



AGENDA

NOTE: In the case of non-members, this agenda is for information only

- Committee** - **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION**
- Date & Time** - **Thursday, 1st September, 2011 at 2.00 pm**
- Venue** - **Norfolk Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham**

Members of the Committee requiring further information, or with specific questions, are asked to raise these with the appropriate officer at least two working days before the meeting. If the information requested is available, this will be provided, and reported to Committee.

Members of the OSC

Mr R R Richmond	Mrs D.K.R. Irving
Mr J.P. Cowen (Chairman)	Mr A.P. Joel
Mr A.J. Byrne	Mr R.G. Kybird
Mr C G Carter	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr R.F. Goreham (Vice-Chairman)	Mr B. Rose

Substitute Members

Mrs S Armes
Mr S.G. Bambridge
Cllr C.R. Bowes

**PERSONS ATTENDING THE MEETING ARE
REQUESTED TO TURN OFF MOBILE
TELEPHONES**

Member Services
Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke,
Dereham Norfolk, NR19 1EE

Date: Tuesday, 23 August 2011

PROTOCOL

Working Style of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission (OSC) and Other Scrutiny Bodies

This document sets out the roles of Members and Officers, and the general principles to be adopted by the OSC and other scrutiny bodies such as Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups.

Member Leadership

Members of the OSC will take the lead in selecting topics for overview and scrutiny and will recognise that best practice identifies scrutiny as a non-executive Member-led activity. The OSC will expect Cabinet members to take prime responsibility for answering their questions about topics which chiefly relate to the Council's activities.

A Constructive Atmosphere

Meetings of the OSC will be constructive and not judgmental. The Commission recognises and accepts that effective scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence should be given due respect and not made to feel under attack.

Independence

Members of the OSC/task and finish groups will not be subject to whipping arrangements by the party groups.

Respect and Trust

Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Consensus

Members of the OSC/task and finish groups will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed targeted recommendations. There will be recognition that the OSC has a primary duty to scrutinise on behalf of the community.

Openness and Transparency

The OSC's business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. The minutes of the Commission's meetings will explain the discussion and debate so that they can be understood by an outside reader.

Impartial and Independent Officer Advice

Officers who advise and support scrutiny will give impartial and independent advice, as officers support all members of the Council.

Regular Review

There will be regular reviews of how the scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working effectively.

Programming and Planning

It is the responsibility of the OSC and the wider non-executive to determine its work programme and to allocate specific reviews either through a dedicated task and finish group or to undertake a review itself. Before each topic/review is commenced, the O&SC will agree the scope of the exercise, what information they will need initially, and which members, officers and external witnesses they wish to see.

Managing Time

The OSC will aim to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.

Member/Officer Roles

Executive members will regularly be called to account for the decisions they have made and to explain progress in key areas of their portfolio – and in the case of the Council Leader – the Council as a whole. Members will be expected to produce and present a brief written account of their executive activities and will then be questioned by members of the OSC for a period no longer than 20 minutes.

Co-optees

“Expert witnesses” may be co-opted onto scrutiny task and finish groups to provide technical assistance to the review. Co-optees possess no voting rights.

Substitutes

Substitute members will be so listed on the agenda papers of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission. It is a member responsibility to alert a substitute in the event that she/he cannot attend a meeting.

PART A - ITEMS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>
1. <u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2011.	1 - 9
2. <u>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES</u> To receive apologies for absence and to note substitute Members in attendance.	
3. <u>URGENT BUSINESS</u> To note whether the Chairman proposes to accept any item as urgent business pursuant to Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4. <u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</u> Members are asked at this stage to declare any interests that they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. The Members' Code of Conduct requires that declarations include the nature of the interest and whether it is a person or prejudicial interest.	
5. <u>NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING</u> To note the names of any non-members or public speakers wishing to address the meeting.	
6. <u>EXECUTIVE MEMBER PORTFOLIO UPDATE</u> Mr M Kiddle-Morris, Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development, has been invited to attend the meeting to update Members on key ongoing issues and policies within his portfolio and to answer any questions.	
7. <u>REVIEW OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK</u> Annual review of the LDF with specific attention to the implications of the Localism Bill and any advice and evidence on the Stone Curlew habitat debate.	
8. <u>OPEN PUBLIC SERVICES WHITE PAPER CONSULTATION</u> Report of the Deputy Chief Executive.	10 - 14
9. <u>DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING</u> To receive an update from the Emergency Planning Officer.	
a) <u>The Bunker</u> Report of the Director of Commissioning.	15 - 24

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>
10. <u>TASK AND FINISH GROUPS (STANDING ITEM)</u>	
Nothing to report.	
11. <u>SCRUTINY CALL-INS (STANDING ITEM)</u>	
To note whether any decisions have been called-in for scrutiny.	
12. <u>COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (STANDING ITEM)</u>	
To consider any references.	
13. <u>WORK PROGRAMME</u>	25 - 28
(a) A copy of the Commission's work programme is attached. The Commission is asked to agree any additions, deletions or amendments to the programme as appropriate.	
(b) <u>Member Issues</u> : In accordance with the Commission's protocol for member leadership, which states that members of the Commission will take the lead in selecting topics for overview and scrutiny and in the questioning of witnesses, members are invited to put forward items for selection for future review.	
14. <u>NEXT MEETING</u>	
To note the arrangements for the next meeting to be held on 6 October 2011.	

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION

**Held on Thursday, 14 July 2011 at 2.00 pm in the
The Gallery Bar, Watton Sports Centre, Dereham Road, Watton IP25 6EZ**

PRESENT

Mr J.P. Cowen (Chairman)	Mr A.P. Joel
Mr A.J. Byrne	Mr R.G. Kybird
Mr C G Carter	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr R.F. Goreham (Vice-Chairman)	Mr B. Rose
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mr R R Richmond

Also Present

Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr W R J Richmond	

In Attendance

Terry Huggins	- Chief Executive
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
Rory Ringer	- Democratic Services Team Leader
Robert Walker	- Assistant Director of Commissioning

Action By

43/11 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

44/11 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

None.

45/11 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 3)

None.

