

REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC SERVICES MANAGER

Agenda item 15.1

1. Changes in Committee Memberships

The Conservative Group has indicated that they wish to make the following change.

RECOMMEND – That the following changes be made to the membership of the Committees indicated:-

- **Corporate Joint Negotiation and Consultation Committee (Health, Safety and Welfare) - remove Councillor Brian Salinger**
- **Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Healthy Start Healthy Futures – replace Councillor Kevin Edson with Councillor Maureen Braun, and replace Councillor Maureen Braun as substitute with Councillor Andrew Harper.**

2. Executive decisions exempted from the call – in process

The Overview and Scrutiny Rules in the Council's constitution provide that executive decision-makers may exempt decisions from call-in and consideration by the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the grounds of urgency, subject to the consent of the Chairman of the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and to such decisions being reported to the next available meeting of Council together with the reason for urgency. The following decision has been exempted from the call- in process:

(i) Decision of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport: Consultation Draft Local Implementation Plan – Approval of Final Version

The consultation draft Local Implementation Plan had previously been agreed by Cabinet who delegated authority to agree any final changes, prior to the commencement of statutory consultation, to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Urgent agreement of these final changes was required to enable the consultation on the Plan to start before the end of July 2005 as agreed with Transport for London and to avoid a late start to the consultation which might prevent the final Plan being submitted to the London Mayor by the agreed deadline. For these reasons, and as the next meeting of the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee was not until 1 August 2005, the approval of the final version of the Plan was exempted from the call-in process.

3. Changes to the Constitution

(i) Under Executive Procedure Rule 1.4 (b), The Leader has advised me of the following amendments to his scheme of delegation of executive functions:

- Powers delegated to the former Director of Economic and Community Development to transfer to the Director of Resources.
- The address of Councillor Christopher Harris to be updated.

The Constitution will be amended accordingly.

Any further changes made by the Leader as a consequence of Councillor Kanti Patel's resignation from the Cabinet will be notified to Council as soon as possible.

- (ii) To reflect staffing changes, Council is asked to agree that the Constitution be amended so that any reference to the Head of Committee and Administration is replaced by Democratic Services Manager.
- (iii) I am aware that there are still some required updates in the Constitution relating to the changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The opportunity will also be taken to rectify the situation and ensure that the Constitution fully reflects the Council's decisions.

RECOMMEND – That the Democratic Services Manager be instructed to make the necessary change to the Constitution arising from changes to the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, the need to substitute the words "Democratic Services Manager" for "Head of Committee Administration" and circulate any required amendments to ensure that the Constitution properly reflects the Council's decisions.

4. Vacancies on School Governing Bodies

Appendix A lists (in bold) all current vacancies now needing to be filled in the Council's representation on school governing bodies. There are a number of other vacancies on governing bodies which are due to reconstitute over the course of the next year. However, as this may lead to a reduction in the number of LEA governors on those bodies, it is not proposed to fill those vacancies until the position at each school is clarified. The table below gives numbers for all LEA governors, including those vacancies which are not presently being filled.

The governing bodies of East Barnet School and Summerside Primary School will shortly be reconstituted with the effect that the number of LEA governors will be reduced. Therefore, although there are two vacancies on each governing body, only one needs to be filled in each case.

In order to reflect the political balance of the Council, the political balance on school governing bodies (as at 18 August 2005) should be: -

Conservative	152
Labour	110
Liberal Democrat	28
Total	290

The current balance on school governing bodies is: -

Conservative	142
Labour	91
Liberal Democrat	21
Vacancies	36
Total	290

All persons appointed will hold office for four years from the date of appointment or until the governing body has been reconstituted under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003 if this has not already occurred.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

RECOMMEND: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.

5. Vacancies Arising from Reconstitution of School Governing Bodies

Under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003 the governing bodies of all schools in England must re-constitute themselves by 31 August 2006. The term of appointment of any governor appointed after 1 September 2003 finishes when the governing body reconstitutes and those governors may be reappointed. Appendix B lists (in bold) vacancies due to arise in the near future in the Council's representation on school governing bodies as a result of the Regulations.

All persons appointed will hold office for four years from the date of reconstitution.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

RECOMMEND: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.

6. Representation of the Council on Outside Bodies

Appendix C lists in bold the vacancies in the Council's representation on Outside Bodies.

The Group Secretaries have been advised of the vacancies.

RECOMMEND: That the Council make appointments to fill the vacancies reported.

7. Representation of the Council on Stonegrove and Spur Road Partnership Board

The Administration wishes to change its representation on the Stonegrove and Spur Road Partnership Board by replacing Councillor Brian Salinger with Councillor Anthony Finn.

Details of the conditions relating to appointments to this body and current representatives are shown below:

Organisation: Stonegrove and Spur Road Partnership Board

Special Conditions:

The representatives should be the Lead Member for Housing and one officer, with one Member and one officer as deputies. Appointments are for 2 years.

No. of Representatives: 2 + 2 deputies

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Brian Salinger	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	SSRPB1 Member
Period of Appointment:	19/05/2004 to 16/05/2006	
2 - Ms Jill Stansfield	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	SSRPB2 Member
Period of Appointment:	19/05/2004 to 16/05/2006	
3 - Councillor Brian Gordon	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	SSRPB3 Deputy
Period of Appointment:	19/05/2004 to 16/05/2006	
4 - Mr Jonathan Lloyd-Owen	(Appointed 18/05/2004)	SSRPB4 Deputy
Period of Appointment:	19/05/2004 to 16/05/2006	

RECOMMEND: That Council approve the replacement of Councillor Brian Salinger with Councillor Anthony Finn as the Council's representative on the Stonegrove and Spur Road Partnership Board.

8. Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2005/2006

Attached, at Appendix D is the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Manager.

RECOMMEND - That the proposed forward work programmes for 2005/06 identified by the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committees, with the exception of the Cabinet Overview & Scrutiny Committee, be approved.

John Marr
Democratic Services Manager

Register of Appointments and Nominations on School Governors

1. Organisation: Beis Yaacov Primary School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- 1 - **Mr Jason Moleman** (Resigned 18/10/2004) VP33.1
 Period of Appointment: 11/06/2003 to 10/06/2007 Liberal Democrat

2. Organisation: Brookland Infant and Brookland Junior Schools

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- 1 - **Mr Simon Berger** (Deceased 20/09/2004) P.23.1
 Period of Appointment: 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 Labour
- 2 - Mr Jeffrey Leifer (Appointed 01/04/2004) P.23.2
 Period of Appointment: 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 Labour
- 3 - Councillor Leslie Sussman (Appointed 01/04/2004) P.23.3
 Period of Appointment: 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 Conservative
- 4 - Councillor John Marshall (Appointed 01/04/2004) P.23.4
 Period of Appointment: 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 Conservative

3. Organisation: Brunswick Park Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- 1 - Ms Elizabeth Lawrence (Appointed 09/07/2002) P.10.1
 Period of Appointment: 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 Conservative
- 2 - Mr Robert Pavitt (Appointed 14/05/2003) P.10.2
 Period of Appointment: 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 Conservative
- 3 - **Councillor Daniel Hope** (Resigned 24/06/2004) P.10.3
 Period of Appointment: 26/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 Conservative

4. Organisation: Chalgrove Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- 1 - Councillor Leslie Sussman (Appointed 06/07/2004) P.25.1
 Period of Appointment: 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 Conservative
- 2 - Mr Sheetal Nehra (Appointed 01/03/2005) P.25.2
 Period of Appointment: 02/03/2005 to 01/03/2009 Labour
- 3 - **Councillor Helena Hart** (Expires 03/11/2005) P.25.3

Period of Appointment: 04/11/2001 to 03/11/2005 Conservative

5. Organisation: Church Hill School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Ms Kelly Liza Tebb | (Resigned 02/03/2005) | P.11.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 19/03/2002 to 18/03/2006 | Labour |
| 2 - Councillor Daniel Hope | (Appointed 28/06/2005) | P.11.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs Joanna Tambourides | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | P.11.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |

6. Organisation: Courtland JMI School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 - Mrs J Burton | (Resigned 13/07/2003) | P.39.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2000 to 08/07/2004 | Liberal Democrat |
| 2 - Mr K Dyll | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.39.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs A Pottinger | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.39.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Labour |

7. Organisation: Danegrove Primary School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mrs Pamela Diffey | (Appointed 28/06/2005) | P.07.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 01/09/2005 to 31/08/2009 | Liberal Democrat |
| 2 - Councillor Terry Burton | (Resigned 18/05/2005) | P.07.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2003 to 09/09/2007 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs Pauline Coakley-Webb | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | P.07.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |
| 4 - Mr Andrew Summers | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | P.07.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |

8. Organisation: East Barnet School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 4

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Olwen Evans	(Resigned 22/06/2005)	S.04.1
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008	Conservative
2 - Mrs M Murrill	(Appointed 10/09/2002)	S.04.2
Period of Appointment:	10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006	Labour
3 - Councillor Terry Burton	(Resigned 18/05/2005)	S.04.3
Period of Appointment:	15/12/2004 to 14/12/2008	Conservative
4 - Councillor Fiona Bulmer	(Appointed 28/11/2001)	S.04.4
Period of Appointment:	28/11/2001 to 27/11/2005	Conservative
5 - Ms Cathy Glasman	(Appointed 02/03/2004)	S.04.5
Period of Appointment:	30/03/2004 to 29/03/2008	Labour

NB – ONLY ONE POST TO BE FILLED.

9. Organisation: Grasvenor Avenue Infant School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mrs Pat Dunton	(Appointed 18/01/2005)	P.45.1
Period of Appointment:	19/01/2005 to 18/01/2009	Conservative
2 - Mr J Tyler	(Disqualified 30/05/2003)	P.45.2
Period of Appointment:	27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005	Conservative

10. Organisation: Hampden Way Nursery School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mrs J G Lodhi	(Appointed 28/06/2005)	P.48.1
Period of Appointment:	29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009	Conservative
2 - Mrs Sandra Hope	(Resigned 15/09/2004)	P.48.2
Period of Appointment:	19/05/2004 to 18/05/2008	Conservative

11. Organisation: Holy Trinity CE School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mr Roderick Tella	(Expires 23/10/2005)	VP.06.2
Period of Appointment:	24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005	Labour

12. Organisation: Manorside JMI School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Ms I Westbrook	(Expires 03/11/2005)	P.21.1
Period of Appointment:	04/11/2001 to 03/11/2005	Conservative
2 - Ms Jane Moore	(Appointed 28/06/2005)	P.21.2
Period of Appointment:	29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009	Labour
3 - Mr K Turner	(Expires 23/10/2005)	P.21.3
Period of Appointment:	24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005	Labour

13. Organisation: Northside Primary School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Anne Hutton	(Appointed 09/07/2002)	P.17.1
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006	Labour
2 - Ms M Lawson	(Expires 23/10/2005)	P.17.2
Period of Appointment:	24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005	Labour
3 - Ms Margaret Pond	(Appointed 28/06/2005)	P.17.4
Period of Appointment:	29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009	Conservative

14. Organisation: Northway School

No. of Representatives: 3

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mrs M Stannard	(Appointed 16/12/2003)	SP.02.1
Period of Appointment:	06/01/2004 to 05/01/2008	Conservative
2 - Mr Hugh Rayner	(Resigned 25/11/2003)	SP.02.2
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006	Conservative
3 - Ms Dadia Conti	(Appointed 08/07/2003)	SP.02.3
Period of Appointment:	01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007	Labour

15. Organisation: Oakleigh School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mr John Tiplady	(Appointed 06/07/2004)	SP.03.1
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008	Conservative
2 - Mrs Anne Jarvis	(Resigned 25/07/2004)	SP.03.2
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006	Labour

16. Organisation: Queen Elizabeths Girls School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Councillor Katia David | (Expires 23/10/2005) | S11.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr Fred Jarvis | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | S11.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |
| 3 - Mrs D Wilkinson | (Appointed 28/06/2005) | S11.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009 | Conservative |
| 4 - Mrs A Rowland | (Appointed 08/07/2003) | S11.5 |
| Period of Appointment: | 01/09/2003 to 31/08/2007 | Labour |

17. Organisation: Sacred Heart RC School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Councillor Gerard Silverstone | (Disqualified 04/04/2005) | VP12.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 - 15/05/2007 | Conservative |

18. Organisation: St Johns CE Primary N11

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mrs Eileen Botham | (Appointed 10/02/2004) | VP.32.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 17/02/2004 to 16/02/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Councillor Terry Burton | (Resigned 05/02/2003) | VP.32.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 30/03/2000 to 29/03/2004 | Conservative |

19. Organisation: St Johns NW4

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mrs R Levy | (Expired 16/02/2004) | VP.21a.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 17/02/2000 to 16/02/2004 | Conservative |

20. Organisation: St Josephs RC Junior School

No. of Representatives: 1

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mr P Theobald | (Deceased 31/08/2004) | VP.16.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 07/11/2000 to 08/11/2004 | Conservative |

21. Organisation: Summerside Primary School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 2

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Mrs J Underhill | (Resigned 25/09/2004) | P.16.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr T Renouf | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.16.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Councillor Mark Langton | (Disqualified 05/05/2005) | P.16.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 08/01/2003 to 07/01/2007 | Labour |

NB – ONLY ONE POST TO BE FILLED.

