

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
9 October 2018 (7.00 - 8.45 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	+Michael Deon Burton, +John Crowder, Philippa Crowder, Robby Misir, John Mylod, Nisha Patel, Melvin Wallace and Michael White
Residents' Group	Ray Morgon and Barry Mugglestone
Upminster & Cranham Residents' Group'	Clarence Barrett and +Linda Hawthorn
Independent Residents' Group	Natasha Summers and Graham Williamson
Labour Group	Keith Darvill (Vice-Chair)
North Havering Residents' Group	Darren Wise (Chairman)

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Ray Best, Judith Holt, Bob Perry and Gillian Ford.

+Substitute Members: Councillor John Crowder (for Ray Best), Councillor Melvin Wallace (for Judith Holt), Councillor Burton (for Bob Perry) and Councillor Linda Hawthorn (for Gillian Ford).

Councillors Damian White, Osman Dervish, Christine Vickery, Paul Middleton and Gerry O' Sullivan were also present.

Unless shown all decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

6 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

7 CALL-IN OF A KEY DECISION 18/51 - HIGHWAYS CAPITAL FOOTWAY AND CARRIAGEWAY RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2018/19

The report before Members detailed the call-in of a Key Executive Decision relating to the Highways Capital Programme 2018/19.

A requisition signed by Councillors Ray Morgan and Clarence Barrett had called-in the Executive Decision dated 17 September 2018.

The reasons for the call-in were as follows:

1. There was a lack of detail in respect of the business case for each intended works.
2. There was a lack of data to provide evidence to back up the “worst first” business case. (There were no figures on the number of repair requests received for works to be done in each road over the past 3 years, details of input from the ALO’s and results of UKPMS surveys).
3. There was a lack of detail on how the Horizon system created the “worst first” list.
4. Lack of detail on the £1.7 million not now required on other schemes.

Members were addressed by the Cabinet Member for Environment who explained the rationale for the decision taken.

Members were advised as a point of clarification that the Balmoral Road referred to in the decision should have read Squirrels Heath ward rather than Hacton ward.

During the debate Members asked for and received several points of clarification which were provided by the Council’s Highways officers.

Several Members commented that they had concerns regarding the roads that had been chosen for repairs as they did not feel that those roads were in the worst state of disrepair.

Officers advised that the footways and carriageways were the most in need of repair following the United Kingdom Pavement Management System (UKPMS) surveys.

Members were advised that the Horizons software identified and prioritised highway maintenance schemes and determined the cost implications of various treatments.

Condition surveys would continue on an annual basis which would allow for future modelling of the highway asset in the future.

Officers extended an invitation to Members to visit the Highways office to see the Horizons software in action.

Members noted that the additional £1.2m of funding for the programme had been met by an underspend in capital budgets.

The vote for the decision as to whether to uphold or dismiss the call-in was carried by 9 votes to 7.

Members voted to dismiss the call-in.

It was **RESOLVED** that the call-in of the Executive Decision dated 17 September 2018 be dismissed.

8 CALL-IN OF A KEY DECISION 18/52 - UPDATE TO CORPORATE COMPLAINTS POLICY AND PROCEDURE

The report before Members detailed the call-in of an Executive Decision relating to the Update to the Corporate Complaints Policy & Procedure.

A requisition signed by Councillors Ray Morgon and Clarence Barrett had called-in the Executive Decision dated 27 September 2018.

The reasons for the requisition were as follows:

- 1 .There was a lack of detail and evidence in changes to performance and complexity of cases justifying changes in target timings.
2. There was a lack of evidence in how Member involvement at stage 3 helped with cases before potential referral to the Ombudsman.
3. There was a lack of detail and evidence as to why the quality of investigations at stage 1 had reduced, together with actions taken to remedy this.
4. There was a lack of detail on how customer service was improved by complainants waiting longer for a reply at stage 2

Members were advised that in April 2015, Cabinet agreed a revised Corporate Complaints procedure. This was to aid and improve performance in both timescale and quality.

The timescales for resolving complaints were publicised as 3 days for an acknowledgement and 15 days for a full response at Stage 1; 20 days for Stage 2 and a calendar month for Stage 3.

