

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Friday, 25 July 2008

at 10.00 am

in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors R W Cook, S Cook, Gibbon, London, A Marshall, Morris, Richardson, Wright and Young.

Resident Representatives:

John Lynch, Brian McBean and Iris Ryder

- 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 19 June 2008
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**
 - 4.1 Portfolio Holders Response – Seaton Carew - Regeneration Needs And Opportunities – *Joint Report of the Director of Regeneration and Planning and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability*
- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

None

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

- 6.1 Youth Justice (Capacity And Capability) Plan 2008/09)– *Head of Community
Safety and Prevention*

7. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV
Provision**

- 7.1 Report on CCTV (Closed Circuit Television) Running Costs – *Head of
Community Safety and Prevention*
- 7.2 Evidence from Cleveland Police
- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Verbal Evidence from a representative of Cleveland Police
- 7.3 Evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade
- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Verbal Evidence from a representative of Cleveland Fire Brigade
- 7.4 Evidence from Housing Hartlepool
- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Verbal Evidence from a representative of Housing Hartlepool
- 7.5 Written Evidence from the Elected Mayor of Hartlepool
- 7.6 Feedback from Site Visit
- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Verbal Feedback from the Tour to see CCTV Cameras in the Town
and Site Visit to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre held on 21
July 2008

8. **ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN**

None

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

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- i) **Date of Next Meeting 21 August 2008, commencing at 2.00 pm in Committee
Room B**

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

19 June 2008

The meeting commenced at 2.00 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Shaun Cook (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob Cook, Steve Gibbon, Ann Marshall and Carl Richardson.

Resident Representatives: Brian McBean and Iris Ryder

Officers: Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services
Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration
Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer
Brian Neale, Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator
Penny Garner-Carpenter, Strategic Housing Manager
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dr Morris, Wright and Young and Resident Representative John Lynch.

2. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

3. Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2008

Confirmed.

4. Portfolio Holder's Response – Scrutiny Investigation into the Availability of Good Quality Affordable Rented Social Accommodation in Hartlepool – Action Plan (Director of Regeneration and Planning)

The Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder, Councillor Peter Jackson, reported to the Forum on Cabinet's consideration of the recommendations made by the forum following its investigation into the Availability of Good Quality Affordable Rented Social Accommodation in Hartlepool. Submitted with the agenda papers was the action plan proposed as a response to the recommendations of the Forum.

Councillor Jackson reported that Cabinet had particular concerns at the requirement set by government that local authority land should be sold at less than market value if a social landlord wished to develop the land. The most recent housing needs survey showed a requirement for nearly 400 such homes in the town. Housing Hartlepool had been approached to ask if they were in a position to develop anywhere near that number and they had indicated that they were not. With the current market downturn it was likely that many developers would 'slow down' their rate of house building in the town.

Members were concerned at the potential for any social landlord homes to be built in the town. The Portfolio Holder commented that Housing Hartlepool would need sufficient reserves to support a bid to government to gain approval for a scheme. This year such a bid would need to be submitted in October. The Director of Regeneration commented that the government had allocated £8bn to support affordable housing development across the country. However, there was a cap on the amount that could be paid for local authority owned land in order to develop these schemes and this was £5000. The grant being paid towards each property to be developed had also been reduced to £47,000. Housing Associations could borrow against the investment but still needed to put in their own reserves in order to undertake the project. The resources were there to be utilised and were not restricted to housing associations and therefore could be something of a lifeline for developers in the current market situation.

Members expressed some concern at the very low capital receipt the council would receive. The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services commented that while the Council did receive a low capital receipt, the schemes needed to be viewed in terms of the Council meeting its role as a housing authority. The Council would also gain nomination rights on excellent new properties. The potential for selling land for private development did seem somewhat remote in the current economic climate.

Members queried whether any of the private developers could potentially sell land to the housing associations. The Portfolio Holder considered that there was probably a greater benefit to the developers to hold on to the land in the longer term rather than sell it on. The Director reported that there was some

consideration being given in central government to purchasing unsold or unfinished houses on private developments as a means of expanding the number of affordable rented homes.

Members discussed these issues on some detail and commented that the government's restriction of the capital receipt for housing association land sales did contradict the government requirement that council's should maximise their income from the sale of assets.

Recommended

That the report and the attached action plan be noted.

5. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

No items.

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

No items.

7. The Role of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer briefly outlined the role and remit of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum together with the agreed meeting dates for the forum.

Recommended

That the report be noted.

8. Six Monthly Monitoring of Agreed Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Recommendations (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 21 November 2007 approved the introduction of an electronic database to monitor the delivery of agreed scrutiny recommendations since the 2005/06 Municipal Year. Approval was also given for the introduction of a standardised six monthly cycle for the submission of progress reports to each Scrutiny Forum (June and December). An updated copy of the database in relation to this scrutiny forum's recommendations and actions was submitted at the meeting.

The Chair thanked the Regeneration and Planning Services Department and its officers for the work that had been undertaken in the actioning of the

forum's recommendations. In reviewing the database, Members raised a number of questions which are detailed below with the responses given by officers at the meeting.

Hartlepool Railway Station – were Network Rail to open the platform on the Marina side of the line? This was being discussed with Network Rail though it had to be said that much of the work at this moment in time was about approving the overall appearance of the station. The Railway Forum was active on this issue. Members indicated their wish to keep the pressure on Network Rail to undertake the works that had been agreed and supported the work of the Railway Forum. Members requested that should further developments on this issue happen before the next scheduled monitoring report they would wish to receive details.

Seaton Carew investigation and the application for SeaChange funding – it was commented that the Mayor had made a statement indicating that SeaChange funding was to be used for the Marina and the Headland when it should be targeted solely at Seaton Carew. It was reported that clarification was being sought on what SeaChange could actually fund as first indications were that the schemes were much narrower in definition than had originally been thought. An application would be made for whatever schemes in Seaton Carew SeaChange could support, but the forum was reminded that this funding regime did require match funding.

Railway Approaches – Members were concerned that a further update was required as it appeared little action had been taken in certain areas. This issue needed to be addressed as there was little time left between now and the Tall Ships event in 2010 and these problems needed to be addressed before then. The Chair commented that the Mayor was also shocked that little action had taken place relating to the mural and was following up on this matter.

