

additional papers 1

Executive Committee

Tue 23 Aug
2011
7.00 pm

Council Chamber
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, all items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- (Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:
www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact
Ivor Westmore
Committee Support Services**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: 01527 64252 (Extn. 3269) Fax: (01527) 65216
e.mail: (meeting contact)[@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:meetingcontact@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) Minicom: 595528**

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

Chair

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

Running Order

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

Refreshments : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

Decisions

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

Members of the Public

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

Special Arrangements

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

Further Information

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

Fire/ Emergency instructions

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.

The emergency Assembly Area is on Walter Stranz Square.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

- Where the item relates or is likely to affect your **registered interests** (what you have declared on the formal Register of Interests)

OR

- Where a decision in relation to the item might reasonably be regarded as affecting **your own** well-being or financial position, or that of your **family**, or your **close associates** more than most other people affected by the issue,

you have a personal interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare the existence, and nature, of your interest and stay**

- The declaration must relate to specific business being decided - a general scattergun approach is not needed
- **Exception** - where interest arises only because of your membership of another **public body**, there is no need to declare unless you **speak** on the matter.
- You **can vote** on the matter.

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

- It is a personal interest **and**
- The item affects your **financial position** (or conveys other benefits), or the position of your **family, close associates** or bodies through which you have a **registered interest** (or relates to the exercise of **regulatory functions** in relation to these groups)

and

- A member of public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably believe the interest was likely to **prejudice** your judgement of the public interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare and Withdraw**

BUT you may make representations to the meeting before withdrawing, **if** the public have similar rights (such as the right to speak at Planning Committee).



Executive

Committee

Tuesday, 23rd August, 2011

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Carole Gandy (Chair)
Michael Braley (Vice-Chair)
Juliet Brunner
Greg Chance
Brandon Clayton
Malcolm Hall
Jinny Pearce
Debbie Taylor
Derek Taylor

<p>12. Employment Policies - Review</p> <p>(Pages 131 - 132)</p> <p>Head of Finance and Resources</p>	<p>To consider the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Staff Volunteering Policy.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>(No Direct Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>19. – 22.</p> <p>Shared Service Board - Decisions</p> <p>(Pages 133 - 142)</p> <p>Chief Executive</p>	<p>To consider the minutes and decisions of the meeting of the Shared Services Board held on 18th August 2011.</p> <p>These are to be considered in conjunction with the reports to the Shared Services Board which were circulated previously under separate cover.</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 16th August, 2011

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Phil Mould (Chair), Councillor Mark Shurmer (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Peter Anderson, Andrew Brazier, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Gay Hopkins and Alan Mason.

Also Present:

Mrs T Buckley and Mr R Colebrook (Co-opted representatives from UNISON).

Officers:

H Arnold, H Bennett, J Bough and E Cartwright

Committee Services Officer:

J Bayley and M Craggs

Minute 66

STAFF VOLUNTEERING POLICY

The Committee received the draft staff volunteering policy for pre-scrutiny. The Committee's co-opted representatives from UNISON attended the meeting to speak on this item.

Members were advised that the staff volunteering policy would provide officers with an opportunity to undertake 16 hours of volunteering every year during working hours. Officers would be matched to placements and permission would need to be obtained from the employee's manager. The opportunity to participate in voluntary placements would not replace existing opportunities for staff to act in roles such as a school governor's post.

A similar policy had been introduced in recent years at Bromsgrove District Council. The impact of the policy had not yet been monitored, though it was understood that the number of officers who had utilised the opportunity to volunteer had been relatively low, ensuring that requests to volunteer had not undermined service

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 16th August, 2011

delivery. However, feedback received from members of staff who had participated in voluntary placements had been largely positive.

Concerns were expressed about the potential benefits of staff participating in voluntary placements rather than attending work. Council staff were considered to be a valuable resource and therefore any placements needed to represent value for money for both the Council and local residents. However, it was noted that through volunteering an officer could make a valuable contribution to local voluntary and community sector organisations and the local economy whilst the officer could develop transferable skills that might be utilised to deliver services more effectively at the Council. Furthermore, the contingencies of the service would be prioritised.

