

Scrutiny committee

Date: Thursday, 13 July 2017

Time: 16:30

Venue: Mancroft room, City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH

All group pre-meeting briefing – 16:00 Mancroft Room

This is for members only and is not part of the formal scrutiny committee meeting which will follow at 16:30. The pre-meeting is an opportunity for the committee to make final preparations before the start of the formal meeting. The public will not be given access to the Mancroft room before 16:30.

Committee members:

Councillors:

Wright (chair)
Brociek-Coulton (vice chair)
Bogelein
Bradford
Bremner
Coleshill
Grahame
Haynes
Jones (B)
Manning
Malik
Packer
Thomas (Va)

For further information please contact:

Committee officer: Lucy Palmer
t: (01603) 212416
e: lucypalmer@norwich.gov.uk

Democratic services
City Hall
Norwich
NR2 1NH

www.norwich.gov.uk

Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website

Agenda

Page nos

- | | | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| 1 | Apologies

To receive apologies for absence | |
| 2 | Public questions/petitions

To receive questions / petitions from the public (notice to be given to committee officer in advance of the meeting in accordance with appendix 1 of the council's constitution) | |
| 3 | Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting) | |
| 4 | Minutes
To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017 | 7 - 14 |
| 5 | Appointment of representative and substitute to the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Purpose - To appoint a representative and a substitute to the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the ensuing civic year. | 15 - 18 |
| 6 | Appointment of representative and substitute for the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny sub panel
Purpose - To appoint a representative and substitute for the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny sub panel for the ensuing civic year. | 19 - 20 |
| 7 | Quarterly Performance Report
Purpose - To consider if there are any measures within the main report to take forward for future analysis and decide how scrutiny committee members would like to scrutinise corporate performance in the future. | 21 - 30 |
| 8 | Setting of the scrutiny committee work programme for 2017/18
Purpose - To assist committee members in setting the work programme for 2017/18. | 31 - 44 |

Date of publication: **Wednesday, 05 July 2017**

- T** is this, the right **TIME** to review the issue and is there sufficient officer time and resource available?
- O** what would be the **OBJECTIVE** of the scrutiny?
- P** can **PERFORMANCE** in this area be improved by scrutiny input?
- I** what would be the public **INTEREST** in placing this topic onto the work programme?
- C** will any scrutiny activity on this matter contribute to the council's activities as agreed to in the **CORPORATE PLAN**?

Once the TOPIC analysis has been undertaken, a joint decision should then be reached as to whether a report to the scrutiny committee is required. If it is decided that a report is not required, the issue will not be pursued any further. However, if there are outstanding issues, these could be picked up by agreeing that a briefing email to members be sent, or other appropriate action by the relevant officer.

If it is agreed that the scrutiny request topic should be explored further by the scrutiny committee a short report should be written for a future meeting of the scrutiny committee, to be taken under the standing work programme item, so that members are able to consider if they should place the item on to the work programme. This report should outline a suggested approach if the committee was minded to take on the topic and outline the purpose using the outcome of the consideration of the topic via the TOPIC analysis. Also the report should provide an overview of the current position with regard to the topic under consideration.

By using the flowchart, it is hoped that members and officers will be aided when giving consideration to whether or not the item should be added to the scrutiny committee work programme. This should help to ensure that the scope and purpose will be covered by any future report. The outcome of this should further assist the committee and the officers working with the committee to be able to produce informed outcomes that are credible, influential with SMART recommendations.

Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound

Scrutiny committee and a protocol for those attending meetings of the scrutiny committee

- All scrutiny committee meetings will be carried out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect
- Members of the scrutiny committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups
- Scrutiny committee members will work together and will attempt to achieve evidence based consensus and recommendations
- Members of the committee will take the lead in the selection of topics for scrutiny
- The scrutiny committee operates as a critical friend and offers constructive challenge to decision makers to support improved outcomes
- Invited attendees will be advised of the time, date and location of the meeting to which they are invited to give evidence
- The invited attendee will be made aware of the reasons for the invitation and of any documents and information that the committee wish them to provide
- Reasonable notice will be given to the invited attendee of **all** of the committees requirements so that these can be provided for in full at the earliest opportunity (there should be no nasty surprises at committee)
- Whenever possible it is expected that members of the scrutiny committee will share and plan questioning with the rest of the committee in advance of the meeting
- The invited attendee will be provided with copies of **all relevant** reports, papers and background information
- Practical arrangements, such as facilities for presentations will be in place. The layout of the meeting room will be appropriate
- The chair of the committee will introduce themselves to the invited attendee before evidence is given and; all those attending will be treated with courtesy and respect. The chair of the committee will make sure that all questions put to the witness are made in a clear and orderly manner

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**16:35 to 18:00****22 June 2017**

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Brociek-Coulton (vice chair following election) Bogelein, Bradford, Bremner, Grahame, Haynes, Jones (B), Manning, Malik, packer and Thomas (Va)

Apologies: Councillor Coleshill

1. Appointment of vice chair

Councillors Bogelein and Brociek-Coulton were moved as vice chair. Following a vote it was:-

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Brociek-Coulton as the vice chair for the ensuing civic year.

2. Public questions/petitions

The following public question was received from Reverend Joy Croft:

"I have long assumed the Scrutiny Committee's function to be just that: scrutiny. I.e. that its purpose was to examine the Council's policies, priorities and projects, before they were enacted, to ensure that they were consistent with one another and with the law. As changes to the city's crossings, roads and walkways makes Norwich increasingly unsafe for those of us with registered visual impairments and the Committee does not intervene, I must conclude that my assumption is wrong. After all, these disabling changes do at least merit examination under current disability equality legislation.

So please, would the Convener explain what the Committee's actual function is, and how we registered disabled citizens can work with it in situations like this to keep Norwich from disabling us further?"

She was unable to attend the meeting therefore the chair read out the following response:

"Thank you Reverend Croft for your question.

The scrutiny committee is required to maintain an overview of the discharge of the council's executive function and has the right to scrutinise any executive decision made by the cabinet or by council officers, under delegated powers, or to review the council's policy-making or decision-making processes; or to undertake the work aimed at policy development within the council.

We are not a decision making body within the council, and cannot force through changes, but we do make recommendations to cabinet that are more often than not taken on board.

If a member of the public has an item that they would like the scrutiny committee to consider adding to our work programme, we have a form available for completion which would be returned to our scrutiny liaison officer for consideration for inclusion by the committee.

You comment that the 'changes do at least merit examination under current disability equality legislation'.

I quite agree, which is why at the meeting today we are considering the current status of the council's transportation and highways strategies as detailed in the report, and will be taking first-hand accounts of city access issues by a number of speakers representing different groups.

The follows on from an informal scrutiny committee walkabout, where some Norwich city councillors, officers and members of disability access groups took part in an access tour of Norwich to identify accessibility issues within the city area.

It is worth pointing out that we are, due to resources available, not able to look at every single aspect of the council's work but will seek to carry out scrutiny of any area of concern identified to us."

3. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Minutes

Subject to noting that Councillor Manning was present at the meeting and including the date of the city accessibility walk as 30 June 2016 it was:-

RESOLVED to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2017.

5. City accessibility

The chair introduced the item and said that he would be inviting guests to speak first and then members would be able to ask questions.

George Saunders, chair of the Access Group addressed the committee and listed issues that the Access Group wanted to highlight.

Smooth pavements – It was difficult and uncomfortable for wheelchair users or those with mobility issues to travel on uneven or cobbled pathways. Where smooth walkways had been installed, these were often blocked by bus stops and street furniture. He said that a scheme had been implemented in Barcelona whereby smooth pathways had been installed through cobbled areas.

