partnership Task Group.  Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be informed when the subject is due to be discussed at the Task Group.  This topic is on the Task Group’s work programme and will be reviewed once the relevant officers are available. The County Council officer has been on secondment

Action to be carried out		Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer
WP 11	OSC to examine the long-term impact on the four organisations which would be subject to the largest grant cuts.	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	2 February 2012	18 June 2013	Originally this was due to be presented at the March meeting. Community Services is currently carrying out further work with organisations. Following a discussion with the officer and Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee it has been agreed that the update will be presented in June 2013.
WP 16	Forward the new Scrutiny Proposal form to Councillors Khan and Rackett	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	30 November 2012	Completed – sent by email
WP 17	Set up the Task Group to review the management of disabled parking bays – including confirmation of membership	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	24 December 2012	The Task Group has been set up and an update is included elsewhere on this agenda.
WP 18	Transfer Councillor Martin's proposal to the new form	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	30 November 2012	Completed
<b>Hospital Parking Charges Task Group</b>					
HP 7	Hospital Trust to be requested to supply details of the number of penalty notices issued in Watford General Hospital's car park and the number of appeals.	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012		The Associate Director has been asked to provide the information.
HP 8	Contact the Associate Director for an update on the progress of the plans for the car park.	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	May/June 2013	Added to rolling work programme.

Action to be carried out		Responsibility	Committee Date	Deadline	Comments/officer
<b>Previous Reviews Updates</b>					
PR 2	<u>Services for the Deceased</u> Outstanding recommendations to be further reviewed	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	25 July 2012	September 2013 (Originally February 2013)	Due to the current work being undertaken to review service delivery within the Council, it is too early to provide a further update on the outstanding recommendations. An update to be presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in September 2013.  Added to rolling work programme
<b>Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework Task Group</b>					
VCF 2	Update to be presented to the Scrutiny Committee in June 2013	Committee and Scrutiny Officer	21 November 2012	June 2013	Added to the rolling work programme.

## Update on request for information from previous meeting –

**Action:** Contact the Housing Service for future projections regarding CS13 (KPI 6) – the number of households living in temporary accommodation, including budgets

## Response from the Housing Section Head

We do not have a projection at the current time. This is due to the complexity of the situation and the unknown, cumulative outcome of a growing number of factors, e.g. economic crisis, Welfare Reform, lack of mortgage affordability, lack of available land and cuts in finance for new affordable housing.

These are at the same time as the Council retaining a homelessness duty to people who may present as homeless without prior notice and may have to be accommodated.

Together with the above factors, there are some proxy measures officers routinely monitor which have led to the service flagging up the risk that the situation could deteriorate:

- Newbuild pipeline projection of 122 units during 2012/13 declining to only 56 units in 2013/14 (as yet, further sites may come forward).
- Private sector properties made available through our schemes - 19 in quarter 1, 17 in quarter 2 whereas in previous years we were achieving higher numbers through our rent deposit scheme alone e.g. 74 last year, whereas in 2009/10 we had 134.

The PI is a snapshot figure taken at the end of the quarter. While the service does not have a projection, a *target* of 90 households has been set, based on our need to monitor this as a service risk (bearing in mind the capacity available in hostels and other properties and when this capacity will be exceeded which means B&B usage will increase).

At present, the figure of 90 is frequently exceeded, although not necessarily at the end of the quarter when the snapshot is taken. This may be in a cycle until a new build development comes which then creates a series of chain moves and results in households leaving temporary accommodation.

In terms of budget, hostels and regular temporary accommodation are self financing through rents. For 2013/14 the service has agreed a B&B budget of £150,890 which is allowing for the previous peak demand. The aim is to recoup a proportion of costs through housing benefit and client contributions - a budget estimate for the monies to be recouped is £30,000.

This is a complex area with so many impacting factors. The Council is taking the approach of continuous monitoring so that risks can be flagged up as incremental rises are experienced.

In terms of how the Council supports this, preventative work continues, particularly with partner agencies, housing associations etc around Welfare Reform issues. It is anticipated that there will be corporate discussion about use of assets, investment in affordable housing etc which will be taken forward through Asset Management Group and Regeneration Strategy Group.

This page is intentionally left blank

## AHR1 – Affordable Housing Threshold

### Planning Policy's Response –

The **Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted on 30 January 2013**. This means that the Core Strategy now forms part of the development plan and will be used in determining planning applications.

From June 2010, the policy on affordable housing used a threshold of 15 or more units at a rate of 35%. Today however, post the Core Strategy adoption, the Council is seeking 35% affordable housing on major schemes of 10 or more units. Proportions of the affordable housing are now seeking 20% social rent; 65% affordable rent; and 15% shared ownership/intermediate housing.

The new Policy HS3 has only been applied since the Inspector's report on the Core Strategy at the end of September 2012. Up until this point it was not considered to be a material consideration. Therefore Policy HS3 has only been used for 5 months and in that period the level of major applications (over 10 units) has been minimal.

The Annual Monitoring Report 2012 shows that there has been a total of 95 affordable homes delivered during 2011/12, across 4 sites. This was based on the previous threshold of 15 units. The AMR predicts that next year that figure will be 127 units.

This page is intentionally left blank



\*PART A

**Report to:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2013  
**Report of:** Partnerships and Performance Section Head  
**Title:** Update on the council's key performance indicators and measures – third quarter (October - December) 2012/13

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Watford BC's Corporate Plan 2012-16 set out the eight key performance indicators that the council has selected to measure its key priorities and where it knows it needed to improve performance during 2012/13. Overview and Scrutiny Committee scrutinise and comment on the performance of these indicators on a quarterly basis. In June 2012, Committee discussed a proposed set of additional indicators that it would monitor during 2012/13.
- 1.2 This report, therefore, presents an update on the council's key performance indicators (KPIs) as at the end of quarter 3 2012/13 (October - December) as well as other performance measures identified and agreed by Committee for scrutiny during 2012/13.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Note and comment on the performance of the council's key performance indicators for 2012/13 at the end of quarter 3.
- 2.2 Note and comment on the performance of those additional performance measures identified for Committee's consideration at the end of quarter 3.

### **Contact Officer:**

For further information on this report please contact:  
Kathryn Robson, Partnerships and Performance Section Head  
telephone extension: 8077 email: [kathryn.robson@watford.gov.uk](mailto:kathryn.robson@watford.gov.uk)

### 3.0 **Background information**

Each year, Watford Borough Council's Corporate Plan sets out the key performance indicators (KPIs) that the council has selected to measure its priorities and where it knows it needs to improve performance.

It was agreed that Overview and Scrutiny Committee would scrutinise the council's performance in relation to these key performance indicators on a quarterly basis. At its meeting in June 2012, Committee agreed the additional performance measures be reported as part of its quarterly scrutiny of performance and a template reflecting this was developed.

This report presents the template that incorporates Committee's recommendations, including the performance of the council's KPIs at the end of quarter 3 2012/13.

### 3.1 **Key performance indicators (KPIs)**

3.1.1 For 2012/13 the council identified eight key performance indicators (KPIs). These are a continuation of the KPIs for the previous year and are attached as Appendix A.

#### 3.1.2 **End of quarter 3 (2012/13) report on Watford BC KPIs – performance against target**

Of the 8 KPIs, KPI1 (time taken to process benefit claims – new + change of circumstances) is reported as two indicators as the council monitors it in two parts and KPI4 (street cleansing) as three indicators. This means 11 performance measures are reported in total. In terms of performance against target at the end of quarter 3 2012/13 (October - December)

- 3 were above target
- None were on target
- 6 were below target

The remaining performance measures – see below – are not collected during quarter 3 (KPI5 is collected at the end of quarters 2 and 4 and KPI7 is an annual indicator) and will not be reported until the end of 2012/13:

- KPI5 - Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)
- KPI7 - CO2 reductions from local authority operations

### 3.1.3 KPIs performing above target

The following KPIs were reported as performing above target at the end of quarter 3 2012/13.

KPI4i	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter)
KPI4ii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of detritus)
KPI4iii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti)










### 3.1.4 KPI performing below target




The following KPIs were reported as performing below target at the end of quarter 3 2012/13.

KPI1i	Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit - new claims
KPI1ii	Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit - change of circumstances
KPI2	Residual household waste
KPI3	Household waste recycled and composted
KPI5	Number of households in temporary accommodation
KPI8	The average working days lost to sickness per full time equivalent employee

### 3.1.5 Performance against target – actual performance

The table below shows the actual performance against target at the end of quarter 3 2012/13.

