

# CABINET

## MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

29 September 2008

The meeting commenced at 9.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond) - In the Chair

Councillors: Gerard Hall (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder),  
Peter Jackson (Neighbourhoods & Communities Portfolio Holder),  
Victor Tumilty (Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio Holder),

Officers: Paul Walker (Chief Executive)  
Andrew Atkin (Assistant Chief Executive)  
Nicola Bailey (Director of Adult and Community Services)  
Adrienne Simcock (Director of Children's Services)  
Dave Stubbs (Director of Neighbourhood Services)  
Peter Devlin (Chief Solicitor)  
Alison Mawson (Head of Community Safety and Prevention)  
Peter Gouldsbro (Community Safety Officer)  
Alistair Rae (Public Relations Manager)  
James Walsh (Scrutiny Support Officer)  
Denise Wimpenny (Principal Democratic Services Officer)

### Also present:

Councillor Jonathan Brash, Chair of Health Scrutiny Forum  
Councillor Shaun Cook, Chair of Regeneration and Planning  
Services Scrutiny Forum  
Councillor Chris Simmons, Chair of Adult and Community  
Services Scrutiny Forum

## **108. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Pamela Hargreaves, Deputy Mayor, Cath Hill, Children's Services Portfolio Holder and Robbie Payne, Finance & Efficiency Portfolio Holder.

## **109. Declarations of interest by members**

None

## **110. Inquorate Meeting**

It was noted that the meeting was not quorate. The Mayor indicated that (as permitted under the Local Government Act 2000 and the Constitution) he would exercise his powers of decision and that he would do so in accordance with the wishes of the Members present, indicated in the usual way. Each of the decisions set out in the decision record were confirmed by the Mayor accordingly.

## **111. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2008**

Confirmed.

## **112. Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Final Report** *(Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum)*

### **Type of decision**

Non key

### **Purpose of report**

To present the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision'.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum presented the report which outlined the overall aim of the investigation, terms of reference, methods of investigation findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

The Mayor suggested that this item of business be discussed following the presentation of the Action Plan for CCTV Provision under Minute Number 113. Accordingly, details of discussion were included in Minute No 113 below.

### **Decision**

The decision was set out in Minute No 113 below.

## **113. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision - Action Plan**

*(Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings and subsequent recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The Head of Community Safety and Prevention presented a proposed Action Plan, attached at Appendix A to the report, relating to the implementation of the proposed recommendations in response to the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision

During discussions regarding the recommendations and action plan the Mayor requested feedback from a recent viewpoint survey regarding the public's perception of CCTV provision. The Head of Community Safety and Prevention reported that 93% of responses received indicated support for CCTV. There was a general feeling that cameras made people feel safer and more than half considered that the police and local businesses should contribute to running costs. Whilst one third of those surveyed considered that the Council should continue to provide the service, a quarter indicated that the police should be responsible.

The Head of Community Safety and Prevention provided clarification on a number of technical and cost issues raised by Members. The need to explore the possibility of monitoring cameras on behalf of the private sector to assist with income generation was suggested for consideration by the relevant Portfolio as well as close liaison with the police to identify hot spot areas.

The Mayor expressed some concern regarding the recommendation that a trial of talking cameras in Church Street/York Road be explored. Discussion ensued with regard to the advantages and disadvantages of talking cameras, monitoring and linkages costs and the success rates in Middlesbrough as a result of talking cameras.

Following discussion regarding the costs of implementing each recommendation, it was requested that the draft CCTV Strategy should include details of the costs of implementing each recommendation for resubmission to Cabinet by the end of the year.

## Decision

- (i) That the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, as set out below, be endorsed with the addition that costs of implementing each recommendation be included in the draft CCTV Strategy, referred to in recommendation (h), for resubmission to Cabinet by the end of the year.
- (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 had provided evidence that had resulted in a conviction;
  - (iii) Cleveland Police – As the major user of the Community CCTV system in Hartlepool; and
  - (iv) Local Businesses – Where cameras were 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 continued 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 was laid, suitable to carry the Authority's fibre optic cables;
- (e) That before Community CCTV cameras were commissioned, decommissioned or relocated, an assessment be 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 resubmitted to Cabinet incorporating the agreed recommendations from this enquiry.
- (ii) That the Action Plan in response to the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision, be approved, subject to the amendment to recommendation (h) as outlined above.

