



Civic Centre  
HARTLEPOOL

28 June, 2021

Councillors Ashton, Boddy, Brash, Brown, Cassidy, Clayton, Cook, Cowie, Cranney, Creevy, Elliot, Falconer, Feeney, Fleming, Groves, Hall, Hargreaves, Harrison, Howson, Jackson, Lindridge, Little, B Loynes, D Loynes, Moore, D Nicholson, V Nicholson, Picton, Price, Prince, Richardson, Riddle, Smith, Stokell, Tiplady and Young.

Madam or Sir,

You are hereby summoned to attend the COUNCIL meeting to be held on THURSDAY, 8 JULY 2021 at 6.00 p.m. in the Borough Hall, Middlegate, The Headland, Hartlepool to consider the subjects set out in the attached agenda.

Yours faithfully

D McGuckin  
Managing Director

Enc

# **COUNCIL AGENDA**



**Thursday 8 July 2021**

**at 6.00 pm**

**in the Borough Hall, Middlegate,  
The Headland, Hartlepool.**

- (1) To receive apologies from absent Members;
- (2) To receive any declarations of interest from Members;
- (3) To deal with any business required by statute to be done before any other business;
- (4) To approve the minutes of the last meeting of the Council held on 25 February 2021, the Extraordinary meeting held on 18 March 2021 and the Annual Council meeting held on 25 May 2021 as the correct record
- (5) To answer questions from Members of the Council on the minutes of the last meeting of Council;
- (6) To deal with any business required by statute to be done;
- (7) To receive any announcements from the Chair, or the Head of Paid Service;
- (8) To dispose of business (if any) remaining from the last meeting and to receive the report of any Committee to which such business was referred for consideration;
- (9) To consider reports from the Council's Committees and to receive questions and answers on any of those reports;
- (10) To consider any other business specified in the summons to the meeting, and to receive questions and answers on any of those items;

(11) To consider reports from the Policy Committees:

- (a) proposals in relation to the Council's approved budget and policy framework; and
- (b) proposals for departures from the approved budget and policy framework;
  - 1. Proposal To Increase Capacity For Send Education Provision – Report of Finance and Policy Committee
  - 2. Children's Social Care Capacity – Report of Finance and Policy Committee

(12) To consider motions in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11;

1.  
"The Level-Up Hartlepool campaign is collecting signatures for a paper petition asking the government to address the revenue budget cuts to Hartlepool and other Tees Valley Local Authorities. This has since been backed by other Councillors from across the floor.

The reality is that since the 2013/2014 financial year, our Council's revenue funding from Central government has been cut by £22.024 million per year, in real terms.

In order to make up that loss, our Council has had to both increase Council tax and cut services – residents bearing the burden of both.

We believe that this strategy simply isn't tenable any longer and therefore move that Hartlepool Borough Council publicly endorse the level-up campaign through their external channels and adopt the following three-pronged approach:

- Publicly endorse the level-up campaign through their external channels
- To immediately write to our MP and the Government asking them to urgently reassess our core government funding to ensure all statutory services are adequately funded by Central Government and cease passing this burden on to local taxpayers.
- Request the Leader of the Council ask neighbouring Tees Valley Local Authority Leaders to support us in this course of action."

Signed: Councillors Brown, Young, Jackson, Moore, Stokell and Cook.



2.

“Those that have lost loved ones during the Covid19 pandemic will appreciate firsthand how important it is to be able to share your grief and celebrate the lives of those you have lost, together with family and friends.

Such gatherings and celebrations can in some cases be dangerous to our wildlife and environment, including lantern launches and balloon releases.

Hartlepool is a town steeped in history and still has two Brazier Beacons from World War 1. We would like to propose that Hartlepool Borough Council write to the Crown to ask permission for us to make use of these beacons and organising a celebration of life at each of the Solstice days in the year (June 21st and December 21st) where the are lit beacons (subject to funding being identified if permission is granted) to allow communities to come together, to pay respects and to reflect on the lives of those they have lost.”

Signed: Councillors Brown, Young, Jackson, Moore, Stokell and Cook

3.

“Motion to stop registered sex offenders from standing for any public office

Following successful campaigning recently in the Hartlepool by local activist Sarah Gate with support from Sacha Bedding MBE and Teresa Driver of The Wharton Trust, highlighting the current disqualification criteria for standing as a Councillor and MP as outdated and inadequate, they have been forced to protest and set up a petition achieving over 17,700 signatures by 16<sup>th</sup> June 2021. This motion regards the following:

Currently only those convicted of an offence carrying a prison sentence of more than 3 months are banned from serving as a local councillor.

The rules for parliamentary candidates are less restrictive and a person is only disqualified from standing if they have been found guilty of an offence and sentenced to be imprisoned or detained for more than a year.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2018 the then Local Government Minister Rishi Sunak announced following extensive consultation, that the rules to prevent people found guilty of serious crimes from serving on local councils would be strengthened.

The new rules would mean that any person who is subject to an Anti-Social Behaviour Injunction, a Criminal Behaviour Order, a Sexual Risk Order or who is on the Sex Offenders' Register, will no longer be able to stand for elected office in their community.



Despite the announcement nothing has happened to make the required changes to the law.

The issue was recently publicised when a registered sex offender was able to stand as a parliamentary candidate at the recent by-election in Hartlepool.

The rules on disqualification should be changed and apply to both councillors and parliamentary candidates.

This council resolves to:

- Write to Robert Jenrick, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, demanding legislative change be actioned as a matter of urgency.”

Signed: Councillors Ashton, Boddy, Brash, Brown, Cassidy, Clayton, Cook, Cowie, Cranney, Creevy, Elliott, Falconer, Feeney, Fleming, Groves, Hall, Hargreaves, Harrison, Howson, Jackson, Lindridge, Little, B Loynes, D Loynes, Moore, D Nicholson, V Nicholson, Picton, Price, Prince, Richardson, Riddle, Smith, Stokell, Tiplady and Young.

4.

“Council tax is too high and this is the direct result of unequal and unfair cuts imposed upon Hartlepool by the Conservative government.

Since 2013/14 Hartlepool's budget has been cut by £22million per year and in the same period council tax has increased by £11million per year to compensate.

Research by the Institute for Fiscal Studies estimates that cuts in the North East have been 1.7 times greater than to areas in the South. This is equivalent to some £9million that Hartlepool has been cut that other councils have not, with the burden passed to council tax payers.

If the Conservatives are to truly level up then they need to give Hartlepool its money back so that Council Tax can come down.

We welcome the 'Level up Hartlepool - Council Tax' initiative started by Independent councillors and believe that all elected members should be united behind it.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Publicly endorse and welcome the 'Level up Hartlepool - Council Tax' campaign launched by Independent councillors and supported by Labour and Conservative



councillors

2. Use its full resources to promote the petition that is seeking 10,000 signatures to allow this matter to be raised in parliament
3. Write to our MP, Jill Mortimer, to request that she lobbies her Conservative colleagues in government to level up Hartlepool Council's funding."

Signed: Councillors Harrison, Brash, Hargreaves, Clayton, Boddy, Feeney, Creevy, Elliott, Prince, Howson and Richardson.

- (13) To receive the Managing Director's report and to pass such resolutions thereon as may be deemed necessary;
- (14) To receive questions from and provide answers to the public in relation to matters of which notice has been given under Rule 9;
- (15) To answer questions of Members of the Council under Rule 10;
  - a) Questions to the Chairs about recent decisions of Council Committees and Forums without notice under Council Procedure Rule 10.1
  - b) Questions on notice to the Chair of any Committee or Forum under Council Procedure Rule 10.2
  - c) Questions on notice to the Council representatives on the Police and Crime Panel and Cleveland Fire Authority
  - d) Minutes of the meetings held by the Cleveland Fire Authority held on 12 February 2021 and 16 April 2021 and the Police and Crime Panel held on 2 February 2021 and 4 March 2021.



# **COUNCIL**

## **MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS**

### **25 FEBRUARY 2021**

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and was an online remote meeting in compliance with the Council Procedure Rules Relating to the holding of Remote Meetings and the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

#### **COUNCILLORS:**

C Akers-Belcher	S Akers-Belcher	Brewer
Buchan	Cartwright	Cassidy
Fleming	Hall	Hamilton
Harrison	Howson	Hunter
James	King	Lauderdale
Lindridge	Little	Marshall
Moore	Prince	T Richardson
C Richardson	Smith	Stokell
Tennant	Thomas	Ward
Young		

Officers: Denise McGuckin, Managing Director  
Chris Little, Director of Resources and Development  
Hayley Martin, Chief Solicitor  
Jill Harrison, Director, Adult and Community Based Services  
Amanda Whitaker, Democratic Services Team.

The Managing Director advised elected members that she had received apologies from the Chair of Council who is ill and the Vice-Chair had resigned due to circumstances relating to council procedures and technology issues. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Full Council was required to elect Vice Chair:-

It was moved by Councillor Moore and seconded by Councillor Buchan:-

"That Councillor Young be appointed vice-chair"

In the absence of dissent Councillor Young was appointed.

