

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Wednesday, 27 October 2010

at 4.30 pm

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

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. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 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

Investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures':-

7.1 Types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used locally:-

- (a) Covering report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Presentation - *Traffic Team Leader*
- (c) Verbal feedback from site visit around Hartlepool – *Members of the Forum*
- (d) Written evidence from:
 - (i) St. John Vianney School and Children's Centre;
 - (ii) West View Primary School;
 - (iii) Holy Trinity C of E Primary School; and
 - (iv) Kingsley Primary School

7.2 Types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used nationally and how traffic calming could be undertaken in the future utilising innovative solutions, such as 20's Plenty:-

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- (b) Verbal evidence from national, regional and partner organisations

7.3 Landlord Accreditation Scheme – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEM FOR INFORMATION

- (i) **Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 10 November 2010, commencing at 4.30 p.m. in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

15 September 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,
and Carl Richardson.

Also Present: Councillor Marjorie James.

Councillor Peter Jackson, Portfolio Holder for Transport and
Neighbourhoods.

Resident Representative: Iris Ryder.

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Alastair Smith, Assistant Director (Transport and Engineering)
Mike Blair, Highways, Traffic and Transportation Manager
Sylvia Pinkney, Public Protection Manager
Laura Stones, Scrutiny Support Officer
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

9. Apologies for Absence

Councillor McKenna and Resident Representatives John Cambridge and
Brenda Loynes.

10. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

11. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 August 2010

Confirmed.

12. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

No items.

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

No items.

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

No items.

15. Six Monthly Monitoring of Agreed Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's Recommendations (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

A series of updates on those recommendations where there had been some delay in the actioning were tabled at the request of the Chair. The Chair requested that in future all the progress reports be as up to date as possible. The Monitoring report also included an update on the Headland Dust issue. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods reported that the letters to the Environment Agency (SCR-NS/10a) had been sent. Meetings had also been held with PD Ports and Van Dalen and there would be a further meeting with representatives of the companies and the Mayor next week. PD Ports indicated that they were to employ a consultant to develop a dust strategy. New 'grabs' for the cranes had been purchased to reduce dust. Discussions had been held with Van Dalen on the potential of relocation but this did seem unlikely at present.

The Director also reported that the monitoring equipment had now been installed on the Headland at the Town Wall. The new permanent monitoring station would be delivered in October and officers outlined the new monitoring equipment that would be included. There had been a delay due to the requirement to undergo a full procurement process for the monitoring equipment. The additional member of staff referred to in the actions was also being recruited. Leaflets for householders on the Headland were also being printed. In relation to the joint meeting with the Health Scrutiny Forum, the Director indicated that he understood that Dr Kelly had completed his investigations and that a date for the joint meeting was now the next step.

The Coastal Defence and Shoreline Management actions were questioned, specifically what the money allocated by government would be spent on. The

Director indicated that he would need to clarify that and respond to Members after the meeting.

Recommended

That the report be noted.

16. Investigation into '20 Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures' (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Highways, Traffic and Transportation Manager gave a presentation to the forum outlining the Council's traffic calming policies and procedures. The presentation outlined how funding for schemes was drawn from the Local Transport Plan and Local Safety Schemes; the role of the Neighbourhood Forums, Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) and New Deal for Communities (NDC); planning gain and how new developments had traffic calming designed into them. The presentation outlined how the council's policies had been drawn together in line with the appropriate legislation and a brief outline of the process from implementation of schemes. Details were circulated at the meeting showing the schools within the town where 20 mph schemes had, or could be, implemented.

Following the presentation the following points and questions were made by the forum and the residents present at the meeting and responded to by the officers present: -

- Was traffic calming only implemented around schools? No, but schemes were very dependent on funding.
- How were 20mph zones around schools determined? Much depended on the category of road concerned. Catcote Road, for example had a number of schools located on it, but the road was a primary traffic distributor road for the west of the town and it would therefore be inappropriate to place a 20mph speed limit on it. However, there had been a number of visual traffic calming measures implemented – red tarmac and signage – to highlight the dangers to drivers. Other schools located on more residential roads would be suitable and a number had the zones already.
- Why had Fens Primary School not had a 20 mph zone implemented? Officers indicated that they would have to come back on the reasons.
- Was it not a past Council decision that 20 mph zones would be implemented at all schools where appropriate? Where appropriate and finance permitting, the zones would be implemented. Each school did need to be assessed individually.
- Could variable speed signs be implemented, even in areas of Catcote Road, so that the speed limit was 20 mph for short periods of the day when schoolchildren were going in and leaving school? Was it not also possible to use coloured tarmac much more around schools to alert drivers as it was cheaper than road cushions/humps? There were locations where temporary lighted signs were used and these could be explored further. Lights do need to be switched on and off by crossing patrol staff so did have an additional cost. Coloured tarmac was hugely expensive so not

always the cheapest alternative.

