

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



17 April 2013

at 1.00pm

in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Beck, Cook, Gibbon, Jackson, Loynes, Payne and Tempest.

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 MARCH 2013**
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

No items
- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No items
- 6. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS/BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

No items



7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- 7.1 Scrutiny Investigation into the JSNA topic of 'Environment' - Consideration of Draft Final Report - *Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum*

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION



NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

20 March 2013

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

Present:

Councillor: Sylvia Tempest (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob Cook, Steve Gibbon, Peter Jackson and Brenda Loynes

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2 (ii), Councillor Jim Ainslie was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Robbie Payne.

Also present:

Alan Snape, Northumbrian Water Authority
Kevin Ensell, Hartlepool Water
Graeme Yull, Environment Agency

Officers: Alastair Smith, Assistant Director, Transportation and Engineering
Jane Kett, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial Services)
Adrian Hurst, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Environmental Protection)
Debbie Kershaw, Quality and Safety Officer
Paul Hurworth, Climate Change Officer
Elaine Hind, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Armstrong, Principal Democratic Services Officer

74. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Paul Beck.

75. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

76. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2013

Confirmed.

77. Matters arising from the Minutes

In relation to minute 68, Members were informed that the Assistant Director, Performance and Achievement had indicated that the issue of school meals take up will be raised at the next meeting of the Head Teachers' Forum that was due to take place on 19 June 2013 with the outcome of the discussions to be forwarded to Members.

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

None.

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

None.

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

None.

80. Scrutiny Investigation into the JSNA topic of 'Environment' - Water *(Scrutiny Support Officer/Quality and Safety Officer/Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial Services))*

Members were informed that Officers from the Public Protection and Parks and Countryside Teams had been invited to attend the meeting to provide information in relation to the investigation into the JSNA topic of 'Environment'.

The Quality and Safety Officer gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation on the quality of bathing water and provided a schedule of analysis of bathing water from 1998 to 2012 across the three designated beaches located at Seaton North, Seaton Centre and Seaton North Gare. It was noted that generally the results had improved with the occasional poor or sufficient result which it was suspected was due to heavy rainfalls. The presentation highlighted who was at risk from bathing water pollution and why and listed the main causes of pollution to bathing water.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (i) A Member questioned which beaches were designated and questioned why none of the beaches on the Headland were designated beaches. The Quality and Safety Officer confirmed the three designated beaches

were located at Seaton Carew. Members were informed that due to the port activities and location of the shipping channel, it was not feasible to designate beaches at the Headland as bathing water beaches. It was noted that the beaches on the Headland, particularly the fish sands and block sands were frequently used by bathers and were monitored by lifeguards, yet they were not designated beaches. It was highlighted that whilst the use of these beaches was a historical thing, further examination of the areas would be undertaken to ascertain whether it was safe to bathe or whether signage should be erected warning bathers of the water quality.

- (ii) A Member sought clarification as it appeared from the presentation that since the new more stringent EU Bathing Water Directive had been implemented in 2012, the bathing water quality results had improved. The Quality and Safety Officer confirmed that the new Directive was more stringent and the way the bathing water was tested and sampling was undertaken was different. The representative from Northumbrian Water Authority (NWA) informed Members that a recent collapse of a storm outfall in Mainsforth Terrace had resulted in intermittent operation and due to the area being a special protection area for birds, NWA had been unable to enter the site to undertake any repairs. However, it was hoped that the repairs would be complete in Spring this year. The representative from NWA added that the key to solving the problems of bathing water pollution was to understand the source of that pollution and the impact of the bacteria contained within that pollution.
- (iii) A Member questioned whether during times of heavy rainfall, samples were taken from the River Tees as there were various water courses that run into that River before the sea. The representative from the Environment Agency (EA) confirmed that there were a number of sample points including at the stell and other areas to enable the identification of potential pollution sources before the water reaches the sea. Members were asked not to under estimate the impact of the weather on bathing water pollution as it could have a significant impact.
- (iv) During the presentation it was noted that mis-connecting of drains can be a cause of bathing water pollution and a Member sought clarification on how this would be tackled. The Quality and Safety Officer confirmed that this would be undertaken through press and publicity and highlighting at public meetings.

The Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial Services) gave a detailed presentation on the quality of drinking water, informing Members of the two water suppliers in the town and highlighting who was at risk and why from drinking water pollution. Whilst it was explained that the majority of the town were supplied with mains water supplied by one water company, it was noted that drinking water was supplied to the local brewery via a private water supply. The Council is responsible for identifying and monitoring private water supplies and must carry out a full risk assessment every 5 years. There are also several private distribution networks in the town that are utilised by the water companies where the owner is responsible for the maintenance of the pipework structures and for managing any incidents which may affect water quality or supply.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (v) A Member questioned the frequency of risk assessments that were undertaken and whether they should be undertaken more frequently than every five years. The representative from Hartlepool Water informed Members that the Chief Inspectorate for drinking water had reduced the frequency for inspections of the public suppliers who were consistently performing very well due to being a highly regulated industry with comprehensive monitoring, to enable a greater focus on the private suppliers who were not performing as well.
- (vi) In relation to the operation of water meters, a Member questioned the take up of meters and whether when a household was using a meter, the water usage had decreased. The representative from Hartlepool Water informed Members that in the 1980's the take up of water meters was very low. However, take up had increased with customers living in higher rateable houses with low occupancy benefitting the most. In addition water meters were installed in all new developments. The current estimate was that around 30% of houses in Hartlepool were operating water meters which was typical of the north east area. It had been calculated that households who were operating a water meter did tend to use less water.

All the officers and representatives were thanked for their informative presentations and for answering Members' questions.

Recommended

- (i) The presentations and discussion that followed would be used to inform Members during their investigation.
- (ii) That further examination of the fish sands and block sands beach areas would be undertaken to ascertain whether it was safe to bathe or whether signage should be erected warning bathers of the water quality.

81. Scrutiny Investigation into the JSNA topic of 'Environment' – Air *(Scrutiny Support Officer/Principal Environmental Health Officer)*

The Principal Environmental Health Officer (Environmental Protection) gave a comprehensive presentation on Air Quality which provided Members with an overview of the air quality in the area across Hartlepool and Teesside. The presentation included an outline of who was at risk and why and the different monitoring arrangements that were in place.

- (i) A member of the public in attendance asked whether Hartlepool was still a smoke free zone as it appeared that some people were still burning coal. The Principal Environmental Health Officer confirmed that the only places that were not smoke controlled were the outlying villages apart from Greatham. Whilst it was noted that there was a big push nationally for the

usage of bio-fuels, it was noted that when burned this also produced pollutants.

- (ii) A Member sought clarification on whether any complaints had been received from many Headland residents in relation to air quality pollution. The Principal Environmental Health Officer indicated that whilst there would always be an occasional incident due to the area incorporating an operational port, they were very infrequent. However, Officers received regular shipping, loading and unloading reports and observational visits were undertaken on an ad hoc basis.
- (iii) In relation to the results on air quality on the Headland area, a Member sought clarification on whether sea salt affected these results. The Principal Environmental Health Officer confirmed that sea salt did affect the results and this had been identified with higher results in times of high winds from the sea. Whilst it was recognised that this was not the ideal location for a monitor of this type, it had been placed there at the request of residents.
- (iv) The representative from the Environment Agency confirmed that the operation of the port was monitored through an Environment Agency permit, and whilst all port operations had the potential to produce particulates, the permit ensures that all effective mechanisms be put in place to prevent or minimise any necessary omissions. It was noted that the company who operated the port had installed a number of improvements to procedures, including the stopping of loading cargo in particularly windy circumstances. In addition, the Environment Agency regularly check the operation of the port, targeting loading operations when there was a higher risk of issues. Members were reassured that communications were ongoing between the company and the Environment Agency to ensure that all that was reasonably practical was undertaken to prevent significant impact on the air quality of the area.
- (v) A Member questioned whether the smell of seaweed would impact on the monitoring equipment used on the Headland area. The Principal Environmental Health Officer confirmed that the monitoring equipment only monitored particulates in the air. However, the sea salt affected the way the monitors work and they were very expensive to purchase and maintain.
- (vi) In relation to point (ix) above, a Member questioned whether a check could be undertaken to ascertain if the sea salt did affect the monitoring results of the equipment located close to the sea. The Principal Environmental Health Officer indicated he would explore this issue further and report back to Members.