The 'No Messin' Campaign' – Members expressed disappointment that Network rail had not taken their No Messin' Campaign into Hartlepool's schools as had been agreed. Officers commented that they had thought that appropriate arrangements had been put in place for this to happen but it appeared that it had stalled due to certain officers leaving the authority. It would be pursued as a matter of urgency following this meeting.

Recommended

That the progress against the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's agreed recommendations, since the 2005/06 Municipal Year, be noted.

9. Determining the Scrutiny Forum's Work Programme for 2008/09 *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer indicated that the Forum needed to develop a Work Programme for the 2008/09 Municipal Year, together with a timeframe for each review, for consideration by the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee on the 4 July 2008. Detailed terms of reference would also need to be developed at the start of each inquiry.

The Chair had met with the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability to discuss potential areas of investigation and the table set out in the report showed the subjects that had arisen during that debate and also those matters highlighted by individual members. The forum already had one investigation underway as a result of a referral from Cabinet on Hartlepool BC's Community CCTV Provision. There would also be an examination of the Annual Youth Justice Plan 2008/09 by this forum as part of the Budget and Policy Framework of the Council.

The subject proposed through the Chair's discussions was an investigation into The Marketing of Hartlepool to gain an understanding of how Hartlepool is marketed in terms of tourism and business and identify ways of further raising the profile of the town, in particular with the Tall Ships Event in Hartlepool in 2010. The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities had suggested via email that an investigation into the Provision of Sites for Travellers should be considered as this had become a significant issue due to changes in national policy.

Members supported the investigation into the marketing of Hartlepool as they saw this as of major importance not just for the tall Ships Event in 2010 but for the future of the town. The Chair indicated that the investigation into CCTV would need to take immediate priority as cabinet wished a final report on this issue by the end of September. The marketing investigation could then commence early in the autumn allowing Members sufficient time for a full investigation.

Recommended

That a report be submitted to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee indicating that the two proposed work programme investigations for this forum were Hartlepool BC's Community CCTV Provision and The Marketing of Hartlepool.

10. Scrutiny Investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision' – Scoping Report *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that on the 8 February 2008 the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee agreed to a referral from Cabinet on the topic of Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision. Due to the time constraints to complete the referral by the end of the 2007/08 Municipal Year, Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee agreed to provide Cabinet with an Interim Report which would form the basis of a in-depth investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision to be undertaken by the Regeneration and Planning Scrutiny Forum during the 2008/08 Municipal Year.

Cabinet considered the Interim Report from Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee at its meeting on the 28 April 2008 and agreed that the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum should undertake a detailed investigation

into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision' and report their findings back to Cabinet by the end of September 2008.

The Scoping Report set out the current situation in relation to CCTV management and operation in Hartlepool and highlighted some principal issues the forum may wish to investigate in detail. The following specific terms of reference for the investigation were set out in the report and supported by the Forum: -

- (a) To consider the establishment of a fund for the repair, replacement, renewal and appropriate running costs of the community CCTV system, investigating with partner organisations (e.g. Cleveland Police, Cleveland Fire Brigade) for a financial contribution into this fund;
- (b) To investigate the utilisation of Planning gain to ensure that where appropriate, CCTV camera provision is built in, or where this is not viable then funding sought to add to the repair, replacement, renewal and running costs fund;
- (c) To review the current camera provision throughout Hartlepool to recommend if cameras should be decommissioned, relocated or new cameras commissioned;
- (d) To engage with all partners to ensure that CCTV cameras continue to contribute to combating the crime and the fear of crime;
- (e) To seek ways of partnership working with utilities and other authorised contractors who dig up the roads in Hartlepool, to ensure that fibre optic cables can be laid at the same time, therefore, improving the network;
- (f) To investigate if the current transmission service provider, British Telecommunications, are providing a quality service or if other providers in the market place might exceed those standards; and
- (g) To assess the current siting of the Community Monitoring Centre and engage with Housing Hartlepool to discuss future plans for the building, as well as the Service Level Agreement between the Council and Housing Hartlepool for the operation of the CCTV system that is due to expire in March 2009.

The report went on to set out the timetable for the investigation, the proposed community engagement and the potential areas of enquiry and sources of information/evidence.

Recommended

That the remit of the Scrutiny investigation as set out above and in the report submitted be approved.

11. Scrutiny Investigation into ‘Hartlepool Borough Council’s Community CCTV Provision’ (*Community Safety Officer*)

The Community Safety Officer gave a presentation to the Forum highlighting;

- Possible future developments including new sites, cameras and technology;
- The Partnership arrangements, the Council’s ownership and financial responsibility and users of the system;
- The effectiveness of the cameras, their monitoring, their abilities and restrictions.
- Police involvement and the use of intelligence, the restrictions on the use of images and the fact that cameras were directly involved in around 30 arrests each month in Hartlepool.
- Camera locations, their concentration in the town centre and the other locations where they were utilised.
- How decisions on camera siting were taken and the funding implications.
- Possible future developments and the use of additional avenues to fund new cameras such as planning gain.
- The various partners involved in the provision and use of the CCTV system in Hartlepool.

Members were invited to visit the CCTV control centre during the investigation to see first hand how the system was monitored.

Members queried what other uses the system could be put and highlighted the use of cameras to monitor traffic violations. It was stated that the CCTV system in Hartlepool was not used for traffic regulation. There was new government legislation in relation to their use in monitoring yellow-box junctions. If Council departments wished to use the CCTV system to assist in particular enforcement activities, then operators would work with them on those matters. Members also questioned the use of mobile cameras and how these could be utilised. The Community Safety Officer reported that the mobile cameras that officers would like to use were not those based in a van as utilised by the Police. The mobile cameras in question cost around £8000 and were mounted on top of a lamp post for period of days, weeks or months, depending on the problem they were to monitor. Such cameras would create significant flexibility and were also more cost effective than fixed position cameras.

Members questioned the involvement of New Deal for Communities in the provision of cameras, how many had been provided and was the council in a position to take on their management when NDC ended? The Community Support Officer indicated that NDC had provided thirteen additional cameras and there was an exit strategy being developed to deal with the transfer of the cameras to the Council. Members also raised the issue of the payment to

Housing Hartlepool for the management of the system.

Members also questioned the quality of the images from the cameras and how the pictures were transferred to the control room. The Community Support Officer stated that the images were of a very high quality and were frequently used by the Police in court. Most cameras communicated with the control room via fibre optic cables though there were still a small number that used a radio link.