- Was it possible to put road humps on bus routes as some people were being told that it wasn't as this was the reason traffic calming had not been implemented at Fens School. Officers would provide Members with their best professional advice on schemes but the decision would at the end be up to Members. There was pressure to de-clutter road signage and there were signs in the town that breached current guidance.
- There seemed to be quite a difference in some of the road humps implemented around the town, why? There were standards for road humps but a number of designs that could be implemented. All had to be between 75mm and 100mm high for example. The next two schemes to be implemented would use a new bolt down rubber road hump in case they needed to be removed.
- Do the emergency services complain about road humps? The 'blue light' emergency services were all consulted in the process of implementing any road safety or traffic-calming scheme. Nothing would be implemented that the emergency services objected to.
- Did officers try to maximise the use of planning gain even if it couldn't be used in the area of the development? Yes, planning gain was used wherever possible and funds would be used in other areas if there was no appropriate scheme in the vicinity of the development.

The Chair thanked Members, officers and the members of the public for an interesting debate that raised some points that would no doubt form part of the forums on-going discussion on this issue.

Recommended

That the presentation and the points raised through the discussion be noted.

17. Investigation into '20 Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures' – Evidence from the Member of Parliament for Hartlepool and the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer informed the forum that the member of Parliament, Iain Wright, had been unable to attend the meeting, but was still keen to input to a later meeting in the investigation. The MP also invited the Forum to submit written questions which he would ask in Parliament to the Secretary of State as a means of aiding the Forum in its investigation. If Members did have any questions they were asked to pass them onto the Chair or the Scrutiny Support Officer.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods, Councillor Peter Jackson, was present at the meeting and addressed the forum. The Portfolio Holder commented that he had gone through a very difficult process in June to reduce the current Local Transport Plan (LTP) budget by 11%. There was less than £1m in the overall LTP budget but if we wished to do all the works that had been identified, it could cost in excess of £25m

Wherever there was a risk to children and/or pedestrians then it would be addressed. The Portfolio Holder believed that the Council had a balanced view on traffic calming. Some London streets, for instance, had very high humps stopping some cars using certain roads. We have to get traffic around the town. If we put calming measures on Belle Vue Way or Catcote road the build up of traffic at certain points would create even greater problems than those we were trying to resolve.

In addressing the questions set out in the report, the Portfolio Holder believed that the Council was addressing these issues in the right way, but if there were any suggestions/improvements highlighted through the investigation then they would be looked at positively. In relation to the Fens School 20 mph zone highlighted through the previous debate, the Portfolio Holder indicated that the proximity of the school entrance to a junction may have been an issue rather than the bus route in the scheme not going ahead at this stage. There was consultation being undertaken with the emergency services on the potential implementation of traffic calming on Merlin Way. There was also the issue for residents of the noise that traffic calming measures sometimes created that had to be taken into account.

The Portfolio Holder didn't believe that a 20 mph speed limit should be implemented as a default in the town centre area but it could be supported in the residential estate areas. 20 mph speed limits did reduce accident injuries and should be implemented where appropriate. One recently considered 20 mph zone was the sea front in Seaton Carew. There had been objections to this, but the Portfolio Holder commented that he had tested the route and a 20 mph speed limit would mean it would only take 12 seconds longer to travel the extent of the proposed restriction.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that there were severe budget restrictions but if the risk was high enough then it was right to spend money to address the problems. If it came to it, the Portfolio Holder stated that he would rather some potholes went unfilled in order to see a 20 mph zone implemented outside a school. With the budget situation the council was facing it was likely that fewer school safety schemes could be addressed but that did not mean they were being ignored.

Members supported the Portfolio Holders comments and supported the twenty's plenty approach for residential areas. Where they had been implemented, traffic calming had shown that despite objections, it was the right thing to do. The Portfolio Holder commented that there was a difference between twenty's plenty and traffic calming. Traffic calming was physical works that were designed to slow traffic down. The 20 mph speed signs would slow the majority of motorists down but the Police had previously indicated that enforcing them would not be a priority and there would still be speeders.