The Officer was thanked for the informative presentations and for answering Members' questions.

Recommended

- (i) The presentations and discussion that followed would be used to inform Members during their investigation.
- (ii) That a check could be undertaken to ascertain if the sea salt did affect

the monitoring results of the equipment located close to the sea.

82. Scrutiny Investigation into the JSNA topic of ‘Environment’ - Hartlepool Draft Environment JSNA Entry (*Scrutiny Support Office*)

The report provided Members with the JSNA ‘Environment’ entry for consideration as part of the ongoing Forum investigation. The Climate Change Officer informed Members that the draft document they had received was slightly amended to the previous draft version. The document had been amended by representatives in the NHS and returned to Members for comments. Members were informed that the document was likely to go live on the Tees JSNA website in the next few weeks.

The Climate Change Officer confirmed that there was still a significant amount of updating required before the document would be uploaded onto the website with the document being updated as a live document, as and when necessary with the approval of the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods or the Assistant Director, Transportation and Engineering.

Recommended

Members noted the content of the JSNA ‘Environment’ and that the document would be further updated prior to uploading on the TEES JSNA website.

83. Scrutiny Investigation into the JSNA topic of ‘Environment’ – Formulation of recommendations for the JSNA topic of ‘Environment’ (*Scrutiny Support Office*)

The report provided Members with the opportunity to formulate views and make recommendations in relation to the JSNA topic of ‘Environment’. A number of suggested recommendations had been drafted as a result of discussions during the investigation and were tabled for Members’ consideration.

It was suggested that recommendation (2)(iv) be expanded to include help to reduce the problem of dog fouling.

Whilst Members acknowledged the amount of work that had been involved in creating the JSNA reports, it was recognised that further development of the quality of the reports needed to be undertaken.

Recommended

The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum had taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of

recommendations. The Forum's key recommendations to inform the development and delivery of the Health and Wellbeing and Commissioning Strategies were:

- (1) That the following is undertaken in relation to the Environment JSNA entry:-
 - (i) the entry is updated, edited and authorised by Hartlepool Borough Council prior to being uploaded on the Tees JSNA website, and all future updates to the live document, including those supplied by partner organisations, be appropriately reviewed and authorised;
 - (ii) the entry will reflect the increasing need for collaborative working between Hartlepool Borough Council and partner organisations to deliver services that address the priorities of local communities.

Over and above the Forum's comments in relation to the JSNA entry, the following key recommendations were also made in relation to the development and delivery of future services:-

2. That the potential to expand the current enforcement activity undertaken by Hartlepool Borough Council be explored through:-
 - (i) further development of collaborative working arrangements with Hartlepool Neighbourhood Police to increase the use of enforcement powers currently available;
 - (ii) potential flexible working arrangements for Council Officers;
 - (iii) delegation of the power to issue fixed penalty notices to more Council Officers; and
 - (iv) working in conjunction with partner organisations, such as residents' associations, to help reduce the problem of litter and dog fouling.
3. That consideration is given to splitting income received from the lease of land in relation to renewable energy projects between the Community Benefit Fund and the Invest to Save Scheme.
4. That in order to help reduce fuel poverty, current and future energy saving or cost reducing schemes, such as collective switching, be publicised as widely as possible, and via methods that include residents who do not have access to the internet, by Hartlepool Council and partner organisations.
5. That the energy efficiency of Council buildings is a factor taken into consideration when identifying possible assets for disposal.
6. That the use of solar panel water heaters on Council buildings be investigated.

84. Issues identified from the Forward Plan

None.

85. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent

None.

The meeting concluded at 2.39 pm

CHAIR

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

17 April 2013



Report of: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

Subject: DRAFT FINAL REPORT – INVESTIGATION INTO
THE JSNA TOPIC OF 'ENVIRONMENT'

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the findings of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) topic of 'Environment'.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum met on the 1 August 2013 to consider their Work Programme and agreed that the Forum would in 2012/13 focus on the following JSNA topic:-

Environment - The environment people live in is critical to a sense of health and wellbeing. The quality of air, water, noise pollution and cleanliness across the town is often of concern to residents. Therefore, services need to be provided and monitored to ensure a clean and healthy environment.