#### **COUNCILLOR YOUNG PRESIDING**

Terms of regret were expressed in relation to the recent death of Honorary

Alderman John MacRae. Elected Members observed a minute silence as a mark of respect.

104. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENT MEMBERS

Councillors Loynes and Brown.

105. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS

None

106. BUSINESS REQUIRED BY STATUTE TO BE DONE BEFORE ANY  
OTHER BUSINESS

None

107. MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

The Minutes of Proceedings of the Council held on the 28 January 2021, having been laid before the Council.

RESOLVED - That the minutes be confirmed.

108. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ON THE MINUTES  
OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

With reference to minute 98 (a) (1), Councillor S Akers-Belcher referred to the concerns which he had expressed regarding the implications of the decision made by Full Council with regard to the Local Council Tax Support Scheme. During the debate concerns had been expressed by Councillor S Akers-Belcher regarding the legal advice provided to elected members at the meeting by Hayley Martin, the Chief Solicitor. Councillor S Akers-Belcher advised that what he had stated had been unreasonable and uncalled for and apologised to Mrs Martin.

109. BUSINESS REQUIRED BY STATUTE

None

110. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None



111. TO DISPOSE OF BUSINESS (IF ANY) REMAINING FROM THE LAST MEETING AND TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF ANY COMMITTEE TO WHICH SUCH BUSINESS WAS REFERRED FOR CONSIDERATION.

- (1) Referral from Council – Review of Sanctions imposed on Councillor Tony Richardson – Report of Audit and Governance Committee

The Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee presented the report to enable Full Council to consider the outcome of the review of the sanctions currently imposed on Councillor Tony Richardson. The Audit and Governance Committee had received the referral from Full Council at its meeting on the 11 February 2021 and during the course of discussions had considered expressions of support for both the removal and retention of the imposed sanctions. Issues considered included:

- The short period remaining before the start of purdah; and
- Training completed by Councillor Tony Richardson.

The Committee had recommended:-

“That Full Council receives the Audit and Governance Committee’s recommendation that existing sanctions remain in place for the remainder of Councillor Tony Richardson’s current term of office (as originally agreed).”

Elected Members debated issues arising from the report.

In accordance with Rule 8 of the Council’s Procedure Rules relating to the Holding of Remote Meetings, a recorded vote was taken:-

Those for

Councillors Hamilton, Harrison, Howson, Lindridge, Marshall, Prince, C Richardson and Thomas

Those against

Councillors C Akers-Belcher, S Akers-Belcher, Brewer, Buchan, Cartwright, Fleming, Hall, Hunter, King, Lauderdale, Little, T Richardson and Smith

Those abstaining

Councillors Cassidy, James, Moore, Stokell, Tennant and Young.

The vote was lost.

112. TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE COUNCIL’S COMMITTEES

- (1) Periodic Review of the Council’s Constitution – Report of Constitution Committee

The Chief Solicitor/Monitoring Officer presented the report which referred elected members to the decision at the Extraordinary meeting of Full Council held on 10 June, 2020, to approve a senior management restructure following consideration of a revised structure by the Finance and Policy Committee. The effect of the restructure meant that a number of service areas had been moved to different departments.

The alignment of functions and service areas involved comprehensive changes to Part 3 of the Constitution. During the review of Part 3, in conjunction with consideration of the new senior management structure, it has been noted that some services are cross cutting. On the 11 January 2021, the Chief Solicitor had presented a report to a Members' Seminar (a copy of which was appended to the report). Members had been content with the proposals set out in the report but had commented that they considered that it was important to keep a committee for 'Regeneration' to ensure inward investment and economic growth sit outside of Finance and Policy Committee (other than financial decisions) to avoid conflict and ensure good scrutiny and challenge. It had been recommended that the title of the Committee be the Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee.

The Committee had recommended that Full Council:-

- (i) Approves the proposals set out in the report
- (ii) Delegates to the Monitoring Officer the authority to make such amendments and consequential changes to the Council's Constitution to fully incorporate the changes.

The recommendations of the Committee were approved, with no dissent.

#### 113. TO CONSIDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS SPECIFIED IN THE SUMMONS OF THE MEETING

##### (1) Mental Health Champion Update – Mental Health Champion

Full Council received an update by Councillor Thomas, Mental Health Champion. A copy of a report entitled 'Mental Health: A Developing Picture' had been circulated which provided an overview on the impact Covid-19 had had on services delivering care and support to people with a mental health need in Hartlepool. The Mental Health Champion had highlighted that people living in the poorest neighbourhoods were experiencing higher rates of mental ill health. The long term implications were highlighted also, including future challenges. Councillor Thomas expressed his appreciation of the support he had received whilst undertaking his role and suggested the benefits of other Member Champions also presenting annual reports to Full Council.

Elected Members expressed their thanks to Councillor Thomas, acknowledged the issues which had been highlighted and congratulated him on his excellent report.

#### 114. REPORT FROM THE POLICY COMMITTEES

- (a) Proposal in relation to the Council's budget and policy framework
- (1) Medium Term Financial Strategy – 2021/22 Statutory Budget and Council Tax Determination – Report of Finance and Policy Committee

The Chair of the Finance and Policy Committee presented the report which provided details of the final 2021/22 Local Government Finance settlement announcement to enable Members to finalise the 2021/22 technical Council Tax calculations, which incorporated Council Tax levels independently set by precepting bodies.

The report set out the statutory arithmetic calculation of the overall level of Council Tax, which incorporated Council Tax levels set by individual 'precepting bodies' in accordance with the specific Government Council Tax referendum limits. It was highlighted that the 'precepting bodies' had set their own budgets and Council Tax requirements and the role of Full Council as the 'billing authority' is to incorporate these figures into the overall Council Tax calculation and then collect these amounts.

Details of the Council's statutory budget calculation were provided as an Appendix and supporting departmental budgets were appended also.

The following recommendations were moved by Councillor Moore and seconded by Councillor Smith:-

- i) Approve the statutory budget calculation for the Council budget as detailed in Appendix A and approve the detailed supporting departmental budgets detailed in Appendix B;
- ii) Approve the statutory Council Tax calculations detailed in Appendix A, which includes the Council Tax increases approved by the individual precepting bodies.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.6 and Rule 8 of the Council's Procedure Rules relating to the Holding of Remote Meetings, a recorded vote was taken:-

Those for

Councillors C Akers-Belcher, S Akers-Belcher, Brewer, Buchan, Cartwright, Cassidy, Fleming, Hall, Hamilton, Harrison, Howson, Hunter, James, King, Lauderdale, Lindridge, Little, Marshall, Moore, Prince, T Richardson, C Richardson, Smith, Stokell, Tennant, Thomas, Ward and Young.

Those against

None

Those abstaining

None

It was announced that the vote had been carried unanimously.

(2) Council Plan 2021/22-2023/24 – Report of the Finance and Policy Committee

The report enabled Full Council to consider the proposed Council Plan 2021/22 – 2023/24 following referral from Finance and Policy Committee. The Plan appended to the report had been agreed for referral to Full Council by the Finance and Policy Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2020. The Plan established a clear vision for Hartlepool and identified what the delivery of that vision will mean. This reflects what was identified through consultation with residents, elected members and public, voluntary, community and private sector partners whilst also recognising the emerging and continually evolving challenges the Council faces from the pandemic. It was noted that activity to deliver the Council Plan would be captured in a range of delivery plans and regular performance reports would be brought to the Finance and Policy Committee outlining the progress being made. Progress will also be shared more widely with Elected Members, the community and partners.

The following recommendation of the Committee was moved by Councillor Moore and seconded:-

“That Full Council approve the Council Plan 2021/22-2023/24”

The recommendation was approved, with no dissent.

(b) Proposal for Departure from the Budget and Policy Framework

None

## 115. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

The following Motion had been received:-

1. “The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted and emphasised the extent of pre-existing health inequalities in many towns and cities and particularly those in the North of England. Hartlepool has high numbers of residents with disabilities and lifelong conditions which often impact massively on their ability to access services, facilities and many aspects of day-to-day life which many of us take for granted. This can impact on physical and mental wellbeing and subsequently lead to isolation, loneliness and exclusion.

Over many years Hartlepool Borough Council has developed services and facilities aimed at supporting residents with disabilities and lifelong conditions and has invested in state-of-the-art facilities

such as the Centre For Independent Living and worked closely with health and community and voluntary sector partners.

However, much still needs to be done if Hartlepool is to become a truly accessible town for all of our residents and visitors to ensure that the voices of residents living with disabilities and lifelong conditions are sought, heard and incorporated into future Council initiatives which may impact on the future physical, economic and social environment of the town.

To this end, the Labour Group calls upon the Council to agree that the Audit and Governance Committee's 2021/22 work programme will include:

A review of Council regeneration & development activity and accessibility to services for those with disabilities and lifelong conditions to ensure that any barriers, physical, procedural or otherwise, which may inhibit access to services and day to day living are identified, so that reasonable adjustments can be made"

Signed: Councillors Thomas, Harrison, Prince, Hamilton, C Richardson and Howson.