Members stated that they understood that the Council received specific money for fixing potholes. The Director stated that the Council did get an additional one-off allocation of £108,000 after last year's severe winter. There

was a budget of around £300,000 for repairs and £800,000 for capital schemes, but as had been said earlier, to address all the repairs and schemes we currently have listed, the Council would need £25m.

Forum members raised concerns with the maintenance of traffic lights and specifically road crossing controls. The Director indicated that these would be followed up. Residents complained of speeding in Tarnston Road which they believed was being exacerbated by the traffic lights. Members also suggested that the utility companies could fill in some of the potholes around the sites they were working on as a goodwill gesture. Officers indicated that over recent years the Council had become very strict with utility companies on the standards of the work they undertook to bring them up to the standards we expected.

The Portfolio Holder welcomed any suggestions that would improve the current systems. If twenty's plenty was rolled out to residential areas that would require considerable signage which as well as being expensive was not what the new coalition government wished to see. Gateway schemes may be a more cost effective and appropriate way to highlight 20 mph zones.

The Chair thanked the Portfolio Holder for his input into the meeting and indicated that the investigation would move into the consultation phase to gather views.

Recommended

That the Portfolio Holder's comments be welcomed and noted.

18. Food Law Enforcement Service Plan 2010/2011 (*Director of Regeneration and neighbourhoods*)

The Public Protection Manager outlined the main aspects of the Council's Food Law Enforcement Plan. The plan had been approved by Cabinet for consultation prior to final consideration and referral to Council. Members questioned the star ratings of food premises in the town. The Public Protection Manager indicated that the star rating system had been introduced across the Tees Valley and had proved to be very popular with the public. It was now also popular among food outlets as they saw the benefits of a high star rating. The number of 5 star ratings had improved significantly since the introduction of the scheme and the ratings were a very popular section on the Council's website. There was also a new iPhone application that users could download.

Members questioned the inspections undertaken by staff and the recent problems experienced in other areas with Legionnaires Disease. The Public Protection Manager indicated that the authority could not charge for the annual inspections undertaken by officers. Charges could be made for any outlet that requested an inspection in order to improve its star rating but not for other inspections. There had been some particularly poor premises inspected recently though none had been closed. In response to Members questions, the Public Protection Manager had not seen any impact from the recession on

the cleanliness of premises but officers had the legal powers to require improvement, or close premises, if any problems were encountered during an inspection. The authority also had a Legionella Inspection team that regularly inspected council properties and schools.

Recommended

That the report be noted.

19. Issues Identified from the Forward Plan

No items.

20. Date of Next Meeting and Site Visits

The Chair highlighted that the next meeting of the forum would be held on Wednesday 27 October 2010 at 4.30 p.m. In advance of that meeting, a site visit to the 20 mph zones in the town would be held on 11 October and all Members were encouraged to attend. There was also to be a site visit to Newcastle to discuss with Members and officers how the 20 mph zones had been implemented in Newcastle and what lessons could be learned from that experience. The Chair also encouraged Members to attend this visit. Details of both visits would be circulated to members in the near future.

The meeting concluded at 6.25 p.m.

CHAIR

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
SCRUTINY FORUM**

27 October 2010



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: 20'S PLENTY – TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES – TYPES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES USED LOCALLY: COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that Officers from the Council's Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 4 August 2010, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.

2.2 Consequently, Officers from the Council's Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department will be in attendance at today's meeting to deliver a presentation, as part of this Forum's investigation into 20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures in relation to the following issues:

- (a) The types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used locally; and
- (b) The costs of providing each type of traffic calming measure

2.3 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of this investigation Members of the Forum attended a site visit on 11 October 2010 to see a variety of traffic calming measures used in Hartlepool. In line with good practice, Members of this Forum who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.

2.4 Written submissions on traffic calming have also been received from the Headteacher's at St. John Vianney School and Children's Centre; West View

Primary School; Holy Trinity C of E Primary School; and Kingsley Primary School. All submissions are included as item 7.1 (d) of today's agenda.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 That the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum:-

- (a) note the content of the presentation, seeking clarification on any relevant issues from the officers in attendance;
- (b) discuss findings from the site visit held on 11 October 2010; and
- (c) consider the written submissions as referred to in section 2.4 of this report.

Contact Officer:- Laura Stones – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: laura.stones@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (a) Scrutiny Investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures' - Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 04.08.10

Response to Questions for:

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM: INVESTIGATION INTO '20'S PLENTY – TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES'

(a) What traffic calming measures are in place outside your school?