22. Organisation: The Orion Primary and Goldbeaters Primary Schools

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Ms Nargis Narenthira | (Appointed 14/09/2004) | P.50.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 | Labour |
| 2 - Councillor Gill Sargeant | (Appointed 14/09/2004) | P.50.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 | Labour |
| 3 - Mr Vinay Sharma | (Appointed 14/09/2004) | P.50.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 | Conservative |
| 4 - Mr J Hart | (Resigned 04/11/2004) | P.50.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 15/09/2004 to 14/09/2008 | Conservative |

23. Organisation: Wessex Gardens Primary School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 1 - Mr F Dannenburg | (Appointed 18/05/2004) | P.27.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 19/05/2004 to 18/05/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr A Maund | (Appointed 28/06/2005) | P.27.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mrs Vanessa Gearson | (Appointed 28/06/2005) | P.27.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 29/06/2005 to 28/06/2009 | Conservative |
| 4 - Councillor Monroe Palmer | (Expires 23/10/2005) | P.27.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 24/10/2001 to 23/10/2005 | Liberal Democrat |

Register of Appointments and Nominations on School Governors
Posts which will expire on reconstitution of the Governing Body

1. Organisation: Barnet Hill JMI and Nursery School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Mr Gordon Massey | (Appointed 17/05/2005) | P2.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 28/06/2005 to 27/06/2009 | Labour |
| | | |
| 2 - Mr J Tyler | (Disqualified 13/06/2003) | P2.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 27/07/2001 to 26/07/2005 | Conservative |
| | | |
| 3 - Councillor Linda McFadyen | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | P2.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |

2. Organisation: Childs Hill School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 - Ms Beverley Burchell | (Resigned 18/03/2005) | P.29.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 12/10/2004 to 11/10/2008 | Conservative |
| | | |
| 2 - Ms Margo Clegg | (Appointed 09/07/2002) | P.29.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 | Labour |
| | | |
| 3 - Mr Simon Kovar | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | P.29.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Liberal Democrat |

3. Organisation: Colindale JMI School

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Councillor Danish Chopra | (Appointed 26/10/2004) | P.32.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 29/10/2004 to 28/10/2008 | Labour |
| | | |
| 2 - Mr R Hubbard | (Appointed 19/11/2002) | P.32.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 19/11/2002 to 18/11/2006 | Conservative |
| | | |
| 3 - Mr Nitin Parekh | (Appointed 01/04/2004) | P.32.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 02/04/2004 to 01/04/2008 | Labour |
| | | |
| 4 - Mr Christopher Randall | (Appointed 16/12/2003) | P.32.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 06/01/2004 to 05/01/2008 | Labour |

4. Organisation: East Barnet School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Councillor Olwen Evans | (Resigned 22/06/2005) | S.04.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mrs M Murrill | (Appointed 10/09/2002) | S.04.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2002 to 09/09/2006 | Labour |
| 3 - Councillor Terry Burton | (Resigned 18/05/2005) | S.04.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 15/12/2004 to 14/12/2008 | Conservative |
| 4 - Councillor Fiona Bulmer | (Appointed 28/11/2001) | S.04.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 28/11/2001 to 27/11/2005 | Conservative |
| 5 - Ms Cathy Glasman | (Appointed 02/03/2004) | S.04.5 |
| Period of Appointment: | 30/03/2004 to 29/03/2008 | Labour |

NB – The vacancies S.04.1 and S.04.3 also appear on Appendix A, relating to routine vacancies. Any appointment made to fill the routine vacancy will run until 10 October 2005. This schedule invites nominations for appointments to commence on 11 October 2005, for which only 2 nominations are required..

5. Organisation: Livingstone Primary School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 3

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 - Mrs Usha Chopra | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | P.06.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Labour |
| 2 - Ms Rosallind Maira | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | P.06.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |
| 3 - Councillor Terry Burton | (Resigned 18/05/2005) | P.06.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |
| 4 - Mrs Elizabeth Pearson | (Appointed 22/10/2003) | P.06.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 22/10/2003 to 21/10/2007 | Labour |

6. Organisation: Oakleigh School

No. of Representatives: 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 - Mr John Tiplady | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | SP.03.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mrs Anne Jarvis | (Resigned 25/07/2004) | SP.03.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 | Labour |

NB – Vacancy SP.03.2 also appears on Appendix A, relating to routine vacancies. Any appointment made to fill the routine vacancy will run until 19 October 2005. This

schedule invites nominations for an appointment to commence on 20 October 2005.

7. Organisation: Summerside Primary School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Mrs J Underhill | (Resigned 25/09/2004) | P.16.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 2 - Mr T Renouf | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | P.16.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 3 - Councillor Mark Langton | (Disqualified 05/05/2005) | P.16.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 08/01/2003 to 07/01/2007 | Labour |

NB – The vacancies P. 16.1 and P. 16.3 also appear on Appendix A, relating to routine vacancies. Any appointment made to fill the routine vacancy will run until 2 November 2005. This schedule invites nominations for appointments to commence on 3 November 2005 for which only 2 nominations are required.

8. Organisation: The Ravenscroft School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 4

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1 - Mr A Hardy | (Appointed 26/08/2004) | S.12.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 10/09/2004 to 09/09/2008 | Labour |
| 2 - Ms Helena Davis | (Appointed 14/05/2003) | S.12.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 14/05/2003 to 13/05/2007 | Conservative |
| 3 - Mr S Lane | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | S.12.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 4 - Councillor Brian Coleman | (Appointed 06/07/2004) | S.12.4 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2004 to 08/07/2008 | Conservative |
| 5 - Councillor Fiona Bulmer | (Appointed 09/07/2002) | S.12.5 |
| Period of Appointment: | 09/07/2002 to 08/07/2006 | Conservative |

NB – Only two of the posts are to be filled.

9. Organisation: Underhill Infant School

No. of Representatives: Reducing to 2

Current Representatives

Vac Ref

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 1 - Councillor Anita Campbell | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | P.1a.1 |
| Period of Appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Labour |
| 2 - Mr Duncan Macdonald | (Appointed 11/11/2003) | P.1a.2 |
| Period of Appointment: | 11/11/2003 to 10/11/2007 | Liberal Democrat |
| 3 - Ms R Burrage | (Expired 05/01/2004) | P.1a.3 |
| Period of Appointment: | 06/01/2000 to 05/01/2004 | Liberal Democrat |

Register of Appointments and Nominations on Outside Bodies

1. Organisation: Almshouse Charities of Samuel Atkinson and Others

Special Conditions:

Persons appointed need not be Members of the Council but they must be nominated by the Councillors representing the Edgware Ward.

Appointment is four years, or for the remaining unexpired term if an appointee is replaced mid-term.

No. of Representatives: 3 (Representative Trustees)

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Joan Scannell	(Resigned 02/12/2003)	1002
		Member
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2003 to 06/12/2004	
2 - Mrs Jackie Page	(Appointed 20/03/2002)	1003
		Member
Period of Appointment:	20/03/2002 to 19/03/2006	
3 - Councillor Brian Gordon	(Appointed 26/11/2002)	1004
		Member
Period of Appointment:	26/11/2002 to 25/11/2006	

2. Organisation: Barnet Housing Associations Liaison Group

Special Conditions:

The representatives must include the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Director of Social Affairs (or his representative for Housing or his representative for Social Services).

No. of Representatives: 4

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Fiona Bulmer	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0047
		Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
2 - Councillor Brian Gordon	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0048
		Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
3 - Head of Housing	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0049
		Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
4 - Director of Community Services	(Resigned 05/07/2005)	0050
		Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	

3. Organisation: London Youth Games Limited

Special Conditions:

- (a) Annual appointment.
- (b) The representative must be a Member of the Council.
- (c) The substitute is to be an Officer.

No. of Representatives: 1 + 1 substitute

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Councillor Christopher Harris	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0124 Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
2 - Head of Education	(Resigned 07/07/2005)	0125 Substitute
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	

4. Organisation: National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection

Special Conditions:

The Council's representatives on this body must include the Head of Environmental Services or their representative (G.P. Cttee. Dec. 2/6/75-8(e)).

No. of Representatives: Up to 5

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Head of Environment and Neighbourhood	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0132 Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
2 - Mr Ray Phillips	(Appointed 17/05/2005)	0132a Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	
3 - Mr David Norton	(Resigned 16/08/2005)	0132b Member
Period of Appointment:	18/05/2005 to 16/05/2006	

5. Organisation: Poors Allotment Trust for Chipping Barnet and East Barnet

Special Conditions:

(a) Term of office is for four years.

(b) Representatives may, but need not, be Members of the Council. Meetings are held once a year in October/November.

No. of Representatives: 6 (Representative Trustees)

Current Representatives		Vac Ref
1 - Mr Don Goodman	(Expires 04/11/2005)	1109
		Member
Period of Appointment:	05/11/2001 to 04/11/2005	
2 - Councillor Wendy Prentice	(Appointed 14/05/2002)	1110
		Member
Period of Appointment:	14/05/2002 to 13/05/2006	
3 - Mrs M Leggett	(Appointed 09/07/2003)	1111
		Member
Period of Appointment:	09/07/2003 to 08/07/2007	
4 - Councillor Olwen Evans	(Appointed 26/08/2004)	1112
		Member
Period of Appointment:	27/08/2004 to 26/08/2008	
5 - Councillor Katia David	(Appointed 23/01/2002)	1113
		Member
Period of Appointment:	23/01/2002 to 22/01/2006	
6 - Mr John Tiplady	(Appointed 14/05/2002)	1114
		Member
Period of Appointment:	14/05/2002 to 13/05/2006	

REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGER**Overview and Scrutiny Committees - Programme of Work for 2005/2006**

The Constitution of the council states that Overview and Scrutiny Committee's/Sub-Committee's will be responsible for setting their own forward work programme and in doing so should take into account wishes of Members on that committee who are not members of the political group or groups forming the administration. It is a requirement of the Constitution that these work programmes be submitted to the Council for approval.

Detailed in this report are the suggested work programmes for 2005/2006 for the Overview and Scrutiny Committees. This does not include the Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee which deals with call-in procedures.

1. Summary

The Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committees forward Work Programmes detail areas for investigation in 2005/06 as agreed by Members of the Council's five Overview & Scrutiny Committees (excluding Cabinet Overview and Scrutiny Committee).

2. Relevant Previous Decisions

The Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee's met during June and July 2005 to discuss and agree forward work programmes for 2005/06.

3. Policy Considerations

Publication of a forward work programme for each Overview & Scrutiny Committee takes account of the requirement to programme reviews in respect of service delivery and service improvement, best value, policy issues and development, budget development and review of performance management throughout the Council.

The forward work programme must also allow capacity for scrutiny reviews and investigations which may arise at any point throughout the year. The work programmes must also pre-plan for the review of some external organisations and Council partners.

Each of the council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee's may also review and scrutinise the Council's Corporate Plan, Community Plan, relevant service Performance Management Plan (PMP) and wider performance information relevant to the committee's terms of reference and responsibilities.

4. Background Information / Officers Comments

The Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee's met at the following times to identify their forward work programmes for 2005/06.

- Cleaner, Greener, Transport and Development (2nd June 2005)
- First Class Education & Children (30th June 2005)
- Resources, Performance and Partnerships (1st June 2005)
- Supporting the Vulnerable in Our Community (20th July 2005)
- Tackling Crime and Housing (27th June 2005)

5. Overview & Scrutiny Committee Work Programmes 2005/06

The following work programmes have been identified by the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee's for 2005/06:

5.1 Cleaner, Greener, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To scrutinise and review:

1. Utility Companies
2. Parking
3. Building Control Service
4. Section 106
5. Grounds Maintenance, Street-Scene and Cleansing
6. Recycling
7. Air Quality Monitoring
8. The Council's Corporate and Community Plan's

5.2 First Class Education & Children Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To scrutinise and review five key headings as detailed in the Annual Performance Assessment (APA) relative to education and children:

1. Physical and mental health and emotional well-being *
2. Protection from harm and neglect *
3. Education, training and recreation *
4. Contribution made by young people to society *
5. Social and economic well-being *

6. Local education Authority OFSTED reports
7. Underlying causes for non-use of the boroughs leisure centres
8. The Council's Corporate and Community Plan's

(NB: the reviews marked * will be considered within the context of the Annual Performance Assessment framework).

5.3 Resources, Performance and Partnerships Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To scrutinise and review:

1. Gershon and Efficiencies
2. Consultation and Community Representation
3. The Future Shape of Barnet's Workforce
4. Voluntary Services Best Value Review
5. The Council's Corporate and Community Plan's

5.4 Supporting the Vulnerable in Our Community Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To scrutinise and review:

1. NHS Service Delivery and Major NHS Developments and Reconfigurations
2. Public Health & Health Improvement
3. Performance Measures and OPMP
4. The NHS assessment for improvement 'annual health check' process
5. Local NHS capacity and infrastructure / population growth in the borough
6. The Council's Corporate and Community Plan's

5.5 Tackling Crime and Housing Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To scrutinise and review:

1. Housing Complaints
2. Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)
3. Support for Vulnerable Council Tenants
4. Performance Monitoring

5. The Regional and Sub-Regional Approach to Housing Investment
6. Licensing Act 2003 – Implementation of Licensing Policy
7. Housing Benefits Administration
8. Housing Regeneration
9. Responding to Diversity
10. The Council's Corporate and Community Plan's

RECOMMEND - That the proposed forward work programmes for 2005/06 identified by the council's Overview & Scrutiny Committees, with the exception of the Cabinet Overview & Scrutiny Committee, be approved.

1. Overview and Scrutiny Committees in 2004/05: Annual Report

Introduction

- 1.1 The underlying purpose of the overview scrutiny function is to contribute to the improvement of services for Barnet's residents through the mechanisms of holding the executive to account, assisting with policy development, engaging with local communities and addressing performance management. This work is guided by the council's overall priorities and by the targets to which each service is working.
- 1.2 Each overview and scrutiny committee is responsible for setting its own work programme, taking account of the views of all its Members, key partners and community and voluntary groups subject to annual report to full Council. Committees may conduct research, question heads of service and Cabinet members, take evidence from whatever sources they may choose and make suggestions for the Executive to consider. These may take the form of discussions at the meeting, a written request to a Cabinet member or a formal report based on the findings from an inquiry, with recommendations for consideration by the Executive or the full Council (depending on which body is responsible for the function in question).