Indicator	Target	Result	Performance against target
Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit <i>- new claims</i>	25 days	26.07 days	
Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit <i>- change of circumstances</i>	15 days	19.08 days	
Residual household waste	127.79kg	130.76 kg	
Household waste recycled and composted	39.15%	37.29%	
Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter)	5%	2.44%	
Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of detritus)	5%	1.63%	
Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti)	4%	2.67%	
Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of households in temporary accommodation	90	99	
CO2 reductions from local authority operations	6% (30% over 5 years)	Annual indicator	N/A
The average working days lost to sickness per full time equivalent employee	4.88 days	7.00 days	

-  = performing above target
-  = performance on target
-  = performing below target

## 3.2 End of quarter 3 2012/13 performance report overview

3.2.1 Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report at the end of quarter 3 2012/13 (October - December) is attached as Appendix B. Those performance measures that are not performing against target by 10% or more are highlighted with a !. This just relates to under performance. Where a measure is performing well (on or above target) it is highlighted with a 😊 even if this is over 10%.

Areas to note from the progress report:

- The waste and recycling performance figures are under performing in quarter 3. The service still anticipates being on target for the end of year
- The housing indicators have seen a slight dip in the third quarter. This was anticipated in quarter 2 as the positive impact of new social housing units becoming available had helped keep performance steady during quarters 1 and 2.
- Benefits performance has consolidated its improved performance since quarter 2 and continues to improve
- The council set a 'stretch target' for sickness absence for 2012/13 at 6.5.days. This was a response to consideration of previous years' results and noting that the council's performance had 'plateaued' to some extent at around 8.5 days. Although measures have been put in place to improve performance, at this stage in the year it is apparent that the target will not be met and the end of year result will be around 8.5 days

## 4.0 IMPLICATIONS.

### 4.1 Financial

4.1.1 The Head of Strategic Finance comments that at this stage in the year there are no financial implications within this report.

### 4.2 Legal Issues (Monitoring Officer)

4.2.1 The Head of Legal and Property Services comments that there are no legal implications within this report.

## Appendices

Appendix A - Watford BC 2012/13 key performance indicators

Appendix B – Watford BC - Measures of Performance – Progress report as of end of quarter 3 2012/13

## Background papers:

- Corporate Plan 2012-16

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix A - Watford BC 2011/12 and 2012/13 key performance indicators






<u>Reference</u>	<u>Definition</u>
KPI1	Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change of events* <i>* This is defined as one indicator although the council reports it as two parts – new (i) and change of circumstances (ii)</i>
KPI2	Residual household waste
KPI3	Household waste recycled and composted
KPI4	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter, detritus and graffiti)* <i>* This is defined as one indicator although it has four parts (i-iv). Three elements are key performance indicators</i>
KPI5	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)
KPI6	Number of households in temporary accommodation
KPI7	CO2 reductions from local authority operations
KPI8	The average working days lost to sickness per full time equivalent employee

This page is intentionally left blank









## WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL – MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE

### Third quarter (October - December) 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Environmental Services</b>									
ES1 KPI7	CO2 reductions from local authority operations	N/A (6% for year - annual indicator)	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A	Environmental Services	Still on track to achieve 5 years 30% reduction.
ES2 KPI2	Residual household waste per household	127.79kg <b>(513.11kg for year)</b>	130.76 kg	2.32%		↓	↓	Environmental Services	There has been an unexpected increase in residual waste this quarter which will be investigating further once we have received the clarifications from Hertfordshire CC.
ES3 KPI3	Household waste recycled and composted	39.15% <b>(40.20% for year)</b>	37.29%	4.75%		↓	↓	Environmental Services	The increase in residual household waste has had an impact on this performance indicator which requires further investigation. However, even if the







<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
									figures are correct the council is still on track to achieve the year end target.
ES9	Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arising which have been recycled	17.15% <b>(17.43% for year)</b>	16.60%	3.21%		↓	↓	Environmental Services	High tonnage of residual household waste having a negative impact
ES10	Percentage of waste sent for composting including waste which has been treated through a process of anaerobic digestion	22.00% <b>(22.77% for year)</b>	20.68%	6.00%		↓	↓	Environmental Services	Sharp decrease in tonnages of greenwaste collected this quarter as is expected this time of year. Still on track to achieve end of year target.
ES4 KPI4i	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter)	5% <b>(4.5% for year)</b>	2.44%	51.2%		↓	↑	Environmental Services	Although an adverse trend continues since qtr 1 it shows some levelling off and continues to show sustained improved performance against both quarterly and cumulative targets.




<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
									Cumulative result for quarters 1 2 and 3 is 1.85%
ES5 KPI4ii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of detritus)	5% <b>(6% for year)</b>	1.63%	67.4%		↑	↑	Environmental Services	<p>Detritus through the autumn period shows significant improvement as a result of conducting mechanical sweeper trials for the greater part of the leaf fall period using various units from 4 manufacturers.</p> <p>Cumulative result for quarters 1, 2 and 3 is 3.23%</p>
ES6 KPI4iii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti)	4% <b>(3.5% for year)</b>	2.67%	33.25%		↔	↑	Environmental Services	<p>No change – weather suppressing both level of tagging and clearances</p> <p>Cumulative result for quarters 1 2 and 3 is 2.67%</p>
ES7	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels	0.3%	0.0%	1%		↑	↑	Environmental Services	Target wards for period typically less





<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
	of fly posting)	<b>(0.33% for year)</b>							affected by fly posting combined with a significant reduction in activity after summer events
ES8	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of fly tipping)	Effective <b>(Annual indicator)</b>	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A	Environmental Services	The domestic waste collection policy has been approved and a plan for its implementation developed.




<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Community Services</b>									
CS12 KPI5	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	Community Services	Re-phasing from quarter 2 projection. This indicator is reported on alternate quarters. Leggatts (18 social rented), Aldenham Square (18 social, 6 shared ownership), Callowland (16 social rent), Rainbow House (16 social rent, 31 affordable, 15 shared ownership). <b>Quarter 4 anticipated:</b> Cassio Campus 68 units Leggatts 3
CS13 KPI6	Number of households living in temporary accommodation	90 <b>(90 at end of quarter)</b>	99	10%		↓	↓	Community Services	Continuing to monitor closely, increase compared to previous quarter where new build had reduced figures




<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
CS15	The number of people sleeping rough on a single night within the area of the local authority	5  <b>(5 at Dec 2012 - annual indicator)</b>	8	60%	!	N/A	N/A	Community Services	Estimate to be submitted once a year to Department for Communities and Local Government in December. Working through the POSH (Prevention of Single Homelessness) partnership with Watford New Hope Trust (WNHT) on launch of No Second Night Out. Lead on Herts Single Homelessness Project, continuing grant funding to WNHT outreach team.
CS16	Number of households who considered themselves as homeless, who approached the local authority's housing advice service(s), and for who housing advice casework intervention resolved their situation	85  <b>(95 for year)</b>	tbc	-	-	-	-	Community Services	Continuing issues with transition to new recording system. End of year intensive work underway to close down and record cases in each category. Homelessness decisions show comparative levels with last year.




<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
									Additional 120 advice cases not reflected in categories above
CS17	Number of private sector units secured for use under Rent Deposit Guarantee Scheme, Housing Association Leasing Direct or other initiatives	20 <b>(80 for year)</b>	8	60%	!	↓	N/A	Community Services	Private sector leasing is not proving successful due to the economic and housing market factors which make it unattractive to many landlords. Supply Team continuing to work with landlords to identify opportunities to incentivise joint working.
CS18	The number of households in bed and breakfast accommodation	9 <b>(9 at end of quarter)</b>	5	44.44%	😊	↑	↑	Community Services	Lower numbers in earlier quarters were due to cycle of new build and impact on this snapshot figure. No households with children in over 6 weeks.  7 single person households in addition at end of Quarter 3, none in previous quarters.

<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.





Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Planning</b>									
PL1	Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for 'major' applications (% determined within 13 weeks)	85% <b>(85% for year)</b>	42.86%	49.58%	!	↓	↑	Planning	<p>2 applications in this category in Q1; 1 application in Q2; 4 applications in Q3</p> <p>The 4 applications determined in Q3 were: Rembrandt House and 24/30 King Street (delays in completing s.106 planning obligations) and the school and retail proposals at Ascot Road (needed to await next available Development Control committee).</p>
PL2	Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for 'minor' applications (% determined within 8 weeks)	90% <b>(90% for year)</b>	90.36%	0.4%	☹	↑	↓	Planning	<p>50 applications in this category in Q1; 57 applications in Q2; 75 applications in Q3</p> <p>Performance improving despite increase in numbers of applications</p>





<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.



Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13




Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
PL3	Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for 'other' applications (% determined within 8 weeks)	90% <b>(90% for year)</b>	99.01%	10.00%		↑	↑	Planning	

Page 53

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Legal and Property Services</b>									
LP5	Voter registration	96%	96.5%	0.52%		N/A	↑		This is an annual indicator so only reported in Quarter 3. The result of 2012 canvass was a slight improvement on previous year and was 2nd best performance in Hertfordshire despite change to statutory canvass dates.







<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Human Resources</b>									
HR1 KPI	Sickness absence (working days lost)	4.88 days <b>(6.5 days for year)</b>	7.00 days (cumulative)	43.44%	!	↓	↓	Human Resources	An improvement on last 2 quarters. Long term and medium term absence is improving however short term absence (up to 5 days) is increasing.






<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Revenues and Benefits</b>									
RB1 KPI1i	Av time to process benefits claims (from date of claim)	25 days <b>(25 days for year)</b>	26.07 days	4.28%		↑	↑	Revenues and Benefits	Slight peak in workload due to Christmas – work received but office closed / reduced staff.
RB2 KPI1ii	Av time to process change of circumstances for benefit claims	15 days <b>(15 days for year)</b>	19.08 days	27.20%		↑	↑	Revenues and Benefits	See above.
RB3	Av time to process benefit claims (from receipt of all information)	15 days <b>(15 days for year)</b>	13.46 days	10.27%		↑	-	Revenues and Benefits	See above.
RB4	Accuracy of information which affects the subsidy received by the Council	To be confirmed  Annual indicator	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A		







<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13





Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>ICT</b>									
IT1	ICT service availability to users during core working hours  Priority 1 Applications – ABS (COA) Academy (Windows) Uniform Email Internet WBC Website Lagan File and Print Server	99.5%  <b>(99.5% for year)</b>	99.84%	0.34%		↑	↑	ICT	Availability was within the KPI target.
IT2	ICT service availability to users during core working hours  Priority 2 Applications – Touchpaper EROS Gauge Resource Link Intranet	99.5%  <b>(99.5% for year)</b>	99.98%	0.48%		↓	↓	ICT	Availability was within the KPI target.

<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.




Appendix B - Watford BC - Measures Of Performance – Progress report as of quarter 3 - 2012/13

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
<b>Corporate</b>									
Cor 1	Calls resolved at first point of contact	90% <b>(90% for year)</b>	99% excl transfers	10%		↔	↑	Environmental Services	Reporting figure excludes Switchboard transfer calls.
Cor 2	Complaints resolved at stage one	90% <b>(90% for year)</b>	69%	23.33%		↓	↓	Environmental Services	As at the end of the second quarter there were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 unresolved cases</li> <li>• 3 escalated to stage 2</li> <li>• 2 escalated to stage 3</li> </ul>
Cor 3	% of stage 1 complaints resolved within 10 days	80% <b>(80% for year)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	Environmental Services	Data cannot be supplied. Collecting and reporting system operating effectively from January 2013.
Cor 4	CSC service levels – 95% all calls answered	95% all calls answered <b>(95% for year)</b>	98%	3.18%		↔	↓	Environmental Services	

<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

Ref	Measure	Target for Quarter 3 2012/13	Actual at end of 2012/13 (Quarter 3)	% variance <sup>1</sup>	  	Trend since last period (Q2 2012/13)	Trend since last year (2011/12)	Service Lead	Comments
Cor 5	CSC service levels - 80% calls answered in 20 secs	80% calls answered in 20 seconds  <b>(80% for year)</b>	83%	3.75%		↑	↑	Environmental Services	

**Key to performance against target**

-  on target or above target
-  not on target but there is no cause for concern at this stage.
-  not on target/ more than 10% variance and is a cause for concern.

<sup>1</sup> Variance: difference between actual performance and profile for quarter as a percentage of the profile.

# Watford Borough Council

## Executive Decision Progress Report

### May 2012 – May 2013

Contact Officer: Sandra Hancock  
Committee and Scrutiny Officer

Telephone: 01923 278377

Email: [legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk](mailto:legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk)

All officer decisions relating to Traffic Regulation Orders and other Borough Council Highways matters are available on the Council's website – <http://watford.moderngov.co.uk/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx?bcr=1>

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Agree to the set up of a Hertfordshire Police and Crime Panel	Legal and Property	Cabinet	June 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 18 June 2012 Not called in
Adoption of the Framework and 5-year action plan for allotments across the Borough	Community Services	Cabinet	June 2012	Key decision Originally this decision was due to be considered by Cabinet at its meeting in November 2011. Since then it has been deferred on several occasions. Agreed by Cabinet on 18 June 2012 Not called in
Watford Health Campus Programme Update and proposed site assembly development	Corporate Management	Cabinet	June 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 18 June 2012 Not called in



<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Review the outcome of the Sports Facilities Study and agree consultation and feasibility proposals to support the development of a Sports Facilities Strategy (Parts A and B)	Community Services	Cabinet	June 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 18 June 2012 Not called in
Charter Place re-development (Part B)	Legal and Property	Cabinet	June 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 18 June 2012 Not called in
Service specification, performance standards and evaluation criteria for the procurement of Parks and Open Spaces, Waste and Recycling and Street Cleansing	Corporate Management	Cabinet	July 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 9 July 2012 Not called in
Community Right to Challenge under the Localism Act 2011	Legal and Property	Cabinet	Not applicable	Non-key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 9 July 2012 Not called in

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Relocation of the Town Centre CCTV Control Room	Legal and Property	Cabinet	July 2012	Key decision Considered at Cabinet on 9 July 2012. Recommendation to Council, decision taken on 18 July 2012.
Property review decision (Part B)	Legal and Property	Portfolio Holder (Planning and Legal and Property)	July 2012	Key decision Originally this decision was due to be taken in June 2012 but was deferred. Delegated decision taken on 9 July 2012 Not called in
Application to the Secretary of State to remove the allotment status from the Willow Lane site.	Legal and Property	Portfolio Holder (Planning and Legal and Property)	July 2012	Key decision Delegated decision taken on 9 July 2012 Not called in
Introduction of further cycling stands in Watford	Planning	Portfolio Holder (Planning and Legal and Property)	July 2012	Key decision Delegated decision taken on 16 July 2012 Not called in

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Water Fountain Area, opposite the Town Hall steps	Planning	Portfolio Holder (Planning and Legal and Property)	July 2012	Non key decision Delegated decision taken on 16 July 2012 Not called in
Willow Lane Allotments (Section 106)	Legal and Property	Portfolio Holder (Mayor)	July 2012	Key decision Delegated decision taken on 16 July 2012 Not called in
Agree the draft local Council Tax benefit scheme for consultation	Revenues and Benefits	Portfolio Holder (Mayor)	July 2012	Key decision Delegated decision taken on 23 July 2012 Not subject to call-in. The final scheme will be presented to Council for approval.
Property Review (not for publication – Paragraph 3 Schedule 12A)	Legal and Property	Portfolio Holder (Planning and Legal and Property)	September 2012 – then withdrawn	Key decision Originally due to be taken by the end of August 2012 then moved to September 2012. It has now been decided that this decision is not to be taken.
Decision to out source the ICT Shared Service and the supplier recommended as the Preferred Bidder	Information Technology	Cabinet	September 2012 – then withdrawn	Key decision This decision was delegated to the Three Rivers and Watford Shared Services Joint Committee. Cabinet will therefore not be required to make a decision on this item.

