

# **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA**



**Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> August 2010**

**at 4.30 pm**

**in Committee Room B,  
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Barclay, Cook, Fleet, Flintoff, Gibbon, Griffin, McKenna, Richardson and Thomas

Resident Representatives:

John Cambridge, Brenda Loynes 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 7<sup>th</sup> July 2010

**4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

No items.

**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. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- 7.1 Scrutiny Investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures – Scoping Report - *Scrutiny Support Officer*

**8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN**

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

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- i) Date of Next Meeting Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> September 2010, commencing at 4.30 pm in Committee Room B

# **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

## **MINUTES**

7 July 2010

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

Councillor: Stephen Thomas (In the Chair)

Councillors: Alan Barclay, Rob Cook, Mary Fleet, Bob Flintoff, Steve Gibbon,  
Sheila Griffin and Carl Richardson

Peter Jackson, Transport and Neighbourhoods Portfolio Holder

### **Resident Representatives:**

John Cambridge, Brenda Loynes and Iris Ryder

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods  
Denise Ogden, Assistant Director  
Mike Blair, Highways Traffic and Transportation Manager  
Adrian Hurst, Principal Environmental Health Officer  
Paul Hurwood, Climate Change Officer  
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Elaine Hind, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

## **1. Chair's Thanks**

The Chair expressed his thanks to the former Chair of the Forum, Councillor Stephen Akers-Belcher, for his hard work and commitment as Chair over the years.

## **2. Apologies for Absence**

None

## **3. Declarations of interest by Members**

None

## **4. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2010**

Confirmed

**5. Portfolio Holders Response to the Possible Environmental Impacts of Dust Deposits on the Headland and Surrounding Areas** *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods)*

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods stated that Cabinet had approved the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into the possible environmental impacts of dust deposits on the headland and surrounding areas with the exception of the request for a statutory nuisance claim to be pursued. It was noted that this request was against professional advice backed up with a further recommendation that the Council lobby the Member of Parliament for Hartlepool and Secretary of State for Environment for the environment to change the statutory nuisance law. This issue would be revisited in 6 months time in view of the new monitoring arrangements to be implemented.

Appendix A to the report set out the proposed actions to be taken in relation to each of the specific recommendations.

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods gave an overview of the actions being taken on the recommendations as set out on the Action Plan attached to the report.

During the discussion that followed a Resident Representative requested a copy of the toxicology reports to which the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods advised that the reports had previously been provided, however, a further copy would be circulated under separate cover following the meeting.

With regard to recommendation (f) that the Council explore the option of moving the scrap metal and all cargoes, Members were advised that this was currently being examined, progress of which would be regularly reported to the Forum and local residents.

In relation to the location of the new monitoring station, it was reported that the most appropriate location would be determined by the Principal Environmental Health Officer in consultation with local residents.

Residents, who were in attendance at the meeting, invited new Members of the Forum to observe the damage to their homes. Any such visits would be co-ordinated by the Scrutiny Team.

**Recommendation**

That the proposed actions, attached at Appendix A, be noted.

## **6. Portfolio Holders Response to the Investigation into Car Parking on Estates in Hartlepool** *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods)*

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods stated that Cabinet had approved, in their entirety, the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into car parking on estates in Hartlepool. Appendix A to the report set out the Executive's response and proposed action to be taken in relation to each of the specific recommendations.

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods gave an overview of the actions being taken on the recommendations as set out on the Action Plan attached to the report.

With regard to recommendation (a), the Transport and Neighbourhoods Portfolio Holder referred to the financial implications of extending the enforcement hours of resident parking schemes and indicated that this could only be recovered through increased permit charges.

### **Recommendation**

That the proposed actions, attached at Appendix A, be noted.

## **7. Portfolio Holders Response to the Investigation into Climate Change and Carbon Management** *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods)*

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods stated that Cabinet had approved, in their entirety, the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into climate change and carbon management with the addition of the following additional recommendation:-

- (k) That officers explore the feasibility of requesting firms who submit tenders to include information on the carbon footprint of the works being tendered for.

Appendix A to the report set out the Executive's response and proposed actions to be taken in relation to each of the specific recommendations.

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods gave an overview of the actions being taken on the recommendations as set out on the Action Plan attached to the report.