Themes for the Year

- 1.3 During 2004/05 overview and scrutiny committees used their 'challenge' role to contribute to service improvement and policy development in a diverse range of areas. Examples include:

'Healthy Start Healthy Futures' North Central London: Improving services for children and young people, pregnant women and newborn babies in Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington. A Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (JOSC) was established to scrutinise the HSHF proposals across the 5 boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington.

A preliminary programme of visits was also organised to the Acute Hospital sites in the North Central London area: (Barnet & Chase Farm, North Middx, UCLH, and the Royal Free & Whittington Hospitals). Further meetings of the

HSHF Joint Committee were also planned in order to consider evidence from PCTs, service providers and experts, to consider patient and public views, transport & other infrastructure issues, and also to consider feedback from JOSOC visits and consultation events.

NHS Continuing Care Consultation: The Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee considered a on a consultation launched by Barnet PCT to consider the future provision of NHS Continuing Care in the Borough. The Committee asked the PCT to take into consideration the issues raised by the committee before any further commissioning of nursing home care was undertaken.

MCS Programme: The Audit & Resources Scrutiny committee was asked to give oversight to of the MCS Programme, the procurement/IT project to replace the council's finance, human resources and payroll computer systems with a single, integrated new computer system. The committee considered the MCS Programme at various meetings in 2004/05 and was briefed at three major project milestones - 'supplier selection', 'blue printing' and just before 'go live'. One such meeting was held jointly with the Performance, Policy and Partnerships OSC.

Oversight of the Council's External Auditor: RSM Robson Rhodes, was also conducted on a cyclical basis, commencing with its Annual Audit and Inspection Plan, then reviewed the Interim Management Report and then considered the final Annual Audit and Inspection Letter.

Housing Association Development Partners; The Housing, Neighbourhoods & Community Safety Scrutiny Committee monitored the performance of both the Housing Service and the Council's panel of housing association development partners, examining areas of under performance and seeking information on the action being taken to improve performance.

Barnet Homes' draft Five Year Draft Business Plan 2005-10: In March 2005 Members of the Housing, Neighbourhoods & Community Safety Scrutiny Committee reviewed Barnet Homes' draft Five Year Draft Business Plan 2005-10, questioning its key achievements since being established as an arm's length management organisation in April 2004 and its main plans and challenges for the future.

National e-Government Targets: The Performance Scrutiny committee investigated the progress the Council was making towards implementing the national e-government targets and meeting the government's December 2005 deadline. The committee reviewed Information Systems' latest Priority Outcomes and Change Management Self Assessments prepared for the Council's IEG4 return to the government.

Best Value Reviews: Between September 2004 and March 2005, the Performance Scrutiny committee scrutinised the focus, conduct and rigour of the Information Systems BVR, starting with the scoping paper, reviewing progress in January 2005 and ending with the final report.

OFSTED Reports: The Education & Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee considered school Ofsted reports, questioning schools and the LEA on school

improvement, pupil attainment and other educational matters highlighted in individual school reports.

- 1.4 All committees conducted their annual review of the draft performance management plans 2004/05 for the services within their scrutiny remit and passed their comments to Cabinet, to be considered before budgets and plans were finally recommended to full Council.

- 1.5 Highlights of the work undertaken by each of the nine portfolio-based overview and scrutiny committees during 2004/05 are attached at Appendix 1.

Paul Rogers
Overview and Scrutiny Manager

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
Audit and Resources O&SC	
<p>Internal Audit Unit</p> <p>The committee cyclically oversaw the work of the council's Internal Audit Unit. It considered some specific follow-ups from the unit's 2003/04 annual report, considered the 2004/05 interim report and approved the draft 2005/06 Annual Audit Plan.</p>	<p>The committee paid close attention to those audits performed by Internal Audit where a remaining risk to the council was found to exist and made specific suggestions for improving these council functions. It also focussed on audits that had been conducted where no client response from the relevant head of service or director had been forthcoming. High-profile functions that were revisited included payroll fraud and the council's debt collection arrangements (i.e. issues to do with arrears, debt recovery procedures and other matters within the Revenues & Benefits Service). Observations and recommendations were given to the relevant directors, the Head of Human Resources and the Borough Treasurer.</p> <p>At the committee's suggestion and following discussions with the Chief Internal Auditor, the Internal Audit Unit produced a 'vision statement' for the service.</p>
<p>MCS Programme</p> <p>The committee was asked to give oversight to of the MCS Programme, the procurement/IT project to replace the council's finance, human resources and payroll computer systems with a single, integrated new computer system.</p>	<p>The committee considered the MCS Programme at various meetings in 2004/05 and was briefed at three major project milestones - 'supplier selection', 'blue printing' and just before 'go live'. One such meeting was held jointly with the Performance, Policy and Partnerships OSC.</p>
<p>Human Resources Service</p> <p>The committee oversaw the recovery plan for the Human Resources Service following the qualification by the Audit Commission of all the council's official human resources performance indicators in 2003/04.</p>	<p>At its meeting in November 2004, the committee was told by the external auditor, RSM Robson Rhodes, that there was corporate risk attached to the council's HR Service. The committee oversaw the project to improve the HR Service and the payroll function.</p>
<p>Corporate Anti-Fraud Team (CAFT)</p> <p>Scrutiny of the Corporate Anti-Fraud Team (CAFT), set up in 2003/04, came within the terms of reference of the committee for the first full municipal year.</p>	<p>The committee established a cyclical approach to the CAFT and an annual report was to be prepared by the CAFT on its work during 2004/05.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>External Auditor</p> <p>Oversight of the council's external auditor, RSM Robson Rhodes, was also conducted on a cyclical basis, so that this scrutiny in 2004/05 commenced with its Annual Audit and Inspection Plan, then reviewed the Interim Management Report and then considered the final Annual Audit and Inspection Letter.</p>	<p>The committee reviewed the various documents produced by the external auditor' (in conjunction with the Audit Commission, since these documents were joint publications covering both audit issues and inspection matters). The committee passed its comments on various aspects of the external auditor's findings to the cabinet, the external auditor and chief officers as required.</p>
<p>Annual Budget Consultation</p> <p>Discussion of the council's annual budget consultation and questionnaire sent to all households in the borough.</p>	<p>At its autumn meetings, the committee had traditionally debated the council's planned consultation mechanisms on budget setting, which were conducted in the winter and new year period. The committee did this again in 2004/05, offering observations to the council leader and the officers running the budget consultation project, and then receiving a report upon the results in early 2005.</p>
<h2>Children O&SC</h2>	
<p>Introducing the Delivery and Improvement Statement (DIS)</p> <p>The Head of Children and Families Service briefed the committee on the spring Delivery and Improvement Statement (DIS).</p>	<p>It was reported that the DIS was one way of monitoring the performance of the service against government objectives. The DIS was produced twice yearly, as a spring and autumn cycle. There were ten objectives set by the government for this area. For example, Objective 1 – Progress with Safe and Secure Care. It was reported that there were also target figures provided. For example, Objective 1: Targets and Performance Indicators show figures for 2003 Plan (what the service was aiming for), 2003-04 Forecast (what the service was predicting), 2003-04 Outturn (spring) the actual figure achieved.</p>
<p>The Hillingdon Ruling</p> <p>The Manger for Looked After Children (MLAC) briefed the Committee on the outcome of the High Court judicial review brought against Hillingdon Council concerning an asylum seeker, looked after under Section 17 of the Children Act 1989 and access to services under the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000.</p>	<p>The Committee questioned whether the Council would fund the continuing support of asylum seeking young people and were advised that it would.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Spring Delivery and Improvement (DIS) Statement</p> <p>The Divisional Manager for Looked After Children (DMLAC) and the Divisional Manager for Information and Service Improvement (DMISI) attended the committee to answer questions concerning the Spring Delivery and Improvement Statement (DIS).</p>	<p>The Committee reviewed performance against a number of the key performance measures detailed in the DIS, including young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 5 GCSE at grades A*-C, health of children looked after, protocols to support transition by children with disabilities from Children's Services to Adult Services and recruitment and retention levels.</p>
<p>Annual Report of Statutory Social Services Complaints</p> <p>The committee was briefed by the Central Complaints Liaison Officer (CCLO). The CCLO noted that there had been changes in complaints procedures since April 2004. Children who had made a complaint were offered an 'independent advocate' to check if they were satisfied with the way the complaint had been handled. Some children chose to make their complaints via the Children's Rights Service (Barnados in Barnet's case). The complaints leaflets had been already redesigned, and a more 'user friendly' version was in the process of being prepared.</p>	<p>In terms of numbers, there were few complaints, but this was a national phenomenon – most Stage 1 complaints required a letter of apology or explanation only. From April 2005, the Commission for Social Care Inspectorate will take over the stage 3 of the complaints procedure. If a complainant is unhappy after the formal investigation is carried out it will be referred to the CSCI, they will then decide if a review takes place, it is not an automatic right as it is at present. A new national requirement will also be introduced in April 2005, whereby there will be a 12-month time limit on making a complaint. The next annual report must contain an analysis of the age of complainant and the time that it took to resolve their complaint.</p>
<p>Children and Families Service – the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) Report</p> <p>The Head of Children and Families Service gave a presentation on the inspection of the Children and Families Service which took place between 6th-16th July 2004 by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI). An inspection of the service takes place once every three years. It was reported that the performance of the service is monitored by Central government through the spring and autumn Delivery and Improvement Statement (DIS), which is then followed by the Annual Review Meeting (ARM) and in November, star ratings for the service announced. The committee were informed that the Children and Families Service had retained their two star rating. The committee were informed that only five out of 150 Local Authorities with Children's services were judged to be 'serving all well with excellent prospects' and that a further two boroughs were judged as 'serving all well with promising prospects'. Only seven out of 150 boroughs were doing better than Barnet's Children service, which was</p>	<p>The Committee asked how decisions were reached involving keeping children with parents or placing them in care. The Committee were informed that the National Assessment Framework was used to assess the degree of risk involved. There was also some judgement involved after a thorough assessment of each situation and after working closely with council partners such as the police, health and education. The committee noted that the authority had had a problem with fostering in past years which no longer seemed to be the case. It was reported that all targets on adoptions were now being met. The number of in-house foster carers had also increased. Two very different types of need had to be met. Firstly, children who needed to be adopted and secondly, children who were placed with temporary foster carers with the intention of being returned to their natural parents at some stage.</p> <p>Members asked how deprivation helped shape the provision of the service. They were informed that service users were referrals (from the GP, school etc) and it did not matter whether the service was located in the East or West of the borough. People also visited health centres and schools first and it was these services that decided when to intervene. The HoSC&F was working closely with the Director for</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
currently in the top 17%.	Education and Children and the Chief Education Officer in this area. The Committee asked if the service was able to recruit a range of families for children from ethnic minorities and were informed that this is reasonably good. The service were working much more closely with the North London Consortium and it was also planned to pool resources with the London Borough of Enfield.
<p>Barnet Primary Care Trust and Delivery of the National Service Framework</p> <p>The Assistant Director for Children and Young People (Barnet Primary Care Trust) addressed the committee concerning implementation of the National Service Framework.</p>	It was reported that the intended timescale for delivery of the NSF was 10 years. Members were informed that the National Service Framework had 11 standards (within 3 parts – Part 1 for children, Part 2 for children in special circumstances and Part 3 for maternity services). It was also reported that it would require a cultural shift, working across the Children Act 2004 and the National Service Framework and bringing the two together.
<p>Health Arrangements for Looked After Children (LAC)</p> <p>The Divisional Manager for Looked After Children addressed the committee. It was reported that the LAC area required further development and that the health outcomes for LAC had always been significantly poorer than those of their peers living within their families. As a consequence, the implementation of new guidance on meeting the health needs of looked after children was a key element of the Quality Protects Programme initiated in 1998. It was reported that central to this was the requirement that all looked after children should have a health assessment on a 6 monthly basis or until they were 5 years old and yearly thereafter. In order to meet this requirement, the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had allocated one senior nurse and one junior nurse into the Children and Families Service. The committee were informed that the health assessment was of the child's health needs, with the nurses confirming whether immunisations were up to date and that there were no medical concerns. Eating habits, sleep patterns, family planning and other matters were also discussed with the children and young people. As a result of this assessment, a health plan is then drawn up by the child, the nurse and the carer and the social worker copied into the Plan to ensure that it's implementation and monitoring takes place.</p>	In response to the Committee's questions, it was reported that if a child comes from out of borough, then the child's medical records are still the responsibility of that borough's Children and Families service. Although the file will not be forwarded to Barnet, nurses do have access to the national health database. As part of the Children Act 2004, a new integrated Children's system was under development. It was often very difficult to ascertain asylum seeking children's medical history, although the children were often more receptive to receiving a medical assessment. The committee were also informed that the Health Guidance had been updated and there was a requirement that the initial health assessment be conducted by a medically qualified practitioner. Through the Quality Protects programme and various other funding streams a looked after children's service had been established as part of Barnet's Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, comprising of psychiatry, psychology, art and family therapy and child psychotherapy.