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Delivery of the Green Deal to Watford residents and businesses	Environmental Services	Cabinet	September 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2012 Not called in
Agree the design for the improvement for the Parade and evaluation criteria for selecting a contractor	Corporate Management	Cabinet	September 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2012 Not called in
Choice Based lettings scrutiny review	Legal and Property Services	Cabinet	Not applicable	Non-key decision Endorsed by Cabinet on 17 September 2012 Not called in
Summary of Financial Outturn 2011/12	Finance	Cabinet	Not applicable	Non-key decision Agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2012 Not called in

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Local Authority Mortgage Scheme	Legal and Property Services and Finance	Cabinet	See status column	<p>Key decision</p> <p>As the item had not been included in the Forward Plan, the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee was consulted, who gave permission for this item to be included on the agenda for the September Cabinet meeting.</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2012</p> <p>Recommendation to Council agreed on 17 October 2012</p>
To authorise a closure of part of the pedestrianised section of Hempstead Road adjacent to the Town Hall under s21 of Town Police Clauses Act 1847 to accommodate the Remembrance Day Event	Planning	Head of Planning		<p>Non-key officer decision</p> <p>Approved by Head of Planning on 25 September 2012</p>
The Borough of Watford (Nascot Area) (Prohibition of Waiting) Order 2012	Planning	Head of Planning		<p>Non-key officer decision</p> <p>Approved by Head of Planning on 26 September 2012</p>
Determinations made under the Building Regulations, in accordance with s.16 of the Building Act 1984	Planning	Head of Planning		<p>Non-key officer decisions</p> <p>Approved by the Head of Planning between 1 October and 2 November 2012</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Approve the Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework 2013-16	Community Services	Cabinet	October 2012	Key Decision Agreed by Cabinet on 8 October 2012 Not called in
To approve the medium Term Financial Strategy 2012/2017	Finance	Cabinet	October 2012	Key decision This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required. The reason for this was that notification was received just before the introduction of the new Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012. The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the matter could be dealt with in accordance with Procedure Rule 15 of the Constitution, "General Exception". Agreed by Cabinet on 8 October 2012 Not called in

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Approval of final Charter Place land transaction with delegated powers to the Managing Director to enter into the necessary legal documentation	Corporate Management	Cabinet	October 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the matter could be dealt with in accordance with Procedure Rule 16 of the Constitution, "Special Urgency".</p> <p>The reason for the urgency was that the transfer was due to take place on 10 October.</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet on 8 October 2012</p>
<p>The Borough of Watford (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2007 (Amendment) (no4) Order 2012</p> <p>The Borough of Watford (Watford Central Area and West Watford) (Controlled Parking Zones) Consolidation) Order 2012 (Amendment) (No.3) Order 2012</p>	Planning	Head of Planning		<p>Non-key officer decision</p> <p>Approved by the Head of Planning on 9 October 2012</p>

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
To authorise a closure of the High Street between Market Street and Water Lane s21 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 to accommodate the switching on the Christmas lights event on 8 November 2012	Planning	Head of Planning		Non-key officer decision Approved by the Head of Planning on 19 October 2012
Approve Watford Tenancy Strategy for adoption and publication	Community Services	Cabinet	November 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 5 November 2012 Not called in
To agree the write off of irrecoverable business rates	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	November 2012	Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 5 November 2012 Not called in
Finance Digest 2012/2013: Period 6 (End of September)	Finance	Cabinet	Not applicable	Non-key decision Agreed by Cabinet 5 November 2012 Not called in



Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Watford Market – going forward	Legal and Property Services	Cabinet	November 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee was notified that the matter would be dealt with at Cabinet on 5 November, in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 15 of the Constitution, “General Exception”.</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 5 November 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Update on localising Council Tax Support	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	See status column	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the matter could be dealt with in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 16 of the Constitution, "Special Urgency".</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 5 November 2012</p> <p>Not subject to call-in – the call-in procedures did not apply in order to allow consultation to take place and to maximise the time allowed for organisations and local residents to respond.</p>
Decision to adopt a local lettings plan to encourage the development of new sustainable communities and make the best use of social accommodation for new Registered Provider development at Cassio Campus	Community Services	Mayor	December 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>Agreed by the Mayor 20 November 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Weekly Collection Support Scheme Funds	Environmental Services	Mayor	By 30 November 2012	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the matter could be dealt with in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 16 of the Constitution, "Special Urgency".</p> <p>Approved by the Mayor 30 November 2012</p> <p>Not subject to call-in – the call-in procedures did not apply as notification of the award was not received until 22 November and confirmation of acceptance had to be returned by 30 November 2012.</p>
Award contract to manage and maintain the Council's hostels and managed properties from 1 April 2013 (Part B)	Community Services	Cabinet	December 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This report was discussed in the private section of the meeting due to the content of the report. It was covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 3 December 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
<p>Approval to accept the surrender of the long leasehold interest of Council land at Ascot Road, Watford (Former Post Officer site) and to simultaneously enter into new lease(s) with Morrisons (NewInco) (Part B)</p>	<p>Legal and Property Services</p>	<p>Cabinet</p>	<p>December 2012</p>	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This report was discussed in the private section of the meeting due to the content of the report. It was covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 3 December 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
<p>An update on the Watford Health Campus including a decision subject to further negotiations if needed to enter into a joint venture (LABV) agreement with Kier. Agreement to grant exclusivity to the LABV to develop on Council owned land at the Campus.</p> <p>Review of options and agreement of a preferred option and agreement of a preferred option for the Farm Terrace allotments.</p> <p>(Part A and Part B reports)</p>	Corporate Management	Cabinet	December 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>Part of this report was discussed in the private section of the meeting as the Part B report contained financially sensitive information relating to the decision to entering the LABV.</p> <p>It is covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 3 December 2012</p> <p>Called in</p> <p>Considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee 20 December 2012 – agreed Cabinet decision</p>
<p>To note the options for the Council's new structure and approve the Corporate priorities as a basis for service business plans</p>	Corporate Management	Cabinet	December 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 19 December 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
To decide on proceedings to the best and final offer stage in the procurement of parks and open spaces, street cleansing and waste and recycling. (Part A and Part B reports)	Corporate Management	Cabinet	December 2012	<p>Key decision</p> <p>This report was discussed in the private section of the meeting due to the content of the report. It was covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 19 December 2012</p> <p>Not called in</p>
To delegate authority to the Portfolio Holder for Community Services – West Herts Golf Club	Community Services	Mayor	N/A	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Agreed by the Mayor 19 December 2012</p>
Amendment to the Executive Scheme of Delegation – Assets of Community Value	Legal and Property Services	Mayor	N/A	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Agreed by the Mayor 19 December 2012</p>
Boundary Way Memorandum of Understanding with Department of Energy and Climate Change	Environmental Services	Head of Environmental Services	N/A	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Non-key officer decision</p> <p>Agreed by the Head of Environmental Services 19 January 2013</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
To approve disposal of former allotment land at Callowland Allotments for expansion of Orchard Lane school (currently fallowland)	Community Services	Cabinet	January 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013 Not called in
Heritage Lottery Fund Round One Award, appointment of consultancy team, update on progress and Inland Waterways Association Festival update	Community Services	Cabinet	January 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013 Not called in
Draft Revenue and Capital Estimates 2013/16 To agree the Council Tax Base To agree the Collection Fund Surplus/deficit Approve Growth Approve Savings Approve Fees and Charges Approve detailed Revenue estimates Approve Capital Programme	Corporate Management	Cabinet	January 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013 Referred to Council Approved by Council 30 January 2013

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
To agree Watford's local Council Tax Reduction Scheme from 1 April 2013 and to recommend scheme to Council	Revenue and Benefits	Cabinet	January 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013</p> <p>Referred to Council</p> <p>Approved by Council 30 January 2013</p>
Council Tax discounts	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	January 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013</p> <p>Referred to Council with the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme</p> <p>Approved by Council 30 January 2013</p>
To ratify decision taken by the Executive Director and the Head of Environmental Services to award contract to UPM for recycled paper Part B report	Environmental Services	Cabinet	January 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013</p> <p>This report was discussed in the private part of the meeting as the report contained commercially sensitive information</p> <p>It was covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).</p> <p>Not called in</p>



Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Watford's Monitoring Report 2012	Planning	Cabinet	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key decision Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013 Not called in
Land at Tolpits Lane To note the information provided by the Head of Legal and Property Services in respect of the Agreement for lease and proposed lease as agreed between the Council and the Trustees of the Watford Muslim Youth Centre in respect of Tolpits Lane	Legal and Property Services	Cabinet	January 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 21 January 2013 Not called in
Award of Contracts after procurement exercise for Cassiobury Park Heritage Lottery Fund funded project	Community Services	Head of Community Services	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key officer decision Agreed by Head of Community Services 23 January 2013