46/11 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 4)

During discussion of Agenda Item 9 (Parking Task & Finish Group) Mr Byrne declared a personal interest with regard to charging for parking, as a member of the Norfolk Police Authority, Fire & Rescue Service Regional Management Board.

47/11 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Mr W Smith was in attendance for Agenda Item 6 only. Mr G Bambridge and Mr W Richmond were also in attendance.

48/11 EXECUTIVE MEMBER PORTFOLIO UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Mr W Smith explained that Portfolios had changed since the election

Action By

and he now had responsibility for the Customer Contact Centre and Human Resources as well as ICT and ARP. He then gave an update on each area.

ICT

ICT had been in-sourced creating savings of about £317,000.

The ICT Manager had left the authority and been temporarily replaced by two interim managers. Their fees were being shared by South Holland and the ARP was also making a contribution. They had been asked to review the ICT service and put forward options. Their research indicated that the best option was to join with other partners. Potential future savings of around £300,000 had been identified.

The first priority was to maximise savings for the Council. All options for ICT would be considered and these included outsourcing, joining with Compass Point, Norfolk County Council or ARP. Mr Smith was keen to develop ICT in partnership with the ARP to provide capacity and resilience and to be able to offer the 'full package' to customers.

Mr Rogers asked if the likely savings would off-set the effects of the £1.2million shortfall and Mr Smith confirmed that they would and that if the favoured option, of joining with the ARP, was chosen savings could be in excess of £600,000. The Chief Executive advised that that figure would not be reached within the next financial year.

Mr Smith then asked Mr Bambridge to update Members on the Members' IT roll-out.

Mr Bambridge explained that he had been made E-Champion in May and had concentrated on the roll-out which had gone reasonably well with a few hiccups. Members were asked to let him have their comments for a report he was writing about the process, which would be presented to the Joint Audit & Scrutiny Panel in October.

Three Members were still experiencing problems with the new equipment, mainly due to line quality, and BT was working to rectify that. One Member was using his Norfolk County Council kit and one Member had no IT equipment. Four Members had yet to make an appointment to have their equipment delivered. It was hoped that all Members (with the exception of the one who did not use IT) would be connected a week before the deadline date of 29 July 2011. A series of training sessions were being organised which it was hoped would be mandatory, as there were new elements of the equipment that Members needed to be aware of.

The Helpline was being used to good effect. Members were asked to emphasise the importance of using the system to all Members as a few people were trying to by-pass the system which caused enormous problems. He had not received any complaints from those Members that were using the helpdesk and he asked to be informed of any problems. The service agreement required a two hour response and that was one of the things that would be reviewed at the Joint Audit & Scrutiny Panel meeting in October.

Mrs Irving said that the IT service was vastly improved now that it was in-house. She asked if the new e-mail addresses for Senior Managers

had been added to the Outlook address book. The Chief Executive advised that the move over to the new e-mail addresses was in transition. Once complete the address book would be updated.

Mr Gilbert agreed that the Helpline was excellent. However, he asked if a free text field could be added to the drop-down menu as it wasn't always possible to allocate a problem to the items in the list. Mr Bambridge agreed to raise that matter at the next project meeting.

The Vice-Chairman commended Mr Smith for sharing information with his colleagues. He asked for clarification of the projected additional savings. The Leader had commented that the Council would ensure that the partnership with South Holland was working well before looking for other opportunities – was that still the case?

The Chairman also asked if there were any residual issues from in-sourcing of the ICT contract.

Mr Smith advised that there had been some problems with the Steria contract. Its termination had left the Council vulnerable with regard to Disaster Recovery. At the recent Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee a paper had been adopted to release funds to enable a new Disaster Recover system. Other contracts organised by Steria had yet to come to an end, but no further problems were envisaged.

The Chairman felt that lessons should be learned for the future. He asked if measures were in place to prevent the same problems from happening again. Mr Smith noted that the Contract Monitoring Team had been set up to oversee such things. It had been temporarily overtaken by joint working and staff changes but was now back on the agenda.

The Chief Executive advised that the new structure contained a Commissioning arm which in time would include a generic contract monitoring role.

As part of the further development of the partnership with South Holland Mr Smith had asked for a service function analysis and he thanked the Business Improvement Team for the quality of the work they had done. He handed round a sheet which set out the statutory and discretionary functions of the Council with a breakdown of their costs and man-hours. A similar exercise would be carried out at South Holland and the results would provide an extremely potent management tool.

ARP

It had been a very successful year. Bury St Edmunds had joined the partnership and East Cambridgeshire, who had originally been clients, had also bought in to share the risks and benefits. In 2010/11 there had been about £1million to share between Breckland, Forest Heath and East Cambs. The share decreased with an additional partner, but it was a smaller share of a larger profit.

A member of staff had been recruited to find additional work for the ARP and he was employed on a commission basis.

Customer Contact Centre

There had been a lot of investment in the CCC and also in the

Action By

Joanne
Linton

Councillor
Gordon
Bambridge

Action By

Breckland Local Offices. Mr Smith wished it to be put on record that when he had taken over responsibility for the CCC it had been left in very good order by the previous Executive Member, Lady Fisher.

The interim ICT managers had been asked to give an overview of the service and they considered it to be one of the best in the region with average call waiting times of only 73 seconds and up to 90% first point of contact resolution.

One problem with the local offices was their cost per transaction. It might prove necessary to reduce opening times but Mr Smith was keen to keep the facility as he said not everyone had access to e-mails and vulnerable and anxious people needed face to face contact.

The One Stop Bus was also very successful and well used and put the Council in the public eye.

Human Resources

Mr Smith thanked the officers concerned for their work in the TUPE of staff from Steria to Breckland which had gone very well.

The HR department would be reviewing all Policies and Procedures and would also be ensuring that any future contracts were well negotiated.

The Chairman invited Members to put questions to the Executive Member.

Mr Joel asked about the future of the One Stop Bus. He agreed that it was very much appreciated, especially by older residents. He was concerned that it was only funded until September.

The Chairman thought that it was essential that the bus and local centres should be maintained. It should not just be a question of money. The district covered over 500 square miles which meant some residents had long distances to travel. The bus and local centres were desperately needed.