- 2.2 The Marmot principle, 'Create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities' was the overarching principle which the Forum used to measure the provision of Council Services throughout their investigation into 'Environment'. The priority objectives and policy recommendations in relation to this principle being:-

Priority Objectives:-

- (a) Develop common policies to reduce the scale and impact of climate change and health inequalities.
- (b) Improve community capital and reduce social isolation across the social gradient.

Policy Recommendations

- (a) Prioritise policies and interventions that reduce both health inequalities and mitigate climate change, by:

- Improving active travel across the social gradient;
 - Improving the availability of good quality open and green spaces across the social gradient;
 - Improving the food environment in local areas across the social gradient;
 - Improving energy efficiency of housing across the social gradient.
- (b) Fully integrate the planning, transport, housing, environmental and health systems to address the social determinants of health in each locality.
- (c) Support locally developed and evidence based community regeneration programmes that:
- Remove barriers to community participation and action
 - Reduce social isolation.

3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

3.1 The membership of the Scrutiny Forum was as detailed below:-

Councillors Beck, Cook, Gibbon, Jackson, Loynes, Payne and Tempest.

4. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

4.1 The overall aim of the Scrutiny investigation was to strategically evaluate and contribute towards the development of the 'Environment' topic within Hartlepool's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, whilst reflecting (where possible / appropriate) on the Marmot principle to 'Create and Develop Healthy and Sustainable Places and Communities'.

5. FINDINGS

5.1 The terms of reference for the investigation were based on the ten key questions outlined in the JSNA. Members received evidence from a wide range of sources relating to these key questions and the findings are detailed in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.34 of this report. Details of evidence presented to the Forum are attached as **Appendix A**.

Setting the Scene

5.2 At the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 September 2012 Members received a setting the scene presentation from the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods. The presentation covered the following Environment JSNA questions:-

- What are the key issues?
- Who is at risk and why?
- What is the level of need?

What are the key issues?

- 5.3 The Forum was supportive of the key issues identified within the JSNA at the meeting of the Forum on 19 September 2012 and at the meeting of the Forum on 20 March 2013, where the JSNA entry was presented as a whole.

Who is at risk and why?

Enforcement

- 5.4 A Member questioned whether there were particular areas of the town targeted for enforcement activity in relation to dog fouling and litter. The Waste and Environmental Services Manager confirmed that due to the level of resources available, areas known as hot spot areas were targeted including the town centre, Seaton and the Headland promenades. However, when reports of excessive litter in other areas were received they were always responded to.
- 5.5 Members indicated that they would like to see an increase in enforcement activity and innovative ways of delivering services investigated, though it was recognised that this would need to form part of future budget considerations.

Bathing Water Quality

- 5.6 At the meeting of the Forum on 20 March 2013, members received a presentation regarding bathing water from the Quality and Safety Officer from the Parks and Countryside Team. Members raised concerns regarding the loss of the blue flag status at Seaton Carew. Members were advised that the new bathing water directive, which had been introduced, was twice as stringent as the old testing regime and extremely heavy rainfall experienced last year had also affected the water quality readings for the area.
- 5.7 Members heard from a representative of Northumbrian Water that a collapsed storm outfall at Mainsforth Terrace had also added to the problems with the bathing water in the area. Work to repair this was ongoing, but had been delayed due to protected birds using the area over winter. The Forum was pleased to note that Northumbrian Water had recognised the poor water quality results at North Seaton and were factoring sewage modelling systems work into their business plan for 2015-2020.
- 5.8 A representative from the Environment Agency highlighted the effected the extreme weather had on water samples all over the country and advised the forum that during normal weather conditions the infrastructure in Hartlepool coped well with the water levels experienced.

