



Public Document Pack

FINANCE AND RESOURCES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AGENDA

Scrutiny making a positive difference: Member led and independent, Overview & Scrutiny Committees promote service improvements, influence policy development & hold Executive to account for the benefit of the Community of Dacorum.

TUESDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 7.30 PM

DBC BULBOURNE ROOM - CIVIC CENTRE

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Membership

Councillor Howard	Councillor E Collins
Councillor Herbert Chapman (Chair)	Councillor Fethney
Councillor Douris (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Silwal
Councillor Ashbourn	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Barnes	Councillor Tindall
Councillor Birnie	Councillor Gbola Adeleke
Councillor Clark	

Substitute Members:

Councillors Anderson, Brown, Guest, Link, Matthews, Ransley and W Wyatt-Lowe

For further information, please contact Kayley Johnston Ext: 2226

AGENDA

1. MINUTES

To confirm the minutes from the previous meeting

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of interest

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered -

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent

and, if the interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest, or a personal interest which is also prejudicial

- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter (and must withdraw to the public seating area) unless they have been granted a dispensation.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Members' Register of Interests, or is not the subject of a pending notification, must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal and prejudicial interests are defined in Part 2 of the Code of Conduct For Members

[If a member is in any doubt as to whether they have an interest which should be declared they should seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the start of the meeting]

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

An opportunity for members of the public to make statements or ask questions in accordance with the rules as to public participation

5. CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO CALL-IN

6. Q2 FORECAST FINANCIAL OUTTURN REPORT 2015/16 (Pages 3 - 18)

7. Q2 PERFORMANCE & OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER REPORTS - LEGAL GOVERNANCE (Pages 19 - 24)

8. Q2 PERFORMANCE & OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER REPORTS - FINANCE & RESOURCES (Pages 25 - 46)

9. Q2 PERFORMANCE & OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER REPORTS - PERFORMANCE & PROJECTS (Pages 47 - 68)

10. SICKNESS PROJECT UPDATE

An update presentation will be given by Matt Rawdon on sickness.

11. BERKHAMSTED MULTI-STORY CAR PARK PETITION REVIEW (Pages 69 - 95)

12. ACTION POINTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (Pages 96 - 99)



AGENDA ITEM: 6

SUMMARY

Report for:	Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	8 November 2016
PART:	1
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	Budget Monitoring Quarter 2 2016/17
Contact:	Cllr Graeme Elliot, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources David Skinner, Assistant Director (Finance & Resources) Richard Baker, Group Manager (Financial Services)
Purpose of report:	To provide details of the projected outturn for 2016/17 as at Quarter 2 for the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Fund • Housing Revenue Account • Capital Programme
Recommendations	1) That Committee note the forecast outturn position.
Corporate objectives:	Delivering an efficient and modern council
Implications:	Financial and Value for Money implications are included within the body of the report.
Risk Implications	Risk implications are included within the body of the report.
Equalities Implications	There are no equality implications.

Health And Safety Implications	There are no health and safety implications.
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	GF – General Fund HRA – Housing Revenue Account

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline the Council's forecast outturn for 2016/17 as at 30 September 2016. The report covers the following budgets:

- General Fund
- Housing Revenue Account (HRA)
- Capital Programme

2. General Fund Revenue Account

2.1 The General Fund revenue account records the income and expenditure associated with all Council functions except management of the Council's own housing stock, which is accounted for within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) (see Section 6).

2.2 Appendix A provides an overview of the General Fund provisional outturn position, separating expenditure into controllable and non-controllable categories in order to focus scrutiny on those areas that officers are able to influence, i.e. the controllable.

2.3 The majority of non-controllable costs result from year-end accounting adjustments, e.g. depreciation charges. These are required to show the true value of resources used to provide the Council's services, but do not result in a cash charge to taxpayers.

2.4 Variances on non-controllable and corporate items

The charge made to the HRA for properties owned by the General Fund, but utilised by the HRA for dwelling purposes is forecast to be £80k higher. This is due to a lower amount of repairs and improvements at these properties.

Additional new burdens grants totalling £85k, along with an adjustment of £6k to prior year New Homes Bonus grants provide an additional £91k of unallocated grants. Included in these grants is £73k towards the cost of meeting welfare reforms and benefit cap changes. It is unknown at this stage how much of these grants may need to be utilised. The remaining grants are small in value and it is not anticipated that additional budgets will need to be given to services. Section 31 grants are retained corporately unless there is evidence of a significant new burden.

2.5 The current budget is the original budget approved by Cabinet in February 2016, plus the following approved amendments:

Amendments	£000	Approved
2016/17 Original budget	16,946	
Corporate Graduates	18	Council July 2016
Reserve Funded Staff Costs	(46)	Council September 2016
Digitalisation of Planning Microfiche data	100	Council September 2016
2015/16 Current Budget	17,018	

2.6 The table below provides an overview by Scrutiny area of the current forecast outturn for controllable budgets within the General Fund.

	Current Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Variance	
			£000	%
Finance & Resources	7,773	7,693	(80)	-1.0%
Strategic Planning & Environment	7,479	7,845	366	4.9%
Housing & Community	1,766	1,765	(1)	-0.1%
Total	17,018	17,303	285	1.7%

2.7 The following sections provide an analysis of the projected outturn and major budget variances shown by Scrutiny area.

3. Finance and Resources

Finance & Resources	Current Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Variance	
			£000	%
Employees	10,999	10,963	(36)	-0.3%
Premises	1,766	1,757	(9)	-0.5%
Transport	32	42	10	31.3%
Supplies & Services	3,870	3,994	124	3.2%
Third-Parties	336	332	(4)	-1.2%
Income	(9,230)	(9,395)	(165)	1.8%
	7,773	7,693	(80)	-1.0%

3.1 Employees - £36k under budget (0.3%)

Underspend of £70k – Following the restructure of the Council’s leadership team in May 2016, a saving of £70k has arisen in the management team salaries budgets.

Pressure of £34k – A pressure across services is projected linked to the vacancy provision. This target is set at 5% of direct salary costs for 2016/17. This position will continue to be monitored.

3.2 Supplies and Services - £124k over budget (3.2%)

Pressure of £40k – This pressure relates to budgeted savings in the Parking service which are not expected to be fully realised, and additional costs of upgrading Pay and Display machines prior to the introduction of new £1 coin in March 2017.

Pressure of £25k – A pressure is forecast in the Revenues and Benefits service from bank charges incurred, prior to the implementation of credit card surcharging. The new system has now been implemented to recover credit card charges from customers at the time of payment.

Pressure of £20k – This pressure has arisen from a review of the Estates service, which will assist in identifying future efficiencies in the service.

3.3 Income £165k over-achievement of income (1.8%)

Over-achievement of income of £135k – The income on Investment Properties is forecast to exceed budget by £135k. An additional £90k of income expected as a result of successful rent reviews secured this financial year. In addition service charges are expected to generate an additional £45k of income due to improvements in the methodology for billing costs back to tenants.

4. Strategic Planning and Environment

Strategic Planning and Environment	Current Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Variance	
			£000	%
Employees	9,362	9,610	248	2.6%
Premises	970	923	(47)	-4.8%
Transport	1,479	1,430	(49)	-3.3%
Supplies & Services	4,085	4,078	(7)	-0.2%
Third-Parties	88	82	(6)	-6.8%
Income	(8,505)	(8,278)	227	2.7%
	7,479	7,845	366	4.9%

4.1 Employees - £248k over budget (2.6%)

Pressure of £50k – There is a pressure of £50k in the budget for Employee costs in Waste Services. There has been an increase in the number of roads in the borough that are proving difficult to access, which is necessitating an additional

narrow access round to collect the waste, costing an additional £90k. The service has reviewed the overall round structure in detail to optimise each round and ensure that crews are working as productively as possible, and some efficiencies have been made in the Commercial Waste rounds, which has reduced this pressure by £40k to a net pressure of £50k.

Pressure of £130k – A pressure of £130k is expected in Building Control. There are a number of vacant posts within the establishment and agency staff are currently carrying out this work, but at a more expensive rate. Work is ongoing to improve processes within the service and make efficiency savings going forward. In addition the challenges in staff recruitment and retention are being addressed and options are being appraised as to the best way of ensuring the correct levels of staffing are in place and succession planning is considered.

Pressure of £68k – A pressure of £68k is linked to the vacancy provision across services.

4.2 Income - £227k under-achievement of budget (2.7%)

Under-achievement of income of £100k – A pressure of £100k has been identified in the Commercial Waste service. In recent months the service has seen a reduction in the number of customers, due to more aggressive sales strategy of competitors, which can draw customers away from the Council. Work is taking place to understand why customers have left and highlight the benefits of the Council's local, flexible Commercial Waste service.

Over-achievement of income of £70k – In Waste Services an additional £70k of income has been generated as a result of an incentive payment from Hertfordshire County Council to reward Dacorum for improvements in the rate of recycling as a result of the co-mingled waste service.

Under-achievement of income of £180k – A pressure of £180k has arisen in the Planning service, due to current uncertainty in the housing and development markets following the EU referendum in June.

5 Housing and Community

Housing & Community	Current Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variance	
	£000	£000	£000	%
Employees	2,549	2,630	81	3.2%
Premises	805	777	(28)	-3.5%
Transport	16	20	4	25.0%
Supplies & Services	2,079	2,173	94	4.5%
Third Parties	758	758	0	0.0%
Income	(4,441)	(4,593)	(152)	3.4%
	1,766	1,765	(1)	-0.1%

5.1 Employees - £81k over budget (3.2%)

Pressure of £81k – There is a pressure of £81k across services linked to the vacancy provision, which has been set at 5% across all services. This will be closely monitored as the year goes on.

5.2 Supplies and Services - £94k over budget (4.5%)

Pressure of £40k – A pressure of £40k has arisen in the People and Performance service from a strategic review of sports and leisure facilities across the borough. It is proposed that this expenditure be funded from the Management of Change reserve. This will be proposed in the 29 November Cabinet report.

Pressure of £15k – This pressure has arisen in the Community Partnerships service, from reserve funded Arts support which was agreed in the budget setting round for 2015/16 but not spent until 2016/17. It is proposed that this expenditure be funded from the Management of Change reserve. This will be proposed in the 29 November Cabinet report.

5.3 Income - £152k over-achieved (3.4%)

Over-achievement of income £150k – the income from the rental of Garages is expected to exceed budget by £150k. This is due to the level of voids being lower than anticipated.

6. Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

6.1 The HRA is a ring-fenced account relating to the Council's Landlord functions. A guiding principle of the HRA is that revenue raised from rents and service charges must be sufficient to fund expenditure incurred. The forecast outturn position for the HRA is shown at Appendix B.

6.2 The projected HRA balance at the end of 2016/17 is in line with the budgeted balance of £2.9m.

6.3 Dwelling Rents - £117k under-achievement of income (0.2%)

Following a review of the changes implemented as part of the statutory reform to housing rents, the Supported Housing budget requirement has been checked, and an adjustment of £115k is required. A correction will be made for the budget 2017/18.

6.4 Contribution towards Expenditure - £152k under-achievement of income (23.2%)

There is a deficit of £140k in leaseholder charges for repairs work, due to the estimate for works carried out in 2015/16 being £140k higher than the amount to be billed. There is also a deficit of £50k in income expected from the Recharges Officer, as the post was not filled for a full financial year (started October). These pressures are partially offset by an increase in minor capital receipts of £40k for legal work carried out, such as deed of variation and lifting of restrictive covenants.

6.5 Repairs and Maintenance - £453k over budget (4.2%)

At Q1 the volumes of repairs and voids were consistent with those experienced last year, however there has been a slight downturn in the scope of work required in voids that were returned in Q2. Overall the profile of the revenue spend is being closely monitored and currently there are pressures within a number of demand led areas including, responsive repairs, minor aids and adaptations, drainage, and asbestos testing and removal. The pressure is being offset by a reduction in small works, however currently the forecast position of £453K is still expected.

The forecast includes a £50k underspend for a reduction to the performance related profit (PRP) for 2015/16. Following a challenge from officers, Osborne have agreed to reduce the amount of PRP payable for the year.

The capital programme is currently being reviewed, and it is proposed that a virement request will be raised in Quarter 3 to align budgets with planned activities between capital and revenue.

6.6 Supervision & Management - £46k under budget (0.4%)

The projected underspend has arisen in 2 main areas:

£60k underspend in the Tenants and Leaseholders section from vacancies in the Supporting People service.

£75k underspend in the Housing Cleaning service from vacant posts.

These are offset by a forecast pressure of £80k relating to rent received on properties that are used to house Council tenants but are owned by the General Fund. (The corresponding entry is shown in the General Fund as a decrease in non-controllable costs).

6.7 Transfer to Housing Reserves - £689k under budget (5.1%)

The overall variance on the HRA is currently forecast to reduce balances by £689k.

The Capital Programme is being reviewed to ensure that components are not replaced before they are required (an example of which is delaying roof replacements that had previously been scheduled in, based upon property conditions surveys). Due to these changes in the programme, an underspend in capital expenditure is forecast. As set out in paragraph 6.5, a virement will be proposed to align the capital and revenue budgets with planned works, and during the process the contribution to the Housing Reserve will be examined.

7. Capital Programme

7.1 Appendix C shows the projected capital outturn in detail by scheme.

The table on the next page summarises the overall capital outturn position by Scrutiny area.

The 'Rephasing' column refers to those projects where expenditure is still expected to be incurred, but it will now be in 2017/18 rather than 2016/17, or conversely, where expenditure planned initially for 2017/18 will now be in 2016/17.

The 'Variance' column refers to those projects which are now complete, but have come in under or over budget and those projects which are no longer required.

The current budget is the original budget approved by Cabinet in February 2016, plus approved amendments, including re-phasing of the slippage identified at Quarter 1 into 2017/18.

	Current Budget £000	Projected Outturn £000	Rephasing £000	Variance	
				£000	%
Finance & Resources	12,871	12,818	(56)	3	0.0%
Strategic Planning & Environment	6,605	6,828	(90)	313	4.7%
Housing & Community	1,727	1,697	0	(30)	-1.7%
G F Total	21,203	21,343	(146)	286	1.3%
HRA Total	27,390	24,652	(2,231)	(507)	-1.9%
Grand Total	48,593	45,995	(2,377)	(221)	-0.5%

7.2 General Fund Major Variances

There is an overall projected overspend of £140k on the General Fund. This is a combination of forecast overspend of £286k, and slippage of £146k into 2017/18.

The projected net overspend of £286k includes:

- Line 156: overspend of £238k on the Disabled Facilities Grants budget. The grant funding allocated to the Council on this scheme has increased considerably from £366k in 2015/16 to £672k in 2016/17. The forecast overspend is based on the year to date run rate.
- Line 163: overspend of £200k on Regeneration of the Town Centre. This project is almost at a close, however there are still some issues to be resolved regarding the power supply to the town centre. An overspend of £93k was reported last financial year on the project, however some further costs are expected, which at this stage are estimated to be £200k. This would bring the total overspend on the project to £293k, which is approximately 6% of the overall budget. Unbudgeted grant and S106 funding has been received to the value of £105k, which offsets some of the overspend.
- Line 165: overspend of £100k on the Water Gardens. An additional £50k is expected to be incurred due to additional footpath works agreed at Waterhouse Street. There is also the possibility that delays in the project will necessitate additional costs in the region of £50k.

- Line 166: underspend of £200k on the Bus Interchange. £300k was carried forward from 2015/16 as slippage, in anticipation of the final costs on this project. Given the complexities of previous projects such as the Marlowes Shopping Zone, where a number of unforeseen expenses were incurred, a prudent estimate of the final costs was made, however this estimate has subsequently proved to be £200k too high.

The projected rephasing to future years includes:

- Line 92: slippage of £82k on Future Vision of CRM. Progress with the deployment of CRM has been delayed significantly due to changes in the Northgate's strategic approach to the product. Northgate advised the council in June 2016 that a new version of the product is being developed and advised against substantial development on the current platform. CRM development is therefore being pushed back to 2017/18.
- Line 161: slippage of £50k on Maylands Urban Realm project. Landscaping works are now expected to take place in 2017/18. These are seasonal works, which will need to take place in the spring.
- Line 169: slippage of £60k on Hemel Street Furniture. Reprogramming of work to help manage the Water Gardens project will cause a delay in delivery of this project.

7.3 HRA Major Variances

There is a projected underspend on the HRA capital programme of £1,298k.

- Line 183: underspend of £507k on the Property and Place budgets for planned capital works. The programme is being reviewed as set out in paragraph 6.7. These budgets also contain a contingency of 5%.
- Line 191 and 192: underspend of £149k and £140k respectively on Farm Place and St Peter's Court. Although these schemes are complete, budget was slipped forward from 2015/16, which will be reallocated by virement to the New Build General line to fund other schemes in the programme.
- Line 193: underspend of £684k on Aspen Court, London Road Apsley. At the time of setting the budgets, an additional allocation of £600k was allowed for to cover previously unforeseen costs. This was incorrectly allocated to the Aspen Court, London Road budget, however it should have been allocated to the New Build General Line. The underspend on this line will therefore be re-allocated to the New Build General line.
- Line 194: slippage of £1.8m on New Build General. This reflects re-phasing of a number of schemes to align with revised timescales.
- Line 196: slippage of £484k on Able House. This scheme is now expected to be finished early 2017/18.

	Month			Year-to-Date			Full Year		
	Adjusted Budget £000	Actuals £000	Variance £000	Adjusted Budget £000	Actuals £000	Variance £000	Adjusted Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Variance £000
Controllable									
Finance and Resources	645	2,156	1,511	3,356	3,134	(222)	7,773	7,693	(80)
Strategic Planning and Environment	338	296	(42)	3,961	4,088	127	7,479	7,845	366
Housing and Community	77	161	84	877	946	69	1,766	1,765	(1)
Controllable	1,060	2,613	1,553	8,194	8,168	(26)	17,018	17,303	285
Non-Controllable									
Finance and Resources	(145)	(45)	100	(870)	(61)	809	(4,086)	(4,167)	(81)
Strategic Planning and Environment	303	0	(303)	1,819	0	(1,819)	3,927	3,927	0
Housing and Community	93	0	(93)	559	1	(558)	1,652	1,652	0
Non-Controllable	251	(45)	(296)	1,508	(60)	(1,568)	1,493	1,412	(81)
General Fund Service Expenditure	1,311	2,568	1,257	9,702	8,108	(1,594)	18,511	18,715	204
Reversal of Capital Charges							(4,125)	(4,125)	0
Minimum Revenue Provision							378	378	0
Interest Payable							587	581	(6)
Interest Receipts							(242)	(292)	(50)
Revenue Contributions to Capital							5,796	5,796	0
Contributions to / (from) Reserves							(7,105)	(7,191)	(86)
Contributions to / (from) Working Balance							0	28	28
Budget Requirement:							13,800	13,890	90
Met From:									
Revenue Support Grant							(971)	(971)	0
Non-Domestic Rates							1,053	1,053	0
New Homes Bonus							(3,491)	(3,497)	(6)
Other General Government Grants							(125)	(210)	(85)
Council Tax Surplus							(49)	(49)	0
Requirement from Council Tax							(10,217)	(10,217)	0
Total Funding:							(13,800)	(13,891)	(91)

Interpreting this report

General Fund Service Expenditure

This subtotal includes those costs which are directly attributable to specific Council services.

Budget Requirement

This subtotal shows the total cash requirement to operate the Council for one year. It includes the General Fund Service Expenditure plus corporate costs and income.

