

POLICY & STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3RD AUGUST 2005

Report of the Director of Regeneration
DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

purpose of the report

1. To present for consideration the draft Statement of Community Involvement which will form an integral part of the forthcoming Wear Valley District Local Development Framework.

background

2. One of the Government's key objectives of the recent reform of the planning system is to strengthen community and stakeholder involvement, making it an integral, active and meaningful part of the planning process. Community engagement is considered essential in order to achieve local ownership and legitimacy for the policies and development control decisions that will shape the future distribution of land uses and development in Wear Valley.
3. To ensure that local planning authorities integrate this principle into their plan making and development processes, Central Government has introduced the requirement for an engagement strategy, which is to be known as a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI will have Local Development Document status and thus will form an integral part of the emerging Local Development Framework, the new Development Plan for the District that will progressively supersede the adopted Wear Valley District Local Plan.
4. The preparation of the SCI has been prioritised as the first Local Development Document to be produced by this Council. Members of the Regeneration Committee endorsed this earlier in the year through the adoption of the Wear Valley District Local Development Scheme, the project plan for the Local Development Framework.
5. During June 2005, a pre submission consultation exercise was carried out in accordance with the requirements of current planning regulations to gauge public and stakeholder opinion regarding the potential content of such a document, prior to the production of a draft document. Unfortunately, response levels were exceptionally poor.

the draft statement of community involvement

6. The draft document sets out the opportunities that this Council will provide to facilitate local communities, stakeholders and statutory consultees to engage in both the plan making and development control processes, building upon

minimum standards set out in the current planning regulations and Planning Policy Statement 12, Local Development Frameworks.

7. The Strategy has been developed in accordance with relevant regulations, legislation and best practice guides that have been issued over recent months. Regard has also been made to the approaches of local planning authorities elsewhere in the country. The Strategy has been tailored to the local circumstances of the District and has regard to the resources currently available to this Council to deliver such a commitment.
8. A summary of the structure and content of the draft SCI is contained in Annex 1. The actual draft SCI is contained in Annex 2. The tests that the independent inspector will apply to assess the 'soundness' of the final submission SCI at Public Examination are contained in Annex 3.

next steps

9. It is critical that the 'key milestones' set out in the adopted Local Development Scheme are adhered to. It is therefore proposed that a pre submission public participation exercise, which seeks representations on the draft SCI, is carried out for a 6 week period to commence no later than Friday 19th August 2005 (Ending Friday 30th September 2005).

conclusion

10. The SCI is based upon the principles of; early involvement, eliminating barriers to participation, providing transparency and feedback. It seeks to formalise and build upon methods that are already employed by the Council. It will assist the Council in meeting the objectives of Central Government and in creating a planning process for the District which is more efficient, effective and responsive to the community and stakeholders needs and aspirations, leading to a sustainable future.

RECOMMENDED 1 That Members endorse the publication of the draft SCI for public consultation.

background information

The Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, 2004
The Town & Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2004
PPS 12 Local Development Frameworks (2004)
Creating Local Development Frameworks – ODPM best practice guide
Wear Valley District Local Development Scheme (April 2005)

Officer responsible for the report

Robert Hope
Director of Regeneration
Ext 264

Author of the report

Carole Dillon
Principal Forward Planning Officer
Ext 269



POLICY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3RD AUGUST 2005

Report of the Director of Central Resources
MEMBER TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

purpose of the report

1. To consider the Member Training and Development Strategy drafted by the Member Development Working Group. The evolving modernisation agenda has placed increasing emphasis on an authority's need to rethink its approach to Member support and development. The Member Development Working Group have identified the need for a Member Training and Development Strategy as a key requirement of a modern local authority which recognises the vital role of Members in local government.

background

2. As Members are aware the Council has signed up to the North East Charter for Elected Member Development. The Member Development Working Group are undertaking a self-assessment against the Charter criteria and based on the self-assessment will be developing an Action Plan. During this process the Group have identified the need for the Council to develop a Member Training and Development Strategy.

member training and development strategy

3. The draft Strategy is attached at Annex 4. The Strategy contains a statement of commitment to Member development and identifies the roles and responsibilities of the Member Development Working Group, individual Members and Directors.

RECOMMENDED that the Member Training and Development Strategy be adopted.