Placements would not automatically be approved. The needs of the service area in which the officer worked would be prioritised by managers when considering applications to volunteer. Managers would also have the authority to reject proposed placements which were not considered likely to add value.

Members noted that the policy would need to be promoted effectively to ensure that officers were aware of the opportunity to participate in volunteering activities. As part of this process information about the policy could be provided during staff briefings and in the Council's online staff magazine. It was also suggested that members of staff from Bromsgrove who had participated in the scheme could be invited to brief Redditch based staff about the process.

The Committee's co-opted representatives commented that the unions would be largely supportive of the introduction of this policy. The appropriate timing for the introduction of the policy would need to be considered carefully, as many Council staff would be involved in the Council's transformation programme and would potentially be affected by the introduction of shared services. In this context many staff might welcome the opportunity to participate in volunteering activities which could help them to develop their skills and thereby improve their future career prospects.

RECOMMENDED that

subject to noting Members' comments as detailed in the preamble above, the Staff Volunteering Policy be approved.

SHARED SERVICES BOARD

18th August 2011 at 5.30pm

COMMITTEE ROOM 3, TOWN HALL, REDDITCH

Present: Councillors Carole Gandy (Chair), Michael Braley, Malcolm Hall and Bill Hartnett (Redditch Borough Council).
Councillors Steve Colella, Margaret Sherrey and Mike Webb (Bromsgrove District Council).

Also in attendance: Cllr Kit Taylor (Observer, BDC).

Officers: Kevin Dicks, Claire Felton, Sue Hanley, Angie Heighway, Teresa Kristunas, Helen Mole, Jayne Pickering, Deb Poole, Guy Revans, John Staniland, Amanda de Warr, Judith Willis (RBC / BDC) and Mike Parker (Wyre Forest DC).

Notes: Steve Skinner.

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Cllr Roger Hollingworth (BDC)

2. MINUTES

Subject to the correction of:

- a) the spelling of Cllr Sherrey's name; and
- b) under Minute 3) "Progress Report - Single Business Case, reference to *"the end of the calendar year"* to read *"the end of the financial year"* in Recommendation 2;

the minutes of the previous meeting of the Board held on 30th June 2011 were agreed as a correct record.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The content of the reports to this meeting, although widely circulated to Members and Council employees, remain confidential / 'exempt' at this stage in view of the fact that:

- a) meetings of the Board are not subject to statutory Access to Information requirements; and
- b) information relating to individual post holders and employee relations matters would be revealed.

However, these Minutes themselves are an open public record of proceedings of the Board.

3. MATTERS ARISING – FINANCIAL REPORTING

Cllr Hartnett requested that the agreement to provide more detailed financial reports, including record of costs / savings allocated Council by Council, be formally recorded.

Mr Dicks confirmed that this matter would be addressed for the next meeting of the Board and had been picked up in the action monitoring for RBC's Executive Committee.

4. LAND DRAINAGE AND WATERCOURSES - BUSINESS CASE

The Board considered a report covering shared service restructuring proposals in relation to Land Drainage and Watercourse-related service areas. The proposal was for a fully integrated service to cover all three North Worcestershire Districts, hosted by Wyre Forest District Council.

Guy Revans, Head of Environmental Services, and Mike Parker of Wyre Forest DC introduced the report and provided Members with further explanations and responses to their questions.

Officers advised that as well as combining the functions of the proposed three partner Districts, some County functions would also be taken in.

Officers clarified that reference to 'Specialist Fees' in the report was perhaps slightly misleading, and should say 'Budget for Works'.

Board Members specified that Councillors should definitely be represented in the membership of the proposed 'Higher Management Group'.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) the shared Land Drainage Service proposals detailed in the Business Case at Option 3 be approved, in accordance with the previously agreed Project Initiation Document dated 22nd June 2011;**
- 2) the three Councils agree this new service be known as the "North Worcestershire Land Drainage Service"; and**
- 3) all initial set up costs be met from within existing budgets.**

5. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – SEVEN SERVICES

The Board considered a report covering shared service restructuring proposals in relation to seven distinct service areas.

