

# **SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE AGENDA**



**Monday 25 July 2011**

**at 2.00 pm**

**in the Council Chamber  
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

**MEMBERS: SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE:**

Councillors C Akers-Belcher, S Akers-Belcher, Cook, Fenwick, Griffin, James, Loynes, Preece, Richardson, Rogan, Shaw, Shields, Simmons, Thomas, Wells and Wilcox.

Resident Representatives: Evelyn Leck and 2 vacancies

- 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 3 June 2011
  - 3.2 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2011
  - 3.3 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2011
- 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**

No items

**9. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**Bus Services Working Group**

- 9.1 Update on the Outcome of the Activities of the Bus Services Working Group:-
  - (a) Report of the Bus Services Working Group - *Chair of the Bus Services Working Group*; and
  - (b) Presentation - *Assistant Director (Transport and Engineering) and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Economic Development*.
- 9.2 Call-in of Decision: Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies (Specifically the Decision Taken in Relation to Seaton Carew Nursery School) – Further Information – *Scrutiny Manager*

**Penalty Charges (Income)**

- 9.3 Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee Consideration of 2012/13 Budget Items:-
  - (a) Scoping Report - Scrutiny Manager
  - (b) Presentation – *Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer and Assistant Chief Finance and Customer Services Officer*
- 9.4 Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee Workforce Services Working Group - *Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer*
- 9.5 Development of a Hartlepool Health and Wellbeing Board - *Assistant Director for Health Improvement and Adult Social Care*
- 9.6 Potential Request for Change to Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Work Programme for 2011/12 - *Scrutiny Manager*
- 9.7 Request for Funding to Support Informal Scrutiny Chairs Meetings - *Scrutiny Manager*

**10. CALL-IN REQUESTS**

No items

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

**FOR INFORMATION**

- i) **Date of Next Meeting Friday 19 August 2011 commencing at 2.00 p.m.**

# **SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

## **MINUTES**

3 June 2011

The meeting commenced at 2.00 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

Councillor Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Christopher Akers-Belcher, Rob Cook, Mick Fenwick, Sheila Griffin, Brenda Loynes, Arthur Preece, Trevor Rogan, Jane Shaw, Linda Shields, Chris Simmons, Stephen Thomas and Angie Wilcox.

Resident Representative Evelyn Leck.

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods  
Dale Clark, Estates and Asset Manager  
Chris Little, Chief Financial Officer  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors S Akers-Belcher, Richardson and Wells.

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

Councillor Loynes declared a personal interest in Minute No. 9.

### **3. Confirmation of the minutes of the meetings held on 7 April and 15 April 2011**

Confirmed.

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

No items.

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

No items.

**6. Forward Plan**

No items.

**7. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents**

No items.

**8. Consideration of financial monitoring/corporate reports**

No items.

**9. Feedback Report - Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Response to the Referral in relation to Proposals for the Provision of the Revenues and Benefits Service - Chair of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee** *(Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee)*

The Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee reported the feedback on the outcome of Cabinet's consideration of the Committee's response to the referral in relation to proposals for the future provision of the revenues and benefits service.

The Chair reported that she had presented all the Committee's concerns to Cabinet but was disappointed that after the time spent considering the referral, little appeared to have been taken on board by Cabinet.

This view was echoed by another Member who was present at the Cabinet meeting who was concerned at the implications of Cabinet's proposals on other scrutiny investigations, principally the Provision of Face-To-Face Advice and Information Services in Hartlepool.

**Recommended**

That the report be noted

## **10. Bus Services Working Group - Membership Update** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Chair reported that a meeting of the Working Group had been held earlier in the day and it was anticipated that a report from the Working Group would be submitted to the July meeting of this Committee. In light of this the anticipated issue in relation to the membership of the Working Group following the appointments made to the Committee at the Annual Meeting did not now arise.

A member reported that they understood that representative of Hartlepool Hospital and the Health Authority were discussing reinstating the bus service between Hartlepool and North Tees hospitals. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods indicated that he would make enquiries on this issue and report back to Members.

### **Recommended**

That the report be noted.

## **11. Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006**

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

## **12. Jackson's Landing "Take Off"** *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods provided the Committee with an update on the current situation relating to Jackson's Landing.

### **Recommended**

That the Committee's support for the potential redevelopment of the Jackson's Landing site as outlined at the meeting be noted.

## **13. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent**

The Chairman ruled that the following items of business should be considered by the Committee as a matter of urgency in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(B) (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 in order that the matter could be dealt with without delay.

## 14. Call-In Requests

The Chair reported that an appropriately completed Call-in Notice had been received in relation to the decision of Cabinet made on 23 May 2011 “Strategy for Bridging the Budget Deficit 2012/13 – ICT, Revenues and Benefits Services”. The Committee was informed that the Call-in Notice had not yet been formally accepted by the Monitoring Officer and there was concern expressed that there was no senior officer available to complete the process. The Chair indicated that subject to this formal part of the process being completed, she would wish to hold a meeting of the Committee at the earliest possible opportunity to commence the scrutiny call-in investigation.

### **Recommended**

That subject to the formal acceptance of the Call-in Notice by the Monitoring Officer, the Call-in Notice be received and noted by this Committee and the process to investigate the Call-in be expedited once the Monitoring Officer had conveyed their decision on the notice to the Chair.

The meeting concluded at 12:35 p.m.

CHAIR

# SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

14 June 2011

The meeting commenced at 6.27 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

Councillor: Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Christopher Akers-Belcher, Stephen Akers-Belcher, Rob Cook, Sheila Griffin, Brenda Loynes, Arthur Preece, Carl Richardson, Jane Shaw, Linda Shields, Chris Simmons, Stephen Thomas, Ray Wells and Angie Wilcox.

### **Also Present:**

The Mayor Stuart Drummond and Councillor Jonathan Brash, Portfolio Holder for Performance

### **Officers:**

Paul Walker, Chief Executive  
Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive  
Alyson Carman, Legal Services Manager  
Joanne Machers, Chief Customer and Workforce Services Officer  
John Morton, Assistant Chief Finance and Customer Services Officer  
Graham Frankland, Assistant Director, Resources  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
Angela Armstrong, Principal Democratic Services Officer

## **15. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mick Fenwick and Ged Hall.

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

None.

## **17. Call-In Requests – Call-In of Decision: Strategy for Bridging the Budget Deficit 2012/13 – ICT, Revenues and Benefits Services** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The report presented to Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee the relevant information relating to the Call-In of the decision taken by Cabinet on 23 May 2011 in relation to the Strategy for Bridging the Budget Deficit 2012/13 – ICT, Revenues and Benefits Services, as per the Authority's Call-in procedure. After considering the notice, Members

accepted the call in and proceeded to examine the call in notice. The Legal Services Manager provided clarification that the Committee needed to address the notice and indicate why this decision had been called in.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues.

- (i) Members felt that when the issue of the Revenues and Benefits service provision was referred to Scrutiny from Cabinet (Cabinet minute 169 refers), they were disbarred from undertaking any consideration of the IT solutions and this represented a lack of openness in the decision making process in relation to this issue. This concerned Members as the outcome of the decision in relation to the strategy for bridging the budget deficit for 2012/13 was heavily weighted on an IT solution. The Mayor confirmed that Cabinet had accepted all the recommendations contained within the report of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and did not consider that Scrutiny had been prevented from examining anything.
- (ii) Clarification was sought on the decision to use the OGC Buying Solutions Framework for ICT for Revenues and Benefits services. The Assistant Director, Resources confirmed that the OGC was set up by the Government to put in place frameworks for selling services and enable Councils to access contracts rather than individually procuring services. Contracts within the framework have been procured using the normal route of giving notice across the European union to enable a wider selection. These frameworks cover a number of managed services provided by the Government. Members were asked to note that from a procurement viewpoint, the companies included within the frameworks were willing to respond and could move quickly resulting in a more cost effective way of securing contracts.
- (iii) A Member questioned why the referral from Cabinet precluded the Committee from examining the IT solutions around the revenues and benefits service which had resulted in Members feeling hampered in their investigation. The Mayor reiterated that it was not within Cabinet's interest to exclude Scrutiny from examining anything and Scrutiny was asked for a view on the future provision of the revenues and benefits service. It was confirmed that all the reports on this issue had been open reports and considered within open meetings and subsequently referred to Scrutiny for a view.
- (iv) In relation to the reasonableness of the Cabinet decision, Members were concerned that a number external factors, ie the Department of Work and Pensions taking over the provision of the benefits service and the future negotiations of the Council's IT contract could have placed the local authority at risk if a separate IT solution had been invited that was not tied to Northgate.
- (v) In discussions with the Chief Executive it had been verbally reported that £300,000 savings were required from his Department, however, this amount was never reported to Scrutiny and Members considered that a significant part of this saving required may have been identified during discussions at Scrutiny meetings. The Mayor responded that it would be naïve of the Council to identify the amount of savings



required as a result of procuring a service as this may pre-empt the bids submitted and the intention was to generate the biggest saving possible.