## **114. Formal Response to Departmental Structures and Efficiencies Referral** (*Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

The present the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's formal response to the Departmental Structures and Efficiencies Referral.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The Chair of the Health Scrutiny Forum, Councillor Jonathan Brash and Chair of the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum, Councillor Chris Simmons presented the formal response of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee in relation to the Departmental and Efficiencies Referral.

Members attention was drawn to the following summary of the formal response as set out in Section 3 of the report:-

- (a) That Members are not, in principle, against an efficiency saving proposal at Director level but feel the timing of this particular proposal is inappropriate in view of the Business Transformation Programme being in its early stages. Whilst the Committee strongly recognises the need to make efficiency savings, it is felt that the projected savings to be generated in year three are unlikely to materialise;
- (b) Members are of the opinion that reviewing the Directors posts in isolation could lead to an increase in the salaries of the Assistant Directors due to their potentially increased responsibilities: this does not appear to have been factored into the Chief Executive's proposal;
- (c) Members regret that a review of top tier of management was not included in the current business transformation programme undertaken by KPMG. The committee are of the view that any future review of the Council's top management structure should be undertaken by an independent body to remove the pecuniary interest of key individuals;

- (d) That the Chief Executive should embark upon his planned cultural change within the senior management of the Council. A direction of travel should be established to move Directors to focus more on strategic planning and to be less involved in day to day operational matters;
- (e) 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 in line with the Council's current policies and procedures;
- (f) That although only the Elected Mayor's role is recognised by statute; in practice it was felt that such duties / responsibilities of the role are often devolved to individual Cabinet Members, in particular to that of the Deputy Mayor. As such Members support the Chief Executive's proposal to review the Mayoral role on the basis that all Cabinet Members are included;
- (g) Members were concerned that to instigate two transformation programmes one at Director level and one across the Council, using different methodology could result in neither programme achieving their full potential;
- (h) That overall the proposals put forward by the Chief Executive have not proved sufficiently persuasive to receive the support of the Scrutiny process.

In response to the Mayor's request for clarification on the reasons why the Committee felt that projected savings were unlikely to materialise, Councillor Brash advised that the Committee were unable to predict if there would be savings as there was some ambiguity with regard to the changing role at Director and Assistant Director level in terms of responsibility which could lead to an increase in salaries. It was also considered that there would be an adverse impact on the stability of departments.

Following discussion regarding Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's concerns that a review of top tier management was not included in the current business transformation programme, the Chief Executive added that KPMG had recommended a reduction in the number of his direct reports and that his original report to Cabinet stated that the proposed management structures would form an integral part of the business transformation programme.

With regard to the suggestion that any future review of the Council's top management structure should be undertaken by an independent body to remove the pecuniary interest of key individuals, the Mayor expressed concerns regarding this suggestion and stated that it was the Chief Executive's responsibility, and within the Chief Executive's remit, to conduct any senior management review.

Discussion ensued in relation to the roles and responsibilities of the Elected Mayor and Cabinet Members and how the proposal to review the Mayoral role would be conducted. The Mayor acknowledged the benefits of the proposal and indicated his intention to implement an independent review of the role of Mayor, Deputy Mayor and all other Members of Cabinet.

A Member commented on the effects of reorganisation on staff and highlighted that assurances should be given that the business transformation programme was to achieve efficiency savings and was not intended to be a full departmental restructure.

### **Decision**

Cabinet noted the formal response of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to the Departmental Structures and Efficiencies referral as outlined in Section 3 of the report.

The meeting concluded at 10.00 am.

**P J DEVLIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 3 OCTOBER 2008**