The Chief Executive sounded a word of caution with regard to the Bus. He said that it was well used in some places but that Members needed to look at its overall use before reaching a conclusion on its future.

He also advised that as things stood, in 2014 there would be a Unified Social Benefit. There would be no more Housing Benefit and the Government expected 99% of claims to be made on-line. That might lead to pressure to provide a social service to residents.

The Chairman reiterated that the Council needed to support and help people and the Commission had to act as a cautionary role to Cabinet.

He thanked the Executive Member for a very helpful presentation.

49/11 JOINT WORKING ARRANGEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Chief Executive gave an update on Shared Management.

There had been some staffing issues and it had been necessary to find alternative solutions for some posts such as Legal Services. A

Action By

Business Development Manager had been recruited and would be starting in early August. The Environmental Health Manager had withdrawn from the post and the Building Control Manager was managing both teams at present whilst the situation was assessed. The Community Development Manager would be moving on and a replacement would be recruited. The Chief Executive said it was healthy for people to be ambitious and to move on.

The new Senior Managers had spent time establishing good relationships with their teams and their Portfolio Holders. They were now working at establishing the same good working relationships with all other Members. The new system was bedding in well.

Efficiency aids such as common processes were being developed. The Committee report format had been aligned and the governance structure and performance reporting were also being aligned and proposals would be reported to Audit and Governance Committees.

Video conferencing had been established and was well used, saving time and money on travel. Members would soon be receiving training on the use of Web-Ex which would enable them to take part in conversations via telephone and video conferencing with access to shared information on screen.

All shared managers were moving to new e-mail accounts to ensure that they could receive e-mails from both authorities wherever they were.

The next stage would be to identify areas for further vertical integration to make savings. More opportunities for sharing services would be sought. A Joint Informal Board had been established between the two authorities and would hold its first meeting soon. Scrutiny Chairmen would be invited to attend as observers.

Finally, both Leaders were aware of the potential for additional savings through increasing to three partners. That would only happen when the time was right and if the right partner could be found.

The Vice-Chairman asked if in future briefing notes could be provided so that Members could formulate questions in advance of the meeting. He was concerned that Scrutiny was last on the agenda for the new Shared Managers, as it had done excellent work over the years and helped Cabinet to make informed decisions.

As a result of an informal meeting he understood that some officers feared being invited to attend the Commission. He asked the Chief Executive to promote the Scrutiny function and encourage the officers to be more enthusiastic.

The Chief Executive said that although all of the Shared Managers had not had an opportunity to get to know the Commission yet they would take the time to do so. He asked Members if they would like an informal session to be arranged.

The Chairman felt that it would be good to sit down with the Senior Management Team and Portfolio Holders to explain Scrutiny and encourage information exchange. He suggested that when 75% of

Action By

Senior Managers were in place the meeting should be arranged.

The Chief Executive suggested that the autumn would be a good time.

The Vice Chairman emphasised the fact that the importance of Scrutiny needed to be understood. Scrutiny was about making things better and helping Cabinet to make decisions that moved the Council forward. He was disturbed that Officers were not comfortable to attend.

The Chairman added that another aspect was a tendency for officers to misunderstand why questions were asked. They needed to understand what was being done to steer the Council towards better outcomes.

The Chief Executive was surprised and disappointed to hear that officers had a negative view of Scrutiny. It was not something he had been aware of and he was sure it was not fed by Senior Management. He could understand junior staff finding it daunting but hoped that Senior Managers were comfortable to come to Scrutiny.

The Chairman wanted to take matters forward in a constructive way to engage with the officer corps.

Mr Kybird asked if the authority would be responding to the Open Public Services White Paper and if Scrutiny would be involved. The Chief Executive advised that he had been planning to take the matter to the Executive and he would invite them to feed their draft through to Scrutiny.

The Chairman raised the question of a joint filing system for Members. He felt that issues raised across both Councils should be accessible by Members of both. Mr Bambridge agreed to look into it.

Councillor
Gordon
Bambridge

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive for his update.

50/11 BRECKLAND BUSINESS PLAN (AGENDA ITEM 8)

The Chief Executive provided the update in place of the Performance Team Leader.

At the beginning of the financial year the Corporate Plan was reviewed and revised and cascaded down to individual Business Plans. Due to the elections, the new administration and the scrapping of a lot of National Indicators it had been sensible to delay the process.

A new Corporate Plan was now being prepared. The two Cabinets had met jointly and agreed the headline messages. Individual priorities at each Authority had been developed. Managers had been tasked with reflecting those in the new Plan.

At the end of August the Plan would go to the Executive to check that requirements had been correctly captured. The draft would then go to Scrutiny, etc. Comments would be reported back to Cabinet and then a final draft would be presented to Council for adoption.

Service Managers and Portfolio Holders would be setting new service plans which would include performance measures. There was new freedom to select performance measures that were meaningful. It was

considered that a separate meeting of the Commission would be needed to allow input into the Business planning that would take place.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive for the update.

51/11 TASK AND FINISH GROUPS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The Democratic Services Team Leader presented the report which sought approval of the Membership and Terms of Reference of the next Parking Task & Finish Group review in Dereham.

The Chairman noted that under the Chairmanship of Mrs Matthews the previous reviews had run well with good public participation.

Mr Rogers pointed out that there had been an item in the local press which said that the majority of people wanted free car parking and he hoped that Breckland would keep that.

The Vice Chairman echoed his comments and said that free parking was key to Dereham. He also requested that Ward Representatives be included as witnesses to the review.

The Chairman agreed to that and pointed out that the reviews were not looking at charges, their main aim was to look at tensions that existed. In the case of Attleborough the Town Council had actually requested parking charges to try to prevent people parking all day and travelling to Norwich and other places by train, to work.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- (1) that the Democratic Services Team Leader would liaise with Mrs Matthews to establish a quorum for the Task & Finish Group. Members should include Mrs Matthews as Chairman with Mr Martin, Mr Duigan, Mrs Spencer and Mrs Irving; and
- (2) to approve the Terms of Reference and the Project Plan.

Mr W Richmond volunteered to be a member of the Group.