- (vi) A Member questioned how many companies included within the OGC Framework had experience of providing a revenues and benefits service. The Mayor responded that there were a number of companies capable and interested in bidding for the provision of this service and each bid received would be looked at on its own merits and in line with the criteria set. The Assistant Director confirmed that out of 12 companies included within the OGC Framework, 6 had shown an interest in providing ICT and Revenues and Benefits service. The Chief Executive confirmed that TUPE arrangements would be in place and the Portfolio Holder for Performance confirmed that the protection of staff would be an integral part of any contract for the revenues and benefits service.
- (vii) The Assistant Chief Executive confirmed that any contract would include a full process of due diligence and would include detailed arrangements for exit and transition.
- (viii) A Member sought clarification on whether the creation of a community interest company by the revenues and benefits section had been considered. The Portfolio Holder for Performance confirmed that a number of options had been examined and it was considered that the OGC Framework route would make a higher level of saving and be a more secure option.
- (ix) A Member commented that there appeared to be no business plan and questioned the financial investment into other areas such as the contact centre and counter-fraud when savings were being sought and whether investigations into other areas were being considered. In addition, the Committee were concerned that the impact of the recommendations from the recent enquiry into the provision of face to face financial advice and information services would be diluted by the removal of an 'in house' service. The Portfolio Holder for Performance commented that to make further savings in this area now would result in more redundancies and it was suggested that securing a contract through the OGC Framework would secure those jobs whilst achieving significant savings. The Cabinet Members present gave reassurances that the recommendations from the inquiry would be carried out.
- (x) Clarification was sought on the possibility of extending the current contract with Northgate. The Assistant Chief Executive confirmed that legal advice provided had indicated that given the length of time the current contract had been in place, testing the market would ensure that the Council achieved the most cost effective outcome.
- (xi) In response to a question from a Member, the Mayor confirmed that Cabinet's decision had been that the preferred option was to go out to tender, but if this process did not generate the required savings, alternative options would be examined.
- (xii) A Member questioned whether the option of keeping the service in-house had been considered. The Portfolio Holder for Performance confirmed that this option had been examined but it would not be possible to achieve the level of service required as job cuts would be

required to achieve the required savings. It was confirmed that job protection was a number one consideration when examining a future contract.

All officers left the meeting to enable the Committee to deliberate.

- (xiii) There were some concerns that only certain aspects of the revenues and benefits service would be subject to the procurement exercise and some more vulnerable areas would not. It was suggested that any savings identified that did not form part of the procurement exercise should be implemented immediately.
- (xiv) In addition to this, Members were encouraged to take a more proactive role in linking the decisions included within the Forward Plan and work planning. This would include the Chairs of Scrutiny Forums examining reports submitted to the Portfolio Holder for their relevant service area and discussing any areas of concern with the Portfolio Holder prior to the decision being taken.
- (xv) It was suggested that a letter be forwarded to the CFPS to obtain a view on the changes to the interpretation/implementation of the call-in process required to comply with the advice of Counsel. This letter to be formulated by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee in conjunction with the Scrutiny Manager.
- (xvi) A discussion ensued on the circulation of confidential (pink) papers and the difficulties faced by Members should they wish to call-in any confidential decisions.

In relation to the timescales prescribed for the completion of a call-in, the Scrutiny Manager indicated that there were variations in approaches across local authorities with the majority utilising 7 days and in one case using 5 days to complete the consideration of a call in notice.

In conclusion Members acknowledged the need to be more proactive in examining executive decisions and liaising with the relevant portfolio holder prior to decisions being taken where it was felt appropriate.

In conclusion, Members did not feel that the referral from Cabinet for Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to examine the proposals for the revenues and benefits service, identified the desired aims and of the referral. There were concerns that only part of the revenues and benefits service provision was to be included within the OGC Framework. For that reason, it was suggested that any savings identified from the elements that did not form part of that tendering process should be implemented with immediate effect therefore optimising savings for the Council.

## **Recommendation**

- (i) That the Chair and Vice Chair formulate a letter to the CFPS and Association of North East Councillors to obtain a view on the changes to the interpretation/implementation of the call-in process required to comply with the advice of Counsel.

- (ii) That Cabinet be asked to reconsider its decision of 23 May 2011 (minute 246 refers) on the grounds that it contravened the principles of decision making in relation to the provision of clear aims and desired outcomes.
- (iii) That any savings identified from the elements of the revenues and benefits service that did not form part of that tendering process should be implemented with immediate effect therefore optimising savings for the Council.
- (iv) That the issue of circulation of confidential (pink) papers and the call-in process be referred to Constitution Committee for consideration.
- (v) That Members take a more proactive approach in examining forthcoming executive decisions and discussing any issues of concern that arise with the relevant portfolio holder prior to the decision being taken.

## **18. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent**

None.

The meeting concluded at 7.44 pm

CHAIR

# SCRUTINY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

24 JUNE 2011

The meeting commenced at 12.00 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

Councillor Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Christopher Akers Belcher, Rob Cook, Mick Fenwick, Sheila Griffin, Arthur Preece, Trevor Rogan, Jane Shaw, Linda Shields, Chris Simmons, Stephen Thomas and Ray Wells.

Also Present: Councillors Allan Barclay, Ann Marshall, and Sylvia Tempest.  
Resident Representatives John Cambridge and Iris Ryder.

Children's Services Scrutiny Forum Co-opted Members: Eira Ballingall and David Relton.

Children's Services Scrutiny Forum Young People's Representatives: Millie Allen, Danielle O'Keefe, Alise Hanna and Ashleigh Bostock.

Officers: Nicola Bailey, Director of Child and Adult Services  
Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods  
Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive  
John Morton, Assistant Chief Finance and Customer Services Officer  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
Elaine Hind, Laura Stones, and James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officers  
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

### **19. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors S Akers-Belcher, Loynes, Richardson and Lawton and Resident Representatives Evelyn Leck, and John Maxwell and Cabinet Members The Mayor, Stuart Drummond, Councillors Brash and Payne

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

None.

### **21. Confirmation of the minutes of the meetings held on 3 June and 14 June, 2011**

Consideration of the above minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

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

No items.

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

No items.

**24. Forward Plan**

No items.

**25. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents**

No items.

**26. Consideration of financial monitoring/corporate reports**

No items.

**27. Departmental Briefings by Directors** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Assistant Chief Executive, the Director of Child and Adult Services and the Director of Neighbourhood Services gave presentations to the meeting outlining the structure of the relevant three departments, Assistant Directors/Chief Officer areas of responsibility and the structure of the various divisions. In each of the presentations the officers highlighted the areas of their departments that faced the key financial and service pressures in the current financial year and those areas where Members would be faced with difficult decisions in the forthcoming budget review exercise required to meet the governments reduced grant allocations.

The presentations highlighted those areas that provided statutory services and those that were linked to the provision of those statutory services. Where service provision was non-statutory, Officers highlighted, where applicable, the inter-relationship with other areas of the council and those where alternative methods of service delivery were being investigated. Officer responded to Members questions throughout the presentations.

**Recommended**

That the Directors and Assistant Chief Executive be thanked for their very informative presentations.

**28. Determining the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2011/12 - (*Scrutiny Manager*)**

The Scrutiny Manager reported that as part of the consideration of the Work Programme for Scrutiny Coordinating Committee and the five standing forums, an introductory overview of Hartlepool Borough Council's Budget Position for 2012/13 was to be provided by the Assistant Chief Executive, in the absence of the Chief Finance Officer. The presentation highlighted the very challenging budgetary position faced by the authority.

Members requested that they be provided with a breakdown of those services that were statutory and those provided by local determination.

The Chair commented that it wasn't always the case that less service had to be delivered for less cost. Producing the same for less money was also a saving. Income generation also had to be a major focus for Members. The Assistant Chief Executive commented that councillors and officers would be faced with making some very difficult decisions on services that we were all very proud of and had built up over the years. Income needed to be seen as profit and while delivering more for the same was an inferred saving, there was still a need to produce real bottom line savings on the budget.

Members acknowledged that cutting services was going to affect the public directly and that income generation would also affect them as they would have to pay for previously free services or pay more for others. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods commented that income generation would be a way of maintaining some services in the future. However, with the uncertainty of central government grant funding it was difficult to make decisions, at this time for longer than a year into the future. The Chief Finance Officer would be concerned at the maintenance of services for only one year through income generation and would therefore seek the greater certainty of bottom line budgetary cuts.

The Chair acknowledged that members would have to make some very difficult decisions through the forthcoming deliberations on the budget. Members would need to reply on the best advice of officers to make the best decisions they could.

**Recommended**

That the report and presentation be noted.

**29. Determining the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2011/12 – Selection and Timetabling of Project / Service Areas to Feed into the 2012/13 Budget Process** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager reported that Members had in the past been supportive of the need for Overview and Scrutiny involvement in the budget setting process at a far earlier stage than has previously occurred. In recognition of this, and the extreme financial challenge facing the authority, it was intended that Overview and Scrutiny would focus its attention throughout 2011/12 on preparations for the 2012/13 budget. Set out in Appendix 1 to the report details of a range of projects / service areas to be considered as part of the 2012/13 budget process.

It was noted that in a couple of cases the listed 'Potential Scrutiny Forum' may need to be revised and Members requested that the Scrutiny Manager clarify the relevant forums with Forum Chairs.

**Recommended**

That the report be noted and that the listed projects / service areas be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee / Forum for consideration as part of the 2011/12 work programme.

**30. Determining the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2011/12 – Selection of Potential Additional Topics for Inclusion in the 2011/12 Scrutiny Work Programme** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager submitted a report to assist Members in the selection of potential additional topics for inclusion into the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for the 2011/12 Municipal Year. In accordance with usual practice, discussions had been held between Scrutiny Chairs, Cabinet Members and Directors / Assistant Directors in relation to potential areas / issues which Scrutiny may wish to explore as part of its Work Programme. In addition to this, suggestions had also been sought from residents, resident representatives and community / voluntary groups across the town.