The Chair thanked the Community Support Officer, Peter Gouldsbro for his presentation and answering members' questions. The investigation would continue at the next meeting of the forum on 17 July 2008 when the Head of Community Safety and Prevention would be present to respond to members questions.

Recommended

1. That the presentation and the comments/questions raised be noted.
2. That a site visit for the forum to the control room be arranged as apart of the investigation.

The meeting closed at 3.40pm.

S COOK

CHAIRMAN

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

25th July 2008



Report of: Joint Report of Director of Regeneration and Planning and the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability

Subject: PORTFOLIO HOLDERS RESPONSE – SEATON CAREW - REGENERATION NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members of the Scrutiny Forum with feedback on the recommendations from the investigation into 'Seaton Carew - Regeneration Needs and Opportunities' which was reported to Cabinet on 9th June 2008.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The investigation into 'Seaton Carew - Regeneration Needs and Opportunities' conducted by this Forum falls under the remit of the Regeneration and Planning Department and is, under the Executive Delegation Scheme, within the service area covered by the Regeneration and Liveability Portfolio Holder.
- 2.2 On 9th June 2008, Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum into 'Seaton Carew - Regeneration Needs and Opportunities'. This report provides feedback from the Portfolio Holder following the Cabinet's consideration of, and decisions in relation to this Forum's recommendations.
- 2.3 Following on from this report, progress towards completion of the actions contained within the Action Plan will be monitored through the newly created Scrutiny Monitoring Database, with standardised six monthly monitoring reports to be presented to the Forum. In addition to this, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will also receive a breakdown of progress against all Scrutiny Forums' recommendations on an Annual basis (July).

3. SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXECUTIVE DECISION

- 3.1 Following consideration of the Final Report, Cabinet suggested amendments to 2 of the Forums recommendations. It is suggested that recommendation (i):

‘That based on the strength of feeling expressed throughout the investigation, the Council should not dispose of land on either side of the Road to the north of Seaton Carew (up to, and including, the Coronation Drive / Warrior Park site) for the purpose of further development’

should be reconsidered following the completion and consideration of the report into the potential marketing of development sites in Seaton Carew and;

- 3.2 In relation to recommendation (b) Cabinet resolved that it could not ‘ring fence’ the reinvestment of any future capital receipts gained from disposal of land in Seaton Carew back into the resort’ as such a proposal would tie the hands of Cabinet when considering the best use of capital receipts. Cabinet agreed to an amended version of the proposal that allowed flexibility and is reflected in Appendix A.
- 3.3 Details of each recommendation and proposed actions to be taken following approval by Cabinet are provided in the Action Plan attached at **Appendix A**.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to this report (**Appendix A**) and seek clarification on its content where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer:- Andy Golightly
Regeneration and Planning Department
Hartlepool Borough Council
Telephone Number: 01429 284099
E-mail – andrew.golightly@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) The Scrutiny Forum’s Final Report ‘Seaton Carew Regeneration Needs and Opportunities’ considered by Cabinet on 9th June 2008
- (ii) Decision Record of Cabinet held on 9th June 2008.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
(a)	<p>That further opportunities to continue to raise the profile of Seaton Carew on a region and sub regional basis be explored;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Officers are involved in continuous engagement with One North East and Tees Valley Unlimited regarding the Seaton Sands/Seaton Front development site, to take forward regeneration proposals (following the outcome of the Coastal Strategy Study) as outlined in the Tees Valley Investment Plan. Seaton is a priority within the Coastal Arc Strategy and officers will work to ensure the Coastal Arc objectives (including Seaton Carew) are included in the Tees Valley Multi Area Agreement. 	<p>Derek Gouldburn</p> <p>March 2010</p> <p>September 2008</p>
(b)	<p>That consideration be given to ‘ring fencing the reinvestment of any</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed joint report to be taken to Cabinet by Director of 	<p>Stuart Green/John</p> <p>December 2008</p>

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	future capital receipts gained from disposal of land in Seaton Carew back into the resort,;	Regeneration, Director of Neighbourhood Services and Director of Adult and Community Services regarding future management and development of HBC assets in Seaton Carew. Cabinet will therefore determine the land disposal and destination of any capital receipt and <i>where possible</i> will look to retain that capital receipt in Seaton.	Mennear
(c)	That the feasibility of the suggested regeneration opportunities, identified during the course of this investigation (Section 13.8, 13.11 and 15.2 of the final report), be explored as part the development of future regeneration activities in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Officer working group to be established to consider the feasibility of suggested regeneration opportunities outlined in the final report. The outcome of this initial feasibility work to feed into recommendation 	Andy Golightly
			September 2008

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

	RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	Seaton Carew;	(j).		
(d)	That a review of the current provision of organised activities and events be undertaken that identifies options to increase the variety and frequency of events to further attract visitors to the resort;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of organised activities to be considered by working group identified in (c) and fed into recommendation (j). 	Andy Golightly	December 2008
(e)	That in recognition of the key role played by local businesses and groups, the benefits of re-establishing the former Seaton Carew Business Association together with a mechanism to encourage and support the involvement of the wider community (to include Seaton Carew's young people) be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the demand for a Business Forum including taking soundings from the business community. Review of membership and operation of Seaton Carew Renewal and Advisory Group (SCRAG) in Seaton to be undertaken to ensure wider community membership. 	Antony Steinberg/Andy Golightly	December 2008

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

RECOMMENDATION		EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	explored;			
(f)	That the provision of integrated community facilities in Seaton Carew be supported, with the proviso that existing community facilities should not be removed until agreements are in place to deliver new / replacement facilities;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future management of HBC owned assets and community facilities in Seaton will be subject to a detailed Cabinet report referred to in (b) and (i). 	Stuart Green/John Mennear	December 2008
(g)	That pending the outcome of Seaton Carew's Coastal Strategy Study, consideration be given to delaying the establishment of interim arrangements for the marketing and planning activity for land susceptible to flooding in and around Seaton Carew;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report to Cabinet from Director of Neighbourhood Services regarding the outcome of the Coastal Strategy Study. The results of the study will influence the timing of further marketing of main seafront development sites in Seaton. Other sites in Seaton brought 	Alan Coulson	January 2010

