

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE AGENDA



Friday 26th September 2008

at 2.30 pm

in The Council Chamber
Civic Centre, Hartlepool

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE :

Councillors Akers-Belcher, Atkinson, Brash, R W Cook, S Cook, James, Kaiser, London, A Marshall, McKenna, Preece, Richardson, Shaw, Simmons, Wright and Young

Resident Representatives: Christopher Akers-Belcher, 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 19th September 2008 (*to follow*)

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**

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

No Items

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

9. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

9.1 Scrutiny Investigation into Kerbside Recycling Scheme Referral – Scoping Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

9.2 Scrutiny Investigation into Kerbside Recycling Scheme Referral:-

(a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*;

(b) Setting the Scene Presentation – *Director of Neighbourhood Services*; and

(c) Verbal Evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities.

10. **CALL-IN REQUESTS**

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

FOR INFORMATION

Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday, 8th October 2008 at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

19 September 2008

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Stephen Akers-Belcher, Reuben Atkinson, Jonathan Brash, Rob W Cook, Shaun Cook, Frances London, Ann Marshall, Arthur Preece, Carl Richardson, Chris Simmons and Edna Wright.

Resident Representatives:

Christopher Akers-Belcher and Iris Ryder.

Officers:

Mike Ward, Chief Financial Officer
Joanne Machers, Chief Personnel Officer
Keith Smith, Head of Finance and Development, Neighbourhood Services
John Robinson, Children's Fund Manager
Georgina Taylor, Principal HR Officer
Sajda Banaras, Strategy and Development Officer
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also Present: Councillor Caroline Barker

Edwin Jeffries, UNISON

44. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stan Kaiser, Jane Shaw and David Young and resident representative Linda Shields. Apologies for absence were also received from Councillors Pamela Hargreaves, Portfolio Holder for Performance and Councillor Robbie Payne, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency.

45. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

46. Minutes of the meetings held on 8 August and 5 September 2008

Confirmed.

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

None.

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

None.

49. Forward Plan

None.

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

None.

51. Departmental Structures and Efficiencies Referral: Feedback from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees *(Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees)*

The Scrutiny Manager introduced the report which provided the collective views of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the four standing Scrutiny Forums (with the exception of the Health Scrutiny Forum), following their recent consideration of the Chief Executive's Departmental Structures and Efficiencies proposal. Members formally expressed their disappointment at the non-attendance of the Chief Executive and key officers at their last evidence gathering meeting held on 5 September 2008 and as such a written explanation had been sought by the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee from the Chief Executive. Members' attention was drawn to a letter from the Chief Executive sent to the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee which included an explanation of why he and a number of his Chief Officers were unable to attend the meeting held on 5 September 2008. As a consequence of the non-attendance of the Chief Executive and key officers, the feedback submitted to this Committee was based mainly on the evidence received prior to the 5 September 2008.

Members were of the view that the restructure proposals submitted had been poorly thought out and were proposed to be implemented at an inappropriate time. There was also concern that should the 3-year savings not be realised, the 3-year review of the structure may result in a return to 5

departments with an increase in top level salaries.

Summarised within the report was the collective feedback to the Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committees in relation to the Chief Executive's Departmental Structures and Efficiencies proposals. Members considered each point within the report in turn and made the following comments and amendments.