Officer responsible for the report
Gary Ridley
Director of Central Resources
Ext 227

Author of the report
Sharon Spence
Head of Committee & Democratic Services
Ext 314

POLICY & STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3rd August 2005

Report of the Chief Executive

**UPDATE ON RECYCLING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT TEAM PROGRESS
– BVPI 82a**

purpose of the report

1. To seek approval from Members to commence the proposed programme of the recycling (BVPI 82a) Performance Improvement Team (PIT).

background

2. In 2004 the Policy and Strategic Development Committee tasked the Head of Management Support with establishing a PIT review for BVPI 82a (percentage of household waste recycled) due to an identified decline in previously improving performance.
3. Due to the significant resource demands which had been placed upon the Community Services Department by the implementation of a wheeled bin service, a green waste collection service, and the provision of free/subsidised home composting bins; and with Committee's approval, the start of the PIT review was postponed.
4. Now that the Department has completed most of the additional work associated with wheeled bin and green waste implementation, resources are available to provide support to the revised PIT programme.
5. The Team that will be conducting the review is:
 - Policy and Research Officer, MSU – Team Leader
 - Waste and Recycling Officer – Community Services Departmental Team member
 - Performance Improvement Manager, MSU – Independent Team member

action plan

6. A preliminary action plan with timescales has been produced; this outlines tasks that will be undertaken as part of the review process. The plan is attached to this report as Annex 5.

financial implications

7. Financial implications for the conduct of the review will be met from existing budgets.

human resource implications

8. Staffing for the conduct of the review will be made available from existing resources in the Community Services Department and the Management Support Unit.

conclusion

9. The review of performance for BVPI 82a – recycling was postponed because of additional resource demands placed upon the Community Service Department by the introduction of wheeled bins and composting arrangements.
10. Resource to support the PIT is now available and both the Community Services Department and the Management Support Unit are in a position to commence the PIT process.

RECOMMENDED

- i. That Committee approve the commencement of the BVPI 82a Performance Improvement Team process in line with the Action Plan detailed at Annex 5 to the report.

Officer responsible for the report

Iain Phillips
Chief Executive
Ext 304

Author of the report

Gillian Cotterill
Policy & Research Officer
Ext 448



POLICY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3rd August 2005

Report of the Chief Executive

LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENT 1

purpose of the report

1. To provide a final summary of performance towards meeting the Council's Local Public Service Agreement 1 (LPSA1) targets and an outline of the estimated timeframe and payment for the associated Performance Reward Grant (PRG).

background

2. Central Government launched the first Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) programme in 2002 as an incentive framework to deliver improved and cost effective performance in local authorities. The framework is an agreement between central Government and upper tier local authorities. It is designed to reward local authorities with a one off Performance Reward Grant if they meet agreed 3 year targets negotiated between the two parties.
3. The government did not allow District Councils to join this scheme directly, but encouraged County Councils to involve District Councils in their agreements. Durham County Council agreed to involve its District Councils in the "cost efficiency indicators" part of its LPSA.
4. All the District Councils within Durham have agreed their own individual basket of PI's with the County and are signed up to the scheme. Different Districts have similar, but not identical "baskets".
5. If performance rises sufficiently between 2001/2002 (baseline year) and 2004/2005, the councils are awarded a one off Performance Grant of 2.5% of the 2001/2002 budget. The formula used to calculate success divides total performance improvement across the basket by the increase of costs in the Council as a whole.
6. The County Council estimate that in Wear Valley's case, if the targets are met then the Performance Grant payment would be approximately £214,000.
7. The eleven indicators chosen by Wear Valley have been monitored over a three year period, and the calculations that show a summary of final performance can be found at Annex 6. The indicators that made up the initial, agreed performance index are shown at Annex 7.

8. A cost index is derived by comparing overall increases in performance with increases in the council's running costs, and cost effectiveness is defined as the change in the performance index divided by the change in the cost index, multiplied by one hundred. .
9. A summary of performance for all of the agreed indicators is shown in graphical format at Annex 8.
10. The initial target that was set and agreed was for each District Council to achieve an improved cost effectiveness of 108 or better over three years, when compared with the baseline index (performance during 2001/02) of 100.
11. Wear Valley District Council's Cost effectiveness performance over the three years was:

YEAR	OUTCOME
1	115.03
2	124.27
3	146.93

12. Wear Valley's three-year minimum cost effectiveness target of 108 was surpassed in year one
13. As the target has been met the council can expect to receive a performance grant of approximately £214,000. This will be paid in two equal parts over two years; it will be further split into two equal parts for revenue and capital.
14. It is anticipated that this will not be paid until the final year figures have been verified by the Audit Commission. This process will not be complete until approximately December 2005 and the first payment will be made after that.

financial implications

15. The receipt of the grant money, which must be split into capital and revenue, is the only financial implication for the Council.

conclusion

16. Wear Valley District Council has successfully achieved (and surpassed) the agreed performance target that was set by the government as part of our LPSA1 in 2002. Because the targets that were set have been achieved, a performance grant of approximately £214,000 will be paid to the Council over the next two years.