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

RECOMMENDATION		EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
		forward for development will be subject to the standard flood risk analysis as part of the planning application process.		
(h)	That opportunities to encourage community enterprise schemes in Seaton, be explored;	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council Officers to liaise with key groups within the Voluntary and Community Sector to determine the potential of social/community enterprise schemes in Seaton and access to funding.	Mick Emmerson/Andy Golightly	December 2008
(i)	That based on the strength of feeling expressed throughout the investigation, the Council should not dispose of land on either side of the road to the north of Seaton Carew (up to, and including, the Coronation Drive / Warrior Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cabinet will reconsider this recommendation following the completion and consideration of the report into the potential marketing of development sites in Seaton Carew.	Stuart Green	December 2008

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN**NAME OF FORUM:** Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum**NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY:** Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities**DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT:** April 2008

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	site) for the purpose of further development.		
(j)	That the Council explore the Department for Culture Media and Sport ‘Sea Change’ funding programme to establish potential opportunities for submission of a bid for Seaton Carew under the remit of the programme.	Derek Gouldburn	December 2008

REGENERATION & PLANNING SERVICES

SCRUTINY FORUM

25TH JULY 2008



Report of: Head of Community Safety and Prevention

Subject: YOUTH JUSTICE (CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY)
PLAN 2008/09)

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1** To set out proposals for the development of the new Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan 2008/09 and to consider issues for the Youth Offending Service (YOS) during 2008/09

2. Background

- 2.1** Each year the Youth Justice Board (YJB) requests the Youth Offending Service to set out in an annual plan, how they are going to respond to the Youth Justice Performance Management Framework, to address areas of under performance and deliver continuous improvement.
- 2.2** The Government have agreed a new national Youth Justice Performance Framework for 2008/09 and beyond, which is aligned to the new National Indicator set for Local Authorities and Partnerships. There are 6 specific youth justice indicators:

NI 111 Number of first time entrants to the youth justice system aged 10-17
NI 19 Rate of proven re-offending
NI 43 Rate of court convictions leading to custodial sentence
NI 44 Ethnic composition of offenders of youth justice disposals
NI 45 Engagement in education, training and employment
NI 46 Suitable accommodation

3. Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan Specification

- 3.1** The YJB have produced a Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan template and guidance, to serve as the format for the annual plan.
- 3.2** The five sections to be covered are:

- The national and local context of youth justice – what are the strategic aims and priorities of the national and local youth justice systems
 - Use of resources and value for money - the extent to which the YOS's financial, staff, programme and ICT resources have been used to deliver quality Youth Justice services
 - Capacity and Capability – a preventing offending and reoffending problem-solving tool, which is designed to help YOS management boards, and the YJB, arrive at an annual direction of travel assessment against local and national strategic aims of the youth justice system, and to monitor performance and continuous improvement
 - Business change and innovation: Youth Justice: the Scaled Approach is designed to assist youth justice services to direct time and resources to young people appropriately, in accordance with their risk assessment. YOS's will be expected to implement the scaled approach model from April 2009, which will coincide with the introduction of the provisions arising from the Criminal Justice and Immigration Bill. The most significant youth justice provision in the Bill relates to the Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO).
 - Risk of future delivery assessment summary – the extent to which the YOS workforce development strategy will help the YOS and its partners to effectively manage the risks of future delivery
- 3.3** The Youth Justice (Capacity & Capability) Plan will provide data towards the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA). It will also be crucial to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, as pre-inspection evidence for YOS inspections from April 2009.
- 3.4** The Issues paper attached at Appendix 1 has been developed for consultation with users of the service, partners and for consideration by this Scrutiny Forum. This was agreed by Cabinet on 9th June 2008.
- 3.5** The final draft Plan will be considered by Cabinet on 4th August 2008 and full Council on 18th September 2008.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1** It is recommended that the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum:
- a) considers the contents of this report and the Issues Paper attached at Appendix 1 and question the Head of Community Safety and Prevention accordingly;
 - b) formulates any comments and observations on this Budget and Policy framework item to be fed back to Cabinet

Contact officer: Danny Dunleavy, YOS Manager

Background papers YJB guidance

YOUTH JUSTICE (CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY) PLAN 2008/09

Capacity and Capability (Section 3) will be the main focus of the plan. There are 7 questions to answer which are designed to assist the Youth Offending Service (YOS) Management Board and the Youth Justice Board (YJB) to assess the YOS performance against the principal aim of preventing offending and to identify risk to future delivery:

1. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to reducing first time entrants to the Criminal Justice system and reducing any disproportionality including young people from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) backgrounds

Preventing offending is the principal aim of the youth justice system. Reducing the number of first-time entrants into the youth justice system forms part of Government's Public Service Agreement (PSA) 14, "Increase the number of children and young people on the path to success", and it significantly contributes to the Every Child Matters outcomes. It is National Indicator (NI) 111 and it is performance indicator 24 in the Assessment of Police and Community Safety (APACS). The Youth Crime Action Plan, which will be launched in the summer of 2008, will set a national target for a reduction in first-time entrants.

The Hartlepool Intervention Project (HIP) Panel continues to be the main mechanism for the co-ordination and delivery of preventative services in Hartlepool. The panel offers support to children, young people and their families who are at risk of becoming involved in crime, anti-social behaviour or social exclusion. During the year the National Probation Service and the Hartlepool Young People Substance Misuse Team (HYPED) have been added to the Panel which consists of representatives from Children's Service (Education, Social Care, Youth Services, Connexions and Children's Fund), Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, Primary Care Trust, Local Authority Housing, Housing Hartlepool, Police, Anti-Social Behaviour Unit, Connexions, Barnardo's Fire Brigade, and the Youth Offending Service (YOS). All referrals accepted by the Panel are subject to Onset (YJB prevention assessment tool) assessments and an intervention plan drawn up following a Family Focus group, involving the young person and their family.

There has been a 13% decrease in the number of first time entrants (FTE) in 07/08 compared to the previous year 06/07 (298 to 259). Although there was a decrease the first two quarters continued the trend of the previous year with figures increasing (90 and 82 respectively) however the third and fourth quarters showed reductions in these figures of approximately 50% (46 and 41).

The increase in numbers has been the subject of much discussion both within the YOS Management Board and the Safer Hartlepool Partnership as well as the Police and Cleveland Criminal Justice Board (CCJB). The trend is not unusual with other Cleveland Police Districts experiencing increased numbers. It has been acknowledged that the introduction of

Neighbourhood Policing and the Offences Brought to Justice (OBTJ) target have had a significant impact on the number of children and young people coming into the criminal justice system. Performance Indicator 24 in the Assessment of Police and Community Safety will ensure that we are now working with the same targets and not conflicting ones.

