

REPORT: Environment and Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board

DATE: 15th June 2011

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Policy & Resources

SUBJECT: Policy & Performance Board Work Programme 2011/2012

WARDS: Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider possible topics for scrutiny as part of the 2011/12 work programme.

2.0 RECOMMENDED THAT:

- (1) Members of the Policy and Performance Board indicate target topic areas for potential scrutiny in 2011- 2012.**
- (2) Details of topic briefs be agreed by the Chair and Vice Chair of the PPB in conjunction with the Lead Officer for the Board.**

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 Each year the PPB has the opportunity to identify topics or work areas that it would like to scrutinise in detail as part of its work programme for the year.
- 3.2. Good practice, based on experience, suggests that 2/3 Topics is manageable, however the choice lies with the Board depending on its priorities and commitments. The process for scrutiny is that, following their adoption by this Board, the topics selected are worked up as detailed topic briefs and agreed with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the PPB in conjunction with the Lead Officer for this Board.
- 3.3 In considering which are good topics to include in the work programme Members will need to keep in mind the Overview and Scrutiny Guide/Toolkit. Guidance on Topic Selection is attached as an aide-memoire. In particular, the Board's attention is drawn to paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 which relate to added value, capacity and resources.
- 3.4 It should be remembered that much of the work of this PPB will be cross-cutting and will impact on or be of relevance to other PPBs.
- 3.5 It should also be noted that Performance Monitoring of the Reporting Departments (Policy, Planning & Transportation; Economy, Enterprise and Property; Prevention and Commissioning Services (Housing Strategy); and Community and Environment), will in any case be received by this PPB.

4.0 2011/12 Work Programme

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

- A review of the new Household Waste Collection Policy following its adoption (subject to its approval by Executive Board on 17th March 2011). It was also identified that a review of waste collection operations meant that the Waste Management Topic Group needed to be re-established. It was resolved, therefore, that the Divisional Manager Waste and Environmental Improvement, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Environment and Urban Renewal PPB, reconstitute the membership of the Waste Management Topic Group to review these two issues.
- The following Members nominations were received for the Topic Working Group: Councillors Hignett, Gerrard, Thompson, Wainwright and Hodgkinson. It is anticipated that the Topic Group will have met for the first time before today's meeting of the Board and a verbal update will be given, if appropriate. The Chair, Vice Chair and Lead Officer for the Board will have agreed the Topic Brief prior to the first meeting of the Working Group.

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

5.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None at this stage.

6.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None at this stage.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL'S PRIORITIES

7.1 **Children and Young People in Halton**

None

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

None

7.3 **A Healthy Halton**

None

7.4 **A Safer Halton**

None

7.5 Halton's Urban Renewal

None

8.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

8.1 None.

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

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

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Topic Selection Checklist

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

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