Details of the suggestions received from all sources had been compiled and were submitted as appendices to the report for consideration on a Forum-by-Forum basis. In each appendices were details of the suggested topics from Cabinet Members, the relevant Director, Members and members of the public/resident representatives/community groups or co-opted members. Where topics were suggested, the aim of the investigation together with brief background information was set out together with extracts from the relevant sections of the Corporate Plan and Performance indicators.

#### Scrutiny Coordinating Committee

It was noted that there were two ongoing investigations; a call-in in relation to School Governor Position – Seaton Nursery and the Review of the Community Pool Allocation Criteria. The suggested topic for investigation was The Borough Council Museum and Art Gallery Collection. The Chair suggested that it may be more appropriate to establish a working group to look at this subject outside of the Committee's scheduled meetings and requested that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee to establish the working group.

The Chair then moved onto deal with the potential additional topics for the individual forum's work programmes for 2011/12. The meeting noted that the Health Scrutiny Forum would establish its own work programme in accordance with the constitution.

Each of the individual Forum's Chair's were invited to consider the work programmes for their Forum.

#### Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum

The suggested topic was the 'Early Intervention and Reablement Services'. This investigation was supported by the Forum Chair and members present.

#### Children's Services Scrutiny Forum

Two topics had been suggested for information. The relevant Director and Portfolio Holder and other Members had suggested the 'Provision of Support and Services to Looked After Children/Young People'. The 'Education of Children with Learning Difficulties' had also been suggested. The Forum Chair also highlighted that the Young peoples Representative Members of the Forum had suggested that 'Young peoples Access to Transport' should be investigated. The Forum Chair indicated that the Young Peoples Representatives would be tasked with investigating this subject and reporting back to the Forum. The investigation of the 'Provision of Support and Services to Looked After Children/Young People'; was supported by the Forum Chair and members present with an agreed deadline of 1 November to feed into the budget.

#### Health Scrutiny Forum

As stated earlier, the work programme of the Health Forum would be decided by the Forum itself at its first meeting. Once agreed, a report would be submitted to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee advising them of the topics under consideration.

#### Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

Members and the Director/Portfolio Holder had suggested the topic of 'Landlord Accreditation / Selective Licensing / Good Tennant Scheme'. The Director and Portfolio Holder had also suggested 'School Crossing Patrols' as another potential area of investigation. The Forum Chair supported the 'Landlord Accreditation' topic and indicated that the investigation could be scheduled to fit into the major report on the roll out of the scheme to be considered by Cabinet in early December 2011. In relation to the 'School



Crossing Patrols', it was suggested that this should be referred to the Council Working Group for consideration.

#### Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

Members had suggested 'Housing Regeneration', Members of the public/resident representatives had suggested 'Recreational Facilities on New Housing Developments' and 'Employment and Training Opportunities for Young People 19+' and the Director/Portfolio Holder had suggested 'Tees Valley Unlimited' and 'Empty Homes'. The Forum Chair considered that there was a valid case for each of the investigation topics. Members were concerned that any investigation into Housing Regeneration could potentially lead Forum Members that were also Members of the Planning Committee to predetermine planning matters. It was indicated that the subject could be concisely kept to the regeneration of existing housing stock. The meeting agreed that the subject of Tees Valley Unlimited would be best served by a Members Seminar. Following a lengthy debate the meeting supported the selection of 'Housing Regeneration', based solely on existing housing areas, as the topic of investigation in 2011/12, with the issue of 'Employment and Training Opportunities for Young People 19+' to be held in reserve, for consideration should time allow. It was also agreed that it would be more appropriate for the issue of 'Empty Homes' to be referred to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum for consideration as part of its 'Landlord Accreditation / Selective Licensing / Good Tennant Scheme' investigation.

The Chair thanked all the members present for their input into the meeting. The Scrutiny Manager indicated that there would be scoping report for the topics agreed at the meeting submitted to the first meeting of the relevant forums.

#### **Recommended**

1. That the following topics be included in the relevant Committees / Forums work programme for 2011/12 –

Scrutiny Coordinating Committee - Borough Council Museum and Art Gallery Collection

Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum - Early Intervention and Reablement Services'

Children's Services Scrutiny Forum - Provision of Support and Services to Looked After Children/Young People

Health Scrutiny Forum – to be determined at the meeting on 11 August 2011

Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum - Landlord Accreditation / Selective Licensing / Good Tennant Scheme (also to incorporate the issue of Empty Homes)

Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum - Housing Regeneration, with the issue of 'Employment and Training Opportunities for Young People 19+' held in reserve, for consideration should time allow.

2. That the topic of School Crossing Patrols be referred to the Council Working Group for consideration.
3. That a Members Seminar be held on the subject of Tees Valley Unlimited.

### **31. Call-In Requests**

No items.

The meeting concluded at 4.10 p.m.

CHAIR

## **SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

25 July 2011



**Report of:** Bus Services Working Group

**Subject:** REPORT – BUS SERVICES WORKING GROUP

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To report the outcome of the Bus Services Working Group meetings held on 31 March and 3 June 2011 to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Hartlepool Borough Council faced a significant budget deficit when setting the Council Budget for the 2011/12 Municipal Year. This position required Council Members to make many difficult decisions regarding future service provision. During the 2011/12 budget setting process, as a result of impending cuts to funding provided by Central Government, Members felt they could no longer support a £287,000 subsidy to local bus companies used to support a number of unprofitable bus services. Members also agreed to the withdrawal of the Dial-a-Ride service (a saving of £209,000) due to the cost of running the service and the fleet of vehicles used to provide the service requiring replacement.
- 2.2 The budget decision was unanimously endorsed by all Councillors present at a full meeting of Hartlepool Council on 10 February 2011.
- 2.3 As a result of the Council decision to withdraw subsidies for non-profitable service routes, bus providers withdrew or reduced the services available on a number of routes from April 2011. The Council provided Dial-a-Ride service also ceased in April 2011.
- 2.4 The Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department received a number of petitions from different sources objecting to the withdrawal of the supported bus services and the Dial-a-Ride scheme.
- 2.5 Due to public concern regarding the withdrawal of the supported bus services and Dial-a-Ride the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Economic Development requested that a joint working group be set up with the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to consider these issues.

### **3. ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE WORKING GROUP**

- 3.1 The working group first met on 31 March 2011 (minutes attached at **Appendix A**) where Members considered a presentation by the Transport Team which detailed the impact of the comprehensive spending review and identified the bus services withdrawn as a result of the decision to remove the subsidies.

#### **Alternative providers**

- 3.2 Members were advised that Manor West Community Transport / East Durham Communicare had developed a service similar to Dial-a-Ride, where customers could book transport in advance. It was noted that this was not Dial-a-Ride being provided by Manor West Community Transport / East Durham Communicare, but an entirely separate service.
- 3.3 All statutory school transport was now being provided by the Councils own Integrated Transport Unit, by commercial operators or on a contract basis.
- 3.4 Streamline Taxis had offered a concessionary fare scheme for group travel to outlying Hartlepool villages.
- 3.5 Members felt that these schemes needed to be allowed time to settle in and their usage should be assessed prior to any action being taken by the Council.

#### **Travel Club**

- 3.6 The Transport Team identified a 'travel club' as a possible means for providing a limited demand driven service. Due to the legality of charging arrangements this would need to be a service into which travel club members paid a fee in advance of travel, as it was not possible to take fares on the buses. The service would not operate on a route basis as this was not cost effective.
- 3.7 Members were mindful that services had been withdrawn from the bus routes in question due to a lack of demand, resulting in the routes being unprofitable for commercial companies to operate. As a result it was determined that a questionnaire should be sent to all petition signatories (where the information was available) requesting details of potential service use and the willingness to join a travel club.
- 3.8 Members also agreed to keep a watching brief on the services already in operation from alternative providers, to be able to consider their patronage at a later meeting of the group.

#### **4. QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES**

- 4.1 At the meeting of the Bus Services Working Group on 3 June 2011 (minutes attached at **Appendix B**) the Transport Team provided Members with the results of the questionnaires circulated to petition signatories.
- 4.2 Of the 608 questionnaires distributed 114 responses were received. It should be noted that an additional 50 questionnaires were requested by a Greatham resident, in addition to those originally sent to petition signatories, with the majority of the questionnaires returned being from the Greatham and Central areas and some areas returning no responses at all.
- 4.3 Responses received indicated services would be used less frequently than prior to April 2011 and very low support for a travel club, with a routed service the preferable option. However, this may be due to a lack understanding as 38% of respondents indicated they were willing to join a travel club.
- 4.3 Members were advised that since the previous meeting of the Bus Services Working Group East Durham Communicare had commenced provision of a limited bus service to Elwick and Dalton. Members were provided with an update on the usage figures for the Communicare bus provision in Elwick and Dalton, which were an average of 5.8 passengers per bus; Members were also advised of indications that the service is currently not covering its costs.
- 4.4 The Working Group concluded that, based on the evidence provided, there did not appear to be sufficient demand to justify a general travel club and private providers and the voluntary sector were stepping in to fill voids in service. However, Members were supportive of the Transport Team looking into further options for service provision to the very vulnerable who may not be provided for by commercial operators and also to young people, whose needs had not been considered in great detail to date.
- 4.5 Members discussed the reintroduction of services should funding become available, but were concerned that any funding that could be found would be short term, which would lead to the services being withdrawn once again. This was not considered to be an acceptable solution and any reintroduction of services would need to be sustainable at least in the medium term.
- 4.6 Members went on to discuss a number of further options that were available and were advised that the Council fleet of vehicles are already being hired to the voluntary and community sector, schools and youth organisations and there was a big take up in this area. Members were also advised of the work with the private sector that was being undertaken to develop transport in the local area.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 The Working Group concluded that:-