Drinking Water Quality

- 5.9 At the meeting of the Forum on 20 March 2013, during a presentation by the Principal Environmental Health Officer with input from a representative from Hartlepool Water, Members noted that there was one private water supply in Hartlepool, but several private distribution networks. Members heard that drinking water quality is heavily regulated, tested and was of good quality. The Council was required to carry out a full risk assessment of the private water supplies every 5 years. With regard to private distribution networks the landlord/owners were responsible for maintenance of the pipework and for managing any incidents which may affect water quality or supply.

What is the level of need?

- 5.10 Whilst Members recognised that the town was generally clean and looked after, it was acknowledged that the continuous promotion of the services and facilities available to recycle needed to be undertaken with a view to changing people's behaviour.

What services are currently provided?

Cleanliness and Enforcement

- 5.11 At the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 December 2012, Members received evidence for the Environment Team in relation to cleanliness and enforcement. Following discussions regarding local environmental quality and the responsibilities undertaken by the street cleansing operatives, the importance of reporting any areas of concern in relation to litter problems was emphasised.
- 5.12 The problem of abandoned vehicles was discussed and the impact these vehicles had on communities, Members queried the definition of an abandoned vehicle and sought clarification regarding the powers available to remove such vehicles from outside peoples' homes. The Senior Environmental Enforcement Officer provided details of the powers available to the Council highlighting the various restrictions applied which prevent removal.
- 5.13 During evidence regarding enforcement activities reference was made to the higher level of fixed penalty notices issues in Hartlepool in respect of dog fouling in comparison to neighbouring authorities and the reasons for such levels were questioned. It was reported that given that Seaton Carew and the Headland were popular tourist attractions, there was a significant impact on the level of litter and dog fouling. It was noted that a significant number of fixed penalty notices were issued to non-Hartlepool residents.
- 5.14 The Forum raised a number of queries in relation to the level of patrols and enforcement arrangements to which the Senior Environmental Enforcement Officer provided clarification. Members discussed the potential benefits of extending the hours over which enforcement activities took place, given concerns raised that a number of incidents of dog fouling occurred outside current working hours.

- 5.15 The Forum was of the view that the option to delegate the power to issue fixed penalty notices to more officers of the Council was something that could be considered.
- 5.16 Concerns were raised regarding the problem of cigarette butts and various methods of addressing this town wide problem were discussed, which included approaching residents associations to assist with the distribution of ash trays and the need to review current fine levels. The Forum noted that the level of fines are set by the Government.

Noise

- 5.17 At the meeting of the Forum on 13 February 2013 Members received evidence from the Public Protection and the Community Safety Team in relation to the noise elements contained within the Environment JSNA entry.
- 5.18 The Forum were advised of the national noise action plan which requires the highways authority to implement an action plan to reduce the levels of traffic noise at specific locations in Hartlepool. A Member sought clarification on the timescales for resurfacing roads which were identified as requiring low noise surfaces, particularly if the road surface was relatively new. The Principal Environmental Health Officer confirmed that the next time the road was due to be resurfaced the low noise surfaces would be utilised, there was no requirement to resurface the road immediately.
- 5.19 Members questioned local authority powers to stop the continuous disturbance of noise in residential areas due to maintenance on properties. The Principal Environmental Health Officer confirmed that, if builders were causing a disturbance out of normal working hours, restrictions could be introduced to restrict their work to day time hours. However, it was recognised that any building works would cause a disturbance in the short term, and if this was at a time deemed acceptable there was little that could be done to stop it.

What is the projected level of need / service use?

- 5.20 At the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 17 October 2012, Members received evidence in relation to the Climate Change element of the JSNA topic of environment. The Climate Change Officer outlined the process and benefits of the Collective Energy Switching Scheme in response to a number of queries raised by the Forum. Members commented on the need to publicise the scheme to residents acknowledging the continuing increase in fuel poverty in the town.
- 5.21 The Forum discussed renewable energy issues, the proposals to introduce wind turbines at Brenda Road and the potential benefits as a result. The Forum suggested that any income received in relation to this should be split between the Community Benefit Fund and the Invest to Save Scheme.

- 5.22 Members suggested that the use of solar panel water heaters on Council Buildings was investigated. The Forum also suggested that the least energy efficient Council buildings should be considered for disposal first.

What evidence is there for effective intervention?