The Motion was moved by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Prince who advised Full Council of the rationale and background of the Motion.

Following concerns expressed regarding the implications of the Motion, the following amendment was moved by Councillor Hall and seconded by Councillor Little:-

"That the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Motion be amended to agree that the Audit and Governance Committee will examine the contents of the Motion in the next municipal year."

In accordance with Rule 8 of the Council's Procedure Rules relating to the Holding of Remote Meetings, a recorded vote was taken on the amendment to the Motion:-

Those for:

Councillors C Akers-Belcher, S Akers- Belcher, Brewer, Buchan, Cartwright, Cassidy, Fleming, Hall, Harrison, Howson, Hunter, James, King, Lauderdale, Lindridge, Little, Marshall, Moore, Prince, T Richardson, C Richardson, Smith, Stokell, Tennant and Young

Those against:

Councillor Hamilton and Thomas

Those abstaining:-

None

It was announced that the vote was carried.

The mover of the Motion advised Full Council that he accepted the amendment.

## MANAGING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

### 116. SPECIAL URGENCY DECISION

In accordance with the requirements of the Access to Information Procedure Rules included in the Council's Constitution, Full Council was informed that there was one special urgency decision taken in the period November 2020 – January 2021. The decision related to extending the period in which the NMRN can exercise the existing break clause in their lease and to extend the payment of a subsidy for a further 12 months. This decision had been taken at the Finance and Policy Committee meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

### 117. POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY REVIEW

Further to minute 101 of the meeting of Full Council held on 28 January 2021, the Managing Director reminded Members of the advice that it was required to undertake a proportionality review following notice of a new political group; the Hartlepool People Group (HPP).

Elected Members were updated that notification had subsequently been received of an additional new political group the Hartlepool Veterans and People Party (HVAPP) which had implications for the report previously presented to Elected Members. As a consequence, there were no changes to the labour group and HPP allocations set out in the report. However there were changes to the second set of committee vacancies detailed in the report which were now allocated to HVAPP, impacting upon the Coalition group allocations.

Following presentation of the report:-

- Councillor Prince relinquished her seat on the Constitution Committee
- An additional nomination of Councillor Tony Richardson on the Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee
- An additional nomination of Councillor Tony Richardson on the Children's Services Committee
- The HVAPP advised they would advise the Chief Solicitor of their outstanding nominations following the meeting.

In accordance with Rule 8 of the Council's Procedure Rules relating to the Holding of Remote Meetings, a recorded vote was taken on the seat on the seat on the Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee:-

Councillor C Akers-Belcher – Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor S Akers-Belcher – Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Brewer - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Buchan - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Cartwright - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Cassidy – abstain  
Councillor Fleming - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Hall - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Hamilton – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Howson – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Hunter – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor James - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor King – abstain  
Councillor Lauderdale - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Lindridge – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Little - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Marshall – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Moore – abstain  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor T Richardson - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor C Richardson – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Smith – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Stokell – abstain  
Councillor Tennant – abstain  
Councillor Thomas – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Young – abstain

It was announced that Councillor Tony Richardson had been appointed to the Committee.

In accordance with Rule 8 of the Council's Procedure Rules relating to the Holding of Remote Meetings, a recorded vote was taken on the seat on the seat on the Children's Services Committee

Councillor C Akers-Belcher – Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor S Akers-Belcher – Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Brewer - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Buchan - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Cartwright - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Cassidy – abstain  
Councillor Fleming - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Hall - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Hamilton – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Howson – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Hunter – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor James - Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor King – Councillor King  
Councillor Lauderdale - Councillor Tony Richardson

Councillor Lindridge – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Little - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor Marshall – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Moore – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor T Richardson - Councillor Tony Richardson  
Councillor C Richardson – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Smith – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Stokell – abstain  
Councillor Tennant – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Thomas – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Ward – Councillor Lindridge  
Councillor Young – Councillor Lindridge

It was announced that Councillor Lindridge had been appointed to the Committee.

The remaining appointments set out in the report were approved, with no dissent.

#### 118. COVID UPDATE

An update was provided by the Managing Director reflecting the Prime Ministers announcement on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021, when a roadmap out of the current COVID restrictions was made. Elected members were reminded of the key dates included in the roadmap.

Full Council was updated also on the local position in terms of the prevalence of covid-19 cases and the number of covid patients in North Tees and Hartlepool hospital. It was reported that there had been no deaths in care settings in the previous two weeks and no new cases reported over the previous week. This was really positive and it was hoped it reflected the impact of the vaccination programme.

RESOLVED – That the update be noted.

#### 119. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Elected members were reminded that that Full Council had approved the terms of reference under which two community governance reviews would be undertaken. In accordance with the terms of reference the consultations had now concluded. Identical reports had been considered by both the Audit and Governance Committee and Finance and Policy Committee in respect of each proposal (appended to the report). Those Committees had been invited to express a view as to the extent that the consultation proposals were implemented. On 11 February 2021 the Audit and Governance Committee had considered the reports and had expressed its unanimous support to fully implement the proposals. On 15 February 2021 the Finance and Policy



Committee had considered the reports and expressed its unanimous support to fully implement the proposals.

RESOLVED – That Full Council instruct the Chief Solicitor to draft reorganisation orders to give effect to the following proposals in readiness for the next ordinary parish elections:

**Elwick Community Governance Review:**

- 1) That the area in question should be removed from Elwick Parish Council and a stand-alone Wynyard Parish Council (Hartlepool) be established in relation to that area.
- 2) That the newly formed Wynyard Parish Council (Hartlepool) be comprised of 7 councillors and Elwick Parish Council remains comprised of 7 councillors.

**Greatham Community Governance Review:**

- 3) That the area in question be removed from Greatham Parish Council.
- 4) That Greatham Parish Council remains comprised of 7 councillors.

120. PAY POLICY 2020/2021

The Managing Director reported that under Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011, Full Council had to approve a Pay Policy Statement on an annual basis. The updated document for 2021/22 was appended to the report. The document has been updated as follows:

- i. 3.2 Updated in line with wording negotiated with Trade Unions in the Single Status Agreement.
- ii. 4.1 Updated to give greater clarity in line with supplementary guidance under the Openness and Accountability in Local Pay document.
- iii. 8.3 New paragraph to explain Council responsibility for severance packages (identified at over £100K).

RESOLVED – That the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22, appended to the report, be approved.

121. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Managing Director reported that the Local Government Act 2003 required Full Council to determine a Treasury Management Strategy for borrowing and to prepare an Annual Investment Strategy, which sets out the Council's policies for managing its investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments. The recommended strategy had been considered by the

Audit and Governance Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> January; a copy of the report submitted to the Committee was appended to the report.

RESOLVED – That the following Committee recommendations be approved:-

#### **Borrowing Strategy 2021/22**

- i) **Core borrowing requirement** – following the securing of exceptionally low interest rates approve that the remainder of the under borrowing is netted down against investments.
- ii) To note that in the event of a change in economic circumstances that the Director of Resources and Development may take out additional borrowing if this secures the lowest long term interest cost.
- iii) To authorise the Director of Resources and Development to implement Treasury Management arrangements which minimise the short and long term cost to the Council.

#### **Investment Strategy 2021/22**

- iv) Approve the Counterparty limits as set out in paragraph 8.7 of Appendix 1.

#### **Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement**

- v) Approve the MRP statement outlined in paragraph 9.3 of Appendix 1.

#### **Prudential Indicators 2021/22**

- xi) Approve the prudential indicators outlined in Appendix 2.

### 122. CIVIC HONOURS

The Managing Director reminded elected members that at the meeting of the Civic Honours Committee held on 14 December 2020, the Committee considered inviting the submission of nominations for civic honours with a timeline agreed by the Committee. Due to implications in respect of Covid and subsequent lockdown, it had not been possible to advertise in recent resident newsletters. In order that civic honours can be considered this municipal year as had been intended, Full Council was requested to consider the following revised timeline for civic honours:-

- Week commencing 22 February, nominations sought using social media and press releases.
- Closing date for nominations 8 March
- Meeting of Civic Honours Committee 11/12 March to discuss nominations

- Individuals to be consulted on whether they accept their nominations
- Accepted nominations to be submitted to an Extraordinary Council meeting on 18 March

RESOLVED – That the proposed revised timeline for civic honours be approved.

## 123. PUBLIC QUESTION

Question from Mr Ferguson

*“Why, at a time when organisations and public bodies are being advised and encouraged to hold less private and personal details appertaining to members of the public, are HBC going against this advice.*

*I refer to Neighbourhood Services Committee meeting 13th March 2020 Appendix B section 4.5.to say this information will ensure officers have an understanding of associations and sites is ludicrous and I would think against data protection. The Council have no right to demand a, b, c or d. This is personal information and has nothing to do with HBC.”*

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Committee responded that the proposed requirement for additional information regarding individual association members would only be requested should an association wish to take on management responsibility of a site. It is considered that as part of a due diligence process the provision of such information would provide evidence of the associations sustainability as an organisation in taking on such a task. All information gathered would be held in line with any relevant national and/or local policy on the retention of personal data at that time. The implementation of this has been postponed until 2022 and an allotment report would be taken to the next Adult and Community Based Services Committee in March.