Total Funding

This subtotal shows how the Council receives sufficient funding from different sources to meet the Budget Requirement. In order to 'balance the budget', Total Funding must equal the Budget Requirement.

Housing Revenue Account
Projected Outturn 2016/17 - September 2016

	Original Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Forecast Variance £000	%
Income:				
Net Dwelling Rents	(55,849)	(55,732)	117	-0.2%
Non-Dwelling Rents	(80)	(80)	0	0.0%
Tenants Charges	(388)	(388)	0	0.0%
Leaseholder Charges	(477)	(479)	(2)	0.4%
Interest and Investment Income	(206)	(206)	0	0.0%
Contribution towards Expenditure	(655)	(503)	152	-23.2%
Total Income	(57,654)	(57,388)	267	-0.5%
Expenditure:				
Repairs and Maintenance	10,702	11,155	453	4.2%
Supervision & Management:	11,766	11,720	(46)	-0.4%
Rent, Rates, Taxes & Other Charges	14	29	15	107.1%
Interest Payable	11,643	11,643	0	0.0%
Provision for Bad Debts	250	250	0	0.0%
Depreciation	9,506	9,506	0	0.0%
HRA Democratic Recharges	220	220	0	0.0%
Total Expenditure	44,101	44,523	422	1.0%
Transfer from Housing Reserves	13,553	12,865	(689)	-5.1%
HRA Deficit / (Surplus)	0	0	0	0.0%
Housing Revenue Account Balance:				
Opening Balance at 1 April 2015	(2,900)	(2,900)	0	
Deficit / (Surplus) for year	0	0	0	
Proposed Contributions to Reserves	0	0	0	
Closing Balance at 31 March 2016	(2,900)	(2,900)	0	

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR SEPTEMBER 2016

Scheme	Budget Holder	Original Budget	Prior Year Slippage	Adj's, Supps, Virements	Adjustments (Slip. C/F)	In-Year Adjustments	Current Budget	YTD Spend	Projected Outturn	Forecast Slippage	Projected Over / (Under)
General Fund											
Finance and Resources											
Commercial Assets and Property Development											
42 Strategic Acquisitions	Nicholas Brown	950,000	(463,500)	0	(486,500)	(486,500)	0	0	0	0	0
43 Demolition of Old Berkhamsted Depot and new barrier	Nicholas Brown	50,000	0	0	0	0	50,000	14,976	50,000	0	0
44 Demolition of Health Centre	Nicholas Brown	350,000	0	(15,000)	0	(15,000)	335,000	0	335,000	0	0
45 Old Town Hall - Cafe Roof and stonework renewal	Nicholas Brown	75,000	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	75,000	0	0
46 Demolition of Civic Centre	Nicholas Brown	0	(1,990)	0	0	0	(1,990)	0	0	0	1,990
47 Bennetts End Community Centre - Replace Main Hall Pitched Roof Covering	Nicholas Brown	35,000	0	0	(35,000)	(35,000)	0	0	0	0	0
48 Highfield Community Centre - Resurface Car Park	Nicholas Brown	0	0	15,000	18,318	33,318	33,318	0	33,318	0	0
49 Adeyfield Community Centre - replace roof	Nicholas Brown	0	44,230	0	(44,230)	(44,230)	0	0	0	0	0
50 Tring Community Centre - new play area for Childrens Nursery	Nicholas Brown	0	13,110	0	0	0	13,110	0	13,110	0	0
51 Bennetts End Community Centre Toilet Provision	Nicholas Brown	18,000	0	0	0	0	18,000	0	18,000	0	0
52 Rossgate Shopping Centre - Structural Works	Nicholas Brown	0	90,910	0	(90,910)	(90,910)	0	0	0	0	0
53 Leys Road - Roof	Nicholas Brown	55,000	0	0	(55,000)	(55,000)	0	0	0	0	0
54 High Street, Tring - Replace External Cladding & Roof	Nicholas Brown	30,000	50,000	0	0	0	80,000	6,536	80,000	0	0
55 The Denes Shopping Centre - Renew Walkway & Canopy Covering	Nicholas Brown	50,000	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000	0	0
56 Commercial Properties - Renew Obsolete Door Entry Controls	Nicholas Brown	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
57 Silk Mill - Renew asphalt tanking to stairs	Nicholas Brown	16,000	0	0	0	0	16,000	0	16,000	0	0
58 Car Park Refurbishment	Nicholas Brown	90,000	99,172	0	(187,572)	(187,572)	1,600	2,400	2,400	800	0
59 Water Gardens Car Park - Re-Lining (Asphalt) Top Floor	Nicholas Brown	435,000	0	0	0	0	435,000	2,950	435,000	0	0
60 Multi Storey Car Park Berkhamsted	Nicholas Brown	3,432,000	(161,436)	0	(3,085,093)	(3,085,093)	185,471	55,835	185,471	0	0
61 Kingshill Cemetery - Toilet Provision	Nicholas Brown	150,000	0	0	0	0	150,000	0	150,000	0	0
62 Bunkers Farm	Nicholas Brown	25,782	183,606	0	55,332	55,332	264,720	270,061	270,061	5,341	0
63 Refurbishment of Facilities at Woodwells Cemetery	Nicholas Brown	0	57,597	0	0	0	57,597	0	57,597	0	0
64 Heath Lane - Welfare Facilities	Nicholas Brown	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
65 Woodwells Cemetery - Improvements to Burial Areas	Nicholas Brown	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
		5,821,782	(88,301)	0	(3,910,655)	(3,910,655)	1,822,826	352,758	1,830,957	6,141	1,990
Democratic Services											
69 Election Management System Replacement	Jim Doyle	30,000	0	0	(30,000)	(30,000)	0	0	0	0	0
70 Civic Car Purchase	Jim Doyle	30,000	0	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000	0	0
		60,000	0	0	(30,000)	(30,000)	30,000	0	30,000	0	0
Development Management and Planning											
74 Planning Software Replacement	Sara Whelan	0	86,964	0	(86,964)	(86,964)	0	0	0	0	0
		0	86,964	0	(86,964)	(86,964)	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Management											
78 Payroll (Invest to Save)	Richard Baker	0	2,447	0	0	0	2,447	2,425	2,425	0	(22)
79 Credit Card Surcharging (Invest to Save)	Richard Baker	16,000	0	0	0	0	16,000	8,375	16,000	0	0
80 Upgrade of HSM Module (BACS / DD Security)	Richard Baker	6,000	5,000	0	0	0	11,000	11,700	11,700	0	700
		22,000	7,447	0	0	0	29,447	22,500	30,125	0	678
Housing & Regeneration Management											
84 The Forum (Public Service Quarter)	Mark Gaynor	9,350,000	1,015,400	0	0	0	10,365,400	5,776,962	10,365,400	0	0
85 Gade Zone	Mark Gaynor	150,000	0	0	0	0	150,000	11,495	150,000	0	0
		9,500,000	1,015,400	0	0	0	10,515,400	5,788,457	10,515,400	0	0
Information, Communication and Technology											
89 Rolling Programme - Hardware	Ben Trueman	75,000	41,700	0	0	0	116,700	23,294	136,700	20,000	0
90 Software Licences - Right of Use	Ben Trueman	50,000	32,000	0	0	0	82,000	32,232	82,000	0	0
91 Website Development	Ben Trueman	0	69,500	0	0	0	69,500	(2,296)	69,500	0	0
92 Future vision of CRM	Ben Trueman	152,000	0	0	(70,000)	(70,000)	82,000	0	0	(82,000)	0
		277,000	143,200	0	(70,000)	(70,000)	350,200	53,230	288,200	(62,000)	0

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR SEPTEMBER 2016

Scheme	Budget Holder	Original Budget	Prior Year Slippage	Adj's, Supps, Virements	Adjustments (Slip. C/F)	In-Year Adjustments	Current Budget	YTD Spend	Projected Outturn	Forecast Slippage	Projected Over / (Under)
People											
96 Incoming Mailroom	Matt Rawdon	0	48,009	0	0	0	48,009	0	48,009	0	0
97 Reprographics	Matt Rawdon	0	5,247	0	0	0	5,247	0	5,247	0	0
98 EIS Replacement	Matt Rawdon	0	70,000	0	0	0	70,000	0	70,000	0	0
		0	123,256	0	0	0	123,256	0	123,256	0	0
Totals: Finance and Resources		15,680,782	1,287,966	0	(4,097,619)	(4,097,619)	12,871,129	6,216,945	12,817,938	(55,859)	2,668
Housing and Community											
Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance											
106 Telephony upgrade & virtualisation	Ben Hosier	0	4,600	0	0	0	4,600	0	4,556	0	(44)
107 Customer Services Unit Refurbishment	Ben Hosier	0	9,870	0	0	0	9,870	10,190	9,870	0	0
108 CSU Flow Management Solution	Ben Hosier	46,500	0	0	0	0	46,500	23,560	27,600	0	(18,900)
109 Replacement of Inform 360 Communications	Ben Hosier	19,000	0	0	0	0	19,000	18,920	18,920	0	(80)
110 Self Service Kiosks	Ben Hosier	47,000	0	0	0	0	47,000	8,070	44,500	0	(2,500)
		112,500	14,470	0	0	0	126,970	60,740	105,446	0	(21,524)
Legal , Democratic and Regulatory Management											
114 Highbarns Land Stabilisation Project	Mark Brookes	0	8,360	0	0	0	8,360	(1,242)	8,360	0	0
		0	8,360	0	0	0	8,360	(1,242)	8,360	0	0
People											
118 Capital Grants - Community Groups	Matt Rawdon	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
		20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0
Residents Services											
122 Rolling Programme - CCTV Cameras	Julie Still	25,000	0	0	0	0	25,000	17,451	25,000	0	0
123 Lift Replacement to Theatre - Old Town Hall	Julie Still	40,000	0	0	(40,000)	(40,000)	0	0	0	0	0
124 Verge Hardening Programme	Julie Still	350,000	7,840	0	0	0	357,840	50,912	350,000	0	(7,840)
125 Youth Centre Provision	Julie Still	50,000	82,807	5,762	0	5,762	138,569	113,489	138,569	0	0
		465,000	90,647	5,762	(40,000)	(34,238)	521,409	181,852	513,569	0	(7,840)
Strategic Housing											
129 New Build - Elms Hostel Redbourne Road	Julia Hedger	0	0	0	0	0	0	(59,426)	0	0	0
130 Affordable Housing Development Fund	Julia Hedger	0	0	1,050,000	0	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	0	0
		0	0	1,050,000	0	1,050,000	1,050,000	990,574	1,050,000	0	0
Totals: Housing and Community		597,500	113,477	1,055,762	(40,000)	1,015,762	1,726,739	1,231,924	1,697,375	0	(29,364)

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR SEPTEMBER 2016

Scheme	Budget Holder	Original Budget	Prior Year Slippage	Adj's, Supps, Virements	Adjustments (Slip. C/F)	In-Year Adjustments	Current Budget	YTD Spend	Projected Outturn	Forecast Slippage	Projected Over / (Under)
Strategic Planning and Environment											
Commercial Assets and Property Development											
138 Hemel Sports Centre - renew heat and power system	Nicholas Brown	0	76,050	23,878	0	23,878	99,928	0	99,928	0	0
139 Hemel Sports Centre - renew outdoor pool water heaters	Nicholas Brown	0	4,952	(4,952)	0	(4,952)	0	0	0	0	0
140 Berkhamsted Sports Centre - heating system upgrade	Nicholas Brown	15,000	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	0	0
141 Air Handling Unit - Hemel Hempstead Sports Centre	Nicholas Brown	0	18,926	(18,926)	0	(18,926)	0	0	0	0	0
		15,000	99,928	0	0	0	114,928	0	114,928	0	0
Environmental Services											
145 Wheeled Bins & Boxes for New Properties	Craig Thorpe	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000	2,142	20,000	0	0
146 Play Area Refurbishment Programme	Craig Thorpe	224,000	106,916	132,216	(150,916)	(18,700)	312,216	153,505	312,216	0	0
147 Litter Bin Upgrade	Craig Thorpe	40,000	0	0	0	0	40,000	0	40,000	0	0
148 Waste & Recycling Service Improvements	Craig Thorpe	0	75,000	0	(75,000)	(75,000)	0	0	0	0	0
149 Play Areas & Open Spaces - replace equipment	Craig Thorpe	0	14,722	0	0	0	14,722	0	14,722	0	0
150 Cupid Green Depot - Security Gates Upgrade	Craig Thorpe	81,000	0	0	0	0	81,000	19,263	70,326	0	(10,674)
151 Dog Kennels / Pest Control store Cupid Depot	Craig Thorpe	40,000	0	0	0	0	40,000	0	10,000	0	(30,000)
152 Fleet Replacement Programme	Craig Thorpe	862,000	94,231	0	(485,244)	(485,244)	470,987	59,650	470,987	0	0
		1,267,000	290,869	132,216	(711,160)	(578,944)	978,925	234,561	938,251	0	(40,674)
Regulatory Services											
156 Disabled Facilities Grants	Chris Troy	603,000	(61,346)	0	0	0	541,654	367,073	780,000	0	238,346
157 Home Improvement Grants	Chris Troy	0	8,893	0	0	0	8,893	6,140	8,893	0	0
		603,000	(52,453)	0	0	0	550,547	373,213	788,893	0	238,346
Strategic Planning and Regeneration											
161 Maylands Phase 1 Improvements	Chris Taylor	476,000	813,256	0	0	0	1,289,256	660,352	1,239,256	(50,000)	0
162 GAF - Urban Park/Education Centre	Chris Taylor	0	0	0	30,000	30,000	30,000	34,578	50,000	20,000	0
163 Regeneration of Hemel Town Centre	Chris Taylor	0	0	0	0	0	0	176,664	200,000	0	200,000
164 Maylands Business Centre	Chris Taylor	550,000	335,000	0	0	0	885,000	67,597	900,000	0	15,000
165 Water Gardens	Chris Taylor	177,217	2,005,260	0	0	0	2,182,477	1,212,025	2,282,477	0	100,000
166 Bus Interchange	Chris Taylor	0	300,000	0	0	0	300,000	42,748	100,000	0	(200,000)
167 Heath Park Gardens Improvements (Fully funded from S106)	Chris Taylor	0	12,892	0	0	0	12,892	(2,797)	12,892	0	0
168 Town Centre Access Improvements	Chris Taylor	0	507,961	0	(457,961)	(457,961)	50,000	956	50,000	0	0
169 Hemel Street Furniture	Chris Taylor	166,000	0	0	(30,000)	(30,000)	136,000	14,489	76,000	(60,000)	0
170 Gadebridge Park	Chris Taylor	500,000	0	0	(500,000)	(500,000)	0	0	0	0	0
171 The Bury - Conversion into Museum and Gallery	Chris Taylor	75,000	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	75,000	0	0
		1,944,217	3,974,369	0	(957,961)	(957,961)	4,960,625	2,206,611	4,985,625	(90,000)	115,000
Totals: Strategic Planning and Environment		3,829,217	4,312,713	132,216	(1,669,121)	(1,536,905)	6,605,025	2,814,385	6,827,697	(90,000)	312,672
Totals - Fund: General Fund		20,107,499	5,714,156	1,187,978	(5,806,740)	(4,618,762)	21,202,893	10,263,253	21,343,010	(145,859)	285,976

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR SEPTEMBER 2016

Scheme	Budget Holder	Original Budget	Prior Year Slippage	Adj's, Supps, Virements	Adjustments (Slip. C/F)	In-Year Adjustments	Current Budget	YTD Spend	Projected Outturn	Forecast Slippage	Projected Over / (Under)	
Housing Revenue Account												
Housing and Community												
Property & Place												
183	Planned Fixed Expenditure	Fiona Williamson	18,334,000	0	(4,628,000)	0	(4,628,000)	13,706,000	5,350,128	13,199,000	0	(507,000)
184	Pain/Gain Share (Planned Fixed Expenditure)	Fiona Williamson	0	0	(0)	0	(0)	(0)	10,585	(0)	0	0
185	M&E Contracted Works	Fiona Williamson	0	(630,178)	1,108,000	0	1,108,000	477,822	126,574	477,822	0	0
186	Communal Gas & Heating	Fiona Williamson	0	0	2,950,000	0	2,950,000	2,950,000	793,166	2,950,000	0	0
187	DBC Commissioned Capital Works	Fiona Williamson	0	0	570,000	0	570,000	570,000	12,382	570,000	0	0
			18,334,000	(630,178)	0	0	0	17,703,822	6,292,835	17,196,822	0	(507,000)
Strategic Housing												
191	Farm Place Berkhamsted	Julia Hedger	45,040	105,505	0	0	0	150,545	(43,815)	1,230	0	(149,315)
192	Galley Hill / St. Peters Court / The Nokes	Julia Hedger	0	140,125	0	0	0	140,125	(37,490)	0	0	(140,125)
193	Aspen Court / London Road, Apsley	Julia Hedger	322,534	837,800	0	0	0	1,160,334	347,426	476,800	0	(683,534)
194	New Build General	Julia Hedger	7,057,628	343,266	0	(1,840,214)	(1,840,214)	5,560,680	1,117,458	4,737,550	(1,796,104)	972,974
195	Queen Street (Old Tring Depot)	Julia Hedger	337,815	73,422	0	0	0	411,237	331,613	460,000	48,763	0
196	Able House	Julia Hedger	2,084,636	178,309	0	0	0	2,262,945	434,608	1,779,000	(483,945)	0
			9,847,653	1,678,427	0	(1,840,214)	(1,840,214)	9,685,866	2,149,801	7,454,580	(2,231,286)	0
Totals: Housing and Community			28,181,653	1,048,249	0	(1,840,214)	(1,840,214)	27,389,688	8,442,636	24,651,402	(2,231,286)	(507,000)
Totals - Fund: Housing Revenue Account			28,181,653	1,048,249	0	(1,840,214)	(1,840,214)	27,389,688	8,442,636	24,651,402	(2,231,286)	(507,000)
Totals			48,289,152	6,762,405	1,187,978	(7,646,954)	(6,458,976)	48,592,581	18,705,889	45,994,412	(2,377,145)	(221,024)



AGENDA ITEM:

SUMMARY 8

Report for:	Finance and Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	8 th November 2016
PART:	1
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	Quarter 2 Performance Report – Legal Governance and Democratic Services
Contact:	Cllr Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Corporate Services Author/Responsible Officers: Mark Brookes (Solicitor to the Council) Jim Doyle, Group Manager (Democratic Services)
Purpose of report:	To provide Members with the performance report for quarter two in relation to Legal Governance and Democratic Services.
Recommendations	That Members note the report.
Corporate objectives:	Resources and Value For Money; Optimise Resources and Implement Best Practice.
Implications:	<u>Financial</u> None.
'Value For Money Implications'	<u>Value for Money</u> Monitoring Performance supports the Council in achieving Value for Money for its citizens.
Risk Implications	Risk Assessment completed for each service area as part of service planning and reviewed quarterly.
Equalities	Equality Impact Assessment completed for each service area

Implications	as part of service planning and reviewed quarterly.
Health And Safety Implications	None
Consultees:	Cllr Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Corporate Services
Background papers:	Annex 1: Quarter 2 Performance Report Annex 2: Quarter 2 Operational Risk Register

- Members will find attached to this report the Corvu performance data for Legal Governance and Democratic Services, together with the Operational Risk Register, in relation to quarter 2 of 2016/17.