A Board regulation – A Boards often forced wheelchair users off of the pavement and were a hazard for those people with visual impairments.

Blue badge parking – He said that this needed better enforcement including checking for fraudulent use.

Disability Discrimination Act – It had been 22 years since the Disability Discrimination Act had come into force but some businesses were still not accessible. Mr Saunders said that he would like to see the council make it a requirement that any planning applications for refurbishment or change also had to comply with Part M building regulations wherever possible.

Controlled Crossings – The Norwich Access Group whole heartedly opposed the removal of controlled crossings. He said that he could not emphasise enough how difficult the removal of these crossings made getting around Norwich. He said that he was aware of people who had stopped coming into the city centre for this reason.

Edward Bates (Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind) and Mike Wordingham (Royal National Institute of Blind) addressed the committee. Edward Bates said that the NNAB and the RNIB has been working together for a number of years as both groups had concerns around city accessibility. The Norwich Area Transport Strategy stated that the intention was to create good access for everyone. He said that he was frequently contacted by people with visual impairments who said that they could not independently access the city centre. He introduced a short video in which a number of visually impaired people gave information on difficulties they faced in the city centre

(The video can be viewed at this link <https://vimeo.com/222183086>)

Mike Wordingham said that Norwich City Centre was becoming a 'no go' zone for visually impaired people. He wanted to see controlled crossings reinstated on Cleveland Road and also on Rampant Horse Street, specifically at site H in the report. He said that kerb on Westlegate needed to be at least 60mm high and therefore needed to be heightened.

He would like to see a different way of working introduced with more thorough access audits being carried out by experts within this field. He felt that the equality impact assessment attached to the report was inadequate as the scheme disadvantaged visually impaired people and did not address the concerns raised by the NNAB. There was no mention of any mitigating factors being implemented. He suggested that these assessments could be put through a panel of disabled users as a second check.

He suggested that more robust consultation was needed to include blind and partially sighted people. Norfolk County Council had a list of groups representing different disabilities and Mike suggested that the council may want to think about the best way to consult with these groups. He said that the sensory team could be made

more use of (although he understood that there were cost implications with this) and tactile models could be made relatively inexpensively. He suggested exploring links with the local arts university for this.

He asked that the shared space scheme be halted before new guidance was developed in consultation with disabled people. The policy of turning controlled crossings into zebra crossings was diminishing quality of life for blind and visually impaired people.

He was interested in the idea of a street charter and said that he would be delighted to assist in the development of this. Such a charter would change people's lives.

Aliona Derrett, Chief Executive Officer of the Norfolk Deaf Association (NDA) spoke next. She said that controlled crossings were best for their users as lots of traffic noise made it very difficult to cross roads, especially with age and sight loss also. She said that electric vehicles could also be a problem as they were too quiet. She asked that more sound be put into crossings as some people were unable to see the green light to cross the road if there were people standing in front of them. Signs with crossing lights should be available on the front of the crossing and should also be easy to see in sunlight.

Pedestrianised areas were good but they were also used by cyclists who usually could not be heard so perhaps different areas for cycles could be thought about. She said that the NDA could always be approached for advice.

Susan Ringwood, Chief Executive of Age UK addressed the committee and presented comments that had been gathered at their recent AGM.

The bus services was regarded as being very good, however, the distance between bus stops was too far with too few stops having bench seating. A boards and street furniture were obstructive and she was not aware of a policy surrounding these. Pedestrianised streets were very good but there was nowhere to drop people off who needed to use the businesses in the city centre. She gave the example of the Post Office on St Stephens Street of this. She suggested an inner city hopper bus that circled the pedestrianised areas would be beneficial for not only older people but also for tourists. Older people would benefit from well signed drop off points, especially in the social and cultural areas of the city.

She said that she was aware of increased unauthorised blue badge parking but said that older people often felt too vulnerable to confront others about this.

Dr Katherine Deane of the University of East Anglia Accessibility Taskforce gave a presentation to the committee (available on the council's website). She said that twelve percent of UEA students had declared a disability and there was a corporate commitment to equal access for all. She said that some improved power assisted doors had been installed all new buildings on campus has hoist assisted toilets. She offered to share their accessible design guide.

She said that the students faced the barriers to accessing the city described by the previous speakers. Buses had ramps but the internal design of the vehicles needed some thought. With the implementation of new legislation around equal taxi fares she had concerns that taxis with wheelchair space could be lost. She would like to see it be mandatory for a certain percentage of taxis to be wheelchair accessible.

The chair thanked all the speakers and invited questions from members of the committee.

In response to a member's question, the principal planner (transport) said that the assumption was not that zebra crossings were safer than controlled crossings. This was always dependent on location and each individual location was subject to an assessment and national best practice guidance was followed. He added that with defunct crossings, each would be looked at on its own merits and a decision would be made on the type of crossing to be installed within the limit of resources. He referred to the crossing at Cleveland Road and said that the intention was to replace the controlled crossing once funding became available.

The principal planner (transport) said that the £500,000 cost for a crossing referred to in the report was the approximate cost of a full trafficked junction and not just a pedestrian crossing. Other types of crossings would cost less and subsequently more could be installed.

In response to a question from a member, the city agency manager (Norfolk County Council) said that a wide range of schemes were planned across the county with Norwich having a specific budget allocated to it. He acknowledged that Norwich was a key location in the area and understood the need for crossings but projects were always limited by available resources.

Members discussed the assessments for crossings and the consultation on these. The principal planner (transport) said that visits were undertaken to locations to observe those using the area and consultations were undertaken on every project. Proposals and changes to the projects were advertised to the public and stakeholders were written to for comment. He added that people were involved in the process at an early stage but a proposal had to be worked up to consult on. When beginning a project, a wide range of groups were engaged. Edward Bates of the NNAB said that he understood there were difficulties; they would like to be consulted at an earlier stage in the process. Dr Katherine Deane said that the UEA design guidance had helped with their response to consultations as it gave an expected status quo for new designs. With regards to a disability champion sitting on the Norfolk Highways Agency Committee, the principal planner (transport) said that issues faced by disabled people were already discussed extensively.

In response to a member's question the principal planner (transport) said that shared space scheme had been through a safety audit and there was an acknowledgement that light controlled crossings were needed. However, Rampant Horse Street was a heavily pedestrianised area so light controlled crossings in particular may not be the answer in that location.

The principal planner (transport) addressed member's queries regarding the raising of kerb height on the Westlegate scheme, the policy on A boards and the priority of replacing the light controlled crossing on Cleveland Road. He said that Westlegate was a pedestrian area the use of kerbs was not appropriate. However, margins had been put down to provide some differentiation between areas to each side of the street and areas which service vehicles were expected to use to minimise potential conflict. With regards to A boards, there had been some staffing issues within the team that would implement the policy. These had been rectified and a letter would shortly be going out to all city centre businesses giving them one month to comply with the new policy. He confirmed that a copy of that letter would be going to councillors and stakeholders.

The city agency manager (Norfolk County Council) added that there was the intention to put a light controlled crossing on Cleveland Road and a feasibility study had been commissioned to understand the costs involved. Work was being undertaken on identifying funding but there was a commitment to identify the work needed.

A member raised concerns around the channel shift to online consultations and how these would be made accessible to visually impaired people. The city agency manager (Norfolk County Council) said that they encouraged people who were having any difficulties to contact officers who would deal with their needs on a case by case basis.

Members discussed the idea of a charter around city accessibility and agreed that the street charter from Hull city council was a good statement of intention.