Question from Mr Swift

*“Under what legislation can the Council give themselves the right to enter and inspect any shed, greenhouse or poly tunnel. That is the personal property of the tenant. Surely entry is restricted to RSPCA, Fire Service and Police in essential circumstances and not the Council without the presence of the Police, and a warrant of entry. I refer to Neighbourhood Services meeting Appendix B section 4.12 dated 13th March 2020.”*

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Committee responded that whilst the primary reason for a visit to a site would usually be to check levels of cultivation should there be a reasonable reason to look inside a structure, i.e. animal welfare reports, concerns regarding the storage of dangerous/flammable liquid, or other breaches of tenancy, the current Rules of Tenancy (1.8 Power of Entry and Inspection) allow any officer of the Council, at any time, when directed by the Allotments Service to enter and inspect an allotment garden to ensure compliance with rules and regulations of tenancy. This would include any

buildings on site. Should the tenant not be present on the plot, the officer would give notice to the tenant to attend the plot for the inspection to be carried out. This ensures that the inspection will always be in the presence of the tenant.

Question from Mr Hayes

1. *“Can you please confirm the number of vacant allotments across the town and what measures you have in place to safeguard the sites against crime and anti-social behaviour?”*

The chair of the Neighbourhood Services Committee responded that there are 23 vacant plots across all allotment sites. All sites have gates which are locked and keys are provided to individual tenants and partners in order to access plots. In addition officers regularly visit sites and speak to both individuals and Associations in order to understand any issues which may be occurring on a site and provide support where possible including feeding any intelligence through to the Community Safety Team. Other measures taken include:

- Height restricting barriers on entrance points to prevent fly tipping,
- Site checks made every week by officers to identify any issues.
- Collaboration with the Police in providing advice on target hardening sites with anti-vandal measures such as anti-vandal paint, fence strips, Equipment DNA printing/marketing as well as tenant engagement on site.
- Responding via emergency call outs to works on sites which would leave them vulnerable to crime should the item not be repaired. This includes the Officer locking sites/plots that have had locks vandalised to prevent repeat occurrences.
- Intelligence sharing with the Enforcement Team for proactive monitoring of sites through overt and covert CCTV.
- Proactive tenant engagement for any perceived crime risk/weak points on sites with advice provided.

*“Can you please outline the current year’s income and expenditure in respect of the Council’s budget for Sport and Recreation?”*

In response, the Chair advised as follows:-

- Expenditure Budget £2.375 million
- Income Budget £1.835 million
- Net budget (i.e. expenditure less income) £540,000.

## 124. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

- a) Questions to the Chairs about recent decisions of Council Committees and Forums without notice under Council Procedure Rule 12.1

None

- b) Questions on notice to the Chair of any Committee or Forum under Council Procedure Rule 12.2

None

- c) Questions on notice to the Council representatives on the Police and Crime Panel and Cleveland Fire Authority

None

- d) Minutes of the meetings held by the Cleveland Fire Authority and the Police and Crime Panel

Minutes of the meetings held by the Cleveland Fire Authority held on 16 October 2020 and the Police and Crime Panel held on 17 November 2020 were noted.

CHAIR

The meeting concluded at 7.50 p.m.

CEREMONIAL MAYOR

# **EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL**

## **MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS**

**18 MARCH 2021**

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and was an online remote meeting in compliance with the Council Procedure Rules Relating to the holding of Remote Meetings and the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

### **COUNCILLORS:**

C Akers-Belcher	S Akers-Belcher	Brewer
Brown	Buchan	Cartwright
Cassidy	Fleming	Hall
Harrison	Howson	Hunter
James	King	Lauderdale
Lindridge	Little	Marshall
Moore	Prince	T Richardson
C Richardson	Smith	Stokell
Tennant	Thomas	Ward
Young.		

Officers: Denise McGuckin, Managing Director  
Hayley Martin, Chief Solicitor  
Neil Wilson, Assistant Chief Solicitor  
Amanda Whitaker, Democratic Services Team

### **COUNCILLOR YOUNG PRESIDING**

Terms of regret were expressed in relation to the recent death of former Councillor, Mary Fleet. Elected Members observed a minute silence as a mark of respect.

### **125. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENT MEMBERS**

Councillors Hamilton and Loynes.

It was agreed that best wishes be forwarded from Full Council to Councillor Loynes, Ceremonial Mayor, who was currently in hospital.

126. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS

Personal interests were declared by Councillors Brown, C Akers-Belcher, Smith, Moore, Stokell, C Richardson, Marshall, Buchan, James, Hunter and Young.

127. BUSINESS REQUIRED BY STATUTE TO BE DONE BEFORE ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

128. 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 items of business on the grounds that they 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 129 – Nomination for Election as Freeman/Freewoman and Alderman/Aldерwoman of the Borough – This item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 namely (paragraphs 1 and 2), information relating to any individual (paragraph 1) and information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual (paragraph 2)

129. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION AS FREEMAN/FREEWOMAN AND ALDERMAN AND ALDERWOMAN OF THE BOROUGH (*Civic Honours Committee*) This item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 namely, paragraphs 1 and 2.

Full Council considered a report of the Civic Honours Committee which reported that the Committee had considered 30 nominations received in respect of the award of civic honours, based on the agreed criteria.

The debate arising from the report and votes taken are set out in the exempt section of these minutes.

**THE MEETING RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION.**

The Managing Director reported that she was pleased to announce that Full Council had agreed the recommendations of the Civic Honours Committee and she would be informing the successful nominees of the decision of Full Council.

It was highlighted that this was the last meeting of Full Council in the municipal year, the Vice Chair paid tribute to those Councillors that were retiring in the forthcoming local elections and thanked them for their contribution to Council and to the town.

Councillors paid tribute to Councillors Christopher Akers-Belcher, Stephen Akers-Belcher, James, Thomas and Hamilton.

The meeting concluded at 7.15 p.m.

CEREMONIAL MAYOR



# **ANNUAL COUNCIL**

## **MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS**

### **25 MAY 2021**

The meeting commenced at 7.00 p.m. in the Borough Hall, Hartlepool

The Ceremonial Mayor (Councillor B Loynes) presiding:

COUNCILLORS:

Ashton	Boddy	Brash
Brown	Cassidy	Clayton
Cook	Cowie	Cranney
Creevy	Elliott	Falconer
Feeney	Fleming	Groves
Hall	Hargreaves	Harrison
Howson	Jackson	Lindridge
Little	D Loynes	Moore
D Nicholson	V Nicholson	Picton
Price	Prince	Richardson
Riddle	Smith	Stokell
Tiplady	Young	

Officers: Denise McGuckin, Managing Director  
Hayley Martin, Chief Solicitor  
Amanda Whitaker and Denise Wimpenny, Democratic Services Team.

#### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENT MEMBERS

None

#### 2. ELECTION OF CHAIR OF COUNCIL/CEREMONIAL MAYOR

Nominations were sought for the office of Chair of Council/Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year:-

Nomination moved by Councillor Moore and seconded by Councillor Young:-

“That Councillor B Loynes be elected Chair of Council/Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year”.

A further nomination was moved by Councillor Harrison and seconded by

Councillor Brash:-

That Councillor Prince be elected Chair of Council/Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year”.

A recorded vote was taken:-

Councillor Ashton – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Boddy – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Brash – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Brown – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Cassidy – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Clayton – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Cook – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Cowie – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Cranney – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Creevy – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Elliott – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Falconer – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Feeney – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Fleming – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Groves – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Hall – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Hargreaves – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Howson – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Jackson – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Lindridge - - Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Little – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor B Loynes – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor D Loynes – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Moore – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor D Nicholson – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor V Nicholson – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Picton – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Price – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Richardson – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Riddle – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Smith – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Stokell – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Tiplady – Councillor B Loynes  
Councillor Young – Councillor B Loynes

The Managing Director announced that Councillor Loynes was elected as Chair of Council/Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year.

The Ceremonial Mayor signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office.

### 3. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR OF COUNCIL/DEPUTY CEREMONIAL MAYOR

Nominations were sought for the office of Vice Chair of Council/Deputy Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year:-

Nomination moved by Councillor Harrison and seconded by Councillor Brasj:-

“That Councillor Prince be elected Vice Chair of Council/Deputy Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year”.

A further nomination was moved by Councillor Moore and seconded by Councillor Brown:-

That Councillor Young be elected Vice Chair of Council/Deputy Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year”.