Mr Dicks introduced the report, advising that:

- a) Staff were aware of the proposals and had generally welcomed them being brought forward in a single business case.
- b) the proposals contained in the Business Cases would provide a firmer base for transformational working across the two authorities.
- c) Transformation reviews still needed to be undertaken in due course, and that further savings would arise from those. However, the present Shared Services proposals would release some savings at an early stage to the benefit of both Councils.
- d) Financial assessments, future salaries and staffing figures were all indicative only at this stage: Human Resources Officers would be further checking the staffing details, including all indicated potentially redundant posts.
- e) In terms of Job Evaluation of the Grades which would be attached to new posts, Mr Dicks advised that Officers now had a reasonable understanding of likely Job Evaluations based on prior BDC / RBC experience to date.
- f) Current proposals could not, take account of a number of issues, known to be in the pipeline, but not yet in place, such as proposals under the Localism Bill for Local Development Plans, for example, and associated Council resource requirements. As soon as such implications could be assessed, they would be dealt with.

Mr Dicks expressed his thanks to the team of Directors and Heads of Service for achieving this substantial piece of work so quickly. He also thanked Helen Mole, Transformation Programme Manager, and Susan Tasker, the Chief Executive's Personal Assistant, for the parts they had respectively played in getting the reports together in time for the present meeting of the Board.

Members echoed those expressions of gratitude, and in turn thanked Officers for the Redundancy / Pension costs information now being provided in reports, which they felt was in a format which was much easier to read and understand.

Cllr Braley, RBC Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management, suggested that figures reported over at least a three-year period would provide a more accurate picture of the benefits of the Shared Service reviews. He also enquired about the possibility of capitalising any of the costs implicit in the present proposals. Officers agreed to look into this further in time for next consideration of these proposals by the RBC Executive Committee / BDC Cabinet.

In response to a specific question about severance costs, Officers advised that these would initially be taken from balances.

Members also asked about future recruitment processes. Officers responded that their intention was to have formal Assessment Centre processes in respect of all new 4th tier Manager posts. Less intensive recruitment processes would apply for staff at lower levels. Officers clarified that this was not intended to discredit any existing Managers but only to ensure the necessary skills would be met to serve two separate Councils.

Finally, further to detailed consideration of each of the Business Cases, as set out in the separate Minutes below, Members considered the covering recommendations, as follows:

RECOMMENDED that

subject to any matters detailed under the separate records below,

- 1) the Single Business Case proposals be approved in respect of shared services for the following seven services:**
 - **Community Services**
 - **Customer Services**
 - **Environmental Services**
 - **Financial Services**
 - **Legal and Democratic Services**
 - **Planning and Regeneration**
 - **Secretariat and Directorate Support Services; and**
- 2) the Operational Agreement at Appendix Two, which is in draft only at this stage, be finalised in readiness for approval by BDC Cabinet / RBC Executive Committee.**

6. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – COMMUNITY SERVICES

Angie Heighway, Head of Community Services, introduced this Case, and made mention of existing successful shared services which fell within her area of management control, namely CCTV /Lifeline and Community Safety.

Ms Heighway explained the context of the current further Shared Services proposals with reference to the position of the Private Housing and Housing Strategy functions.

In this connection, she also mentioned the exceptional position and reporting line of the current RBC Grants Officer. In respect of this post the Chair requested Officers to review where the post should sit within new structures, as it was not felt that it was currently best located.

The service was proposed to be hosted by Bromsgrove District Council, principally because of existing 3rd party contractual relationships, in this case with the Bromsgrove District Housing Trust.

It was **AGREED** that

In respect of the RBC Grants Officer post, Officers be requested to review where the post ought properly to be located within revised structures.

(The prime recommendation remained as detailed under Minute 5 above.)

7. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – CUSTOMER SERVICES

Amanda de Warr, Head of Customer Services, introduced this Case, advising that, at this stage, it only covered shared management arrangements. Further Service Review would be necessary, in approximately 12 to 18 months' time, once the Customer Services Team had gone further through the Transformation process.

