



Minutes

Name of meeting	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
Date and time	THURSDAY, 10 JUNE 2010 COMMENCING AT 5.00 PM
Venue	COMMITTEE ROOM ONE, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT
Present	Cllrs Jonathan Bacon (Chair), George Cameron, Vanessa Churchman, Heather Humby, Colin Richards, Arthur Taylor, Ian Ward, Margaret Webster, David Whittaker
Also Present (non voting)	Cllrs Edward Giles, David Pugh, David Williams
Officers Present	Stuart Love, Heidi Marshall, Julie Martin, Paul Thistlewood
Apologies	Cllrs Reg Barry, Julie Jones-Evans

1. **Minutes**

RESOLVED :

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [15 April 2010](#) be confirmed.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations at this time.

3. **Call In of Delegated Decision 18/10 Site Safety Assessment, Pixley Hill**

A call-in had been received in respect of a delegated decision taken on 11 May 2010 relating to a site safety assessment undertaken with regard to Pixley Hill, Freshwater by the cabinet member for Environment and Transport, Councillor Giles.

The lead member for the call in, Councillor Ward outlined the reasons behind this action. He advised the committee that there had been inadequate consultation with stakeholders, partners or the public and the absence of evidence for the decision.

Those signing the call in believed that had been little or no opportunity for public debate and comment on the decision and at least two letters from local residents had not been included and that there had been procedural failures.

Members were advised that Southern Vectis had been spoken with to see if they would change back to the original route, but they refused. A safety audit was carried

out and the auditor was provided with a brief which was shared with members of the Pixley Hill Action Group.

The notice relating to the change in route was received in 2008. The Traffic Commissioners notified local authorities of changes registered with it by bus operators. A local authority only had limited grounds on which it could object and there was no obligation for it to comment on any application. In this case the council declined to comment.

The cabinet member indicated he was aware of the missing letters, one of which was dated 12 December 2009, at which time the safety audit was being considered. The other letter dated 18 May 2010 was seven days after the decision had been taken. He believed he had taken all correspondence into consideration prior to making his decision.

There was some discussion relating to crime and disorder and the committee was advised there was no mandatory requirement for a report to contain section 17 information. The cabinet member did not believe there would be any crime and disorder issues relating to buses running in Pixley Hill.

It was noted that there was a width restriction in Pixley Hill but buses were exempt from that. There were a number of roads on the Island where similar circumstances existed.

The Committee sought clarification on the Council's internal process for dealing with applications for the registration of bus routes. It was indicated that these had now been revised so that information was shared with the road safety team. Regarding the recommendation included within the independent site safety assessment about further discussions with residents and the bus operator the cabinet member believed that he was already well aware of the views of residents and Southern Vectis.

Members of the public were then invited by the chairman to ask questions related to this matter. Questions were asked by Myles Mence, Jamie Sheldon, Peter Cake, Steven Grey, Penny Green and David Green, all of Freshwater of the cabinet member to which replies were given.

In concluding the matter the members signing the call in suggested that the processes involved in the registration of bus routes could be looked at in more detail by the relevant scrutiny panel.

RESOLVED :

THAT the Economy, Environment and Transport Scrutiny Panel include in its workplan an enquiry looking at the processes and consultation involved when looking at bus routes, including the traffic safety considerations that are taken into account.

4. Performance Management

(a) Audit Commission Report on Performance Management Review

Angie Blowman from the Audit Commission attended for this item. The report arose from the Use of Resources Assessment 2009, which was identified as an area for improvement for the Council. The current status, of both the report and the action plan, had been agreed with officers. Overall there had been a wide range of improvements undertaken by the Council since last year's review and the Council was moving in the right direction.

The Council's Corporate Plan had got clearer priorities and targets were being set to measure progress against those priorities. The Service planning was better with three year Service Plans, which made them much more manageable in terms of performance. Individual appraisals were also improved.

There were still areas for improvement for performance management. There needed to be better integration of the transformation programme and how it was monitored in service plans, so it was clear to services what their contribution was to the transformation programme and how it would be monitored.

In terms of improving the quality of cabinet reports, there were still some areas for further improvement such as ensuring that reporting was timely so that decisions about underperformance could be made promptly and to ensure that where performance was not meeting target there were clear action plans in all cases to show how that performance would be improved.

The council had responded positively to the recommendations made around the areas for improvement and had set actions and the outcome from those actions in the action plan and dates by which they would be achieved.

The government had announced abolition of the Comprehensive Area Assessment, although there were references in the report which was finalised prior to government announcement. As this would now no longer take place it would be important for members to ensure the action plan was implemented and followed through as part of the council's improvement agenda.

Members discussed a range of issues a key area being the steps being taken to improve the cabinet role in performance management. Any issues coming out of performance reports in terms of particular areas of underperformance would be the subject of a follow up report to the cabinet. A more robust process had been introduced involving cabinet members and directors to challenge performance, identify weaknesses and agree action required. The timescale with regard to receiving indicators was being tightened so that there was a minimal delay in reporting these to the cabinet.

The review had highlighted the need for the council to make clear the link between thematic outcomes and the corporate plan. Members were advised that there was a communications plan related to the performance management framework. The committee requested that a copy of this be circulated to them. The importance of benchmarking, particularly at service plan level, was an area

that required development. The role played by personal development reviews was also a key element. The committee was advised these assisted in assessing training needs which could then be delivered through a variety of methods.

RESOLVED:

- (i) THAT a report, reviewing progress with the action plan, be brought back to the committee in six months.
- (ii) THAT the report be noted.

(b) Quarterly Performance Management Report - Quarter 4 2009/10

The Committee discussed the Council's performance and strategic risks for the fourth quarter of 2009/10 ending 31 March 2010, which had been considered by Cabinet at its meeting on the 1 June 2010.

Members noted that in the performance summary 47% were still below target and asked if a list could be supplied of those which formed these areas. The Strategic Manager for Policy and Performance indicated they data was still being updated for some of the indicators. The committee sought clarification as to the timescales for the collection of data given that during the previous item it had been stated that it was intended to get reports to cabinet within a tighter timescale. The committee was assured that this had been built into the revised arrangements.

There was some discussion in relation to the process of reviewing targets, which had started in December 2009 and completed in March 2010. The committee believed that it was just as important to ensure that those targets which were continually being exceeded were reviewed so that the resources were appropriate and represented value for money.

RESOLVED:

THAT the report be noted.

5. **Forward Plan**

Members' noted the Forward Plan for June – September 2010. No items were highlighted for discussion.

RESOLVED :

THAT the report be noted.