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Use of DCLG Homelessness grant to support Voluntary Sector projects	Community Services	Portfolio Holder for Community Services	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key decision Agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Community Services 7 February 2013 Not called in
Increase budget to include extending tender process for competitive dialogue as set out in agreement with V4 Services	Corporate Management	Executive Director	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key officer decision Delegated decision agreed by Executive Director on 8 February 2013
New technology for Parking Shop –online parking modules	Planning	Head of Planning	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key officer decision Agreed by Head of Planning 11 February 2013
Watford Business Park car park – upgrading to pay and display parking	Planning	Head of Planning	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key officer decision Agreed by Head of Planning 11 February 2013

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Radlett Road (Timberlake Car Park) upgrading to Pay and Display parking	Planning	Head of Planning	N/A	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Non-key officer decision</p> <p>Agreed by Head of Planning 11 February 2013</p>
Approval of the Shopfront design guide	Planning	Cabinet	February 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 18 February 2013</p> <p>Not called in</p>
To agree the company to deliver the Parade improvement works Part A and Part B	Corporate Management	Cabinet	February 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>This report is covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information). It will contain commercially sensitive information.</p> <p>Agreed by Cabinet 18 February 2013</p> <p>Not called in</p>

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Independent audit of Watford Community Housing Trust's delivery of the stock transfer promises to tenants	Corporate Management	Cabinet	February 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Cabinet 18 February 2013 Not called in
Designation of Oxhey Conservation Area	Planning	Cabinet	February 2013	<b>New</b> Non-key decision Agreed by Cabinet 18 February 2013 Not called in
Amendment to Housing Nomination Policy on bedroom entitlement	Community Services	Mayor	N/A	<b>New</b> Non-key decision Agreed by the Mayor 19 February 2013 Not called in
Agree Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for public consultation	Planning	Mayor	March 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision Agreed by Mayor 11 March 2013 Call-in deadline Tuesday 19 March 2013

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Option to Tax for land at Ascot Road	Legal and Property Services	Portfolio Holder of Legal and Property Services	March 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>This decision is covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information). It contained commercially sensitive information.</p> <p>The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the matter could be dealt with in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 16 of the Constitution, "Special Urgency".</p> <p>Agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Legal and Property Services 11 March 2013</p> <p>Not subject to call-in - Legal exchange and completion of the various re-gearred ground leases and associated legal agreements was due to take place within the next 5-working days and consequently swift notification had to given to HM Revenue &amp; Customs. A decision on this matter was required immediately to enable proceedings to begin as soon as possible.</p>

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Approval and adoption of the Watford Allotment Strategy 2013-2018	Community Services	Cabinet	April 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision
To approve and adopt Watford Green Spaces Strategy 2013-2018	Community Services	Cabinet	April 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision
Final decision on Service re-design options for Parks and Open Spaces, Street Cleansing and Waste and Re-cycling (Part A and Part B reports)	Corporate Management	Cabinet	April 2013	<b>New</b> Key decision  The Part B report will be covered by Paragraph 3, Schedule 12A, which refers to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority holding that information).
Approval of a policy to administer Discretionary Housing Payments	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	April 2013	<b>New</b>  This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.  In accordance with the Access to Information Procedure Rule 15 the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee was notified.

Decision	Department	Decision maker	Date Key Decision to be taken (as shown on the Notice of Executive Decisions)	Status
Approval of a fair collection policy to clarify the processes to be employed in recovering local authority debts and the approach to adopt if rent arrears to Watford Community Housing Trust are also owed.	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	April 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>This decision did not meet the 28 day notice required.</p> <p>In accordance with the Access to Information Procedure Rule 15 the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee was notified.</p>
To write off irrecoverable debts	Revenues and Benefits	Cabinet	April 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>This item has been deferred from April.</p>
Approval of the Private Sector Housing Renewal Policy	Community Services	Cabinet	June 2013	<p><b>Amended</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>Previously due to be taken by February 2013</p>
Approval of the revised Housing Nominations Policy	Community Services	Cabinet	June 2013	<p><b>New</b></p> <p>Key decision</p>
Approval of the revised Homelessness Strategy	Community Services	Cabinet	September 2013	<p><b>New and amended</b></p> <p>Key decision</p> <p>Previously proposed to be taken in June 2013</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



## Part A

**Report to:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2013  
**Report of:** Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer  
**Title:** Management of Disabled Parking Bays Task Group

### 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the Management of Disabled Parking Bays Task Group.
- 1.2 The Task Group is investigating problems that residents with Disabled Parking Bays marked outside their homes have encountered. Problems are mainly caused by other vehicles with a general parking permit occupying the bays.
- 1.3 The Task Group hopes to:
- Review the current system for Disabled Parking Bays
  - Introduce a system for enforcing appropriate use of Disabled Parking Bays
  - Review the use / abuse of the Blue Badge System and introduce appropriate measures to combat identified problems

### 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes the this update.

**Contact Officer:**

For further information on this report please contact: Rosy Wassell  
telephone extension: 8375 email: [legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk](mailto:legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk)

**Report approved by:** Pat Thornton, Democratic Services Manager

### 3.0 UPDATE ON THE TASK GROUP

3.1 The Task Group has met on two occasions.

3.2 The group have looked at information on:

- Advisory bays both in and outside CPZs in the borough and whether the bays can be enforced
- Details of the number of bays within the borough
- The application process for a Disabled Parking Bay
- Information on disabled bays in other local authorities

3.3 Members and Officers have devised a survey to be sent to residents with a disabled parking bay. The survey to be sent out on 20 February with a closing date of 15 March. A copy of the survey has been included at Appendix 1

Replies will be analysed and reported to the group.

3.4 The next meeting will be on Monday 25 March.

### Appendices

Appendix 1 Disabled Bay Survey – March 2013

### Background Papers

No papers were used in the preparation of this report.

### File Reference

None

**Are You Always Able to Use Your Disabled Bay ?**

The Council is undertaking a scrutiny review of Disabled Parking Bays that have been installed within the Borough.

In order to ascertain if the way we manage Disabled Bays needs to be reviewed, it would be helpful if you could provide us with a response to the two questions below relating to your Disabled Bay.

**Question 1.** How often have you been unable to use the bay because someone else has parked in the marked bay?

- a) never;
- b) occasionally (less than once a week);
- c) frequently (more than twice a week).

**Question 2.** Have you ever complained about the problem of cars parking in your allocated Disabled Bay?. If yes who have you complained to:

- a) The Parking Shop
- b) Watford Council
- c) Your local Councillors

What was the outcome of the complaint?

Please use the reverse of this questionnaire for any comments.

Your input and any other comments you may have would be helpful. I have therefore included a pre paid envelope for your convenience. Please respond by Friday 15 March 2013.

Many thanks

Barbara Staples  
Senior Administration Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

## PART A

**Report to:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
**Date of meeting:** 26 March 2013  
**Report of:** Committee and Scrutiny Officer  
**Title:** Work Programme and New Scrutiny Suggestions

### 1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides the latest version of the rolling work programme and two scrutiny suggestions for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee.

### 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 that the rolling work programme, attached at Appendix 1, be noted.

2.2 that Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers the scrutiny proposal, submitted by Councillor Khan, to review the Watford Community Housing Trust as set out on the proposal attached as Appendix 2.

2.3 that Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers the scrutiny proposal, submitted by Councillors Rackett and Khan, to scrutinise the Council's property assets attached as Appendix 3.

#### **Contact Officer:**

For further information on this report please contact: Sandra Hancock,  
Committee and Scrutiny Officer  
telephone extension: 8377 email: [legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk](mailto:legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk)

**Report approved by:** Carol Chen, Head of Legal and Property Services

### 3.0 DETAILED PROPOSAL

#### 3.1 Work Programme

The latest version of the 2012/13 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme is attached at Appendix 1 for Members' consideration. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to review the rolling work programme and consider whether any amendments are required.

#### 3.2 Scrutiny Suggestions

Since Overview and Scrutiny Committee's meeting on 21 November 2012 two scrutiny proposals have been submitted. Each suggestion is shown

below and Members are asked to consider the proposals and decide whether to approve them for time limited Task Groups.

