

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE AGENDA



Monday 7 April 2008

at 5.00 pm

in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

MEMBERS: SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE:

Councillors Akers-Belcher, Brash, R W Cook, S Cook, Fleet, Flintoff, James, Laffey, A E Lilley, G Lilley, A Marshall, Plant, Preece, Shaw, Simmons and Wright.

Resident Representatives: Jean Kennedy, Iris Ryder and Linda Shields

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
3. **MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2008.
4. **RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO REPORTS OF THE SCRUTINY COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No Items
5. **CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS FROM COUNCIL, EXECUTIVE MEMBERS AND NON EXECUTIVE MEMBERS**

No Items
6. **FORWARD PLAN**

No Items

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

7. **CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

No Items

8. **CONSIDERATION OF FINANCIAL MONITORING/CORPORATE REPORTS**

No Items

9. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV (Closed Circuit Television) Provision Scrutiny Referral

9.1 Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Setting the Scene

(a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

(b) Presentation by the Head of Community Safety and Prevention

9.2 Written Evidence from the Elected Mayor of Hartlepool

9.3 Feedback from Various Site Visits / Meeting of the Community Safety Forum

(a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

(b) Verbal Feedback from the meeting of the Community Safety Forum held on 19 March 2008

(c) Verbal Feedback from the Site Visit to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre held on 26 March 2008

(d) Verbal Feedback from the Site Visit to Middlesbrough Council's CCTV Control Centre held on 1 April 2008

10. **CALL-IN REQUESTS**

11. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of Next Meeting Friday 18 April 2008, commencing at 2pm in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

6 March 2008

The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors Brash, R W Cook, S Cook, A E Lilley, G Lilley, A Marshall, Plant, Preece, Shaw and Simmons.

Resident Representatives: Jean Kennedy, Iris Ryder and Linda Shields

Also Present: The Mayor, Stuart Drummond and Councillors Atkinson, Gibbon, Hall, Johnson, Lauderdale, Payne and Richardson and Resident Representative Ted Jackson.

Officers: Joanne Smithson, Head of Community Strategy
Richard Starrs, Neighbourhood Renewal & Strategy Officer
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Post Office Limited:
Matt Silcock, Senior External Relations Manager
Liz Morgan, Field Change Adviser

127. Apologies for Absence

Akers-Belcher, Fleet, Flintoff, Laffey, and Wright.

128. Declarations of interest by Members

No items.

129. Minutes

No items.

130. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Reports of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

No items.

131. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews from Council, Executive Members and Non Executive Members

No items.

132. Forward Plan

No items.

133. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents

No items.

134. Consideration of financial monitoring/corporate reports

No items.

135. Post Office Limited Network Change Programme – Formal Consultation Process – Evidence from Post Office Limited and Key Witnesses *(Scrutiny Manager)*

Evidence from Key Groups/Witnesses

Post Office Limited

Matt Silcock, Senior External Relations Manager, and Liz Morgan, Field Change Adviser, were present from Post Offices Limited. Mr Silcock gave a presentation to the meeting cover the following main points: -

- The need for change and the issues and challenges faced by the company, including the financial losses.
- The Government announcement in May 2007 and the proposed closures numbers.
- The accessibility criteria applied to the retained post offices.
- How the process would work both before and through the consultation period.

- The effect in the Hartlepool Constituency which was part of the Cleveland with South Durham and Richmond plan.
- The three branches to close in Hartlepool; Elwick Road, Hart and Raby Estate.

A copy of the Post Offices' detailed action plan for the Cleveland with South Durham and Richmond area was submitted with the agenda papers by the Post Office for the committee's information and consideration.