Ms de Warr mentioned the County Council's involvement and implications for funding currently provided by the County towards the Worcestershire Hub arrangement.

It was proposed that Redditch would be the host authority, given the size of the current staff group and higher volume of customers, which was due in part to Redditch BC still holding Housing stock. On this point Members considered that figures should be recast to omit the Housing Revenue Account element, which was relevant to Redditch only. Officers agreed to take this on board.

Ms de Warr advised that Team comments to date had been in support of the new structure, even where staff were directly impacted by the proposals.

It was **AGREED that**

financial reporting in relation to this Business Case be reviewed, in view of the RBC Housing Service implications mentioned by Board Members.

(The prime recommendation remained as detailed under Minute 5 above.)

8. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

This case was presented by Guy Revans, Head of Environmental Services, who reminded Board Members of the evolution of the reviews of Environmental Services to date. He advised that these next proposals built on what had previously been put in place.

It was proposed that Bromsgrove would host the service. This proposal was based essentially on the higher level of commercial services currently offered by Bromsgrove DC: Trade Waste, Garden Waste, Cesspools etc.

Members queried whether ultimately this Shared Service proposal might assist better integrated refuse collection rounds, for example with Redditch based vehicles covering areas of Bromsgrove District and vice versa. Officers agreed that, subject to further Member decision, this might be feasible as would even further realignments with other neighbouring Districts.

(The recommendation remained as detailed under Minute 5 above, without addition.)

9. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – FINANCIAL SERVICES

Teresa Kristunas, Head of Finance and Resources, introduced this Case, and reminded the Board of the updated structure chart which had been circulated since issue of the main report pack for the meeting.

Mrs Kristunas mentioned that the proposals included provision of an ongoing temporary staffing resource, to assist corporate Transformation processes. Clearly this would be removed later, triggering further savings in due course.

(Recommendations were as detailed under Minute 5 above, taking into account the proposed revised Structure.)

**10. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE
– LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

The Legal and Democratic Services Business Case was presented by Head of Service, Claire Felton, who explained the proposal in more detail and explained the differentials in levels of likely savings to each authority. These were due to:

- a) different levels of legal advice offered to each authority, mainly due to the implications of Redditch's housing stock; and also
- b) different levels of Overview and Scrutiny activity currently undertaken at each Council.

Bromsgrove had been selected to host the service owing to relationships with the Bromsgrove District Housing Trust and Worcestershire Regulatory Services which were also hosted by Bromsgrove District Council.

Mrs Felton emphasised that, although Bromsgrove would be the host authority, Redditch Members would still receive an equally high quality service from Legal & Democratic Services and that a staffing presence would be maintained at both authorities' premises.

(Recommendations were as detailed under Minute 5 above, without addition.)

(Prior to consideration of this Case, Mr Skinner, RBC Democratic Services Manager, withdrew from the meeting in view of his personal interest in the proposals.)

11. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – PLANNING & REGENERATION

John Staniland, Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services, presented this Case, highlighting the areas which had already been covered under other recent reviews (Local Land Charges, Building Control and Economic Development) and what this proposal now covered. Proposed staffing levels in the current proposal included a degree of support for Local Land Charges, under the recently agreed proposal for that service. Staff at both Councils had acknowledged the issues relating to this review and had expressed support for these proposals.

Mr Staniland drew attention to the current uncertain national planning policy climate and how this might ultimately impact on the development of both Councils' Core Strategies. For this reason, he explained that there was no recommendation at this stage for a Planning Policy Shared Service.

A further issue was the position of the Town Centre Regeneration function. This currently involved a single RBC Officer post, had been well received in Redditch and covered issues of Regeneration and also Town Centre events. It might therefore later be considered for relocation under the now established North Worcestershire Economic Development Team, if at some stage that proved acceptable to the partner Councils.

(Recommendations were as detailed under Minute 5 above, without addition.)