We have a 20mph Zone which extends from the edge of our school at the east end of King Oswy Drive to beyond St. Hild's School to the west. This includes 'speed bumps'

(b) How effective have such measures been?

At school 'drop-off' and 'pick-up' times there is a great deal of traffic outside of school, so it would seem that traffic is usually not travelling at 20 mph at these times. However, once the 'school run' has cleared traffic can move freely along King Oswy Drive. The majority of vehicles seem to slow down as they go over the 'bumps' then speed up until they reach the next 'bump' and so on, but the speed is kept down because of this stop-start progress. However, there are a significant number of vehicles that pass the school at speeds that would seem to be faster than this limit.

Due to our surestart children's centre and childcare at school opening from 7.30 a.m. to 6.00 p.m., we often have very young children and their carers arriving and leaving at times other than the usual expected school times, and I guess drivers are not as vigilant about their speed since they don't expect to encounter children and parents crossing the road at these times.

(c) What are your views on the implementation of 20mph as the default speed limit for all residential and town centre roads?

There are two ways of thinking about this: Firstly, a single speed limit could mean that drivers became used to the speed and might begin to travel at a lower speed almost unconsciously. However, it would mean that the 'specialness' of the 20 mph limit would disappear, so drivers would no longer increase their vigilance and care outside of schools and other identified places.

Response compiled by

John Hardy (Head teacher)
St. John Vianney School & Children's Centre
King Oswy Drive



West View Primary School

Davison Drive • West View • Hartlepool • TS24 9BP
Telephone: (01429) 267466 Fax: (01429) 236237
Email: admin.westview@school.hartlepool.gov.uk
Co-Headteachers: Mr A A Brown Mrs I A Parkinson



11th October 2010

Councillor S Thomas
11 Lancaster Court
HARTLEPOOL
TS24 8PS

Dear Councillor Thomas

Thank you for your letter dated 13th September kindly inviting us to your Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum but unfortunately, due to holiday commitments, none of our Leadership Team will be available to attend.

However, after consultation with various members of my team, I can now forward the following comments from Mrs Crowe, School Bursar and also our Lollipop Lady, Betty.

"The traffic calming measures outside of school are a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph from Carrick Street to Warren Road. There have been some standard speed reduction signs put up but as yet we are still waiting for the electronic speed signs to be sorted. As we discussed, it has been difficult to monitor speeds as we are not out there and the new houses block any view. Having said that I have not received any complaints from anyone about problems out there but I do think Betty would be a good person to ask as she will have the first hand experience of whether the reduction has had any impact.

Although I don't think this is part of the scrutiny process, we also had yellow lines painted outside of the school to compliment the speed reduction, so at least enforcement action can be taken if anyone parks there during the specified hours. The problem comes with insufficient parking enforcement officers to monitor, the staff do a great job but all schools are on a rolling programme, so probably get to us for one week during the school year. They are very accommodating though and when we were having particular problems during the house building project; they were quick to alter their programme to help us out. Betty The Lollipop Lady has also stated that the signs are showing no effect on speeds as she crosses children in and out of school."

I hope these comments are of some help to you and once again apologise for not being able to attend the meeting.

Yours sincerely

pp Mr A Brown
Co-Headteacher



National College for
School Leadership





**Holy Trinity C of E (Aided) Primary
Seaton Carew**

Crawford Street
Seaton Carew
Hartlepool
TS25 1BZ
Phone: 01429 266214
Fax: 01429 280066

Headteacher: Mrs A E Baines B.Ed(hons)P.G.C.E. Dip Ed NPQH

www.holytrinitycofeseatoncarew.co.uk

Councillor Stephen Thomas
Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum
11 Lancaster Court
HARTLEPOOL
TS24 8PS

22.9.10

Dear Councillor Thomas

**INVESTIGATION INTO '20'S PLENTY – TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES –
27TH OCTOBER 2010 AT 4.30 P.M.**

I refer to your letter dated 13th September 2010 and would inform you that I am unable to make the meeting on 27th October however am pleased to provide you with the following details:

- (a) Traffic calming measures in place outside school consist of speed humps and keep clear markings with yellow zigzags to prevent parking.
- (b) These traffic calming measures are however not very effective – people 'jump' them, park on them and on the pavement which causes problems for pedestrians and cars. Zig-zag yellow exclusions zones are completely ignored
- (c) We would be fully supportive in the implementation of 20mph as the default speed limit for all residential and town centre roads. However we feel that barriers should be put up around pavements outside all schools. Main problem not speed but inconsiderate parking which leads to:
 - Reduced pedestrian access for wheel chairs, prams and pedestrians
 - People driving half on pavements and half on roads
 - Turning round/reversing onto pavements.