A recorded vote was taken:-

Councillor Ashton – Councillor Young  
Councillor Boddy – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Brash – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Brown - Councillor Young  
Councillor Cassidy - Councillor Young  
Councillor Clayton – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Cook - Councillor Young  
Councillor Cowie - Councillor Young  
Councillor Cranney - Councillor Young  
Councillor Creevy – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Elliott – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Falconer - Councillor Young  
Councillor Feeney – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Fleming - Councillor Young  
Councillor Groves - Councillor Young  
Councillor Hall – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Hargreaves – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Howson – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Jackson - Councillor Young  
Councillor Lindridge - Councillor Young  
Councillor Little - Councillor Young  
Councillor B Loynes - Councillor Young  
Councillor D Loynes - Councillor Young  
Councillor Moore - Councillor Young  
Councillor D Nicholson - Councillor Young  
Councillor V Nicholson - Councillor Young  
Councillor Picton - Councillor Young  
Councillor Price - Councillor Young  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Richardson – Councillor Prince

Councillor Riddle – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Smith – Councillor Prince  
Councillor Stokell - Councillor Young  
Councillor Tiplady - Councillor Young  
Councillor Young - Councillor Young

The Managing Director announced that Councillor Young was elected Vice Chair of Council/Deputy Ceremonial Mayor of the Borough of Hartlepool for the ensuing municipal year.

#### 4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

#### 5. TO ELECT THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Nominations were sought for the Leader of the Council.

Nomination moved by Councillor Brash and seconded by Councillor Prince:-

“That Councillor Harrison be elected as Leader of the Council for the ensuing municipal year”

A further nomination was moved by Councillor Young and seconded by Councillor Smith:-

“That Councillor Moore be elected as Leader of the Council for the ensuing municipal year”

A recorded vote was taken:-

Councillor Ashton – Councillor Moore  
Councillor Boddy – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Brash – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Brown - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Cassidy - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Clayton – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Cook - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Cowie - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Cranney - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Creevy – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Elliott – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Falconer - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Feeney – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Fleming - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Groves - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Hall – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Hargreaves – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Harrison

Councillor Howson – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Jackson - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Lindridge - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Little - Councillor Moore  
Councillor B Loynes - Councillor Moore  
Councillor D Loynes - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Moore - Councillor Moore  
Councillor D Nicholson - Councillor Moore  
Councillor V Nicholson - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Picton - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Price - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Richardson – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Riddle – Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Smith - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Stokell - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Tiplady - Councillor Moore  
Councillor Young - Councillor Moore

The Managing Director announced that Councillor Moore had been elected as Leader of the Council.

It was highlighted, therefore, that Councillor Moore was appointed Chair of the Finance and Policy Committee, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, Chair of the Constitution Committee and appointed to Appointments Panel and outside bodies set out in the outside body schedule circulated to elected members.

Nominations were sought for the office of Deputy Leader of the Council for the ensuing municipal year.

Nomination moved by Councillor Harrison and seconded by Councillor Prince:-

“That Councillor Brash be elected as Deputy Leader of the Council for the ensuing municipal year”

Nomination moved by Councillor Moore and seconded by Councillor Brown:-

“That Councillor Young be elected as Deputy Leader of the Council for the ensuing municipal year”

A recorded vote was taken:-

Councillor Ashton – Councillor Young  
Councillor Boddy – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Brash – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Brown – Councillor Young  
Councillor Cassidy – Councillor Young  
Councillor Clayton – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Cook – Councillor Young  
Councillor Cowie – Councillor Young

Councillor Cranney – Councillor Young  
Councillor Creevy – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Elliott – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Falconer – Councillor Young  
Councillor Feeney – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Fleming – Councillor Young  
Councillor Groves – Councillor Young  
Councillor Hall – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Hargreaves – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Harrison – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Howson – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Jackson – Councillor Young  
Councillor Lindridge – Councillor Young  
Councillor Little - Abstain  
Councillor B Loynes – Councillor Young  
Councillor D Loynes – Councillor Young  
Councillor Moore – Councillor Young  
Councillor D Nicholson – Councillor Young  
Councillor V Nicholson – Councillor Young  
Councillor Picton – Councillor Young  
Councillor Price – Councillor Young  
Councillor Prince – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Richardson – Councillor Brash  
Councillor Riddle - - Councillor Brash  
Councillor Smith - Abstain  
Councillor Stokell – Councillor Young  
Councillor Tiplady – Councillor Young  
Councillor Young – Councillor Young

The Managing Director announced that Councillor Young was elected Deputy Leader of the Council and would consequently be appointed to a seat on the Finance and Policy Committee.

## 6. MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

A schedule of Council meetings for the municipal year 2021/22 had been circulated. Council was requested to approve the meeting dates as set out and to approve the change of commencement time of Council to 6.00 pm, following the success of the meetings at this time during 2020 / 21, and to the consequent change to Council Procedure Rule 5.1 in Part 4 of the Constitution.

RESOLVED, with no dissent – That the schedule of Council meetings be approved and the change of commencement time of Council to 6.00 pm, with the consequent change to Council Procedure Rule 5.1 in Part 4 of the Constitution.

It was agreed that votes for the remaining contested seats would be by way of show of hands.

## 7. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, FORUMS AND OTHER BODIES

A document tabled at the meeting advised elected members that in accordance with Regulation 8 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, the under-mentioned Councillors have given notice to the Managing Director of their wish to be regarded as members of the political groups as set out below:-

### Hartlepool Coalition

Councillors Ashton, Brown, Cassidy, Cowie, Cranney, Falconer, Fleming, Groves, Jackson, Lindridge, B Loynes, D Loynes, Moore, D Nicholson, V Nicholson, Picton, Price, Stokell, Tiplady and Young.

### Labour Group

Councillors Boddy, Brash, Clayton, Creevy, Elliott, Feeney, Hargreaves, Harrison, Prince, Richardson and Howson.

### Putting Seaton First Group

Councillors Little and Smith.

It was reported that the proposed membership of Committees, Forums and other bodies had been circulated prior to this meeting of full Council. An invitation had been extended to leaders of the political groups and independent members to make nominations for the position of Chairs and Vice Chairs which were indicated on the schedule circulated to elected members.

Votes were taken on Chairs of each of the Policy Committees:-

**Adult and Community Based Services Committee** – Councillor Boddy and Councillor Fleming had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Fleming had been appointed Chair of the Committee and was, therefore, also appointed to the Finance and Policy Committee.

**Neighbourhood Services Committee** – Councillor Creevy and Councillor Stokell had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Stokell had been appointed Chair of the Committee and was, therefore, also appointed to the Finance and Policy Committee.

**Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee** – Councillor Brown and Councillor Hargreaves had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Brown had been appointed Chair of the Committee and was, therefore, also appointed to the Finance and Policy Committee.

**Children's Services Committee** – Councillor Brash and Councillor Lindridge had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Lindridge had been appointed Chair of the Committee and was, therefore, also appointed to the Finance and Policy Committee.

Votes were taken on Vice Chairs of the Policy Committees:-

**Adult and Community Based Services Committee** – Councillor Little and Councillor Boddy had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Little had been appointed Vice Chair of the Committee and would therefore take the unallocated seat on the Committee.

**Neighbourhood Services Committee** – Councillors Creevy and Price had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Price had been appointed Vice Chair of the Committee.

**Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee** – Councillors Hargreaves and Young had been nominated.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Young had been appointed Vice Chair of the Committee

**Children's Services Committee** – Councillor Harrison nominated. The Managing Director advised that she had been advised that Councillor Fleming nomination had been withdrawn and this seat was, therefore, no longer contested. Councillor Harrison was appointed Vice Chair of the Committee.

Council's approved the non-contested seats on the Policy Committees as set out in the Committee schedule circulated to members.

Full Council was then requested to vote upon the contested unallocated positions on the Policy Committees:-

**Finance and Policy Committee**

Candidates nominated were Councillors Hargreaves and D Nicholson. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Nicholson had been appointed to the Committee.

**Neighbourhood Services Committee** – Candidates nominated were Councillors Cook, Feeney and Little. Following the vote the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed to the Committee.

**Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee** – Candidates nominated are Councillors Cook and Feeney. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed to the Committee.



**Children's Services Committee** – Candidates nominated are Councillors Boddy, Moore and Riddle.

Councillor Brash advised that he relinquished his seat to be replaced by Councillor Boddy and urged Councillor Moore to support Councillor Riddle's nomination.

A vote was therefore taken on the 2 remaining nominations. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Moore was appointed to the Committee.

Votes were then taken on the other Council Committees:-

**Health and Wellbeing Board** – Following Councillor Moore appointment as Leader, seat 1 was allocated. Full Council approved the uncontested nominations which had been received and a vote was taken on the remaining contested seat for which Councillor Creevy and Councillor Cook had been nominated. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed.

### **Licensing Committee**

Chair – Councillors Cassidy and Feeney had been nominated. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cassidy had been appointed Chair of the Committee.

Vice Chair – Councillors Feeney and Fleming had been nominated. Following the vote, the Vice Chair announced that Councillor Fleming had been appointed Vice Chair of the Committee.

There were no remaining contested seats and Full Council approved the remaining membership of this Committee.

### **Planning Committee**

Chair – 2 nominations had been received – Councillors Elliott and Young.

Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Young had been appointed Chair of the Committee.

Vice Chair – Councillors Elliott and Brown had been nominated. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Brown had been appointed Vice Chair of the Committee.

Unallocated Seat – Councillors Cook and Feeney had been nominated. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed.

There were no remaining contested seats on the Committee and Full Council approved the remaining membership of the Committee.