- (a) *That Members were not against the proposals but feel the timing was not right hence the proposals should be delayed on the basis that the Council needed a clearer understanding of the work of KPMG together with its likely impact and associated implications.* Members felt that the reference to KPMG was confusing as they had not been given the opportunity to consider KPMG's report and it had been made clear by the Chief Executive that this was a completely separate issue. Although Members were not against a proposal which would result in efficiencies, it was suggested that an independent organisation be procured to provide a more objective view. Members were of the opinion that the proposals could be challenged in relation to the degree of self interest of the Chief Executive and added that a 'gamekeeper/poacher' principle would not be tolerated.
- (b) *That Members strongly recognise the need to make efficiency savings and draw attention to the potential cashable efficiencies of between £6-12m arising from the work of KPMG against the very small projected saving from the restructure proposal.* Members added that whilst the need for efficiency savings was recognised, £300k over 3 years was not a strong enough reason for all the disruption that would be caused during the implementation of this proposal. It was suggested that point a) and b) be combined.
- (c) *That as part of KPMG's original brief, a review of the Council's top management structure should have been included, as part of the Business Transformation Programme.* It was suggested that any future examination of the Council's structure at Director level be undertaken by an independent organisation.
- (d) *That Cabinet should consider any savings achieved under the Business Transformation process being returned to the Council's General Fund.* It was suggested that this point be reworded to state that Cabinet should 'ensure' any savings achieved were returned to the General Fund.
- (e) *That the Chief Executive should embark upon a cultural change within the senior management of the Council. A direction of travel should be established to move the role of Directors to a more strategic planning role and Assistant Directors to operational management.*
- (f) *That to assist the Council in responding to the likely retirement of some but not all of the Directors during the next five years, the concept of succession planning should be further explored.* It was noted that the Council did have a policies and procedures in place to implement succession planning and it was suggested that this should be strictly adhered to.
- (g) *That whilst it was acknowledged that the Elected Mayor's role was only recognised by statute, that should the Elected Mayor's role be reviewed*

as part of the Chief Executive's proposals, that of the Deputy Mayor's role should also be included due to the significant level of responsibility in the absence of the Elected Mayor. Members suggested that due to the delegation of the Mayor's statutory responsibility to all Executive Members, any review should be undertaken collectively across the whole Executive and incorporate all elements of decision making.

- (h) *That Members were of the view that by reviewing the Directors posts in isolation will lead to an increase in the salaries of the Assistant Directors through enhanced responsibilities and this will absorb, if not all, any savings to be made, proving extremely difficult for Councillors to justify to the public.*
- (i) *That concern was expressed regarding the short time span for the consideration of the Chief Executive's proposals. The Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee thanked all scrutiny Members for their participation in this enquiry, including attending additional meetings, to enable the tight timescale prescribed by the Executive to be complied with.*
- (j) *That the proposals put forward by the Chief Executive had not proved sufficiently persuasive, particularly as the savings predicted were significantly lower than those that could be achieved through the Business Transformation Programme. Members added that the current proposals could be challenged fairly easily and that the point should be reworded to indicate that any savings would be relatively smaller than those achieved through the Business Transformation programme not significantly lower.*

Overall Members felt that the enquiry had been hampered by the absence of senior officers when the whole process had been meticulously planned due to the prescribed tight timescale. All Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, with one exception, approved the formal response with the inclusion of the comments noted above.

To enable the submission of Scrutiny's formal response to Cabinet on 29 September, in line with the agreed timetable, delegated authority was sought for the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to approve and make the necessary amendments to the content of the report to reflect the spirit of the discussion at this meeting.

Recommendation

- (i) That the formal response to Cabinet be compiled to include the above comments.
- (ii) That delegated authority be granted to the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to approve and make the necessary amendments to the content of the formal response to reflect the spirit of the discussion at this meeting, to enable its submission to the Cabinet on 29 September 2008 in accordance with the agreed timescale.

52. Revenue Outturn Report 2007/2008 *(Chief Financial Officer)*

The Chief Financial Officer presented a report which provided details of the Council's 2007/2008 Revenue Outturn. This report had been submitted to Cabinet on 27 May 2008 and was attached as Appendix 1. It was noted that this was a detailed and comprehensive report and the Chief Financial Officer highlighted several areas within the report.

A number of queries were raised, the main issues being:

- (i) Members were concerned at the level of school balances and a further report was requested to provide details of the balances across all schools.
- (ii) Further information was sought on the progress made in relation to Clavering play area.
- (iii) Clarification was sought on the location of the skateboard park referred to in the report.
- (iv) An update was requested on the operation of the Raby Road puffin crossing.

Recommendation

- (i) That the report was noted.
- (ii) That the Chief Financial Officer provide a written response outlining the additional information requested above, direct to Members.

53. NRF, Capital and Accountable Body Programme Outturn Report 2007/2008 *(Chief Financial Officer)*

The Chief Financial Officer presented a report which detailed outturn reports for Capital for each Portfolio along with outturns for the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and the spending programmes where the Council acted as the Accountable Body. The report followed the format adopted for previous reports, which allowed each Portfolio Holder to readily review the outturn for their area of responsibility. The detailed and comprehensive report had been submitted to Cabinet on 18 August 2008 and was attached as Appendix 1.