In response to a member's question, the director of customers and culture said that cabinet would be considering a report covering a motion to council around city accessibility and recommendations around the mention of city accessibility in the corporate plan. The strategy manager reminded members that there had not been any changes to the corporate priorities; instead the mention of city accessibility could contribute to the narrative to contextualise the priorities.

The city agency manager (Norfolk County Council) informed the committee of the work that Norfolk County Council had undertaken with 'Opening Doors' which represented those with less visible disabilities. Safe journey cards had been developed for bus users with hidden disabilities such as clear speech, anxiety and mobility issues.

The chair thanked all of the speakers for their participation.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) Ask Norfolk County Council's Environment, Development and Transport committee to review the same evidence presented to this meeting to inform their work going forward; particularly in relation to their work with bus stops and bus companies,
- (2) Improve stakeholder representation earlier in the design process of new transport schemes, potentially with a champion to sit on relevant committees or a stakeholder panel to be established,
- (3) Ask relevant officers to ensure that any new signage be evaluated in terms of accessibility
- (4) Ask the Norwich highways Agency Committee to consider formally pausing the use of shared space schemes,
- (5) Ensure the A Boards policy is easily accessible on the Norwich City Council website,
- (6) Extend consultations to groups not represented at the scrutiny meeting, especially those with hidden disabilities,

- (7) Ask cabinet to consider ways to more robustly enforce the engine switch off policy for buses within Norwich,
- (8) Consider ways to increase awareness of the telephone number to report misuse of blue badge parking,
- (9) Ask the chair of the licensing committee to consider receiving a report on the sufficient supply of wheelchair accessible private hire vehicles,
- (10) Ask relevant officers to approach the Business Improvement District (BID) to explore ways of improving city center retail access for those with mobility issues, such as more drop off points and a mini bus 'hopper' service; and
- (11) Consider the formation of a task and finish group at the work programme setting meeting of the scrutiny committee to progress the idea of a city accessibility street charter

CHAIR

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 5

REPORT for meeting to be held on 13 July 2017

Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Summary:

This report provides a brief introduction to health scrutiny, the county council's role, the city council's role and an explanation of how the city council's representative on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC) role is undertaken. The scrutiny committee is also requested to select a representative and substitute to sit on the Norfolk County Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2017/2018

Conclusions:

Since the Health and Social Care Act 2012 came into effect in 2013, health scrutiny powers lie with the county council rather than directly with the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. County and district councils have different service responsibilities, but both have a significant impact on health and wellbeing. By adoption of a way of working provided by the suggested protocol, the city council and its representative on NHOSC will be able to continue to work in partnership towards positive outcomes on behalf of residents.

Recommendation:

- (1) Agree to continue with the protocol agreed last year
- (2) Select a member of the scrutiny committee to be the representative to sit on NHOSC
- (3) Select a member of the scrutiny committee to be the substitute representative on NHOSC

Contact Officer:

Beth Clark
Scrutiny liaison officer
bethanyclark@norwich.gov.uk
01603 212153

What follows is the text from the protocol and reporting agreements agreed by last year's Scrutiny Committee. It is recommended that this approach is continued and the dates noted of the planned meetings for 2017 / 18. A suggested report back timetable is outlined in the main work programme document.

1 Introduction to health overview and scrutiny

1.1 Since the Health and Social Care Act 2012 Norfolk County Council has delegated its powers to Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC). The county council has a statutory duty to run a county-wide Health and Well Being Board, to which the city council send a representative from the cabinet. It has eight county councillors and seven co-opted district council members. The scrutiny committee at Norwich appoints a member representative (plus a substitute).

1.2 The Norfolk County Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee acts as a central point to consider and review the overall links between different parts of the broad health and well-being services and activities across Norfolk. All commissioners and providers of health services, not just NHS organisations, are included in the overview / remit of health scrutiny. It also reduces the risk of organisations needing to duplicate reports or responses across a number of councils. It [defines](#) its own role as:

"The Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee is a statutory Committee which considers all matters relating to the needs, health and health related-services of the population of Norfolk. It scrutinises services that have an impact on the health of Norfolk's citizens and challenges the outcomes of interventions designed to support the health of Norfolk people."

1.3 County and district councils have different service responsibilities, but both have a significant impact on health and wellbeing. For example the county has social care, education and public health roles and districts have planning and housing roles.

1.4 Overall the challenges for health scrutiny can fall between taking a strategic approach and a more local focus. With this comes an importance of understanding of how the county and district councils can complement each other and add value when scrutinizing local health and wellbeing matters.

1.5 Norwich City Council has a scrutiny member representative who sits on the NHOSC plus one substitute member.

2. A protocol for a good working practice between the City Council Scrutiny Committee and the Norfolk County Health Overview Committee

2.1 All NHOSC members have the opportunity to suggest items and the chair and the full committee decides whether or not to put them onto

the forward work programme. NHOSC has the ability to delegate health scrutiny powers to district councils for review of specific local subjects

- 2.2 Following each meeting members are given a brief note of the outcomes and actions from the meeting to enable them to report back to their councils. At the 26 February 2015 meeting of the city council scrutiny committee it was agreed that regular updates from the NHOSC representatives should be reported back to the scrutiny committee.
- 2.3 It is therefore suggested that scrutiny committee agree a protocol for the representative of the council to work to:
- **The representative should make it clear if they are not representing an agreed view of the council or scrutiny committee**
 - **A topic for scrutiny can be placed onto the NHOSC work programme either at a meeting of NHOSC as a member of NHOSC or on behalf of the Norwich scrutiny committee or the council if they have been asked to do so.**
 - **The council's representative on NHOSC may submit relevant reports and recommendations of the scrutiny committee for consideration by NHOSC either if agreed by the chair of the scrutiny committee or by the committee itself or as a result of a request made by the NHOSC chair.**
 - **The council's representative on NHOSC cannot agree on behalf of the Norwich scrutiny committee to carry out a piece of health scrutiny work. It is for the scrutiny committee to decide if it would like to include the matter on its work programme following a report back.**
 - **If the Norwich scrutiny committee wishes to take on an item of the NHOSC work programme, it would need to request this via the representative, through the chair of the NHOSC to seek the appropriate agreement of the county council to delegate health scrutiny powers for that item.**
 - **The council's representative on NHOSC must report back to the scrutiny committee on a regular basis and should liaise with the scrutiny officer on an ongoing basis. Reporting back will be scheduled onto the work programme. The summary of the NHOSC meeting provided by the county council will be attached to the agenda and the representative will give a verbal update and answer questions from the committee.**

The following dates have been agreed for 2017 / 18:

- 20 July 2017
- 7 September 2017
- 26 October 2017
- 7 December 2017
- 11 January 2018
- 22 February 2018
- 5 April 2018

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 6

REPORT for meeting to be held on 13 July 2017

Appointment of representative and substitute for the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny sub panel

- Summary:** To appoint a representative and substitute for the community safety scrutiny panel.
- Conclusions:** To appoint a representative and substitute for the community safety scrutiny panel.
- Recommendation:** To appoint a representative and substitute and that they report back at the earliest next scrutiny committee, subject to meetings being organised.
- Contact Officer:** Beth Clark
Scrutiny liaison officer
bethanyclark@norwich.gov.uk
01603 212153

1. Norwich City Council has a scrutiny member representative who sits on the Norfolk countywide community safety partnership scrutiny sub panel plus one substitute member. The role of the Norfolk countywide community safety partnership scrutiny sub panel is to:
 - Scrutinise the actions, decisions and priorities of the Norfolk Countywide community Safety Crime and Disorder Partnership in respect of crime and disorder on behalf of the county council communities committee
 - Scrutinise the priorities as set out in the annual countywide community safety partnership plan
 - Make any reports or recommendations to the countywide community safety partnership and the county council communities committee.
2. While the scrutiny sub panel has the duty of scrutinising the work of the CCSP, the police and crime panel scrutinises the work of the police and crime commissioner. There is a protocol regarding the relationship of these two panels to encourage and exchange information and to cooperate towards the delivery of their respective responsibilities. The community safety partnership meets once or twice a year at County Hall.