### **Audit and Governance Committee**

Chair – Councillors Cook and Hall had been nominated. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed Chair of the Committee.

Unallocated Committee Seat – Councillors Clayton, Hall and Riddle had been nominated.

Councillor Brash withdrew his Group's nomination of Councillor Clayton.

It was moved by Councillor Brash and seconded by Councillor Little:-

“That the Hartlepool Coalition Group also relinquish a seat on the Committee to allow independent Councillors to be appointed to the Committee.”

Elected Members debated issues arising from the Motion.

It was moved by Councillor Young and seconded by Councillor Brash:-

“That the Council meeting be adjourned for 10 minutes.”

Upon the meeting being reconvened, a vote was taken on the unallocated seat on the Audit and Governance Committee. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Riddle had been appointed to the Committee.

There are no remaining contested seats on the Committee and Full Council approved the remaining uncontested membership of this Committee including Vice Chair of Committee.

It was reported that under the Localism Act, 2011, the Council was required to appoint Independent Persons. The Council's Audit and Governance Committee had previously approved the “selection criteria” and “role description” of the ‘Independent Person’ and the positions had been advertised and applications considered in accordance with the legislation. On the 11 and 12 March 2021, Councillor Hall (Chair of) and Councillor Harrison (Member of) the Audit and Governance Committee, together with the Council's Chief Solicitor and Director of Resources and Development interviewed and recommended for appointment\*:

- Ms Gillian Holbrook
- Mr Martin Slimmings
- Ms Tracy Squires.

*\* one other was recommended for appointment but has since withdrawn*

**Full Council approved the recommended appointments for a term of two years commencing on 28 May 2021.**

### **Constitution Committee**

There were no contested seats. Council approved membership of the Committee as set out in the Committee schedule.

## **Appointments Panel**

There were 2 Unallocated Seats.

Seat 1 – Councillors Cook, Creevy, Little, Prince and Young had been nominated.

Councillor Little withdrew her nomination.

Following a vote it was announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed to the seat on the Committee.

Seat 2 – A vote was taken on the nominations of Councillors Creevy, Prince and Young. Following the vote it was announced that Councillor Young was appointed to the seat on the Committee.

Council approved the non-contested seats.

## **8. APPOINTMENTS TO JOINT COMMITTEES AND OTHER OUTSIDE BODIES**

It was highlighted that a list setting out suggested representation on joint committees and other outside bodies had been circulated. Leaders of the political groups and independent members had been invited to make nominations.

Council's approval was requested to the outside bodies where there were no contested seats, as set out in the schedule.

With regard to the contested outside body appointments, votes were taken as follows:-

### **Hartlepool and District Sports Council**

3 seats available – Councillors Little, Jackson, Hargreaves, Price and Riddle had been nominated. Votes were taken on each of the seats. Following the votes, the Managing Director reported the following appointments:-

Seat 1 – Councillor Little

Seat 2 – Councillor Jackson

Seat 3 – Councillor Price

**Hartlepool Power Station Community Liaison Committee** – 2 nominations had been received – Councillors Brash and Jackson– for the one vacancy. Councillor Brash withdrew his nomination. Councillor Jackson was appointed.

**Local Government Association** – seat 2 contested between Councillors Brash and Stokell. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Stokell had been appointed.

**Durham Tees Valley Airport Board** – There were 2 nominations- Councillors B Loynes and Harrison– for the one vacancy. Following the vote, the Managing Director announced that Councillor Brenda Loynes had been appointed.

**Durham Tees Valley Airport Consultative Committee** – There were 2 nominations - Councillors Cook and Clayton – for one vacancy. Following the vote, it was announced that Councillor Cook had been appointed.

**River Tees Port Health Authority** – 3 nominations – Councillors Cook, Creevy and Young – had been submitted for 2 vacancies. Following the votes, the Managing Director reported the following appointments:-

Seat 1 – Councillor Cook  
Seat 2 – Councillor Young

**North East Regional Employers Organisation** – Council approved the appointment of Councillor Moore as the executive member.

There were no nominations for the vacancies set out in the schedule.

The meeting concluded at 8.15 p.m.

CEREMONIAL MAYOR

# COUNCIL

8 JULY 2021



**Report of:** Finance and Policy Committee

**Subject:** PROPOSAL TO INCREASE CAPACITY FOR SEND EDUCATION PROVISION

---

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To enable the Council to consider the proposal referred from Finance and Policy Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2021 to increase capacity for Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND) Education Provision at Catcote Academy using Prudential Borrowing – which will be paid back through the High Needs Block (HNB) and therefore not impact on the Council's General Fund revenue budget.

## 2. REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COUNCIL AND CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES

- 2.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution all proposals to use Prudential Borrowing need to be considered by Finance and Policy Committee before referral to full Council. At the Finance and Policy Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> July Members will consider a request from the Children's Services Committee to use Prudential Borrowing for the purpose detailed in a paragraph 1.1.
- 2.2 Owing to the timing of meetings this report is being submitted to enable Members to familiarise themselves with the proposals. Accordingly sections 3 to 13 detailed the full information reported to Children's Services Committee, and Finance and Policy Committee.
- 2.3 A verbal outcome on the decisions of Finance and Policy Committee will be provided at Council.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Children and Families Act 2014 and subsequent SEND Code of Practice: 0-25 years clearly sets out the duties placed on local authorities in relation to children with additional needs. Local authorities are required to ensure that provision is available to meet the needs of children with Special Education Needs and/ or Disabilities (SEND).

- 3.2 The local authority is required to undertake a strategic needs assessment understanding the supply of provision and the current and future demand. Hartlepool's SEND JSNA can be found at [https://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/downloads/file/5753/send\\_jsna\\_2020](https://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/downloads/file/5753/send_jsna_2020)
- 3.3 Nationally there has been a steady increase in the number of children with SEND over the last three years from 2.8% (2017) of the child population with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) to 3.3% (2020). There has also been an increase in the number of children with SEN support plans from 11.6% (2017) to 12.1% (2020). Locally the increase in children needing support has significantly increased from 434 children and young people with EHC plans in 2014 to 725 in 2021.
- 3.4 High Needs provision and support is funded through the High Needs Block (HNB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which the local authority receives. The Local Authority in consultation with Schools Forum make decisions on how the HNB is spent and consults stakeholders where required.
- 3.5 In addition to the High Needs Block funding (revenue) the local authority has recently received SEND capital funding. In 2018/19 the Authority was allocated £0.500m payable in 3 equal installments over financial years 2018/19 to 2020/21. A further £0.116m was received in May 2018 and a further £0.233m was allocated in December 2018. £0.500m is receivable in financial year 2021/22. This is to support the development of SEND provision in the area but the amount received does not meet the needs identified in the town.
- 3.6 The above capital monies was allocated to Springwell School to make modifications for children with Profound and Multiple Disabilities (which includes significant health needs). Of the above monies there is £0.201m left to support the project at Catcote Academy.

#### **4. CATCOTE ACADEMY**

- 4.1 Catcote Academy is the only secondary phase special school for children and young people in Hartlepool. It provides high quality provision and graded as good (Ofsted 2020). Children, young people and their families tell us that they really value the provision and feel part of the Catcote family.
- 4.2 The current main building on Catcote Road has not had investment for a significant number of years with “temporary” arrangements to teach children in a demountable being in place for approx. 15 years. The current building is not fit for purpose due to:
- The building was not built to meet the varying needs that are now evident in the school population
  - The complexity of children and young people's needs have significantly increased over the last five years and the accommodation has not been adapted to meet these needs
  - There are currently more children identified needing specialist provision than the current building can manage. This means that in Sept 2021 we

have a significant number of children that are being educated off site at other buildings in Hartlepool. This is not appropriate for the children who are not part of the main Catcote family on Catcote Road or the staff who have to travel to various venues to teach.

- 4.3 There are currently 48 children being educated in the demountable and there are 22 children with Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) who will be educated at Centre for Excellence in Creative Arts (CECA) and Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) as an interim arrangement from Sept 2021.
- 4.4 In addition there is a Looked after Child identified that needs specialist provision. This child has highly complex needs and if Catcote does not have the extra capacity created will have to be placed out of area in a residential provision which we do not believe is the right plan.
- 4.5 Based on all the above there is a requirement to invest funding at Catcote Academy to build additional provision to meet the needs of the children - those already attending and those due to start in Sept 2021.
- 4.6 Catcote Academy is the only secondary school in the town that has not had external investment to rebuild the school. The other five secondary schools have been rebuilt with funding provided from the Durham and Hexham Diocese or the Department for Education (DfE) under either the Buildings Schools for the Future Programme or the Priority School Buildings Programme.