(a) Joint Scrutiny Working Group

The meeting on 23 June 2011 had been held to review the way in with each authority dealt with Scrutiny. At South Holland there were two Committees, one dealing with Performance and the other with Policy.

The Chairman informed Members that following frank and open discussions with Councillor Brian Alcock, Chairman of one of the two Scrutiny Committees from South Holland, it had been agreed that each Council would carry on as it was.

The future of the Commission was safe. There would be no joint scrutiny arrangements for the time being and any future joint meetings would be by video link.

The Vice Chairman suggested that the joint management arrangements with South Holland may need to be scrutinised in future

Action By

Rory
Ringer,
Teresa
Smith

Action By

and that would be best to be done as a joint arrangement.

The Chairman agreed and said that was what had prompted the meeting.

52/11 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT (AGENDA ITEM 11)

The report was noted.

53/11 SCRUTINY CALL-INS (AGENDA ITEM 11)

None.

54/11 COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (AGENDA ITEM 12)

None.

55/11 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The Chairman thanked everyone that had attended the training session at which they had focussed on future work for the Commission.

He advised Members that he had received a formal letter from the Shadwell Estate in Thetford asking the Commission to investigate decisions regarding future development in Thetford. The letter had been passed to the Deputy Chief Executive as the Chairman did not wish to respond to it without an official review.

Timing was an issue and the Commission would need to deal with this issue at its meeting on 1 September 2011 and then advise Cabinet of the implications. The Review of the LDF was already timetabled for that meeting and officers would have to address the matters raised in the letter at that meeting.

All Commission Members would receive a copy of the letter.

Mr Bambridge asked if representatives from Shadwell would be invited to attend the Commission meeting and the Chairman confirmed that they would.

Regarding future items, the Vice Chairman asked if the Commission could receive a presentation on Discretionary and Non-discretionary services.

He also mentioned the financial pressures on Homelessness, which was not a discretionary service and asked if that could be looked at.

Mr Joel asked if it was likely that the Council would be obliged to home any travellers displaced from the site in Essex which was to be closed. The Chief Executive explained that the Council was required to provide a number of pitches for travellers, based on a Travellers Needs Assessment. If the displacement increased the need it would be dealt with at the next assessment review.

Mr Gilbert asked if some Members and Officers could have a pre-meeting to discuss who to invite to the review of future residential development to be held on 6 January 2012.

Action By

With regard to the Health Review scheduled for 6 October 2011, Mr Joel urged caution as he said that Health reviews never seemed to reach any conclusion. The Chairman felt that the scope of the review would be clearer once the details of the Localism Bill and the extent that responsibility had devolved to District level was known.

Mrs Irving asked if the programme of Executive reports had been confirmed and was advised that the aim was to invite the Executive Members in turn or to tie-in with a specific agenda item.

56/11 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 14)

The arrangements for the next meeting on 1 September 2011 were noted.

The meeting closed at 4.25 pm

CHAIRMAN

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

Report of: Mark Stokes, Deputy Chief Executive

To: Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 1 September 2011

Author: Ben Wood, Business Development Manager

Subject: OPEN PUBLIC SERVICES WHITE PAPER

Purpose: To bring the Open Public Services White Paper to Member's attention, assess the impact upon Breckland and decide whether a formal response to the consultation is needed

Recommendation:

- That Members note the Open Public Services White Paper, and decide whether an organisational response to the consultation is needed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Open Public Services White Paper is the latest publication in the Coalition Government's plans to reform public services. It sets out a vision for more "open" services, characterised by flexibility and a diverse market in provision, with a stronger role for third sector organisations and private sector companies. It follows a series of initiatives and legislation announced since May 2010, and many of the reforms build upon previous announcements relating to welfare, public health, education and the Localism Bill in particular.

As such some of the measures outlined are already underway (eg. Free Schools), some are currently being debated in Parliament (eg. Supporting staff-led mutuals as part of the Localism Bill) and some will be subject to further development and consultation (eg. Open Commissioning). The White Paper can therefore be seen as a general policy statement from central government, and an overview of its programme for the next few years.

1.1 Background

The *Open Public Services White Paper* was launched on the 11th July and is in the public domain for a "listening period" until the end of September. The following summarises the main themes:

The Government's overall approach is underpinned by five key principles:

:

- Wherever possible we should increase choice by giving people direct control over the services they use
- Power should be decentralised to the lowest possible level

- Public services should be open to a range of providers competing to offer a better service
- The state's role is to deliver fair access, fair funding and fair competition
- Public services should be accountable to users and to taxpayers.

Government identifies three broad types of public services, and different policy proposals are made for each:

1. Individual services – e.g. education, skills, social care, childcare, housing, health
2. Neighbourhood services – those provided collectively and locally e.g. recreation, community safety, leisure
3. Commissioned services – those that 'cannot' be devolved to individuals or communities e.g. tax collection, prisons, emergency healthcare

There is a clear focus on competition and choice and the role of diverse market provision in driving up standards and in delivering better outcomes for users. The paper makes clear that state provision is no longer the 'default position' and it identifies an important new role for government as having responsibility for ensuring free competition. Public bodies, including councils, will be forced to consider charities, mutuals, social enterprises and businesses in the commissioning of core public services including healthcare, education and childcare. The Paper gives an account of existing reforms aimed at achieving the five principles including payment by results, community budgets, the general power of competence and greater financial control for local government. It also sets out new policies with questions for consultation on how they might be implemented, these include:

- "Open Commissioning" in a number of specific services (to be consulted on) – commissioners will consult on and be challenged by potential providers from all sectors on the future shape of the service; seek and fully consider a minimum of three providers when they contract for services and transparently link payment to results
- Decentralisation of commissioning to local government in a range of services, including natural environment support; public transport support; skills; and services for families with multiple problems
- Minimum standards will be used to regulate service providers
- A stronger role for neighbourhood councils (i.e. parish, town and community councils) to take greater control of local services within formal schemes of delegation.
- Further development of community budgets.