- 5.23 Throughout the investigation, Members were advised of the service provided and resulting levels of interventions currently being undertaken by Hartlepool Borough Council and partner organisations. Members were satisfied that these were effective, though more could always be done to improve the local environment, as highlighted by the recommendations contained within section 6.
- 5.24 At the meeting of the Forum on 20 March 2013, Members considered the draft JSNA entry as a whole. Whilst acknowledging that the entry was the latest draft and was not yet live on the Tees JSNA website the Forum felt that there was a substantial amount of editing required to ensure the entry reflected the good work undertaken by the Council, but also contained the needs identified as being important to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Hartlepool. The Climate Change Officer advised Members that a number of suggested inclusions and rewording had already been passed to the site administrators at NHS Tees and this work would continue until the entry was signed off by Hartlepool Council as being ready to go live on the website.
- 5.25 Members questioned the authorisation process for updating the website once the document was live, and suggested that a system of authorisation was implemented to maintain the quality of the entry.

What do people say?

- 5.26 As part of the investigation in order to seek the views of residents on the JSNA topic of 'Environment' members of the Forum attended the North and Coastal and South and Central Neighbourhood Forum meetings held on 3 October 2012. A number of ward issues were raised in relation to the environment theme which were responded to by the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods. Members were satisfied that the issues raised were covered by the investigation and resulting recommendations.

What additional needs assessment is required?

- 5.27 During the meeting of the Forum on 13 February 2013, Members were presented with evidence by the Community Safety Team in relation to the noise element of the environment topic.
- 5.28 Members discussed the proposed future anti-social behaviour powers and their impact on the Local Authority and the Police. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods confirmed that Government policy

dictated whether Local Authorities or the Police had specific powers in relation to anti-social behaviour and whilst the new proposals were currently going through Parliament as a draft bill, they might be amended before becoming becomes an Act of Parliament in April 2014. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods confirmed that the Police were suffering severe budget cuts similar to Local Government, so the implementation of any new regulations would need to be considered in partnership.

- 5.29 In relation to Community Protection Notices, a Member questioned how the decision was taken whether the noise being complained about was deemed a nuisance. The Neighbourhood Safety Co-ordinator confirmed that the officer attending the complaint would make a decision whether to issue a warning or a fine based on their opinion, after undergoing appropriate training. A Member highlighted a concern that any new proposals that transferred powers could de-skill Council officers. It was identified that, subject to the contents of the Act, the adoption and implementation of Community Protection Notices would required training for both Cleveland Police and Hartlepool Borough Council officers.

What needs might be unmet?

- 5.30 At the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 December 2012, Members welcomed evidence from Cleveland Police, Chief Inspector for Neighbourhood Policing. It was recognised that the need for all partner organisations to work together to deliver services that meet the needs of communities in Hartlepool was greater than ever, particularly given the current economic climate.
- 5.31 Members of the Forum questioned the levels of enforcement activities that were currently undertaken by Neighbourhood Police Officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and were advised that these were recorded on a force-wide level and were not broken down further into specific areas. It was agreed that more needed to be done to ensure that the powers available to all partners were linked to the priorities of the community to deliver services that yield the greatest impact. The Chief Inspector for Neighbourhood Policing identified such an area as working with partners to deliver the forces 'Pledge Operations'.
- 5.32 The Forum was supportive of further collaborative working to address the needs of communities, particularly in relation to enforcement activities, and felt that this should be represented in the JSNA entry for Environment.

What are the recommendations for commissioning?

- 5.33 At the meeting of the Forum on 20 March 2013 Members considered the JSNA entry as a whole. Members were supportive of the commissioning priorities identified, though concerns were raised regarding the current quality and editing of the entry, as it was in draft form and contained several gaps. Members recognised that work was already underway to ensure the entry was updated prior to being uploaded onto the Tees JSNA website.