An analysis of the increasing numbers in the second quarter of 07/08 was undertaken and it was found that a significant number of young people entering the system had been subject to fixed term exclusions from school. Discussions have taken place with the secondary heads to promote referrals to the HIP Panel. Training/awareness sessions have taken place in some of the Secondary and Primary schools, this is an ongoing process.

The HIP workers have been amalgamated with the Family Intervention Project (FIP) workers and support the work of both projects. The team sits jointly between the Anti-social Behaviour Unit (ASBU) and the YOS, ensuring that young people coming to the attention of the ASBU are given appropriate support.

Training has been given to the Police Officers and Community Support Officers to make them aware of the referral process and what preventative services are available, to ensure timely appropriate referrals are made for those young people coming to their attention and promote early diversion for those young people at risk.

The YJB Prevention Funding has enabled the establishment of a Youth Inclusion Programme (YIP) in three areas of the town and work with the schools in these areas is developing positively.

The YOS Inspection Report (Oct 2006) commented positively on the "HIP and YIP arrangements contributing to targeted community regeneration and providing a multi-agency resource addressing the needs of referred families".

A six module Prevention Awareness Course has been developed and delivered in the secondary schools with the schools identifying pupils they believe to be at risk of becoming involved in crime or anti-social behaviour. All young people receiving a reprimand are involved in a court scene acting out the roles and discussing the impact of offending upon the young person, their family, the victim and the community, as well as giving them an understanding of the court process.

The Straightline Project an alcohol awareness programme, has continued to be developed with referrals now being taken directly from parents who have concerns for their children in relation to alcohol.

Children and young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds are proportionally under represented in the youth justice system in Hartlepool which is positive.

During 2008-09 work will continue to raise the awareness of HIP with all partner agencies to encourage referrals as early as possible. A prevention awareness day promoting all prevention activity will be held on 17th September 2008.

A strong partnership has been developed with Manor Residents Association to develop the YIP model used in the Owton Manor area across the town. Junior YIPs covering children aged 8-13 will be developed during the year initially starting in the Dyke House area.

Hartlepool YOS is to be one of the pilot sites for the pooling of YJB Prevention Funding within the Local Authority to ensure a focused package of support is delivered to young people in need. This initiative will be linked to the newly established officer group of service leads associated with PSA 14 "Increase the number of children and young people on the path to success" and will assist in delivering targeted youth support.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

New Risks

- Widening of Prevention Agenda in Children's Services, focus taken away from preventing Crime and Anti-social Behaviour.

Current Risk

- Failure of agencies to identify children and young people at risk at an early stage.
- Number of referrals increase beyond capacity of the team.
- Intervention Plans not linked to assessment of Risk factors identified Onset.

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Deadline
Ensure YOS involvement in Development of Prevention Services	Agreed Prevention Structure	YOS Manager	Sept 2008
Multi Agency Prevention Awareness Day	Event takes place HIP referrals increase.	Prevention Team	Sept 2008
Monitoring Referrals to HIP	Young person receives a service	HIP Chair	Ongoing
ONSET and Intervention Planning Training	Intervention plans address risk factors	Interventions Co-Ordinator /Prevention Manager	Sept 08

2. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to reducing reoffending and reducing any disproportionately including young people from BME backgrounds.

Nationally the YJB is the lead agency for preventing youth reoffending and the harm caused through reoffending to others as part of PSA 23, "Make communities safer". This aim also significantly contributes to the Every Child Matters outcomes. It is National Indicator (NI) 19 and it is performance indicator 23 in the Assessment of Police and Community Safety (APACS).

In Hartlepool the overall reoffending rate after 12 months has reduced year on year from the 2002 cohort (ie group of offenders) at 39.6% to the current 2005 cohort at 28.8% a percentage reduction of 27.3% over the period. The re-offending rates compare favourably with those of:

The statistical neighbour, being below in all of the four cohorts.
England and Wales, where other than in 2002 the re-offending rate is again lower

Whilst overall the re-offending rate is lower the re-offending rates of those receiving community sentences has shown some increased trends. The numbers in the cohorts are relatively small and the more serious and persistent offenders tend to be a large percentage of the cohort. Increased numbers entering the system since April 2006 may start to affect the figures further.

The day to day work of the YOS staff is directed at reducing re-offending by children and young people through rigorous assessment and interventions to address the identified risk factors and strengthen positive factors. Following a regional audit of Assets (YJB assessment tool) and the YOS Inspection in 2006 Hartlepool YOS invested in further training with staff both within the YOS locally and regionally to raise the quality of assessments and intervention plans.

Pathways Plus (an accredited cognitive behaviour offending programme) has been delivered to young people initially to those on the Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP an alternative to custody) and will be delivered during 2008/09 to young people with lower tariff community orders.

Education, training and employment as well as suitable accommodation for young people are seen as the areas which we need to continually monitor and improve if we are to change the offending patterns of young people in the youth justice system. In 2007-08, 81% of young people completing statutory orders were in education, training or employment (ETE) against a national target of 90% whilst the performance level was below the target it was above the national, regional and family group performance. Against a national target of 95% for young people being in suitable accommodation at the end of their orders Hartlepool achieved 95.9%. Whilst the target was achieved, placements for 16-17 year olds who become homeless remains

problematic with bed and breakfast accommodation often being the only option. Additional support to young people is offered through the Resettlement and Aftercare Programme (RAP) which has resulted in a number of positive outcomes for young people in sustaining accommodation and engaging in employment/training, however the posts are only funded for another year.

Children and young people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds are proportionally under represented in the youth justice system in Hartlepool.

During 2008/09 the YOS will be preparing for the introduction of the Scaled Approach which is designed to assist youth offending services to direct time and resources to young people appropriately, in accordance with their risk assessment. This will involve the development of a tiered approach to interventions based on risk, supported by the new Youth Rehabilitation Order to be introduced in the Criminal Justice and Immigration Bill. The work on improving the quality of assessment and intervention planning will therefore be a key feature during the year. A recent regional quality assurance of Assets showed significant improvements in the quality of Assets being completed. In Hartlepool the areas for improvement have been identified in relation to offence analysis and risk and training has been organised to address these areas.

