

FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

28 August 2015

The meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor Christopher Akers Belcher (In the Chair)

Councillors: Allan Barclay, Kevin Cranney, Brenda Loynes, Carl Richardson, Chris Simmons and George Springer.

Also Present: Councillor Alan Clark as substitute for Councillor Marjorie James
Councillor Jim Lindridge as substitute for Councillor Sirs
Councillor Jim Ainslie.

Officers: Gill Alexander, Chief Executive
Chris Little, Chief Finance Officer
Denise Ogden, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Louise Wallace, Director of Public Health
Chris Catchpole, Head of Commissioning and Clinical Quality
Carol Johnson, Head of Health Improvement
Richard Maynes, Solicitor
Joan Stevens, Scrutiny Manager
Alastair Rae, Public Relations Manager
Amanda Whitaker, Democratic Services Team

60. Apologies for Absence

Councillors James, Riddle and Sirs

61. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Clark and Lindridge declared a personal interest in agenda item 5.1 relating to Community Right to Bid (minute 65 refers).

62. Minutes

- (i) The minutes of the meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee held on 27 July 2015 were received.
- (ii) The minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 2 March 2015 were received.
- (iii) The minutes of the meeting of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership held on

15 May 2015 were received.

63. Savings Programme 2016/17 – Chief Executive's Department (*Chief Executive*)

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework

Purpose of report

To enable consideration of the initial 2016/17 savings proposals relating to the Committee's remit. Comments made by the Committee would be incorporated with those received from each of the Policy Committees in relation to their remits.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report provided the background to the budget process agreed for 2016/17. The savings target established at the outset of the budget process for the Chief Executive's department was £211,000. The savings programme proposed totalled £235,000 which exceeded the initial target and reflected the overall approach adopted by the Corporate Management Team to protect front line services. Details were provided on the Divisional proposals which delivered the following proposed savings:-

Service	Proposed Savings
Assistant Chief Executive	(£k)
Changes in operations / Management Arrangements	42.5
Income and running costs	62.5
Chief Finance Officer	
Deletion of vacant post / Changes in Management Arrangements	80
Running costs	20
Chief Solicitor	
Changes in Management Arrangements	30
Total Proposed Savings	235

It was highlighted that a number of options had been considered in respect of the savings proposed. A summary of those options was set out in the report. The options which had been included in the report had been recommended to the Committee as they provided a balance between protecting front line services, maximising savings to be taken, the assessment of service delivery and receipt of voluntary redundancy requests was aligned and could be managed in the context of the continued delivery of services.

Members were advised that there were a number of risks implicit in the

delivery of any package of savings. A summary of the risks which had been considered as part of the proposals was set out in the report.

In response to clarification sought on the impact of the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration, the Chair requested that a response be provided to all Members in due course.

It was noted that a further report would be submitted to the Committee on 19 October 2015. It was requested that the report include an analysis of the level and impact of redundancies.

Decision

The proposals were accepted for final consideration at the meeting of the Committee on 19 October 2015 and the report submitted to that Committee meeting include an analysis of the level and impact of any proposed redundancies.

64. Savings Programme 2015/16 and 16/17 – Public Health Department *(Director of Public Health)*

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework

Purpose of report

To identify proposals for the delivery of savings in relation to public health grant funded services. The savings proposals were for consideration as part of the 2015/16 budget management process and budget setting process for 2016/17.

Issue(s) for consideration

The ring fenced public health grant had been allocated for 3 years covering financial years 2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced that the £2.8 billion ring fenced public health budget was to be reduced in year and on a recurring basis by £200 million although there were no details of how the £200 million nationally would be distributed. For Hartlepool this equated to approximately a £630,000 (excluding 0-5 services) budget cut in year in 2015/16 and on a recurring basis from 2016/17 and beyond. It was highlighted that the risk to the public health budget was not limited to the £200 million reduction. The report included the key issues impacting on the development of the budget for 2016/17 and future years.