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Draft Budget and Performance Management Plans for the Children and Families Service</p> <p>The Head of Children and Families Service provided an overview of the Children and Families Service draft Performance Management Plans (PMPs), reporting that :</p> <p>That the main difference in the 2005/6 Children and Families Service PMP concerned the Children Act 2004, concerning the five priorities of staying safe, being healthy, enjoying and achieving, economic wellbeing and making a contribution. The function of the Children's Service was to focus and assess children most in need. Members were also informed that the 18 recommendations made by the CSCI inspectors had been incorporated into the report.</p>	<p>Key risks had been identified which included the capacity of partners, the consequences of asylum and Immigration legislation/regulation and the importance of ensuring that Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) did reduce anti-social behaviour rather than increase the number of young people entering care and/or custody.</p>
<p>Culture, Community Engagement, Human Resources and Equalities O&SC</p>	
<p>How Greenspaces Aim to Meet the Community Leisure Needs in the 21st Century</p> <p>The Service Manager for Greenspaces briefed the Committee on the ways in which Greenspaces aimed to meet the community leisure needs in the 21st Century. The Committee considered the Greenspaces Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>The Committee expressed unanimous agreement that money should go directly into parks and not to a central fund. The Committee established that there would be a monitoring of Section106 income to ensure it is tracked and spent as intended. The Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet that Barnet achieve at least one green flag park as soon as possible and well before 2008. The Cabinet member confirmed that he was happy for Barnet to achieve one Green Flag status in a park as soon as possible and that the council would submit a site for green flag assessment in 2005-6.</p> <p>The Committee also reviewed refreshment facilities in parks as an area that should be promoted further to encourage more people to use the borough' park's. The Greenspaces Manager informed the Committee that the renewal of café leases were taking place and that tenders were being considered. The Committee discussed the quality of pitches in the borough and subsequently undertook further work into the hire prices of Barnet pitches with a comparison to other boroughs.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Youth Services in Barnet – Developing Partnerships and Widening Participation</p> <p>The purpose of the review was to assess the current extent and nature of the voluntary youth sector in Barnet, how local voluntary and community groups operated, how they helped young people to develop as individuals, broaden their experiences and skills and realise their personal potential and What sort of help the Council could best give the Barnet voluntary and community youth sector to help them develop their activity programme, widen participation among young people and support them as organisations. The committee took evidence from a number of organisations to support the review. Research also included questionnaires and interviews and over 40 voluntary and community groups were contacted and site visits were made. Voluntary and community organisations attended the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to inform members of their organisation's work and interviews were carried out with the London Borough of Barnet's Youth Service which included the Grahame Park and Rainbow Youth Centre managers, the Detached Youth Work team leader, the Drugs and Alcohol manager, Oasis and Barnet Grants Unit.</p>	<p>The Committee drafted a report detailing a number of recommendations arising from the review, which were put forward for further consideration by the Cabinet. Some of the recommendations included the development of an effective and consistent method of registering voluntary youth organisations with a clear remit of what is expected from a voluntary organisation; advice on Council funding and the different avenues of funding available be given to voluntary organisations and that the Council looks at how additional youth facilities, both centre-based and otherwise could be provided, including active partnership with the voluntary sector.</p>
<p>Greenspaces, Pitches and Cafes</p> <p>The committee considered the councils management of green spaces, sports pitches and café facilities located in parks. The Greenspaces Manager presented a report regarding cafés in the parks of Barnet and the cost of pitches compared with adjacent Boroughs.</p> <p>It was reported that in the past, leasing had taken place on an ad hoc basis, but that this was no longer the case as a dedicated officer with the responsibility of overseeing the leasing of cafés in the parks had been employed. It was reported that there was concern regarding some of the café buildings and that where leases were available, these were being advertised and tendering was due to take place which would be a good indication of whether some buildings were really viable for use.</p>	<p>The committee noted the variance in usage of cafes across the borough's parks, and sought clarification as to why this was the case and whether there were any particular reasons for such inconsistency of usage across the parks. It was informed that a number of explanations could be put forward, ranging from ease of access to the park itself, other facilities available in the park to attract people to it and the management of the businesses themselves. With regard to those cafes out of lease, the committee asked what financial implications arose in relation to any such properties and were advised that the Council did not stand to lose money. Buildings that were not used were boarded up and after tendering, assessed whether they were viable to keep open. The committee also sought further clarification over the tendering process and associated timescales with the tendering process.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Barnet Parks – Green Flag Status</p> <p>The Cabinet member for Environment and Transport attended the committee in order to answer questions by the members of this committee on its recommendation that at least one Barnet park achieves Green Flag status as soon as possible and well before 2008. In reference to a Cultural Services Inspection report, the committee sought clarification as to whether one or two parks would attain green flag, as there seemed to be a discrepancy. The Committee were informed that submission of any applications for Green Park status were required by February 2005. An internal self-assessment had been undertaken and completed. The parks service were seeking an external body to review the findings and outcomes of the self-assessment. The Cabinet Member advised the committee that the intention was to put forward more than one park for Green Flag status.</p>	<p>The committee asked what the difference was between Premier Parks and Green Flag Status parks. The Cabinet Member stated that Premier Parks was the Council's strategy whereby sixteen of the borough's parks were identified for further improvement and the quality of the premier parks was measured against the 'Green Flag' standard, which was a national initiative. Each of the 16 parks were subject to a five year improvement plan. The Cabinet member stated that there was concern about non-premier parks and that this had been discussed in detail with the Head of Service. Measures had been taken to improve the standards of quality in these parks. The committee noted that the strategy focus of the plan appeared to be balanced, but also noted that there should be no risk of green flag status leading to a potential downgrading of those parks outside of the green flag category. The committee were advised that a five-year improvement plan was in place for Premier Parks, and that associated issues of grounds maintenance and the allocation of parks resources were also to be reviewed.</p>
<p>Partnership Working and Community Engagement in Barnet</p> <p>The Community Partnerships Manager gave a presentation on partnership working, community planning and community consultation and engagement. The presentation outlined how the Council had been meeting its statutory responsibility under the 2000 Local Government Act to prepare a community strategy; the role and work programme of Barnet's Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) and how the consultation and engagement strategy agreed by Cabinet aimed to enhance the authority's engagement with the wider community. The committee sought detail as to the range of work undertaken to engage with communities. It was informed that a range of networks outside of the council are also used for community engagement activities. For example, the council had arrangements in place with the Barnet Voluntary Service Council (BVSC), Barnet Arts Council as well as the Resident Participation Service. However, it was recognised that this may not reach every part of the Barnet community.</p>	<p>The committee asked whether there was another way in which these organisations could feed into the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) without attending the Civic Network. Barnet First, the council's community publication, was put forward as another vehicle for wider community communication. For example, the Council's revised Community Plan needs to be adopted by mid-2006 and consultation around this will take place through the publication. Officers also have contact with the Equalities team who have Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) contacts in a number of community groups.</p> <p>The Committee asked whether consultation was undertaken in languages other than English. Large scale consultation was not undertaken in other languages, although a paragraph at the end of the document for translation requests is made available. It was reported that demand for the service had been low. The document was placed in all of the council's libraries.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Leisure and Fitness: Access to Leisure and Community Facilities</p> <p>The Acting Leisure Service Manager (ALSM) and the Contracts Manager for Greenwich Leisure Limited (CMGLL) attended this meeting. The acting Leisure Service Manager informed the committee that in January 2003, Greenwich Leisure Limited had become an active partner of the Council with the remit to manage eight leisure facilities and that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The eight facilities were open for at least 12 hours each weekday • Copthall Leisure Centre, Finchley Lido and Church Farm pool were open for 15 hours each day • Most centres can be reached using public transport although it was recognised that this was more difficult for Copthall Leisure Centre and Copthall Athletics Stadium • The Bonus Card was available to those users most in need • New computer systems were being installed which would allow for better data to be collected which would allow for different user groups to be identified • The Council recently commissioned a Disabled and Facilities Review of all the facilities under the management of GLL to determine the suitability of the accommodation in respect of Disabled Access • The committee were informed that in order to obtain further information about the non-users of these facilities a questionnaire would be placed before the Citizen's panel in January 2005. 	<p>The committee noted that although good developments had taken place, in other boroughs the initiative was to target certain groups that under-used leisure facilities. The committee sought to clarify whether there were any initiatives in Barnet supported by GLL addressing needs of minority groups. In response, CMGLL informed the committee that they worked closely with the Leisure Service to identify such groups. For example, at Copthall and Finchley there were swimming pool sessions for Muslim women only. The committee addressed funding streams and how their future level would shape the delivery and output of services via leisure centres in the borough. The committee were advised that there had been no reduction in funding from the council to support such services. GLL's objective was to provide a complete service and contractual obligations were in place to ensure that those services were provided. Reviewing the concessionary rates data, Members noted that there was a £20 single (monthly) membership fee which was at a concessionary rate. Members asked whether it was thought that this fee was reasonable. The ALSM was of the opinion that it was, particularly when compared to private health facilities.</p> <p>The committee noted that the Cultural services inspection findings gave the Leisure services a low rating and only 26% were satisfied with the services. The committee asked what actions had been taken to improve performance. The committee were advised that Audits had been undertaken and it became evident that the wording of the questionnaire used was misleading. The questionnaire was to be repeated through the Citizens Panel, with results by the end of January 2005. The committee asked for further detail as to the underlying causes for the council's poorer comparative performance with other London authorities. The fact that the methodology for conducting the survey had changed was conveyed as a possible explanation for the results, as well as the point that people's perceptions of what constituted 'leisure' needed further clarification and a clearer definition. The committee sought detail for levels of usage of Barnet's leisure facilities and were advised that there was room for further improvement. It was also reported, however, that the leisure centres were seeing an increasing number of people who had switched from private facilities and who now viewed the council's facilities as good as those in private facilities. GLL had also appointed a Community Development Officer whose role was to promote these facilities with groups in the community and schools to encourage young people to use the facilities as well. In terms of physical access to the facilities, the committee were advised that refurbishments which had taken place complied with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA).</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Review of the Draft Budget and Performance Management Plans 2005/06</p> <p>The Head of Leisure and Libraries and Acting Head of Human Resources attended the committee. The committee scrutinised a number of the areas detailed with the respective Performance Management Plans (PMP) for these services.</p>	<p>Leisure and Libraries</p> <p>With regard to performance management issues, the committee queried how the service changes would affect Performance Indicator performance relating to 'maximise usage of libraries through visits and take-up of service', and more specifically to the stock issues targets for books. The HoLL pointed out that due to the 6.50% reduction in opening hours and 9% budget for stock, following on from the reduced spend in 2003/04 on stock, there would be an inevitable reduction in loans, estimated at 9% on book issues, but higher on music audio due to market changes. Due to the success of Hendon Library the service may meet the Public Library Service standard for visits. The committee agreed to request that Cabinet reconsider the proposed reduction in resource to the libraries service and whether it would be possible to find a sponsor for the mobile library vehicle earmarked to be taken out of service and to reassess the proposals concerning reduced opening hours.</p> <p>The committee also sought clarification regarding the Council's responsibility to ensure that the leisure buildings comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and whether the leisure services target of 5% increase in participation in sports development was a realistic target considering reduction in service resource. It was within GLL's contract to ensure that compliance with DDA legislation was in respect of building accessibility was complied with. All newly refurbished leisure buildings took DDA into account. The Sports Development officers were confident that they would meet the target of increase in participation in sports development by 5% target owing to the fact that the service worked in partnership with a number of groups to deliver sports development programmes and could also secure funding for such groups. The committee were of the opinion that there should be a specific amount of funding from the Council for sports programmes rather than external groups, depending on external funding and grants.</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <p>Gender Equalities Act:</p> <p>The committee asked how Barnet had implemented the Gender Equalities Act in terms of equality of pay. The committee were advised that equal pay and progression schemes had been identified for further review in some detail. The pay grading system was another area identified for further work to ensure that the authority met the Equal Pay Act.. During 2005, HR would be collecting the data for</p>