The Government argues that there are clear benefits of this 'open' approach for many stakeholders:

1. For individuals – in that there will be greater choice and that money will flow to 'chosen' providers
2. For communities – with extra powers for local areas to take control. There are also proposals to "make it easier to set up a neighbourhood council"
3. For local government – with more freedom and flexibility
4. For staff in the public sector – with additional "discretion" and opportunities to 'spin out' of the public sector (the Government has set a target of 1 million public sector workers to be in spin-out mutuals by 2015)

5. For independent providers or all sizes from any sector - with greater opportunities to bid and compete.

The role of government – both locally and centrally is set to change significantly in the light of these proposals. Decentralisation applies not only to the transfer of power from central to local government, but also to the empowerment of communities and individuals. David Cameron announced on 11th July that, “we want to see democracy on a properly hyper-local scale”. The role of the state will not only shrink, but will change, to one of less direct provision, setting standards and intervention where services fail.

The White Paper includes a section on the role of local government in enabling open public services, saying “Strong local government is at the heart of our reforms” (7.3). It also credits councils with having made more progress in commissioning than the rest of the public sector: “The wider public sector has much to learn from local authority success” (5.8). The challenge for the government now lies in the delivery of these reforms and explaining exactly how they will work in practice.

Government is consulting on a number of specific questions which can be found along with a full version of the White Paper at www.openpublicservices.cabinetoffice.gov.uk

After the ‘listening period’ concludes at the end of September, government will publish further detailed plans of how the proposals will be implemented – the White Paper states that government will set out plans at a departmental level in November 2011. Where legislation is required, we would expect there to be separate, specific consultation in those areas.

1.2 Issues

Reactions from local government to the overall thrust and main themes of the paper have been positive overall, although further details regarding implementation of reforms are awaited. Local government commentators have pointed to a few key issues:

- There are concerns that if the market were to collapse, front line services will be vulnerable to closure (eg. Southern Cross). The White Paper contains few details on how minimum standards will be enforced, or how it will respond to poor service provision, bad management or service failure.
- Will managers and staff in public services have the appetite and interest in leading mutual spin-outs, given the risks associated with contracting budgets, payment on results and access to capital?
- Are charities/ third sector organisations ready to be commissioned to deliver services at a time when they are contracting due to reductions in grants and fund-raising?
- No service should be exempt from being “open”
- There is relatively little acknowledgement of the pressure spending cuts will inevitably put on services and how that will be managed in the context of increasing demand

Various organisations and groups are preparing responses to the White Paper, including the LG Group and the District Council's Network. There are also plans for more localised, collective responses.

With regards to Breckland Council, we would consider ourselves to be very much aligned to the philosophy and proposals outlined in this White Paper, from our innovative shared management structure to the different models, partnerships and contracts we have to manage a range of services.

At this stage the White Paper does not appear to present any new or extra opportunities for making efficiencies or doing things differently. Officers will continue to monitor progress of relevant enabling measures such as the general power of competence and community right to buy/ challenge as the Localism Bill progresses through Parliament, identifying opportunities for the Council to make savings and undertake transformational change.

Members are asked to consider whether a response to the consultation is required. The questions asked are numerous and highly specific in many cases. It may be that a general statement, highlighting any areas of interest/ concern would be a better use of Member and officer time, along the following points:

- We welcome the overall philosophy underpinning the Open Public Services White Paper and consider that Breckland have been at the forefront of this approach for some time already
- Are there any particular examples or innovations that we would draw upon to highlight the above? (eg. Shared management structure)
- We would wish to re-enforce the notion that competition is a means of increasing efficiency and productivity, but local democratic accountability for overall provision of services is still important
- Decentralisation to the lowest appropriate level would logically mean uneven patterns of service delivery, based upon local circumstances and need. We would like to see more recognition of this as part of the 'localist' approach
- We welcome moves to delegate decision making and funding to neighbourhood levels where appropriate, but as above would welcome recognition that in many cases this is not the most efficient means of spending money
- The move to "open" public services is welcome and, in principle, no service should be exempt from this list

1.3 Options

1. Members submit a direct response on behalf of the organisation during the 'listening period', along the lines above;
2. Members submit a joint response along with South Holland District Council (*recommended*);
3. Members submit an indirect response on behalf of the organisation to the LG Group/ District Councils Network, for them to submit a collective response;
4. Members submit no response on behalf of the organisation, and individual Members submit responses should they feel it necessary

1.4 Reasons for recommendations

Assuming Members want to respond to the consultation, option (2) above is recommended.

Given the breadth of issues covered by the Open Public Services White Paper a more general response would be the best use of officer and Member time, highlighting the fact that Breckland Council (and South Holland District Council) are very much exemplars of the “open” public services approach that the Coalition Government have articulated.

Report of Maxine O'Mahony, Director of Commissioning

To: CMT 22 August 2011, Overview & Scrutiny Commission (deadline 15 August 2011) 01 September 2011

(Author: Ralph Burton, Strategic Property Manager)

Subject: Bunker long term use & Deeds store

Purpose: To confirm the long term use of the bunker, Breckland business Centre (Dereham) and confirm the split of duties between Asset management and Legal/Democratic Services for the management of the Council's deeds.

Recommendation(s):

1. To authorise the long term use of the bunker at the Breckland Business Centre (Dereham) as long term corporate storage and its management and responsibility remains with Asset Management.
2. To confirm the split of duties between Asset Management (retrieval/return only) and Legal/Democratic Service's (overall responsibility and management) of the deeds and their storage.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The bunker is located at the Breckland Business Centre (Dereham) and is approximately 1,500 sq ft split into different rooms including a kitchen, shower/toilets, generator room and vent room.

1.1.2 In January 2011 the Emergency Planning Officer requested actions to be undertaken from the Council's Corporate Business Continuity Action Plan. One of those actions was to review how the Customer Contact Centre would be maintained in the event of an emergency. Asset Management was asked to provide a quote to undertake a feasibility to determine the full costs of bringing the bunker at the Breckland Business Centre (Dereham) back into use as a potential emergency use space.

1.1.3 Until that date the bunker was being used by three different service areas. Legal Services used it for the Council's deed store, Emergency Planning were using it for storage and as an emergency centre and Electoral Services were using part for storage of election equipment. None of those departments were recharged costs of the space they occupied and neither was the space being recharged to all departments (which would normally be the case for corporate storage).