Head of Community Strategy

The Head of Community Strategy outlined key points and statistics from the two reports submitted to the Committee. These focussed on the socio-economic reason why the three propose closures should not be undertaken. The Head of Community Strategy highlighted the following key points: -

- The Raby Estate Post Office lies within the Dyke House / Stranton / Grange Neighbourhood Renewal area. There is a population count of 31,091 (23,487 Adults) within a one mile catchment area of the Raby Estate Post Office. Car ownership within this catchment area is low at 36% compared to 44% nationally. Within the catchment area approximately 7,500 people (24%) suffer from long term limiting illness compared to 18.5% nationally. There are 8,392 families living within the catchment area with 22 % of these being lone parents against a national average of 16.5 %. There is an elderly population of approximately 4,650 (15%), this measures against a national average of 16%. The percentage of people having access to a bank or building society account within the 1 mile catchment area of the Raby Estate Post Office is lower than the national average (95 % against national average of 97.5%). The Post Office (PO) is based within an independent retail store with four staff. The postmaster indicated that the store would close if the Post Office function was not retained. Should this PO close there will be approximately 634 addresses over 1 mile away from nearest PO. Of these 634 addresses, 144 are from the Lower Layer Super Output Area 2006 which is ranked as in the bottom 22.27% of most deprived areas within England (Index Multiple Deprivation 2007). However under both Employment Deprivation and the Health Deprivation and Disability Domain this particular SOA falls within the most deprived 10 %
- The Elwick Road Post Office lies on the Boundary of the Hartlepool NDC area and the Rift House / Burn Valley Neighbourhood Renewal area. There is a population count of 29,247 (22,117 Adult) within a one mile catchment area of the Post Office. Car ownership is low at 36% compared to 44% nationally. The next nearest branch is the Rift House estate branch 0.5 miles away, to which there is no direct bus service. Approximately 7,000 people (24%) suffer from long term limiting illness compared to 18.5% nationally. There are 8,190 families living within 1 mile of the Elwick Road Post Office, with 22% of these being lone parent families measured against 16.5% nationally. There is an elderly population of around 4,650 (16%). The percentage of people within the one mile catchment area accessing a bank or building society account is

below the national average (95% against 97.5%). There are six care homes within the immediate vicinity of the Elwick Road Post office with an overall total capacity of 132 people. Elwick Road Post Office is Co-operative owned and lies within one mile of four other Post Offices in the area. During the course of the study it was not possible to ascertain the future viability of the shop if the post office function was to close.

- The population count within a one mile catchment area of the Hart Village Post Office is 2,898 (2180 adult population). This will increase on completion of the Middle Warren estate. A further 315 dwellings are under construction or have Planning approval and will all be within 1 mile of the Post Office (PO). Car ownership is 52% compared with 44% nationally, this equates to 1046 people not owning a car within 1 mile of the village post office. The next nearest branch is the West View Post Office at 21 Brus Corner. This Post Office is 2.19 miles away from the Hart Post Office with an hourly bus service to and from Hart. King Oswy Post Office is 2.35 miles away and has no direct bus service to and from Hart. People suffering from long term limiting illness is 14% compared to the national average of 18.5%. The percentage of elderly people within one mile is 7%, lower than the national average of 16%. The percentage of people having access to a bank or building society account is almost 100 %, higher than the national average of 97.5%. The PO was based in the 'village shop' and the postmaster stated that the store would close if the Post Office contract was cancelled, and as the only shop in village this would have an adverse impact upon the less mobile members of the community.
- The report also considered those post offices not identified for closure but considered to be at risk of closure. These included; Greatham, Elwick, Middleton Road, Rift House Estate and Owton Manor West. Detailed statistics on these Post Offices was also set out in the report based on the area within one mile of each.
- To assist with the formulation of the Authority's formal response to the Post Office consultation, further work had been being undertaken to investigate any potential oversights in the Post Office Ltd proposals. This was submitted in the additional report to the Committee which took into consideration public transport links, demographics, socio economic issues and future regeneration in and around the eight Post Offices identified within the first report. It was considered that the public transport issues and the walking routes used were a significant weakness of the Post Offices Limited's evidence.