With regard to recommendation (g), a Member queried the timescale for

holding meetings in smaller rooms to which the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods reported that a common sense approach was being adopted in relation to meeting room venues with the Democratic Services and Scrutiny teams addressing this issue in respect of formal Council meetings.

The Forum discussed the introduction of electrical vehicles, the potential use of electrical charging points and the proposed actions to be taken to promote cycling initiatives to the public and workforce. In response to a request for clarification, the Director provided details of the cycle salary sacrifice scheme.

### **Recommendation**

That the proposed actions, attached at Appendix A, be noted.

## **8. Consideration of requests for Scrutiny Reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee**

None

## **9. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents**

None

## **10. The Role of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum** *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer submitted a brief report outlining the background to the approach to overview and scrutiny in the Council. The key roles of Scrutiny were detailed as:

- Policy development and review
- Scrutiny
- Finance

The functions of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee was set out with a detailed description of the role and functions of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum. The report highlighted that the strategic direction of the Scrutiny Forums was to assess, monitor and advise on the Council's progress towards the seven priority aims. The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's remit was to consider issues relating to property, technical services, environmental services, emergency planning, public protection and housing. A schedule of the Forum's meeting dates was also included in the report.

### **Recommended**

That the report, be noted.

## **11. Determining the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's Work Programme for 2010/11** *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Chair presented a report that requested the Forum to identify a Work Programme for the 2010/11 Municipal Year, together with a timeframe for each review, for consideration by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 23 July 2010.

As such the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods, the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods and the Corporate Plan had been the foundation sources for the report to enable the Forum to compile its Work Programme.

From these sources and suggestions received by the Scrutiny Team from Elected Members the following list of potential subjects for investigation had been identified:-

- i) Integrated Transport Provision in Hartlepool
- ii) Foreshore Management
- iii) Maintenance of Hartlepool's Traffic Lights
- iv) 20s Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures
- v) Dog Control Orders
- vi) Landlord Accreditation Scheme

In addition, Members were reminded that budget and policy framework items relating to the 2010/11 budget and 2010/11 Corporate Plan would be presented to the Forum during the course of the year, an estimated timetable of which was set out in the report.

In setting the Work Programme for 2010/11, Members were requested to consider the information detailed in the report together with any individual Members' identified topics. The Forum was referred to Appendices G and H which detailed the relevant sections of the Corporate Plan as a potential area for consideration.

Members were advised that it was envisaged that the Forum would also be involved in Business Transformation - Service Delivery Options (SDO's), the process for which was to be determined by Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee. The Forum was reminded to be cautious in setting an overly ambitious work programme and it was recommended that a maximum of two topics should be considered for investigation.

The Forum debated the topics for possible inclusion within the 2010/11 work programme during which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) With regard to the Landlord Accreditation Scheme, it was pointed out that an investigation into this issue had previously been

undertaken. Members were of the view that whilst this issue required further examination it was not appropriate to undertake a further investigation at this stage given the other issues the Forum would be involved with. However, the Chair requested that regular progress reports be provided in this regard.

- (ii) In response to a Member's comments on the benefits of investigating the integrated transport system in view of the government's proposals to withdraw subsidy, the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods advised that if this issue was to be investigated it would need to be examined across the whole of Tees Valley. The possibility of revisiting this issue later in the year was suggested.
- (iii) The advantages of investigating 20s plenty and foreshore management were discussed whereupon it was suggested that these two topics be investigated in the 2010/11 municipal year commencing with 20s plenty.

### **Recommended**

That the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee be advised that the Forum wished to undertake the following investigations as part of its 2010/11 Work Programme:

- 20s Plenty
- Foreshore Management

## **12. Issues Identified from Forward Plan**

None

## **13. Date and Time of Next Meeting**

It was reported that the next meeting would be held at 4.30 pm on Wednesday 4 August 2010.

The meeting concluded at 5.40 pm.