LEGAL GOVERNANCE

Legal Services

- The Legal team frequently represent the Council in the courts and tribunals, leading on injunctions, prosecutions and defending employment tribunal cases. In the last quarter the Legal team were successful in the following court cases :-
 - S Gallagher (Berkhamsted West ward) - S.204 Housing Act 1996 appeal. Ms G was arguing that the property we allocated to her after her homelessness application was unsuitable. The judge found that we had acted on the evidence provided and could not be criticised.
 - J Lee Lill (Berkhamsted West ward) – Closure Order– allegations of drug use and noise nuisance at property owned and managed by Affinity Sutton. Action taken on their behalf.
 - A Webb Watson (Adeyfield East ward) – Closure Order – allegations of drug dealing and drug use. Police raided the council address and found evidence of property being used to supply drugs.
 - M Horsfall (Aldbury & Wiggington ward) – Injunction – allegations of verbally and physically abusing his elderly father. He was given a final warning in writing before action was taken.
 - M Kmiotek (Highfield ward) – Closure Order
- The property and planning section of the team are dealing with a particularly high volume of casework presently, which consists of a mixture of new leases, licenses, deeds of variation and general advice. In the last quarter alone they received 57 new instructions and a further 25 Right to Buy applications to process.

Service improvements

4. The Legal team have been working on a quarterly intranet legal update page which will aim to keep internal departments up to date with relevant statutory and case law changes. This will go live in November.

The Licensing Team

5. The Licensing team have been reviewing the provision of taxi- ranks within Hemel Hempstead to ensure that there is adequate provision situated appropriately throughout the town centre. It is proposed to introduce a new night-time (2200-0600) rank for 5 taxis outside 89 to 95 Marlowes (Royal Bank of Scotland to A-Plan Insurance). This rank is aimed at facilitating the effective dispersal of persons frequenting the town's night time venues which should help prevent anti-social behaviour. The rank appointment is currently going through the Portfolio Holder Decision process.

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Elections/Electoral Registration

6. The first two phases of the annual canvass to update and compile the Electoral Register for 2017 have been conducted throughout this quarter. These phases, based on elector responses, have progressed well, with a return rate around the 85% mark (about 30% of this in e-responses). This year, responders could provide more than just 'no changes' electronically and this has led to fewer paper returns, decreased scanning, and reduced processing time.
The final stage of 'door knocking' to encourage those who have not yet responded will commence on 26 October.
Going on past data and return rates, we are currently on target to achieve a canvass in the high 90% as usual.
7. There were two by-elections during the quarter: an election of a Parish Councillor for Flamstead Parish Council and election to fill the Adeyfield West, Dacorum Borough councillor vacancy. Both of these were conducted successfully.

Member Support Services

8. During Quarter 2, Member Support managed and organised the following:
 - Published 21 agendas
 - Completed 21 sets of minutes
 - Spent 36 hours at evening meetings
 - Processed 55 public speakers at Committee
 - Published 7 Portfolio Holder Decisions
 - Published 15 Officer Decisions
 - Representation at 7 Community Association meetings
 - 3 High Sheriff Tours and 1 Planning Meeting
 - 4 Mayoral visits to parishes including Nash Mills and Flaunden

- Deputy Lieutenant tour
9. Work and training is still ongoing in order to further develop the use of Modern.Gov, Issue Manager. Officer Decisions are now carried out using the system and the process is working well. Further testing of its use for Officer Decisions and Portfolio Holder Decisions is ongoing and protocols for their production are being developed.

Member Development

10. Four Member Development sessions took place during this quarter, with 40 attendances which equates to 0.78 average per councillor. Sessions included Safeguarding & WRAP, Planning Committee Members Update, Effective Member Officer Partnerships, and Condensation and Damp Training; all provided as a result of the member requests following the Personal Development Plans or were deemed appropriate/compulsory by the Member Development Steering Group.
11. During this quarter the following attendances were seen:
- 24 councillors did not attend any of the courses provided
 - 17 councillors attended 1 course
 - 8 councillors attended 2 courses
 - 2 councillors attended 3 courses
 - no-one attended all four.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

12. The Operational Risk Register is annexed to the report. There have been no changes to the residual risk score since quarter 1.

September 2016

Chief Executive's Unit - Mark Brookes

CE_R01 Failure to deliver successful elections

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Mark Brookes	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating
----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
4 Very Likely	4 Severe	16 Red	1 Very Unlikely	4 Severe	4 Green

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
--------------	------------------	-----------

<p>Legal sanction and re-run of election at DBC expense. Loss of faith in elections process. Intense scrutiny on future referenda Potential 'Failed service' designation from Electoral Commission. Personal Financial liability for Returning Officer. Invalid or unsubstantiated election Results. Dissatisfaction of key stakeholders with the borough council elections and the process for future referenda.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Election Preparation Plan and Risk Assessment - Establish Election Team, allocate resources, audit and prepare equipment - Oversee actual Election - Check Results - Conclude election paperwork - Clear and Store election equipment 	<p>The Parliamentary, Borough and Parish/Town Council elections held in May 2015 and the PCC election (May 2016) and EU Referendum (June 2016) were conducted successfully which demonstrates the effectiveness of a comprehensive action plan which is monitored and updated every two weeks by the Chief Executive, as the Returning Officer, the Solicitor to the Council, the Corporate Director (Finance and Operations) and the Group Manager (Democratic Services) as the three Deputy Returning Officers.</p>
---	--	---

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete
No amendments to the existing scoring required.





Agenda item: 9

Summary

Report for:	Finance & Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	8 November 2016
Part:	1
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	Finance & Resources Performance and Risk Report Quarter 2 2016/17
Contact:	Cllr Graeme Elliot, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources Cllr Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Corporate Services David Skinner, Assistant Director (Finance & Resources)
Purpose of report:	To provide Committee with analysis of quarterly performance and risk management within Finance & Resources for the quarter to September 2016
Recommendations	That Committee notes the contents of the report and the performance of Finance & Resources for Quarter 2 2016/17.
Corporate objectives:	The provision of effective financial services and the allocation of resources such as building assets and facilities management support all five of the Council's corporate objectives, with particular reference to the <i>Delivering an efficient and modern council</i> and, through Revenues, Benefits and Fraud division, <i>Building strong and vibrant communities</i> .
Implications:	<u>Financial</u> Contained within the body of the report.
'Value for money' implications	<u>Value for money</u> Contained within the body of the report.
Risk implications	Contained within the body of the report
Equalities implications	None
Health and safety Implications	There are no health and safety implications.
Consultees:	Group Manager (Commercial Assets & Property Development) Group Manager (Financial Services) Group Manager (Revenues, Benefits and Fraud)

	Group Manager (Procurement, Commissioning & Compliance)
Background papers:	6/9/16 F&R OSC Performance & Risk Report Quarter 1 2016/17
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	F&R OSC – Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1. Risk and Performance reports are presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committees on a quarterly basis. They provide Members with an opportunity to scrutinise performance against a range of key indicators, and to review how the key risks facing the Services are being managed.
2. The attached appendices provide comprehensive risk and performance information for Finance & Resources for Quarter 2 of 2016/17 (July-September).

Appendix A - Performance Report

Appendix B - Risk Report

3. All scores as set out in the operational risk register at Appendix B have been reviewed during Quarter 1. There has been one update to a risk score:
 - a. The Residual Probability risk score for FR_F02 Delays to Capital programme has been updated to reflect the success of the rephasing of the General Fund capital programme to realign it. The score was 5 and is now 4 to reflect the residual probability based on the latest forecast position for slippage of the HRA capital programme.

QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE

Finance and Resources

September 2016

High Level Only







Page 27

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Trend	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Actions	Comments	Sign Off
CP01 - Percentage of commercial property occupation	Nicholas Brown Adriana Livingstone	97.32% (582/598) Target: 95	↓	97.99% (586/598) Target: 95	98.49% (589/598) Target: 95	The figures remain strong and the Estate is fully let.	Updater The Number of vacant properties has risen slightly as we have taken delivery of 2 new build commercial assets in Apsley.	✓
CP02 - Percentage arrears on commercial property rents	Nicholas Brown Adriana Livingstone	8.1% (343362/4244200) Target: 8.8	↓	7.3% (322627/4447200) Target: 8.8	8.1% (343362/4244200) Target: 9	We continue to focus to keep debt levels low.	Updater With continued focus on the commercial rents Estates and sundry debtors are successfully keeping percentage arrears within target.	✓
CSU02 - Percentage of enquiries that are resolved at first point of contact within the Customer Service Centre	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	98.37% (13183/13401) Target: 90	↓	99.46% (12234/12300) Target: 90	99.46% (15193/15275) Target: 90		Owner Performance continues to be maintained. The number of face to face customers continues to reduce. However the rate of change is decreasing.	✓
CSU03 - Percentage of customers satisfied with service received from the Customer Service Centre	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	99.78% (1849/1853) Target: 80	↓	99.95% (1859/1860) Target: 80	99.57% (5777/5802) Target: 80		Owner Satisfaction levels continue to be maintained	✓
CSU05 - Percentage of enquiries that are resolved at first point of contact within the Contact Centre	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	97.69% (33216/34001) Target: 90	↑	97.18% (30312/31191) Target: 90	98.8% (83872/84890) Target: 90		Owner Performance continues to be maintained	✓
CSU06 - Percentage of customers satisfied with service received from the Contact Centre	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	98.87% (1834/1855) Target: 80	↓	98.99% (2061/2082) Target: 80	98.66% (3825/3877) Target: 80		Owner Satisfaction levels continue to be maintained	✓
CSU09 - Head of Service Satisfaction Survey Score	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	100% Target: 45		No Data Target: 45	81% Target: 45		Owner Group Managers continue to show that they are satisfied with the service the CSU provides	✓
CSU10 - Call Handling: Average wait time	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	174.67 Second(s) Target: 210	↑	202 Second(s) Target: 210	102 Second(s) Target: 210		Owner Performance during the last quarter was above target with calls being answered in an average of 2 minutes 55 seconds. This is an improvement in performance from the previous quarter.	✓
CSU11 - Call Handling: Abandoned Call Rate	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	16.6% (6768/40769) Target: 20	↑	20.55% (8067/39257) Target: 20	11.73% (2900/24728) Target: 60		Owner Overall performance for this quarter is above target.	✓

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Trend	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Actions	Comments	Sign Off
CSU12 - Face to Face; Average Wait Time	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	2715 Second(s) Target: 450	↗	3755 Second(s) Target: 450	2575 Second(s) Target: 450		Owner Average time to see customers during the last quarter was 4 minutes 31 seconds which is above target.	✓
CSU13 - Face to Face: Waiting time more than 20 minutes	Mark Housden Tracy Lancashire	4.74% (635/13401) Target: 5	↘	2.75% (338/12300) Target: 5	0.06% (6/9836) Target: 5		Owner During the quarter 635 customers experienced a wait of more than 20 minutes. This is above the agreed targets. July's performance was below target . Implementation of new equipment relating to customer queuing and staff training had an impact as did the continued vacancy for an apprentice. A right to remedy was issued and the situation has now improved	✓
FIN01 - Percentage of creditor trade invoices paid within 30 days	Richard Baker Sally Nunn	95.8% (3124/3261) Target: 96	↘	96.6% (3205/3319) Target: 96	97.4% (3945/4050) Target: 96		Owner There has been a slight decrease in the number of invoices paid within the target. This is due to the introduction of the No PO no pay procedure. Although there has been a slight decrease while this beds in, it is still expected that the annual target will be met.	✓
FIN02a - Time taken for debtors to pay	Richard Baker Clare Dempsey	35.6 Days Target: 40	↘	33.9 Days Target: 40	38.7 Days Target: 45		Owner A great result for the quarter	✓
FIN03 - General Fund expenditure – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Caroline Souto	£18716000 Target: 18511000	↗	£19077000 Target: 18438000	£19475000 Target: 19199000		Owner The key variances are detailed within the supporting financial performance report	✓
FIN04 - HRA expenditure – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Caroline Souto	£44523000 Target: 44101000	↘	£44353000 Target: 44101000	£57788000 Target: 57765000		Owner The key variances are detailed within the supporting financial performance report	✓
FIN05 - HRA income – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Caroline Souto	£57386000 Target: 57654000	↘	£57701000 Target: 57654000	£58049000 Target: 57765000		Owner The key variances are detailed within the supporting financial performance report	✓
FIN06 - General Fund Capital Expenditure – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Caroline Souto	£21143000 Target: 21202893	↘	£20950713 Target: 25821655	£23826137 Target: 29052188		Owner The key variances are detailed within the supporting financial performance report	✓

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Trend	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Actions	Comments	Sign Off
FIN07 - HRA Capital Expenditure – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Caroline Souto	£25233622 Target: 27389688	↑	£27932397 Target: 29229902	£36191609 Target: 35563608		Owner The key variances are detailed within the supporting financial performance report	✓
FIN08 - Investment income – outturn forecast against budget	Richard Baker Tracy Claridge	£437750 Target: 448000	↓	£489720 Target: 448000	£509260 Target: 313000		Owner Interest rates available continue to fall following the base rate cut, although some institutions are still offering competitive rates for 6 month funds. We have been able to take advantage of this by placing fresh deposits with them before rates drop off further.	✓
FIN11 - Investment Property Income ytd budget against ytd actual	Nicholas Brown Caroline Souto	£3142056 Target: 3091741	↓	£2116621 Target: 2036321	£2817961 Target: 3034511	we will continue to work towards a full year outturn in excess of budget.	Owner We are strongly up on figures for the same quarter in 2015 and are looking at a full year surplus.	✓
FIN13 - Car Parking Income ytd budget against ytd actual	Nicholas Brown Caroline Souto	£1084193 Target: 1042570	↑	£533576 Target: 521285	£1096208 Target: 1042500	We will continue to look to innovate and run a cost efficient service.	Owner Figures remain above expectation.	✓
RBF01 - Average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit	Chris Baker Matthew Kelly	17.4 Days (9812/564) Target: 20	↑	20.8 Days (12558/604) Target: 20	19.6 Days (13479/687) Target: 23		Updater Performance has been consistently good for new claims throughout the quarter. A small reduction in the number of applications received has helped to sustain the good performance. Owner This is a very good performance from the team, reflecting the work which has been done to improve efficiency.	✓
RBF02 - Average time taken to decide a change event for Housing Benefit	Chris Baker Matthew Kelly	9.9 Days (59880/6036) Target: 11.5	↓	8 Days (60997/7612) Target: 11.5	15.3 Days (105615/6887) Target: 13		Updater Performance has been consistently good over the quarter. Owner This shows continuing good performance from the benefits team.	✓
RBF04 - NNDR (Business Rates) in-year collection rate	Chris Baker Jake Seabourne	52.3% Target: 51.6	↑	27.7% Target: 27.7	52.6% Target: 51.5		Owner Most of our large ratepayers have instalments due on the first of the month. Timing of receipt of payments from some of these payers is varying this year between a day or so in advance, to a day or two after the due date. This is making comparison to prior years more difficult, but we are continuing to work to understand the impact we expect this will have on collection by the end of the year.	✓

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Trend	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Actions	Comments	Sign Off
RBF05 - Council Tax collection rate	Chris Baker Jake Seabourne	58.2% Target: 58		30.4% Target: 30.2	58% Target: 58		Owner Collection continues to be slightly above the profiled target.	
RBF06 - Council Tax customer contact response (percentage of contacts responded to within 14 days)	Chris Baker Anna Elliott	95% (8756/9259) Target: 98		91% (10056/11066) Target: 75	No Data Target: 90		Updater Although we did not achieved the target this quarter, it is still pleasing to see we are achieving a high performance overall for our customers. Having identified August as being the blip in performance, this is a month where our resources are usually stretched, but overall during this busy quarter our customer have received a response from us within 14 days. I will continue to monitor our performance and challenge processes and procedures to identify any improvements to our productivity. Owner Looking at the detail of the data for this indicator, there is a period of about two weeks over the end of August and beginning of September where daily performance did not reach the 98% target. This is a consequence of a half-day of system unavailability, and then the recovery time to catch up with the work from that period. During the other 2 1/2 months of the quarter, the vast majority of customers received a prompt response.	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Finance & Resources - David Skinner

CE_R08 The CSGC contractor focuses attention on meeting speed of response targets and not quality of service

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating
----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	1 Very Unlikely	4 Severe	4 Green

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calls are not resolved at first point of contact. • Insufficient time is dedicated to callers to ensure that call has been fully resolved in a satisfactory manner. • Reputational damage to the Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New KPI's have been set to provide greater clarity on the quality of the performance • Regular customer & stakeholder surveys • Quarterly quality assessments with GM's • Monthly meetings with back office to assess service delivery and monthly operational Board meetings to escalate issues. • Monitoring of complaints and performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly performance reports • Minutes of Operational Board meetings • Quarterly Partnership Board meetings • All performance indicators are on track. • The above provide assurances that the CSGC contractor maintains focus on achieving the response targets and quality of service.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Performance has been maintained from quarter 1 with no exceptions to performance to report.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



FR_CPC01 Failure to comply with procurement legislation and internal controls

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	1 Very Unlikely	4 Severe	4 Green
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council would face an increased risk of legal challenge from unsuccessful bidders Contracts could be set aside by the courts The Council could face financial penalties under the Remedies Directive The delivery of contracts could be delayed Lack of a robust and transparent procurement process Unable to demonstrate value for money All of the above would result in damaging the Council's reputation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Commissioning & Procurement Standing Orders (CPSO's) have been re-written to complement the Public Contract Regulations 2015. The CPSO's have been written to simplify the processes for officers to follow. All OJEU tenders must be supported by an officer of the Commissioning & Procurement team. All procurement officers that manage the OJEU tenders are professionally qualified. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CPSO's are regularly updated following any policy notes or guidance as issued by Crown Commercial Services Awareness training on the CPSO's is offered to all GM's and their teams. Procurement officers keep abreast of changes in legislation and best practice within the industry. Internal audit have completed a draft report on Contract management that is still in discussions between officers and the internal auditors. 	
Sign Off and Comments					
Sign Off Complete					
The management information suite is being developed and is beginning to demonstrate trend information that can be developed for future performance data.					