## **5. PROPOSALS**

- 5.1 A Schools Capital report was presented to Children's Services Committee on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 which set out the situation in relation to SEND provision and proposed a new build at Catcote to increase the provision and it highlighted a shortfall of £2.050m. The Local Authority has recently received a SEND capital allocation of £0.500m therefore the proposal is to borrow £1.550m.
- 5.2 This will fund a significant extension to the school to replace the demountable and to add capacity to meet needs of the MLD group of children and future demand in the forthcoming years.
- 5.3 Officers hoped that there may be some opportunities to bid for academy funding through the DfE. However this is not currently available and it is unknown due to COVID pressures whether this will be available in the foreseeable future. The children and young people needing Catcote provision cannot wait for an unlimited time for the provision to be built.
- 5.4 Officers will continue to seek external grant funding for this project. Any successful bids would reduce the amount of prudential borrowing required for this project. However, a commitment is needed to approve the prudential borrowing to enable the commencement on site to deliver the project within the timescale.

## 6. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are significant risks if this build does not go ahead:
- Children and young people currently using the demountable will have to continue to access this temporary accommodation which is not conducive to high quality education
  - We would need to look for other education options for the MLD children identified to start in Sept 2021. This could cost between £0.880m and £1.3 m per year and would be against the principle that our children should be educated within their Hartlepool community.
  - There would be no provision available at Catcote for children and young people from 2022 onwards other than those transferring from Springwell who could be accommodated within the numbers if there were sufficient leavers. Early mapping work with mainstream primary schools indicates there will be a cohort of at least 10 children who due to their extreme vulnerability with MLD needs will need to be accommodated at Catcote. If the provision is not accommodated at Catcote the children who need to be placed in out of area provision at a cost of £40-60k per annum per young person plus transport costs.
- 6.2 There is a risk that the costs could increase as the building is undertaken. However significant surveys have been undertaken and officers are confident that we understand all requirements and these have been included within the proposed costs. The plans have been submitted to the One Stop Shop (planning) and all feedback has been included within the costs.
- 6.3 Between 2015/16 and 2019/20 the HNB has overspent by £1.482m. Proactive action in conjunction with Schools Forum delivered savings to the block by restructuring top up payments, freezing rates and reviewing all areas of expenditure. The HNB underspent by £0.848m in 2020/21.
- 6.4 Additional funding of £1.998m has been received for 2021/22. The authority in conjunction with Schools Forum are considering how best to use this additional funding.
- 6.5 DfE position statement – requested.

## 7. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The cost of the project is £2.750m. Basic Need grant funding of £0.499m and SEND capital grant funding of £0.701m have been identified to support the project. It is proposed to fund the shortfall of £1.550m from prudential borrowing.
- 7.2 Over a 25 year period the annual cost of repayment would be £0.078m. It is proposed to fund this repayment from the HNB.
- 7.3 The Regulations allow the schools budget to be used for prudential borrowing for the purpose of facilitating the modernisation and rationalisation of the school estate, where the revenue savings expected to be achieved as a result



are equal to or more than the expenditure expected to be incurred in borrowing the money.

- 7.4 If this project was approved the annual cost (without transport costs) to the HNB would be:-

	£'000
22 Places at £10k per place	220
22 Top Ups at 5ii £10,850	239
Annual Prudential Borrowing Repayment	78
Total Cost to HNB	537

- 7.5 If the 22 young people could not be educated at Catcote Academy the local authority would need to find provision out of town. This would cost the HNB between £40k and £60k per year per pupil. Therefore, the cost to the HNB (without transport costs) would be between £0.880m to £1.320m per year. It needs to be noted that there would still be a group of children being educated in the temporary demountable.
- 7.6 On the basis of the above figures the cost of this proposal provides a saving to the HNB of between £0.343m and £0.783m.

## 8. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 A legal agreement will be put in place between Catcote Academy Board of Trustees and the council to ensure that any funding/ building allocated is used for the purposes outlined in this report. The agreement will also include the need for Catcote Academy to ensure like for like provision is provided in the event of the academy moving accommodation.

## 9. CONSULTATION

- 9.1 The school have been significantly consulted on the needs of the children and how they can meet the needs. Families via the Parent Carer Forum have clearly said they want their children educated in Hartlepool.
- 9.2 Schools Forum – Schools Forum considered this proposal at a meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Schools Forum were wholly supportive of the proposal to ensure that children with SEND were supported within the right environments. However Forum wanted funding opportunities to be considered e.g. use of future High Needs Capital Provision Capital Allocations, further exploration of Condition Improvement Fund (CIF) applications and use of any underspends in the High Needs Block. It was noted that there was concern that we were being reactive however it was acknowledged that the High Needs Block Review that is being currently undertaken will be addressing the need to be more proactive.

**10. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 10.1 Children and young people identified in this report have been assessed as needing specialist education provision. It is important that all children have the opportunity to succeed. There are no specific child and family considerations.

**11. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 11.1 It is important that children and young people identified needing specialist support through an Education, Health and Care Plan are offered the highest quality provision. This will allow them to fulfil their potential. This report sets out the proposals to ensure that needs are met.

**12. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

- 12.1 There are no staff considerations.

**13. CONCLUSION**

- 13.1 As detailed in this report increased SEND provision is required to meet current and future demand for the young people of the Town. The proposal to develop a local unit funded from grant funding and prudential borrowing is the most cost effective solution to the HNB budget, providing an overall saving of between £0.343m and £0.783m.
- 13.2 As set out above in this report it is important that children that live in Hartlepool are able to be educated in Hartlepool. The additional capacity at Catcote Academy will ensure that more children can be educated within their community.

**14. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 14.1 Finance and Policy Committee will consider the following recommendations and a verbal update on the recommendations approved for Council consideration will be provided at the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> July:
- a) Note the contents of the report.
  - b) Approve the proposal referred from Finance and Policy Committee (which were unanimously supported by Children's Services Committee). To support a sustainable solution for the provision of additional capacity for children with SEND and to approve the use of Prudential Borrowing of £1.550m, saving the HNB annually between £0.343m and £0.783m.
  - c) Note the loan repayment cost will be met from the HNB and will not impact on the General Fund Budget of the Council.

- d) To seek Council approval of the total capital budget for the project of £2.750m, which is funded grant funding of £1.2m and £1.550m from Prudential Borrowing.

**15. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 15.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution all proposals to use Prudential Borrowing need to be considered by this Committee before referral to full Council.

**16. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 16.1 Schools Capital Works Programme 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 – Children's Services Committee

Proposal to increase capacity for SEND Education Provision – 23rd June 2021 - Children's Services Committee

**17. CONTACT OFFICER**

Danielle Swainston  
Assistant Director, Joint Commissioning  
Level 4, Civic Centre  
Victoria Road  
Hartlepool, TS24 8AY  
Telephone: 01429 523732  
e-mail: [danielle.swainston@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:danielle.swainston@hartlepool.gov.uk)

Chris Little  
Director Resources and Development  
Level 3, Civic Centre  
Victoria Road  
Hartlepool, TS24 8AY  
Telephone: 01429 523002  
e-mail: [chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk)

Sign Off:-

Managing Director

Director of Resources and Development

Chief Solicitor



# COUNCIL

8th July 2021



**Report of:** Finance and Policy Committee

**Subject:** CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE CAPACITY

---

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To enable Members to consider a proposal to increase Children's Social Care Capacity.

## 2. REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COUNCIL AND CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES

- 2.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution all proposals to use Prudential Borrowing need to be considered by Finance and Policy Committee before referral to full Council. At the Finance and Policy Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> July Members will consider the use of Prudential Borrowing for the purpose detailed in paragraph 1.1.
- 2.2 Owing to the timing of meetings this report is being submitted to enable Members to familiarise themselves with the proposals. Accordingly sections 3 to 12 detailed the full information reported to Finance and Policy Committee.
- 2.3 A verbal outcome on the decision of Finance and Policy Committee will be provided at Council.

## 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As outlined in previous MTFS reports councils have seen sustained increases in the number of vulnerable children requiring care and support. Demand for children's social care has continued to increase due to significant adult related issues such as domestic abuse, substance misuse and parental mental ill health. These issues have impacted on Hartlepool and over the period 2017/18 to 2021/22 the number of children in our care has increased from 278 to 360 – a 30% increase. To provide some context this is broadly the number of children in a typical primary school.
- 3.2 In financial terms the recurring cash budget increase is approximately £7m – a 43% increase, as investment has been required across the whole system

to manage the volume of demand for children's social care and reflects the significant increase in the complexity and number of vulnerable children needing support. This includes more children are requiring support at the highest levels of intervention, i.e. subject to child protection plans or in the care of the local authority.

- 3.3 As reported to Finance and Policy Committee on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020, within the Medium Term Financial Strategy, further placement capacity is needed to meet existing and forecast demand and ensure the Council has a sufficient supply of placements within residential care. Currently the Council operates three children's homes which provides a permanent home for eight children and short break care for children who have additional needs. Over the last 18 months, the permanent places within our children's homes have been fully occupied and the children who live there have experienced good quality consistent care. They have thrived with the care they have received and as a result there have been no children move in or out of these homes. Consequently, where another child in our care has needed residential care, placements have had to be secured from the private sector which are more costly than local authority ran children's homes, and usually outside of Hartlepool and the child's home town. This can lead to a child experiencing further disruption, for example to their education, health care and social networks.
- 3.4 All of the children's homes currently delivered by Hartlepool Borough Council are regulated by Ofsted and are judged to be good or outstanding.
- 3.5 The proposal is to open an additional Children's Home as this provides the best possible outcome for children and is 25% (£0.2m) more cost effective than external placements.
- 3.6 The budget approved by Council on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 included an increase in the Children's Social Care budget, including the funding to increase capacity.