- 5.34 In addition to the recommendations contained within the JSNA entry for the environment topic a number of further recommendations were suggested, as detailed in section 6, to inform the development and delivery of the Health and Wellbeing and Commissioning Strategies.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS TO INFORM THE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING AND COMMISSIONING STRATEGIES

- 6.1 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations. The Forum's key recommendations to inform the development and delivery of the Health and Wellbeing and Commissioning Strategies are:-

- 1 That the following is undertaken in relation to the Environment JSNA entry:-
 - (i) the entry is updated, edited and authorised by Hartlepool Borough Council prior to being uploaded on the Tees JSNA website, and all future updates to the live document, including those supplied by partner organisations, are appropriately reviewed and authorised;
 - (ii) the entry reflects the increasing need for collaborative working between Hartlepool Borough Council and partner organisations to deliver services that address the priorities of local communities.

Over and above the Forum's comments in relation to the JSNA entry the following key recommendations were also made in relation to the development and delivery of future services:-

- 2 That the potential to expand the current enforcement activity undertaken by Hartlepool Borough Council is explored through:-
 - (i) further developing collaborative working arrangements with Hartlepool neighbourhood police to increase the use of enforcement powers currently available;
 - (ii) potential flexible working arrangements for Council Officers;
 - (iii) delegation of the power to issue fixed penalty notices to more Council Officers; and
 - (iv) working in conjunction with partner organisations, such as residents associations, to help reduce the problem of litter and dog fouling.

- 3 That consideration is given to splitting income received from the lease of land in relation to renewable energy projects between the Community Benefit Fund and the Invest to Save Scheme.
- 4 That in order to help reduce fuel poverty, current and future energy saving or cost reducing schemes, such as collective switching, are publicised as widely as possible, and via methods that include residents who do not have access to the internet, by Hartlepool Council and partner organisations.
- 5 That the energy efficiency of Council buildings is a factor taken into consideration when identifying possible assets for disposal.
- 6 That the use of solar panel water heaters on Council buildings is investigated.

**COUNCILLOR SYLVIA TEMPEST
CHAIR OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Forum is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of our investigation. We would like to place on record our appreciation, in particular of the willingness and co-operation we have received from the below named:-

Hartlepool Borough Council:

Helen Beaman – Environment Co-ordinator
Alison Carberry - Senior Environmental Enforcement Officer
Adrian Hurst – Principal Environmental Health Officer
Paul Hurwood – Climate Change Officer
Debbie Kershaw – Quality and Safety Officer
Jane Kett – Principal Environmental Health Officer
Denise Ogden – Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Sylvia Pinkney – Public Protection Manager
Alastair Smith – Assistant Director Transportation and Engineering
Nicholas Stone – Neighbourhood Safety Co-ordinator
Craig Thelwell – Waste and Environmental Services Manager
Albert Williams – Property Manager
Jon Wright – Neighbourhood Co-ordinating Manager

External Representatives:

Kevin Ensell – Hartlepool Water
Graeme Hull – Environment Agency
Steve Jermy – Cleveland Police
Allan Snape – Northumbrian Water
Gamini Wijesinghe – Middlesbrough Council

Appendix A

Evidence provided to the Forum

The following evidence was presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum throughout the course of the investigation into the JSNA topic of 'Environment':-

Date of Meeting	Evidence Received
1 August 2012	Scoping Report – <i>Scrutiny Support Officer</i>
19 September 2012	Setting the Scene Presentation – <i>Assistant Director Neighbourhood Services</i>
17 October 2012	Presentation – Climate Change – <i>Climate Change Officer</i> Information from the Health Protection Agency - Health Effects of Climate Change in the UK 2012
19 December 2012	Presentation – One Planet Living – <i>Middlesbrough Council Community Protection Officer</i> Presentation – Local Environmental Quality (Cleanliness) – <i>Environment Team</i> Presentation – Hartlepool Neighbourhood Policing - <i>Chief Inspector of Neighbourhood Policing</i>
13 February 2013	Presentation – Noise – <i>Public Protection Team</i> Presentation – Noise – <i>Community Safety Team</i> Feedback from the North and Coastal and South and Central Neighbourhood Forums

20 March 2013	<p>Presentation – Bathing Water Quality – <i>Parks and Countryside Team</i></p> <p>Presentation – Drinking Water Quality – <i>Public Protection Team</i></p> <p>Presentation – Air Quality – <i>Public Protection Team</i></p> <p>Hartlepool Draft JSNA Entry</p>
---------------	---

DRAFT