CHAIR



## NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

4 August 2010



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO '20's PLENTY – TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES' – SCOPING REPORT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To make proposals to Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum for their forthcoming investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures'.
- 1.2 At the time of writing this report, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee had not yet considered / approved the Forum's work programme. Therefore, if the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee makes any amends / changes to the Forum's work programme, following consideration of it at their meeting of 23 July 2010, these will be reported verbally at this meeting.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Council's strategy for the implementation of traffic calming measures focuses on a desire to improve safety on the roads. Currently the Council utilises a variety of methods to calm traffic including speed humps, build outs, pedestrian islands, vehicle activation signs and speed cameras.
- 2.2 In December 2009, the Department for Transport revised the guidance set by the Government Circular 01/06 - Setting Local Speed Limits. It now recommends 20 mph speed limits for all roads which are primarily residential in nature and in town and city streets where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high. For example, around schools, shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas which are not part of any major through route.
- 2.3 A national campaign run by the organisation 20's Plenty for Us supports those communities wishing to implement 20 mph as the default speed limit for all residential and town centre roads.

2.3 The following Local Authorities have all initiated a policy of implementing an authority wide 20 mph speed limit for residential roads:-

- (a) Portsmouth was the first city to implement 20 mph across all residential roads. This was started in 2007 and completed in May 2008 over 5 phases. There was much public engagement with leaflets going out to all families in each phased area.
- (b) Norwich City Council voted unanimously to implement 20 mph across the authority. Currently this is being trialled in a small number of roads.
- (c) Oxford City Council is currently going through public consultation on implementing 20 mph across the whole authority. There was considerable debate as to whether to include arterial roads as well.
- (d) Newcastle City Council after trialling advisory 20 mph speed limits, Newcastle City Council has decided that, on the basis of Portsmouth's results, it will convert the advisory 20 mph schemes into mandatory limits.
- (e) Leicester has made a decision to gradually roll-out 20 mph across the whole town over the next 5 years.
- (f) Warrington is already piloting an authority-wide implementation by means of an experimental traffic order on 147 roads.
- (g) Bristol is planning 20 mph as the default across a third of the city.
- (h) Islington is the first London Borough to set in place a budget for the implementation of 20 mph across the whole borough.
- (i) Colchester is investigating all of its residential streets being set a speed of 20mph.
- (j) Southwark is now 'infilling' any residential streets not already set at 20 mph.
- (k) Wirral announced in February 2010 that it will be phasing in 20 mph on all its residential streets.

2.4 Due to the current economic climate and the financial constraints on the provision of services it is important to consider how the effectiveness and efficiency of services can be improved and delivered at a reduced financial cost.

### **3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION/ENQUIRY**

3.1 To explore the way forward for the provision of traffic calming measures in Hartlepool.

#### **4. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION/ENQUIRY**

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

- (a) To gain an understanding of how traffic calming is implemented in Hartlepool and the legislative and policy requirements;
- (b) To gain an understanding of the types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used nationally and locally;
- (c) To explore how traffic calming could be undertaken in Hartlepool in the future utilising innovative solutions, including 20's Plenty as a possible alternative to physical measures; and
- (d) To gain an understanding of the impact of current and future budget pressures on the way in which traffic calming is provided in Hartlepool;
- (e) To explore how traffic calming could be provided in the future, giving due regard to:-
  - (i) Improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the way in which the service is currently provided; and
  - (ii) If / how the service could be provided at a reduced financial cost (within the resources available in the current economic climate).

#### **5. POTENTIAL AREAS OF ENQUIRY / SOURCES OF EVIDENCE**

5.1 Members of the Forum can request a range of evidential and comparative information throughout the Scrutiny review.

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

- (a) Member of Parliament for Hartlepool;
- (b) Elected Mayor;
- (c) Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods;
- (d) Director / officers of the Council's Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department;
- (e) Ward Councillors;
- (f) Resident Representatives;

- (g) Appropriate national/regional organisations and partner agencies, i.e. The Department for Transport, emergency services, 20's Plenty for Us; AA, Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group; Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents, Road Safety North East; Institute of Advance Motorists; Tees Valley Safety Partnership;
- (h) Other Local Authorities as examples of good / alternative practice;
- (i) local bus operators and taxi drivers;
- (j) Local residents;
- (k) Local schools, hospitals and residential day care;
- (l) Representatives of minority communities of interest or heritage; and
- (m) Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

5.3 The Forum may also wish to refer to a variety of documentary / internet sources, key suggestions are as highlighted below:-

- (a) The Department for Transport – <http://www.dft.gov.uk>; and
- (b) 20's Plenty for Us - <http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk>

## 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT / DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY

6.1 Community engagement plays a crucial role in the Scrutiny process and diversity issues have been considered in the background research for this enquiry under the Equality Standards for Local Government. Based upon the research undertaken, paragraph 5.2 includes suggestions as to potential groups which the Forum may wish involve throughout the inquiry (where it is felt appropriate and time allows).