(Cllr Hall expressed his apologies and left the meeting at 7.33 pm.)

12. SINGLE BUSINESS CASE – SECRETARIAT & DIRECTORATE SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr Dicks, presented this Case, advising that, at this stage, the proposal only went so far down the existing structure in order to provide a platform for subsequent Transformation review.

Because of essential differences in the services provided to each authority, some costs were indicated as purely RBC costs.

The proposal indicated Redditch Borough Council as host authority, but with new supervisory arrangements for Bromsgrove District Council to ensure appropriate levels of high quality service to both Councils, and to their Civic Heads / lead Members.

(Recommendations were as detailed under Minute 5 above, without addition.)

(Prior to consideration of this Case, Ms Mole, Transformation Programme Manager, withdrew from the meeting in view of her personal interest in the proposals.)

13. CAR PARKING – BUSINESS CASE

The Board considered a report covering shared service restructuring proposals in relation to Car Park Services. The report included proposals for the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement in Bromsgrove District. The service was to be hosted by Wychavon District Council. This case impacted more on Bromsgrove than Redditch, where Civil Parking Enforcement had already operated for some time.

Guy Revans, Head of Environmental Services, introduced the item.

Further to Redditch Borough Council's experience, Bromsgrove Members were interested in the practical implementation of the scheme and Mr Revans advised that:

- a) Parking Enforcement Officers used 'partnership' logos, not Wychavon District Council logos, to identify themselves.
- b) An initial introductory period allowed time to inform residents about the new arrangements.
- c) An initial 'amnesty' allowed residents time to get used to the implications of parking outside of the scheme and the penalties which would apply.
- d) as identified by Board Members, there was a need for sensitive treatment re penalties and their impact on income to the Council.
- e) Some existing traffic orders might need to be reviewed as to whether they are now fit for purpose.

Officers advised that there would be no additional IT costs, as use of the existing Wychavon IT systems came as part of the management agreement.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) Option 2 (to “extend Wychavon District Council’s Service to include Bromsgrove District Council”) be chosen as the preferred option for the future delivery of the shared Parking Service;**
- 2) Bromsgrove District Council should introduce Civil (Decriminalised) Parking Enforcement in partnership with Wychavon District Council;**
- 3) authority be delegated to the Head of Environmental Services to exercise the Council’s civil parking enforcement powers within the District of Bromsgrove, when civil parking enforcement within the District comes into effect;**
- 4) the Council enter into a Deed of Arrangements with the Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London Adjudication Joint Committee for the functions in relation to adjudicators under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004;**
- 5) authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services to sign any necessary agreements or other documents to enable the introduction of civil parking enforcement within the District; and**
- 6) up to £75,000 be made available within Bromsgrove District Council’s budgets to meet the set up costs of Civil Parking Enforcement.**

14. EMERGENCY PLANNING – BUSINESS CASE

The Board considered a report covering shared service restructuring proposals in relation to the Emergency Planning Services.

Officers' recommendation was for an integrated service covering all three North Worcestershire Districts' areas, which Officers considered provided the best opportunity to meet statutory requirements; to provide the partner authorities with a greater voice; and to reduce costs.

John Staniland presented this Case, explaining that the proposed implementation date of 1st April 2012 coincided with the renewal date of the existing Service Agreement with Worcestershire County Council.

In response to Members' queries, Officers advised that they did not feel anything significant would be lost by moving away from the current County-wide arrangement. Whereas in the three Districts, Emergency Planning formed only a small part of existing Officers' roles, the proposed combination would allow for proper focus and priority to be accorded under a dedicated Officer arrangement.

In the case of any actual emergency, the same practical inter-agency arrangements would apply as at present and existing Emergency Plans would still be relevant.

RECOMMENDED that

the proposal in respect of a shared Emergency Planning service be approved as detailed in the Business Case under Option 3 (for a North Worcestershire Shared Service).

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was **AGREED** that

the next meeting be held on Thursday 29th September 2011 in the Conference Room at Bromsgrove District Council, starting at 5.30 pm.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm
and closed at 7.55 pm.