<p><u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u></p>	<p><u>Findings and Recommendations</u></p>
	<p>this work to proceed with a major project scheduled for initiation in 2006/07.</p> <p>Absence and Sickness Data</p> <p>The committee noted that the target for absence and sickness in the authority was 7 days, which the committee thought to be quite high. It asked what would be done to reduce this and whether the underlying causes for sickness were known. The committee was advised that there were a significant number of staff who were absent on long-term sick leave. The HR Department had a dedicated member of staff assisting in helping people back to work.</p> <p>Risk Assessments:</p> <p>The committee sought confirmation as to whether the risk assessments framework detailed in the PMP could be resourced so as to meet its requirements. The committee were informed that HR were reviewing ways to ensure that the requirements were met. Apart from buildings and structure, organisational culture and improving information and communication had to be considered.</p> <p>Disabilities</p> <p>The committee asked what the figure was for disabled people employed by the Council. It was advised that the figure stood at 2%, but that employees may not disclose this information as they did not consider themselves to have a disability. The committee also asked how the authority was actively promoting the employment of disabled people. It was informed that focus was on internal and existing staff rather than through external recruitment, due to lack of existing vacancies. Provision of work experience had been identified for further development.</p>
<p>Leaflets and the Dissemination of Information to the Community and Effectiveness of the Borough Website</p> <p>The Head of Cultural Services and Library Service Manager reported to the committee that hard copy information sources found in the boroughs libraries were largely grouped by information type and priority order. This led to two significant information types; local information relevant specifically to within the borough of Barnet and secondly, information relating to neighbouring boroughs and cross-</p>	<p>The committee questioned the statement in the report that the council's publication 'Barnet First' was distributed to every household within the borough. The committee were of the opinion that this was detrimental to the promotion of some council activities and asked what action was being taken to address this. The LSM responded that the council's Communications team dealt with the distribution of Barnet First. Cultural Services had found from past experience that the level of distribution of the magazine across the borough improved when concerns with the performance of the distributors was brought to the direct attention of the Communications team, who then raised the matter directly. Every household within</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>borough activities. The information sources were also categorised and made available by relevance, for example, literature of interest to older people would be made available and presented together within the library. Use of the Council's website was being monitored to ascertain how it was used by user groups. Opportunities were sought to utilise the web site in order to reach a wider audience, specifically around promotion of special events and promotions facilitated and supported by Cultural Services. The report to the committee also detailed the range and type of information material made available to the public, where it can be found and, in some instances, provides data relating to actual take up and usage of the material.</p>	<p>the borough, including residents in council blocks and flats, should receive a copy of Barnet First. The Committee asked whether the Post Office's postal address database could be used as the basis for future distribution of the magazine. It was advised that the council presently used the Electoral Role as the main data source. However, the committee's concerns around the distribution of the magazine would be raised directly with the Communications Team.</p> <p>The Committee noted the report's details on the rise in the use of the web to access information generally. Members asked what provision was made specifically for older people, who may have a disability which ruled out using technology, or for those residents who simply did not have access to such technology. The LSM stated that all staff working in the borough's libraries were trained to help all citizens who may have specific information requests. Staff take the time to source the material, which is free of charge. The Social Services Department provided a guide specifically for pensioners detailing relevant and useful services, which was available in all of the council's libraries. The Committee asked whether a strategy existed to promote greater use of the council website. It was informed that such a strategy was in place. There were also national transactional e-gov performance indicators relating to the library service for example. National targets also existed around take up of on-line payment facilities.</p>
<p>Provision of Arts Services by the Arts Depot Trust Ltd in Partnership with Cultural Services</p> <p>The Head of Cultural Services reported to the committee. The report outlined the range of work currently undertaken by the Arts Depot Trust Ltd in partnership with Cultural Services and the existing Arts Depot work programmes for 2004/05 and new work programme for 2005/06.</p> <p>It was reported that the Arts Depot Trust had agreed £108,000 funding over the next three years. Rather than run the potential risk of duplicating council activity, the agreement allowed for the Arts Depot to be the central focus for community arts activity within the borough. Joint working between the Arts Council and Cultural Services would, however, be central to the future management of the arts programme within the borough, specifically with regard to a diverse and strategic approach to future cultural provision. It was envisaged that the</p>	<p>The Committee asked whether a strategy had been prepared for when the three years of secured Arts Depot funding came to an end. The HoCS advised that it had not at the time. However, funding had been secured to cover the important 12-18 month period for firmly establishing the Arts Depot within the borough. The HoCS stated that in arts development terms, secured funding over a three year period was viewed as a reasonable timescale. Cultural Services were however working with the council's Legal Services Department with regard to future funding arrangements.</p> <p>The Committee asked whether the 2005/06 work programme detailed in the report was the full programme. It was advised that it was not, but was a summary of key activities of work to be undertaken by the Arts Depot and council staff. Provision had been allowed for further activities to be included in the work programme over the course of the year. The Arts Depot was required to produce an Annual report providing data around take up of services over 2003/04, as well as providing other monitoring data on the activities taking place at the Depot.</p> <p>The Committee asked how the Arts Depot Annual Work Programme was agreed.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>agreement would also allow for greater scope of future arts provision and help facilitate in particular the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal arts events • Educational achievement • Community partnerships • Delivery of the annual work programme • Engagement with young people <p>It was envisaged that the agreement would provide greater access to arts education, reduce the risk of exclusion and encourage young people to participate in arts and cultural events.</p> <p>The Committee received the Arts Depot work programme for 2004/05, and the future work programme for 2005/06. The activities and events which comprised the yearly work programmes were funded by groups such as Sure Start and the Milly Apthorp Trust and therefore the funding underpinning the work programmes was reported to be sound. The work programmes were designed to make provision for all community groups and people of all ages.</p>	<p>The HoCS informed the Committee that this was done by legal contract, which was signed by all parties. Regular contact was also maintained between parties and a reconciled statement provided to Cultural Services from the Arts Depot detailing how monies for the associated activities and events was actually spent.</p> <p>Regarding revenue funding for community festivals, the Committee asked if this was at the same level as before the Arts Depot agreement. The HoCS advised that it was at approximately £5,000. The Committee asked if any charges were levied to set up the community festivals. The HoCS replied that this was uncertain in terms of hire of marquees and tents, but that the £5,000 revenue fund was used to provide advice regarding health and safety and other areas. The funding was separate from Arts Depot funding and only provided to those constitutionally formed groups recognised by the council.</p> <p>Members asked why the Big Draw – Community Focus event was taking place at Brent Cross shopping centre rather than the Arts Depot. The HoCS advised the Committee that the council had established good partnership working with the Brent Cross centre, that the BCC was a partner in the Local Strategic Partnership, and had the advantage of a high throughput of people visiting the shopping centre. Consequently this allowed for major exposure of such initiatives which could not be readily replicated elsewhere.</p>
<p>Satisfaction with Leisure Services – Citizens Panel Survey 2005 and Annual Residents Survey 2005</p> <p>The Acting Leisure and Partnerships Manager and Corporate Performance Research Officer presented the findings of the Citizens Panel Survey (February) 2005 and Annual Residents Survey (January) 2005 in relation to the provision of Leisure Services in the borough.</p> <p>The Annual Residents Survey showed that user satisfaction levels within the borough were lower than in 2004, with a headline satisfaction figure of 19%, which accounted for users and non-users of leisure services in the borough. However, when the figures are broken down to look at satisfaction levels with users only, the satisfaction level reached 61%. Following the outcome of the respective surveys, council officers would be discussing the results with Greenwich</p>	<p>The Committee asked whether surveys had been distributed to all Barnet residents and were advised that the Citizens Panel survey was distributed to one thousand Citizen Panel members, across the borough. The survey was concerned specifically with leisure centres. The survey was undertaken on a one-to-one basis, which included non-users of the boroughs leisure facilities (the definition of leisure for the purpose of the survey did not include cinema, theatre, bowling etc). It was found that the majority of users of leisure centres in the borough were satisfied. The Committee sought clarification as to how the sample for the Citizens Panel was selected and was informed that the Citizens Panel comprised one thousand residents, which when taken as a whole reflected the demographics of the borough in terms of ethnicity, age profile etc.</p> <p>The committee asked whether the action plan would specifically address the shortfall in user satisfaction levels. They found that Greenwich Leisure had a community officer to raise the profile of the leisure centres in order to raise usage and, therefore, income arising which was then returned to the running of the centres. The</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Leisure. Greenwich Leisure were in the process of producing their own user survey, which would also include non-users.</p> <p>Contrary to the Annual Residents Survey, the Barnet Citizen's Panel survey reported that 61% of all users were satisfied with the provision of leisure services, which was similar to the outcomes arising from the Barnet Citizens Panel survey. Consequently, Barnet officers planned to contact other London boroughs who were currently in partnership arrangements with Greenwich Leisure in order to establish whether there were any significant discrepancies in satisfaction rates of users between the respective boroughs. An action plan would be put in place, detailing measures and initiatives to encourage an increase in the usage of the boroughs leisure centres.</p>	<p>outcomes from both the Annual Residents Survey and Citizens Panel Survey would be fed into the Greenwich Leisure Annual Survey. Members asked where the budget would be found for the follow up to the Greenwich Leisure user survey. It was reported that Greenwich Leisure would fund their own survey.</p> <p>In response to the committee asking whether the service had Greenwich Leisure customer satisfaction statistics for their leisure operations in other boroughs, it was reported that such data was available and that Barnet officers were scheduled to visit six London Boroughs who also had partnership agreements with Greenwich Leisure in order to review their user satisfaction levels for their leisure centres. If there appeared to be any disparity in the satisfaction levels between Barnet and other boroughs further action would be undertaken.</p> <p>The committee were advised that a total of four hundred Citizen Panel surveys were returned, which was considered to be a good rate of return for a postal survey. A total of One thousand Annual Resident Surveys were completed, via one to one street interviews. Members asked if a sample of one thousand was appropriate for a survey which was then used as an indicator of customer satisfaction levels in a borough with a population of over three hundred thousand people. It was confirmed that a sample size of one thousand would be considered satisfactory and fit for purpose. It was also noted that there were a total of thirty-two sampling points across the borough in respect of the Residents Survey.</p> <p>The committee asked whether in light of the level of usage of leisure centres being increased, should Leisure Services not target specific non-user groups and whether or not such groups specifically targeted in the survey. This was particularly applicable in the case of black and minority ethnic groups. Members were advised that the Resident's Survey used census information specific to Barnet in order to reflect the ethnic make up of the borough. Furthermore Leisure Services were endeavouring to raise the profile of leisure centres in the borough generally to increase usage of the centres. The service would be working closely with Greenwich Leisure to address these areas via a targeted action plan, which accounts for specific groups within the community.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
Education and Lifelong Learning O&SC	
<p>The Council as a Corporate Parent</p> <p>The report was presented to the Committee by the Divisional Manager for Looked After Children and the Divisional Manager for Information and Service Improvement. The document "If this were my child...A councillor's guide to being a good corporate parent" was discussed by the Committee. The Committee agreed that this document was vital in the scrutiny of this service area and that the concept of corporate parenting was the responsibility of all the councillors in the borough.</p>	<p>The health, education and well-being of looked after children was addressed, with reference to the document. The Committee discussed areas which included the health of looked after children and young people, the number of incidents with the police and the outcomes and the education of looked after children. The Divisional Managers outlined the work that had already taken place regarding the areas highlighted by the Committee. The Committee referred the document on corporate parenting responsibilities to full Council.</p>
<p>Barnet Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB)</p> <p>The Project Manager for the Barnet Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB) and the Head of Children and Families Service informed the Committee of the work undertaken by the Board. Areas addressed included responsibilities of the Board, the Boards potential to develop joint delivery and resourcing mechanisms for education, social care, youth services and health and mechanism's for addressing the requirements of the Children Bill in relation to the establishment of statutory Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (SCB). Members of the committee asked a number of questions relating to statutory timescales for setting up the Strategic Partnership Board, multi-agency and partnership work taking place in Barnet and how it would be developed further through the Children's Centres and the Extended Schools initiative, how the work of the CYPSPB linked in to the work of Connexions, what mechanisms were in place to measure the Board's commitment and priorities and how children's health issues were incorporated into this.</p>	<p>The committee found that the statutory requirement is for Local Government to be moving towards Children's Trusts by 2006 and should have established Children's Trusts by 2008. For Barnet, the CYPSPB is a virtual trust as the voluntary and the statutory services come together to improve the services for young people.</p> <p>Priorities are identified and agreed by the board and this information is disseminated to services. Developments in multi-agency and partnership work has taken place in Barnet and will be developed further through the children's centres and extended schools. The Project Manager and the Head of Children's Service explained that: the Children's Centres build on existing provision to provide a one stop source of early education, child care and family support. They are key to the development of preventative strategies in their area, and their range of services may or may not be located under the same roof. The Extended Schools initiative is based on bringing schools to the centre of the community and using the school as a provider of multi-agency services therefore not only providing education, but also healthcare, social care, child care, after school clubs, holiday clubs, study support, youth services and adult education. This aims to support schools in providing family and community services on the school site for the benefit of pupils, their families and the wider community. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) has indicated that all LEAs will eventually have at least one 'full service' Extended School. From April 1st 2005, Whitefield Secondary School will pilot this.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>An update on the Victoria Climbié Inquiry – Area Child Protection Committee</p> <p>The Head of Children and Families Service updated the Committee on the Victoria Climbié Inquiry and the Area Child Protection Committee. The committee learned that as a result of the Laming Report, all authorities were required to carry out a self audit which was moderated by the Social Services Inspectorate (SSI). The report outlined the action points of Barnet Social Services and it was stated that all the recommendations were overseen by the Safeguarding Board. Members were reminded that the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) would take place in Barnet and that the focus of the inspection would be the Safeguarding agenda.</p>	<p>Issues raised by the committee included what development had taken place in relation to the Out of Hours Service and how the translation and interpreting service was used by the Children and Families Service, as this was highlighted by the VCI as a vital component of a service meeting the needs of all children. The Out of Hours service had been delivered through a service level agreement at Harrow. A completed internal audit had just been completed and there were a wide range of issues that have arisen which the Children and Families Service were looking into. The committee found that the translation and interpretation service was delivered through a whole Council approach. The committee were advised that the service was out to tender and a new contract would be in place by September 2004.</p> <p>The committee sought to establish what happened to children once they had moved out of the borough. It found that there was a set of pan-London procedures to follow for this section of the recommendations. There was one set of Child Protection Procedures covering all London boroughs. However, if a child moved out of the borough, that borough must be informed that that child is on the Child Protection Register. An effective system is not in place- it can be argued that the Information, Referral and Tracking (IRT) would have been a way forward, but there have been considerable problems regarding civil rights issues linked to the rights of parents. Each local authority was required to develop their own information sharing system, but this did not deal with the issue of children regularly relocating to different boroughs. The committee also reviewed further the findings of the internal audit carried out on the Emergency (out of hours) Service.</p>
<p>OFSTED INSPECTIONS</p> <p>The Committee held a number of meetings dedicated to school OFSTED Inspection reports for both primary and secondary schools, questioning schools and the LEA on school improvement, pupil attainment and other educational matters highlighted in individual school reports.</p>	<p>The Committee noted the Ofsted recommendations and the progress the schools were making and the role of the LEA.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Early Years Provision</p> <p>The Assistant Chief Education Officer (Early Years, Families and Play) presented to the Committee. The report was a summary of Barnet's progress against the National DfES Strategic Goals and Targets for early years and childcare provision. The majority of the targets set had been achieved, and in some cases exceeded. The Assistant Chief Education Officer provided detail on the eight goals and targets.</p>	<p>It was emphasised that multi-agency work was taking place and that a global view had been adopted, particularly through the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB). It was reported that the issues of housing had to be taken into account. Although dealt with efficiently on an individual basis, there was scope to develop this further at a strategic level.</p>
<p>Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB)</p> <p>The Project Manager for the Barnet Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Board (CYPSPB) and the Chief Education Officer addressed the Committee on the work of the Board.</p>	<p>The committee learned that the CYPSPB brings together all services with responsibility for children and young people in Barnet, with the possibility of involving parents, carers and young people. The CYPSPB is driven by Every Child Matters (September 2003) and Every Child Matters: Next Steps (March 2004) and the Children Bill. Development of Children's Centres was taking place and money had been received from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to pilot two Children Centres and one Extended School in Barnet.</p>
<p>Behaviour Support Plan</p> <p>The Chief Education Officer reported that the purpose of the Behaviour Support Plan was to capture and present to schools what was happening in Barnet, to provide guidance and outline key activities taking place.</p>	<p>The Committee sought detail concerning how many exclusions schools made that were not supported by the LEA and what monitoring took place if a child had been permanently excluded. It was reported that two exclusions were overturned through an independent appeal panel, not the LEA. Headteachers were not using permanent exclusions as there was more support available through the Learning Mentors. Learning support centres were also found to be very effective. Early intervention work was viewed a priority. If a child was permanently excluded the LEA provided full time provision for that child. There was also the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) with capacity for up to 50 secondary pupils. For primary school children, there was one permanent exclusion for the year, with the child concerned being placed in one of the two schools the LEA has an agreement with (to provide provision for excluded primary pupils). The Committee were further advised that it was the responsibility of the LEA (for out of borough placements) to inform Barnet LEA that the child had been permanently excluded. It was reported that there was increased support provided to schools due to Learning Mentors and due to partnership working with the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). It was reported that CAMHS had assessed 200 pupils in Barnet during the course of the year, highlighting the move towards a preventative culture.</p>