The publication of the updated guidance to youth offending teams on the Prevent and Deter strand of the Prolific and Other Priority Offenders (PPO) Strategy clearly defines Deter as targeting high risk young offenders with the potential to become the PPOs of the future. Work with young offenders who are identified in the Deter cohort will link to the introduction of The Scaled Approach with those young people identified in the cohort receiving appropriate levels of intervention and support.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvements

Current Risks:

- Ability to engage young people in Full Time Education Training and Employment. (ETE)
- Lack of appropriate accommodation for homeless 16-17 year olds
- Quality of Asset assessments and Intervention Plans.

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Deadline
Continue to strengthen links with Training providers	Increase in ETE Performance	YOS Manager	Ongoing
Continue to work with partner agencies to increase accommodation	No young person placed in Bed and Breakfast	YOS Manager	Ongoing
Asset Training Intervention Planning to address areas identified in QA of Asset	Offence Analysis undertaken Intervention plans address risk factors identified Risk of serious harm assessment and Management plan completed on all relevant cases	YOS Operational managers	Oct 08

3. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to reducing custodial remands and sentences and reducing any disproportionality including young people from BME backgrounds.

Using custody only as a last resort is one of the key assumptions that underpin the YJB's strategy for the secure estate (custodial settings) for children and young people. Reducing the use of custody for young people is National Indicator (NI) 43. It forms part of PSA 14, "Increase the number of children and young people on the path to success", and it significantly contributes to the Every Child Matters outcomes.

In 2007/08 Hartlepool achieved a performance of 6.7% for the use of Remand compared to the target of less than 9%. There were 8 occasions when young people were remanded into custody from 115 Remand decisions.

In terms of custodial sentences, again the target of 5% or less was achieved with a performance of 5%, which equates to 15 custodial sentences from 300 sentences. Effective services are in place prior to court hearings to assess young people for Bail ISSP or remand to local authority accommodation as an alternatives to custody.

Two remand carers are available for remands to local authority accommodation, or where no suitable accommodation is available and there is a risk of custody because of homelessness.

Work with the Housing Advice Team and Social Care Teams to provide suitable accommodation to address the needs of those young people who become homeless is ongoing.

YOS court staff have a good working relationship with the youth court magistrates and court staff. All Pre Sentence Reports (PSRs) are quality assured by operational managers and an evaluation sheet is completed by the sentencing magistrates indicating a sound congruence rate and high satisfaction levels.

Recently there have been a number of young people coming from police custody in Middlesbrough to court on a Saturday morning which has led to a review of the arrangements for court cover to ensure that remands to custody are not made without all relevant information being made available to the court.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

Current risk:

- Young people placed before the court on a Saturday where there is a risk of a custodial remand and no YOS representative present.

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Date
Agree arrangements for staff to cover court on Saturdays and Bank Holidays	No young person remanded to custody on a Saturday without presence of YOS representative in court	YOS Manager	July 08

4. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to addressing the risk of serious harm to the public through local application of YJB risk of serious harm procedures.

Nationally, HM Inspectorate of Probation's (HMIP) joint inspections of Youth Offending Services have highlighted significant concerns in the way in which Youth Offending Services manage the risk of serious harm to the public posed by children and young people.

All young people are assessed using the Asset assessment tool and where a risk is identified, a second assessment, a Risk of Serious Harm (ROSH) is completed. Where the ROSH indicates a medium or high risk, a Risk Management Plan is completed to manage the risk and reviewed 6 weekly by YOS management. Again the importance of timely and good quality assessments is essential and needs to be consistent across the team. This will be reinforced through further risk training for the team.

The Chair of the YOS Management Board randomly selects cases and checks procedures are being followed, reporting back to the Management Board. Further checks are to be carried out by managers to ensure all new offences of a violent or sexual nature result in a ROSH being completed.

YOS is actively involved in the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) for any young person who has been registered under MAPPA.

The YOS Manager sits on the Teesside MAPPA Strategic Management Board representing Hartlepool, Stockton and South Tees YOS's and chairs the Procedures Sub Group.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

Current Risks

- Risk Assessment are not consistent and appropriate across the team.
- Changes in circumstances in relation to risk of harm are responded to immediately.

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Date
ASSET training to identify Risk and appropriate offences	Young people with relevant offences have a ROSH completed	Operational Managers	Ongoing

5. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to keeping children and young people safe from harm.

The YOS has a statutory duty under section 11 of the Children Act 2004 to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child. The YJB's Strategy for the Secure Estate for Children and Young People requires that the Every Child Matters outcomes must also govern all secure establishments for children and young people.

Where an indication of vulnerability is identified in the Asset or Onset assessment a Vulnerability Management Plan identifying the risk as low, medium or high is implemented, plans are reviewed 6 weekly. Staff from Children's Services and the Anti-social Behaviour unit will attend future meetings to ensure a multi-agency response. Numbers of young people and levels of vulnerability are reported to the YOS Management Board quarterly.

The YOS Manager is a member of the Hartlepool Safeguarding Children's Board, chairs the Operational Practice and Policy Group and is a member

of the Performance and Quality Sub Group. The Deputy YOS Manager is a member of the Training Sub Group. YOS staff participate in the multi-agency safeguarding training.

Procedures are in place to ensure relevant information is routinely forwarded to the Secure Estate staff including risk, safeguarding and substance misuse information when a young person receives a custodial remand or sentence. YOS workers are contacted in the event of any vulnerability or safeguarding issues identified in custody. Strong links are in place with the nominated workers in Castington and the RAP team. As part of the workforce development three members of the YOS staff are to job shadow workers in Castington.

It is also important to ensure that the remand carers are receiving the appropriate information relating to young people placed in their care whether placed by the YOS or Children's Services.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

Current Risk:

- Remand Carers do not receive appropriate information/documentation on placement

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Date
Ensure staff complete appropriate documentation before placing a young person	No young person placed without appropriate documentation	YOS Children's Services	Ongoing

6. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to improving public confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the Youth Justice System

The Working Together to Cut Crime and Deliver Justice: A Strategic Plan for 2008-2011 sets out how English and Wales criminal justice agencies, including youth justice services, will deliver a justice system which engages the public and inspires confidence. The YJB has a corporate responsibility to contribute to achieving PSA24: "Deliver a more effective, transparent and responsive Criminal Justice System for victims and the public".

The YOS has maintained a performance level of 4/5 (5 highest) against National Standards during 2007/08.

Magistrates are confident in YOS services with the Pre-sentence report recommendations being followed in 87% of cases.