RECOMMENDED

1. That Committee notes the information presented in this report as further evidence of the continuing improvements in the Council's performance.

Officer responsible for the report

Iain Phillips
Chief Executive
Ext 304

Author of the report

John Docherty
Head of Management Support
Ext 306

POLICY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3rd August 2005

Report of the Chief Executive

LOW PERFORMING BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2005/06

purpose of the report

1. To submit for approval a list of low performing indicators to be included in our 3-monthly monitoring arrangements during 2005/06. The indicators have been drawn from the annual BVPI performance report submitted to the Policy and Strategic Development Committee.

background

2. A list of all BVPI's (by department) that have outcomes in the bottom or below average quartiles during the period 2004/2005 can be found at Annex 9.
3. The analysed data shows that the total number of indicators in the bottom quartile has increased from 12 in 2003/04 to 14 in 2004/05. This represents a 7% increase year on year for the bottom quartile indicators. The number of indicators for the below average quartile has decreased by 3. A summary of this information is provided below.

Department	No in Bottom Quartile 04/05	No in Bottom Quartile 03/04	No in Below Average Quartile 04/05	No in Below Average Quartile 03/04	No where the performance fell 04/05
Central Resources	9	5	2	9	3
Community Services	1	1	2	0	2
Housing Regeneration	3	5	2	1	1
MSU	1	1	2	0	2
	0	0	1	2	0
Totals	14	12	9	12	8

4. The Council's Performance Management Framework (PMF) recommends that where BVPIs are identified as being in need of improvement, then they should be included in a list that requires them to be reported and monitored for improvement on a quarterly basis.
5. The 2005-2006 BVPIs outcomes have been analysed by the Management Support Unit and a proposed list for inclusion on the 3-monthly monitoring arrangement is attached at Annex 9. In addition a commentary has been drafted on some of the BVPIs and this is attached as Annex 10.

conclusion

6. To comply with our agreed PMF we need to approve for 3-monthly monitoring and reporting, a list of BVPIs, from those that among our lowest performing. A proposed list has been submitted for consideration and approval.

RECOMMENDED

That the 2005/06 indicators contained in Annex 9 as being in the below average or bottom quartiles for performance be monitored by the MSU and reported to the Policy and Strategic Development Committee on a three-monthly basis.

Officer responsible for the report

Iain Phillips
Chief Executive
Ext 304

Author of the report

John Docherty
Head of Management Support
Ext. 306

POLICY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3rd August 2005

Report of the Chief Executive
JOINT BEST PRACTICE PROCUREMENT PILOT WITH TEESDALE DC

purpose of the report

1. To inform Members of progress made with the development of a joint best-practice procurement pilot with Teesdale District Council and to seek approval to proceed with the project.

background

2. Members will be aware that the Gershon review, Comprehensive Performance Assessment and a number of government initiatives have made effective and efficient procurement a high priority for all government departments and agencies, including local government.
3. As an Authority we have been aware of the increasing priority ascribed to procurement as a function as well as its importance as evidence of good management practice. We have actively addressed the issue through the undertaking of a Best Value review which has highlighted the fact that, if we are to improve our effectiveness in this area, then we need to put in place some corporate resource to take ownership of the agenda and progress it.
4. An unsuccessful bid for a dedicated procurement officer was made in the 2004 – 2005 budget setting process. This meant that key elements of the Best Value review improvement plan for developing effective procurement in the Council could not be taken forward.
5. Once the budget setting process had been completed the Head of Management Support and the Housing Services Department's Head of Business Support met with Director of the North East Centre of Excellence (NECE) to discuss Wear Valley District Council's procurement arrangements.
6. At the meeting the Director of NECE expressed concern around his perception of our procurement capacity, but he also made clear his commitment to providing support from his organisation, if at all possible.
7. As a result of the meeting discussions were held between the Director of Housing Services and the Head of Management Support with a view to seeking funding support from the NECE for a best-practice procurement pilot that would be launched in the housing repairs service of the Housing Department. If successful, then the procedures developed during the pilot would be available to be rolled out across other Council departments.
8. Subsequent to a meeting between the Management Teams of Wear Valley and Teesdale District Councils it was also agreed that a bid for funding support should

be reinforced by a joint pilot between both Councils who are at similar stages in the development of their procurement capacity.