<p align="center"><u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>Findings and Recommendations</u></p>
<p>Meeting the needs of English as an Additional Language (EAL) pupils in the London Borough of Barnet</p> <p>The manager of the Minorities Achievement Project presented to the committee.</p>	<p>The committee established that the performance of EAL pupils in Barnet was significantly above national levels in tests at each key stage in 2003. Fewer EAL pupils achieved Level 4 or more in English (4% gap) and maths (2% gap) at Key Stage 2 compared with the average for all Barnet pupils. However by GCSE, 2% more EAL learners achieved 5+A*-C grades than the LEA average for all pupils.</p> <p>The LEA had responsibility for supporting schools in improving outcomes for EAL and minority ethnic learners. The LEA's support for schools emphasised the development of whole school and classroom strategies that promote positive attitudes to cultural and linguistic diversity. MAP Consultants advise and in some instances work alongside staff in planning and modelling classroom practice that reflects the experiences, languages and cultural heritage of all children, differentiates approaches to teaching and learning to engage all pupils and monitors individual children's progress to inform planning. From September 2004, the MAP and Primary Strategy Teams would be working with five primary schools as an associate of a national primary bilingual project intended to narrow inequalities in achievements of pupils learning English as an Additional Language by developing the expertise and confidence of mainstream teachers in meeting their needs. The MAP Refugee Consultant had worked intensively with a number of secondary schools during the past year to review and extend opportunities for welcoming and inducting new refugee arrivals. A Barnet school was highlighted as an example of excellence in a recent Ofsted publication "Managing the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant: Good practice in primary schools".</p>
<p>The Performance of the LEA</p> <p>The Chief Education Officer made a presentation to the committee on the performance of LEA. The LEA Profile (November 2004) and the Barnet Learning Networks document were provided for the committee.</p> <p>The Committee were informed that Barnet was divided into four Learning Networks which aimed to meet the needs of the children in those communities. Whilst there were schools in special measures, the committee were informed that two of these schools had recently come out of this category and that HMI judged the schools within this category as on track for the target date for removal. The CEO informed the committee that additional schools had been identified by the LEA as causing concern and that the LEA had directed support to</p>	<p>Foundation Stage</p> <p>The Chief Education Officer informed the committee that this was the phase of education for children aged 3 to 5 years old. The Foundation Stage Profile (2004) highlighted areas that required further development, particularly in writing.</p> <p>Key Stage 1</p> <p>The committee were informed that Key Stage 1 (Writing Level 2) was a concern and that an analysis of schools with a 10%+ fall in writing highlighted various reasons for this. It was reported that the LEA were working with these schools and were advocating the use of a variety of methods to develop this area which included the combination of writing and extended writing skills with reading, listening and other</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>those schools to prevent them from falling into the 'special measures' category. In addition to strong governance, rigorous self-review and swift intervention, the assessment of pupils and better tracking of pupils was also a priority. The CEO presented each section to the committee.</p>	<p>skills.</p> <p>The Committee asked the CEO whether extended writing was being used in other subjects. They were advised that it was at Key Stage 1 and particularly at Key Stage 2, which provided children with a reason to read and write and to be confident in this area. Since September 2004, the Education service had been working with children in their school to improve writing skills. The use of drama combined with writing skills was being encouraged, and additional support was received from the DfES. A conference for teachers, particularly Key Stage 1 teachers teaching English as an additional language was also planned. Science was not an indicator that the LEA was s required to report on, but Science was included within the LEA Profile. The Committee asked if there were any extra resources for these pupils and were advised that there was a transfer of resources to pupils with special educational needs and to pupils with English as an additional language.</p> <p>With regard to a system of evaluation being in place in Barnet schools, in September 2003, the Education Service introduced an evaluation document to all schools in Barnet. The Chair of Governors was required to sign the evaluation document off, which is then verified by the LEA.</p> <p>Key Stage 2</p> <p>Results were very positive with some very good successes. The committee were also informed that an increasing number of schools were using the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) data, which predicted progress from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3. The value-added analysis was good and as the presentation indicated, children at Key Stage 2 were making more progress than predicted by the FFT. The committee were informed that there were some concerns linked to the achievement of ethnic minority groups and that the gap in achievement had widened since the previous year. It was reported that this was already evident in primary schools.</p> <p>Key Stage 4</p> <p>There were some very good GSCE results with Barnet outperforming its statistical neighbours and the national statistics. Although it was reported that the performance of Black African and Black Caribbean pupils was lower than other ethnic groups and the overall Barnet results, the gap between performance of Black African and Black Caribbean pupils and Barnet overall was less than in 2003. Post-16 results were</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
	<p>also reported to be extremely good compared to Barnet's statistical neighbours and the national figures. Previous targets for the education of Looked After Children had not been achieved although measures to meet the LPSA target for 2005 were in place. Fixed term exclusions, which also included half day exclusions, were considerably lower than other boroughs.</p> <p>The committee were informed that the priorities for the LEA included narrowing the achievement gap for black Afro-Caribbean pupils and looked after children, the 14-19 strategy to develop vocational pathways, consistency and quality in teaching, enhancing school review and the professional development of middle managers.</p> <p>SEN</p> <p>The three SEN key indicators were reported on: statements of SEN issues and prepared within 18 weeks, appeals upheld by SEN tribunal and pupils with SEN placed in and out of borough residential special needs. The Committee noted that the priorities identified did not include safeguarding children and were informed that this was a priority included in the service's priority plan. This was a requirement of the LEA and not the school.</p>
<p>Education Service Draft Budget and Performance Management Plans 2004-05</p> <p>The Chief Education Officer and the Assistant CEO attended the committee.</p>	<p>The committee found that progress on the Ofsted recommendations had been thoroughly reviewed and that recommendations had been withdrawn from the report if they had been fully and robustly completed. Where Ofsted recommendations had been withdrawn, it was reported that there was a robust audit trail. The First Stat process and Management Board were used to raise issues and it was reported that concerns about Key Stage 1 test results, the number of students at 16 without any qualifications, a review of traded services and collection of data on racist incidents in schools had been raised through these fora. The CEO advised committee that the Youth Service was now managed within the Education Service. Connexions and the Youth Service provided targeted support for young people at risk and at the same time, targeted resources for hotspots and areas in need of this support, so they were being brought together rather than keeping them as separate services. In respect of funding, funds had been received from Connexions and the Primary Care Trust to fund posts in these fields. Therefore, in addition to the internal service budget, resources from outside the Council were being secured.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Special Educational Needs Procedure and Strategy</p> <p>The Assistant Chief Education Officer gave a presentation to the committee on the Special Educational Needs Procedure and Strategy. The presentation highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THE DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2002 • STATUTORY performance and the completion of statements • Delegation to schools and the involvement of parents • Tribunals and the Special Educational Needs Inclusion Strategy 2004-08 • The number of children attending out of borough provision • Key actions and Funding 	<p>In response to questions arising from the Committee, Members were informed that the reduction in out of borough placements equated to half a million pounds, which would be used to find schools to take pupils with autism. With the number of statutory assessments reduced, the service facilitated an annual conferences for parents, the first one held in 2003. Investment had taken place in speech and language therapists. At a second conference, parents wanted to learn more about their child's condition. Overall, parents had expressed confidence in the strategy.</p>
<p>The Role of Connexions and Information on Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) in Barnet</p>	<p>The Committee requested additional information from the Connexions Manager on the Connexions service and the role of Personal Assistants, young people Not in Education, Employment and Training including information on the number of schools in Barnet using Connexions. The Committee considered the accuracy of these figures and a further breakdown of NEET figures by postcode and/ gender.</p>
<p>Barnet Youth Service: Priorities for 2005-06</p> <p>The Youth Services Manager (YSM) presented 'Barnet Youth and Connexions Service: The Vision, The Future for Young People in Barnet' to the committee.</p> <p>The presentation gave detail for the integration of the Youth and Connexions service, detailed the future vision for the service and how it would support its principal client groups, detailed the principal service and corporate priorities, statutory requirements, partnership arrangements, performance planning and future targets and outcomes for the service.</p> <p>The Connexions Manager (CM) and Chief Education Officer (CEO) were also present to answer questions arising.</p>	<p>The Committee sought further detail as to how outcomes of success of the approach in supporting client groups were measured and what contingency plans were in place to support particularly hard to reach clients. It was reported that accreditation targets and outcomes were established. It was recognised that not all accreditation programmes would be met and therefore a wider range of accreditation outcomes were required to reflect the variety of young people engaging through the Connexions service. In respect of reaching the 'hard core' client groups, varied and creative programmes needed to be initiated and pursued. The Youth Offending Team (YOT) also worked with the 'top ten' clients in order to establish the programme with them. The Connexions Service had developed good working links with the Police, voluntary sector and Youth Offending Service (YOS). It was largely recognised that the council's resources were not infinite and therefore a targeted approach was required to reach the 'hard core' clients. This entailed making best use of those resources available and move towards better planning and co-ordination of activities with council partners and other external agencies.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
Environment and Transport Services O&SC	
<p>Recycling & Waste Minimisation Issues</p> <p>The scope of the review was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider the impact of the council's compulsory recycling pilot scheme • To consider a report detailing progress and cost implications of establishing bring sites in Barnet • To explore the feasibility of expanding the range of materials recycled and further waste minimisation measures • To look at innovative ways of encouraging more residents to recycle through publicity and advertising • To visit other local authorities to see how they approached recycling 	<p>The committee considered the Compulsory Recycling update report and a report on wider recycling and waste minimisation activities in December 2004.</p> <p>Further updates were considered in March 2005 covering consultant findings and results of questionnaire into the Compulsory Recycling Pilot scheme.</p> <p>Members of the committee visited other council's to learn from their recycling practices and experiences. Councils visited included Dacorum DC, Daventry BC and Camden BC.</p> <p>The committee took the decision that Recycling and Waste Minimisation would become an on-going review topic area.</p>
<p>Reviewing Highways Works and Sites (Footway & Highway Repairs/Maintenance)</p> <p>Members of the committee undertook a number of tours of the borough, in conjunction with the Head of Highways, to review progress of the council's highways and footways improvement programme.</p>	<p>Members of the committee considered a report on the Councils re-surfacing programme (including performance in repairing 'pot holes') at a meeting of the committee in February 2005.</p> <p>The committee noted the progress being made in respect of the council's highways and footways resurfacing programme and resolved to ask the service to continue to increase work on footways.</p>
<p>Graffiti</p> <p>The committee agreed to consider a report on Barnet Council's enforcement strategy and operations (to include the effectiveness of CCTV services on the street scene).</p>	<p>The committee received and considered the report in May 2005.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Traffic Management Policy in Barnet</p> <p>The committee reviewed traffic management policy in Barnet, paying particular attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how locations for traffic management works in Barnet are identified and pursued • the criteria used in accident remedial programmes • how accident trends and statistics compare with other boroughs 	<p>The committee received and considered the report in March 2005.</p>
<p>The Street Cleansing Service</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the performance of the Street Cleansing Service (including customer satisfaction feedback)</p>	<p>The committee received and considered the report in March 2005.</p>
<p>Abandoned Vehicles</p> <p>The committee considered the effectiveness of local strategy and operations with regard to abandoned vehicles</p>	<p>The committee received and considered the report in March 2005.</p>
<p>Ground Maintenance & Weed Control Services</p> <p>The committee reviewed the effectiveness of the Ground Maintenance Service and the Weed Control service.</p>	<p>The committee received reports from both services in respect of their operational roles. Two tours of grounds maintenance sites within the borough were organised for Members of the committee visit various parts of the borough in respect of grounds maintenance and wider maintenance operations.</p> <p>A Service action plan was subsequently developed to rectify issues and problems identified through the Member site visits.</p> <p>A further report on the effectiveness of the Weed Control service was considered by the committee in May 2005</p>
<p>Draft PMP and Budget 2005/6</p> <p>Consultation with the Environment & Transport Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the draft Performance Management Plans and draft service budgets for 2005/6</p>	<p>The committee received draft PMPs and budget details from those services within their remit in February 2005. The committee's comments concerning the draft PMPs and budget were relayed to the Cabinet for consideration.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Performance Indicators & Measures (including the Council's Corporate Plan)</p>	<p>The committee reviewed the performance of services against the Corporate Plan and other relevant performance targets.</p> <p>Performance tables for services scrutinised by the committee were considered in October 2004 and March 2005.</p>
<p>Further Work Considered by the Committee in 2004/5 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Handheld Technology Pilot in the Street Enforcement Service • Quantifiable results of the Council's Tree Service • PFI Street Lighting Improvement Project 	<p>Reviewed by the committee in December 2004.</p> <p>Reviewed by the committee in December 2004</p> <p>Reviewed by the committee in October 2004</p>
<h2>Health and Social Care O&SC</h2>	
<p>'Healthy Start Healthy Futures' North Central London</p> <p>Improving services for children and young people, pregnant women and newborn babies in Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington</p> <p>The first meeting of the HSHF JOSC took place in the summer of 2004 at Camden Town Hall when the parameters were set for future working. The second meeting appointed a Chairman and chose a Consultant to write the JOSC's final report and agreed procedural arrangements, terms of reference, a project plan and meeting dates.</p> <p>A preliminary programme of visits was also organised to the Acute Hospital sites in the North Central London area: (Barnet & Chase Farm, North Middx, UCLH, and the Royal Free & Whittington Hospitals). Six further meetings of the HSHF Joint Committee were also planned in order to consider evidence from PCTs, service providers and experts, to consider patient and public views, transport & other infrastructure issues, and also to consider feedback from JOSC visits and consultation events.</p> <p>The HSCOSC also looked at a pre-publication draft summary and</p>	<p>Following a number of articles in the local press in August/September 2004 regarding the pre-publication proposals the HSCOSC Chairman wrote to the press requesting input and information from interested Barnet residents which resulted in some informed comment.</p> <p>As a result of the JOSC's concerns, re: the reduction of the current 6 sites providing in-patient maternity facilities to 4 such sites and the future of the Royal Free Hospital's facility, the North Central London SHA (NCLSHA) considered withdrawing the consultation document and looked at alternative options, these were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not to proceed with consultation on a firm proposal, but issue another discussion document setting out further work that needed to be done • Proceed to consult on a proposal to retain specialist maternity and obstetric services at the Royal Free, but move the paediatrics to the Whittington (changes to include consolidation of maternity and services for children and young people in Barnet at the Barnet Hospital). <p>A NCLSHA stakeholder event and another JOSC meeting were held in November 2005. At these meetings David Hobbs (Director of Corporate Development at NCLSHA) reported that the SHA and PCT Board had reached broad agreement on the preferred model for consultation but had yet to produce a final draft of the</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>noted how the proposals outlined could affect Barnet residents, notably the proposals to concentrate paediatric and obstetric inpatient services on 4 sites (from 6). The Committee felt that the proposed removal of inpatient services from the Royal Free could affect a significant number of Barnet residents living in the south of the borough.</p>	<p>proposals as further work was still in progress.</p> <p>The Cross Borough Joint Committee expressed concerned over how the consultation had been delayed and handled.</p> <p>JOSC members were informed that the Royal Free Hospital's in-patient consultant led maternity service would remain for the time being as further study on women requiring specialist care and the specialist services provided by RFH was planned</p> <p>In January 2005 the JOSC was informed that HSHF consultation exercise had been postponed and would be re-launched at a later date and after the general election</p> <p>Therefore the JOSC was temporarily suspended until such time as the Strategic Health Authority/joint board of PCTs had carried out additional work and were fully prepared to launch their consultations. The Committee noted that this could be as early as summer 2005.</p>
<p>Barnet and Chase Farm Hospitals Trust - Clinical Services Review 'Healthy Hospitals'</p> <p>A number of meetings with officers from Enfield Council and Herts County Council took place to establish a JOSC to consider the clinical services review consultation.</p> <p>Council 6/7/04 appointed 3 non-Executive members to serve on this JOSC. Proposals were expected in n November 2004 for a 4 month consultation period.</p>	<p>Due to the lengthy delays in the publication of both of these consultation documents and the extra administrative work caused for the 5 boroughs with the HSHF proposals , officer representatives across Barnet, Enfield & Herts had decided to wait for clearer confirmation of publication dates before officially constituting the 'Healthy Hospitals' Joint Committee (HH JOSC).</p> <p>As Barnet Hospital would be an integral part of the HSHF proposals the B&CFHT consultation was also postponed in January 2005 and would be re-launched to run alongside the HSHF consultation.</p>
<p>Other Health Re-Configuration Proposals and Health Delivery Topics</p>	<p>The Committee considered a on a consultation launched by Barnet PCT to consider the future provision of NHS Continuing Care in the Borough. The Committee was asked to consider three options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refurbishment of existing accommodation, • Commissioning Services from another NHS Provider • Provision by the Independent Sector. <p>The Committee put forward a number of points I relation to the three areas above.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>NHS Continuing Care Consultation</p>	<p>The Committee was reassured that regardless of the population projections for the next 5 years, the PCT were envisaging an upward trend in demand for NHS Continuing Care and anticipated Continuing Care placements increasing.</p> <p>The PCTs preferred option proposed that there would be a range of facilities available in different locations that would meet modern care standards and provide a more homely setting. The Committee identified a number of concerns regarding the preferred option. These were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the long term sustainability of contracting out services to the independent sector (having regard to the long term viability of many nursing homes) • the dependency on the private sector to provide NHS services and the concern that services could become more fragmented in the future • the quality of medical backup currently provided and proposed under option 3 • the difference in inspection regimes in private homes and NHS facilities • that the proposals could possibly trigger a shift in the responsibilities for funding towards local authorities and thereby increase the probability of numbers of Barnet residents having to pay for services they currently receive free of charge • whether the necessary quality and frequency of medical and specialist care could be adequately provided in privately run homes • that more than one site for continuing care services would make things more difficult for GPs. <p>The Committee was also concerned that in a market where the demand for nursing home placements outweighs supply, a competitive element could arise with the Local Authority. This could adversely impact on Barnet Council's ability to place people, especially on discharge from hospital. The Committee asked the PCT to take into consideration the concerns outlined before any further commissioning of nursing home care was undertaken.</p>
<p>Health Scrutiny – Public Health & Health Improvement</p> <p>To Review Health Improvement Priorities for Barnet</p>	<p>The Committee received a presentation from the Improvement/Medical Director for Barnet PCT on the Public Health White Paper 'Choosing Health' and its relationship with local Health Improvement work.</p> <p>The committee noted that the core message in the White Paper was that real progress depended on effective partnerships across communities, including local government, the NHS and the business sector: The Committee noted that PCT local</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
	<p>targets would be developed with local partners from 2005-6 onwards and NHS bodies would be encouraged to work closely with Councils.</p> <p>The Committee acknowledged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The root causes of ill health and how much ill health would continue to cost the NHS in future if there was no substantial improvement in public health. • That in the future PCTs and their partners would be measured on the health status of their residents as well as on service provision. • Smoking would continue to be the PCTs top priority as a significant amount of premature death in Barnet was directly attributable to smoking. <p>After some discussion the Committee decided it would be best to focus its efforts initially on smoking as this was the most important local priority and possibly focus on obesity and sexual health at a later stage. The Committee resolved to start a review of the effectiveness of local work commissioned and managed by the PCT and partners which was designed to reduce tobacco consumption in Barnet. The scope of review was identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine all work designed to reduce tobacco consumption in the Borough • Identify gaps and areas requiring greater attention in PCT commissioned and partner agency mainstream work and specific initiatives • Examine examples of good practice elsewhere • Make recommendations to the PCT, Local Authority and other health improvement partner agencies <p>In April 2005 the Committee considered the first report in a scrutiny review of the effectiveness of local work designed to reduce tobacco consumption in Barnet. The Committee noted the health impact of smoking nationally & locally, the Government guidance and good practice for PCTs and Barnet PCTs draft work plan for the Stop Smoking Service. The Committee was also asked to consider what further information or evidence it would like to receive in light of this initial report.</p> <p>The Committee noted that a wide range of initiatives in a variety of settings had been put into place which were outlined in the PCTs Draft Stop Smoking Services Work plan. Although initially the PCTs performance had been relatively poor, the Committee was reassured that the PCTs Stop Smoking Service was continually</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