Ward Councillors

Councillor Hall, Burn Valley Ward, commented on the closure of the Elwick Road Post Office and raised serious concerns at the effect the closure would have on the significant elderly population in the vicinity. As well as a large number of elderly people in their own homes, there were residents at quite a number of residential homes in the area for whom the walk to the next nearest PO would be prohibitive. There were also still large numbers of local residents using the PO which was based within a local store. Councillor Hall questioned the business case for closing this PO as he understood it to be a profitable store with the benefits of low operational

costs due to its location within the Cooperative Store and even benefitted from an in-store security guard. The business case for closing this branch was very weak.

Councillor Lauderdale, Burn Valley Ward, supported Councillor Hall's comments and highlighted the very difficult walking route that would be faced by the elderly to go to the next nearest branch as recommended by the Post Office. The route to Rift House PO required people to cross a busy main road without a nearby crossing. Those in most need of the facilities of a post office were those most likely to lose out.

Councillor Brash, Burn Valley Ward, highlighted the statistics for the area around the Elwick Road Post Office. There were six care homes in the near vicinity, low car ownership, poor bus links and elderly residents would be required to walk what he considered to be a dangerous route to the alternative recommended by the Post Office. Using a fit and able bodied employee to walk the route did not highlight the significant problems the elderly would have.

Councillor Atkinson, Dyke House Ward, raised his objection to the closure of the Raby Road Post Office. A petition had already been raised by local residents and users of the post office, many of whom already travelled more than a mile to access the branch.

Councillor Plant, Brus Ward, commented that there were already significant problems for many people to access the current post office provision, particularly during periods of bad weather, without it being reduced.

Councillor G Lilley was concerned at the inclusion of Greatham Post Office on the 'at risk' list. Councillor Lilley commented that many of the statistics set out in the Head of Community Strategy's report were skewed by the inclusion of an element of the Fens Estate in the area served by the post office. Greatham Village did not have as high a level of car ownership as portrayed and had a large number of elderly residents. There were distinct levels of deprivation that were not being taken account of.

Iain Wright, Member of Parliament for Hartlepool

The town's MP, Iain Wright, indicated that he had already had a meeting with representatives of the Post Offices and raised many concerns including some of those voiced at this meeting. Mr Wright made the following specific points: -

- The ill-health inequalities of the residents in Hartlepool needed to be taken into account.
- There were major issues of financial inclusion that were not being addressed. Many people in the areas affected did not have access to a bank account and relied on the post office. They were also highly unlikely to have other means of access to post office services, such as the internet.
- There were major logistical issues not being addressed. The

alternatives offered to the people of Hart were unrealistic. For the residents in the Chatham Road area accessing Raby Road Post Office, the walking route through the cemetery was not considered viable on personal safety grounds. The alternatives to the Elwick Road branch would lead pedestrians to cross busy main roads.

- There was a proven local business multiplier effect that post offices had. For every £10 spent in a post office, the local businesses benefitted by £16.20.
- Alternatives to service delivery had not been properly explored, such as building relationships with the local authority and other service providers.
- Could postal staff collect as well as deliver post from specific facilities such as residential homes for the elderly.

The major health and deprivation issues in Hartlepool had not been taken sufficiently into account by the Post Office. Mr Wright indicated that he had written to the Post Office on 11 February setting out his concerns and in response to the Chair's request indicated that he would be happy to submit that letter into the scrutiny investigation.

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

The Mayor commented that he had made his main comments during the public meeting he had held on Friday 29 February. The evidence set out in the Head of Community Strategy's report showed why these closures would be disastrous on the local community. The Mayor also referred to the point made by others in the meeting that there was serious concern that if closures were prevented here, they would result in another closure elsewhere. What concerned the Mayor more was if one of Hartlepool's near neighbours successfully argued to save one or more post offices, then those on the 'at risk' list could face closure. The fixed number of 2500 closures nationwide was irresponsible.