The report set out recurring savings proposals for 2016/17 and beyond in each of the service areas in public health funded through the ring fenced public health grant. It was highlighted that the proposals would mean the

loss of service provision and preventative activity in Hartlepool, but had been put forward as proposals as they were deemed 'discretionary' to be funded from the ring fenced grant. The proposals delivered the following proposed savings:-

Service	Proposed Savings (£)
Drug and Alcohol Services	£100,000
Health Improvement	£195,500
Sport and Recreation	£125,000
Public Protection	£95,000
Commissioning and Clinical Quality	£125,000
Total Savings	£640,500

The Director of Public Health responded to issues raised by Members arising from the report. Referring to the proposals for a reduction in the contribution to Stay Safe Stay Warm Fire Service Programme and with reference to the proposed reduction in contract values relating to Smoking services prevention programme, the Director responded to concerns regarding the impact of proposals. The Chair requested that if the proposals involved changes to the models for delivery of the programmes, a report be submitted to the Committee on the impact and the alternative model prior to final consideration of the proposal.

In relation to the proposal to review the contribution to the taxi marshalling scheme, the Director advised that it was proposed that the issue be considered by the Safer Hartlepool Partnership in order to determine if Partner organisations could contribute to the scheme.

In response to clarification sought from a member of public in relation to dementia issues, the Chair suggested it would be appropriate to refer the issues to the Director of Child and Adult Services. A member of the Audit and Governance Committee referred to a recent scrutiny investigation which considered dementia related issues. The Chief Executive made reference also to the direction of travel being about working together with health colleagues and the Better Care Fund provided the opportunity to commission services to transform services.

Referring to the reduction in ring fenced public health budgets, the Chief Executive advised the Committee of the concerns which had been expressed by the Association of Chief Executives in terms of the protection the budget had received when under the remit of the National Health Service which no longer applied since the transfer of responsibilities to Local Authorities.

Decision

(i) The Committee noted the content of the report and agreed that the proposals be accepted for final consideration at the meeting of the Committee on 19 October 2015 and the report submitted to that Committee

meeting include an impact analysis for any new models of service delivery as requested by the Chair.

(ii) The Committee noted the £630,000 reduction in public health grant funding in 15/16 and on a recurring basis.

(iii) The Committee noted the possibility of a further reduction of an additional circa £800,000 in public health grant funding if pace of change is applied and Hartlepool is moved to target allocation of £6.9 million.

65. Community Right to Bid (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Key Decision (Test ii applies.) General Exception provisions applied.

Purpose of report

To seek Committee approval to list Victoria Park as an Asset of Community Value subsequent to an application by Hartlepool United Football Club Supporters Association (HUFCSA).

Issue(s) for consideration

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods reported that Assets of Community Value were rights derived from the Localism Act 2011 and reflected in accompanying regulations. Local people through community or voluntary organisations with a local connection or Parish Council's could identify local buildings and land which were of importance to them and nominate them to the Council. These could be in either public or private ownership.

Members were advised that the Council was under a duty to consider the nomination and assess within an eight week timescale whether the nominated land should be listed against the definition of an Asset of Community Value as defined in the Localism Act. This stated that the current use of the asset furthers the social wellbeing or social interests of the community. If the nomination met the definition then the asset should be listed. The Director proposed that having undertaken an assessment of the application by HUFCSA that the information provided accorded with the requirements for listing and therefore should be listed as an asset of Community Value and a land charge placed against the Title.

It was highlighted that Victoria Park belonged to the Council and let to Hartlepool United Football Club by way of a lease for 70 years with 52 years unexpired. The listing of these assets of community value Bid would affect either a freehold sale or a proposal from the Football Club to assign their lease as the leasehold interest was originally granted for a period in

excess of 25 years. If the Council or HUFC wished to dispose of their interest in the football ground then there would be a potential delay of up to 6 months before being able to transfer the interest. As such there could be a delay in achieving a capital receipt.

Members spoke in support of the nomination and endorsed the proposal set out in the report.

Decision

The Committee approved the nomination to agree to Victoria Park being listed as an Asset of Community Value and the applicants/owners and lessees be informed and a land charge registered against the freehold title.

66. NHS Health Check – Options for Future Delivery (Director of Public Health)

Type of decision

Key Decision (test (i) and (ii) apply). Forward Plan reference number PH12/15.

