

## **PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD**

14 September 2010

The meeting commenced at 3.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

**Present:**

Councillor Jonathan Brash (Performance Portfolio Holder)

Officers: Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive  
Joanne Machers, Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer  
Joanne Smithson, Head of Performance and Partnerships  
Lisa Anderson, Research Officer  
Julian Heward, Public Relations Officer  
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

### **12. Request for use of the Town Seal – Assistant Chief Executive**

**Type of Decision**

Non key.

**Purpose of Report**

To request the Portfolio Holder's approval in principle for the image of the Hartlepool Town Seal to be used as part of the naming of a train

**Issues for Consideration**

Earlier in the Summer the Hartlepool Mail ran a 'Name Our Train' competition, inviting Hartlepool school pupils to suggest a name for one of the Grand Central trains operating to and from London. The winning name – 'Hart of the North' – had been chosen, prompting the Hartlepool Mail to request permission of the Council to use the image of the Town Seal on the side of the train beside the winning name. This was felt to be a very positive use of the Town Seal to promote Hartlepool and its heritage. Officers were therefore recommending approval be given for this use, subject to the relevant legal agreements to ensure that the integrity of the seal is maintained at all times which were now in place. There would be no cost to the Council and no financial remuneration would be sought for its use.

The Portfolio Holder sought assurance that the seal could only be used on the designated train and could not be utilised by Grand Central or the Hartlepool Mail in any other way.. The Public Relations Officer confirmed this, advising that the agreement was between the Council and Grand Central for use on one

train and the Hartlepool Mail would have no usage rights. The Assistant Chief Executive added that whenever Grand Central used the seal they would be legally obliged to acknowledge this use

### **Decision**

That the use of the Town Seal on the side of the Grand Central train as part of the naming of the train be approved subject to the legal agreements referred to.

## **13. Review of Charges for CRB Admitted Bodies – Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer**

### **Type of Decision**

Non key

### **Purpose of Report**

To inform the Portfolio Holder of the outcome of a review of locally set charges associated with Criminal Record Bureau Checks undertaken for Admitted Bodies by Hartlepool Borough Council (Umbrella Body) and request approval to the scale of fees.

### **Issues for Consideration**

Hartlepool Borough Council is a registered body with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) meaning external bodies are able to use their services to act as an intermediary between them and the CRB. The Council are charged a monthly processing fee by the CRB for checks undertaken on their behalf. In addition the Council levy an additional administration charge on any external organisations ('Admitted Bodies') using this intermediary service. Current administration charges stand at £10.30 for someone in paid employment and £8.25 for volunteers. An enhanced CRB check costs a further £36 although this only applies to those in paid employment. It was now proposed to introduce a nominal one-off fee of £8 for external organisations to register as 'Admitted Bodies', covering the cost of providing a pack of information for organisers. It was also proposed to increase administration charges to £13 for CRB and Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) registration for those in paid employment and £10.50 for volunteers. There would be separate fees for ISA registration only. These fees would not come into effect until a comprehensive review of ISA had taken place and new safeguarding arrangements introduced. The proposed fees were broadly in line with, or lower than those set by neighbouring authorities. They would be reviewed annually and increased in line with inflation.

The Portfolio Holder expressed concern that any increase in fees could have a detrimental impact upon smaller charities and organisations. He indicated that while he would approve these changes he requested that officers consider ways to be more flexible in the fees charged to smaller groups.

He asked that officers bring these considerations back to a future Portfolio meeting, in the form of an options paper with a view to possible inclusion in the 2011/12 budget proposals.

### **Decision**

That the changes to the locally set fees be approved as set out within the report.

## **14. Corporate Complaints – April to June 2010 – Head of Performance and Partnerships**

### **Type of Decision**

Non key.

### **Purpose of Report**

To report to the Portfolio Holder on corporate complaints performance for the first quarter of 2010/11.

### **Issues for Consideration**

The report covered performance information on numbers of complaints, timescales for investigation and outcomes of investigations for formal complaints dealt with in the first quarter of 2010/11. A total of 16 formal complaints were received in the quarter. 13 of these were responded to within the Authority deadlines. Three out of the 16 complaints were upheld in full or in part. Complainants were provided with explanations and apologies. Departments had provided information on what lessons had been learnt from the complaints they had received and what actions had been taken to prevent their recurrence.

Officers highlighted that these figures were broadly comparable with those achieved in the same quarter of the previous year. The Portfolio Holder queried whether the reasons that a small number of complaints had not been reported to within deadlines were the same as the previous year. The Assistant Chief Executive advised that the specific reasons differed year on year however they tended to remain at similar levels. The Portfolio Holder requested further information on these reasons in previous years be provided to him. He also suggested that publicity around the number of complaints which had been satisfactorily dealt with be considered.

### **Decision**

That the report be noted

The meeting concluded at 3:15 pm

**P J DEVLIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 20th September 2010**