3.3 Watford Community Housing Trust

Councillor Khan has suggested that a scrutiny review is carried out to look at the quality of service provided by Watford Community Housing Trust to local residents. The full proposal is attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

3.4 Following receipt of the suggestion the Committee and Scrutiny Officer emailed all non-Executive to enquire if they were interested in taking part should a Task Group be agreed. To date the following Councillors have expressed an interest in taking part in the review. They are listed in order of response –

- Asif Khan
- Jackie Connal
- Stephen Johnson
- Anne Joynes
- Karen Collett

3.5 The Committee and Scrutiny Officer also contacted the Executive Director and Head of Community Services informing them of the suggestion. It was noted that the proposal did not relate to a Council function.

3.6 The Committee and Scrutiny Officer has also forwarded the scrutiny suggestion to the Chief Executive at Watford Community Housing Trust.

3.7 The Scrutiny Committee is asked to review Councillor Khan's scrutiny suggestion and consider whether to establish a Task Group. If agreed, the Scrutiny Committee will need to agree the Task Group membership.

3.8 Property Services

The second scrutiny suggestion was submitted by Councillors Steve Rackett and Asif Khan. This proposal suggests a Member-led scrutiny of the Council's property assets. The full proposal is attached as Appendix 3 to this report.

3.9 The Committee and Scrutiny Officer contacted all non-Executive Councillors inviting expressions of interest in the prospective review. The following Councillors have indicated that they would like to participate in the review should it be agreed –

- Steve Rackett
- Asif Khan
- Stephen Johnson

3.10 The Committee and Scrutiny Officer forwarded the suggestion to the Head of Legal and Property Services and Property Section Head for her

comments. The response is appended to the scrutiny suggestion at Appendix 3.

- 3.11 The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the proposal to review the Council's property assets and decide whether to establish a Task Group. If agreed, Members are asked to approve the membership for the Task Group. The Task Group should comprise a minimum of three Councillors and preferably no more than five.
- 3.12 If the Scrutiny Committee agrees to set up two Task Groups, it will be necessary to prioritise the order in which the Task Groups are carried out. This is to ensure there is sufficient support available in Democratic Services to carry out its work. It is suggested that the Scrutiny Committee sets a timescale for each of the reviews.

#### 4.0 **IMPLICATIONS**

##### 4.1 **Financial**

4.1.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report.

##### 4.2 **Legal Issues** (Monitoring Officer)

4.2.1 The Head of Legal and Property Services comments that there are no legal implications in this report.

#### Appendix

Appendix 1 – Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rolling Work Programme

Appendix 2 – Scrutiny Proposal from Councillor Khan – Watford Community Housing Trust

Appendix 3 – Scrutiny Proposal from Councillors Rackett and Khan – Review of the Council's property assets and response from the Head of Legal and Property Services

#### Background Papers

Minutes of previous meetings

#### File Reference

None

This page is intentionally left blank



**Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
Rolling Work Programme**

**2012/2013**

**Committee Membership:**

**Chair**                    **Councillor Karen Collett**  
**Vice-Chair**           **Councillor Asif Khan**  
**Councillors**        **Jeanette Aron, Nigel Bell, Sue Greenslade, Kareen Hastrick, Mark Hofman, Rabi Martins, Steve Rackett**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Office/Councillor</b>
<b>20 June 2012</b>	Outstanding actions and questions	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Affordable Housing Review – recommendations 3 (Band E applicants) and 4 (partnership working)	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Quarter 4 2011/12 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Performance Indicators – Review of all performance indicators for Watford Borough Council	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Community Safety Partnership Task Group – to agree the Task Group’s membership	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel – to agree the Panel’s membership	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	The Way Ahead for Council Services – Task Group – 1) Approve the minutes of the Task Group meeting held on 9 February 2012 2) Review Cabinet’s comments and consider when the recommendations need to be reviewed	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Draft Voluntary Sector Commissioning Framework Task Group – update on the Task Group during May	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>5 July 2012</b>	For Call-in only	Not required

February 2013

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Office/Councillor</b>
<b>25 July 2012</b>	Outstanding actions and questions	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Progress of Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework Task Group	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Affordable Housing Review – status of core strategy	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Update on Task Groups	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Previous Review Update: Neighbourhood Forums	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Call-in	NONE
	Previous Review Update: Choice Based Lettings	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>19 September 2012</b>	Outstanding actions and questions – including Affordable Housing Review – status of core strategy	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Benefits Service – update on the service	Portfolio Holder for Shared Services
	Quarter 1 2012/13 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Waste and Recycling Task Group – Final report	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework Task Group – Final report	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Hospital Parking Charges Task Group – review outcome of report – Deferred to next meeting	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>3 October 2012</b>	For Call-in only	Not required
<b>25 October 2012</b>	For Call-in only	Not required

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Office/Councillor</b>
<b>21 November 2012</b>	Call-in	NONE
	Outstanding actions and questions	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Quarter 2 2012/13 Performance Report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Previous Review Update: Affordable Housing Review – recommendation 2 (piecemeal development policy)	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Previous Review Update: Hospital Parking Charges Task Group	Committee and Scrutiny Officer and Associate Director of Infrastructure, Hospital Trust
	Previous Review Update: Choice Based Lettings	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework Task Group – Cabinet response	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Scrutiny Review	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	New scrutiny proposal	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>20 December 2012</b>	For Call-in only	Update on Watford Health Campus
<b>15 January 2013</b>	For Call-in only	Not required
<b>23 January 2013</b>	Cancelled	
<b>7 February 2013</b>	For Call-in only	Not required

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Office/Councillor</b>
<b>March 2013</b>	Outstanding actions and questions	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Quarter 3 2012/13 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Affordable Housing Review – Recommendation 1 – Affordable Housing threshold and the status of the Core Strategy	Committee and Scrutiny Officer / Head of Planning
	Affordable Housing Review – recommendations 3 and 4 (Band E and partnerships)	Committee and Scrutiny Officer / Housing Section Head
	Annual report contribution	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>22 April 2013</b>	For Call-in only	

2013/14

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>To be decided</b>	Affordable Housing Review – recommendation 6 (benefit changes impact) – possible Task Group	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>27 June 2013</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 4 2012/13 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Update on plans for the Hospital car park	Committee and Scrutiny Officer / Associate Director of Infrastructure
	Update on Housing Benefits progress	Head of Revenues and Benefits
	Previous review update: Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Framework	Committee and Scrutiny Officer / Head of Community Services
	Update on the organisations who were subject to a cut in their grant	Head of Community Services
	Community Safety Partnership Task Group – membership for 2013/14	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel – membership for 2013/14	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Work Programme	
<b>4 July 2013</b>	Call-in	
<b>25 July 2013</b>	Call-in	
<b>26 September 2013</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 1 2013/14 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Previous Review Update: Services for the Deceased	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>24 October 2013</b>	Call-in	

February 2013

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>28 November 2013</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 2 2013/14 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Review the first and second quarters' performance of the new Nomination Policy	Committee and Scrutiny Officer / Housing Section Head
<b>19 December 2013</b>	Call-in	
<b>22 January 2014</b>		
<b>6 February 2014</b>	Call-in	
<b>6 March 2014</b>	Call-in	
	Affordable Housing Review – recommendation 1 (affordable housing units)	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
	Quarter 3 2013/14 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
<b>27 March 2014</b>	Call-in	

2014/15

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item for agenda</b>	<b>Officer</b>
<b>June 2014</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 4 2013/14 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Work Programme	
<b>July 2014</b>	Call-in	
<b>September 2014</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 1 2014/15 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
<b>October 2014</b>	Call-in	
<b>November 2014</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 2 2013/14 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head
	Affordable Housing Review – Recommendation 2 Piecemeal developments and Section 106 obligations further update	Committee and Scrutiny Officer
<b>December 2014</b>	Call-in	
<b>January 2015</b>		
<b>February 2015</b>	Call-in	
<b>March 2015</b>	Call-in	
	Quarter 3 2014/15 Performance report	Partnerships and Performance Section Head

February 2013

**The above programmes dos not include the standing items –**

- Minutes from Budget Panel / Outsourced Services Scrutiny Panel / Task Groups
- Outstanding actions and questions
- Notice of Executive Decisions
- Work Programme
- Dates of Next Meetings



## Suggestions for topics to be scrutinised – evaluation table

A Member, Officer or member of the public suggesting a topic for scrutiny must complete Section1 as fully as possible. Completed tables will be presented to Overview & Scrutiny for consideration.