Purpose of report

To advise the Committee on options for the future commissioning and delivery of, feasible and appropriate, NHS Health Checks, in the context of the Cardiovascular Disease (CVD) review and Council's provision of wider public health services to address ill health, inequalities and premature mortality caused by CVD.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report set out the background to the NHS Health Check programme; a mandated responsibility of the Local Authorities under the Health and Social Care Act 2012. In exploring potential options for the delivery of NHS Health Checks in Hartlepool, in line with the wishes of the Committee, a review of the provision of the checks through GP and the Mobile Health Improvement Services had been undertaken between February 2015 and July 2015. The report set out the process for the review including associated timeline. The Committee was advised that in considering options for future delivery of the service, in the context of wider health improvement services, a number of challenges existed in terms of targeting provision as set out in the report. To assist the Committee a survey had been undertaken seeking views of those residents in Hartlepool who were eligible to receive the NHS Health Checks to assist in the future development of the service. The results of the survey were detailed in the report. Key messages from the survey were that there needed to be increased promotion of the availability of the NHS Health Checks.

It was noted that the review had indicated that GP's were uniquely placed to

meet the universal offer for reasons stated in the report. The main focus of the report was therefore to consider how the universal GP offer could be complimented by a preferred model of community provision. With the role of GP practices reinforced as a fundamental component of any model for the provision of the service, potential options for future community provision were summarised in the report in terms of the advantages and disadvantages of each of the four models presented to the Committee. The table presented as a confidential appendix outlined the financial implications of each of the models and contained exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006) namely paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

It was highlighted that if Members accepted that the provision of a universal GP offer was essential, then this could be secured through the direct award of a contract to all 15 GPs in Hartlepool and this would be effectively managed through the support of the TVPHSS. The existing contract for the Mobile Health Improvement Service was due to naturally expire on 30th Sep 2015, therefore if Members accepted that health improvement services should be maintained pending the implementation of a new model for the provision of community hubs, then any new provision in that regard would require a new quick quote procurement exercise for open market competition. Details of the contract value were outlined in the confidential appendix, with funding for healthy heart checks through the Mobile Health Improvement Service on a payment by activity basis, and a 6.4% reduction on the remaining mobile health improvement service budget.

Following presentation of the report, Members debated issues relating to the introduction of community hubs. Assurances were provided to Members in relation to the timescales for community hub provision which were central to a new efficient model of service delivery.

Decision

(i) It was agreed that a universal provision for NHS Health Checks be provided by GP's and subsequent contract award by 1st April 2016 be approved;

(ii) Members supported Option 4 as the preferred option for the future provision of community based NHS Health Checks in Hartlepool, as this offered the necessary ability to meet required capacity and demand / need;

(iii) It was agreed that the mobile health improvement service is reviewed in light of the development of health improvement services as part of the community hub model; and

(iv) It was agreed that a competitive tendering process is undertaken in September 2015 to secure an appropriate provider to deliver against a

specification for mobile health improvement services for 12 months.

67. Referral from Council (Council Motion from 25th June 2015) (Chief Executive)

Type of decision

Non Key Decision

Purpose of report

To consider the report and recommendations required by the Motion agreed by Council on 25th June 2015.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report set out the terms of the Motion agreed at the Council meeting on 25th June 2015. It was highlighted that there were a number of potential considerations arising from the motion (both direct and indirect). A number of elements had been considered as part of the report. It was highlighted that any considerations or recommendations had been identified in the light of the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 which made provision for members of the public to 'report and commentate' on local authority meetings.