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



FR_CPC02 Continued Non-Authorised procurement expenditure

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
4 Very Likely	2 Medium	8 Amber	1 Very Unlikely	3 High	3 Green
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This expenditure may result in the Council being in breach of procurement legislation • This increases the risk of legal challenge and the Council could face penalties under the Remedies Directive • Lack of a robust procurement process may increase the risk of fraudulent activity • Potential for non-compliance with relevant legislation such as H&S • Poor financial management • All of the above would result in damaging the Council's reputation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CPSO's have been re-written to complement the Council's Financial Regulations with regards to officer authorisation levels. • The CPSO's clearly define the processes that must be followed by officers when procuring goods, services and works. • Contracts have been set up for corporate requirements. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with colleagues in finance to implement a 'No PO No Pay' policy. • Working with colleagues in finance to roll out the 'Electronic Purchasing Card'. • Awareness training on the CPSO's is offered to all GM's and their teams. 	
Sign Off and Comments					
<p>Sign Off Complete</p> <p>The introduction of "No PO No Pay" has worked well and has improved compliance with minimal impact on performance. The percentage of trade creditor invoices being paid within 30 days is at 95.8% against a target of 96%.</p>					

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



FR_F02 Delays to Capital programme					
Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:		Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
Financial	Dacorum Delivers	David Skinner		Graeme Elliot	Treating
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	4 Very Likely	2 Medium	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>Many of the major projects within the Capital Programme are fundamental to delivery of the Council's corporate objectives. Therefore significant delays can impact on the achievement of the corporate plan.</p> <p>Financial decision-making is negatively affected if the timing of projects in the Capital Programme is wrong. This can result in lost investment income or increased interest costs as the Council moves closer to the point where it will need to borrow.</p> <p>The estimated delivery date is considered as part of the decision to allocate capital funds to one project over another. If estimated timings are not accurate, there is a risk that the allocation of funds is not being decided on appropriately.</p> <p>If inaccurate project management is tolerated, there is a risk that the culture of financial management across the Council will be negatively affected which will have consequences for wider financial decision-making.</p>		<p>The controls that have been implemented to mitigate this risk target the robustness of capital bids both at the time they are submitted and throughout the delivery phase of the projects.</p> <p>In particular, scrutiny is focussed on those elements of the capital bid that experience indicates are the primary cause of delays to capital projects. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How robust are the assumptions on the estimated duration of the procurement exercise? • How realistic is the estimated time taken for contractors to deliver the works? • How realistic are the assumptions on officer availability to manage the project on time? <p>The rationale behind this approach is that an increased culture of challenge will lead to more realistic programming of future capital projects, and therefore a</p>		<p>The 2013/14 Final Outturn showed that the slippage of capital projects was around 30% against the Original Budget approved by Members in February 2013. This is an improvement on previous years where slippage against Original Budget has been around 60%.</p> <p>As at the end of Quarter 2 2014/15 (the mid-point of the year), the capital forecast on the General Fund is broadly on budget, with no material slippage reported at this stage. Slippage on the HRA capital programme is forecast to be well below 5%.</p> <p>The budget position as at Quarter 3 was reported to Cabinet in February 2015. The report showed that forecast net slippage on the General Fund Capital Programme was low at around 3%. Forecast slippage on the HRA Capital Programme has, however, increased significantly since the Quarter 2 forecast, at around 25%.</p> <p>The Provisional Outturn was reported to Cabinet in may</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



<p>Not delivering major projects within the timeframe to which it has committed itself exposes the Council to reputational risk.</p>	<p>reduced likelihood of slippage.</p> <p>The following controls are in place with a view to developing a culture of scrutiny and challenge for officers to improve the accuracy of future bids:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Strategy Steering Group (CSSG) comprising senior officers from across the Council required to challenge new bids for robustness ahead of recommendation to Members; • Monthly meetings take place between accountants and budget holders to monitor progress against original timeframes and costs; • Corporate Management Team (CMT) receive a monthly report on the progress of capital projects against anticipated timeframes; • Performance Group comprising Chief Officers and cabinet Members receive a monthly report on the progress of current projects; • Reports go to Cabinet and all Overview and Scrutiny Committees (OSC) every quarter. These reports have been redesigned to focus on the more immediate risk of in-year delivery, highlighting higher risk areas to invite closer scrutiny from Members. 	<p>2015. The report showed that slippage against the full year budget on the General Fund Capital Programme was around 10%. Outturn on the HRA shows slippage of around 24%. These are addressed in more detail in the sign-off notes, below.</p> <p>2014/15 Confirmed slippage into 2015/16 was Â£10.1m or 10% of the total approved capital programme according to the 2014/15 approved accounts.</p> <p>The Provisional Outturn was reported to Cabinet in May 2016. The report showed that slippage against the full year budget on the General Fund Capital Programme was around 28%. Outturn on the HRA shows slippage of around 5%.</p> <p>2015/16 Confirmed slippage into 2016/17 was £8.1m or 28% of the total approved capital programme according to the 2015/16 approved accounts.</p> <p>As at the end of Quarter 2 2016/17(the mid-point of the year), the capital forecast on the General Fund is broadly on budget, with no material slippage reported at this stage. Slippage on the HRA capital programme is forecast to be 8% or c£2m.</p>
--	--	---

Page 35

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Additional actions to address delays within the capital programme have been included within the 2016/17 budget setting process. The additional measures included scrutiny of delivery schedules, quality assurance of estimates and project challenge were part of the process of officer assurance, the work of the Budget Review Group and the work by members through the Joint Scrutiny process.

An additional action plan has been drafted for consideration to examine escalation and trigger points.

An additional review carried out by the finance team recommended a number of budgets were rephrased into future years and this intervention has brought the General Fund capital programme back on track. Further work is being carried out to look at the HRA capital programme.

The residual probability risk score has been updated to reflect the updated progress on the General Fund programme but still reflects the slippage on the HRA capital programme.

F03 Variances in General Fund revenue budget

Category: Financial	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	2 Unlikely	2 Medium	4 Green
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
Accurate, well-controlled budgeting relates directly to the achievement of the Dacorum Delivers corporate objective, and indirectly, through the financial decision-making process, to the achievement of all of the Council's corporate objectives. Inaccurate budgeting negatively affects the Council's ability to make evidence-based decisions. A significant underspend at year-end could indicate that funds have been needlessly diverted from a competing priority. A		The following controls aim to reduce the probability of there being a variance in the General Fund Revenue Budget by ensuring that there is strong challenge put to Budget Holders on the robustness of their assumptions, from a range of audiences. It is intended that these controls will increase the opportunity for flawed assumptions to be exposed as soon as possible, as well as inculcating a stronger culture of financial management across the Council leading to		The Council's budgetary controls are assessed each year by Internal Audit. In January 2013, the Council received a 'Full' level of assurance. A further Internal Audit on the Council's budgeting process, undertaken in September 2014, resulted in a 'Substantial' level of assurance. Despite this being a lower mark than the exceptional one achieved in the previous audit, it should be noted that it remains a good result.	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



significant overspend at year-end could result in reserves being used to support lower priority objectives. Both of these could result in reputational damage for the Council.

Failure to address the causes of inaccurate budgeting could negatively impact the Council's culture of financial management, which in turn increases the risk of poor financial decision-making.

Page 37

continuous improvement in the setting of accurate budgets.

The annual budget-setting process consists of an ongoing scrutiny process in which senior officers from across the Council, together with the Financial Services team, challenge the following year's budget bids from Group Managers.

This scrutiny process is augmented by the Budget Review Group (BRG), consisting of Chief Officer Group and representatives from the Portfolio Holder group, which provides early Member-level challenge.

There are two opportunities for OSCs to scrutinise the budget proposals and directly question the relevant officers before the budget report is finalised and considered by Cabinet and Council.

Once approved, in-year budget performance is managed through monthly meetings between accountants and budget holders, which underpin monthly reports to CMT and quarterly reports to Cabinet and OSCs.

The Council's Financial Regulations provide a guide to all budget-holders and are subject to annual review.

The recommendations of the Internal Auditor that led to the reduced marking were not systemic in nature, and they do not pose a material threat to the overall control environment of the budget-setting process. Efforts have, however, been redoubled, and the causes of the recommendations have been addressed.

An Internal Audit report on the Council's 'Main Accounting' function was presented to Audit Committee in February 2015, in which a 'Full' level of assurance was awarded. This audit covered a range of areas including integrity of transactions, manual adjustments, and year-end procedures. All of these areas contribute to the accuracy of the in-year monitoring reports that the Finance team is able to produce. Consequently, Members can draw assurance from this audit opinion that the chances of this risk crystallising are reduced by the robust financial management procedures the Council has in place.

Final confirmed outturn for 2014/15 was within £48k of budget (after contributions to and from reserves) as reported to Audit committee and approved as part of the audited accounts and was consistent with the budget monitoring over the preceding year.

An Internal Audit report on the Council's 'Budgetary Control' function was presented to Audit Committee in April 2016, in which a 'Full' level of assurance was

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Page 38		<p>awarded. This audit covered a range of areas including budget setting; budget upload; budget monitoring and savings realization; budget alterations and virements; and management information. All of these areas contribute to the accuracy of the in-year monitoring reports that the Finance team is able to produce. Consequently, Members can draw assurance from this audit opinion that the chances of this risk crystallising are reduced by the robust financial management procedures the Council has in place.</p> <p>The 2015/16 audit of Core Financial Systems was also reported to have either Full or Substantial levels of assurance.</p> <p>Final confirmed outturn for 2015/16 was within 2% of budget (after contributions to and from reserves) as reported to Audit committee and approved as part of the audited accounts and was consistent with the budget monitoring over the preceding year.</p>
---------	--	--

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

FIN03 is AMBER and is currently projecting an adverse variance (£205k) or 1.1% of the budget. Budget Action Plans have been put in place for major areas of overspend. At quarter 1 2016/17 an adverse variance of £639k or 3.46% was forecast.

FR_I02 Failure to optimise income generated by commercial assets				
Category: Infrastructure	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	3 High	9 Amber	2 Unlikely	3 High	6 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>The council has a significant portfolio of commercially let properties, which provides one of the council's largest sources of income.</p> <p>Council officers must attempt to maximise income from these assets whilst avoiding the risk of vacant properties and increasing bad debts, which could arise if rents are set too high, and would jeopardise the council's achievement of its corporate objectives of Regeneration and Dacorum Delivers.</p> <p>The continuing recession and the difficulties it brings for local businesses increases the likelihood of this risk crystallising.</p>		<p>The following controls aim to mitigate the risk of under-performance of the Council's commercial assets by maintaining good communication links between relevant Council services, and by regularly monitoring performance against targets (see KPIs CP01 and CP02) to ensure that underperformance is identified and addressed as quickly as possible. The existence of these controls has led to the 'Inherent Probability' of this risk occurring reducing from a score of 3, which is shown in the Residual Probability (i.e. after controls implemented) being a 1.</p> <p>Estates officers responsible for negotiating rent reviews hold monthly meetings with the Debtors team to track current bad debtors. This increases their understanding of the economic pressures businesses are facing, and how it can impact on council income.</p> <p>There are currently Corvu performance targets to maintain the number of voids (empty properties) below 5%, and to keep the rent arrears below 10%. Failure to meet either of these targets would prompt further investigation.</p>		<p>The year-end performance figures for 2013/14 demonstrate that occupation rates are above target (98.8% against a target of 95%), and that the level of arrears is also better than target (at 7.32% against a target of 9.5%).</p> <p>The year-end performance figures for 2014/15 demonstrate an occupation rate of 98.3% against a target of 95%. The level of arrears is at 6.5% against a target of 9.5%.</p> <p>Quarter 1 performance for 2015/16 are above target and demonstrate an occupation rate of 98.66 versus a target of 95%. The level of arrears has increased slightly to 7.3% versus a target of 9%.</p> <p>Q2 occupation levels are holding up well at 98.49% and arrears are being held within acceptable levels at 8.1%. Q3 occupation levels are marginally down at 97.99% and arrears have improved significantly by 1.7% to 6.4%.</p> <p>Q4 occupation rates have increased slightly to 98.49% and arrears have reduced from 6.45 down to 5%.</p> <p>Q1 occupation rates have reduced slightly to 97.99%</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



		<p>versus a target of 95% and arrears have slightly increased to 7.3% versus a target of 8.8%</p> <p>Q2 occupation rates are 97.32% versus a target of 95% and arrears are at 8.1% versus a target of 8.8%. Investment property income is exceeding target and is £324k ahead of the Q2 result for 2015/16.</p>
--	--	---

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Performance has not materially altered since quarter 1 and is still being maintained above target levels.

FR 104 Failure to maintain an effective business continuity plan for all relevant service areas

Category: Infrastructure	Corporate Priority: Safe and Clean Environment	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
Disruption caused by service failure leading to hardship for individuals, potential loss of business and significant reputational damage		<p>These controls are implemented to ensure that the Council is adequately prepared and able to continue providing key services in the event of an emergency situation. Through this control, the probability of the Council being unable to respond to such an emergency is reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual review process. - Corporate business continuity process and procedures 		A CMT emergency planning exercise was conducted in October which all members of the Finance and Resources DMT attended.	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



set out in emergency response toolkit.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The emergency planning exercise was very helpful and received positive feedback. Further work is planned to take this down to group and team level.

FR_R01 Council Tax and Business Rates collections rates drop below budget

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>Distribution of collection fund to other preceptors is based on the budgeted collection level, if collection falls short this could lead to a cashflow issue within the Council's finances. The fund distribution is balanced after the end of the financial year.</p> <p>Reputational risk if collection rate falls significantly – this could also impact on future years' council tax base leading to increased budget pressures.</p> <p>Financial risk in relation to business rate retention scheme if rates collection falls below government set baseline.</p>		<p>The following controls aim to identify as quickly as possible if the Council is falling behind on its collection rates target for the year. If a problem is identified, the Council is then able to invoke a range of options to minimise the ongoing negative impact on collection.</p> <p>Profiled monthly collection rates are monitored monthly - see KPIs RBF04 and RBF05. Reasons for variances are then investigated in order to address problems quickly as possible.</p> <p>Direct debit payment is recommended for all customers – a pre-filled instruction is sent to all non-DD payers with their annual bill or a first bill for a new taxpayer. The direct debit method reduce the risk of under-</p>		<p>The full year Council Tax Collection Rate for 2013/14 (Performance Indicator RBF05) was 97.7% against a budget of 97.5%.</p> <p>The full year Business Rates collection rate in 2014/15(Performance Indicator RBF04) was under budget at 98.1% against a target of 99%.</p> <p>Q1 Council Tax collection rates is 30.2% versus a target of 30.1%</p> <p>Q1 Business Rates collection is 30.2% versus a target of 24.8%</p> <p>Q2 Business rates collection is 52.6% achieved versus a target of 51.5%.</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



<p>Page 42</p>	<p>collection because it eliminates the risk of a payer forgetting to make a monthly payment.</p> <p>There is an active programme for taking formal recovery action against non payers.</p>	<p>Council tax collection is on target at 58%.</p> <p>Q3 Business rates collection is 77.2% and is running at 0.5% ahead of target.</p> <p>Council tax collection is at 86.2% which is 0.2% off target but is a 0.1% improvement from the same period last year.</p> <p>Internal Audit have performed a routine assessment of the control environment within Council Tax collection and have given an assurance of Full/Substantial . This is a good result and has highlighted a number of minor improvements that can be made to the timeliness of some work. This does however provide assurance to members that the fundamental design and operation of the control processes are robust.</p> <p>Members can gain additional assurance from the routine Internal Audit assessment of Business Rates as being at Full/Substantial levels.</p> <p>Council tax collection for 2015/16 was 98% which is 0.3% improvement on 2014/15.</p> <p>Business rate collection was 98.3% narrowly missing the target of 99% but improving on the 2014/15 performance by 0.2%.</p> <p>Q1 Business Rates collection is 27.7% which is exactly on target and Council tax Collection is 30.4% which is 0.2% up on target.</p>
----------------	---	---

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



		Q2 Business Rates collection is 52.3% which is ahead of target (51.6%) and Council tax Collection is 58.2% which is 0.2% up on target.
--	--	--

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The team continue to exceed target levels and are gathering more data to analyse the timing differences in the receipt of some payments.

FR_R02 Delays and errors in the processing of Benefits claims

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: David Skinner	Portfolio Holder: Graeme Elliot	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
4 Very Likely	3 High	12 Red	3 Likely	2 Medium	6 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>This risk links to the corporate objective Dacorum Delivers, focussing on an efficient and effective council.</p> <p>Customers could suffer personal hardship resulting from delays or errors in the processing of claims.</p> <p>Significant reputational risk associated with high-profile errors.</p> <p>Staff time spent on addressing unnecessary errors leads to duplication of effort and is an inefficient use of resources.</p>		<p>The controls in place aim to mitigate this risk by closely monitoring performance to assist with effective decision-making around resource allocation. This is a heavily process driven service area and close monitoring also helps to identify bottle necks in the process which need to be improved to optimise performance. By subjecting the process to this regular in-depth scrutiny the Service is able to reduce the probability of the risk crystallising, hence the reduction between the Inherent Risk score (4) and the Residual Risk score (2) after the controls have been taken into account.</p>		<p>The successful and continuously improving management of this risk can be seen in the improved performance of KPI RBF01a - Average Time Taken to Decide a New Benefit Claim.</p> <p>Performance for the full year 14/15 was 22.9 days, which was within the target of 23 days for the first time.</p> <p>This represents an improvement of 4.5 days over the 27.4 days average in 2014/15, and an improvement of 9.9 days against the 12/13 result of 32.8 days.</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



<p>Government subsidy for housing benefit expenditure is based on external audit certification of the claim made. There is financial risk if errors on cases are identified during their testing.</p> <p>Communications with claimants needs to be well written and jargon-free in order to reduce the risk of repeat queries which puts pressure on limited staff resources.</p>	<p>Quality checking and individual performance management is in place. These mean that each officer has targets for their personal productivity and accuracy, and information from quality checks is fed back in order to sustain improvement.</p> <p>Average time taken for processing new claims and changes in circumstances forms part of monthly monitoring.</p> <p>Processes are in place to expedite cases where the customer is vulnerable or facing eviction. These processes start when a case is identified within benefits, or by customer services, homelessness, housing etc.</p> <p>Monthly meetings are held between senior officers within Finance & Resources to monitor detailed performance levels at each stage of the claims process.</p> <p>This enables intermediary targets to be set for discrete elements of the process, which in turn enables the more effective monitoring which has resulted in significantly improved performance over the last 6 months.</p>	<p>It should be noted that these improvements have been achieved without additional resource. It has purely been the result of improved process design and increased efficiency.</p> <p>Average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing benefit is 22.7 days versus a target of 23. This is the first quarter since the same period last year where the target has been met.</p> <p>Average time taken to decide a change event in Housing Benefit is at 12.3 days versus a target of 13.0.</p> <p>Q2 performance has been very good in relation to new claims. The team have achieved 19.6 days versus a target of 23 days.</p> <p>Q3 performance has been very good. New claims are now being processed within 17.4 days versus a target of 23 days. This is an improvement of 9.2 days on the same period last year and 2.2 days improvement on the previous quarter.</p> <p>The average time taken to decide on a change event in Housing benefit is 10.8 days versus a target of 13 days. This is an improvement of 5.6 days on the same period last year and an improvement of 1.5 days on the previous quarter in this year.</p> <p>Q4 performance has been very good. New claims are now being processed within 18.4 days versus a target of 23 days. This is an improvement of 6.2 days on the same</p>
---	---	---

Page 44

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Page 45

period last year.

The average time taken to decide on a change event in Housing benefit is 4.9 days versus a target of 13 days. This is an improvement of 2.2 days on the same period last year and an improvement of 5.9 days on the previous quarter in this year. This reflects the inclusion of calculations relating to annual benefit uprating and rent changes but is still better than last year when similar changes occurred.

Q1 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 20.8 days versus a target of 20 days. This is still 1.9 days better than the same point last year.

The average time taken to decide a change event is 8 days versus a target of 11.5 and is 4.3 days better than the same point last year.

Q2 performance for the average time taken to decide a new claim for Housing Benefit is 17.4 days versus a target of 20 days. This is an improvement of 2.2 days on the same point last year.

The average time taken to decide a change event is 9.9 days versus a target of 11.5 and is 5.4 days better than the same point last year.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



The performance is beginning to stabilise and with the recruitment of staff to fill 3 vacancies then it could improve further.