A Member sought clarification on the expenditure allocated against the Single Regeneration Budget. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that although the scheme had finished, not all expenditure had been incurred and details of this would be incorporated into the written response to all Members' queries raised at this meeting.

Recommendation

- (i) That the report was noted.
- (ii) That the above query be incorporated into the Chief Financial Officer's

written response.

54. Quarter 1 – Corporate Plan and Revenue Financial Management Report 2008/2009 *(Chief Financial Officer)*

The Assistant Chief Executive presented a report which provided details of the progress against the Council's overall revenue budget for 2008/2009. The report included financial information for Quarter 1 and a report on the progress against Performance Indicators and actions for 2008/2009 would be presented in October 2008. A detailed and comprehensive report was submitted to Cabinet on 18 August 2008 and was attached as Appendix 1.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (i) Clarification was sought on the Home to School Transport provision and a detailed breakdown of the costs, including any subsidised provision with commercial companies, was also requested. Members were concerned that the financial support in relation to transport and uniforms was not being provided for the parents of children displaced by the closure of Brierton and clarification was sought on this issue and how many families had been denied this support. The Chief Financial Officer would include details on this issue within his written response to Members.
- (ii) A Member sought clarification on the refund received in relation to energy costs and whether this was used to off-set the highways budget deficit. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that this refund was calculated on the number of bulk purchases of energy undertaken by the Council and although would be used to off-set overspends, was not ring fenced to the Highways budget.
- (iii) Further information was requested on the information systems used to collate budget monitoring information across the authority. The Chief Financial Officer informed Members that the current financial management system used across the authority was the Integra Financial Management System which automatically recorded the payments of invoices to budget areas to facilitate regular budget monitoring. The effectiveness of this system was questioned in view of the fact that overspends did occur. The Chief Financial Officer commented that there was a facility within the Integra system to suspend any payments should sufficient budget not be available. Although this facility was currently being examined, it was acknowledged that some areas of expenditure could not be included within this facility due to the statutory nature of the expenditure.
- (iv) There was concern that it was proposed to use General Fund Balances to write off some areas of overspend and Members were of the view that where a budget reached 80% expenditure, this should be highlighted to the manager of that budget or that any authorisation to overspend on a particular budget should only be given by the Chief Financial Officer. Members were asked to be minded of this issue when involved in the budget process consultation.

Recommendation

- (i) That the report was noted.
- (ii) That the above query be incorporated into the Chief Financial Officer's written response.

55. Quarter 1 – WNF, Capital and Accountable Body Programme Monitoring Report 2008/2009 *(Chief Financial Officer)*

The Chief Financial Officer presented a report which provided details of the progress against the Council's overall Capital budget for 2008/2009, the Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF) and the Spending Programme where the Council acts as the Accountable Body. A detailed and comprehensive report was submitted to Cabinet on 18 August 2008 and was attached as Appendix 1.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues.

- (i) The WNF was government funding targeted at jobs and economy in the area and Members questioned whether this fund was being correctly managed in view of the fact that the whole NRF programme had been rolled into the first year of the WNF. The Chief Financial Officer commented that the WNF was incorporated within the Area Based Grant and that this money was not ring-fenced and that the allocation of the WNF would be considered as part of the budget proposals for 2009/10.
- (ii) Clarification was sought on what was included within the capital projects in the Rift House areas referred to in Appendix I. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that this would be included within his written response to Members.
- (iii) Reference was made to Appendix H and whether any funding had been included for potential vandalism and security costs associated with the Rift House Nursery development. A Member also requested clarification on whether any consultation had been undertaken with neighbours and whether the true value for the site had been realised. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that this would be included within his written response to Members.
- (iv) A Member sought clarification on where the funding for neighbourhood policing was identified. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that this would be included within his written response.
- (v) An explanation was sought on the term DDA and SCRAP. The Chief Financial Officer informed Members that SCRAP was Strategic Capital Resource Allocation Project Team and included the Assistant Chief Financial Officer and Head of Procurement, Property Services and Public Protection. This Group looked at various buildings and allocated expenditure where necessary to ensure that buildings complied with the Disability Discrimination Act. A list of buildings

- adapted using this funding allocation would be provided to Members.
- (vi) It was noted that there was an allocation of £2m as a contribution to the H2O project and clarification was sought on where the interest of this budget was being allocated. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that the £2m was included within the projected capital programme budget and not in actual cash terms.
 - (vii) A Member sought an explanation of how the three neighbourhood forum area budgets were calculated as they were all different. The Chief Financial Officer indicated this information would be included within his written response.