The report addressed the following issues:-

- Filming of Council Meetings including web based broadcasting of all public meetings which had been the subject of a petition.
- Quality of audio / Council microphone system
- Standards of Behaviour
- Rules of debate
- Sanctions for inappropriate behaviour
- Role of the Ceremonial Mayor
- Standing for the Mace
- Timings of Council meetings

A summary of the potential implications of each of the issues was presented as follows:-

Item	Capital	Revenue (ongoing costs)
Single point of filming for Council Meetings	£2.5K	None
Web broadcasting of all council meetings	£50K	£30K

Placement audio system	£1K per set of speakers – total cost of £5K; or £30K for a replacement microphone system	None
------------------------	--	------

It was highlighted that there was currently no budget provision for the options identified. The equipment for the single point of filming could be accommodated from within existing budgets as the equipment could be used for other Council based projects and activity. In relation to the web broadcasting of all council meetings and the replacement audio system there were both capital and ongoing revenue costs to these over and above current budget provision. There were significant costs and it was not recommended to pursue these. Should members determine to agree to such changes then for any ongoing revenue costs the implications of these would need to be factored into a greater deficit than that already considered by members and for any capital costs consideration would need to be given in respect of the projected outturn.

Members debated issues arising from the report and expressed support of issues which had been raised by the Chief Executive in her report. The view was expressed that the timing of Council meetings was an issue which should be considered by the Neighbourhood Forums.

Decision

The Committee recommended the following to Council:-

- 2.1.1 Agree to officers of the Council filming and uploading the film of Council meetings
- 2.1.2 Not to pursue the streaming of all meetings.
- 2.1.3 Not to consider the replacement microphone system at this stage but for officers to consider the options of replacement speakers in the first instance and should this be unsuccessful to revisit this issue.
- 2.1.4 Note and endorse the proposed approach for the Chief Executive (as Head of Paid Service) and the Monitoring Officer in terms of Standards of Behaviour
- 2.1.5 Consider and agree the proposal for the development of locally agreed arrangements for sanctions for inappropriate behaviour by Elected Members

- 2.1.6 Note the considerations in respect of the role of the Ceremonial Mayor.
- 2.1.7 Agree to the reinforcement of the requirements in respect of the Mace.
- 2.1.8 Refer the options available for the timing of Council Meetings to the Neighbourhood Forums.
- 2.1.9 Agree to the Monitoring Officer making any required incidental changes to the Constitution following the resolutions of Council.

68. Referral from Council (Council Motion from 26th February 2015) (Assistant Chief Executive)

Type of decision

Non Key Decision

Purpose of report

To follow up on the Motion agreed at the Council meeting held on 26th February 2015

Issue(s) for consideration

The report set out the terms of a Motion agreed by Council on 26th February 2015 in relation to an appraisal scheme for Members. It had been agreed at the Council meeting that a report would be required based upon the principle of implementing a scheme. The report submitted to the Committee highlighted that there were a number of potential considerations arising from the motion (both direct and indirect).

The report addressed issues relating to the staff appraisal system which was undertaken as outlined in the response to the question raised at the Council meeting. Options had been investigated in relation to an appraisal scheme for Members. A number of Councils had been contacted together with colleagues at the Local Government Association for their thoughts on such an arrangement. It had not been possible to identify a Council that operated an appraisal system for Elected Members which offered a structured assessment of both actual performance and achievement of objectives, allied with an assessment against core role competencies and identified training needs. It was highlighted that this Council had a range of options for Member Development which were managed through Member Services. Such arrangements were available for all members and were made available to new and returning members after elections. The arrangements for member development varied significantly between councils and in all of the arrangements that had been identified, it had not been possible to identify an appraisal system for Members which included

the key aspects of such a system. In addition to the nature of any potential system, it was highlighted that the operation of it would require significant development and there were no current resources available to do this.

Views were expressed at the meeting that elected members were 'appraised' by the electorate when they were due for re-election. It was considered, therefore, that an appraisal scheme for Members should not be pursued although the Chair expressed the view that a more robust system for publishing Member attendances was required.

Decision

The Committee considered the various arrangements identified in the report and determined that no additional arrangements be made for a member appraisal system.

The meeting was adjourned for a brief comfort break.

The meeting was reconvened.

69. Proposal to close Hartlepool Magistrates and County Court *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Non-Key Decision

Purpose of report

To consider Ministry of Justice proposals to close Hartlepool Magistrates' Court and County Court and to consider making recommendations to Council following the referral from the Council meeting held on 6 August 2015.