Pedestrian barriers would ensure safety of pedestrians around the perimeter of school as cars would be unable to park on or mount the pavement.

Yours sincerely

Mrs A Baines
Headteacher



**Excellent Education
in a Christian Environment**



e-mail: admin.holytrinity@school.Hartlepool.gov.uk



committed to
inclusive staff
development

**Be a friend,
Not a bully**



Healthy School



Traffic Calming Measures

Kingsley Primary School

Traffic calming measures in place outside Kingsley School:

- speed humps along Kingsley Avenue
- parking prohibitions (8.00 am to 5.00pm) on zig-zag lines outside the school gates, signs etc outside school gates. The zig zag lines need to be extended along Kingsley Avenue towards the corner of Taybrooke Avenue as we have a new school entrance located here.
- lollipop man – 8.30 – 9.00 3.10 - 3.30

Effectiveness of measures:

- The majority of traffic does slow down because of the speed bumps – although a few cars still maintain speed
- Some parents do still ‘drop off’ outside the school – ignoring the prohibitions
- When a traffic warden does a random visit – there are few problems!

20mph speed limit

I live in Eldon Grove where a 20mph limit was introduced earlier this year. I have to report that to date most drivers ignore this limit and many travel faster than the permitted 30mph. For safety reasons, a general 20mph limit for residential areas is a sound one with which I would agree personally. However, would such a limit be realistically enforceable? A child / pedestrian safety based publicity campaign may well help but would it reach the drivers who habitually travel over the 30mph limit?

10.10.10

David Pounder

Kingsley Primary School

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
SCRUTINY FORUM**

27 October 2010



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: 20'S PLENTY – TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES – TYPES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES USED NATIONALLY AND HOW TRAFFIC CALMING COULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE FUTURE UTILISING INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS, SUCH AS 20'S PLENTY : COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that national, regional and partner organisations have been invited to attend this meeting to discuss the types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used nationally and how traffic calming could be undertaken in the future utilising innovative solutions, such as 20's Plenty.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 4 August 2010, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.

2.2 Consequently, national, regional and partner organisations have been invited to attend this meeting to discuss the types and effectiveness of traffic calming measures used nationally and 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.

2.3 During this evidence gathering session it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:

(a) What are your views on the effectiveness of the traffic calming measures used currently in Hartlepool?

- (b) What are your views on implementing 20 mph as the default speed limit for all residential and town centre roads?
- (c) How do you think the Council should be approaching traffic calming issues in light of the budgetary restrictions?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the organisations in attendance in relation to the questions outlined in section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer:- Laura Stones – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: laura.stones@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (a) Scrutiny Investigation into '20's Plenty – Traffic Calming Measures' - Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 04.08.10

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

27 October 2010



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: LANDLORD ACCREDITATION SCHEME

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 At the work programme meeting of this Forum held on 7 July 2010 Members requested a progress / update report on the Landlord Accreditation Scheme. This report seeks Members views on the areas which they want to include in this progress / update report.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The Forum met on the 7 July 2010 to discuss their work programme for the 2010/11 Municipal Year. One of the suggested topics for investigation was the Landlord Accreditation Scheme. However, at this meeting Members decided that they did not have the capacity in their work programme for the current Municipal Year to investigate the Landlord Accreditation Scheme.

2.2 Subsequently, Members requested a progress / update report on the Landlord Accreditation Scheme. It is suggested that this progress / update report be considered by the Forum at their meeting of 23 March 2011, with a view that Members may decide to include it as a suggested work programme topic for inclusion in the Forum's 2011/12 work programme.

2.3 Although, the original topic for consideration was the Landlord Accreditation Scheme, in relation to the operation of private landlords in the town it may be beneficial to widen the remit to include the following areas in the progress / update report:-

- (a) selective licensing; and
- (b) the good tenant scheme

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 That the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum:-

- (a) Widen the remit of the progress / update report to include the areas identified in 2.3 of this report; and
- (b) consider the progress / update report at the meeting of 23 March 2011 and decide whether to include it as a suggested work programme topic for inclusion in the 2011/12 work programme

Contact Officer:- Laura Stones – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive’s Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: laura.stones@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (a) Determining the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum’s Work Programme for 2010 / 11 – Scrutiny Support Officer – 7 July 2010
- (b) Minutes of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum - 7 July 2010