## 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. The pro forma attached at **Appendix A** outlines the criteria on which a request to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will be judged and has been completed by the Scrutiny Support Officer for consideration by this Forum. Members may wish to discuss the information in **Appendix A** in more detail and agree / amend the contents of this as part of the remit of their Scrutiny Investigation.

## 8. PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 8.1 Detailed below is the proposed timetable for the review to be undertaken, which may be changed at any stage:-

### 4 August 2010

To consider scoping report

### 15 September 2010

- 'Setting the Scene' - Report / presentation from the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department (*to cover Term of Reference (a)*) to include:-
  - (a) How traffic calming is implemented in Hartlepool; and
  - (b) The legislative and Policy requirements
- Evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods\*;
- Evidence from the Member of Parliament for Hartlepool, Iain Wright\*

\*Subject to availability

### October 2010

- Consult with Hartlepool's Neighbourhood Consultative Forums to gather views on the effectiveness of the existing traffic calming measures and how innovative solutions can be utilised

### 27 October 2010

Evidence gathering – Report / presentations:-

- From the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department on the types and effectiveness of the traffic calming measures used locally (*to cover term of reference (b)*);
- To hear the views of national, regional and partner organisations on:
  - (a) The types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used nationally (*to cover term of reference (b)*);
  - (b) How traffic calming could be undertaken in Hartlepool in the future utilising innovative solutions, including 20's Plenty as a possible alternative to physical measures (*to cover Term of Reference (c)*)

**November 2010 (dates to be confirmed)**

Site Visit to:-

- (a) 20mph zones / limits in Hartlepool
- (b) another local authority to examine their approach to traffic calming.  
Alternatively, Members may choose to invite Officers from other local authorities to a future meeting.

**10 November 2010**

- Feedback from the site visit or Forum to receive a report / presentation from another local authority on their approach to traffic calming and possible alternatives to physical measures including the financial implications (*to cover Terms of Reference (c) and (d)*)
- Feedback on the views gathered from the Consultative Forums
- Report / presentation from the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department on current and potential future budgetary restrictions (*to cover term of reference (d) and (e)*)

**19 January 2011** – Final Report

**28 January 2011** – Consideration of Final Report by the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee

**7 March 2011** – Consideration of Final Report by the Cabinet (tentative date)

**9. RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 Members are recommended to agree the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's remit of the Scrutiny investigation as outlined in paragraph 4.1.

**Contact Officer: - Laura Stones – Scrutiny Support Officer**  
Chief Executives Department – Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: - 01429 523087  
Email:- laura.stones@hartlepool.gov.uk

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

- (i) Department for Transport – A Safer Way – Consultation on Making Britain’s Roads the Safest in the World
- (ii) Department for Transport - Government Circular 01/06 - Setting Local Speed Limits
- (iii) 20’s Plenty for Us – The case for 20 mph as the default speed limit for residential roads – March 2009
- (iv) 20’s Plenty for Us – Information for Local Authorities regarding the Implications of 20 mph speed limits / zones – June 2010

## APPENDIX A

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

<p><b>Title of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</b></p> <p>Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum</p>
<p><b>Title of the current scrutiny investigation for which funding is requested:</b></p> <p>20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures</p>
<p><b>To clearly identify the purpose for which additional support is required:</b></p> <p>1) Site visit to 20mph zones / limits in Hartlepool</p> <p>2) Site visit to another local authority to identify best practice</p>
<p><b>To outline indicative costs to be incurred as a result of the additional support:</b></p> <p>TBC</p>
<p><b>To outline any associated timescale implications:</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that visits will be in November 2010</p>
<p><b>To outline the 'added value' that may be achieved by utilising the additional support as part of the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:</b></p> <p>Identification of best / alternative practice</p>



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

N/A

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

Unable to gather best / alternative practice evidence

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

Invite other local authorities to attend a meeting