1.1.4 At the time of being asked to undertake the feasibility the question was raised about recharges and the Deputy Chief Executive deemed that this should not occur until the long term future use of the bunker was determined.

1.1.5 The attached feasibility list was provided to the Council's measured term construction/facilities contractor for a cost to bring the bunker back into occupational use. The cost to undertake the full feasibility study was quoted at

£4,500.00. The Emergency Planning Officer declined to take up these works and pursued alternative suppliers.

1.1.6 At the Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee (BISC) on 07 June 2011 the chairman requested that Overview & Scrutiny Commission review the use of the bunker for a more in depth discussion of what the Council's requirements were for business continuity in terms of emergency space.

1.1.7 Following this Asset Management provided input for the Interim Business Development Manager for the BISC meeting on 05 July 2011. The advice given follows.

1.2 Issues

1.2.1 Advice from Asset Management

This advice was provided on the basis of whether the bunker could be used commercially. The Council has never previously let the bunker space to an external organisation. It has previously been used (and still is) as a deed store for the Council, as storage for elections for the Council and as storage for business continuity supplies. We do not believe it holds any significant commercial permanent letting potential that would warrant spending the costs on it to bring it up to occupation standard for the income it would generate. Plus other lettable accommodation exists in the town that is of a better quality. Also previous members of the emergency planning team used to be located in the bunker but ended up going on long term sick, partly due to the isolation and health and safety of the space. However without spending money on undertaking the feasibility (£4,500) or undertaking a marketing exercise this cannot be categorically ruled out, although our opinion is that it does not hold occupational commercial potential and would not be worth spending feasibility sums on.

1.2.2 The Council would be better placed to consider using the bunker space for its own use to relieve another space that would have better commercial viability i.e. an industrial unit, for uses such as long term secured storage that only require infrequent visits. Any alternative use would need a business case to prove its viability and funding to undertake a feasibility study.

1.2.3 Future Use

Since the last district election the bunker's use as storage for election equipment has been deemed unacceptable due to health and safety reasons due to the access to the space. Consequently it is now only used for Emergency Planning storage and the Deed Store storage.

1.2.4 Based on the advice in this report Asset Management recommends that the bunker's primary use should be for long term storage which does not require regular access, or storage of smaller easy to handle items such as Deeds. The space should be incorporated into the Council's existing corporate storage and recharged across all departments. This will enable the existing storage to be rationalised and potentially release an industrial unit which can be used for a commercial letting to help increase the revenue income for the Council. This is provided as a recommendation as this would be a long term decision that would not be cost efficient to change in the short term.

1.2.4 Deed Store

The deed store needs to remain at the bunker due to the statutory requirement to house these documents in a space that has up to 4 hours of fire resistance to give the optimum protection.

1.2.5 Democratic Services was, under the direction of the Head of Legal Services undertaking the management and retrieval of deeds. To help create efficiency Asset Management offered to undertake the retrieval of the deeds as the Caretakers visit the Business Centre daily. This offer was made on the basis that Democratic Services (as appointed by the Head of Legal Services (or equivalent) post) continue to have overall responsibility for the deed store including managing it, making up new files, logging deeds in/out, deed numbers, location of lost deeds and distributing of deeds to staff. In effect Asset Management will only undertake the collection and return of deed packets to/from the deeds store and Democratic Services continue to undertake all other aspects of the responsibility and management of the deeds and their storage. The custodian of the deeds in the constitution is the Head of Legal Services post (4C C1 8 1 &2).

1.2.6 A procedure has been drafted (see Appendix 3).

1.3 Reasons for recommendations

1.3.1 To provide clarity on the long term use for the bunker and split of responsibilities regarding the management of the deed store.

2. IMPLICATIONS

2.1 Risk

2.1.1 I have completed the Risk Management questionnaire and can confirm that risk has been given careful consideration.

2.2 Financial

2.2.1 The financial implications are outlined in the report regarding the additional payments for call-out fees which will need to be met from the salary budget.

2.3 Legal

2.3.1 No implications to the best of our knowledge.

2.4 Equality and Diversity

2.4.1 No implications to the best of our knowledge.

3. Alignment to Council Priorities

- Your Council, Your Services
- Entrepreneurial Council

4. Wards/Communities Affected

4.1 All Wards

Background papers (attached):-

None

Lead Contact Officer

Name/Post: Ralph Burton, Strategic Property Manager

Telephone Number: 01362 656327

Email: Ralph.burton@breckland.gov.uk

Key Decision

This is not a key decision

Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix 1 – Feasibility Assessment List

Appendix 2 – Minutes extract from Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee

Appendix 3 – Deeds packet collection/retrieval procedure

Appendix 1

For: Teresa Cannon
From: Asset Management Service
Date: 13 January 2011
Re: Feasibility of the Bunker at the Breckland Business Centre, St Withburga Lane, Dereham as a potential Work Area Recovery for Corporate Business Continuity Action Plan

Current Occupiers

1. Legal Services - Deed store
2. Electoral Services - Electoral Services storage
3. Emergency Planning

Feasibility Assessment

The Bunker space is currently not fit for use as a work area. To check if the space may be adequate for use the following areas would need to be included in a feasibility assessment. To undertake this quotes could be obtained from relevant contractors (preferably one overall) to undertake the feasibility assessment culminating in a costed report to bring the Bunker space up to a standard for work use.

Key Questions

1. How many people could it accommodate as a working environment?
2. How many people does it need to accommodate as a working environment?
3. How long can people work in that environment?

Feasibility Areas for Inclusion

Mechanical & Electrical

1. Power –
 - a. Electricity - what is the availability, has an electrical circuit test been completed, where is it being metered, ongoing testing. Consider secondary metering if space is split.
 - b. PAT testing, ongoing testing.
 - c. Generator – check the exhaust for adequacy and functionality then move on to servicing check and regular servicing of the generator.
 - d. Fuel tank – condition of check, type of fuel, is there any, is it ok to use?
2. Air handling – what type, what is the capacity/volume of fresh air delivered per litres per second, how is it controlled, what is the minimum number this volume will accommodate for users in the space? Quality of air, duct/filters cleansing.
3. Heating – what type, how many heaters/locations, does it work, what regular testing is required?
4. Lighting – description of, how many, do they wall work, assess current lighting levels at desk levels and seek advice as to adequacy, are they tested?