In 2007/08 a further 8 community volunteers have been recruited and trained to sit on Referral Order Panels.

The Head of South Tees YOS chairs the Cleveland Criminal Justice Board (CCJB) and represents the Tees Valley YOS's. The Stockton YOS Manager is the representative on the Communications sub-group and the Hartlepool Manager is the representative on the Performance group ensuring YOS representation at all levels of the CCJB.

The YOS Manager meets with the Youth Court Panel Magistrates quarterly to discuss issues relevant to the Youth Justice System.

YIP's have been established in three areas (Dyke House, Owton Manor and North Area) of the town and work closely with local community groups.

The YOS participated in the Anti-social Behaviour Awareness Day and delivers the Prevention Awareness Course in all secondary schools. Positive news stories are promoted through the Safer Hartlepool Partnership and the council's Heartbeat magazine however there is no guarantee that they will be published in the local press.

A young man recently received a national award after attending a Referral Order Panel where he met with the victim of his crime and has since turned his life around.

There are a wide range of community reparation projects undertaken by young people working with the YOS.

Along with partner agencies the YOS promotes the work of the Cleveland Criminal Justice Board during the annual Inside Justice Week.

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

Current risks:

- Negative publicity relating to young people and crime/anti-social behaviour.

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Date
Promote good news stories relating to young people and YOS activities	Increase public confidence in the Youth Justice system	YOS Manager	Ongoing

7. Assess the extent to which the YOS has contributed to improving satisfaction in the Criminal Justice System for those who have been victims of youth crime.

The YJB has a corporate responsibility to contribute to achieving PSA24: “Deliver a more effective, transparent and responsive Criminal Justice System for victims and the public”. The Criminal Justice System Strategic Plan 2008-11 sets out how English and Wales criminal justice agencies, including youth justice services, will deliver a justice system which puts the needs of victims at its heart. The plan states that the Criminal Justice System must give victims a voice and ensure that offenders make amends to their victims and communities.

The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime which came into force in April 2006, set statutory minimum standards for services to victims from the criminal justice agencies. There are particular challenges in meeting the needs of the most vulnerable victims. Young people are particularly subject to repeat victimisation for violent crime and it is important to recognise that some young victims of crime may go on to be involved in both offending and further victimization.

The YOS works in partnership with the Children’s Society to deliver services to victims and restorative justice. The YOS Inspection in 2006 cited the joint work with the Children’s Society as an area of good practice, offering a well developed range of service provision to victims. All victims are invited to become involved in a restorative process. Victim impact statements are routinely used when the victim does not wish to attend Referral Order Panels in person or have direct contact if the offender is subject to another order. Until recently there has been very little uptake by victims to participate in direct mediation with the offender. However, there has been a recent increase in the number of victims attending Panel, where direct mediation takes place. 100% of victims have indicated that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the service they receive.

The father of a young victim recently commented:
“I feel the system has worked and I am very satisfied with the youth justice process.

When the police officer said the young person would be sent to the Youth Offending Service I was very unhappy because I thought he’d probably get a holiday or something and nothing would change. Instead I am very pleased with what the Youth Offending Service has achieved. My son has been free of any problems with the young person. In fact, my son told me a teacher saw them talking together and came over to check everything was alright, but he said they’re both prefects at school now and get along well together.

It has given me faith in the local police and the police officer's guidance changed a really frustrating and stressful time into something positive."

Risks to future delivery and continuous improvement

Current Risks:

- Ensure victims who have provided Victim Impact Statements receive feedback on outcomes at all levels of intervention
- Timescales restrict preparation with young people and can lead to non-engagement with victims at Referral panels

Action	Success Criteria	Owner	Date
Case Mangers to make use of Victim Impact Statements in work with young people. Record Young person's response Children's Society to feedback response to victims	Victims receive feedback on young persons response	Operations Manager Children's Society	Sept 08
Ensuring young people are prepared for panel where victim will attend	Victims express satisfaction after panel	Children's Society Case Manager Panel Co-ordinator	Ongoing

GLOSSARY

APACS	Assessment of Police and Community Safety
ASBU	Anti-social behaviour Unit
Asset	National Assessment tool for offenders
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
CCJB	Cleveland Criminal Justice Board
ETE	Education, Training and Employment
FIP	Family Intervention Project
FTE	First Time Entrants to the criminal justice system
HIP	Hartlepool Intervention Project
HMIP	HM Inspectorate of Probation
ISSP	Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme
NI	National Indicator
OBTJ	Offences brought to justice
Onset	National Assessment tool for those at risk of offending
PPO	Prolific and other priority
PSA	Public Service Agreement
PSR	Pre-sentence Report
RAP	Resettlement and Aftercare Programme
ROSH	Risk of serious harm
YIP	Youth Inclusion Programme
YJB	Youth Justice Board
YOS	Youth Offending Service

REGENERATION & PLANNING SERVICES

SCRUTINY FORUM

25TH JULY 2008



Report of: Head of Community Safety and Prevention

Subject: CCTV (Closed circuit television) – running costs

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1** To provide information to Members of the Scrutiny Forum on the current revenue costs associated with running the town's CCTV system.

2. Background

- 2.1** The town's CCTV system was established in the early 1990's, with 8 'black and white' cameras in Church Street.
- 2.2** Regeneration capital funding from City Challenge, Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and specific Home Office initiatives soon extended the early system to 'colour' cameras at various sites across the town. The New Deal for Communities (NDC) initiative extended the number of sites in and around the town centre and Hartlepool Council capital funding has enabled cameras to be sited in car parks and other areas.
- 2.3** Monitoring of cameras was transferred from the Police to the Council in the 1990's. In March 2004 a 5 year Service Level Agreement was signed with Housing Hartlepool, for them to provide the monitoring service.
- 2.4** The Council's community safety team is responsible for managing and developing the town's CCTV camera system. Technical advice is provided by the Technical Services division in Neighbourhood Services. Members may wish to invite the appropriate technical officer to a future meeting, to give information, for example, on transmission options to improve the network and/or make efficiency savings.

- 2.5** Obviously ageing cameras and monitoring equipment require increasing maintenance and repair. This has an impact on the annual budget and in 2008/09 the Council has allocated an additional £30,000 to the budget, to accommodate these costs and those associated with increased transmission and power (electricity) charges.
- 2.6** Cameras and monitoring equipment have been upgraded over the years – we no longer have black and white cameras – but on a piecemeal basis, as capital funding becomes available. There is no capital investment programme to refurbish or replace this equipment.