The Mayor was also critical of the consultation period only being six weeks, when the accepted standard recommended by government was at least twelve weeks. The government's stance that the Post Office was a commercial entity was also criticised by the Mayor; it was a public service. Post Offices provided essential services to the most vulnerable in society and to withdraw them would only hit those who needed them most. Some Councils around the country were looking to buy post offices and provide the service themselves. Unfortunately, Hartlepool was not in that situation. The recently approved budget of the Council was extremely tight already. The Council was ready to discuss the use of council owned buildings to reduce costs for the operation of post office branches if the Post Office wished to discuss that.

The Mayor also voiced his concern that the government was providing £1.7bn of funding for the closure process, much of which would fund compensation for the postmasters of those branches that were being closed. If that money was ploughed into maintaining the viability of the post office network it could have a significant positive effect.

The Mayor welcomed the very persuasive arguments and evidence put forward within the reports presented by the Head of community Strategy and he requested that the Post Office look at this evidence and give it due weight during their considerations.

Councillors

Councillor Payne believed that closure should have been the final option for these branches rather than the only option. The Post Office should look at ways of reinstating the services that had been removed over the years that had led to a fall in customer numbers. Councillor Payne was also concerned that this closure programme was the first stage of a privatisation programme.

Councillor Richardson echoed the point made earlier by Councillor Hall in that there was no financial evidence such as accounts to back up the closure of these three post offices.

Councillor Brash commented that if the Post Office was closing all the branches that were making a loss, then there would be 10,000 set for closure as opposed to only 2500. Councillor Brash questioned what criteria had been set for these closures, and were these three the least profitable and had the levels of deprivation been taken into account when the selections were made.

Questions and answers

Matt Silcock responded to the questions that had been raised so far in the meeting.

- There would be 2500 post office closures, 18% of the current number. The Post Office was required to apply the closures equally and consistently across the regions. If one branch was 'reprieved' a replacement closure would be sought.
- The accessibility criteria outlined in the presentation underpinned all the proposed closures. Consideration was given to the distance to the nearest alternative PO on the ground, the size of the branch, the number of customers and transactions and the overall financial performance of the branch. These were all given equal weight.
- All the branches proposed for closure were loss making.
- The alternative access to cash for residents, where they shopped, the configuration of roads, railways bus services and safe walking routes were all taken into account.
- The potential effect on small communities was also taken into account in rural areas, i.e. the last shop in the village scenario.
- Attempts were made to limit the negative effects on communities but these were difficult decisions and closures were going to have an effect.
- In Hartlepool there was an over-provision of post offices. Drawing the one-mile radius around several post offices would take in several other branches.
- In relation to alternative methods of provision, such as reducing hours, shared premises etc. these wouldn't save the money required. A

number of trials had been held over recent years and the results of these had been fed into the governments consultation exercise. The network did cost a lot to run and this was the first time there had been a proper look at restructuring.

- The assessment of the walking routes between post offices had been undertaken by a company employee. Bus services were examined and it was accepted that in some cases there were no bus services linking alternative post offices. The Post Office was not saying that people had to walk to the nearest alternative.

Councillor Brash was concerned at the walking distances measure to the nearest alternative post office. He commented that for many elderly people, an alternative post office being a mile away may as well be fifty miles away for their ability to walk that distance.

Councillor R Cook commented that the bus service quoted by the Post Office through Hart village was not a regular service. There was going to be no post office in either the Hart or Throston wards. Mr Silcock commented that the simple fact was that there was an over-provision of post offices in Hartlepool and there simply had to be closures. In terms of the deprivation statistics quoted in the meeting, Mr Silcock commented that the Post Office did take these issues into account as far as was possible. The statistics provided by the Council would be examined and taken into account. In Hart it was acknowledged that there was an hourly bus service. There was also a much higher than average car ownership in that area. In relation to the post offices described as at risk, Mr Silcock indicated that the Post Office had made it clear that no individual branch was 'safe'.