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 7

REPORT for meeting to be held on 13 July 2017

Quarterly Performance Report

- Summary:** This report details the final quarterly performance report of 2016 / 17. Detailed questions can be sent to the appropriate head of service.
- Conclusions:** Performance is broadly on track across the corporate priorities with 4 out of 5 priorities rated as green, and one as amber. Specific indicators show direction of travel and current status as per the appended report.
- Recommendation:**
- (1) To consider if there are any measures within those highlighted in paragraph 3.1 or others within the main report to consider for future analysis
 - (2) To consider how scrutiny committee members would like to scrutinise corporate performance in the future
- Contact Officer:** Adam Clark
Strategy Manager
adamclark@norwich.gov.uk
01603 212273

1 Structure of the report

- 1.1 The quarterly reports to cabinet detail progress toward a number of performance measures agreed by council as part of the Corporate Plan and budget setting process.
- 1.2 Measures are grouped by corporate priority, targets agreed and thresholds set which determines a “RAG” (Red / Amber / Green) status of these measures
- 1.3 Each priority areas is given an overall status based upon the combined relative distance away from target (hence an overall status may be green but some individual measures may be red or amber).

2. Overall performance

- 2.1 Overall performance this quarter shows a similar picture to last quarter with four council priorities green and one amber.
- 2.2 There are some areas where the council is performing well and exceeding its targets. For example, all but one ‘Value for Money services’ indicators are green. Each of the performance measures are provided within the relevant section of the performance report at Appendix A.

3. Possible areas to note

- 3.1 The following measures may be of interest to track into the future given either their current status and / or direction:
 - At the end of quarter 4, the timely processing of benefits measure remains at 100%, maintaining the last two quarter's strong performance.
 - There remains a high level of tenant satisfaction with the housing service, standing at 86% against a target of 77%.
 - 100% of people who responded to surveys from the Money and Budgeting Service agreed that their debt issues had become more manageable.
 - The % of residents feeling safe remained below target at 72.5%, against a target of 77%. Although not always possible to identify causes of increases or decreases in people's feeling of safety, police data show that all categories of crime within Norwich have been rising recently.
 - 93.9% of those surveyed were satisfied with their recent visit to a Norwich park or open space.
 - 325 new jobs have been created or supported via council funded activity during 2016/17.
 - Throughout 2016/17, 336 new businesses were created via local publically funded schemes.
 - In quarter 4, the average number of days taken to re-let council homes was 19 days, not meeting our target of 16 days. Performance was

lowest in January, with the effects of the Christmas closure taking effect, but recovered in later months.

- 453 accident casualties on Norwich roads were recorded in the year to the end of December, a further increase to last quarter. This is higher than the anticipated level of 400.

4. Future Reporting

- 4.1 The committee is asked to consider how it would like to scrutinise corporate performance in the future as part of its work programme. The current arrangement of six-monthly reports across the whole framework can be changed to a more thematic focus or to look in more depth at specific areas of concern.



Safe, clean and
low carbon city

Prosperous and
vibrant city

Fair city

Healthy city with
good housing

Value for money
services

Comments

This quarter completes the 2016-17 performance reporting. As with last quarter, 4 of 5 corporate priorities are on track overall, with just 'safe, clean and low carbon' city showing amber. This means that we are performing well across the vast majority of our services, despite resource challenges; for example, all but one measure under 'value for money services' is green and new jobs and business figures show that the city continues to thrive economically.

At the same time, most of our key indicators that relate to vulnerable residents, such as preventing homelessness, timely processing of benefits and increases in wellbeing due to money advice are also performing well. Of course there are big challenges faced by many of our public sector partners so we will continue to keep an eye out for how those service reductions impact on our residents.

Clearly the recent increase in road accident casualties is something we need to continue to address with partners, as is the reduction in levels of feeling safe in the city. However, reductions in CO2 emissions and satisfaction levels with parks continue to be very positive.

Green is on target, amber between target and cause for concern and red is cause for concern.

For more information please contact the Strategy & Transformation team on ext 2535 or email strategy@norwich.gov.uk

Key to tables (following pages) :

RAG - Red, Amber, Green; **DoT** - Direction of Travel: a green upward arrow signifies an improvement in performance compared with the previous reporting period, a red downward arrow shows a drop in performance and a blue horizontal arrow shows no change. **Page 24 of 44**



Safe, clean and low carbon city

Prosperous and vibrant city

Fair city

Healthy city with good housing

Value for money services

Corporate plan

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
SCL8 % of adults living in the City Council's area who cycle at least once per week	21.5%	25.0%	▲	➡	21.5%	25.0%	▲	04/16
Comments: We have seen an increase from 17.7% in 2010/2011 to 21.5% in 2014/15 meaning that we have risen from 10th to 7th in the national ranking of local authorities on this measure. The percentage of adults cycling for utility purposes at least three times a week has shown an increase from 6.7% in 2012/13 to 12% in 2014/15, raising us from 11th to 5th highest local authority on that measure. We have also seen a significant increase in cycling at the count locations across the city councils area. This information was gathered before the completion of the pink pedalway or the publication of the second edition of the cycle map, which we expect will further boost the figures, bringing us closer to our ambitious target for next year. The extra monitoring infrastructure that is being installed through the cycling ambition programme will allow us to improve the performance measure for the next reporting period.								
SCL02 % of people satisfied with waste collection	70.0%	85.0%	▲	➡	73.4%	85.0%	▲	03/17
Comments: The number of responses is still too low (10) for the results to have any significance. We are looking to add a link to the survey on the new online reporting tool (Jadu), which has just gone live.								
SCL07 Number of accident casualties on Norwich roads	453	400	▲	➡	453	400	▲	03/17
Comments: It is disappointing to see a slight rise in the number of casualties since September 2016 which is being closely monitored. At present there remains an overall downward trend in the number of casualties.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
SCL01 % of streets found clean on inspection	92.0%	94.0%	●	➡	90.9%	94.0%	●	03/17
Comments: In all 306 sites across the city were surveyed in March 2017. With regard to littering three transects were graded C- (Morello Close, Morello Close alleyway and Northfields) and five sites were graded C. The survey revealed that the areas with the highest percentage of detritus were in areas with prevalence for parked cars and other highways. Of the sites surveyed, one was graded at D this was Northfields. Twelve sites were graded at C and seven graded at C- .								
Out of the 24 transects that failed for either detritus or litter, all bar 4 sites have now been cleaned and brought back up to an A grade standard- the remaining four sites are due for cleaning within the next 14 days.								
SCL03 % of people feeling safe	72.5%	77.0%	●	➡	75.0%	77.0%	●	03/17
Comments: The % of people feeling safe remains under target this quarter. Norfolk Police report that crime in Norwich has risen and across all categories. While this increase remains within police expected levels, this will be reflected in people's perceptions of safety. Operation Gravity, the police and partners' response to organised drug related activity in Norfolk, remains active and receives regular coverage in the media. While the publicity highlights Operation Gravity successes, the high profile nature of increased criminal activity will also impact on people's feelings of safety.								
SCL04 Residual household waste per household (Kg)	101.1	99.0	●	➡	407.7	402.0	●	03/17
Comments: N.B the figures reported are for Q3.								
We are working together with the Norfolk Waste Partnership to increase awareness of the costs of waste and to promote the 'Reduce, Re-use, Recycle' agenda.								
We cannot 'buck' the national trend in higher levels of waste but our actions do contribute to alleviating the overall effects.								
Since we last measured this indicator we have seen a seasonal rise in waste levels.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
SCL05 % of food businesses achieving safety compliance	96.0%	90.0%	★	🔴	96.0%	90.0%	★	03/17
Comments: The hygiene standard of food premises in the City remains steady at approximately 96%.								
SCL06 % of residential homes on a 20mph street	39.3%	38.0%	★	🔴	39.3%	38.0%	★	03/17
Comments: The target for the number of households included in a 20mph area has been exceeded. Work continues to include yet more streets within a 20mph area								
SCL09 CO2 emissions for the local area	13.5%	2.4%	★	🟢	13.5%	2.4%	★	04/16
Comments:								
SCL10 CO2 emissions from local authority operations	8.7%	2.2%	★	🟢	8.7%	2.2%	★	04/16
Comments: Using the 2015 DEFRA conversion factors, Norwich City Council has made an additional 8.7% reduction in its carbon emissions taking the total reduction to 39.5% saving against its target of 40% by 2019.								
SCL11 % of people satisfied with parks & open spaces (Q)	93.9%	75.0%	★	🟢	92.1%	75.0%	★	03/17
Comments: We are continually working collaboratively with joint ventures to look at improvements and efficiencies. We are also working with and developing relationship with Friends groups to improve what is delivered.								
SCL12 Percentage of people satisfied with their local environment	86.2%	78.0%	★	🟢	85.3%	78.0%	★	03/17
Comments: People's satisfaction with the local environment continues to be above target and has increased for the third quarter in a row which is very positive.								