- (i) The current schemes in operation need time to become established and usages levels and patterns to flatten out;
- (ii) The Transport Team will continue to explore a small scale travel club to benefit the very vulnerable who are unable to use commercial services;
- (iii) A watching brief would be kept by the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Economic Development and the Transport Team on the alternative service provision in place, with regular reports being take to Portfolio Holder meetings;
- (iv) Should funding be available to reintroduce a small number of services this would need to be sustainable for the medium term, as the introduction of a service, which would then be removed once again when funding ran out, was unacceptable;
- (v) Discussions between the Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Holder and other Members had been exceptionally valuable in the identification of potential suggestions / solutions for the future provision of transport services in Hartlepool. In view of this, whilst the work of the Bus Services Working Group was now complete in relation to this issue, the Portfolio Holder suggested that the expertise and views of those Members who had service on the Working Group should be utilised in a 'Think Tank' capacity to enable continued Member involvement in the identification / development of future solutions;
- (vi) As approved by Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee at its meeting of 24 June 2011, the young people associated with the Children's Service Scrutiny Forum would explore the effect the lack of bus services in certain areas and after certain times has on the young in Hartlepool.

## **6. RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 That Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee note and agree the views of the Bus Services Working Group.

### **COUNCILLOR CHRIS SIMMONS CHAIR OF THE BUS SERVICES WORKING GROUP**

**Contact Officer:-** Elaine Hind – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department – Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council

Tel: 01429 523647  
e-mail: [elaine.hind@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:elaine.hind@hartlepool.gov.uk)

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

- (i) Presentation of the Assistant Director of Transport and Engineering entitled 'Proposed Community Travel Club' presented to the Bus Services Working Group on 31 March 2011.
- (ii) Presentation of the Assistant Director of Transport and Engineering entitled 'proposed Community Travel Club' presented to the bus services working Group on 3 June 2011.
- (iii) Minutes of the Bus Services Working Group

## **BUS SERVICES WORKING GROUP**

**31 March 2011**

Councillors: Cranney, Griffin, Hargreaves James, Simmons, and Wells

Officers: Alastair Smith, Assistant Director, Transport and Engineering  
Paul Robson, Integrated Transport Manager  
Jayne Brown, Passenger Transport Services Team Leader  
Elaine Hind, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

1. Appointment of Chair

It was agreed that Councillor Simmons be appointed as Chair.

**Councillor Simmons took the Chair**

2. Apologies for Absence

Councillors Preece and Thomas

3. Position Statement and Presentation (*Assistant Director – Transport and Engineering*)

The Assistant Director provided a comprehensive and detailed presentation which focused on the following:-

- Integrated Transport Unit Structure
  - Passenger Transport Service
  - Fleet Service
  - Road Safety Service
- Make up on Integrated Transport Unit
- Passenger Transport Services
  - 18 vehicles
  - 40 plus fully trained drivers
  - 170,000 journeys per year
- Impact on the Comprehensive Spending Review
- Changes: Stagecoach
- Changes: Other Operators
- What's Happening
- Community Travel Club Proposal



- to provide a flexible, demand responsive service across a varied geographical area;
- Fees must be paid in advance and cover the full cost of the service as drivers are not able to take fares
- How it works
  - Transport Champion Group to identify lead officers for geographical areas
  - The ITU will publish a list of contacts in suitable venues
  - The lead officers will co-ordinate requests for group transport and contact the ITU to arrange the provision on the required date
  - The remaining proportion of the costs of transport will be paid in advance through the lead officer.
- Risks
  - low membership (eg lower patronage equals higher fare)
  - concessionary fares not accepted
- Opportunities
  - agency/brokerage – ensuring best value
  - flexibility and broader access
  - bus/taxi availability
  - provision supplied only when required
  - a bespoke serve to geographical areas
  - could encourage further community funding
- Cost
  - registered route – average £110 per day (17 seats)
  - Travel Club route : average £40 per return journey per bus (17 seats)

In relation to the Dial a Ride service, concerns were expressed that a recent advert in the local paper suggested that the service had transferred from the Council. The Group highlighted the risks regarding the lack of clarity in terms of who was delivering the service and emphasised the need to ensure it was clear that the service had not been transferred to another provider. Members emphasised that the service was no longer being delivered by the Council, there was no statutory responsibility to provide the service, the Council had no involvement in future service provision and there would be no recourse to or legal responsibility for the service of the new providers. The benefits of publicising a specific statement to include details of the new providers were outlined and it was suggested that a public statement clarifying the issues raised be issued.

Following discussion regarding the legality of charging arrangements and the feasibility of introducing a charging system in partnership with another provider, it was suggested that this option be explored as part of the medium to long term planning arrangements.

The Group discussed the community travel club proposal and how this would operate in practice, the most appropriate method of provision, booking and contact arrangements, the role of transport champions, various alternatives in terms of transport booking arrangements and the

most efficient methods of service delivery. Whilst the benefits of operating a loop type circular system were highlighted, the charging implications of such an arrangement were considered. The Group were of the view that the benefits of operating an appropriate loop system to cover the centre of the town and return as well as the Headland and System Carew be further explored as part of the long term vision. In relation to the proposal that fees be paid in advance with a transport credit card type system, the Group suggested that alternative methods of payment should be further examined as part of the longer term vision.

In response to concerns regarding the administrative burden of the proposed booking arrangement, the Assistant Director, Transport and Engineering advised that the administration of the system would be undertaken with current resources and would avoid the need for a loop type system. The benefits of operating a flexible, demand responsive service across a varied geographical area were outlined.

Further debate ensued on the implications of the removal of various bus services on the most vulnerable in the community, the lack of demand for the services that had been withdrawn, the options to address these issues and the level of complaints/petitions received regarding withdrawal of the service. It was suggested that market research be undertaken to identify how much individuals would be prepared to pay for the service and level of demand. In terms of who should be consulted, the option to consult with all signatories to petitions was considered and whilst the majority of Members were of the view that consultation to a wider audience would be beneficial, the cost implications of this arrangement were highlighted. In undertaking the consultation, Members commented on ensuring the most appropriate questions were asked in order to maximise the outcome of the consultation process.

The Group went on to discuss the need to approach Parish Councils with a view to providing funding contributions to the service, the advantages and disadvantages of a travel club arrangement, the likelihood that users of the service would make alternative arrangements once the service was withdrawn and the potential of private operators providing an alternative service.

#### Recommendation

- (1) In relation to the Dial a Ride service, it was agreed that a public statement clarifying the issues outlined above be issued.
- (2) That a letter of consultation be issued to all signatories of the petitions relating to the withdrawal of bus services.
- (3) That Parish Councils be requested to feed into the consultation process and collate responses in relation to their respective parishes.
- (4) The proposed consultation letter be agreed by all Members of the Working Group prior to despatch.

*Bus Services Working Group – 31 March 2011*

- (5) The suggestions of Members be noted and be utilised to assist in the determination of the future bus services provision in the town.
- (6) The next meeting of the Working Group be held in 4 to 6 weeks pending the outcome of the consultation process.

Meeting concluded at 2.20 pm.

CHAIR

## **BUS SERVICES WORKING GROUP**

3 June 2011

The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. at the Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

Councillors: Griffin, Hargreaves James, Preece and Simmons.

Officers: Alastair Smith, Assistant Director, Transport and Engineering  
Jayne Brown, Passenger Transport Services Team Leader  
Elaine Hind, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

### **4. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors Cranney, Thomas and Wells.

### **5. Proposed Community Travel Club (Assistant Director – Transport and Engineering)**

The Passenger Transport Services Team Leader gave a presentation to the Working Group on proposed travel club and updating Members on the issues raised/discussed at the previous meeting.

The presentation highlighted the bus services still in operation around the town particularly highlighting the services to the outlying areas.

In relation to Dial-a-Ride, an alternative service was now being operated by Manor West Community Transport and the East Durham Communicare. It was highlighted that passengers were currently being charged £4 per journey for this service. Manor West Community Transport and East Durham Communicare had reported a drop off in passengers using this service as more customers moved towards using taxis.

East Durham Communicare had also introduced a limited routed service to Dalton and Elwick for which passengers were currently paying £3 per journey. East Durham Communicare were unlikely to be able to operate the routed service in the long term when operating costs were being estimated at £9 per journey per passenger.

The taxi operators were still assessing the situation and there may be more taxis capable of taking wheelchairs introduced but operators were concerned at the cost of the vehicles and the higher costs of operating them.

A questionnaire had been prepared and circulated as discussed at the previous meeting. From 608 questionnaires circulated 114 were returned and

an analysis of the results was shown in the presentation. It appeared that demand for routed services were stronger than a bespoke service with only 38% saying they would wish to join a 'travel club' against 52% saying no. Members considered that with such low numbers, a service was unlikely to be viable.

Members did consider that there was scope for some kind of service to be provided utilising the existing fleet to those that taxis could not provide a service. Members considered that if there was sufficient finance available this should be directed towards a potential scheme.

Members questioned the external use of the fleet and Officers commented that quite a lot of marketing was being undertaken for 'private hire' bookings and income was steadily growing. There was concern at the potential knock-on effect on other local operators through the expansion of the private hire element on the in-house service. Reference was made to the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum investigation into travel services for young people and this was taken on board by officers.