3. Revenue budget – cost analysis

- 3.1** A table showing the breakdown of expenditure and income for 2006/07 and 2007/08, together with the budget allocation for 2008/09 and a projection for 2009/10 is attached at Appendix 1. This does not include HBC staff costs.
- 3.2** The current budget provision includes an allocation of nearly £50,000 in 2008/09 for income generated from NDC and a ‘planning gain’ (section 106) agreement. The income from NDC (£42,710 in 2008/09 is a significant sum, which will cease in 2010/11).

4. Recommendations

- 4.1** Members are asked to note the content of the report.

Contact officer: Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety & Prevention

Background papers

None

HBC Community Safety CCTV – Cost Analysis

	2006/7 Actual spend	2007/8 Actual spend	2008/9 Budget	2009/10 Projected budget
Repairs/Maintenance (Contractor)	56480	66250	60370	58500
Maintenance – DSO	2190	3380	3500	3800
Power	4400	4400	5150	5500
Transmission (Fibre/Telephone)	37110	37040	44800	45000
Monitoring	70020	73230	76090	79130
Exceptional Items	6320 (SIA Licence/train)			4500 (SIA Re-licence)
Total cost	176520	184300	189910	196430
Income				
- NDC	27310	36580	42710	To be finalised 7000
- Section 106	7000	7000	7000	
Overall cost	142210	140720	140200	

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

25 July 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV
PROVISION -- EVIDENCE FROM CLEVELAND
POLICE

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that representatives from Cleveland Police have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently representatives from Cleveland Police have agreed to attend this meeting to submit evidence of the local police force's perspective to the Forum.
- 2.2 During this evidence gathering session with Cleveland Police it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) How and in what circumstances does Cleveland Police currently utilise images captured through Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Cameras?
 - b) How much do the Community CCTV Cameras aid the Police in ensuring that crime and the fear of crime are reduced?

- c) Would Cleveland Police have the capacity and interest in contributing financially towards the running costs of the Community CCTV provision?
- d) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of those representatives from Cleveland Police in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer: - James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

25 July 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV
PROVISION -- EVIDENCE FROM CLEVELAND
FIRE BRIGADE

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that representatives from Cleveland Fire Brigade have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently written evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade is included as **Appendix A** to this report, in addition to their attendance at this meeting to submit verbal evidence of a local partner's perspective to the Forum.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with Cleveland Fire Brigade it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) How and in what circumstances does Cleveland Fire Brigade currently utilise images captured through Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Cameras?
 - b) Does Cleveland Fire Brigade have any future plans for greater usage of the images captured by Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Cameras?

- c) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of those representatives from Cleveland Fire Brigade in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer: - James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.

**SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S
COMMUNITY CCTC PROVISION – RESPONSE BY CLEVELAND FIRE BRIGADE.**

The following responses are based on the report titled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report,' as presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum at their meeting of 19 June 2008:-

Terms of Reference: (a) 'To consider the establishment of a fund for the repair, replacement, renewal and appropriate running costs of the community CCTV system, investigating with partner organisations (e.g. Cleveland Police, Cleveland Fire Brigade) for a financial contribution into this fund'.

Response: While Cleveland Fire Brigade acknowledges the contribution of CCTV Cameras in relation to their contribution to combating crime and the fear of crime, without any information in relation to either the anticipated size of the proposed fund for repair, replacement, renewal and appropriate running costs of the community CCTV system or the percentage of contribution expected of partners, we do not feel able at this time to firmly commit to this proposal.

Terms of Reference: (c) 'To review the current camera provision throughout Hartlepool to recommend if cameras should be decommissioned, relocated or new cameras commissioned' & **(d)** 'To engage with all partners to ensure that CCTV cameras continue to contribute to combating the crime and the fear of crime.'

Response: The Brigade will continue to attend the bi-monthly meetings of the CCTV Management Group and will engage, in terms of consultation and information sharing, with any process to review CCTV provision in Hartlepool and ensure that they continue to combat crime and the fear of crime.

Appendix B: Section 5.1 (viii) 'On conclusion of the scrutiny investigation into CCTV by the Regeneration and Planning Scrutiny Forum, publicity should be generated through a variety of mediums, including the Council's 'Hartbeat' magazine to highlight the role of CCTV cameras in Hartlepool i.e. What the cameras are there for, what the cameras do, who runs them etc.'

Response: The Brigade will continue to support the activities of the SHP Reassurance Task Group and promote the positive role of CCTV Cameras in Hartlepool.

**Dave Turton
DISTRICT FIRE MANAGER
CLEVELAND FIRE BRIGADE**

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

25 July 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV
PROVISION -- EVIDENCE FROM HOUSING
HARTLEPOOL

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that representatives from Housing Hartlepool have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently representatives from Housing Hartlepool have agreed to attend this meeting to submit evidence as the monitoring operator of the Community Monitoring Centre to the Forum.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with Housing Hartlepool it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) The service level agreement for the operation of the Community Monitoring Centre is due to expire by the end of March 2009. Would Housing Hartlepool be interested in continuing this arrangement?
 - b) With reference to question (a); Housing Hartlepool are the owners of the building that houses the Community Monitoring Centre, does Housing Hartlepool have any future intentions to change this arrangement?

- c) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of those representatives from Housing Hartlepool in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer: - James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.

STUART DRUMMOND

Mayor of Hartlepool

Civic Centre
Hartlepool TS24 8AY

AGENDA ITEM 7.5



HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Ref: CEMS/SD/OA

Tel: 01429 266522

Fax: 01429 523701

Your Ref:

DX: 60669 Hartlepool-1

9 July 2008

**FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES
SCRUTINY FORUM**

HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTC PROVISION

The Cabinet has asked for Scrutiny's assistance in looking at the Community 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 are looking forward to receiving the Forum's Final Report containing the thoughts, ideas and possible ways forward, as a result of this scrutiny investigation.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Drummond
ELECTED MAYOR FOR HARTLEPOOL

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

25 July 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S
COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION:
FEEDBACK FROM SITE VISIT – COVERING
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to the Site Visit held to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision, the following site visit was recently attended by Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum:-

(a) Site Visit to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre and tour of Community CCTV Cameras held on 21 July 2008;

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

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum discuss their findings from the Site Visit 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.