Safe, clean and low carbon city

Prosperous and vibrant city

Fair city

Healthy city with good housing

Value for money services

Corporate plan

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
PVC2 Delivery of the council's capital programme	70%	80%	●	↓	70%	80%	●	03/17
Comments: 18 green, 8 amber. In 6 cases this is due to overspend, in one case this is due to delayed completion of project, and in the other case due to on-going contractual dispute with a supplier over the final cost of works.								

PVC7 Delivery of the heritage investment strategy action plan	68%	75%	●	↑	68%	75%	●	03/17
Comments: We continue to make progress with the implementation of the Heritage Investment Strategy. The officer implementation group is meeting more regularly (policy 1), historic building training for Norfolk Museums Service staff has been provided by NPS and is being organised for NPS staff and council managers (policy 2, 5 and 6), asset registers held by NPS will be updated with the stewardship status of certain buildings (policy 4), community infrastructure levy funding is almost secure for Castle Gardens (project 1), a feasibility study has been commissioned for the Halls (policy 5), Mile Cross Gardens landscape project is progressing well (project 8) and the Waterloo Park Pavilion will soon be occupied by Britannia Enterprises. Funding for condition surveys and less urgent repairs remains tight.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
PVC1 Number of new jobs created/ supported by council funded activity	325	300	★	↓	325	300	★	03/17
Comments: The two teams in the council which, in the main, contributed to this target are Economic Development and Planning through advice and/or, relationship management. The target is 300 so this has been achieved. The local economy has performed well in the past year unemployment has fallen and employment has increased.								

PVC3 Amount of funding secured by the council for regeneration activity (£ thousands)	4,166	250	★	→	4,166	250	★	03/17
Comments: £4.166M in total for 2016/7. Funding is from DfT through the Cycle City Ambition Grant. This funding has already been received. There is the Local Growth Funding allocated to the Westgate/Golden Ball Street project and other projects in the Transport for Norwich programme. The funds have been allocated to county but are funding regeneration activity within the city's boundary but have not been included in the total.								

PVC4 Number of new business start ups	336	100	★	↑	336	100	★	03/17
Comments: 336 new businesses have started through local publicly funded schemes delivered by both the New Anglia Growth hub and NWES.								

PVC5 Provision of free wi-fi in City Centre	100%	100%	★	→	100%	100%	★	03/17
Comments:								

PVC6 Planning service quality measure	91%	83%	★	↑	91%	83%	★	03/17
Comments: We aim to be able to report on the planning service quality measure during 2017-18 once the system to monitor planning service quality developed by PAS (Planning Advisory Service) has been confirmed as still supported and is configured for our use. The result reported here is a proxy using the planning performance measures reported to central government i.e. speed of processing of Major, Minor and Other applications. It is hoped that outputs later in 2017-18 will appear in a different format and will include measurements of speed, as part of a broader measure. However, this will be dependent on the receipt of information which is outside the council's full control as information will be processed via PAS and the successful operation of the new quality measures.								

PVC8 % of people satisfied with leisure and cultural facilities	95.4%	90.0%	★	↑	95.4%	90.0%	★	03/17
Comments: Riverside Leisure Centre has maintained "Quest Excellent", the UK quality scheme award for sport and leisure and the Norman Centre was awarded UK Active Code of practice accreditation.								

PVC9 Number of visitors to the City	11,405,800	11,200,000	★	↓	11,405,800	11,200,000	★	04/16
Comments: Figure includes day trip visitors as well as staying visitors. Norwich continues to do well as a tourist destination as brand and identity awareness rise due to a combination of successful marketing campaigns and PR via VisitNorwich and Visit Norfolk over the last few years. The number of staying visitors is decreasing but this could be attributed to the relatively low numbers of accommodation rooms within the city council area, and the high occupancy levels attributable to business stays in the city (not counted in tourism figures).								



Safe, clean and low carbon city

Prosperous and vibrant city

Fair city

Healthy city with good housing

Value for money services

Corporate plan

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
FAC6 % increase in contractors, providers and partner organisations paying a living wage	-9.5%	12.0%	▲	➡	-9.5%	12.0%	▲	03/17
Comments: We are able to confirm that all contractors are Living Wage compliant and two Commissioning partners are working towards paying 100% of their employees the Living Wage. The emphasis of the Council's work in this area is now shifting to that of encouraging other employers in the City to become Living Wage accredited employers by working with Community Leaders across the City and wider environs. The current indicator is calculated using absolute numbers of suppliers, but as the number of suppliers has decreased, this has led to an decrease in the number paying a living wage. The calculation method for next year has been amended.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
FAC1 Delivery of the reducing inequalities action plan	93%	100%	●	➡	93%	100%	●	03/17
Comments: The reducing inequalities action plan themes around social value, locality working and addressing financial exclusion have been largely delivered, with some slippage in other areas due to resource, hence an amber status. However, the collaborative approach to the programme, has realised additional opportunities during the year, such as our successful work around pupil premium take-up in Lakenham.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
FAC2 % of people saying debt issues had become manageable following face to face advice	100.0%	86.0%	★	➡	100.0%	86.0%	★	03/17
Comments: The statistics show clearly that there has been a 100% increase in people reporting an improvement in their wellbeing after receiving advice and assistance with managing their problem debts. Money Advise and Budgeting Service (MABS) manner of working is close and intensive work with individuals which, as they gather confidence over time can be reduced. By its nature it can therefore show a low number of clients but very successful.								
This will be the last time we will be using this exact measure as MABS are the only group we are specifically funding to deal with debt agencies and we are therefore extending this to increase the base which we can measure.								
FAC3 Delivery of the digital inclusion action plan	65%	60%	★	➡	65%	60%	★	03/17
Comments: Performance is on target. We have launched new Digital Hubs to join our existing network and have promoted them on our website and through our Citizen and TLC magazines. Volunteer recruitment is strong and consistent, with new volunteers being trained regularly. Volunteers are placed in the community supporting a wide range of learners with individual needs. We have worked with our colleagues in Sheltered Housing to make more communal rooms connected, and ensure that regular support is available for tenants and people living locally. This offer will be developed throughout the year. We are beginning to work with more of our staff to promote the sharing of digital knowledge and skills in the community through a roll-out of digital skills coaching training, which will be delivered throughout 2017/18. And we participated in a successful Jobs and Skills Fair in the city through coordinating a Digital Zone where we supported people to job search and apply online.								
FAC4 Timely processing of benefits	100.0%	100.0%	★	➡	100.0%	100.0%	★	03/17
Comments: Claimants still face pressures from welfare reforms and other economic factors and processing housing benefit within target helps to support those claimants. Performance has been strong this year processing new claims and changes in a timely manner as well as ensuring discretionary housing payments are well managed and support provided to those in need. Appeals are also turned around promptly to ensure there is certainty provided at the earliest opportunity.								
FAC5 No of private sector homes where council activity improved energy efficiency (YTD)	434	150	★	➡	434	150	★	03/17
Comments: In quarter 4, private households were helped with 111 energy efficiency measures for their homes. This constituted completed cavity wall insulation, loft insulation, energy performance certificates and boiler repairs. In addition to this we gave out 100 winter wellbeing packs to vulnerable customers which contained small insulation measures such as draught proofing tape and radiator foil								