Members supported the proposals discussed in the meeting of the development of a travel club aimed at the disabled/vulnerable that were unable to access taxi services. There was obviously a concern in relation to the financial viability of such a service but it had the potential to provide a service to residents and support the council's existing service.

Members considered that a report detailing the conclusions of the Bus Services Working Group should be taken to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee. Members agreed that the Group had now completed its remit in relation to this issue though the Portfolio Holder suggested that the expertise and views of those Members who had service on the Working Group should be utilised in a 'Think Tank' capacity to enable continued Member involvement in the identification / development of future solutions.

Members thanked the officers for all the hard work that had been undertaken in this exercise.

### **Recommendation**

That a report be submitted to the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee detailing the conclusions of the Bus Services Working Group, including:-

Information provided to the Bus Services Working Group in relation to current service provision and usage;

The potential development of an 'in-house' travel club operation utilising existing vehicles and staff to serve local elderly/disabled/vulnerable travellers who could not access other community transport or taxi services;

iii) Responses to the questionnaire sent to petition signatories regarding the appetite and potential usage of a travel club.

Meeting concluded at 10.55 a.m.

CHAIR

## SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

25 July 2011



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager

**Subject:** CALL-IN OF DECISION: APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES (SPECIFICALLY THE DECISION TAKEN IN REACTION TO SEATON CAREW NURSERY SCHOOL) – FURTHER INFORMATION

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To provide Members with the further information (as requested on at the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee meeting on the 7 April 2011) relating to the Call-In of the Seaton Nursery School element of the decision taken by Children's Services Portfolio Holder, on 22 February 2011.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At the decision making meeting of the Children's Services Portfolio Holder, on 22 February 2011, a report was considered in relation to the appointment of Local Authority representative's governors to serve on school governing bodies. The decision subsequently taken being that:-

"The Portfolio Holder for Children's Services approved the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representatives governors to serve on school Governing Bodies with the exception of the recommendation for **Seaton Carew Nursery School and approved that Councillor Hilary Thompson be appointed to the Governing Body of that nursery school.**"

- 2.2 A copy of the report and full extract from the Decision Record is attached at **Appendix A and B** respectively.
- 2.3 Following the decision taken by the Portfolio Holder, as outlined in Section 2.2 above, a Call-In Notice was submitted to the Proper Officer by 3 Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee. A copy of this Call-in Notice is provided at **Appendix C**.
- 2.4 As the Call-In Notice met all the constitutional requirements, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, at its meeting on the 11 March 2011, gave

consideration to the signatories view / opinion that the decision specifically relating to the Seaton Nursery School appointment had been taken in contravention of the principles of decision making (as outlined in Article 13 of the Constitution). The reason identified in the Call-In Notice being:-

iv) Respect for Human Rights and Equality;

The decision taken disregards the right of an elected member to represent their constituents.

vi) A Presumption in Favour of Openness;

The Portfolio Holder indicates that the reason for her decision was that Cllr Hilary Thompson had managed to foster a relationship with the nursery by attending meetings of the Governing Body as an Observer.

If this is the case it is not readily obvious from the minutes of the Governing Body for the Spring, Summer and Autumn Term meetings of 2010 which do not state that an observer was present.

The perception given is that the Portfolio Holder had either:

- Pre-determined the decision taken; or
- That the decision was politically motivated.

2.5 Having considered the content of the Call-In Notice, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee supported the need to look closer at how the decision had been made and accepted the Call-In Notice. A further meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee was subsequently held on the 7 April 2011, at which detailed consideration was given to the reasons identified for the call-in of the decision. Evidence was provided at this meeting by relevant officers and the Children's Services Portfolio Holder.

2.6 During the course of discussions at the meeting on the 7 April 2011 (The relevant minute from which is attached at **Appendix D**) the following comments were made:-

i) The Children's Services Portfolio Holder confirmed that the reason for appointing Councillor Hilary Thompson to this position had been her involvement with the nursery and specialist interest and experience in early year's education.

ii) Members expressed their disappointment that:

- The recommendation of the General Purposes Committee in relation to this appointment had been disregarded;
- The decision to overturn decisions of the General Purposes Committee was against previous practice; and



- The decision taken disregarded the right of a Seaton Carew Elected Member to represent his constituents and that the minutes of the Portfolio (provided at Appendix B) meeting did not reflect the reasons for the decision as outlined by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting on the 7 April 2011.

iii) Members were of the view that further information was needed before a decision could be taken in terms of:

- The purpose of Councillor Hilary Thompson's visits to the nursery, including dates of visits; and
- Whether the Seaton Ward Councillors were given the same opportunity to visit the nursery.

2.7 Following the meeting on the 7 April, the further information requested was sought from the Head Teacher. The following information was subsequently received:-

- i) The School had been without a Local Authority (LA) Governor for the whole of the academic year.
- ii) At the end of a Governors meeting early in the autumn term 2010, Cllr Geoff Lilley mentioned to the Head Teacher that he knew of a Councillor who may be interested in filling the vacancy of LA Governor at the Nursery. The Head Teacher suggested that the Councillor should contact her with a view to visiting the Nursery.
- iii) Councillor Hilary Thompson telephoned and visited the School on 27.09.2010 at 1.40.
- iv) Still without an LA Governor in January, on behalf of the Governors the Head Teacher wrote to Martyn Aikin 06.01.2011.
- v) Martyn Aikin telephoned me and explained the process, which explained the reason for the delay in appointing an LA Governor.
- vi) This information about the process was shared at the Finance and General Purposes meeting held on 09.02.2011.
- vii) To date the school still has a vacancy for an LA Governor.

### **3. CALL-IN PROCESS – NEXT STEPS**

3.1 In considering the Call-In, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee is required in relation to the decision to, in the first instance, focus its discussions solely at the reasons outlined within the Call-In Notice.

3.2 Having fully discussed the reasons outlined within the Call-In Notice there are two ways forward:-

- (i) Should the Committee be satisfied that the principles of decision making have not been contravened, the decision will be effective immediately; or

- (ii) Should the Committee remain concerned about the decision, comments should be agreed for consideration by the Portfolio Holder at the earliest opportunity.

3.3 Following the receipt of comments from Scrutiny, the Children's Services Portfolio Holder would be required to reconsider the decision in light of them and either reaffirm or amend the decision. A response from the Children's Services Portfolio Holder must be referred back to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, setting out the reasons for reaffirming or modifying the decision, in relation to the issues raised by the Committee.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 That consideration be given to the whether the decision detailed in Section 2.1 was taken in accordance with the Principles of Decision Making (as outlined in Section 13 of the Constitution).
- 4.2 That should the Committee be of the view that the decision detailed in Section 2.1 of this report was not taken in accordance with the Principles of Decision Making, comments be formulated for consideration by the Children's Services Portfolio Holder.

**Contact Officer:-** Joan Stevens – Scrutiny Manager  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 28 4142  
Email: joan.stevens@hartlepool.gov.uk

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

- (i) Hartlepool Borough Council's Constitution;
- (ii) Call-In of Decision: Call-In of Decision: Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies – Briefing Note – Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee (11 March 2011 and 7 April 2011) – Report and minutes;
- (iii) Agenda and Minutes – Children's Services Portfolio Holder (22 February 2011); and
- (iv) Call-in Notice

## **CHILDREN'S SERVICES PORTFOLIO**

Report to Portfolio Holder

22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011



**Report of:** Director of Child and Adult Services

**Subject:** APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY  
REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODIES

---

### **SUMMARY**

#### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To request the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services consideration and approval of the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representative Governors to serve on school governing bodies.

#### **2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The report summarises the process for inviting applications for representative governors and the criteria for their selection.

#### **3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

It is the responsibility of the Portfolio Holder to decide the appointment of Local Authority representative school governors following advice from the General Purposes Sub Committee.

#### **4. TYPE OF DECISION**

Non-key decision.

#### **5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder's meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011

#### **6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

Approval by the Portfolio Holder of the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee, in respect of the appointment of representative Governors to serve on school governing bodies.

**Report of:** Director of Child and Adult Services

**Subject:** APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY  
REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODIES

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To request the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services consideration and approval of the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representative governors to serve on school governing bodies.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Applications are invited from members of the general public, elected members and those governors whose term of office is about to expire or have expired who are interested in serving or wish to continue serving as a Local Authority representative governor on school governing bodies.

The following criteria were agreed by the Borough Council for the recruitment of Local Education Authority representative governors in 2000. Local Authority governors should be able to show:

- demonstrable interest in and commitment to education;
- a desire to support the school concerned;
- a commitment to attend regular meetings of the governing body (and committees as appropriate) and school functions generally;
- good communication/interpersonal skills;
- ability to work as part of a team;
- a clearly expressed willingness to participate in the governor training programme.

A schedule setting out details of vacancies together with applications received in respect of the vacancies was considered by members of the General Purposes Sub Committee at their meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011. (**Appendix 1**).

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Portfolio Holder for Children's Services approves the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representative governors to serve on school Governing Bodies. A schedule outlining recommendations of the General Purposes Sub Committee is attached at **Appendix 1**.