Recommendation

- (i) That the report was noted.
- (ii) That the areas of clarification sought by Members be included within the Chief Financial Officer's written response.

56. Scrutiny Investigation into the Use of Agency Workers within the Council (*Scrutiny Manager/Chief Personnel Officer*)

The Chief Personnel Officer was in attendance to deliver a 'Setting the Scene' presentation as part of the Committee's ongoing investigation into the Use of Agency Workers within the Council. The presentation highlighted four options for Members' consideration in relation to the future use of agency workers.

The Portfolio Holders for Performance and Finance and Efficiency had also been invited but due to previously arranged work commitments had to submit their apologies. The Chair of the Committee informed Members that the Portfolio Holder for Performance had submitted a letter to the Committee which requested that Members give consideration to the modern apprenticeship scheme operated by the Council and how many young people leave the employ of the authority once the 3-year training and development scheme was complete.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues.

- (i) A Member questioned whether the expenditure within departmental budgets included the costs for agency workers? The Chief Financial Officer indicated that agency workers costs were not included within the staffing budgets as they were not employees of the Council. However, the costs were allocated to an appropriate cost code within the departmental budget.
- (ii) Members were concerned that in some departments, agency workers had been employed for a number of years without any monitoring of their employment in place. It also appeared that agency workers were paid a higher rate of pay which had impacted on staff morale. The Chief Personnel Officer commented that the length of time any agency

workers were employed was difficult to quantify as this was not monitored. Although it was acknowledged that the employment of agency workers did impact on staff morale, agency workers tended not to be paid more, the increased hourly rate was inclusive of the cost of the agency. Members were asked to note that a procurement exercise was currently being undertaken and it was hoped that a new HR information technology system would be in place from July 2009 which would enable agency workers to be included within employee monitoring procedures.

- (iii) Clarification was sought on what audit trails were in place for the use of agency workers. The Chief Personnel Officer indicated that there was a monitoring system in place through the appropriate procurement arrangements, although this was mainly to monitor the financial arrangements.
- (iv) A breakdown by department was requested on what roles were covered by agency workers including comparisons of hourly rates paid to permanent employees in the same position. The Chief Personnel Officer indicated that it would be difficult to ascertain the hourly rate the agency worker was paid as invoices stated the agency's hourly rate. However, it was suggested that a random sample of 2 or 3 invoices for agency workers, including comparable hourly rates of permanent employees, be provided for Members to give an idea of the costs involved.
- (v) The Trades Union representative informed Members that the Trades Union recognised the need for agency workers and were seeking equality for those workers. However, it was acknowledged that long term use of agency workers could have a detrimental affect on permanent staff and service provision.
- (vi) There was concern that such a large expenditure was not monitored. Members were informed that the expenditure incurred through the employment of agency workers was monitored through departmental budget monitoring arrangements, although the individual agency workers were not monitored through the HR policies and procedures as they were not employees of the Council.
- (vii) Further information was requested by Members on the process involved in employing agency workers, the recruitment and retention policy and how current employees were trained and redeployed to prevent gaps in service provision. Additional information was also requested detailing how many modern apprentices have been unable to gain permanent employment within the Council over the last 2 years once their 3-year scheme of training and development was complete.
- (viii) Reference had been made during the presentation to the Council operating its own agency including casual registers and Members were generally supportive of this option and requested further information on this.
- (ix) It was suggested that the Head of Procurement, Property Services and Public Protection be invited to a future meeting to discuss the procurement issues around the employment of agency workers.

Recommendation

- (i) That the report was noted.
- (ii) That the additional information requested by Members as detailed above be provided to the next meeting of the Committee.