	Safe, clean and low carbon city	Prosperous and vibrant city	Fair city	Healthy city with good housing	Value for money services	Corporate plan
--	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------	--------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------

Measure	Actual	Target	▲ RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
HCH4 Number of new affordable homes developed on council land or purchased from developers	38	180	▲	➡	38	180	▲	03/17
Comments: We are on our way to meeting the five year target but delivery is not linear. Work has begun on 105 new dwellings at Goldsmith Street and will commence soon on 18 at Threescore. 39 further units are planned for Threescore subject to a decision by Norwich Regeneration Ltd on how it wishes to proceed with later phases. 10 new units have just been accepted at Hansard Close and a further 12 units are being purchased on a site in Northumberland Street. The programme is therefore well on its way to achieving the cumulative target.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
HCH1 Delivery of the Healthy Norwich action plan	91%	100%	●	➡	91%	100%	●	03/17
Comments: We have maintained our commitment to the Healthy Norwich partnership with the Clinical Commissioning Group and county council partners. This has resulted in successful delivery of projects to tackle smoking, unhealthy lifestyles and fuel poverty, with a focus on health inequalities. Although we have not delivered everything in the year's action plan, other additional initiatives (such as our 'Social Prescribing' pilot) have arisen during the course of the year, which support the wider agenda.								
HCH2 Relet times for council housing	19	16	●	➡	16	16	★	03/17
Comments: 211 homes were let in the fourth quarter, taking the total number of relets to 1086 for the year 2016-17. The average relet time for the quarter was just over 18 days for both general needs and sheltered. The lowest performance was in January, with the Christmas closure being a factor, followed by performance recovering in February and being back on target in March. The average relet time for the year as a whole is 16 days, meaning that target has been achieved.								
HCH6 % of people who feel that the work of the HIA has enabled them to maintain independent living	88	90	●	➡	88	90	●	03/17
Comments: Slightly below the target of 90% but not of concern.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
HCH03 No of empty homes brought back into use	31	20	★	➡	31	20	★	03/17
Comments: Annual target exceeded								
HCH5 Preventing homelessness	60.3%	55.0%	★	➡	62.2%	55.0%	★	03/17
Comments: While external factors such as cuts to other services are undoubtedly creating pressure on our housing options team, our prevention-focused approach continues to meet and, in this instance, exceed target. Future challenges such as the introduction of Universal Credit, the Homelessness Reduction Bill and cuts to support services will cause further pressure on our limited resources in the near future and in this environment, such high performance may be difficult to maintain.								
HCH7 % of council properties meeting Norwich standard	97.7%	97.0%	★	➡	97.7%	97.0%	★	03/17
Comments: Since the start of the Joint Venture, NPS Norwich and its contractors have installed 6979 new kitchens, 5037 new bathrooms, 4569 new heating systems, and rewired 2212 homes. We have also installed new uPVC doors at nearly 9000 properties. At the end of the year, 97.7% of the Council's housing stock met the Norwich Standard, ahead of the target set back in 2015. Work, of course, continues and the remaining few elements are already programmed for the coming financial years.								
HCH8 % of tenants satisfied with the housing service	86%	77%	★	➡	86%	77%	★	03/17
Comments: 939 housing tenants have responded in the last 12 months to this quarterly local area survey run by customer contact. After a slight decrease in satisfaction in Q2 of 2016-17, there have been two quarters of very strong performance, with satisfaction being well in excess of 87%. Rolling year-to-date figures also show a trend of improvement. This is a very pleasing and encouraging result.								
HCH9 No of private sector homes made safe	105	100	★	➡	105	100	★	03/17
Comments: Annual target exceeded.								



Safe, clean and low carbon city

Prosperous and vibrant city

Fair city

Healthy city with good housing

Value for money services

Corporate plan

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
VFM4 Avoidable contact levels	29.0%	15.0%	▲	➡	30.2%	15.0%	▲	03/17
Comments: We are continuing work with service areas to monitor and use the data captured in this measure and have seen an improvement in the levels of avoidable contact for this quarter. This quarter represents the best for the year which is encouraging for the future. The target for next year has been increased to be more realistic and help support the work being done to improve the quarterly outturn. Other work being developed around customer access and contact channels will ensure that the performance target set is appropriate and realistic.								

Measure	Actual	Target	RAG Status	DoT	Actual YTD	Target YTD	RAG YTD	Date Measured
VFM1 % of residents satisfied with the service they received from the council	99.8%	93.0%	★	➡	99.4%	93.0%	★	03/17
Comments: The current methodology continues to deliver extremely high levels of satisfaction with improvement again in the latest quarter. In order to drive continuous improvement and identify areas for transformation and savings it has been agreed that we will change the methodology of this measure for the coming year starting in Q1 17/18.								
VFM2 Council achieves savings targets	2,300,...	2,300,...	★	➡	2,300,...	2,300,...	★	03/17
Comments: We successfully delivered a package of general fund savings of £2.3 million for 2016/17 achieving the target								
VFM3 % of council partners satisfied with the opportunities to engage with the council	84.0%	80.0%	★	➡	84.0%	80.0%	★	03/17
Comments: We have continued to actively engage with a range of partners across all sectors in the city and are again above target on this annual measure of partnership satisfaction. The list of partners we invite to take part in the survey is reviewed each year to ensure that it reflects those we have engaged with in the previous 12 months								
VFM5 Channel shift measure	11.12%	10.00%	★	➡	14.05%	8.00%	★	03/17
Comments: Work developing online self-serve forms and methods of contact have continued this quarter and will see significant promotion in 17/18 in order to meet the stretched targets that have been set.								
VFM6 % of income owed to the council collected	97.4%	95.0%	★	➡	97.4%	95.0%	★	03/17
Comments: Ensuring timely collection of income due to the council is vital to support the financial pressure the council faces. Performance in this area has been good ensuring that income owed to the council is collected when it is due.								
VFM7 % of income generated by the council compared to expenditure	49.6%	44.2%	★	➡	49.6%	44.2%	★	03/17
Comments: The quarter 4 outturn general fund income for 2016/17 financial year is forecast to equate to 49.6% of expenditure which is above the target of 44.2%. These are provisional figures pending the finalisation of the accounts in June.								
VFM8 % of customers satisfied with the opportunities to engage with the council	63%	52%	★	➡	59%	52%	★	03/17
Comments: People's satisfaction with the opportunities to engage with the council continues to be above target and has increased for the third quarter in a row which is very positive.								
VFM9 Delivery of local democracy engagement plan	2	2	★	➡	2	2	★	03/17
Comments: Local democracy is vital to the democratic process. Local democracy week is a key feature in this indicator and giving local people the opportunity to find out more about the democratic process, councillors and the council. The plan for this was successfully delivered.								

