

PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES		
NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Partnerships	
DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION	September/October 2013	
TITLE OF REPORT	Single Access Route to Housing – Common Allocations Policy	
P U R P O S E	1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf)	The Single Access Route to Housing is to develop one common waiting across North East Wales. The Common Allocation Policy (CAP) is way to allocate Council/Housing using a banding scheme. The CAP has been subject to extensive public consultation.
	2. What issues are to be scrutinised?	The detail contained within the CAP for those being placed on the single common waiting list.
	3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts?	Project Manager – Single Access Route to Housing
	4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report?	Feed in comment on the details of CAP and influence the final version of it
	5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims & priorities and impact (see overleaf)*	Aims & Priorities 4
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	Various elements of the Sarth project has been to Scrutiny on a number of occasions previously	
REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny's recommendations to be reported elsewhere?	The next step is take it to Cabinet for decision	
AUTHOR	Sue Lewis	

Please complete the following checklist:

	Yes	No
Is the topic already being addressed satisfactorily?		X
Is Scrutiny likely to result in service improvements or other measurable benefits?	X	
Does the topic concern a poor performing service or a high budgetary commitment?		X
Are there adequate resources / realistic possibility of adequate resources to achieve the objective(s)?	X	
Is the Scrutiny activity timely, i.e. will scrutiny be able to recommend changes to the service delivery, policy, strategy, etc?	X	
Is the topic linked to corporate or scrutiny aims and priorities?	X	
Has the topic been identified as a risk in the Corporate Risk Register or is it the subject of an adverse internal audit or external regulator report?		X (in process of being put on Verto)

*The following table is to be used to guide the scores given:

Score	Aims & Priorities	Impact
0	No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities	No potential benefits
1	No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities but a subject of high public concern	Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/customer/client group
2	Some evidence of links, but indirect	Minor benefits to two groups/moderate benefits to one
3	Good evidence linking the topic to both aims and priorities	Moderate benefits to more than one group/substantial benefits to one
4	Strong evidence linking both aims and priorities, and has a high level of public concern	Substantial community-wide benefits

SCORING

Aims & Priorities

4	Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately	Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration
3		
2	Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes	Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately
1		

0

1

2

3

4

Impact