Issue(s) for consideration

On 16 July 2015, the Ministry of Justice had announced a proposal to close 91 Courts and Tribunals in England and Wales, including Hartlepool Magistrates' Court and County Court. The proposals also included the integration of a further 31 Courts and Tribunals. The current proposals would see the work from Hartlepool Magistrates' Court and County Court transferred to the Teesside Magistrates Court and County Court in Middlesbrough. The Ministry of Justice consultation on the proposals would close on 8 October. At the meeting on 6 August 2015, Council had been informed that through the Chief Executive, the Leader of the Council had written to a number of organisations involved in the criminal and civil justice system seeking their views on the proposed closure. The responses received to the consultation had been circulated and a summary of the responses was outlined in the report. At the Committee meeting, a letter

from Peter Bowes JP, Bench Chairman, Hartlepool had been tabled which set out a number of issues in opposition to the proposed closure.

The report set out the Ministry of Justice case for change. It was highlighted in the Ministry of Justice consultation documentation, appended to the report, that the underlying rationale for the proposed closure /integration of a number of courts and tribunals nationally was that the current Courts and Tribunal Service estate did not meet the strategic requirements of the organisation, with the current size and associated cost of the estate being unsustainable in the current financial context.

The report included detailed information relating to the proposals to close Hartlepool Magistrates Court and County Court. In order to illustrate the impact of changes that would result should the court close, a travel model had been adopted and travel time data pre and post court closure was illustrated in the report.

It was noted that the Safer Hartlepool Partnership would also receive a report on this matter for their information.

Members expressed their opposition to the closure of the Hartlepool Magistrates Court. It was questioned whether data was available on the impact of the transfer of the Youth Justice Court which could be included in the case presented in support of the retention of Hartlepool Magistrates Court. The Chair requested that Cleveland Police also be contacted with a view to seeking evidence relating to impact of the the transfer of the Youth Justice Court.

Decision

(i) The Committee noted the Ministry of Justice proposals to close Hartlepool Magistrates' Court and County Court.

(ii) The Committee referred the contents of this report and its recommendations to Council for consideration and debate at the meeting to be held on 17 September to allow for a response to be made to the Ministry of Justice before the stated deadline.

(iii) It was agreed that the Chief Executive Officer and Director of Regeneration & Neighbourhoods finalise that response to the Ministry of Justice in consultation with the Leader of the Council and that Members be made aware of that response.

70. Business Continuity (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Non-Key decision

Purpose of report

The report informed the Committee on business continuity policy arrangements and sought approval for the adoption of the Business Continuity Policy.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report set out details of a revised approach to continuity which would be based on ISO 22301:2012 – Business Continuity Management Systems, with the Council aligning itself to the good practice guidance and recommendations. The Council had developed a Business Continuity Policy, appended to the report, which set out the approach the Council would take in developing, maintaining and implementing plans. The proposed approach would help to ensure that the Council could continue to operate, at pre-defined levels following disruptive events and have in place the information needed to recover from a disruptive event as soon as possible thereafter.

Decision

The Committee approved the approach the Council is taking toward Business Continuity as set out in the business continuity policy.

71. Equality in Employment Policy (*Assistant Chief Executive*)

Type of decision

Non Key

Purpose of report

To request consideration and approval of the revised Equality in Employment Policy 2015.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report advised the Committee that the Equality and Diversity in Employment Policy had been reviewed to ensure the Policy remained up to date and enabled the Council to continue to meet its legislative obligations. The review of the Policy had resulted in a newly titled Equality in Employment Policy 2015 appended to the report. The Policy set out what the Council aims to achieve at each stage of the employee life cycle,

ensuring employees are treated equally, fairly and with dignity and respect. Consultation on the revised Equality in Employment Policy had been undertaken with the Trade Unions and the Policy had been formally agreed with them at a recent Single Table Meeting. The Policy had been also reported to Local Joint Consultative Committee on 29 July 2015. All suggestions made through these forums had been incorporated into the attached policy.

Decision

The Committee agreed the Equality in Employment Policy 2015.

72. Strategic Financial Management Report – as at 30th June 2015 *(Corporate Management Team)*

Type of decision

Non Key Decision

Purpose of report

To inform Members of 2015/16 forecast general fund outturn, corporate income collection performance and 2015/16 capital programme monitoring.