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 8

REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 13 July 2017

Setting of the scrutiny committee work programme for 2017/18

Summary:

The purpose of the report is to assist committee members in setting the work programme for 2017/18. A series of potential items have been listed in this report, which have been raised by the committee throughout the last year.

Conclusions:

Along with this report, the accompanying annual standing items taken to the scrutiny committee (appendix A) and items suggested by members for consideration for the work programme (appendix B), the committee will be able to select future items that assist with the delivery of the council's priorities.

It is proposed that any discussion is as a whole committee using the TOPIC criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.

Recommendation:

To consider the options and agree a realistic and deliverable scrutiny committee work programme for 2017/18. The programme is a standing item at each committee meeting and can be adjusted as necessary

Contact Officers:

Beth Clark – Scrutiny liaison officer
Telephone (01603) 212153
Email bethanyclark@norwich.gov.uk

1. Developing a work programme for the scrutiny committee

- 1.1 When the scrutiny committee considers which items to include on its work programme, it is useful to do so in the context of what the focus is for the council over the coming year and to look at how activity aligns to the council's corporate plan.
- 1.2 This is so that the scrutiny committee will be able to consider where and how it can add value to the work being carried out towards achievement of the council's priorities and ensure that resources are being focussed effectively.
- 1.3 The scrutiny committee has previously adopted the TOPIC flow chart as an aid to selection of scrutiny topics for its work programme. This is attached to the agenda for reference and members are encouraged to pay regard to this in ensuring that any topic that makes it onto the work programme has an agreed scope and may benefit from the scrutiny process.

2. Recurring items

- 2.1 There are certain areas of work identified for the scrutiny committee that are of a recurring nature. Presently, these are pre-scrutiny of the council's draft policy framework (corporate plan) and budget and the performance monitoring reports, as well as a yearly update on the environmental strategy. The scrutiny committee has also requested that it receives the draft equality information report on an annual basis. This latter item is usually in draft for the December meeting.
- 2.2 Last year, members requested that they receive a periodic update from the representative sitting on the Norfolk County Health and Overview Committee. The proposed dates after this meeting for NHOSC along with suggested scrutiny report dates are:
 - 20 July 2017 (21 September 2017)
 - 7 September 2017 (21 September 2017)
 - 26 October 2017 (23 November 2017)
 - 7 December 2017 (14 December 2017)
 - 11 January 2018 (25 January 2018)
 - 22 February 2018 (22 February 2018)
 - 5 April 2018 (TBC June 2018)
- 2.3 Scrutiny committee may wish to keep some space free to be able to move items on and off the work programme as required

3. Scope for scheduling items to the work programme

- 3.1 Although sometimes not possible to achieve, it was previously agreed that the committee should agree as few as possible substantive topics per meeting. The main reason for this is to ensure that there is enough time for the committee to effectively consider the issues and has a fair chance of reaching sound, evidence based outcomes. Ideally, one main item per meeting would be the aim.
- 3.2 Although setting the future work of the committee for up to 22 March 2018, members will have the opportunity on a monthly basis to revise the programme if and when required or due to changing events. This is done via the work programme standing item on the scrutiny committee agendas.
- 3.3 Along with this report, the accompanying annual standing items taken to the scrutiny committee (appendix A) and items suggested by members for consideration for the work programme (appendix B), the committee will be able to select future items that assist with the delivery of the council's priorities.
- 3.4 In addition to this, at the June meeting, members suggested they wanted to establish a task and finish group looking at a city access charter.
- 3.5 It is proposed that any discussion is as a whole committee using the TOPIC criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.

Standing Scrutiny Committee Items

Committee	Day of meeting	Time	2017								2018				
			May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
Scrutiny	Thu	16:30	25	22	13	-	21	19	23	14	25	22	22	-	-

May – *meeting cancelled*

June – *City accessibility meeting*

July – Work programme setting, Quarterly performance review

August – *no meeting*

September – Pre scrutiny of proposed budget consultation (proposed officer suggestion)

October –

November –

December – Corporate plan and performance framework, Equality information report

January – Pre scrutiny of the proposed budget, MTFS and Transformation Programme (before Feb cabinet), Environmental Strategy (yearly update)

February –

March – Annual review of the scrutiny committee

Items for consideration for scrutiny committee work programme 2017-18

1. **Health inequality in Norwich**

A review of the health policies which currently exist for Norwich, such as the Healthy Norwich Action Plan and also a county-wide comparison by looking at the Public Health Strategy for Norfolk, and identify any issues to consider and note successes and progress reported.

2. **Access to justice**

To understand the wide range of issues affecting those seeking legal aid. This includes the impact of legal aid cuts, changes to tribunal fees, debt, and the impact of cuts to probation / prisons / courts. The city council commissions' advice services which provide elements of legal advice and how these work in Norwich.

3. **The private rented sector**

To consider how this has grown since 2001 and the implications for both private renters, low income people / housing benefit cuts / the profits landlords are making / the lack of regulation from national government / the way in which former council properties are moving from the public sector to becoming privately rented accommodation (particularly around UEA). The impact of this upon the city economy.

4. **The co-operative agenda in local government**

A report detailing the current work/case studies of co-operatives throughout the country and how/what city council may be able to implement; what resources are already in place which could be utilised; what cooperatives currently exist and operate in the district area. To understand how the co-operative and social enterprise sector could contribute to council strategy.

5. **Review of council's enforcement service**

'Enforcement' covers a wide range of areas including parking, flytipping, food safety, and planning and licensing conditions. Scrutiny of the enforcement service would enable members to consider the issue as a whole and whether the proposed changes to the service are the most effective way to streamline it. Members will bring a different perspective and may be able to offer new suggestions. This will help to ensure that the council's performance in this area remains as good as possible.

6. **Review of parks and play areas**

To support the scoping of a review of the council's provision of parks and play areas and the facilities therein. Timescales for this are unclear currently, but once review is complete the committee could also seek to form recommendations based on this.