AGENDA ITEM: 7

SUMMARY

Report for:	Finance and Resources Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	8 Nov 16
PART:	1
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	Performance and Risk report Quarter 2 2016/17 – Performance, People & Innovation
Contact:	Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Corporate Services Author/Responsible Officer: Robert Smyth, Assistant Director - Performance, People & Innovation
Purpose of report:	To provide the Committee with analysis of performance and risk management for the services and functions provided by the Performance, People & Innovation Division.
Recommendations	That the Committee notes the contents of the report and the performance of the division for Quarter 2, 2016/17.
Corporate objectives:	The Performance, People & Innovation division supports the delivery of all corporate objectives, although there is a particular focus on 'modern and efficient council'. That is why it is important that it is able to meet its performance objectives and manage risk.
Implications:	<u>Financial</u> Poor performance could lead to increases in costs as well as reducing the value of our service offer.
'Value For Money Implications'	<u>Value for Money</u> The work of the division supports the achievement of value for money in the pursuit of the Council's objectives
Risk Implications	Risk Assessment reviewed October 2016.
Equalities Implications	There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

Health And Safety Implications	There are no health and safety implications arising from this report.
Consultees:	None
Background papers:	Attached: 1. Quarter 2 Operational Risk and Performance reports
Historical background <i>(please give a brief background to this report to enable it to be considered in the right context).</i>	<p>This is a regular report to the committee detailing the performance of the division over the last quarter.</p> <p>The review also considers operational risks and highlights any additional controls and assurances needed to address the issues raised.</p> <p>The focus of the service has recently expanded and it now includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance, innovation and project management - IT and digital services - Corporate admin and support - HR and organisational development - Communications - Community partnerships
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT – Information Technology team • FirstCare – The Council’s sickness management system • KPIs – Key performance indicators

Introduction

- 1.1 Performance reports are produced on a quarterly basis with information collated in the Council’s performance management system (CorVu).
- 1.2 The performance report for the division is attached and it examines progress in relation to three key themes:
 - 1.2.1 Complaints handling
 - 1.2.2 Human Resources
 - 1.2.3 IT and Digital Services
- 1.3 Targets are included in those areas where it is appropriate and would act as a positive driver for performance behaviour.
- 1.4 In light of the new service plan, a fundamental review of the risk register was undertaken and a summary of the changes is included.

Monitoring Performance

Summary

2.1 Overall performance is very positive. Of the nine target driven indicators, eight are on target and one indicator (average days lost due to sickness) is just outside target.

Detailed Analysis

Complaints Handling

2.2 The total number of 'Stage 1 complaints' received (144) is higher than the same period in 2015 (114). This suggests that previous reductions were not symptomatic of a broader trend.

2.3 However overall performance in relation to complaints remains very good. The Council is on target across all three stages of the complaints process and in Stage 1 it achieved 93.75% compliance.

HR

2.4 The Council has made significant progress in tackling sickness absence. The total number of days lost (1464.25 days) is 22% lower than the previous year. Most striking is the reduction in long term sickness absence from 1405 days in 2015 to 1056 days in 2016.

2.5 This has been achieved through a dedicated project involving reviewing policies, a detailed evidence based report and the introduction of FirstCare. The project is also led by a sickness review panel which reviews all sickness cases and ensures that managers address cases of concern. More details will be provided in the presentation.

2.6 The total FTE complement of staff is 4.3% lower than the same quarter in 2015.

IT and Digital Services

2.7 The percentage of incidents resolved in less than two days has improved to 90.65%.

2.8 The percentage of new starter requests also continues to be above target and system and website availability is high.

2.9 The number of website users in the quarter has decreased but this is likely to be seasonal.

Risk Management

Summary

2.10 Following a fundamental review and as part of the joint service plan, a number of changes have been made to the risk register. This is to ensure that the risk profile properly reflects the focus for each of the teams within the division.

PP_R011 Failure to deliver Digital Dacorum leads to poor customer experiences and increased costs from calls and face to face visits (No Change)

3.1 The Council is continuing to make good progress in digitising the way it communicates and provides services. This includes a new website for the Old Town Hall, digital training and online applications for staff car park permits.

3.2 The high number of website visits continues, face to face visits have reduced by 25% and there has been a 26% reduction in printing.

PP_R012 Failure to deliver an effective approach to the management of performance, projects and complaints (New Risk)

2.11 In the last quarter overall management was positive. 64% of high priority KPIs and 70% of strategic projects are on target. The Council received 144 complaints in the quarter and 94% were resolved in the agreed deadline.

PP_R014 Failure to achieve the service outcomes outlined in each of the new community contracts (New Risk)

2.12 In terms of progress, all contracts have been out to tender and two are currently live. The remaining contracts will be completed by the end of the calendar year.

PP_R015 Failure to effectively and proactively manage the media profile of DBC including social media (New Risk)

2.13 In quarter 2 the Council posted 1460 messages across its 18 social media channels with a total twitter reach of 3.06million. It also ran a number of successful campaigns and the Communications Team won a CIPR award for the Dacorum Digest publication.

PP_R016 Failure to effectively and proactively manage all aspects of employee relations (New Risk)

2.14 Over the last quarter the HR team has continued to support and coach managers through all employee relation cases. Furthermore, work on the new People Strategy is progressing well and will be implemented by the end of this calendar year. .

PP_R017 Failure to support the organisation, and in particular the leadership team, to manage organisational change and staff development including the move to the Forum (New Risk)

2.15 Good progress is being made in managing this risk. The Improvement and Innovation Team provided 25 days of internal consultancy and a number of cultural projects have been introduced including the new Forum guide.

PP_R018 Failure to understand and respond to the current and future technology needs of the Council (New Risk)

2.16 A consultant has been appointed to review our line of business applications. This will begin in Mid-October. Work is also continuing on implementation of new technology include a new remote access programme (Direct Access) and Skype for Business.

PP_R04 Failures in ICT resilience or security leading to significant system downtime (New Risk)

2.17 Work is underway on resilient connectivity. The fit out of the new Forum is also being undertaken. Virtualisation of the telephony system is also due for completion at the end of October.

2.18 The Council's PSN submission is in, while overall systems availability was 100%.

F&R OSC QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

Performance and Projects

September 2016



Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Sign Off	Comments
CS02a - Percentage stage 1 complaints resolved in 20 days for the Council	Matt Rawdon Cassie O'Neil	93.75% (135/144) Target: 80	97.78% (132/135) Target: 80	92.11% (105/114) Target: 80	✓	Updater Performance exceeding target - no further action or comments at this time.
CS02b - Percentage stage 2 complaints resolved in 20 days for the Council	Matt Rawdon Cassie O'Neil	85% (17/20) Target: 80	84.62% (11/13) Target: 80	100% (11/11) Target: 80	✓	Updater Performance exceeding target. No overall concerns or action required at this time.
CS02c - Percentage stage 3 complaints resolved in 20 days for the Council	Matt Rawdon Cassie O'Neil	100% (3/3) Target: 80	100% (4/4) Target: 80	100% (7/7) Target: 80	✓	Updater 100% performance, exceeding target, no further action or comments required
HR01 - Total FTE staff employed	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	652 Staff Info Only	660 Staff Info Only	681 Staff Info Only	✓	Updater Less employees than last quarter and last year

Page 2 of 3

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Sign Off	Comments
HR02 - Total number of leavers	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	22 Leavers Info Only	22 Leavers Info Only	25 Leavers Info Only	✓	Updater 13 voluntary resignations, 1 resignation to go to another local authority, 4 dismissals, 1 end of temporary contract, 1 relocation, 1 ill health retirement and 1 other = 22 Same amount of leavers as last quarter, but less than last year
HR03 - Total days lost through sickness absence	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	1464.25 Days Info Only	1019.25 Days Info Only	1856.03 Days Info Only	✓	Updater Higher than last quarter;substantially lower than last year
HR04a - Total days lost through SHORT TERM sickness absence	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	408.25 Days Info Only	369.75 Days Info Only	450.78 Days Info Only	✓	Updater Higher than last quarter; lower than last year
HR04b - Total days lost through LONG TERM sickness absence	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	1056 Days Info Only	649.5 Days Info Only	1405.25 Days Info Only	✓	Updater Higher than last quarter;substantially lower than last year
HR05 - Average days lost due to sickness absence per FTE	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	2.25 Days (1464/652) Target: 2	1.54 Days (1019/660) Target: 2	2.73 Days (1856/681) Target: 2	✓	Owner Although we are higher than last quarter, we are still significantly lower than last year, so in roads have been made by the corporate sickness project.
HR10 - Percentage of employees who have been absent on more than 2 occasions in the quarter	Matt Rawdon Anne Stunell	1.91% (14/733) Target: 8	3.41% (24/703) Target: 8	4.31% (30/696) Target: 8	✓	Updater Below target; less than last quarter and last year

Page 53

Measure	Owner & Updater	Sep 2016 Result	Jun 2016 Result	Sep 2015 Result	Sign Off	Comments
ICT01 - Percentage of incidents resolved in less than 2 days	Ben Trueman Amanda Jeffries	90.65% (950/1048) Target: 90	89.46% (951/1063) Target: 90	92.38% (934/1011) Target: 90	✓	Owner Steady performance across quarter
ICT02 - Availability of primary systems (office hours)	Ben Trueman Amanda Jeffries	100% Target: 99	100% Target: 99	99.7% Target: 99	✓	Owner Uninterrupted availability.
ICT03 - Percentage of New Starter Requests processed in 5 working days from notification	Ben Trueman Amanda Jeffries	96.3% (26/27) Target: 95	96.55% (28/29) Target: 95	95.74% (45/47) Target: 97	✓	Owner Consistently good performance from Service Desk
WEB01 - Percentage website availability	Ben Trueman Murtaza Maqbool	99.99% Target: 99	100% Target: 99	99.96% Target: 99	✓	Owner Consistently excellent availability.
WEB03 - Number of Website Users	Ben Trueman Murtaza Maqbool	115371 Info Only	123748 Info Only	No Data Info Only	✓	Owner Slight drop over quarter - may reflect the summer holiday period.

Page 54

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Performance and Projects - Robert Smyth

PP_R011 Failure to deliver Digital Dacorum leads to poor customer experiences and increased costs from calls and face to face visits

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating
----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber

Consequences	Current Controls	Assurance
--------------	------------------	-----------

<p>89% of adults use the internet regularly and people expect services that reflect their 24/7 online lives.</p> <p>Digital services also provide an opportunity to use new technology to reduce costs while maintaining or improving service quality.</p> <p>However if we don't deliver our digital vision (Digital Dacorum) this will have major consequences.</p> <p>It will mean that we can't provide services in the most effective way. It will also lead to improvements and savings not being realised. Also systems and processes will fall further behind the expectations of residents.</p> <p>Failure to deliver an effective approach to digital services will also result in reputational damage.</p> <p>The customer experience will also suffer as residents</p>	<p>We have created a detailed Digital Dacorum programme and plan of 10 projects which will transform our digital approach and ensure that we deliver a modern, 24/7 experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project 1: website re-design - Project 2: improving website content - Project 3 & 4: Re-designing services to make them digital ready and putting them online - Project 5: E-signatures - Project 6: Developing policy ideas to encourage people to channel shift - Project 7: Reducing digital exclusion - Project 8: Using social and digital media - Project 9: Increasing use of direct debits - Project 10: CRM and developing a citizens portal <p>Each of these projects sets out a series of tasks and the programme runs for 24 months.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specialist digital staff are in place (web team and channel shift advisor) - Digital Dacorum Strategy and Implementation Plan has been published - New website has gone live - New content management and governance process has been introduced - Schedule for re-design and development has been agreed - New online payment portal has gone live
--	--	--

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



cannot access services at a time and in a way that is best for them.

These actions are managed and supported by the Digital team and governed by a Digital Project Board. They are also monitored at the monthly Performance Board.

Progress so Far

- A Digital Dacorum Strategy and Implementation Plan have been launched
- Our new website has gone live (Project 1)
- We improved the content on our website and reduced the number of pages (Project 2)
- An online solution for benefits, green waste charging, allotments and reports of homelessness has been launched (Project 3&4)
- An LGA funded research project to develop options for channel shift has been completed (Project 6)
- A detailed action plan has been developed for supporting digital inclusion (Project 7)
- A new social media strategy has been developed and implemented (project 8)
- Direct debits have been extended and a new payment portal has been introduced (Project 9)
- Proposals are in place for developing a new CRM solution (Project 10)

Page 56

Sign Off and Comments

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Sign Off Complete

We are continuing to make good progress in delivering our digital vision. We have launched a new website for the Old Town Hall, delivered digital training for residents and we will shortly be going live with 'find my nearest' functionality.

We are also digitising a number of internal processes including stationary ordering, car park permit applications and looking at how to automate Statutory Comments and Officer Decision Sheets.

In terms of the impact of these changes, Q2 website visits continued to maintain the improvement compared to last year and we have maintained the 25% reduction in face to face visits when compared to 2015. Internally we have seen a 3% reduction in postage costs and a 26% reduction in printing. We have also automated a number of processes and are helping re-design existing policies and procedures.

PP R012 Failure to deliver an effective approach to the management of performance, projects and complaints					
Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:	
Reputational	Dacorum Delivers	Robert Smyth	Neil Harden	Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>The ability to manage performance, projects and complaints is vital if we are going to successfully deliver the Council's objectives and priorities.</p> <p>Effective project and performance management ensures that we can deliver what's expected on time and under budget. It also enables us to maximise value for money.</p> <p>However poor project and performance management leads to cost overruns, delays and a failure to achieve</p>		<p>We have recently launched Managing Projects Successfully, our new approach to project management. This provides detailed step-by-step guidance on how to develop, define, manage and evaluate a project.</p> <p>We have a well established performance management system (Corvu) underpinned by a detailed performance framework.</p> <p>We have a team of performance and project</p>		<p>- We monitor performance, projects and complaints on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis</p> <p>- We have a dedicated performance and project management system (Corvu)</p> <p>- We have a project management framework (managing projects successfully)</p> <p>- We have a detailed complaints policy and procedure</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



outcomes. It also causes opportunity costs and can lead to expensive or ineffective remedial work.

Failure to manage complaints can lead to poor service, dissatisfaction and an inability to learn from mistakes and issues.

management specialists and on a monthly basis we produce programme and performance monitoring reports which are scrutinised at a Member led Performance Board and Group.

We have a robust complaints policy and a specialist complaints management system.

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

In the last quarter we have continued to deliver an effective approach performance, projects and complaints. 64% of high priority KPIs and 70% of strategic projects are on target. We received 144 complaints in Q2 and 94% were resolved in our agreed deadline.

In terms of delivery we have gone live with the new performance reporting system in several team areas. We have also started to make some improvements to project reporting ahead of a re-launch of our approach in February. Work is also underway to implement our new complaints policy.

PP_R014 Failure to achieve the service outcomes outlined in each of the new community contracts

Category: Organisational/Management	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating
Inherent Probability 3 Likely	Inherent Impact 4 Severe	Inherent Risk Score 12 Red	Residual Probability 2 Unlikely	Residual Impact 4 Severe
Consequences		Current Controls	Assurance	
The community contracts provide vital support services for some of the most vulnerable residents in Dacorum.		We have introduced a number of controls which manage the risk of not achieving the service outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commissioning Tender Returns - Individual Contracts and Agreements 	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



The contracts are:

- Information, Advice and Advocacy
- Supporting the Voluntary Sector
- Reducing Social Isolation
- Living Stable Lives
- Promoting Healthy Relationships

However if we don't achieve the outcomes from each contract, the community will receive inadequate services which can have serious consequence and lead to higher demand for reactive Council services e.g. homelessness, ASB.

Failure to deliver would also adversely affect the capacity of the local VCS, with implications for the broader support base.

There would also be negative implications for the reputation of the Council and for the services involved.

We have undertaken a comprehensive and robust commissioning process, which ensures that we select providers that can deliver on our objectives.

We will agree KPIs with each contract and these will be reported to the CEO and Portfolio Holder.

We will conduct regular contractual performance meetings and we have a well established process for dealing with any issues.

All the contracts will be managed by senior officers with oversight from the Group Manager and Assistant Director.

We have also commissioned an audit of our process by Mazars.

- KPI Monitoring Reports

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

All contracts have been out for tender and four out of five have completed the procurement process. Two contracts are currently live, the rest will be launched by the end of December 2016. Our first performance meeting with CAB (Information, Advice and Guidance Contract) was held in September 2016. The contract management arrangements and reporting requirements are in place.

Overall the commissioning process has worked well but we are continuing to review our approach with the aim of learning lessons and improving the way we work with the voluntary and community sector.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



PP_R015 Failure to effectively and proactively manage the media profile of DBC including social media					
Category: Service Delivery	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth		Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber	1 Very Unlikely	4 Severe	4 Green
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>The media profile of the organisation is a major issue. If our media profile is not professionally managed, it could lead to reputational risk for the council. This includes reputational risk/damage to members and council staff, and questions being asked about service delivery (as a council) and value for money.</p> <p>A positive media profile also offers a real opportunity to attract new investment and resources.</p> <p>The risks from social media occur either because we aren't using the tool to engage residents restricting our contact with key demographics, or because our reputation has been damaged due to inappropriate or negative use or postings.</p>		<p>We have a number of controls in place to mitigate these risks:</p> <p>For press and media coverage we use a press management system called Vuelio. This enables us to plan for both proactive and reactive issues and maintain control of all outbound and inbound media activities.</p> <p>We have developed good working relationships with the local press and media and continue to involve them in our important activities. Similarly the press are in regular contact with the communications team for comments or further information regarding campaigns and activities.</p> <p>For social media we use Crowd Control (CCHQ) which is the UK's leading risk management software for managing all social media accounts across the council. CCHQ is a web-based risk management platform that enables us to efficiently control access to our social</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have a dedicated and experienced communications team with expertise across all forms of media. - The majority of press coverage has been positive with a large emphasis on the Hemel Evolution programme and the various zones that have been completed. - Due to our relationship with the press, we are regularly contacted for a statement or comment on the article being published. - With social media, the risk management software allows us to setup word libraries that will automatically delete posts (using specific words) from the respective social media channels. - We have a communications strategy and a social media strategy. We also have a detailed service plan for communications. 	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



	<p>pages, keeping them safe and secure.</p> <p>We also require all staff to read, understand and sign a number of policies relating to the use of social media and ICT.</p>	
--	---	--

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

In quarter 2 we posted 1,460 messages across our 18 social media channels. Over the same period we received 319 direct messages which were responded to in accordance with our social media policy and guidance.

The overall Twitter reach for this period is 3.06 million with 9,270 followers. We also ran a number of campaigns including Community Champion Awards 2016, Hemel Evolution (Water Gardens), London Road Apsley, (36 new Council homes) and communication campaigns including the Olympics (Max Whitlock and Jessica Stretton), e-newsletter (Digital Digest) and Tring Memorial Gardens entry award for Green Flag People's Choice Award. Our Communications teams have also recently won a CIPR Gold award for 'Best Publication' for Dacorum Digest.

PP_R016 Failure to effectively and proactively manage all aspects of employee relations

Category: Service Delivery	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
Having highly motivated and productive staff is central to everything we do.		We have a number of controls in place to mitigate these risks:		- No Employment Tribunals over the last two years and very few employment appeals to Members.	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



<p>Failure to effectively manage all aspects of employee relations can have a number of implications.</p> <p>A less motivated and productive workforce will lead to issues of poor service and performance. It can also cause high levels of sickness and dissatisfaction.</p> <p>It could also result in appeals and employment tribunal cases and staff turnover will increase causing additional disruption and cost.</p>	<p>We have robust employment policies that are reviewed regularly to ensure they are in line with good practice and the latest employment legislation.</p> <p>We have regular employee relation meetings with trade unions and we consult with them on changes to any relevant policies and procedures.</p> <p>We provide training for managers on employment policies and all managers leading employee relation cases are supported by a qualified HR professional.</p> <p>We also undertake staff surveys and have recently set up a project to understand and respond to the findings of the most recent survey.</p>	<p>- Staff turnover is low. Across 2015/16 the Council had a voluntary annual turnover rate of 10.6% (76 staff). This compares positively to the public sector average (18%) and it is below the level within local government (11.9%). It is also lower than average for district councils (11%).</p> <p>- Services are well received from the public. According to the Herts Tracker Survey 72% of our residents are satisfied with our services, which is the second best in Hertfordshire.</p>
--	--	--

Page 62

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

The HR team continues to support and coach managers through all employee relation cases and to ensure that our policies and procedures are robust and reflect best practice and the latest developments in Employment Law. However staff turnover remains low and we have had no employee tribunal claims in the last 6 months.