	<p>reviewing its performance and was introducing changes and improvements such as revising the reimbursement scheme for primary care. As a result referral rates and the number of 'four week quitters' had now increased and the momentum had been maintained.</p> <p>The committee acknowledged that no one single approach would work on its own and that a combination of concerted action from PCTs and their local partners was required. Members also recognised the importance of working with other organisations to raise awareness of the problem and to help make smoking an unacceptable habit to follow in public places.</p> <p>The committee also acknowledged the potential influence that Local Authorities and wider LSP partners could have in the drive to reduce tobacco consumption. The Committee asked PCT officers to scope where the Council could and should have influence and provide examples of good practice which the Committee could then consider and make appropriate recommendations for Cabinet to consider.</p>
<p>Home Care Commissioning Arrangements (including those services transferred to Housing 21) and the Effectiveness of New Quality Assurance Procedures.</p>	<p>A report on the current services commissioned by the Borough was provided by the Head of Community Care and the Care Group Manager (Older Adults).</p> <p>The Committee noted that since the last report it received, a thorough review of the range and types of Home Care contracts had been undertaken in conjunction with the Council's Strategic Procurement Unit and Commissioning staff and an analysis of information gathered from Service Users and Performance Information had taken place. The review recommended a reduction in the range of contract types and with the employment of fewer providers in order to allow more efficient and focused commissioning and capacity planning.</p> <p>As part of the review of Homecare contracts, it was clear that not only were there too many types but also the range of unit costs and time slots was excessive and led to inefficient use of time. The new contract therefore required tenderer's to accept a unified price structure whereby all agencies would be paid the same unit rate for the job. The range and frequency of monitoring within these contracts had been rationalised to ensure that only verifiable information was submitted by agencies. This monitoring was in addition to the inspection and compliance monitoring which was undertaken by The Commission for Social Care Inspection. The Contract Monitoring information required by Community Care Monitoring Officers included:</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Qualitative data returns from agencies - verified by Monitoring Officers ➤ Quarterly inspections of Provider records by Contracts Monitoring Staff ➤ Issue and follow up of Quality Alerts (a formal document issued by monitoring staff to identify service or compliance failures) ➤ Monitoring of informal and formal complaints <p>The Committee was informed that the most common complaint received from service users' had been that their care workers did not turn up on time or left early. Until recently all care workers were required to have time sheets signed by service users to verify their attendance but in reality this did not ensure that full service was given. The solution was therefore to introduce an electronic Data Capture System, which recorded the arrival and departure times of care workers. This system had now been installed in all the newly contracted agencies and had so far proved beneficial in improving and monitoring care worker attendance.</p> <p>The PCT noted that as part of the continuing commitment to consult with service users and carers, a consultation forum recently took place which provided an opportunity to discuss the quality and standard of service delivery with service users and explored ways in which the service could be improved or more focussed.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the new home care contract awarded in June 2004 had fully addressed the Audit requirements. Additionally a commissioning strategy report had been completed and the results published for consideration by the Community Care Management Team.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that studying the complaints data in order to confirm the main areas of concern was a good starting point. Members also agreed to attending a users event facilitated by the service scheduled for September 2005. An analysis of the complaints data revealed that most complaints received came under 3 main categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Quality of Service ➤ Timescales ➤ Behaviour or attitude of staff <p>Summary of the complaints received:</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
	<p>Quality of Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dissatisfied with quality of service ○ Care not delivered according to care plan ○ Care worker not attending a per care plan. ○ Different care worker attending ○ Care worker did not turn up ○ Received no care when care worker was off sick ○ Relief carers not turning upon time with no undertaking of case history ○ Lack of information/consultation ○ Incorrect information given/not notified about changes in service delivery ○ Carer did not turn up on 3 occasions ○ Complaints about standard of care ○ Complaint that care worker disposed of incontinence pads in the normal refuse ○ Attitude of care workers ○ Carrying out assessments without daughter/ other relatives present. ○ Relatives not being informed that client had been taken to hospital <p>Timescales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carer arrived late ○ Carer left too early ○ Carer does not turn up when expected ○ Car worker does not stay the correct amount of time ○ Delays in invoicing <p>Behaviour or attitude of staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poor staff attitude/rudeness
<p>Performance Indicators</p> <p>To review the performance of the Community Care Service against Corporate Plan and Performance Management Plan targets.</p>	<p>Regular reports were received by the committee detailing progress in achieving Corporate plan priorities.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Draft Community Care PMP and Budget 2005/06</p>	<p>The Committee resolved to note the PMP for the Community Care Service and to relay the following comments to the Cabinet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee was pleased to note that there was no current overspend and requested that a watchful eye continued to be kept on any additional expenditure whether due to social services inflation or any other factors, in order to ensure that no overspend occurred in the coming year • The Committee voiced its continued concern with the slow progress in clearing the backlog of invoices and highlighted that there was still a significant risk of the service not meeting the performance target. • The Committee noted the on-going problems with the SWIFT system and was concerned that many of the services aims and objectives were dependent on the successful implementation of SWIFT.
<p>Housing, Neighbourhoods and Community Safety O&SC</p>	
<p>Anti-Social Behaviour</p> <p>The committee began the year by completing its review of how the Council, police and partners seek to combat anti-social behaviour on the Council's housing estates, making 24 recommendations which were approved by Cabinet in July 2004. These recommendations were subsequently incorporated into an action plan adopted not only by the Housing Service but also by the wider Safer Communities Partnership. In December 2004 the committee discussed the progress made against the action plan with Chief Superintendent Mark Ricketts, the Borough Commander of the Metropolitan Police and the Head of Housing. The committee explored the impact of the more community-based approach now being adopted in Barnet to policing in general and to anti-social behaviour in particular, through an expanding number of Safer Neighbourhoods Teams. Members noted that the Housing Service was working with Barnet Homes to ensure early and appropriate intervention took place in cases of anti-social behaviour and harassment.</p>	<p>The committee's June 2004 review had revealed that, while there was already much work in progress to tackle anti-social behaviour, residents and victims remained dissatisfied with the responses of both the Council and the police and the time taken to reach any outcome when incidents were reported. The 24 recommendations were based around improving processes, speedier case resolution, publicising successes, supporting victims at every stage and ensuring excellent multi-agency co-ordination. The committee also recommended establishing a 24-hour dedicated hotline for residents to report incidents without delay.</p> <p>The action plan showed progress against all these recommendations, including arrangements for closer liaison with victims and a wider range of support to them; training for housing officers in witness support along with a new witness peer support system; new targets for Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and Anti-Social behaviour Orders; improved liaison with police, street enforcement officers, youth services, mental health services and the courts on prevention, detection and enforcement; and annual victim satisfaction surveys.</p> <p>Barnet Homes were examining the feasibility of a 24-hour hotline.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Homeless Strategy Action Plan</p> <p>In November 2004 the committee examined an update of the Homeless Strategy Action Plan and questioned officers on the success of current homelessness policies. Discussions covered the needs assessment process, the pattern of temporary accommodation usage, the developing role of housing advice services, the involvement of private landlords and a rough sleeping preventative strategy.</p>	<p>The committee endorsed the updated Action Plan including a restructuring programme that would result in the creation of a new housing advice service and a Rough Sleeping Prevention Strategy.</p>
<p>Previous Reviews</p> <p>The committee revisited a number of the former Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee's reviews and recommendations to assess what progress had been made in implementing them. The topics covered included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • action taken since the committee's January 2003 review of the Council's response to the 2001/02 Private Sector Stock Condition Survey, including progress in implementing the Empty Homes Strategy and the pilot houses in multiple occupation (HMO) registration scheme; • improvements in leasehold debt recovery procedures, following the scrutiny review of this topic which was endorsed by Cabinet in September 2003; • progress made since the committee's October 2003 review with the regeneration of the Council's four major housing estates at Grahame Park, Stonegrove/ Spur Road, Dollis Valley and West Hendon, including consultation with residents undertaken over the previous year and proposed for the following six months; and • housing complaints, where the committee had earlier queried whether there was under-recording of complaints to the Housing Needs and Resources Service. 	<p>In September 2004 the committee noted the actions taken following its recommendations with regard to the private sector housing stock, with publicity given to the Empty Homes Strategy; over 400 empty properties returned to use; several vacant flats identified for future development; and some progress made in locating and registering houses in multiple occupation in the Childs Hill pilot ward. The committee asked for further information on enforcement action where landlords of HMOs were not meeting the required standards.</p> <p>In February 2005 the committee noted that the recommended review of leasehold debt recovery procedures had been completed, following the establishment of the Home Ownership Service within Barnet Homes; that (according to the Audit Commission) "slow but steady improvements" were being made in collection rates; but that the new information management system needed to significantly improve the efficiency and transparency of income collection had been delayed.</p> <p>The committee noted the progress made with each of the four estate regeneration schemes by April 2005, how residents were being involved and the next phases of the programme.</p> <p>In September 2004 the committee considered both the statistics and examples of complaints made to the Housing Needs and Resources Service and noted the lack of a central system for recording these complaints. Members discussed problems about the definition of 'complaints' in the context of the mismatch between housing demand and supply and asked for regular updates.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Housing Association Performance Monitoring</p> <p>The committee continued to monitor the performance of both the Housing Service and the Council's panel of housing association development partners, examining areas of under performance and seeking information on the action being taken to improve performance. The committee also received an update on the work of the Council's Housing Benefits Service.</p>	<p>The committee noted these reports after questioning the Head of Housing on performance and key issues arising.</p> <p>In December 2004 Members held detailed discussions with Notting Hill Housing Trust about its management and development performance.</p>
<p>Choice Based Lettings Scheme</p> <p>In November 2004 the committee also reviewed the implementation of the Choice Based Lettings Scheme, introduced in October 2003, including how openly, fairly and efficiently it was operating, its impact on the pattern of housing allocations and how more vulnerable people were helped in the bidding process.</p>	<p>The committee noted the report and asked for further information about how the shortage of bids for sheltered bedsit units was being addressed.</p>
<p>Barnet Homes</p> <p>In February 2005 the committee received a report on the outcome of the Audit Commission's November 2004 inspection of Barnet Homes, resulting in a two star rating describing it as a "good" service with "excellent prospects for improvement". This was first major test of the new organisation and a vital condition for the release of major government investment in improving the housing stock to meet Decent Homes Standards by 2010.</p> <p>In March 2005 Members reviewed Barnet Homes' draft Five Year Draft Business Plan 2005-10, questioning its key achievements since being established as an arm's length management organisation in April 2004 and its main plans and challenges for the future.</p>	<p>Members congratulated Barnet Homes on the inspection outcome. The committee also discussed the three areas of re-let times for empty properties, satisfaction with quality of repairs and compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act which had prevented Barnet Homes from achieving a three star rating.</p> <p>In reviewing the Business Plan, Members discussed the issues of support for vulnerable tenants and the impact on estate neighbourhoods. Members also complimented Barnet Homes on the success of its anti-social behaviour work at the Dollis Valley Estate.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Supporting Vulnerable Tenants</p> <p>A major piece of work began in November 2004, looking in depth at how vulnerable tenants are supported in the community, with particular reference to the scope for developing the range of services in Barnet funded through the Supporting People programme. Following briefing on the national and local background, the committee examined how these services are commissioned, the results of a borough wide needs survey, the routes through which people gain access to support, the services provided on the ground and their success from the perspective of service providers. Members have sought evidence from the Supporting People Manager, specialist housing associations, Barnet Homes and the local mental health services and have noted improvements being made to the process of individual needs assessment and referral to appropriate support providers.</p>	<p>The findings of this review are due to be considered by the committee in June 2005 so that constructive, evidence-based conclusions and recommendations can be formulated for Cabinet and/or partner organisations..</p>
<p>Crime and Disorder and Drugs Strategy 2005-08 and Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy</p> <p>Continuing previous practice, the committee in March 2005 reviewed and endorsed two key housing policy documents during their resident consultation stage, before final approval by the Executive.</p> <p>To help them scrutinise the draft Crime and Disorder and Drugs Strategy 2005-08 the committee held further discussions with Chief Superintendent Ricketts, Borough Commander, about the progress made towards making Barnet a safer place and restoring direct contact between the public and police on the streets.</p> <p>Members also reviewed a Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy which represented an important strand of the Council's overall housing strategy and its corporate equalities policies.</p>	<p>After discussion and questioning of a number of issues, the committee endorsed both draft strategies</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
Performance, Partnerships and Best Value O&SC	
<p>Best Value Review (BVR) of Children's and Young People's Services</p> <p>The committee completed work on the Best Value Review (BVR) of Children's and Young People's Services, carried forward from the 2003/04 work programme. In reviewing the initial findings in July 2004, the committee felt that a clearer response was needed in the final report to some of the issues raised by the children and young people who had been consulted, the reasons why other issues had been dismissed from the review's recommendations and where issues outside the review's scope had been passed to the relevant services. In September 2004 the committee examined a detailed response to the consultation exercise and questioned officers on how the final recommendations would be implemented.</p>	<p>After questioning, the committee endorsed the final BVR report, asking Cabinet to ensure that the resulting action plan set clear timescales and outcome measures for each of its recommendations and clearly attributed responsibility for their implementation, whether by the council or external partners. The committee asked for a progress report in 12 months' time.</p>
<p>Information Systems BVR</p> <p>Between September 2004 and March 2005 the committee scrutinised the focus, conduct and rigour of the Information Systems BVR, starting with the scoping paper, reviewing progress in January 2005 and ending with the final report. The committee initially questioned the Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Information Systems and senior officers in his management team, then proceeded to hold discussions with external challengers in the private sector comprising Logica CMG, SCC and Cisco Systems. Throughout the review, Members stressed the importance of having high quality, well designed ICT and endorsed the need for a robust review into how new ICT systems could act as a catalyst for delivering significant organisational and cultural change across the authority.</p>	<p>The committee concluded (a) that the review had been conducted in a thorough and efficient manner and had involved a suitably rigorous process of external challenge; (b) that the development of Information Services and ICT solutions to service improvement were moving in the right direction; (c) that a robust business case needed to be developed, based on the findings of staff and Member surveys and setting out benefits in the delivery and efficiency of services to the public; and (d) that ICT procurement costs and value for money needed to be kept under close and regular scrutiny, ensuring downward pressure as the market develops.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>National e-government targets</p> <p>In parallel with the IS BVR, the committee investigated the progress the Council was making towards implementing the national e-government targets and meeting the government's December 2005 deadline. The committee reviewed Information Systems' latest Priority Outcomes and Change Management Self Assessments prepared for the Council's IEG4 return to the government and explored progress across the board in areas including core infrastructure, remote and home working, security of systems, connectivity with partner organisations and linkage with service objectives in 2005/06 performance management plans.</p>	<p>After detailed examination the committee noted the progress made in each aspect of the e-government agenda and asked for further progress reports throughout 2005. In particular Members asked to be kept informed of how the service was meeting IEG priority outcomes and BVPI targets, the public take-up of Barnet's web-enabled services and how each service area of the Council was progressing with change management and transformation, with identified benefits to the Council and Barnet residents.</p>
<p>Safer Communities BVR</p> <p>Between October 2004 and March 2005 the committee discussed the Safer Communities BVR, noting that it dealt mainly with improving the effectiveness of the Safer Communities Partnership at both strategic and operational level, how it was resourced and how young people were interacting with it as both potential victims and offenders. The committee examined the review's scope, consultation results, outline findings and final conclusions, on which they questioned the Cabinet Member and lead officers.</p>	<p>The committee, having expressed some concerns about what impact if any the review would have on community safety in the borough, decided to note the final best Value report and endorsed its recommendation that the Leader of the Council should in future chair the Safer Communities Partnership Board. The committee urged Cabinet (a) rigorously to evaluate the report and its recommendations; (b) to monitor the new Board's effectiveness, in particular its impact on reducing crime in Barnet and changing residents' perceptions of crime; (c) to work towards the co-ordination of community safety and planning policy with a view to designing out crime and anti-social behaviour; and (d) to liaise with the courts to ensure sufficient capacity to support the Partnership's community safety objectives.</p>
<p>Modernising Core Systems (MCS) project</p> <p>The committee met jointly with the Audit and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review progress with the Modernising Core Systems (MCS) project, following completion of the blueprinting stage, and what had been done to implement the recommendations of the 2003/04 Best Value Review of Financial Management. Members questioned the external auditor about the governance, risk analysis and delivery progress of the MCS project and the associated need for cultural change across the authority. Members then questioned officers about the Best Value Improvement Plan, what had been done and what remained.</p>	<p>This special combined committee thanked the external auditor and members of the MCS programme team who appeared before the committee. It also asked the Borough Treasurer to submit a more specific action plan update on the BVR outcomes, showing deadlines, milestones and responsibilities for implementing recommendations.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Transport Policy BVR</p> <p>The committee questioned officers on the conduct of the Transport Policy BVR including progress in obtaining key data from Transport for London, the capacity constraints on rail networks serving the borough and surrounding areas and the realistic prospects for achieving a 'modal shift' in peak period transport usage towards public rather than private means.</p>	<p>The committee expressed its concern at (a) difficulties encountered in obtaining good quality data from Transport for London which was delaying completion of the review; and (b) the problems which flawed population data could cause for transport planning if it took insufficient account of future population growth. The committee's work on this review is scheduled to continue in 2005/06.</p>
<p>Performance Management</p> <p>The committee received detailed quarterly monitoring reports on how the Corporate Performance Office and Information Systems were implementing the targets set out for them in the Corporate Plan and their 2005/06 Performance Management Plans. The committee also examined new strategic procurement indicators to be used in Barnet in 2005/06.</p>	<p>Members questioned senior officers on key performance issues and asked for further reports on specific topics.</p>
<p>Regeneration and Development O&SC</p>	
<p>Unitary Development Plan (UDP) to the Local Development Framework (LDF)</p> <p>The transition from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) to the Local Development Framework was another area in which the committee built upon its work from 2003/04. The committee had scrutinised the borough's existing UDP at several meetings in 2003/04, and had hosted a workshop in April 2004 on the imminent new system, the Local Development Framework (LDF).</p>	<p>The LDF is to be prepared over the three years up to 2008, and when early stages of LDF preparation commenced in Autumn 2004, the committee received a report from the Planning Service, and offered comment upon, the draft Local Development Scheme (the technical document that is effectively a project plan for preparing the wider LDF). The Local Development Scheme was subsequently submitted and approved by central government in Spring 2005.</p>