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
26 May 2016	Setting of the Scrutiny Committee Work Programme	Phil Shreeve	Members asked for information about the publication of Traffic Regulation Orders	The service is looking at getting TROs online as soon as resource enables it to happen.
30 June 2016	Quarterly performance report	Phil Shreeve	With reference to measure PVC4 (number of new business start-ups) members requested further information, in particular what would happen if a new business were to close?	<p>The Economic development officer responded –‘The figure was gross, it measures new businesses which have started with support from local business support agencies. It is not a measure of active businesses which is a net figure i.e .new businesses + existing businesses – business closures. This measure is available from official statistics but is subject to a 2 year time lag which is why it is not used as a performance measure, it is not timely enough.</p> <p>The measure does not include business closures’</p>
30 June 2016	Update on the Norwich Market Consultation	Adrian Akester	<p>The scrutiny committee to explore the possibility of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. for a bus route to take in the market place via Saint Peters Street; and, 2. to improve sign posting from existing bus stops to the market (particularly on Castle Meadow) 	<p>The head of city development responded, ‘1) is a matter for the county council as they are the passenger transport authority. From the knowledge I do have it is very unlikely to be viable and also a single bus route is only going to be of use for a small proportion of the population.</p> <p>As Scrutiny Committee notes the nearest</p>

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
	Update on the Norwich Market Consultation			main bus stops are at Castle Meadow. The market is already signed from Castle Meadow (at the junction with Davey Place). To provide more signs as requested under 2) would be costly, however there is no budget for this, nor for future maintenance. Such provision could only therefore be justified based on well researched marketing advice of which I am unaware. Additional signs would also add to street clutter.
22 September 2016	Switch and Save	Adam Clark	For members to better understand the Switch and Save process	It was agreed that the best way to implement this would be for the scrutiny committee to refer to documents available on the Norwich City council website
24 November 2016	Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) update	Cllr James Wright	RESOLVED that the chair would write to: a) The GNGB to request as a part of their meetings the inclusion of public questions and the publication of papers in advance of any meeting; and, b) The NALEP to request as a part of their meetings the inclusion of public questions and the publication of papers in advance of any meeting and to encourage trade union representation as a part of the group.	Ongoing

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
	Education and Social Mobility	Cabinet member for fairness and equality, Vaughan Thomas	Ask the cabinet member for fairness and equality to complete the government consultation entitled 'Schools that work for everyone';	Due to time constraints, the cabinet member was unable to complete the consultation before the deadline of 12 December 2016.
24 November 2016	Education and social mobility	Cllr James Wright	Recommend to cabinet the establishment of a cooperative academy chain	Ongoing
		Cllr James Wright	Recommend to Norfolk County Council children's services that they encourage academies to engage more fully with the work of the Early Help Hub	Ongoing
		Cllr James Wright	The chair to write to the new head of children's services at Norfolk County Council, welcoming them to the role and asking that – given the state of educational outcomes in the city – what work was being planned around: i) Vulnerable families; and, ii) Lack of alternative provision	Ongoing
15 December 2016	Equality Information Report	Adam Clark	a) Consider if the current proposed timescale for producing and publishing the equality report is the most suitable or time appropriate. b) Change the final sentence of the equality information to report to refer to	These recommendations were considered by cabinet on 18 January 2017. a) Given the timetable for the publication of underlying data, the existing schedule of publishing the report by the end of January remains optimal.

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
			the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011, rather than the Equality act (2010)	b) Changes implemented on Equality Information Report on council website.
	Neighbourhood model and the role of the ward councillor	Bob Cronk	A workshop on the Neighbourhood model to answer the questions: How are councillors currently engaged and supporting local community activity? - What do members think is the role of the ward councillor in the enabling programme? - What support or training do members need to help communities do more for themselves?	This workshop took place on 10 January 2017
26 January 2017	Pre scrutiny of the proposed budget	Justine Hartley	RESOLVED to: 1) ask the strategy manager to: a) to review the integrated impact assessments for the budget papers prior to the report being taken to cabinet, in consultation with the chief finance officer, b) circulate to all members, information on the purpose of impact assessment for committee reports 2) ask the chief finance officer to: a) circulate information to scrutiny committee members on the decrease in community safety and environment b) review the communication strategy	A response to these points was circulated to all members by the scrutiny liaison officer.

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
26 January 2017	Pre scrutiny of the proposed budget		and consultation timing around the budget papers to council to ensure the citizens of Norwich can engage effectively in the process c) consider using the summer edition of Citizen magazine to publish an accessible summary of the 2017 – 18 budget 3) note the importance of parks and facilities in Norwich	
	Environmental Strategy – Yearly update on the progress statement	Richard Willson	RESOLVED to: 1) note the Environmental Strategy 2015 – 2018 progress update, 2) ask the environmental strategy manager to: a) consider linking the priorities in the Environmental Strategy and the Environmental Statement to allow for easy cross referencing of the documents; and b) send a link to scrutiny committee members to the national dataset for carbon emissions 3) ask the director of regeneration and development to bring the draft environmental strategy 2018 – 2021 to the scrutiny committee at an appropriate time; and	A response to these points was circulated to all members by the scrutiny liaison officer.

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
	Environmental Strategy – Yearly update on the progress statement		4) to consider using a member briefing session for a workshop on the draft environmental strategy 2018 – 2021 to allow all councillor input.	
23 February 2017	Causes of food poverty in Norwich	Bethany Clark, Adam Clark and Cllr Kevin Maguire	To ask all members of the scrutiny committee to send their initial thoughts on the main drivers of food poverty to the scrutiny liaison officer.	Members emailed suggestions and these have been collated in the food poverty report for the 23 March 2017 scrutiny committee agenda
6 April 2017	Food poverty	Adam Clark and Cllr Kevin Maguire	RESOLVED to ask cabinet to consider;- 1) trying to access charitable trust funding to resource projects such as social supermarkets 2) developing a food poverty strategy to act as an umbrella document for existing actions 3) increasing awareness and availability of financial advice and early intervention 4) developing community led food literacy projects 5) increasing awareness of the Go4less cards which entitle residents to reduced allotment fees; and 6) linking older and socially isolated people with good food literacy skills with younger generations in need of such skills	These recommendations are currently on the cabinet's forward agenda.

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
6 April 2017 (exempt item)	*Portfolio Disposal Transition Strategy	Andy Watt and Justine Hartley	RESOLVED to 1) note the asset and investment strategy; and 2) to ask cabinet to consider instead of increasing the delegated authority spending limit for portfolio acquisitions, cabinet instead considers the implementation of a 'fast-track' recorded procedure for purchases retaining wider cabinet member involvement.	This recommendation was taken to 12 April cabinet and the decision was made: To delegate authority to the director of regeneration and development, in consultation with the chief finance officer and the equivalent number of a quorum of cabinet members, including the cabinet member for resources and business liaison, to invest in income generating assets up to the limit in value described in this report as budgeted for in the council's capital programme.
22 June 2017	City accessibility	Bruce Bentley	(1) Ask Norfolk County Council's Environment, Development and Transport committee to review the same evidence presented to this meeting to inform their work going forward; particularly in relation to their work with bus stops and bus companies (2) Improve stakeholder representation earlier in the design process of new transport schemes, potentially with a champion to sit on relevant committees or a stakeholder panel to be established (3) Ask relevant officers to ensure that any new signage be evaluated in terms of accessibility (4) Ask the Norwich Highways Agency Committee to consider formally	Ongoing

The scrutiny committee: work and outcomes tracker 2016 – 2017

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER/LEAD MEMBER	SCRUTINY REQUEST	OUTCOMES OR CURRENT POSITION
			<p>pausing the use of shared space schemes</p> <p>(5) Ensure the A Boards policy is easily accessible on the Norwich City Council website</p> <p>(6) Extend consultations to groups not represented at the scrutiny meeting, especially those with hidden disabilities</p> <p>(7) To ask cabinet to consider ways to more robustly enforce the engine switch off policy for buses within Norwich</p> <p>(8) Consider ways to increase awareness of the telephone number to report misuse of blue badge parking</p> <p>(9) Ask the chair of the licensing committee to consider receiving a report on the sufficient supply of wheelchair accessible private hire vehicles</p> <p>(10) Ask relevant officers to approach the Business Improvement District(BID) to explore ways of improving city center retail access for those with mobility issues, such as more drop off points and a mini bus 'hopper' service</p> <p>(11) To consider the formation of a task and finish group at the work programme setting meeting of the scrutiny committee to progress the idea of a city accessibility street charter.</p>	