Work on the new People Strategy is underway and this will be central in setting out our long term vision and plan of action to ensure we have the right staff in the right place and that they are highly motivated and productive.

PP_R017 Failure to support the organisation, and in particular the leadership team, to manage organisational change and staff development including the move to the Forum

Category:	Corporate Priority:	Risk Owner:	Portfolio Holder:	Tolerance:
-----------	---------------------	-------------	-------------------	------------

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Service Delivery		Dacorum Delivers		Robert Smyth	Neil Harden	Treating
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score	
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber	
Consequences		Current Controls			Assurance	
<p>Managing and adapting to change is key if we are going to deliver the Council's vision.</p> <p>That's why we need to develop and foster a workforce that is flexible, responsive and able to manage organisation change.</p> <p>The consequences of this risk include dis-engaged staff, service delivery issues and low productivity.</p> <p>We could also experience high levels of turnover and a likelihood that key staff would relocate to other organisations.</p> <p>Staff not understanding the new culture within the forum could also cause productivity issues and relationship problems.</p>		<p>We have introduced a number of controls which manage the risk:</p> <p>Our Corporate training programme (featuring mandatory training courses) ensures that staff have the right skills.</p> <p>We have created a Cultural Board to ensure we have the right tools and culture to work in a modern and efficient way.</p> <p>The Managing in Dacorum Programme – identifies and develops key management skills in our Leaders.</p> <p>The Organisational transformation group provides strategic advice and support.</p> <p>We are currently developing a people strategy to ensure staff have to skills, values and experience.</p> <p>Our Service Efficiency Programme (overseen by the Chief Operating Group) will also help to develop the change attitude within the organisation.</p>			<p>- 87% of staff are willing to work with change (staff survey)</p> <p>- Regular staff forum briefings with a bespoke information section on the intranet</p> <p>- Good attendance in the managing in Dacorum Programme</p> <p>- Services are well received from the public. According to the Herts Tracker Survey 72% of our residents are satisfied with our services, which is the second best in Hertfordshire.</p>	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

We are continuing to develop a number of projects to help develop the change capacity of the organisation. In the last quarter the Improvement and Innovation team have provided 25 days of internal 'change consultancy' to help services re-design processes, use nudge theory to re-write letters and provide training on engaging with residents. The team have also been commissioned to review the housing service.

We have delivered a number of improvements as part of the Forum Cultural Programme and work is underway on the introduction of a new People Strategy. We are also developing new proposals on the use of data and supporting the broader introduction of the corporate efficiency strategy.

PPUR018 Failure to understand and respond to the current and future technology needs of the Council

Category: Technical/Operational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>ICT is central to the performance of departments. This includes both hardware and business applications (i.e. software) as well as the service desk and special projects.</p> <p>Poor ICT makes it difficult for departments to provide their services effectively. Issues with ICT can also have a negative impact on the reputation of DBC.</p> <p>In addition there can be significant knock-on costs as a result problems with IT including delays in processing</p>		<p>We have put in place the necessary structure, strategy, plans, budgets and vision to ensure we respond to the current and future needs of the business.</p> <p>The service is based around four core elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the service desk - infrastructure - special projects - business applications 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regular dialogue between ICT and other services. - Technology is discussed regularly at Leadership Team meetings - ICT Strategy and Service Plan. - TOR for joint Customer Insight working group. - Digital Dacorum Strategy 	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



benefits or responding to service requests.

It will also make other agenda's like Digital Dacorum harder to implement.

In terms of controls we have a detailed ICT Strategy and Improvement Plan.

We also have an established staffing compliment and budget which has been shaped around the ICT needs of DBC.

Having a technical project Manager in place has also ensured that further improvements are made.

Each service has an in-team specialist business applications resource and there is a central applications lead to coordinate work.

All staff are provided with the necessary hardware including the roll out of laptops as part of the Dacorum Anywhere programme.

We have regular conversations with other council services and we take a category management approach to procurement.

Page 65

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



A consultant has been appointed to review our line-of-business applications with the aim of streamlining and improving the resilience of our systems. This work is scheduled to begin in mid-October.

Work is also continuing on implementation of new technologies to improve remote access and contact including upgrading to Skype for Business and installing Direct Access.

PP_R04 Failures in ICT resilience or security leading to significant system downtime

Category: Reputational	Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers	Risk Owner: Robert Smyth	Portfolio Holder: Neil Harden	Tolerance: Treating	
Inherent Probability	Inherent Impact	Inherent Risk Score	Residual Probability	Residual Impact	Residual Risk Score
3 Likely	4 Severe	12 Red	2 Unlikely	4 Severe	8 Amber
Consequences		Current Controls		Assurance	
<p>ICT is central to the performance of departments.</p> <p>A failure in ICT resilience or security would see loss of access to some or potentially all ICT applications and services.</p> <p>This would have serious consequences for productivity, communication links with the public and would have a major impact on public facing services.</p> <p>It could also lead to reputational damage or concerns about our capacity.</p>		<p>We have introduced a number of controls which manage the risk:</p> <p>Technical Controls -</p> <p>The Council has a secondary data centre in Aylesbury which can be put into action in the event of a serious failure of the primary data centre.</p> <p>Our Wide Area Network design provides resilient connectivity (diverse routing) so that if the direct connection from the Civic Centre to the primary data centre (Amersham) is severed, traffic will be re-routed to run via the secondary data centre (Aylesbury). NB: currently there is a common path to both connections</p>		<p>Assurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KPI's - ICT01 - % of incidents resolved in less than 2 days. ICT02 - Availability of primary systems. WEB01 - Website availability - High Level Recovery Plan available on request - Successful tests of DR procedure – assuring that services can be restored within the secondary data centre using replicated data. - PSN Compliance. 	

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



between the Civic Centre and the nearest BT exchange.

Servers exist in a virtual environment and are hosted across multiple physical machines, meaning there is less dependence on individual components.

Data is replicated across the two data centres and is also backed up so that it can be called back and restored if required.

Process controls -

Data back-ups are stored off site at Cupid Green.

Security -

We have a number of security processes in place, all of which is underpinned (and assured) by our PSN compliance.

These include corporate firewalls, anti-virus software on end point devices, end point security solutions to block unknown devices, encrypted hard drives, managed permissions and a two factor authentication process (name and crypto card).

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Page 67

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

September 2016



Our approach to ICT resilience continues to be robust. Work is underway on resilient connectivity between The Forum and the data centres (removing common path to local BT exchange). Work to fit out the new Forum including the installation of a new server room, which will become home to our secondary data centre in 2018, is also under way. Virtualisation of our telephony system is also expected to be completed by the end of October 2016.

We have submitted our PSN compliance documentation to the Cabinet Office for assessment and we are expecting the results shortly. In Q2 overall systems availability was 100% and web availability was 99.9%. There were no major power outages to report.



AGENDA ITEM:

SUMMARY

Report for:	Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of meeting:	8th November 2016
Part:	1

Title of report:	Berkhamsted Multi-Storey Car Park Petition Review
Contact:	Elliott Brooks, Assistant Director (Housing) Author/Reviewing Officer
Purpose of report:	For Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the recommendation of the Reviewing Officer following a review of the outcome of the Berkhamsted Multi-Storey Car Park petition
Recommendations	That Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree the following conclusions and recommendations of the Reviewing Officer: 1) That the process followed by full Council in considering the Berkhamsted Multi-Storey Car Park was procedurally correct and carried out in accordance with the Petition Scheme. 2) That no additional steps be required to respond to the Petition.
Corporate Objectives:	The Petition Scheme recognises the importance of giving residents an opportunity to communicate their concerns about issues in their local area and as such it supports all of the Council's corporate objectives.
Consultees:	Mark Brookes, Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer Jim Doyle, Group Manager (Democratic Services) and Administrator for the Petition Scheme
Background papers:	Petition Scheme (Annex 1) Minutes of Council meeting dated 13 th July 2016 (Annex 2)
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	MSCP – Multi-Storey Car Park “DCC” Development Control Committee “The Scheme” The Council's Petition Scheme “The Council” Dacorum Borough Council

Background

1. Dacorum Borough Council (“the Council”) adopted a Petition Scheme (“the Scheme”) on 14th July 2010 made under Section 11 (1) of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. A copy of the Scheme is attached at Annex 1 to this report.

2. A petition was submitted to the Council under the terms of the Scheme which contained over 1,000 signatures (1415 signatures in total as at 5th July 2016). The petition was entitled “stop high rise car park in historic Berkhamsted conservation area”
3. The Scheme is clear that if a petition has, or acquires 1,000 valid signatures, the issue will be debated at a meeting of the full Council.
4. The petition was referred to the full Council meeting of 13th July. As noted in the minutes of the meeting (copy annexed), three Berkhamsted residents spoke in favour of the petition, and five councillors made statements on the petition in response.
5. Full Council resolved that “the Council continue to proceed with the proposed development and refer the matter to a future meeting of the Development Control Committee”. The planning application was referred to the Development Control Committee on 29th September 2016 and the committee resolved to approve the planning application subject to referring the application to the Secretary of State and to the prior completion of a S.106 planning obligation.
6. The Scheme provides that if a Petition Organiser is not satisfied with the Council’s formal response to the petition, he or she may request a review by a senior Council Officer. This senior officer will be given wide scope to reconsider whether the Council should, in all the circumstances take additional steps to respond to the petition. This will normally include reference to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which will itself consider the adequacy of the initial response.
7. A request for review was received by the Petition Organiser on 27th July 2016. The reasons put forward by the Petition Organiser for requesting the review were as follows:
 - (a) As the petition had more than 1000 signatures the Council was under an **obligation** to discuss this matter at a meeting of Full Council, under the terms of its own petition scheme and therefore the Council did not do anything more anything other than the Council complying with its own rules – it wasn’t something additional the Council chose to do in a spirit of engagement with the petitioners.
 - (b) Although representatives of the petitioners were at the Council meeting, we were not allowed to participate in discussion or debate with the members. I fail to see, therefore, how that could be construed as a ‘meeting with’. Meetings usually entail dialogue.
 - (c) Referral to the DCC is also not a decision or choice the Full Council made as the planning application must go through that process anyway.
 - (d) Referring to DCC also does not deal with the matters raised in our petition which are about the wider issues of use of Council funds, consideration of alternative approaches and consultation with the community on the issue of concept rather than detail.

- (e) I would contend that the Councillors who spoke in response to our presentations, did not engage with the specific issues we raised; for example: why there has been no consideration of alternative solutions to perceived parking issues, why the Council can ignore its own planning and parking/transport related policies, the allocation of £3.5m to this proposed project, why the undertaking to consult with the community about the concept rather than the detail of the proposed MSCP was never fulfilled.
8. Elliott Brooks, Assistant Director (Housing) was appointed to carry out the review of the outcome of the Petition on 27th September 2016.
 9. It is noted that the Scheme provides for a 28 day period for the review to be completed from the date the request for review was received. This period has passed and an explanation of why this has happened has been provided by the Scheme Administrator. The reasons for delay have been accepted by the Reviewing Officer as they do not prejudice or influence the outcome of this review but such delays should be avoided in the future.
 10. During a meeting which took place between the petition organiser and the Reviewing Officer on Thursday 20th October it was confirmed that points 7 a – e were the basis of the organiser submitting a review. In addition, specific discussions took place regarding the designated roles within the Scheme being communicated and receiving a formal statutory response.
 11. Following review of communication between the Council and the petition organiser the Reviewing Officer found that whilst it may not have been formally confirmed, Jim Doyle, Group Manager (Democratic Services) was acting as the Scheme Administrator, as stated in Section A paragraph 5 of the Scheme and Responding Officer (Annex 1). Jim Doyle was in regular contact with the petition organiser following the submission.
 12. Regarding the statutory response following the full Council meeting 13th July, an email was sent by Jim Doyle by way of a statutory response directly to the petition organiser on July 19th and then following a request for clarification a further email was sent July 21st. The Reviewing Officer is content that these two pieces of communication act as the statutory response. The Scheme states that the statutory response shall be sent by the Chief Officer. The Reviewing Officer is content that in this instance it was appropriate for the response to be sent by Jim Doyle as the line of communication had been established.
 13. It is acknowledge that the Council should have explained better the individual roles of Scheme Administrator, Responding Officer & Chief Officer soon after the submission of the Petition. This will be an area for consideration moving forward but ultimately the Reviewing Officer is confident that the petition organiser did receive the appropriate information from the appropriate Council Officer.

Petition Review

14. The Scheme (paragraph 4) sets out the guidance which the Council should follow when it receives petitions with over 1,000 signatures.
15. The key elements of this guidance are as follows:
 - If a petition has over 1,000 signatures, the issue will be debated at a meeting of the full Council

- The Petition Organiser, or someone nominated on his/her behalf will have a right to speak about the petition
- The Mayor will decide upon the amount of time to allow for the debate on the petition
- The Council accepts that it will not normally be sufficient for such a meeting merely to 'take note' of the petition, and that there should be a decision taken as to what other steps (including, but not restricted, to the actions specified in Paragraph D2) should also be taken as a response.

The steps referred to in paragraph D2 referred to above are:

- Taking the action requested in the petition
- Considering the petition at a Council meeting
- Holding an inquiry
- Commissioning relevant research
- Organising a public meeting
- Mounting a wider public consultation
- Meeting with the Petition Organiser or representatives of the signatories
- Providing a written response outlining the Council's views on the subject
- Referring the issue to one of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees, or
- Referring the issue to one of the Council's relevant ordinary Committees
- Consulting statutory partners and local service providers
- Instituting discussions with the voluntary and community sectors
- Make representations to commercial or other interests

16. This review focusses on two key issues:

- Has the Council followed the terms of its own petition scheme?
- Was the decision taken by Council to continue with the MSCP scheme a reasoned and justifiable response to the issues raised by the Petition Organiser and fellow speakers and should any further steps be taken to respond to the petition?

It is important to note that it is not the purpose of this review to review the subjective judgements of councillors or to review the full process or decisions that have lead the Council to decide to progress with the MSCP scheme to date. The purpose of this review is to ensure that a fair process was followed in accordance with Scheme, that a reasoned response was given to the petition and that no further steps were appropriate.

Has the Council followed the terms of its own petition scheme?

17. The petition was referred to full Council on 13th July 2016 for debate as it was required to do so. This enabled the petitioners the opportunity to speak and be heard by full Council. Three of the petitioners took this opportunity and their statements are clearly set out in the minutes.

18. The councillors present at the meeting then debated the issues raised and resolved to continue with the proposed development and refer it to the Council's Development Control Committee. The Petitioner has made the point that the debate was inadequate as they were not given the opportunity to participate and debate with councillors once they had made their statements; however, there is nothing specific in the Scheme regarding members of the public having a further opportunity to make comment once statements have been made and therefore the Reviewing Officer cannot find any fault in the process that was followed.
19. The Scheme, at paragraph D2, sets out a range of options which the Council may take in response to a petition. Arguably the most significant step that the Council could take in response to a petition is to refer the matter to full Council for a debate as this step ensures that all Dacorum councillors hear the concerns of residents and have an opportunity to comment or reconsider the proposed actions of the Council. In this case as over 1,000 signatures were received the petition was automatically referred to full Council due to the level of public interest. However, if Council, having properly considered the petition, decides that no further actions as set out in paragraph D2 are appropriate, the Reviewing Officer does not believe that the Scheme requires further steps if this is the decision of Council.
20. It is of note that full Council did resolve to refer the matter to a future meeting of the Development Control Committee (DCC) and it is noted that the Petitioner comments that this was not a choice of full Council as the planning application would go through this process anyway. The Reviewing Officer agrees that the planning application would go to DCC as part of the planning process; however, the Petition called for the MSCP scheme to be stopped and therefore full Council did decide to continue with the MSCP scheme and refer it to DCC. Council could have decided to withdraw the MSCP application and therefore it would not have gone to DCC.
21. It was also appropriate for full Council to refer the planning application to DCC to consider because some of the issues raised by the Petitioners related to issues of need for the MSCP, highway issues, and lack of alternative options. Full Council would not have had sufficient information before them to have made a full judgement on these issues and it was right that DCC should consider them as this is the normal forum for deliberating such issues and where consultants reports and expert evidence would be available, presented and challenged. The principle of continuing with the development was however agreed by Council with the detailed planning issues to be determined by DCC.
22. It is important to note that the primary aim of the Scheme is to ensure that residents have an opportunity to communicate their needs and concerns about issues in their local area (see introductory paragraph to the Scheme). Having reviewed the petition process the Reviewing Officer is satisfied that the Council has complied with the terms of the Scheme.

Was the decision taken by Council to continue with the MSCP scheme a reasoned and justifiable response to the issues raised by the Petition Organiser and fellow speakers and should any further steps be taken to respond to the petition?

23. The Reviewing Officer has considered the minutes of the Council meeting on 13th July. The issues raised by the speakers fall into 4 broad areas; failure to consult on the principle of the development, lack of proven need for the development, failure to consider alternative options and highway issues.
24. Councillor Matthews (Councillor for Berkhamsted West Ward) commented that there have been meetings with residents, employers, council officers and Portfolio Holders on a regular basis to try and come up with a solution. He also commented that there is support for the scheme from many residents.
25. Councillor Marshall concluded in her comments that she believed there was a need for the development due to the current occupancy rates of the existing car park. Councillor Marshall also commented on the location when she commented that “having parking away from the town centre would be pointless” and that DCC should assess the plans.
26. Councillor Mahmood said he also believed there was a need for further parking based on his own personal experience, although he accepted that this was not a scientific approach.
27. Councillor Anderson supported the previous councillor’s comments regarding need and supported the scheme.
28. Councillor Williams commented that the car park meets a proven need and he believed that there was a more balanced opinion from residents than just those presented by the petitioners. He commented that projected population increases are likely to increase the demand for further car parking in the future and that the budget for the car park is capital funded which cannot be moved to other projects. Councillor Williams also commented that the Council is working with Herts Highways to satisfy their requirements.
29. The comments and responses by councillors do, in the opinion of the Reviewing Officer, seek to address the issues raised by the speakers and do provide a reasoned justification for their decision to proceed with the scheme. It will always be difficult for councillors to cover off every issue raised by speakers when they were not aware precisely what the speakers were going to say; however, I do believe when one considers the minutes that consideration was given to the main points raised that an acceptable and reasoned response was given.
30. The matter was referred to Development Control Committee because this was required for the planning application to be approved but also because that was the appropriate forum for detailed planning issues to be considered. Council could have decided, for example, to refer the matter back for further public consultation, or referred the matter to a Scrutiny Committee for reconsideration; however, there was no motion moved by any councillor to do anything other than proceed with the scheme and this was a unanimous decision of all the councillors. The Reviewing Officer does not find that any further steps were or are required to respond to the petition.

Conclusion of Reviewing Officer

31. The Reviewing Officer was appointed to ensure that the Scheme was appropriately followed and that the Council came to a reasoned and justifiable decision to proceed.