<u>Topics Scrutinised and Evidence Taken</u>	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>
<p>Planning Service's Customer Care Improvement Strategy</p> <p>The committee made considerable efforts to maintain continuity in its work in 2004/05 from the previous municipal year. Having reviewed the Planning Service's customer service and the mandatory best value survey of planning department users (November 2003), it monitored the Planning Service's customer care improvement strategy that was rolled out in mid-2004.</p>	<p>The committee monitored the roll-out and impact of the new customer care improvement strategy during 2004/05, including receiving regular six-monthly analysis of statistics from feedback questionnaires which began to be distributed as standard practice in mid-2004.</p>
<p>Dollis Valley Estate Regeneration</p> <p>A case study approach to the Dollis Valley estate regeneration scheme was used, with a stress upon involving the general public.</p>	<p>The committee looked at the regeneration of the Dollis Valley council estate as a case study of the council's four major redevelopment proposals for its council estates, and devoted three meetings to the subject. After receiving briefings from officers and the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development, the committee interviewed local stakeholders – including members of the Dollis Valley Residents' Association (DVRA) and other members of the local community.</p>
<p>Enforcement of Planning Regulations and Planning Breaches</p>	<p>The committee worked informally using a sub-group of its members to investigate in detail strategic issues around the planning enforcement function in Barnet. A detailed report containing over thirty recommendations was prepared for cabinet, after extensive consultation including with councillors, officers and with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development.</p>