57. Final Report – Hartlepool Borough Council's Community Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Provision *(Chair of Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum)*

The report was submitted which presented the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's findings following completion of its investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision'.

The report detailed evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations to the Cabinet as follows:-

- (a) That contributions to the operating costs of the Council's Community CCTV system be explored with:-
 - (i) Safer Hartlepool Partnership – Contribution towards the annual monitoring costs as part of their mission statement towards a safer Hartlepool;
 - (ii) Court Costs – Where Community CCTV cameras have provided evidence that has resulted in a conviction;
 - (iii) Cleveland Police – As the major user of the Community CCTV system in Hartlepool; and
 - (iv) Local Businesses – Where cameras are in existence, a business case be presented highlighting the pre-emptive and reactive benefits of the CCTV cameras, value for money and the number of arrests achieved.
- (b) That a detailed exercise be undertaken to calculate the costs of bringing the monitoring provision 'in-house' together with the feasibility of co-location with Cleveland Police;
- (c) That consideration be given to the future tendering for the monitoring of the Community CCTV camera system, to ensure that the Council continues to receive best value;
- (d) That as major building developments take place in Hartlepool (e.g. Victoria Harbour), contractors be obligated to ensure that a network of ducting is laid, suitable to carry the Authority's fibre optic cables;

- (e) That before Community CCTV cameras are commissioned, decommissioned or relocated, an assessment is made of the merits and appropriateness of the installation, by consulting local residents, police, Ward Councillors, community groups and utilising redeployable cameras to monitor crime levels;
- (f) That a trial of 'Talking Cameras' in Church Street / York Road be explored;
- (g) That a planned series of public events highlighting the importance of the Community CCTV Cameras be arranged;
- (h) That following Cabinet's consideration of this Final Report, the Draft CCTV Strategy be re-submitted to the Cabinet incorporating the agreed recommendations from this enquiry.

Recommendation

That the report be endorsed and submitted to Cabinet for consideration.

58. Request for Items for Discussion – Joint Cabinet/Scrutiny Meetings of 2 October 2008 *(Scrutiny Manager)*

Members were requested to suggest items for discussion as the next Joint Cabinet/Scrutiny Meeting to be held on 2 October 2008.

The following issues were suggested for inclusion:

- (i) Area Based Budget and what was included within this budget;
- (ii) The progress to date on the Tall Ships project.

Recommendation

That the above issues be put forward for discussion at the next meeting of the Joint Cabinet /Scrutiny Meeting to be held on 2 October 2008.

59. Call-In Requests

None.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm.

CHAIR

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

26 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: KERBSIDE RECYCLING SCHEME REFERRAL –
SCOPING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To make proposals to Members of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee for the undertaking of their referral into the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At a meeting of the Authority's Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio on 30 June 2008, the Portfolio Holder agreed to refer the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme to the Overview and Scrutiny Function, following recent concerns expressed by Elected Members. A prescribed timescale for the completion of the Referral was also agreed by the Portfolio Holder, concluding December 2008.
- 2.2 The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, at its meeting held on 4 July 2008, agreed that, due to the congested work programme of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum, that the referral be undertaken through a series of additional meetings by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, with involvement of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY REFERRAL

- 3.1 To gain an understanding of the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme and other recycling service provision, and to make suggestions for improvement, where possible.

4. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY REFERRAL

4.1 The following Terms of Reference for the investigation are proposed:-

- (a) To gain an understanding of the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme with reference to the current internal/external provision and containers used for kerbside collections;
- (b) To explore the Council's approach to on-street recycling such as litter and the provision of bring centres located throughout the town following the introduction of town wide kerbside recycling together with the recycling of waste from council buildings;
- (c) To explore the options available to the Council to work with the voluntary sector to improve the reuse of items collected from the bulky household waste collection service and the household waste recycling centre; and
- (d) To identify possible improvements to the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme, in particular for those residents living in sheltered accommodation, bed sits and flats.

5. POTENTIAL AREAS OF ENQUIRY/SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

5.1 Members of the Committee can request a range of evidential and comparative information throughout the Scrutiny Referral.