32. In doing so the Reviewing Officer has given due consideration to the original purpose of the Scheme which is to give an opportunity to residents to communicate their needs and concerns about issues in their local area. The Petitioners were given an opportunity to present their petition to full Council. This is the most comprehensive Council forum that could have heard the petition and the petition was properly debated before a reasoned decision to proceed with the MSCP scheme was made. Accordingly, the Reviewing Officer can find no fault or procedural error with the process that was followed, and he does not find that any additional steps should be taken to respond to the petition.

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

13 JULY 2016

Present:

MEMBERS:

Councillor Williams (Leader) Councillors, Gbola Adeleke, G Adshead, Anderson, Banks, Mrs Bassadone, Bhinder, Brown, Chapman, Clark, D Collins, E Collins, Conway, Douris, Fantham, Fethney, Fisher, Griffiths, Guest, Harden, P Hearn, S Hearn, Hicks, Howard, Imarni, Link, Maddern, Mahmood, Marshall, Matthews, McLean, Mills, Peter, Ransley, Riddick, Silwal, G Sutton, R Sutton, Taylor, Timmis, Tindall, Whitman, C Wyatt-Lowe and W Wyatt-Lowe

OFFICERS:

Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer, Corporate Director - Finance and Operations, Group Manager - Democratic Services, Member Support Officer, Sally Marshall, Member Support Officer and Kate Norval

The meeting began at 7.30 pm

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2016 were agreed by the Members present and were then signed by the Mayor.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Matthews declared an interest in item 5 'Petition'. He said he was a member of the Berkhamsted Parking Forum which is working with Dacorum Borough Council to develop the Berkhamsted Multi Storey Car Park. Councillor Matthews said he was a member of the Development Control Committee and would not be speaking or voting when the application goes to committee.

3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

4.1 By the Mayor

None.

4.2 By the Chief Executive:

None.

4.3 By the Group Leaders:

Councillor Williams gave apologies on behalf of Councillors S Adshead, Ashbourn, Barnes, Bateman, Birnie, Elliot, and Ritchie.

4.4. Council Leader and Members of the Cabinet:

Councillor Williams, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership

Councillor Williams spoke of his shock, anger and disappointment at The Gazette's front page 'Stuck in Swamp' headline about the supposed failings of The Forum project from the Labour Party Spokesman. The police did not take the Forum space due to operational reasons as they wanted to keep their service together which would have required 600sqm of space when the Forum could only provide 200spm. The regeneration of the whole town is something to be proud of. The Town Centre, the Old Town, the Water Gardens, the Forum and the 100% occupation rate at the Maylands Business Centre are all huge achievements and praise should be given to the great project management skills and sheer hard word of the relevant council departments.

Councillor Williams was happy to take questions.

Councillor Guest asked if the Portfolio Holder agreed that it would be good for the people in Dacorum to have a new hospital on a new site along with the options of the refurbishment at Watford.

The Portfolio Holder gave it a warm welcome and thinks that it is good. It is a step in the right direction, Hemel's services are inadequate and we need a more comprehensive provision at Hemel Hospital. We need to look at a realistic solution and will bear the services in mind at Hemel.

Councillor Tindall asked if it was true that the Hertfordshire Police were planning to join with Bedfordshire Police to create a new location on junction 10 of the M1.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that it was true. However, it was dependant on Bedfordshire relocating their custody suites and this option was not pursued.

Councillor Mrs Griffiths asked if the Portfolio Holder will be writing to the new Prime Minister welcoming her and looking forward to constructive relations with her and her government.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed he will and will also express his passion for housing.

Councillor Tindall asked that in that letter could you include the possibility of getting rid of the Housing and Planning Bill that contains so many unnecessary clauses in planning.

The Portfolio Holder said the Housing and Planning Act was at the forefront of everyone's minds. He said that Councillor Tindall joined him at the Local Government Association conference last week and the 'pay to stay' and sale of high value assets are to be confirmed.

Tenant and Leaseholders

Get Involved Strategy - July will see the completion of a new Get Involved Strategy which set out how we will work to encourage as many tenants as possible to get involved in helping us improve the service we provide to our tenants. The development of this strategy will also see the relaunch of our high level tenant committee (previously called the Tenant and Leaseholder Committee).

We are excited how the next phase of development of tenant involvement at Dacorum Borough Council will progress as increasingly we have new, talented and enthusiastic tenants to work with – further updates will follow.

Recharges - July will also see the recruitment of a Recharge Officer into the Housing Income Team. The Recharge Officer's remit will be to ensure that money owed for damage caused to Council property by existing or former Council tenants is collected. Much work has already been done to prepare for this imminent arrival by strengthening our existing recharge procedures and ensuring that all parties involved (such as Osborne and our Empty Homes Team) are ready to make this a success.

Month of Policy reviews - We have designated August our 'Housing Policy Month'. Recent changes in housing legislation (such as the Housing and Planning Act 2015) has impacted on many of our existing policies. As a consequence we will be seeking to work with a whole host of stakeholders, including Councillors on updating these existing documents. Staff from our Policy and Participation Team will be contacting particularly Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee members through the Chair shortly to ask for contributions on policy changes.

Strategic Housing

Following on from the success of Strategic Housing's Peer Review assessment, the Housing Advice & Options team were asked to showcase the service at the NPSS national conference on the 4/5 July. This is an excellent opportunity for the service to share the positive work that we are doing to improve service delivery in this challenging area and provide details to key stakeholders on areas of good practice that have been identified.

Property and Place

Osborne - Total Asset Management.

- 2016/17 will see an increase in the efficiency of some of our hardest to treat homes
- Across the year Osborne will complete External Wall Insulation to another 60 solid wall properties
- This will help our tenants manage their fuel bills whilst supporting the reduction to our carbon emissions.
- The first properties we are tackling this year are on St Albans Road. This will conclude the wider programme of efficiency works at the Crabtree estate and has provided thermal improvements to the estate and our stock.

There have been two major adaptations completed, to provide ground floor extensions with specialist equipment and facilities, for two families in the borough. The facilities

have dramatically improved the quality of life for these families and have been completed to a high standard.

The year-end performance report for 2015-16, Total Asset Management and Gas servicing and installation contracts will be presented to the Housing and Community Scrutiny Committee, later this month and whilst the overall performance remains strong, some areas in the TAM contract have declined and will be subject to ongoing monitoring and intervention as appropriate.

Sun Realm - Gas Servicing and Installation

The servicing and installation contract has been delivering consistently high levels of compliance, currently 99.97%, with two properties overdue, and customer satisfaction with the service remains high.

Councillor Mrs Griffiths was happy to take questions.

Councillor Mahmood asked if the Portfolio Holder agreed that the work from the Tenant Liaison Committee (TLC) was very good and the feedback from them compliments the work of the Housing and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Portfolio Holder was delighted to endorse the comments. The TLC will be included in the new strategy but this also allows for tenants to become more involved.

Councillor Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Corporate Services

Reports of race hate incidents have not increased in Dacorum since the EU Referendum results. Between 29th April 2016 and 29th May 2016 there were 3 reports and between 29th May 2016 and 29th June 2016 there were also 3 reports. The Council have been made aware of one other incident where a note was put through a letterbox of a family however this has not been formerly reported. According to Police figures, reports of hate crime across the whole of Hertfordshire between 1/4/2016 and 5/7/2016 have increased 15% but reports in Dacorum are down 20.6% from 63 reports for the same period last year to 50 reports for the same period this year.

The Patron's Lunch on 12th June at Adeyfield was a great success despite poor weather and was well attended and received. A Great Royal Bake off and a Royal themed fancy dress were judged by Cllr Chapman and Dacorum Community Choir, Lets Dance Group and BURP (Berkhamsted Ukelele Random Players) all attended the event to entertain the community along with zorbing, go karts and fairground rides.

A further Premises Closure Order was obtained in court on 6th July for a property in Adeyfield where anti-social behaviour and drugs were impacting on neighbouring properties. There is a clear message being sent by Dacorum Borough Council that drug dealing and any associated behaviour will not be tolerated regardless of tenure.

The Old Town Hall has achieved a 74.5% attendance rate for the first quarter of 2016/17 and the Dance project called Lets Dance for age group 55+ goes from strength to strength and they have visited the Mayor of London with young people from Hemel Hempstead School.

Two Adventure Playgrounds are having all weather sports surfaces (football, basketball and mini tennis) installed and will be available to rent outside of playground hours. The playgrounds will also be offering a range of additional paid opportunities such as Laser Tag sessions and Go Karts without reducing the hours of their core services.

Councillor Harden was happy to take questions.

Councillor Timmis asked the Portfolio Holder if he agreed that hate crime should not be tolerated and that there should be a huge emphasis on victims to report hate crimes to the police.

The Portfolio Holder agreed and said even three reports are too many. He expressed how seriously it's taken and the force of law ensures the right course of action and sentence. He encouraged everyone to report any kind of hate crime to the police.

Councillor Tindall joined with the Portfolio Holder in expression of disgust against hate crimes. Hertfordshire County Council has a motion next week to deal with hate crime. Councillor Tindall corrected the Portfolio Holder and said it was the Liberal Democrats that encouraged the government to take the low paid out of the tax threshold.

Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe said that an increase in physically and mental wellbeing should deliver financial dividends.

The Portfolio Holder agreed and said it reminded him of Eric Pickles 'thriving families' project. It is hoped that by improving lives, you can save money which is a bonus. It is hoped that this can be achieved by being specific on delivery targets.

Councillor G Adshead wanted to thank the Portfolio Holder for the successful event for the Queen's Birthday which took place in the Queen's Square at Adeyfield. He also congratulated Councillor Brown for coming second in the bake off competition.

Councillor G Sutton, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Town Centre news

Following the regeneration works in the town centre, it's really pleasing to see how attractive the town is looking and how vibrant it is becoming. Since the works completed there has been private investment in the town, not only from the recent major acquisition of the Marlowes Centre and other shop units by Capital and Regional, but also from a number of independent businesses. Chairman, I am pleased to announce that across the town centre, only 7% of retail units are vacant. In the main pedestrianised shopping area this figure drops to only 3%. All signs that the works we have done under the Hemel Evolution programme are having a real positive effect on the health of the town centre and the facilities available to our residents.

The new fountain at the new town square – with lights and music – is now operational and this will be opened formally by the Mayor this Saturday 16 July. I hope that everyone will join us to Celebrate the switch-on at the 'Making a splash on Marlowes' free family fun day, including children's games, face painting, and a magic & puppet show. There's music on the Rainbow Stage, followed by the first official fountain display at 2pm.

Water Gardens

Work continues to progress well on the water gardens restoration. Planting in the flower garden opposite to Bank Court has started and the vibrant colours of Mrs Susan Jellicoe's original planting scheme are now starting to re-emerge. The new, extended terrace facing the river is being installed and looking bright and fresh.

Maylands Business Centre

Work has now begun on clearing the site adjacent to the business centre for the construction of five new small business units. The planning application has been submitted to the Council, and subject to a favourable outcome, we intend to start work later this year on construction with a view to opening in 2017.

The Business centre continues to go from strength to strength with a waiting list of prospective tenants keen to take up space. There are currently 15 companies on the waiting list for offices and 27 for the units. For the first quarter of this business year, 18 training courses were held at the MBC generating 10k income, resulting in the up-skilling of 154 people, and 192 business meetings were held.

Dacorum's Den

The annual Dacorum's Den judging day was held last week with 7 successful businesses sharing £10k sponsored by FFEI, Sopra Steria, Abode bed and continental, Lumiere Developments and McDonalds. As ever this proves to be a popular event with small businesses providing those with the best ideas a useful grants to help them to grow and develop.

Councillor G Sutton was happy to take questions.

Councillor Tindall said he had received an email from Visit Herts as they are concerned about the referendum result. Can the Portfolio Holder discuss with the two MPs serving Dacorum to ensure positive trading conditions remain and to allow tourism to continue.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed he will be seeing the two MPs later this week and will discuss this issue with them.

Councillor Mahmood asked the Portfolio Holder if he agreed that Hemel Hempstead has the best shopping centre in the area; he noted the town was swamped with people from other towns and it is one of the best for disabled access.

The Portfolio Holder thanked Councillor Mahmood and will pass his comments onto the Regeneration Team. He said everyone should be proud of the Town Centre from Riverside to the Old Town.

Councillor Madden wanted to pass on her thanks to the Friends of Jellicoe Water Gardens. They have invited the Scouts to put Geocaching in the Water Gardens.

The Portfolio Holder said he would pass on Councillor Maddern's thanks and said once the work was complete in the Water Gardens, he hoped it would become a magnet for visitors.

Councillor Fisher said she is taking an optimistic approach; she likes the new bus interchange as she is a regular user of buses. She would like to know what planned works there are for the Market Square as the Salvation Army is really suffering from a

drop in footfall, she would like reassurance that in the next year something will be done.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that it is regularly discussed and it's not something that can be rushed to make a decision on. Once any plans have been decided, then members will be updated.

Councillor Marshall, Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability and Regulatory Services

A small herd of 10 Belted Galloway, a rare breed of Scottish cattle were kindly loaned by the Boxmoor Trust and released into Bunkers Park in Nash Mills in an area known as the Mattens. The animals have a placid temperament and will be there until about October. The herd was released in a special ceremony on the 14 May, officiated by the then Mayor, Councillor Adeleke, and I wish to record the Council's thanks to the Boxmoor Trust.

This month, the campaign "the Love Food Waste Challenge" was started as part of a national campaign to encourage less food waste and saving on money. Waste food costs the average household £470 per annum. Residents that take part will keep a food waste diary and be given goodies and tips to reduce food waste. In just five days, 23 families have expressed an interest in taking part. Further information can be found on the Council's website, www.dacorum.gov.uk/LFHW where you can also find the link to the "Waste Not, Want Not" cookbook written and published by Astley Cooper School.

An Environmental Protection Day was held on 27 April in Adeyfield. Five tonnes of fly tipped waste and litter was picked up in four hours and several items of graffiti were noted for action. Two teams carried out the work, comprising of officers from Environmental Health, Environmental Services, Housing, ASB and Resident Services together with two councillors and local residents from the Adeyfield Neighbourhood Action Group. There are plans to have more such events later this year.

The additional garden waste collection service started in June costing a mere £35 this season for each additional bin emptied. Additional garden waste bins can also be purchased at £25 each. So far, there have been 277 subscribers.

Phoenix Roundabout has been rejuvenated with fresh colourful planting of shrubs, perennials and begonias. This is now a splendid gateway from the M1 into Maylands and Hemel Hempstead. For the rest of the Borough, the summer bedding is now complete.

Councillor Marshall was happy to take questions.

Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe emphasised that we live in a beautiful borough and that the entrance to the town from the M1 looks beautiful. There is a bank at the side of the roundabout not planted – can a scheme be put in place to plant this area.

The Portfolio Holder hesitated to give assurance but appreciates the question.

Councillor Tindall said there had been irregularities in bin collections in Highfield and could this issue be looked into.

The Portfolio Holder said to provide her with the details and she will look into this issue.

Councillor Douris said the Phoenix roundabout was an excellent entrance into the town. He asked if the Portfolio Holder would join him in acknowledging the excellent and efficient work of the Clean, Safe and Green team.

The Portfolio Holder thanked Councillor Douris for his kind comments and would certainly pass them along to the team.

Councillor Ransley said the Memorial Gardens in Tring look wonderful but some roundabouts on the boundary between Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire are rundown and this is another gateway into Dacorum that should look good.

The Portfolio Holder said she would seek clarification on what roundabouts Councillor Ransley means as some of these are not under Dacorum's remit.

Councillor Mrs Bassadone said it was lovely to see the cows in Bunkers Park but questioned where the cows had gone from Boxmoor.

The Portfolio Holder said the Boxmoor Trust has a huge estate and they are probably somewhere else.

Councillor Maddern said how much excitement and joy had been generated in Nash Mills after the cows had been brought to Bunkers Park.

The Portfolio Holder thanked Councillor Maddern for her comments.

Councillor Williams presented on behalf of Councillor Elliot, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources

Finance

The Annual Statement of Accounts were produced and approved on 29 June at Audit Committee in advance of the statutory deadline.

After successful go live with the new Payroll provider in April, the system was updated to include a new payroll for staff working on the Elections. Payments were successfully made in June.

Revenue & Benefits

Working with the Digital Dacorum team, the benefits team has introduced an online form where residents can easily tell the Council about changes in their circumstances.

Commercial Assets & Property Development

Work is ongoing to realise capital receipts and the disposal of garage sites is progressing within expected timeframes. To date we have receipts or bids in process for three garage sites at Montgomery Avenue, Turners Hill and Juno Road in the sum of £1.8m. This is in line with the programme of disposal for this financial year.

Matters are currently in hand to secure planning permission for the proposed Multi Storey Car Park in Berkhamsted and we have been working with colleagues in

planning and HCC Highways to progress the scheme. We have responded to the comments of Herts Highways and are looking to submit the application to the next suitable Development Control Committee.

We have now acquired Bunkers Park to ensure there is suitable cemetery provision for the next 50 years and will explore other options for the land within the parameters of the Local Plan.

Commissioning, Procurement & Compliance

Work has continued to consider the scope of the Facilities Management Service in the Forum and the specification and contractual performance indicators are being finalised by a cross council team. The documentation has also been quality assured by both Cushman & Wakefield from a technical perspective and by Eversheds from a legal perspective.

The Further Competition tendering period for the Facilities Management Service will be live by Friday 8 July 2016 with a tender return date of mid-August.

Work is progressing well with planning the transfer of the Parking Shop from its current location into the Forum. Discussions have taken place between Dacorum Borough Council, Watford Borough Council and Indigo Parking Services with regards to the layout of the working environment and embracing the new ways of working that the Council have adopted.

Councillor Williams was happy to take questions.

There were no questions for the Portfolio Holder.

5 PETITION

To acknowledge receipt and consider a petition containing 1000 signatures from Dacorum Residents (1415 signatures in total as at 5th July 2016) regarding the proposed development of a Multi Storey Car Park in Berkhamsted. The petition gathered on 'Change.org', addressed to Andrew Williams, Leader of the Council is worded as follows:

"Stop high-rise car park in historic Berkhamsted conservation area"

<https://www.change.org/p/andrew-williams-stop-high-rise-car-park-in-historic-berkhamsted-conservation-area>

Wendy Conian

Thank you for the opportunity for letting me speak, I started the petition and I hope to give a voice to the opposition which comes from across the spectrum and the town's community. It is concerning that Dacorum believes an expensive multi storey car park in an historic market town is the only answer. There has been no consideration given to cheaper, less disruptive solutions. It is not good enough; Dacorum Borough Council is not just ignoring residents but their own Urban Transport Plan. There has been no wider public consultation as promised and with the deep cuts within local government, Dacorum Borough Council has spent £350,000 on consultancy fees and £3.5 million has been allocated to the development of the car park. Dacorum should be learning from other councils and their innovative travel plan in Maylands. I hope that members

intervene and stop the plans and the process, set up an inquiry into the process and ensure there is wider consultation.

John Higgins

I was a Berkhamsted Town Councillor until 2015 when I resigned over several issues, the car park being one of them. I was happy to support the Conservative manifesto promise of a new car park for Berkhamsted but I was assured there would be a phased programme of residential parking. I was informed that there were no further plans to revisit the issue in the next ten years. Efforts to discuss other options were dismissed by senior borough councillors. There has been no public consultation and the Berkhamsted borough councillors have favoured commercial interests over the opinions of residents. There are just four routes in the town centre which all end up in one central crossing. There has been a significant increase in traffic in the past years and a car park close to this junction will only add to congestion. I am urging the council to halt development and take control of the process until these issues have been addressed.