Facilities & Health & Safety

5. Drainage – check the working of the drains rising main duplicate pumps etc, plan of location.
6. Toilets – description of, how many, do they work, regular testing?
7. Fresh water – where access located, does it work, legionnaires testing and remedial changes and then regular testing schedule.
8. Fire Safety – Fire Risk Assessment, installation of smoke/heat detectors and sounders, evacuation plan, emergency lights, fire extinguisher equipment date, emergency hatch check. Remedial changes and then regularity of assessment.
9. Kitchen facilities – description of, appliances available and working and then regular testing required.
10. Accessibility – not DDA, should it be, does it need to be, cost to convert?
11. Fixtures, fittings and furniture – currently available, condition of, currently 25 years old, ergonomic adequacy?

ICT

12. IT – description of current connections & equipment available/on-site – what needs to be available
13. Broadband – is it available, is it connected, current billing details – what needs to be available.
14. Telephone – description of current lines and hardware available/on-site, current billing details – what needs to be available?

Miscellaneous

15. Decoration – condition appears satisfactory only known once emptied.
16. One-off deep clean required and then regular cleaning and waste removal cost?
17. Ongoing repairs and maintenance cost, budget?
18. Continuous general regular servicing/checks/tests cost, budget, responsibility?
19. Who has occupational management responsibility for the space and budget?
20. Procedures for use of the space.
21. Keys – holders, who should be holders?
22. Who has access, should have access?
23. Costs to relocate Deed store, Electoral Services storage needs to be investigated.

Appendix 2

05 July BISC Minutes Extract

57/11 The Bunker

The Interim Business Development Manager gave an update using information provided by the Strategic Property Manager.

It had been suggested that the cost of refurbishing the bunker could be off-set by using it as a commercial let. However, the Strategic Property Manager did not think that would be financially viable. Instead it was suggested that the bunker could be used for secure storage, releasing other industrial units (currently used for storage purposes) to be let commercially.

The ICT Consultant said that from a Disaster Recovery perspective the bunker did not have sufficient capacity. There was already a Disaster Recovery site at Breckland House in Thetford which had better connectivity.

The Chairman did not want to spend money on the bunker if it was no longer part of a modern solution. He sought assurance that Disaster Recovery and Civil Contingency requirements were met. The Interim Business Development Manager could not confirm that but said there was an opportunity to provide a range of options which provided flexibility. For example, the Council had a part share in the One Stop Bus which was Broadband enabled and could be used as a response centre in the event of an emergency.

07 June 2011 BISC Minutes Extract

48/11 Emergency Generator (Inc. The Bunker)

It was further explained that a Health & Safety Assessment of the bunker (including water hygiene management) had been undertaken by Norfolk County Council with a list of recommendations (e.g. fire risk assessment, PAT testing) if it was to be considered as a Work Recovery Area for business continuity purposes. The bunker, although currently limited, had a back up generator, telephones, wireless router and broadband connectivity. The facility could accommodate up to 25 people depending on the layout, and could Business Improvement and Projects Sub-Committee support an Incident Management Team and critical services staff in the event of an incident affecting Elizabeth House. Business rates of £3k and the costs of regular generator maintenance were currently paid for from within the Emergency Planning budget.

The Emergency Planning Officer asked for guidance on the way forward as she felt that the bunker, if all tests were carried out, could be used for business continuity. In response to a question, Members were informed that business continuity was on the Risk Register as a medium risk at present. It was explained that under the Civil Contingencies Act the Council had a statutory duty to have business continuity management in place to ensure continuity of critical services in the event of a worse case scenario.

A Member felt that a further quote for a generator was required as he thought the quote from Kings & Barnham was too expensive. He also felt that monies should not be wasted on the bunker when the Council already had a perfectly good building in Elizabeth House. In response to a question about how much workspace was available at Breckland House in Thetford, Members were informed that four floors were probably used.

The Chairman advised that the cost of bringing the bunker up to a working standard would have to be one of the main factors to consider and urged the Council not to be complacent as accidents could happen. He felt that the Emergency Planning Officer and the Asset Management Team should work together on this and the rates should be reviewed. It was not good practice to pay £3k per annum to stand empty.

After further discussion, it was suggested that the bunker should be passed over to the Overview & Scrutiny Commission for a more indepth discussion of what the Council's requirements were for business continuity. Asset Management would have to be involved as part of the deliberations. The Emergency Planning Officer advised that the bunker, if refurbished, could be marketed for other opportunities such as a training facility. It was agreed that this matter should be brought back to the next meeting.

Deed Store Retrieval/Return Procedure

Date 12 August 2011

This procedure outlines the retrieval and return of deed packets to/from the Deed Store only. The management of the deeds and their storage remains under the responsibility of Democratic Services as delegated by the Head of Legal Services post or equivalent.

Definitions

“Appointed representative from Democratic Services” as appointed by the Head of Legal Services post or equivalent.

“Appointed representative from Asset Management” as appointed by the Head of Asset Management post or equivalent.

“Deed Packet Request Form” provided by appointed representative from Democratic Services.

Requesting Deeds

1. Member of staff completes yellow Deed Packet Request Form. Appointed representative from Democratic Services to provide assistance with identification of deed numbers.
2. Completed Deed Packet Request Form is provided to the appointed representative of Democratic Services to:
 - Log/register on an appropriate register that the request has been made
 - Check the deed is on the appropriate register and the deed is logged as being in the Deed Store,
 - Initial and write the cabinet location on the Deed Packet Request Form.
3. If the deed is not in the Deed Store the appointed representative of Democratic Services will inform the member of staff that requested it as to its location. If the Deed packet is in the Deed Store the completed Deed Packet Request Form is put in a designated tray in Legal/Democratic Services office area titled ‘Deed Store’.
4. Appointed representative of Asset Management to collect fully completed Deed Packet Request Form(s) from the ‘Deed Store’ tray and attends the Deed Store for retrieval.
5. At the Deed Store, locate the Deed packet, remove the orange Form from the packet, write on the orange Form the name of the member of staff requesting the Deed packet (from the yellow Deed Packet Request Form). Leave the orange Form in the deed packet location in the filing cabinet and bring the deed packet and yellow Deed Packet Request Form to Elizabeth House.
6. Collected Deed packets are brought back to the ‘Deed Store’ tray where the appointed representative of Asset Management deposits the collected deed packets.