5.2 The Committee can invite a variety of people to attend to assist in the forming of a balanced and focused range of recommendations as follows:-

- (a) Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities
- (b) Director of Neighbourhood Services / Head of Neighbourhood Management; and
- (c) Residents of Hartlepool.

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY

6.1 Community engagement plays a crucial role in the Scrutiny process and paragraph 5.2 details who the Committee could involve. However, thought will need to be given to the structure in the way that the Committee wishes to encourage those views.

6.2 In addition, diversity issues have been considered in the background research for this enquiry under the Equality Standards for Local Government. As such the views of local diversity groups will be sought throughout the inquiry where felt appropriate and time allows. Consequently, consideration has been given as to how the views of people from minority communities of interest or

heritage (for example, people with disabilities, people with learning disabilities, people with mental health problems, black and minority ethnic people, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender people), which may not be gathered through the usual community engagement routes, can be included over the course of the inquiry.

7. REQUEST FOR FUNDING FROM THE DEDICATED OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BUDGET

- 7.1 Consideration has been given, through the background research for this scoping report, to the need to request funding from the dedicated Overview and Scrutiny budget to aid Members in their enquiry. At this stage no additional funding has been identified as being necessary to support Members in their investigation. Members, however, may wish to seek additional funding over the course of the investigation and the blank pro forma attached at **Appendix A** outlines the criteria on which a request to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will be judged.

8. PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF THE SCRUTINY REFERRAL

- 8.1 Detailed below is the proposed timetable for the undertaking of the referral which may be changed at any stage:-

26 September 2008 – Consideration of:-

- (i) Draft Scoping Report;
- (ii) ‘Setting the Scene’ Presentation (To be delivered by the Director of Neighbourhood Services and the Head of Neighbourhood Management); and
- (iii) Verbal evidence from the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder.

7 November 2008 – To consider the views of the residents of Hartlepool and to receive further evidence, yet to be identified.

28 November 2008 – To agree the content of the Draft Final Report before being presented to the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder.

18 December 2008 – Consideration of the Final Report at a Decision Making Meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder.

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Members are recommended to agree the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's remit for the undertaking of the mandatory referral as outlined in the report.

Contact Officer: - Joan Wilkins – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 284142
Email: joan.wilkins@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (i) Minutes of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 4 July 2008.

APPENDIX A

**PRO-FORMA TO REQUEST FUNDING TO SUPPORT
CURRENT SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION**

Title of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
Title of the current scrutiny investigation for which funding is requested:
To clearly identify the purpose for which additional support is required:
To outline indicative costs to be incurred as a result of the additional support:
To outline any associated timescale implications:
To outline the 'added value' that may be achieved by utilising the additional support as part of the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:

To outline any requirements / processes to be adhered to in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rules / Standing Orders:

To outline the possible disadvantages of not utilising the additional support during the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:

To outline any possible alternative means of additional support outside of this proposal:

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

26 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: KERBSIDE RECYCLING SCHEME REFERRAL –
COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members that the Director of Neighbourhood Services will be in attendance at today's meeting to deliver a 'Setting the Scene' presentation to inform consideration of the kerbside recycling scheme referral. Verbal evidence is also to be provided (subject to availability) from the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 In accordance with the process outlined within the scoping report, considered earlier in this meeting, arrangements have been made for the Director of Neighbourhood Services to be in attendance at today's meeting to give a presentation providing an overview of the current operation of the Council's Kerbside Recycling Scheme.
- 2.2 In addition to the above, the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities has been invited to this meeting to provide verbal evidence in relation to the Council's current practice. During this evidence gathering session with the Authority's Portfolio Holder it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- (a) What is your role and responsibility in relation to Council's kerbside recycling scheme?;
 - (b) What is your view on the Council's current approach to kerbside recycling?; and
 - (c) What areas of improvement if any, would you suggest in relation to the Council's current kerbside recycling scheme?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members note the content of the covering report and presentation of the Director of Neighbourhood Services, together with the verbal evidence of the Council's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities.

Contact Officer:- Joan Wilkins – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 284142
Email: joan.wilkins@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (i) Minutes of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 4 July 2008; and
- (ii) Kerbside Recycling Scheme Referral –Scoping Report (Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee – 26 September 2008)