<b>Section 1 – Scrutiny Suggestion</b>	
<b>Proposer: Councillor Asif Khan</b>	
<p><b>Topic recommended for scrutiny:</b></p> <p><i>Please include as much detail as is available about the specific such as;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>included</u> in the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>excluded</u> from the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether the focus should be on past performance, future policy or both.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Give details</i></p> <p>The area of scrutiny is the quality of service provided by Watford Community Housing Trust to local residents. Including areas of repairs.</p> <p>Other areas that need to be looked at include the introduction of the service charges by the WCHT and its financial impact on residents and how the charges will affect the quality of service level.</p> <p>What policies are in place to improve this and the levels of control the WCHT has in place to resolve complaints.</p> <p>How does the WCHT communicate to all stakeholders, including residents, tenants, councillors and council officials.</p>
<p><b>Why have you recommended this topic for scrutiny?</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Give details</i></p> <p>Much of my casework involves dealing with residents' complaints about the poor level of repairs. It also includes service that is received from the WCHT. There have been a number of examples where the most vulnerable have had poor service which resulted in an anxious time for them.(for example, a pensioner on means tested benefit without heating for 4 days during the snow. A family with young children without heating or hot water for 5 days)</p>

**What are the specific outcomes you wish to see from the review?**

*Examples might include:*

- *To identify what is being done and what the potential barriers are;*
- *To review relevant performance indicators;*
- *To compare our policies with those of a similar authority;*
- *To assess the environmental/social impacts;*
- *To Benchmark current service provision;*
- *To find out community perceptions and experience;*
- *To identify the gap between provision and need*

*Give details*

To see an improvement for the quality of service provided by the WCHT on repairs.

To review the policies in place regarding vulnerable residents.

To review the ways in which The WCHT communicates with all stakeholders.

<p><b>How do you think evidence might be obtained?</b></p> <p><i>Examples might include</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires/Surveys</li> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• Interviewing witnesses</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Performance data</li> <li>• Public hearings</li> <li>• Comparisons with other local authorities</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Give details</i></p> <p>Feedback from local residents.</p> <p>Interviews of tenants (some maybe willing to come to the meetings and pass on their comments)</p> <p>Check performance data.</p> <p>Feedback from survey</p>
<p><b>Does the proposed item meet the following criteria?</b></p>	
<p>It must affect a group or community of people</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Give details</i></p> <p>It impacts WCHT tenants and residents who live in areas where the WCHT now manages.</p>
<p>It must relate to a service, event or issue in which the council has a significant stake</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Give details</i></p> <p>It relates to the management of the housing stock and the areas which the WCHT now looks after which was once done by the council.</p>

<p>It must not have been a topic of scrutiny within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>There will be exceptions to this arising from notified changing circumstances. Scrutiny will also maintain an interest in the progress of recommendations and issues arising from past reports.</i></p>	<p>NA</p> <p><i>Please confirm</i></p>
<p>It must not be an issue, such as planning or licensing, which is dealt with by another council committee</p>	<p>NA</p> <p><i>Please confirm</i></p>
<p><b>Does the topic meet the council's priorities?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Making Watford a better place to live in ✓</li> <li>2. To provide the lead for Watford's sustainable economic growth</li> <li>3. Promoting an active, cohesive and well informed Town ✓</li> <li>4. To operate the Council efficiently and effectively</li> </ol> <p><i>Please confirm which ones</i></p>

<p><b>Are you aware of any limitations of time, other constraints or risks which need to be taken into account?</b></p> <p><i>Factors to consider are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>forthcoming milestones, demands on the relevant service area and member availability:</i></li> <li>• <i>imminent policy changes either locally, regionally or nationally within the area under review.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Include details</i></p> <p>There is an introduction of the WCHT service charges.  Service charges will be introduced in April 2013  Ground maintenance charges will be introduced in April 2014</p>
<p><b>Does the topic involve a Council partner or other outside body?</b></p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>Include details</i></p> <p>It involves the Watford Community Housing Trust.</p>

<p>Are there likely to be any Equality implications which will need to be considered?</p> <p><i>Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Age</i></li> <li>• <i>Disability</i></li> <li>• <i>Gender reassignment</i></li> <li>• <i>Pregnancy or maternity</i></li> <li>• <i>Race</i></li> <li>• <i>Religion or belief</i></li> <li>• <i>Sex</i></li> <li>• <i>Sexual orientation</i></li> <li>• <i>Marriage or civil partnership (only in respect of the requirement to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination)</i></li> </ul>	<p>An impact of quality of services and repairs needs to involve whether certain groups with protected characteristics are being affected over the other.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Sign off</b>  <i>(It is expected that any Councillor proposing a topic agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee will participate in the Task Group)</i></p>	
<p><b>Councillor/Officer</b>  <b>Asif Khan</b></p>	<p><b>Date</b>  <b>23/01/13</b></p>

**Suggestions for topics to be scrutinised – evaluation table**

A Member, Officer or member of the public suggesting a topic for scrutiny must complete Section1 as fully as possible. Completed tables will be presented to Overview & Scrutiny for consideration.

<b>Section 1 – Scrutiny Suggestion</b>	
<b>Proposer: Councillor/Officer/Member of public Councillors Steve Rackett and Asif Khan</b>	
<p><b>Topic recommended for scrutiny:</b></p> <p><i>Please include as much detail as is available about the specific such as;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>included</u> in the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>areas which should be <u>excluded</u> from the review.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether the focus should be on past performance, future policy or both.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Property Scrutiny</i></p> <p><i>Member led scrutiny of the council's property assets:</i></p> <p><i>Including all property owned by Watford Council</i></p>
<p><b>Why have you recommended this topic for scrutiny?</b></p>	<p><i>Members have concerns regarding the council's property portfolio:</i></p> <p><i>whether the council is getting the appropriate rental value</i></p> <p><i>whether the arrangements for lettings to the voluntary sector are fair and reasonable</i></p> <p><i>To review previous performance of property management</i></p>

**What are the specific outcomes you wish to see from the review?**

*Examples might include:*

- *To identify what is being done and what the potential barriers are;*
- *To review relevant performance indicators;*
- *To compare our policies with those of a similar authority;*
- *To assess the environmental/social impacts;*
- *To Benchmark current service provision;*
- *To find out community perceptions and experience;*
- *To identify the gap between provision and need*

*Identify whether there are any assets the council can dispose of*

*To look at how the council's involvement in the retail part of its property portfolio is being managed in the current economic climate*

*To see whether any performance indicators are required in terms of occupancy or income*

*To look at how similar authorities manage their portfolios*

*To look at how voluntary sector lets are managed and whether changes need to be made*

*Examine the optimum level of rents which will produce the greatest revenue from businesses*

*Look at the lengths of rental agreements.*



<p><b>How do you think evidence might be obtained?</b></p> <p><i>Examples might include</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires/Surveys</li> <li>• Site visits</li> <li>• Interviewing witnesses</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Performance data</li> <li>• Public hearings</li> <li>• Comparisons with other local authorities</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Hearings/Witnesses</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Looking at other council's asset management and property policies</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Examine income streams and any projected forecasts of rental income.</i></p>
<p><b>Does the proposed item meet the following criteria?</b></p>	
<p>It must affect a group or community of people</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Council owns a number of properties which are let to community groups</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The councils' income from rental and disposal of property impact on revenue and capital funding of the authority</i></p>
<p>It must relate to a service, event or issue in which the council has a significant stake</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>The council owns a significant property portfolio across the borough and its lettings, rental and disposals have impacts on both the commercial and property sector</i></p>

<p>It must not have been a topic of scrutiny within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>There will be exceptions to this arising from notified changing circumstances. Scrutiny will also maintain an interest in the progress of recommendations and issues arising from past reports.</i></p>	<p>Budget Panel received a presentation update on the Property Review as part of the Panel's training programme at its meeting on 29 November 2011.</p> <p>A further update to be presented to Budget Panel at its meeting on 11 March 2013.</p>
<p>It must not be an issue, such as planning or licensing, which is dealt with by another council committee</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p><b>Does the topic meet the council's priorities?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Making Watford a better place to live in</b></li> <li><b>2. To provide the lead for Watford's sustainable economic growth</b></li> <li>3. Promoting an active, cohesive and well informed Town</li> <li><b>4. To operate the Council efficiently and effectively</b></li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Please confirm which ones</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>It certainly meets 2 and 4, and also 1</i></p>