Issue(s) for consideration

The report of the Corporate Management Team outlined the first quarter strategic financial management report for the authority. The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) report considered on 29 June 2015 had detailed the further cuts in funding to be implemented by the Government in 2016/17 and future years. The position had been reinforced in the Spending Review document published on 21 July 2015, details of which were set out in the report. The Government had stated that the Spending Review outcome would be published on 25th November 2015 resulting in the Local Government Funding announcement being unlikely to be made until late December 2015.

The report recommended that one-off resources achieved from the 2015/16 forecast outturn (which for planning purposes it was assumed would be achieved) and the reserves review were earmarked to manage the risks referred to in the report. This would enable a strategy for using these uncommitted one-off resources to be developed as part of the MTFS, which would ensure these resources were used to underpin the Council's financial position. The report set out details of future reporting arrangements and detailed reports relating to specific service areas to be submitted to each Policy Committee.

As detailed in the report an early assessment of the forecast 2015/16 outturn had been completed and this reflected action taken by the

Corporate Management Team to achieve under spends to help address the significant financial challenges facing the Council over the next few years. Budget under spends were being achieved through a combination of robust management actions, detailed in the report. It was anticipated that there would be a forecast net under spend of between £669,000 and £889,000 as detailed in Appendix submitted to the report. The range reflected a small number of potential seasonal factors. As detailed in the report it was recommended that the forecast net under spend be earmarked to help manage the financial risks referred to in section 3 and a strategy for using these one-off resources developed as part of the 2016/17 MTFS.

The report set out potential commitments which Members could consider funding from the 2016/17 forecast outturn, which would need to be considered when the actual Government grant cut for 2016/17 and future years were known.

In addition to the Revenue Budget outturn detailed in the report, the Council also benefited from the receipt of income from Housing Hartlepool from the sale of former Council houses. This income would be dependent on individual house sales and was therefore difficult to forecast as the amount varied from month to month. The total received in the first three months was £61,000. Updates would be provided in future reports and a strategy for using these one-off monies would need to be developed as part of the MTFS. Potential options for using these monies could include supplementing the General Fund Budget outturn, or using the resources for further housing investment which would be subject to a separate future report.

Previous reports had advised Members that significant changes had been implemented with effect from 1st April 2013 to re-localise Business Rates and implement Local Council Tax Support schemes. As a result of these changes approximately 58% (i.e. £50.8 million) of the net General Fund budget is funded from a combination of Business Rates and Council Tax collected locally. The report provided information on the impact of these changes and also progress in collecting Sundry debts.

The report provided an update on the capital programme for 2015/16 and a number of recommendations were approved as set out in the decision record.

Decision

- i) The Committee noted that a strategy for using the forecast uncommitted General Fund outturn of between £0.669m and £0.889m will be developed as part of the 2016/17 MTFS to reflect the actual 2016/17 grant cut. This approach may include allocating this amount to offset a higher actual 2016/17 grant cut than forecast to provide a longer lead time to manage Government funding cuts.
- ii) The Committee approved the St Cuthbert's School - Outside Area

- iii) modifications capital scheme as detailed in the report.
- iv) The Committee approved the Fen's School - Mains Water Supply replacement scheme as detailed in the report.
- v) The Committee approved the transfer of £12,000 into the unallocated Council Capital Fund, as detailed in the report.
- v) The Committee approved returning the £11,000 favourable variance on the Hartlepool Enterprise Centre back to the Councils Capital Fund as set out in the report.

73. 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 the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

Minute 74 – Update on the Potential merger of the Teesside and Hartlepool Coroner Areas – This item contained exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) (paragraph 3)

74. Update on the Potential Merger of the Teesside and Hartlepool Coroner Areas *(Chief Executive and Chief Solicitor)* **Type of Decision** Non Key Decision

Purpose of report

To update the Committee on the present position as to the proposed amalgamation of the Teesside and Hartlepool Coroner areas.

Issue(s) for consideration

The issues considered by the Committee are set out in the exempt section of the minutes.

Decision

The decision is set out in the exempt section of the minutes.

The meeting concluded at 11.35 a.m.

P J DEVLIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 5th September 2015