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond, commented that the whole of the proposal was based on a criteria set by the government and the current consultation exercise was simply a check to ensure nothing obvious had been missed. The Mayor indicated that he had asked what would sway the argument to save a particular post office. Would the evidence submitted be applied to the criteria and was there realistically any chance of saving a branch for closure. Matt Silcock stated that the information being put forward by the Council was the information that the Post Office needed. The consultation exercise was looking for fundamental information that may have been missed. What couldn't be said was if that would change any of the recommendations for closure.

Councillor Lilley was concerned at the information being given in relation to Greatham post office and considered that if the information was going to be used to inform the decisions being made by the Post Office, then it needed to be correct. Councillor G Lilley believed that the information given in the Head of Community Strategy's report was incorrect as it was not solely based on the village but included part of the Fens estate. The Neighbourhood Renewal and Strategy Manager indicated that Councillor G Lilley was correct, the one-mile radius around the Greatham post office did include part of the Fens Estate, but this same radius had been used to collate the statistics for all the post offices included in the report. Councillor

G Lilley felt that very few people from the Fens would use the Greatham post office because of the distance and having to cross the A689 and considered that the statistics did not portray an accurate picture of the Greatham post office.

The Chair invited questions from the residents present at the meeting. Four residents had attended the meeting and all represented residents around the Elwick Road post office. Residents believed that their area had already suffered post office closures in the recent past and should not be targeted again. There were a considerable number of elderly residents in the area and six residential homes; these people would be severely affected by the closure. In light of the need in the area, the post office should never have been on the list. Matt Silcock commented that previous closure programmes had not been taken into account during this review. The number of customers using branches was considered and the review looked at the network as a whole. Residents expressed their dismay at the decision and didn't see how the Elwick Road post office fitted into the criteria being used by the Post Office for the review. Residents also raised concern at the distance that people would now have to walk to alternative post offices and the difficulties the routes posed for the elderly.

The issue of a post office being based in a shop was raised again during the debate. Members were of the view that such instances should surely be retained due to the costs savings involved. Matt Silcock indicated that in these instances, there was no costs saving to the Post Office, the saving was for the postmaster who had to meet all the premises costs. The infrastructure cost of a branch to the Post Office was the same wherever it was located. Location was only an issue for the Post Office for those branches it ran itself; i.e. the crown post offices, such as the main post office in the Middleton Grange Shopping Centre. The Post Office was looking at alternative methods of delivering those services and Mr Silcock referred to the much publicised arrangement with WHSmith that had also been referred to in the meeting.

Iain Wright MP considered that the business case of the Post Office that was leading to locating post offices in branches of WHSmith seemed to contradict the case being used for the review and the proposed closure of branches such as Elwick Road. Mr Silcock indicated that the company was working with WHSmith on some relocation of branches. The Post Office did operate 380 crown post offices and they made an operational loss that was why the company had to look at alternative ways of providing a service. The company was also looking into diversification of product provision. Much of this was driven by the contracts that had been lost. Comments were made about services such as TV licences being returned to post offices but the contract had been lost. The committee discussed some of the services they wished to see returned to post offices to maintain the viability of branches. Mr Silcock restated the position that if the contracts for those services had been lost, there was little the Post Office could do. Liz Morgan commented that of the services that were provided, the Post Office was extending where possible, more of the services to more branches. Services such as car tax

and passports were, however, governed by other agencies (the DVLA and the Passport Agency) and the extending these services required their agreement.

At the conclusion of the debate, Councillor Payne commented that the closure proposals were very disappointing for the residents of Hartlepool. The closures that had taken place a number of years ago should have been the trigger to ensuring the viability of the remaining branches. What the council and all other agencies needed to do now was work in partnership with the Post Office to ensure the long term viability of the remaining network.