9. As a result discussions were held with Teesdale District Council and it was agreed that a bid for funding support for the appointment of a fixed term procurement officer to develop and deliver the pilot would be made to the NECE. A copy of the bid document is attached at Annex 11.
10. We received provisional approval for our joint bid on the 15th of June 2005 and confirmation was given to go ahead following a presentation by officers from the two Councils to the North East Procurement Network meeting in Gateshead on 13th July 2005.
11. The project has three key objectives and these are:
 - The development of a best-practice procurement framework for both authorities;
 - To build procurement capacity in both authorities, and;
 - To deliver above target efficiency savings (3%) through improved procurement in the pilot areas.
12. It is anticipated that if approval is given for the project to begin, then work will get under way to recruit a Procurement Officer on a fixed-term contract, who will be based in Wear Valley District Council but will work across both authorities. One of the first tasks for the appointed officer will be to develop a detailed project plan that will be submitted to the Corporate Management Team for consideration.

project costs

13. The cost of the appointing a Procurement Officer has been estimated at £30,000 p.a. with on-costs (i.e. a base salary of around £25,000). In addition, the funding support from NECE is limited to no more than 18 months. On that basis we have proposed a fixed term contract of 18 months running from September 2005 to March 2007. A summary of the costs and contributions is shown below.

costs

Costs	Value
Salary costs for 18 months	£45,000
Operating expenses	£12,500
Total	£57,500

contributions

Contribution	Value
Transfer from Policy Development Budget	£10,000
Major Repairs Allowance	£10,000
Teesdale DC	£7,500
NECE Grant	£30,000
Total	£57,500

14. Although the bid has been submitted and approved in principle, the Council is not yet formally committed to going ahead with the project and approval is sought from Policy and Strategic Development Committee to undertake the project with Teesdale District Council.

conclusion

15. Both Wear Valley and Teesdale District Councils are aware that the arrangements they have in place for managing our procurement activities would be assessed as inadequate when compared with what the Government sees as best practice.

16. To address this shortfall, both Councils have come together to successfully bid for funding support to pilot the launch of a project aimed at delivering improved capacity in this area in both organisations.

17. Should approval to proceed be given then work will begin to establish improved procurement capacity in both Councils by the appointment of a Procurement Officer working across both Councils on a fixed term, 18 month contract.

RECOMMENDED

- i. That the Policy and Strategic Committee considers the proposed procurement capacity building project and supports its commencement in collaboration with Teesdale DC.

Officer responsible for the report Iain Phillips Chief Executive Ext 304	Author of the report John Docherty Head of Management Support Ext 306
---	--



WEAR
VALLEY
DISTRICT COUNCIL

POLICY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

3rd August 2005

Report of the Chief Executive **BUDGET TRANSFER**

purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to transfer saved salary from the Policy Development Budget to employ a Procurement Manager on a temporary basis.

introduction

2. The Best Value Review of Procurement highlighted the lack of a corporate procurement point resulting in a lack of co-ordination within the procurement activity of Wear Valley District Council. To address this requirement there is a need for a Procurement Officer to develop and implement improved procurement systems and procedures.

background

3. An unsuccessful bid for a dedicated procurement officer was made in the 2004 –2005 budget setting process. This meant that key elements of the Best Value review improvement plan for developing effective procurement in the Council could not be taken forward.
4. As a result discussions were held with Teesdale District Council and it was agreed that a bid for funding support for an 18 month appointment of a fixed term procurement officer to develop and deliver the pilot would be made to the North East Centre of Excellence (NECE).
5. The cost of the appointing a Procurement Officer has been estimated at £30,000 p.a. with on-costs (i.e. a base salary of around £25,000). In addition, the funding support from NECE is limited to no more than 18 months. On that basis we have proposed a fixed term contract of 18 months running from September 2005 to March 2007. A summary of the costs and contributions is shown below.

costs

Costs	Value
Salary costs for 18 months	£45,000
Operating expenses	£12,500
Total	£57,500

contributions

Contribution	Value
Transfer from Policy Development Budget	£10,000
Major Repairs Allowance	£10,000
Teesdale DC	£7,500
NECE Grant	£30,000
Total	£57,500

6. As can be seen from the calculations above we are putting forward £20,000 for this project. This report is to seek approval for £10,000 to be transferred from the Policy Development Budget which is as a result of an under spend incurred from the gapping of the Policy & Research Manager and the Performance Manager posts. A further £10,000 will be transferred from the Major Repairs Allowance. This can be funded from an underspend in 2004/05.

RECOMMENDED

- i) That Committee agree to the transfer of £10,000 from the Policy Development Budget.
- ii) That Committee agree to the transfer of £10,000 from the Major Repairs Allowance.

Officer responsible for the report

Iain Phillips
Chief Executive
Ext 304

Author of the report

John Docherty
Head of Management Support
Ext 306
