

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 31ST JANUARY 2006

Present: Cllrs Mrs Y Clarkson (Chair); Mrs A Bradshaw; F Gleaves; F Heathcote; Mrs J Hully; A Norwood; P Tyson; Mrs C Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from
Cllrs Mrs C Giel; M McVeigh;G Sunderland.

Officers: Mrs H Mitchell, Head of Policy and Performance; Ms C Ponting, Policy and Performance Officer

OSC-PR107

Declaration of interest

Cllrs Mrs J Hully and A Norwood declared a personal interest with respect to any discussion of nuclear interests.

Corporate Plan

Members discussed the Corporate Plan during which the following observations, questions and resolutions were made:

Members were told that work had already started on the next version of the Corporate Plan to start in 2007. There should be a draft available by September. Members felt that there should be greater Member involvement in drafting the Corporate Plan, although accepted that there was a need to avoid writing by committee.

RESOLVED – that further consideration be given to the role of Members in developing and challenging the next Corporate Plan.

Members felt that more detail was required in the Corporate Plan and were told that the detail linked with departmental service plans. They felt that there was need to make clear how individual targets related to those service plans and council strategies and who was responsible at the point of delivery. The also would like to see links to central government Best Value Performance Indicators where appropriate.

RESOLVED – that there is Member input into the format of the next Corporate Plan.

Members felt that there had been insufficient challenge of performance to date. It was raised whether OSC PR should take lead responsibility for receiving Performance management information, not the Executive who under the current system were playing ‘judge and jury’. Members were reminded that the Chairs and Vice Chairs group did take an overview of performance monitoring and each individual committee had begun to challenge Portfolio Holders on some targets. The Performance Monitoring Information was equally a tool for Executive and Corporate Team. It was further added that one committee alone, under the current structure, could not really challenge on the subject areas of the other committees.

RESOLVED – that the Chairs and Vice Chairs’ group further consider how to monitor performance.

Members felt that there were too many acronyms in the document.

RESOLVED - that a glossary of terms be added to the Corporate Plan

With respect to Objective HLE1, Members were concerned as to whether the relevant Members were aware of obligations and targets in the Corporate Plan. In particular, they felt that the Planning Panel might benefit from some training in order that they are fully aware of the expectations of the Corporate Plan in carrying out their responsibilities. All Members, they felt, could do with training in the Corporate Plan.

RESOLVED – that Member Training in objectives of the Corporate Plan is considered.

They felt that the role of Corporate Plan was to bring together aspirations, responsibilities and Council policy and that there should be the necessary links between them all.

They disputed whether some of the targets contained on pages 13 and 14 were agreed Council policy and felt that they were at odds with the position being taken by the Nuclear Working Party.

They were concerned in particular to references of preparing proposals to government on the terms and conditions required to consider the storage and/or disposal of radioactive waste in Copeland by Sep 2006 (PI_E2_04) and to references of 'new build' power generators (PI_E3_02). They also felt that the 'views of the community on options' should be the first objective on page 13. Not until those views were known could the Council negotiate a position. They also felt that the Portfolio Holder for Economic Infrastructure should be on the nuclear working group if he has responsibility for HLE2 & 3.

RESOLVED – that the Corporate Plan should be revisited to ensure that all the Performance Indicators were in line with agreed Council policy and with respect to nuclear issues on pages 13 and 14, were in line with the views of the nuclear working group, and that PI_E2_07 with respect to community consultation should be the first priority.

Members suggested that as there was still not yet a clear decision made on the transfer to a Trust of the sports and leisure facilities, that reference to 'managed by the Trust' at PI_QL_05 should be deleted.

Members felt that 'health strategy' was misleading. They suggested that the title be changed to 'well-being' strategy.

Members also felt that PI_QL2_03 required rewording to clarify exactly what was meant by 'establish clear proposals on hospital facilities for West Cumbria.'

Members questioned whether targets on page 25 were realistic. They felt there was little point to unrealistic targets.

RESOLVED – That targets on page 25 should be revisited to ensure that timescale were realistic.

It was suggested that the second key action on page 26 with respect to grants was misleading and should be reworded.

The meeting closed at 1.30pm

Chair:

Signed:.....