<p><b>Are you aware of any limitations of time, other constraints or risks which need to be taken into account?</b></p> <p><i>Factors to consider are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>forthcoming milestones, demands on the relevant service area and member availability:</i></li> <li>• <i>imminent policy changes either locally, regionally or nationally within the area under review.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The work will help increase the income for the council. To examine the reasons behind the current level of income.</p> <p>Changes of policy will include the new business rates.</p>
<p><b>Does the topic involve a Council partner or other outside body?</b></p>	<p><i>Voluntary sector partners, Capital Shopping, Chamber of Commerce</i></p>

<p>Are there likely to be any Equality implications which will need to be considered?</p> <p><i>Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Age</i></li> <li>• <i>Disability</i></li> <li>• <i>Gender reassignment</i></li> <li>• <i>Pregnancy or maternity</i></li> <li>• <i>Race</i></li> <li>• <i>Religion or belief</i></li> <li>• <i>Sex</i></li> <li>• <i>Sexual orientation</i></li> <li>• <i>Marriage or civil partnership (only in respect of the requirement to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination)</i></li> </ul>	<p>This will have an impact on voluntary groups which provide a service to people with the protected characteristics.</p> <p>Need to ensure that any changes do not have a negative impact on any of the groups which are covered by the Equality act 2010.</p>
--	---

<b>Sign off</b>	
<p><b>Councillor/Officer</b></p> <p><b>Cllr Steve Rackett and Cllr Asif Khan</b></p>	<p><b>Date</b></p> <p><b>29/01/13</b></p>

**The following sections to be completed by Democratic Services in consultation with the relevant Head of Service and Overview and Scrutiny Committee as necessary**

<b>Section 2</b>	
<b>Consultation with relevant Heads of Service</b>	
<i>It is important to ensure that the relevant service can support a review by providing the necessary documents and attending meetings as necessary. The Head of Service's comments should be obtained before the request to hold a review is put to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</i>	
Has the relevant Head of Service been consulted?	<i>Yes/no (if no, please give reason)</i> No discussion with either of the councillors requesting the scrutiny
Is there any current or proposed review of service which would affect this suggestion?	<i>Yes/no (if yes, please provide details)</i> Yes. The property service is subject to service redesign as part of the Council's Road Map, we are seeking to market test the continued in house provision of this service over the next few months. The Managing Director has also asked the service to undertake a property review which has commenced. In addition the service is currently in the process of finalising a number of large property transactions, Charter Place transfer to CSC, Ascot Road lease regear to Morrisons, Health Campus and CRL property related work. The service therefore currently does not have the capacity to support this review.

Is this a topic which the service department(s) is able to support	<p><i>Include HoS comments here</i></p> <p>As stated above the service is currently in the process of finalising a number of large property transactions, Charter Place transfer to CSC, Ascot Road lease regear to Morrisons, Health Campus and CRL property related work. The service therefore currently does not have the capacity to support this review.</p>
When was the last time this service was the subject of a scrutiny review?	<p><i>Include date if known</i></p> <p>Have presented update on property review to Budget Panel last year and due to update Budget Panel at its next meeting.</p>
Is the issue something which will be of significant interest to the public and if so, how should this be managed?	<p>No. May well interest community groups and other third sector organisations who lease from us.</p>
Head of Service consulted and when	<p>Not by proposers of the review.</p>
<b>Completed by</b>	<p>Carol Chen, Head of Legal and Property Services</p>
<b>Date</b>	<p>22 February 2013</p>

## Annual Scrutiny Report 2011/12

Copied below is Overview and Scrutiny Committee's contribution to the Annual Scrutiny Report for 2011/12.

### 2. Overview and Scrutiny Committee

#### Membership:

Councillor Mark Watkin (Chair)

Councillor Steve Rackett (Vice Chair)

Councillors Nigel Bell, Sue Greenslade, Kareen Hastrick, Peter Jeffree, Stephen Johnson, Rabi Martins and Kelly McLeod

#### 2.1 The Committee's work programme for 2011/2012

Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on seven occasions this year. This included one meeting to consider a call-in of a Cabinet decision. The Scrutiny Committee received reports on the following subjects –

- **Outstanding actions and questions** became a regular report to the Scrutiny Committee after the first meeting. The report included all the actions and questions which had been raised at previous meetings. The actions and questions remained on the report until Overview and Scrutiny Committee was satisfied with the response and it was agreed the actions had been completed.
- **Performance updates** were presented on a quarterly basis. It reviewed the performance of the Key Performance Indicators and other performance measures identified by the Scrutiny Committee for review. At the meetings Members discussed the performance indicators and sought clarification in certain areas. A particular area of concern was the performance of the Benefits Service. The Scrutiny Committee has monitored this service throughout the year and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Shared Services provided regular updates.
- **Forward Plan** was reviewed in line with the Scrutiny Committee's terms of reference. Members noted the additions and changes to the Forward Plan since the previous meeting.
- **Task Groups** – the Scrutiny Committee considered proposed topics for Task Groups and the responses from Heads of Service. Three Task Groups were established during 2011/12, two of which completed their review. Further information is available in Section 4.
- **Review of previous reports** Throughout the year the Scrutiny Committee received responses from Cabinet and checked the progress of recommendations from previous reviews. In some cases Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to carry out a further review in the future and in other cases Members agreed that the recommendations had been met. The reviews carried out in 2011/2012 were –

Voluntary Sector Task Group (Cabinet response)

Affordable Housing review (Cabinet response)

Public Pride (review update)  
Services for the Deceased (review update)  
Future of the Colosseum (review update)  
Green Spaces review (review update)

## 2.2 Call-in

There had been one Executive decision called in during 2011/12. Three non-Executive Councillors called-in Cabinet's decision regarding the "Review of three year grant funding programme to achieve savings", which had been discussed at the meeting held on 5 December 2011. Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on 22 December 2011 to review the decision. It was chaired by Councillor Steve Rackett, the Vice-Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Following the discussion the Scrutiny Committee agreed to uphold Cabinet's decision. It was also agreed that Overview and Scrutiny Committee would examine the long-term impact on the four organisations which would be subject to the largest grant cuts. It was also agreed that Members would be involved in the development of the new Commissioning Framework for the voluntary and community sector.

## 2.3 Chair's commentary

The report above describes the work the Committee has carried out this year. What it does not tell you is that this year the way that scrutiny has been performed in Watford has been completely changed. We have introduced a new structure based on an Overview Committee overseeing task groups supported by a new team of excellent officers. Our brief has been to monitor performance and initiate task group based reviews which should be able to span both performance and policy issues. We also scrutinise the work of other bodies where it is of public interest to the residents of Watford. I am pleased to report that under this new scheme scrutiny in Watford Borough Council has been generally successful.

The committee reviewed and amended all the systems and services that were in place. We now have a rolling programme of scrutiny work that stretches into the future; there is a much tighter system of review of the impact of our past reports; we are looking critically at the indicators we use to monitor the performance of the Council's services to ensure that they are relevant and comprehensive; a bit like a super tanker, we took time to get underway and initiate task groups as we got to grips with our new way of working but those that have operated have produced excellent work.

I am particularly pleased that our major piece of work for this year, looking at how the Council will be accountable democratically as it introduces new ways of delivering its services, was requested by the Managing Director. I hope that other members of the senior leadership team and officers in the council will follow his example and propose areas for review particularly where new policy is being considered.

The Committee has three major challenges for the forthcoming year:

1. Greater range of topic subjects – by actively encouraging people from all areas including the general public or associated organisations to propose topics for scrutiny.



2. Keep the recommendations clear - be sure that topic reports generate recommendations that can be tested for their success in the future.
3. Broaden the membership of the task groups - we need to attract more non-executive members who are not on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to work on task groups and participate in the scrutiny process.

I would like to end by thanking all the members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for adjusting so well to their new role; the chairs and members of all the task groups, including specifically the Community Safety Partnership for the great work they carried out; all the officers in Legal and Democratic Services for their dedicated hard work, superb advice and support and their sheer professionalism when approaching this new role for all of them; and all those who contributed to the work of the committee and task groups in providing evidence, information or advice.

Councillor Mark Watkin  
Chair Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2011/12

This page is intentionally left blank