### **4. CONTACT OFFICER**

Ann Turner, Governor Support Officer, Telephone 523766  
Email [ann.turner@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:ann.turner@hartlepool.gov.uk)

# **VACANCIES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVES ON GOVERNING BODIES**

**January 2011**

**Contact Officer: Ann Turner  
Telephone: 01429 523766**

**VACANCIES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY REPRESENTATIVES ON GOVERNING BODIES**

<b>SCHOOL INCLUDING LA GOVERNORS</b>	<b>VACANCIES</b>	<b>POSSIBLE INTEREST</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED FOR APPOINTMENTS</b>
Barnard Grove Primary School Mr Michael Kay Councillor Rob Cook	One Vacancy	No interest expressed	No recommendation
Catcote School	Three Vacancies	Mr J. Bryant	Mr. J Bryant
Eldon Grove Primary School Mrs Jacqui Butterworth Mrs Patricia Vaughan	One Vacancy	No interest expressed	No recommendation
Grange Primary School Councillor R. Flintoff	One Vacancy	No interest expressed	No recommendation
Greatham C. E. Primary School Mrs P. Brotherton	One Vacancy	Councillor Geoff Lilley	Councillor Geoff Lilley
Rift House Primary School Mrs Sylvia Tempest	Two Vacancies	No interest expressed	No recommendation

<b>SCHOOL INCLUDING LA GOVERNORS</b>	<b>VACANCIES</b>	<b>POSSIBLE INTEREST</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED FOR APPOINTMENTS</b>
Rossmere Primary School Mrs M. Smith	One Vacancy	Councillor Patricia Lawton Miss Nicola Marie Leighton	Councillor Patricia Lawton
Seaton Carew Nursery School Councillor Geoff Lilley	One Vacancy	Councillor Hilary Thompson Councillor Paul Malcolm Andrew Thompson	Councillor Paul M A Thompson
St Helen's Primary School Miss C. Lamb Councillor Reubin Atkinson Mr J. Ibbotson	One Vacancy	No interest expressed	No recommendation
Throston Primary School Mrs S. Allison Mr Kevin Shears	One Vacancy	Mrs Wendy Cooper	Mrs Cooper encouraged to apply for current Parent Governor vacancy at the school
West Park Primary School Mrs S. Kirby Mrs Margaret Boddy	One Vacancy	Councillor Ray Wells	Councillor Ray Wells



## **CHILDREN'S SERVICES PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD**

22 February 2011

The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

**Present:**

Councillor Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder)

Councillor Robbie Payne (Finance and Procurement Portfolio Holder)

Officers: Alan Dobby, Assistant Director, Resources and Support Services  
Ann Turner, Governor Support Officer  
Ian Merritt, Strategic Commissioner – Children's Services  
Penny Thompson, Childcare Market Officer  
Emma Marley, Special Educational Needs Manager  
John Robinson, Parent Commissioner  
Jill Coser, Parenting Co-ordinator  
Sarah Bird, Democratic Services Officer

### **27. Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies** *(Governor Support Officer)*

**Type of Decision**

Non key.

**Purpose of Report**

To request the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services consideration and approval of the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representative Governors to serve on school governing bodies.

**Issues for Consideration**

The report summarised the process for inviting applications for representative governors and the criteria for their selection. A schedule of those schools with vacancies and those recommended for appointment by the General Purposes Committee. A number of appointments had been recommended for Catcote School, Greatham C of E Primary School, Rossmere Primary School and

West Park Primary School.

The Portfolio Holder commented that she spoken with the two Councillors who were interested in the vacancy at Seaton Carew and had decided not to go with the recommendation of the General Purposes Committee as the other Councillor had taken an interest in the school and had attended meetings of the Governing Body as an observer.

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder for Children's Services approved the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representatives governors to serve on school Governing Bodies with the exception of the recommendation for Seaton Carew Nursery School and approved that Councillor Hilary Thompson be appointed to the Governing Body of that nursery school.

The meeting concluded at 10.57 am.

**P J DEVLIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 25 February 2011**

## Overview and Scrutiny – Call-in Notice – Scrutiny Chairs

### 1. Which decision would you like to call-in?

(Please include details of the decision, when it was taken and by whom)

Minute 27. of the decision record of the Children's Services Portfolio of 22nd February

### 2. What are the reasons for calling-in this decision?

That the decision was not taken in accordance with the principles of decision making set out in Article 13 of the Constitution

#### Principles of Decision Making

##### iv) respect for human rights and equality;

The decision taken disregards the right of an elected members to represent their constituents.

##### vi) a presumption in favour of openness;

The Portfolio holder indicates that the reason for her decision was that Cllr. Hilary Thompson had managed to foster a relationship with the nursery by attending meetings of the Governing Body as an Observer.

If this is the case it is not readily obvious from the minutes of the Governing Body for the Spring, Summer and Autumn Term meetings of 2010 which do not state that an Observer was present.

The perception given is that the Portfolio Holder had either:  
pre-determined the decision to be taken;  
or that the decision was politically motivated;

Councillor	Position and Party Group	Signature
1. Marjorie James	Chair of S.C.C. - Labour	<i>MA James</i>
2. Carl Richardson	Member of S.C.C. - Labour	<i>Carl Richardson</i>
3. Ray Wells	Member of S.C.C. - Conservative	<i>Ray Wells</i>

NB. Each of the Scrutiny Chairs may initiate call-ins providing they have the support of at least two members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee. The three signatories must represent at least two of the Council's political groups.

Councillor: Marjorie James

Signed: *MA James*

Date: 2nd March 2011

**For office use only**

MINUTE EXTRACT

**SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES**

7 April 2011

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

**Present:**

Councillor: James (In the Chair)

Councillors C Akers-Belcher, A Marshall, Preece, Richardson, Shaw, Simmons and Wells

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2 (ii) Councillor Fleet was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Griffin

**Also Present:**

Councillor Hill, Children' Services Portfolio Holder  
Andy Powell, Housing Hartlepool

**Officers:** Caroline O'Neill, Assistant Director, Child and Adult Services  
John Mennear, Assistant Director, Child and Adult Services  
Damien Wilson, Assistant Director, Regeneration and Neighbourhoods  
Ann Turner, Governor Support Officer  
Gemma Day, Principal Regeneration Officer  
Karen Kelly, Housing Strategy Officer  
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager  
Elaine Hind, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

**260. Call-in of Decision: Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies (specifically the decision taken in relation to Seaton Nursery) Briefing Note/Verbal Evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services** *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager provided Members with the relevant information relating to the Call-In of the Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies (specifically the decision taken in relation to Seaton Carew Nursery School) by the Children's Services

## **MINUTE EXTRACT**

Portfolio Holder on 22 February 2011, in accordance with the Authority's Call-In procedure.

The decision taken was that "The Portfolio Holder approved the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representatives governors to serve on school governing bodies with the exception of the recommendation for Seaton Carew Nursery School and approved that Councillor Hilary Thompson be appointed to the Governing Body of that nursery school"

An extract of the relevant minute together with the report considered by the Portfolio Holder was submitted. Following the submission of an appropriate call-in notice (submitted as an appendix to the report) the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, at its meeting on 11 March 2011, considered and accepted the notice.

Details of the next steps in the process were provided, as set out in the report.

The Committee were asked to consider whether the decision was taken in accordance with the principles of decision making (as outlined in section 13 of the Constitution).

Officers who had been involved in the preparation of the report and the Children's Services Portfolio Holder were in attendance at the meeting to answer any questions in relation to the decision.

In response to a request for clarification regarding the Portfolio Holder's reasons for the decision, the Portfolio Holder was of the view that the decision taken was the correct decision and highlighted that there had been a misunderstanding regarding Councillor Hilary Thompson's attendance at Seaton Nursery Governing Body meetings. Councillor Thompson had visited the nursery on several occasions. However, had not attended the Governing Body meetings. The Children's Services Portfolio Holder confirmed that the reason for appointing Councillor Hilary Thompson to this position was due to her involvement with the nursery and specialist interest and experience in early year's education.

A Member referred to the background to Councillor Paul Thompson's application and queried why it was considered Councillor Paul Thompson would not be interested in this position. The Governor Support Officer provided details of the expressions of interest process together with the follow up action taken as a result of the decision of General Purposes Committee.

The Chair went on to provide details of the decision making process of the General Purposes Committee in relation to this issue.

## **MINUTE EXTRACT**

Members expressed their disappointment that the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee in relation to this appointment had been disregarded, that the decision to overturn decisions of the General Purposes Committee was against previous practice, that the decision taken disregarded the right of a Seaton Carew Elected Member to represent his constituents and that the minutes of the Portfolio meeting did not reflect the reasons for the decision as outlined by the Portfolio Holder today.

A number of questions were raised regarding the purpose of Councillor Hilary Thompson's visits to the nursery, including dates of visits and whether the Seaton Ward Councillors were given the same opportunity to visit the nursery to which the Assistant Director agreed to explore with the Head Teacher and provide clarification in this regard.

In relation to the reasons for the call- in and the Committee's perception that the Portfolio Holder had either pre-determined the decision taken or that the decision was politically motivated, the Children's Services Portfolio did not support this view and expressed extreme concerns in relation to such suggestions.

Following further discussion, the Committee requested that the item be deferred pending receipt of information from the Head Teacher regarding the issues raised, as set out above.

### **Recommended**

That the call-in be further considered at a future meeting of this Committee upon receipt of clarification from Seaton Nursery in relation to the queries raised, as set out above.

## SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

25 July 2011



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager

**Subject:** SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE  
CONSIDERATION OF 2012/13 BUDGET ITEMS –  
SCOPING REPORT

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To make proposals to Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee regarding their consideration of the 2012/13 budget items chosen as part of the Work Programming process on the 24 June 2011.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At the meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 24 June 2011 Members determined their work programme for the 2011/12 Municipal Year. It was decided that each Scrutiny Forum would focus its attention on preparations for the 2012/13 budget during the current Municipal Year, given the extremely challenging financial situation facing the authority.
- 2.2 Each Scrutiny Forum was requested to consider the budget proposals identified in relation to the remit of that Forum, to formulate a view on those proposals and / or to suggest ways of achieving the required savings.
- 2.3 At the meeting on the 24 June 2011, it was agreed that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee would consider the following budget proposals / projects:-
- Extended Customer and Support Services DSO
  - Penalty Charges – Income
  - Council Tax Class A Exemption Removal – Income
  - Bailiff Care Parking Enforcement – Income
  - Review of Service Provision and Potential Divisional Structure in Corporate Strategy
- 2.4 In accordance with the timetable agreed at the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 24 June 2011, consideration is to be given to the below proposal / project at today's meeting:-
- Penalty Charges – Income

**3. OVERALL AIM OF SCRUTINY CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET ITEMS**

- 3.1 To provide views and / or alternative suggestions for savings, regarding the 2012/13 budget proposals presented to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee in relation to 'Penalty Charges – Income'.

**4. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF 2012/13 BUDGET PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 The following Terms of Reference are proposed:-

- (a) To gain an understanding of the service areas in relation to:
  - i) The current budget (as detailed in the budget book);
  - ii) Staffing information;
  - iii) Budgetary and operational pressures / challenges / priorities and statutory responsibilities (where applicable);
  - iv) The level of savings required.
- (b) To explore the budget requirements in relation to:-
  - i) The required savings (including areas where provision of services could be ceased, reduced or changed to improve efficiency);
  - ii) The potential impact of proposals / options on future service provision; and
  - iii) How the provision of service could look in the future.
- (c) To formulate the Committee's comments on the budget proposals to feed in to the decision making process;
- (d) To provide details of, and consider, any alternative suggestions the Committee may develop to achieve the required savings in the areas identified.

**5. POTENTIAL AREAS OF ENQUIRY / SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- 5.1 Members of the Committee can request a range of evidential and comparative information throughout the budget process. However, Members may wish to be mindful of the need to deal with budget proposals in an efficient and timely manner and the impact on the department responsible for the budget area, when considering such requests.
- 5.2 The 2012/13 budget will be discussed at a number of public meetings including Scrutiny Forums, Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, Cabinet and Council. Elected Members, representatives of groups who provide and use services, residents and members of the public are welcome to attend these meetings, where consideration will be given to their views in relation to the budget proposals.



### 5.3 Evidence to be provided:

- (i) Details of the current budget (as detailed in the budget book);
- (ii) staffing information;
- (iii) Details of budgetary and operational pressures / challenges / priorities and statutory responsibilities (where applicable);
- (iv) The level of savings required; and
- (v) Details of potential options identified for the delivery of required budget savings.

## 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. Paragraph 5.2 identifies the budget process route. Further details regarding the public meetings to be held to discuss the 2012/13 budget can be found on the Council's website.

## 7. PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

- 7.1 The tight timescale for consideration of this proposal / project, to enable the submission of a view / report to Cabinet in August 2011, has resulted in the identification of a proposed timetable (as detailed below):-

### 22 July 2011

- 1) Setting the scene presentation and evidence gathering in relation to the 'Penalty Charges – Income' budget proposals / project, including:-
  - (i) Overview of legal background surrounding penalty charges in relation to 'Penalty Charges – Income';
  - (ii) Details of the amount of required savings / income required in relation to Penalty Charges;
  - (iii) Details of how the require efficiencies / income generation may be delivered;
  - (iv) The potential effect of efficiencies / income generation on future service provision / what the service will look like in the future.
- 2) Formulation and consideration by the Committee of suggestions to achieve the required savings / income generation to be fed back to Cabinet at part of the 2012/13 budget decision process.

**August 2011** – Consideration of the Committee's proposals / suggestion in relation to 'Penalty Charges – Income' by the Performance Portfolio Holder.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 Members are recommended to:-

- i) Agree the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's remit of consideration of the 2012/13 budget proposal / project as outlined in paragraph 4.1; and
- ii) Formulate views on proposals for / suggestions in relation to the generation of the required savings / income, to be fed back to the Performance Portfolio Holder in August 2011.

**Contact Officer:** - Joan Stevens – Scrutiny Manager  
Chief Executive's Department – Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: - 01429 284142  
Email:- joan.stevens@hartlepool.gov.uk

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper(s) was/were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Presentation by the Assistant Chief Executive entitled 'Budget Position 2012/13' - delivered to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of 24 June 2011.
- (ii) Report of the Assistant Chief Executive entitled 'Selection and Timetabling of Project / Service Areas to feed into the 2012/13 Budget Process' – delivered to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of 24 June 2011
- (iii) Minutes of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee 24 June 2011.

# **SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

**25 July 2011**



**Report of:** Chief Customer & Workforce Services Officer

**Subject:** SCC Workforce Service Working Group

## **1. Background**

1.1 On 13.11 09 Scrutiny CC considered a report regarding a working group which had previously been constituted from within the membership of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to be involved in the development of the People Strategy and Single Status Agreement. At its meeting on 2 October 2009, the Local Joint Consultative Committee asked that this Committee to consider creating a working group to consider workforce matters on a number of outstanding reviews as specified in the Single Status Agreement.

1.2 It was agreed that in view of the likely topics to be considered, that the working group be named the Workforce Working Group. The Group decided which topics would form its work programme and this would be fed back into Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee. Whilst noting the requirement for political balance where possible, it was agreed that the following Members form the working group:

Councillors Marjorie James (Chair), Jonathan Brash, Arthur Preece, Carl Richardson, Chris Simmons and David Young.

1.3 I presented a report to SCC on 12 11 10 which provided an update on the progress of the Workforce Services Working Group in relation progress to date in relation to the Working Group's consideration of the following projects:-

Flexible Working  
Car, motor and bicycle allowance/car parking  
Member Development  
People and Workforce Development Strategies

## **2. Future of the Workforce Services Working Group**

2.1 The issues facing the Council in terms of the workforce are severely impacted by the need to make significant savings. An exercise is to be undertaken to negotiate with the trade unions on where budget savings

can be made from employee costs. The potential implications for the Council in trying to reach agreement with trade union representatives and employees and implement changes to terms and conditions are relevant to all Elected members.

- 2.2 It is proposed that the Workforce Services Working Group meet with officers to consider and comment on the proposals as they have been developed to date and on an on-going basis as negotiations progress with trade union representatives during August, September and October to ensure that a wider view of Elected Members is obtained.

### **3. Membership of the Group**

- 3.1 Following recent elections and changes to the membership of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, consideration needs to be given to the renewal of the membership of the Working Group. As mentioned in Paragraph 1.2 above the current membership being Councillors Marjorie James (Chair), Jonathan Brash, Arthur Preece, Carl Richardson, Chris Simmons and David Young. Whilst there is no requirement for Working Groups to be politically balanced, Members have in the past been mindful of the need for representation by multiple groups and on this basis nominations would be required as follows:-

### **4. Labour Members**

- 4.1 1 Association of Independent Councillors (AIC) and 1 Independent Councillor\*

\*In the absence of either an AIC or Independent Councillors on the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, Members are asked to consider if they wish fill these places with from the Liberal Democrat and Conservative Members on the Committee. As previously indicated there is no requirement for the membership of Working Groups to be politically balanced.

### **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1 That the Committee considers the renewal of the membership of the Workforce Services Working Group to consider the issue as set out in Paragraph 2.2.

## SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

25 July 2011



**Report of:** Assistant Director for Health Improvement and Adult Social Care

**Subject:** DEVELOPMENT OF A HARTLEPOOL HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 There will be a statutory requirement for Hartlepool (and all Local Authorities) to have Health and Wellbeing Boards, with an expectation that meetings are held in public acting as a 'key forum for public accountability of NHS, public health, social care for adults and children and other commissioned services that the Health and Wellbeing Board agrees are directly related to health and wellbeing'.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Health White Paper *Equity & Excellence* published in July 2010 consulted on the proposed arrangements for Health & Wellbeing Boards. The Government's response to this document *Liberating the NHS: Legislative framework and next steps* was published in December 2010 and gave a greater assessment of the direction of travel and made some modifications to the proposals. In parallel, the Public Health White Paper *Healthy People Healthy Lives* reaffirms the role of Health and Wellbeing Boards.
- 2.2 David Behan (Director General of Social Care) wrote to Local Authorities in January highlighting the importance of Health & Wellbeing Boards and requesting that they consider being part of an Early Implementer programme. Hartlepool expressed an interest and is now part of the early Implementer programme along with all of the other North East authorities.
- 2.3 Following the 'pause' in the Health and Social Care Bill and recent listening exercise orchestrated by the NHS Future Forum, and the subsequent Government response, there is now further clarity on the role of the Health and Well Being Board.

### 3. NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 A full report on Health and Well Being Boards is to be presented to Cabinet on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2011.

- 3.2 A shadow board will be established by end of September 2011.
- 3.3 A draft terms of reference will be agreed with partner agencies at first shadow board meeting in September in the light of the views of Cabinet on 15<sup>th</sup> August.

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members choose one of the following options:-
- (i) To consider the development of the Health and Wellbeing Board in Hartlepool at a future meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee; or
  - (ii) Members may feel it more appropriate to refer the issue for consideration by the Health Scrutiny Forum, with a request for progress reports back to this Committee as the Health and Wellbeing Board develops.