Performance for dealing with complaints was reported quarterly to the Adjudication and Review Committee. Improvements were clearly evidenced in the first two years of the life of the procedure, in both quality and timescales.

Recent changes to performance and complexity of some complaints had prompted consideration of the complaint timings and the need to bring the policy up to date.

Performance had improved a great deal since April 2015. However, there had been a noticeable change in the quality of investigations undertaken at Stage 1 of the process, causing an impact on the depth and complexity of Stage 2 complaints.

Generally speaking, Stage 1 complaints were still meeting the prescribed timescale for 95% completion within 15 days, but this did not reflect the quality of the investigation.

It was proposed that the following changes were made to timescales for the Corporate Complaint Policy and Procedure.

- Stage 1 to be amended to 10 working days
- Stage 2 to increase to 25 working days, to allow for increased pressure caused by more complex investigations
- Stage 3 to be brought in line with working day reporting and to allow a little additional time for Members to make themselves available for a Member Review Panel
- It was proposed to keep the performance indicator targets at the same level.

The current Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system would soon become obsolete. Scoping work was being undertaken to determine the requirements for a new viable system. The introduction of a new system would provide an opportunity for all staff to be trained, or re-trained on both the use of a new complaint management system and the requirements of the Council's Complaint Policy and Procedure. A full training programme would be rolled-out across the authority, and would include mandatory online training on the complaints process.

Members were also advised that senior officers would be attending Adjudication & Review meetings in future if performance issues were of concern to Members

The vote for the decision as to whether to uphold or dismiss the call-in was carried by 4 votes to 10 with 2 abstentions.

Councillors Morgon, Mugglestone, Williamson and Summers voted to uphold the voted to uphold the call-in

Councillors J. Crowder, P. Crowder, Wallace, Misir, Mylod, Patel, Burton, White, Wise and Darvill voted to dismiss the call-in.

Councillors Barrett and Hawthorn abstained from voting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the call-in of the Executive Decision dated 27 September 2018 be dismissed

9 CALL-IN OF A NON-KEY EXECUTIVE DECISION 18/53 TPC864-UPMINSTER BRIDGE CPZ- RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION

The report before Members detailed a Non-key Executive Decision that had sought to possibly introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in the Upminster Bridge area.

An informal questionnaire had been sent out to all residents of the area and the results had been reported back to the Highways Advisory Committee in July 2018.

At the July meeting Members had agreed that a Residents Parking Zone be designed and formally consulted on with residents.

A requisition signed by Councillors Gerry O'Sullivan and Clarence Barrett had called-in the Executive Decision taken on 21 September 2018.

The reasons for the requisition were as follows:

1 The consultation that originally went out to residents in 2017 did not give a range of options the residents could choose from. The Highways Advisory Committee had recently agreed with the Highways Department for a fuller set of options to be offered to residents and this was due to go out to the residents in August. This had not yet happened

2 The response from the residents to the 2017 consultation was not conclusive and Members felt the residents were not fully engaged in such a major change.

3 A one size fits all approach was not likely to work. More work needed to be done in order to achieve the required result without causing major disruption.

4 After due consideration the scheme could have a major impact on surrounding roads not only in the St Andrews Ward but also in Upminster, Emerson Park & Hacton wards.

It was felt that such a major change needed further work before it progressed from an informal to a formal consultation.

During the debate Members asked for and received several points of clarification which were provided by the Council's Highways officers.

Members expressed concerns that there had been a lack of consultation and that there was a number of responses that had been returned with no identifiable home address.

Members also felt that the original scheme was flawed and out of date and that a new round of informal consultation should take place as the existing proposals did not meet with ward councillor's agreement.

The vote for the decision as to whether to uphold or dismiss the call-in was carried by 8 votes to 7 with 1 abstention.

Councillors Hawthorn, Barrett, Morgon, Mugglestone, Summers, Williamson, Darvill and Mylod voted to uphold the call-in.

Councillors P Crowder, J Crowder, Wallace, Misir, Patel, Burton and White voted to dismiss the call-in.

Councillor Wise abstained from voting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the call-in of the Executive Decision dated 21 September 2018 be upheld and referred to Cabinet for its consideration.

Chairman