Jon Rollit

I am a resident of Berkhamsted and I want the council to consider other options. I use Lower Kings Road most mornings and the traffic backs up from the junction to the canal bridge. The area chosen for this car park is well used by pedestrians as a cut through and the development would have a detrimental effect and would make it a dark and dangerous place in a conservation area. The current car park is rarely full so do we really need another one? The money could be spent more wisely with informative signs pointing people to current parking and creating spaces across the town to distribute parking. Encouraging walking, cycling and implementing a bus hopper and removing cars should be a priority.

Comments from Councillors

Councillor Matthews said he was a member of the Berkhamsted Parking Forum. There have been meetings with residents, employers, DBC officers and the Portfolio Holder every few weeks to try and come up with a solution. Councillor Matthews has spoken to many residents who support the plans for a car park from newcomers to people who have lived in Berkhamsted all their lives. Can Councillor Williams confirm that he has received a letter of support from the Chamber of Commerce?

Councillor Marshall asked if there was a need for a car park and if it was in the right place? She said Berkhamsted was a vibrant town popular with shoppers. Additional parking in Berkhamsted has been before the council for many years. The current car parking is at 92% occupancy at peak times which does not allow for any more visitors. It is clear that the need for car parking is undeniable. Having car parking away from the town centre would be pointless and it is down to the Development Control Committee to assess the plans. Should there be a car park? To me, the obvious answer is yes.

Cllr W Wyatt-Lowe arrived at 8:35pm

Councillor Mahmood said he had read the reports after being made aware of the petition. He said that he visits Berkhamsted on a fortnightly basis and his observation – although not scientific – is that there is a need for a car park. It is one of the few towns in Hertfordshire without adequate car parking.

Councillor Anderson said he had listened to the comments made by the speakers and feels the issues are over the concept, not the design of the car park. He echoed previous comments from members about the evident need for a car park. The pleas from the speakers about encouraging use of public transport may well be served by this new car park. It is a paradox situation where more commuters can park in the car park and make use of the trains. I support the need for more parking.

Councillor Williams confirmed in response to Councillor Matthews question that he had received a letter of support. This petition calls on me to stop the process; I do not intend to stop the process. This car park meets a proven need and was a key part of the electoral campaign in 2015. There wasn't sufficient alternative parking and it is up to Berkhamsted Town Council to consult with residents to revisit these issues. This petition has received a significant number of signatures but this is only one side of the argument. I have been following the petition from the start and have followed the process and the comments on social media which I feel are more balanced. The council is currently working to try and satisfy the requirements of Herts Highways before the process goes any further. Successful towns need good parking. The population of Hertfordshire is set to increase 15% by 2030 and rise again another 15% by 2050. This will obviously cause an increase in demand. The £3 million allocated for the car park is capital funded which cannot be moved to other projects. I acknowledge receipt of the petition and it will be referred to the Development Control Committee to make the final decision.

Resolved:

The Council continue to proceed with the proposed development and refer the matter to a future meeting of the Development Control Committee for consideration of the planning application

6 QUESTIONS

None.

7 BUSINESS FROM THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING

None.

8 CABINET REFERRALS

Resolved

That the following be approved:

24 MAY 2016

8.1 CA/053/16 PROPOSALS FOR A DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Decision

That the following be approved:

1. A drawdown of 100K from the Invest to Save reserve, in order to fund the procurement of advice associated with the creation of a Development Company.

2 CA/054/16 CONSTITUTION UPDATE

Decision

That the following be approved:

1. The changes to the Constitution as set out in paragraphs 9, 10, 14, 16 and 21 of the Cabinet report.
2. The changes to the Financial Regulations as set out in paragraphs 22 and 26 of the Cabinet report.

28 JUNE 2016

8.3 CA/062/16 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Decision

1. That the responses to comments received on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (2016) be agreed; and
2. That the new Statement of Community Involvement to guide future consultation on planning matters as annexed to the Cabinet report be adopted.

8.4 CA/064/16 NATIONAL GRADUATE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Decision

1. That £72,800 be drawn down from the Management of Change reserve.

8.5 CA/066/16 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

Decision

1. Agree not to revise or replace the current Council Tax Support scheme for 2017/18.

Agree the proposed minor technical changes to the 2017/18 Council Tax Support Scheme as laid out in paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Cabinet report.

9 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REFERRALS

None

10 CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

None

11 CHANGE TO COMMITTEE DATES

Resolved:

Finance and Resources OSC

To change the meeting date of 4th October 2016 to 5th October 2016.

Strategic Planning and Regeneration OSC

To add an additional meeting for Wednesday 21st September 2016 at 7.30pm.

Standards

To change the meeting date of 15th September 2016 to 22nd September 2016.

Housing OSC

To add the meeting date of 22nd September 2016 and keep 12th April 2017.

12 TMS UPDATE JULY 2016

Resolved:

That paragraph 4.3 of the Treasury Management Strategy is not applied to the United Kingdom.

The Meeting ended at 8.52 pm

Dacorum Borough Council

Local Petitions Scheme 2010

Dacorum Borough Council and its partners recognise the value of citizens communicating their needs and concerns about issues in their local area. Petitions have a long tradition and can be useful in suggesting levels of support for various propositions. The Council has, therefore, introduced this scheme to assist in the effective use of petitions in appropriate circumstances, and Council staff will offer advice and assistance to interested persons as to how best to make use of the scheme in order to achieve their aims.

A INTRODUCTION

1. This is the petitions scheme for the Dacorum Borough Council ('the Council') made under Section 11 (1) of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, ('the Act').
2. The scheme was approved at the full meeting of the Council on 14 July 2010 and is available to view on the Council's website at :- (www.dacorum.gov.uk.)
3. The Council may revise the scheme in line with the legislation and associated guidance and will review its operation within 3 years.
At that time, or in anticipation of any other revision to the scheme, the Council commits to consult widely and in particular to consult such other local service providers as may be affected by the operation of the scheme. Updates specifying the contact details of Council staff responsible for various provisions of the scheme will not require a formal revision.
4. The purpose of the scheme is to establish a clear process for petitions submitted to the Council to be handled in accordance with Sections 10 – 22 of the Act.

The scheme sets out:

- how people who live, work or study in Dacorum can organise or sign a petition and secure a statutory response
 - how specific responses can be triggered by achieving prescribed levels of signatory support
 - who will do what and to what performance standards
 - how Petition Organisers can seek a review of the Council's response
 - how the Council will monitor the effectiveness of the scheme
5. The Council officer responsible for the scheme, and its operation, is the Scheme Administrator, whose name and contact details are Jim Doyle, Group Manager

(Democratic Services), Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, Herts, HP1 1HH.

Telephone: 01442 228222; E-mail jim.doyle@dacorum.gov.uk.

6. The Council will encourage use of the scheme, both within the public sector and voluntary organisations who are delivering local services and also beyond in the wider community.
A summary version of the scheme, 'How to petition your Council' is obtainable in leaflet form, available to the general public.

B ABOUT PETITIONS in DACORUM.

1. The Council, and its partners recognise that petitions are one of the methods by which citizens can communicate to the Council their needs and concerns about issues in their local area. Petitions can be an effective way of expressing levels of support for various propositions and therefore the Council will encourage their use in appropriate circumstances. Council staff will provide advice and assistance to interested persons as to how best to make use of this scheme. Such advice and assistance may be provided by the different departments of the Council, but enquiries should, in the first instance be directed to the Member Support Service Unit, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, Herts, HP1 1HH.
Telephone: 01442 228222; E-mail: petitions@dacorum.gov.uk.

2. 'Early resolution' or 'mediation' provision.

The Council places importance on the opportunity offered by petitions, to seek solutions and agreements to issues identified by Petition Organisers. If this can be accomplished before the period set aside for the petition, then the Council may seek agreement with the Petition Organiser to withdraw the relevant petition.

3. Petitions to the Council should be about matters relating to one of its functions. However, the Council will also consider petitions relating to improvements to 'the economic, social or environmental well-being' of Dacorum, or any part of it, to which the Council or any of its partner authorities could contribute.
4. Potential Petition Organisers who need advice as to whether it would be appropriate to address a petition to the Council or to Hertfordshire County Council will be offered guidance. At first instance, the relevant contact point should be the person specified in Paragraph A5.

C SUBMISSION of PETITIONS

1. Petitions may be submitted to the Council in the following ways:-

- On paper
 - In person
 - Electronically, through the Council's own ePetition facility (available from December 2010)
 - Electronically by e-mail (here each sheet of signatures has to be scanned in full as an exact replica of the original copy. Original copies must be retained for one year).
2. In every case, a Petitions Organiser must identify his or her self and provide such details as will assist the Council or other service providers to make contact to discuss the petition.
If the lead signatory wishes to relinquish their role then another signatory can, and must, be elected as lead signatory
 3. The Council will formally acknowledge and respond to such Petitions as meet the criteria shown in Paragraph 6 of this Section.
 4. For ePetitions, the Council will issue a formal acknowledgement within **5 working days** of its initial submission. Note that during this period, the ePetitions Facility Administrator will act a 'moderator' and establish that there are no problems that might prevent the system from hosting the petition. If there are difficulties, the Facility Administrator or the Scheme Administrator will contact the Petition Organiser and use their best endeavours to resolve matters so that the petition can be open for signatures. Where such a dialogue occurs, the formal acknowledgement will be sent within **5 working days** of the resolution of the difficulty.
 5. For all other petitions, the Council will also issue a formal acknowledgement within **5 working days** of its receipt.
In all cases, formal acknowledgements will indicate how the Council proposes to handle the issue, and where appropriate, to outline what it may be possible for the Council to do in response.
 6. To be a valid petition, and trigger the provisions of the statutory 'duty to respond', a petition must:-
 - Be initiated by a Petition Organiser whose details have been supplied to the Council
 - Relates to the Council's functions or to wider economic, social or environmental issues applicable to Dacorum
 - Not be vexatious or abusive
 - Not related to matters excluded from the scheme. These include any matter relating to individual planning or licensing decisions, for which other established processes exist.
 - Obtain a minimum of 50 valid signatories, including verifiable details that they live, work or study in the Council area. Signatures from others (tourists for example) may be considered valid if relevant to the issue of the petition

- Not be a duplicate or near-duplicate of a similar petition received or submitted under 12 months ago
7. To ensure the Council understands the level of local support for a petition, it reserves the right to seek to verify each signature appended to a petition. This can be significant when establishing whether a petition has obtained the requisite number of signatures to trigger specific processes.
In the case of ePetitions, the Council requires signatories to append their email addresses and their postcodes. Failure to provide this information may lead to the signature not being counted (but these need not always be published on the website).
Unless otherwise agreed following discussions with the Petition Organiser, an ePetition will remain open for signatures for 90 days.
 8. As each petition is received, or created online, the Council will log each one, and publish details on its website. For any petition relating specifically to a Council Ward or Wards, the relevant elected member will be formally notified and asked for comments.

D. RESPONDING TO PETITIONS

1. Upon receipt or submission, the Council will assign the petition to a Responding Officer, who will take responsibility for investigating the issue and advise on the action to be taken by the Council.
The name of the Responding Officer will be notified to the Petitions Organiser at the time of the acknowledgement.
2. Among the actions the Council will undertake are one or more of the following:-
 - Taking the action requested in the petition
 - Considering the petition at a Council meeting
 - Holding an inquiry
 - Commissioning relevant research
 - Organising a public meeting
 - Mounting a wider public consultation
 - Meeting with the Petition Organiser or representatives of the signatories
 - Providing a written response outlining the Council's views on the subject
 - Referring the issue to one of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees, or
 - Referring the issue to one of the Council's relevant ordinary Committees
 - Consulting statutory partners and local service providers
 - Instituting discussions with the voluntary and community sectors
 - Make representations to commercial or other interests

3. Under normal circumstances, the Council will expect to provide the Petition Organiser with a response detailing which of the actions specified in D2, or any other initiatives it intends to take, within 28 days of receipt of a paper petition. In the case of ePetitions, which will be expected to remain open for some time, the response will be within 28 days of the closing date for signatures, or a date requested by the Petition Organiser, whichever is the earlier.
4. If a Petition has, or acquires 1,000 valid signatures, the issue will be debated at a meeting of the full Council (i.e. a meeting to which all the elected members are summoned to attend).
At the full Council meeting, the Petition Organiser, or someone nominated on his or her behalf, will have the right to speak about the petition, normally for up to 2 minutes. Reasonable advance notice will be provided to ensure that any preparation can be undertaken in time
The Mayor will decide upon the amount of time to allow for the debate on the petition, and will take account of the degree of public interest in the issue, the level of support given to the petition and the number of elected members wishing to express their views on the subject.
The Council accepts that it will not normally be sufficient for such a meeting merely to 'take note' of the petition, and that there should be a decision taken as to what other steps (including, but not restricted, to the actions specified in Paragraph D2) should also be taken as a response.
The Petitions Organiser will be formally notified in writing of the decision taken at the Council meeting. This will take place within 5 working days.
5. Petitions may request that a 'senior Council officer' be required to appear and give evidence on an issue for which he or she is responsible. If such a petition has, or acquires 1,000 valid signatures, the Council will refer the matter to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee, though it reserves the right to substitute a more appropriate person for the name referred to in the petition. A 'senior Council officer' is an officer at Chief Officer or Assistant Director level.
6. The Petition Organiser will be given reasonable notice of the meeting and, although able to attend, will not normally be able to participate in the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will normally be prepared to consider suggested lines of questioning from the Petition Organiser or signatories
7. If in the opinion of the Council, an issue raised in a petition seeking to call a senior Council officer to account would be better considered through the attendance of relevant senior officers from a partner authority, the Council may, at its discretion request that such an individual be invited to give evidence to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
Following the meeting at which the senior Council officer appears and gives evidence, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will prepare a report and/or make recommendations. These will be sent to the Council's Chief Executive and

to the Leader of the Council, and a copy sent to the Petition Organiser. Unless the issue raises matters of confidentiality, the Council will normally publish this document on the Council's website.

8. References to 'threshold' numbers of signatures in paragraphs C6, D4 and D5 confer a clear entitlement under the provisions of the scheme. However, the Council accepts that there are situations where issues may be of considerable significance to a small number of stakeholders, and where the absolute number of signatures for a petition may be less appropriate a measure of relevant support.
In these circumstances the Scheme Administrator is authorised to substitute for the thresholds in the paragraphs referred to above, revised numbers that take account of the specifics of the case. When this occurs, the entitlements operate as for the rest of the scheme
8. At the end of the process of considering the petition, the relevant Chief Officer will formally write to the Petition Organiser with a formal response. This communication will normally outline the steps taken by the Council to consider the issue and will refer to the involvement (where applicable) of the Council's elected members.
In the case of an ePetition the response will be distributed by email to all of the petition signees.
A copy of the response to all petitions will be posted to the publicly accessible website and available to view for a period of 6 months from closing the petition. For ePetitions this will include the names of signees.
The letter will also identify the Responding Officer who handled the issue and highlight his or her involvement where appropriate.
This formal response will be despatched within 90 days of receipt or submission of a petition, and a copy will be published both on the Council website and easily accessible from the relevant pages of the ePetitions facility

E REVIEWING THE RESULTS

1. If a Petitions Organiser is not satisfied with the Council's formal response to the petition, he or she may request a review
Such a request should be made in writing within 28 days of the despatch of the formal response to the Petitions Organiser and must provide the reasons underlying the review.
2. Upon receipt of such a request the Scheme Administrator will identify a Reviewing Officer from among the senior Council officers. This senior officer will be given wide scope to reconsider whether the Council should, in all the circumstances take additional steps to respond to the petition. This will normally include reference to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which will itself consider the adequacy of the initial response.

On some occasions, such as where the initial response took the form of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee taking evidence from a senior Council officer, it may be inappropriate for the same Committee to review the issue. In consultation with the Scheme Administrator, the Reviewing Officer will ensure that a suitable alternative process is followed to engage elected members in reviewing the petition.

At the end of the process of reviewing the petition, the Council's Chief Executive will formally write to the Petition Organiser to inform him or her of the results of the review. This communication will normally outline the process followed to establish whether the initial response had been adequate and outline any additional steps taken by the Council as part of the review. It will also refer to the involvement (where applicable) of the Council's elected members.

The letter will also identify the Reviewing Officer who handled the issue and highlight his or her involvement where appropriate.

This review response will be despatched within 28 days of receipt of the request for review, and a copy will be published both on the Council website and easily accessible from the relevant pages of the ePetitions facility.

F REPORTING

1. The Council will report progress in addressing issues raised through petitions by updating the ePetitions system regularly, and by ensuring that the status of each petition is accurately shown.
2. In addition, the Council will prepare an annual summary detailing all petitions submitted, the signatures each attracted, and the Council's formal response to each. This report will be presented to the Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee each year and published on the Council's website.

Finance & Resources OSC Action Point List 2016/17						
Date of meeting	Action point	Responsible for action	Date of action completed	Date chased if not actioned	Final date it needs to be actioned by	Update on Action Point
07/06/2016	D Skinner to confirm what the costs are for the V4 Service Review.	D Skinner	complete		21/07/2016	£44,612.50
07/06/2016	D Skinner to confirm how many Premises there are in Dacorum	D Skinner	complete		21/07/2016	9
07/06/2016	N Brown to confirm the number of wc's fitted with time locks and steel opening doors	N Brown	complete		21/07/2016	E mail was sent to Members on 22/6/16
07/06/2016	M Rawdon to explain the impact of stress/anxiety on the overall sickness absence	M Rawdon	complete		21/07/2016	E mail was sent to Members on 22/6/2016
07/06/2016	D Skinner to confirm when the service review is taking place in building and control.	D Skinner	complete		21/07/2016	The review is scheduled to conclude in December 2016 and will cover- staffing and succession planning, Systems thinking efficiencies and potential income opportunities
07/06/2016	D Skinner to confirm whom the trees belong to with regards to the damage to properties from subsidence due to the tree routes.	D Skinner	complete		21/07/2016	The trees either belong to DBC, and are managed by the Trees and Woodlands Team or are highway trees, that DBC maintain on behalf of HCC under an agency agreement. Due to the current case law position it is difficult to defend such claims where tree roots are identified.
07/06/2016	M Rawdon to confirm for Members what percentage of sickness absences were related to stress.	M Rawdon	complete		21/07/2016	E mail sent to members 22/6/2016
07/06/2016	R Smyth to confirm to Members what the savings are within the paperless approach set within the report.	R Smyth	complete		21/07/2016	E mail sent to members 19/7/2016

Finance & Resources OSC Action Plan		
Date of meeting	Action point	Responsible for action
06/09/2016	To confirm the statistics for sickness absence	M Rawdon
06/09/2016	D Skinner to confirm details of new builds/road layouts/existing footprint in relation to access issues with refuse vehicles (paragraph 4.1)	D Skinner
06/09/2016	D Skinner to confirm figure for total loss of contracts in commercial waste services (paragraph 7.2).	D Skinner

oint List 2016/17		
Date of action completed	Date chased if not actioned	Final date it needs to be actioned by
09/09/2016	N/A	20/09/2016
20/09/2016	N/A	20/09/2016
		20/09/2016

Update on Action Point
Figures Emailed to Members 13/09/16
D Skinner investigated the matter of the hard to access roads and have clarified with the service that the main issues are with parking and this issue was raised and discussed at SPAE OSC.