The Scrutiny Manager indicated that the formal response to the consultation would be made by Cabinet. A report setting out the comments of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee would be submitted to Cabinet on Monday 17 March 2008. A draft report of the comments to be forwarded to Cabinet would be submitted to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee on Friday 14 March.

The Chair thanked all those present for their attendance and input into the meeting.

Decision

1. That Matt Silcock and Liz Morgan be thanked for attending the meeting and responding to the questions of those present.
2. That a draft report setting out the Committee's comments on the Post Office consultation be submitted for consideration at the meeting on 14 March 2008.

136. Call-In Requests

No items.

MARJORIE JAMES

CHAIR

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

7 April 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CCTV PROVISION SCRUTINY REFERRAL – SETTING THE SCENE PRESENTATION: COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To provide Members with an introduction to the 'Setting the Scene' Presentation, which will be delivered at today's meeting by the Head of Community Safety and Prevention, as part of the Committee's CCTV Scrutiny Referral.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Head of Community Safety and Prevention, will be in attendance at today's meeting to deliver a presentation, as part of the Committee's undertaking of the Scrutiny Referral into Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV provision in relation to the following issues:-
- (a) An overview of the current CCTV provision in Hartlepool, including the siting and rationale behind current CCTV camera locations;
 - (b) The effectiveness and future development of the current CCTV provision in the town; and
 - (c) Partnership working and financial contributions.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members note the content of both the report and presentation, seeking clarification on any relevant issues from the Head of Community Safety and Prevention where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer:- James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.

STUART DRUMMOND
Mayor of Hartlepool

Civic Centre
Hartlepool TS24 8AY

Our Ref: CEMS/SD/OA

Tel: 01429 266522
Fax: 01429 523701
DX: 60669 Hartlepool-1

Your Ref:



HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL

26 March 2008

FOR THE ATTENTION OF SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CCTC PROVISION SCRUTINY REFERRAL

The Cabinet has asked for Scrutiny's assistance in looking at the CCTV provision in the town and how it will be provided in the future. The following questions have been raised;

Is the town adequately covered by CCTV? - Are there some areas not covered that should be? Are there cameras in areas that no longer need them?

What is the public's opinion of CCTV? - Do they see cameras as a deterrent? Do they think cameras actually don't work? Is CCTV perceived as 'big brother'? Are cameras doing the job they are meant to?

Are we getting the best out of the available technology? - Are there newer, more up to date cameras out there that provide better value for money? Would we consider using the talking CCTV? Can we get a better deal from the phone line providers?

What is the future of the monitoring station? - Is it at capacity? Do we need a new, purpose built monitoring station? What are Housing Hartlepool's plans for Richard Court? Is there any funding available?

What opportunities are there to generate some income? - Can we win some work from the private sector or other public sector agencies?

What are the Police's views on CCTV? - How often have they used footage to catch criminals?

The Cabinet realise that there is a lot of work involved in looking at this properly and are looking for Scrutiny's initial thoughts and ideas and whether there is anything we have omitted.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Stuart Drummond'.

Stuart Drummond
ELECTED MAYOR FOR HARTLEPOOL

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

7 April 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CCTV PROVISION SCRUTINY REFERRAL: FEEDBACK FROM VARIOUS SITE VISITS / MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY FORUM – COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Committee in relation to the Site Visits held to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre, Middlesbrough Council's CCTV Control Centre and the attendance at a recent meeting of the Community Safety Forum.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision Scrutiny Referral, the following site visits / meetings were recently attended by Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee:-

- (a) Meeting of the Community Safety Forum held on 19 March 2008;
- (b) Site Visit to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre held on 26 March 2008; and
- (c) Site Visit to Middlesbrough Council's CCTV Control Centre held on 1 April 2008.

2.2 In line with good practice, Members of this Committee who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Committee discuss their findings from the Site Visits / meeting of the Community Safety Forum as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of this report.

Contact:- James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.