**Contact Officers:-** Louise Wallace – Assistant Director, Health Improvement  
 Jill Harrison – Assistant Director, Adult Social Care  
 Child and Adult Services  
 Hartlepool Borough Council  
 Tel: 01429 284030 / 523911  
 Email: Louise.wallace@northteespct.nhs.uk /  
 jill.harrison@hartlepool.gov.uk

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (i) Department of Health (2010), *Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS*, Available from [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_117353](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_117353)
- (ii) Department of Health (2010), *Liberating the NHS: Legislative Framework and Next Steps*, Available from [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Healthcare/LiberatingtheNHS/DH\\_122624](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Healthcare/LiberatingtheNHS/DH_122624)
- (iii) Department of Health (2010), *Healthy Lives, Healthy People: Our Strategy for Public Health in England*, Available from [http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH\\_121941](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_121941)

## SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

25 July 2011



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager

**Subject:** POTENTIAL REQUEST FOR CHANGE TO  
REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES  
SCRUTINY FORUM'S WORK PROGRAMME FOR  
2011/12

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek consideration of a potential request from the Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum for a change to the Forum's work programme for 2011/12.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 24 June 2011; to which all Members of the Forum were invited; it was agreed that the main topic for investigation by the Regeneration and Planning Services Forum's Work Programme for 2011/12 would be the issue of Housing Regeneration, with a specific focus on existing homes. Members also agreed that should the Forum have capacity the issue of Employment and Training Opportunities for Young Adults aged 19+ would be considered as a second investigation.
- 2.2 Following further consideration of each of the potential topics the Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum is of the view that the main topic for investigation should be changed. In this basis, the Chair of the Forum will at the first meeting of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, on the 21 July 2011, be seeking Members views on the amendment of the Forum's work programme to enable the issue of 'Employment and Training Opportunities for Young Adults aged 19+' to be taken as its main investigation for 2011/12. Further details regarding the two investigation proposals are attached as **Appendices A and B** for Members information.
- 2.3 An update on the outcome of discussions at the meeting of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum meeting on the 21 July 2011 will be provided by the Chair of the Forum. Subsequent to the outcome of these discussions, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee may be asked to consider

a formal request by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum for the amendment of its Work Programme for 2011/12, as detailed in section 2.2 above.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee be asked to:-

- (i) Note the report and await an update from the Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following the outcome of the Forum meeting on the 21 July 2011;
- (ii) Subject to the outcome of the (i) above; consider a potential request from the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum for a change to its Work Programme for 2011/12.

**Contact Officer:-** Joan Stevens – Scrutiny Manager  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 28 4142  
Email: joan.stevens@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

- (i) Minutes of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee 24 June 2011.
- (ii) Report and minutes of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum meeting on the 21 July 2011.



<p><b>Topic:</b></p> <p>Housing Regeneration.</p>
<p><b>Aim</b></p> <p>To explore housing regeneration schemes in Hartlepool.</p>
<p><b>Background Information</b></p> <p>Potentially a joint piece of work with the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum to review housing regeneration schemes in place, their success and the effect on local communities.</p> <p>Hartlepool Borough Council's key strategic roles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the Housing Partnership, produce the Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• Assess housing 'need' and enable affordable housing to be developed.</li> <li>• Work towards a balanced housing market in the town.</li> <li>• Support the work of the Housing Partnership.</li> <li>• Consult with residents of on important issues relating to housing.</li> <li>• Obtain external funding for housing.</li> <li>• Work with sub-regional partners to produce, monitor and implement the Sub Regional Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• Influence the Regional Housing Strategy.</li> <li>• Ensure there is access to housing, including working with sub regional partners to implement and run a Choice Based Letting Scheme.</li> </ul> <p>The new Housing Strategy (2011-15) is currently out to consultation. The strategy comprises of three main topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Homes/New &amp; Sustainable Communities</li> <li>• Existing Homes/Ensuring Sustainable Communities</li> <li>• Meeting Specific Needs</li> </ul> <p>Suggested potential areas to examine / explore could include the following:-</p> <p>(a) To gain an understanding of:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) housing regeneration, what it delivers and its effects on the local community (including communities on the outskirts of regeneration areas);</li> <li>(ii) potential future legislation which may affect housing regeneration.</li> </ol> <p>(b) To evaluate whether housing regeneration should continue to be provided in its current form to deliver effective and efficient ways of working.</p> <p>(c) To feed into the 2011 – 2015 Housing Strategy consultation.</p>

**What would be the desired area(s) of impact / benefit resulting from the investigation?**

An evaluation of the current housing regeneration schemes in place resulting in improved ways of working that are both efficient and effective.

To positively contribute to the housing strategy 2011-2015 consultation.

**Investigation Requirements.**

Are there any factors affecting the commencement or delivery deadlines of the investigation, such as the consultation period for the Housing Strategy 2011-2015.

How many Forum meetings would the identified areas for investigation require?

**Corporate Plan Actions / Pi's and LAA targets to which the issue relates.**

None

<p><b>Topic:</b></p> <p>Employment and Training Opportunities for Young Adults aged 19+</p>
<p><b>Aim</b></p> <p>To explore the issue of training and employment opportunities in Hartlepool for young people aged 19+, but in particular those in their early to mid twenties, who left school prior to the advent of NEETS and the introduction of structured information, advice, guidance and tracking via Connexions.</p>
<p><b>Background Information</b></p> <p>Suggested potential areas to examine / explore could include the following:-</p> <p>(a) To gain an understanding of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the cohort covered by unemployment as described above (age range etc);</li> <li>(ii) background to key economic factors in the local economy and economic trends;</li> <li>(iii) the Local Authorities and partner agencies responsibilities in this area.</li> </ul> <p>(b) To explore the services currently provided regarding unemployment for this age group (including any potential gaps in service provision) by:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the Local Authorities (including responsibilities for 19+ and apprentices etc);</li> <li>(ii) partnership working;</li> </ul> <p>(c) To explore how effective the current service provision is and if it should continue to be provided in the existing way;</p> <p>(d) How support should be provided in the future taking in to consideration future funding streams and the current budgetary situation the Council and its partners face.</p>
<p><b>What would be the desired area(s) of impact / benefit resulting from the investigation?</b></p> <p>An evaluation of the current programmes and assistance in place to help people back in to employment, education and training resulting in improved ways of working that are both efficient and effective.</p>
<p><b>Investigation Requirements.</b></p> <p>Are there any factors affecting the commencement or delivery deadlines of the investigation?</p> <p>How many Forum meetings would the identified areas for investigation require?</p>
<p><b>Corporate Plan Actions / Pi's and LAA targets to which the issue relates.</b></p> <p>Theme: Jobs and the Economy Outcome: People have greater access to employment and skills opportunities Indicator: NI 151 Overall Employment rate (proportion of people of working age population</p>

who are in employment)

## SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

25 July 2011



Report of: Scrutiny Manager

Subject: REQUEST FOR FUNDING TO SUPPORT INFORMAL  
SCRUTINY CHAIRS MEETINGS

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek approval from the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee for a request for funding from the meeting of Informal Scrutiny Chairs, from within the Overview and Scrutiny Function's dedicated scrutiny budget.

### 2. FUNDING PROPOSAL

- 2.1 In line with Council procedures, the agreed pro-forma has been completed and is attached as **Appendix A**. The purpose of the completed pro-forma is to assist this Committee in determining whether approval should be given to fund the additional support requested by the meeting of Informal Scrutiny Chairs.

### 3. THE COUNCIL'S FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULES

- 3.1 The Financial Procedure Rules are those rules that the Council must have to govern its financial affairs. These rules are required by law to ensure that large sums of public money are spent properly and wisely.
- 3.2 The Financial Procedure Rules together with Standing Orders, apply to all parts of the Council, to Elected Members and employees and form an integral part of the Council's Constitution.
- 3.3 Consequently, whilst this Committee is requested to make a decision on the merits of the request for funding, the Committee must also adhere to the Council's Financial Procedure Rules.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee:-

- (a) determines whether the proposal is justified on the basis of information provided in **Appendix A**;
- (b) determines whether the proposal is a sufficient priority within the remaining budgetary provision; and
- (c) agrees in principal that any funding allocated, is in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rules.

**Contact:-**

Joan Stevens – Scrutiny Manager  
Chief Executive's Department – Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 284142  
Email: joan.stevens@hartlepool.gov.uk

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.



## APPENDIX A

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

<p><b>Title of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</b> SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE</p>
<p><b>Title of the current scrutiny investigation for which funding is requested:</b> INFORMAL MEETING OF SCRUTINY CHAIRS</p>
<p><b>To clearly identify the purpose for which additional support is required:</b> Lunch for Members</p>
<p><b>To outline indicative costs to be incurred as a result of the additional support:</b>  6 Members @ £3.50 per head for 5 meetings, £105 in total</p>
<p><b>To outline any associated timescale implications:</b> Informal Scrutiny Chairs Meetings to be held approximately every 8 weeks from 22 July 2011</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> To enable Members to participate given the proximity of the meeting to the afternoons meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee</p>
<p><b>To outline any requirements / processes to be adhered to in accordance with the Council’s Financial Procedure Rules / Standing Orders:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>To outline the possible disadvantages of not utilising the additional support during the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:</b>  N/A</p>
<p><b>To outline any possible alternative means of additional support outside of this proposal:</b> N/A</p>