7. The appointed representative from Democratic Services checks the deed packet on the register and then delivers the deed packets to the requesting officer.

Returning Deeds

1. Deed packets are returned to the appointed representative of Democratic Services who will log/register on an appropriate register that the deed packet has been returned.
2. The Deed packet is then put the designated tray in Democratic Services office area titled 'Deed Store'.
3. Appointed representative of Asset Management to collect deed packets from the 'Deed Store' tray and attends the Deed Store for returning the Deeds.
4. At the Deed Store, find the orange Form where the deed was removed from, cross the last name off the orange Form and put the orange Form back in the deed packet and return the deed packet to the same location.

Breckland Council

Overview & Scrutiny Commission

Work Programme 2011 – 2012

This is only an outline programme and will be amended as issues arise or priorities change

Meeting date / Venue	Topic	Member / Officer	Exec Member / Portfolio	Objective	Comment / Outcome
1 September 2011 Norfolk Rm,	Executive Report Review of Local Development Framework	Mark Kiddle-Morris Keith Eccles / David Spencer	Assets & Strategic Development Mark Kiddle-Morris Asset & Strategic Dev.	To provide an Executive update on portfolio. An Annual review of LDF with specific attention to the implications of the Localism Bill and any advice and evidence on the Stone Curlew habitat debate as furthered by evidence from DEFRA, English Nature et al.	 David Spencer invited to meeting 19/7.
	Disaster Recovery Planning	Emergency Planning Officer (Teresa Cannon)	Lynda Turner Localism, Community & Environmental Services	Understanding the issues re: emergency generation and back up supplies generally.	Teresa Cannon has been invited to provide a report/verbal update to OSC. (TS 20/7) Steve Udberg made aware of agenda item (TS 20/7) This item was requested from BIPSC 7.6.11
	Disaster Recovery - Bunker	Asset mgt (Ralph Burton) and Emergency Planning (Teresa Cannon)	Mark Kiddle-Morris Asset & Strategic Dev.	In-depth discussion of what the Council's requirements are for business continuity.	Teresa Cannon has been invited to provide a report/verbal update to OSC. (TS 20/7) Steve Udberg & Ralph Burton been informed of agenda item & I have requested their input at the meeting (TS 20/7) This item was requested from BIPSC 7.6.11
6 October 2011	Executive Report	Paul Claussen	Executive Member for Planning & Environmental Services	To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	Mr Claussen able to attend. (12/8)
	Drainage & Flooding	Drainage Board to Discuss new ways of working.		Should be at the centre of planning decisions	

	Breckland Tenancy Strategy	Anita Brennan, Housing	Paul Claussen	To adopt the Breckland Tenancy strategy	<i>(info from forward plan)</i>
	Homelessness Strategic Delivery Plan	Anita Brennan, Housing	Paul Claussen	To adopt the Homelessness Strategic Delivery Plan that sets out how the Council will streamline and improve its services to offer additional value for money over the next year.	<i>(Info from Forward Plan.)</i>
	Extension to Serco Environmental Services Contract	Sarah Bruton	Lynda Turner / Paul Claussen	To be confirmed	<i>(Info from Forward plan)</i>
	Health Review			To ensure that residents of Breckland are getting the best out of the NHS, e.g. looking at the new proposed arrangements for GPs managing their own budgets. Again in the light of the new health Bill, the provision of and GPs role in the commissioning of patient services.	
2011	Executive Report	tbc		To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	
	Broadband access in Breckland			Invite a representative from Norfolk County Council (Ann Steward as exec member with responsibility for economic growth) to provide an update on the situation.	
	Stone Curlews <i>(should be a part of the LDF discussion and maybe spin out a T&FG as a consequence)</i>	Keith Eccles / David Spencer ?	Paul Claussen Planning & Environmental Serv.	A European Habitat Directive which focuses on developments within 1500m of nests is raising both planning issues and frustrations within the local community. A review could consider the plan of work and planning guidance.	
	Breckland Tenancy Strategy	Anita Brennan, Housing	Paul Claussen	New tenancy strategy	<i>(info from forward plan)</i>

6 January 2012	Executive Report	tbc			To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	
	Future residential developments and the impact on surrounding towns/villages.	Forward planning team, CIL implications, section 278 contributions etc.	Paul Claussen Planning & Environmental Serv.		A Substantial new residential development is taking place on the old RAF Watton site. The Site is in the village of Carbrooke (i.e. not within the town of Watton) and the development has raised issues within the local community. To consider the impacts should this happen in the future.	
	Discretionary & Non-Discretionary Services	Business Improvement Team	Adrian Stasiak		To receive a report on the impact of discretionary & non-discretionary services within the authority.	TS to liaise with BIT.
9 February 2012	Executive Report	tbc			To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	
	Impact of Recession	Economic Development?			Looking at the issues around the effect of the recession on the Breckland area, e.g. knock-on effects on employment etc.	
	Homelessness in Breckland	Housing	Paul Claussen		To receive a report on the financial pressures and effects homelessness is having on Breckland.	
15 March 2012	Executive Report	tbc			To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	
	BT Phone Box removal plan				Scope to scrutinise the current removal plan.	
26 April 2012	Executive Report	tbc			To provide an Executive update on portfolio.	
	Norfolk Fire & Rescue				Invite a representative for an update on issues affecting the Breckland area.	

Utilities Review – there is to be a single meeting arranged to look at the work the main utility companies are undertaking to enable the necessary infrastructure to be in place when large scale development takes place.

Note:

Standing items on OSC Agenda are:

- Executive Report (as listed in work programme)
- Joint Working Arrangements
- Call-in
- Councillor Call for Action
- Verbal updates from Outside bodies Scrutiny Panels, e.g Joint Scrutiny Panel (Phil Cowen) and Health Scrutiny Panel (Robert Kybird).
- Decision Tracking