#### **4. PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The MTFs proposal was based on renting an appropriate property, as this service delivery model has previously been used successful to deliver an existing home.
- 4.2 Further work has been completed on the development of a new Children's Home and this has identified that a better longer term solution may be to purchase a suitable property. Initial budget modelling indicates the funding allocated for rent should be sufficient to meet the Prudential Borrowing costs of buying a suitable property and carry out the necessary modifications to meet Ofsted requirements and provide an appropriate home for our children.
- 4.3 This work has also identified that the 'ownership' model, funded using Prudential Borrowing, would also be appropriate to replace the St David

Walk Children's Home, which is currently rented. St David's Walk Children's Home is a two bed home and the property is very small. Whilst the children are well cared for, the property is not ideal and does not really provide sufficient space for the children and staff. Ofsted have expressed the view that the building could be better. The move to an 'ownership' model and acquisition of new premises for the home would significantly improve the living environment.

- 4.4 The rental model may still be an appropriate model in some circumstances and the key criteria in the model adopted need to be the provision of appropriate homes for children – not whether the Council owns or rents the property. In either situation the local delivery and operation of Children's Homes should provide the best outcomes for children.

## 5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are three key risks:

- The housing market is currently experiencing a positive period of price increases, coupled with low number of properties for sale and this may impact on the financial viability;
- there is currently a shortage of certain building materials and rising costs of raw materials which may affect both project completion dates and forecast costs;
- Obtaining all of the necessary regulatory and planning requirements to operate a property as a Children's Home.

## 6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The proposal is to provide two Children's Home, one with capacity for three children and one for four children. The cost of acquiring and converting two properties will depend on the individual properties purchased and there are two options:

- Option 1 – purchase two properties – estimated acquisition and conversion costs £750,000 – annual loan repayment cost £28,000.
- Option 2 – use of existing council owned property and purchase of one additional property – estimated acquisition and conversion costs £850,000 – annual loan repayment cost £32,000.

- 6.2 Option 2 reflects the decision made at Finance and Policy Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021 when Members approved the purchase of a property to facilitate highways improvements. The report indicated the property would be resold. As part of the consideration of the report Members requested that officers consider the feasibility of retaining the property for service delivery. Owing to the market price paid for this property it is estimated that the overall costs of option 2 will be higher than option 1. Under option 1 officers will

endeavour to minimise the purchase cost of both properties, whilst ensuring a high standard of accommodation for children in the Council's care.

- 6.3 With both options the purchase of properties provides a housing asset which could be sold at a future date if no longer required for service needs.
- 6.4 The available revenue budget provides capacity to support Prudential Borrowing for either option 1 or 2 to fund the acquisition and conversion costs.
- 6.5 It is proposed that authority to allocate the overall budget between the acquisition and refurbishment of two properties is delegated to the Managing Director, in consultation with the Chair of Finance and Policy Committee, the Chair of Children's Service Committee and the Director of Resources and Development. This will provide flexibility to develop the individual business cases and also minimises the risk of declaring the amount the Council has to purchase properties.

## **7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 None

## **8. CONSULTATION**

- 8.1 Once properties are identified the Chair of Children's Services Committee and the relevant ward councillors will be consulted. Planning consultation will be undertaken as required.

## **9. CHILD AND FAMILY POVERTY (IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM TO BE COMPLETED AS APPROPRIATE.)**

- 9.1 None

## **10. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY CONSIDERATIONS (IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM TO BE COMPLETED AS APPROPRIATE.)**

- 10.1 None

## **11. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS**

- 11.1 Additional staff will be recruited to operate the Children's Home and will be recruited in line with Council procedures and Ofsted registration requirements.

## **12. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

- 12.1 Purchase of properties.

### **13. RECOMMENDATIONS**

13.1 Finance and Policy Committee will consider the following recommendations and a verbal update on the recommendations approved for Council consideration will be provided at the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> July:

- i) Determine whether to adopt option 1 or 2 as detailed in paragraph 6.1
- ii) Approve the use of Prudential Borrowing of up to £750,000 if option 1 is approved, or £850,000 if option 2 is approved, to purchase and convert two properties to provide two children's home and to note the loan repayment costs can be funded from the existing revenue budget;
- iii) Note the operation of Children's Homes by the Council is a lower cost option than external placements and provides Hartlepool based services for children where it is appropriate for them to remain in the town;
- iv) Delegate authority to allocate the overall capital budget between the acquisition and refurbishment of two properties to the Managing Director, in consultation with the Chair of Finance and Policy Committee, the Chair of Children's Service Committee and the Director of Resources and Development.

### **14. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

14.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution all proposals to use Prudential Borrowing need to be considered by this Committee before referral to full Council.

### **15. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Finance and Policy Committee 30<sup>th</sup> November 2020 – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 to 2024/25

Council 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 to 2024/25

Finance and Policy Committee 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021 – Proposed Property Purchase

Finance and Policy Committee 7<sup>th</sup> July – Children's Social Care Capacity

### **16. CONTACT OFFICERS**

Chris Little  
Director of Resources and Development  
Email: [chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:chris.little@hartlepool.gov.uk)  
Telephone: 01429 523003



Sign Off:-

Managing Director



Director of Resources and Development



Chief Solicitor





**Report of:** Managing Director

**Subject:** BUSINESS REPORT

---

**1. COVID UPDATE (TO FOLLOW)**

**2. SPECIAL URGENCY DECISION**

In accordance with the requirements of the Access to Information Procedure Rules included in the Council's Constitution, Full Council is informed that one special urgency decision was taken in the period February 2021 – April 2021 as set out below:-

**Decision** – Proposed Property Purchase

**Decision Route** – Finance and Policy Committee – 15 March 2021

**Reason(s) for Urgency** – To facilitate a time sensitive land and property purchase.

Council is requested to note the report.

**3. OUTSIDE BODY APPOINTMENTS**

Following the appointments made to Outside Bodies at the Annual Council meeting on 25 May, the following vacancies remain:-

Northumbria Regional Flood and Coastal Committee – 1 vacancy  
Tees Esk and Wear Valley NHS Trust – subject to outcome of Member Champion referral to Constitution Committee

Local Joint Consultative Committee – 2 Coalition vacancies

Suez Recycling and Recovery UK Ltd – 1 vacancy

Tees Valley Local Access Forum – 1 vacancy

Age UK Teesside – subject to outcome of Member Champion referral to Constitution Committee

Preston Simpson Scholarship in Music – 2 vacancies – Mr Chris Simmons has expressed an interest in continuing on this body.

Teesmouth Field Centre – 1 vacancy

National Association of Councillors General Management Committee – 1 vacancy

North East Regional Employers Organisation – 1 vacancy

Teesside Pension Board – 1 vacancy

Furness Seaman's Pension Fund – 1 vacancy

Economic Regeneration and Tourism Forum – At the Annual Council meeting the following representation was agreed:-

Director or Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services  
Chair of Finance and Policy Committee  
Chair of Adults and Community Based Services

It has been noted following the Annual Council meeting that the above appointments do not reflect the new senior management structure and subsequent alignment of committee functions with that structure. The following changes to representation on the Forum is, therefore, proposed:-

Director of Resources and Development to replace Director or Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services  
Chair of Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee to replace Chair of Adults and Community Based Services  
Chair of Finance and Policy Committee

Council is requested to consider the above appointments.

**COUNCIL**

8 July 2021

**Report of:** Managing Director**Subject:** BUSINESS REPORT

---

**1. COVID UPDATE**

Stage 3 COVID-19 restrictions in England were lifted on the 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021. Following the lifting of restrictions, Hartlepool saw a decline in the number of cases and saw 7 day case rates per 100,000 reach single figures until the 7<sup>th</sup> June when they started to rise. Cases continued to rise from then and we are now currently seeing a 7 day case rate at 1<sup>st</sup> July of 331 cases per 100,000.

We know that the Delta variant is becoming more prevalent in Hartlepool. Latest figures tell us that between the 19<sup>th</sup> June and 26<sup>th</sup> June we are aware of 147 cases of the variant. This estimate is much lower than the true value as not all tests are sequenced for the variant and not everyone who tests positive on a lateral flow test gets a confirmatory PCR test. The variant can only be sequenced from a PCR test.

Other parts of the North East and Tees Valley are seeing a large rise in the number of cases. The majority of our cases are in the 17 -29 age group which we would expect to see as the 18+ age groups have only just been invited for vaccination. We have had a strong vaccine uptake in older age groups but are seeing a slower take up in the younger age groups. We are not seeing a large rise in the numbers of people being hospitalised or dying at this stage.

We are concerned at the increased rate of cases which has coincided with the lifting of restrictions and other activities taking place in the town. We need to reinforce the messaging around hands, face, space and fresh air as the increase in cases shows that we are not at the end of the pandemic yet.

Communications have included ongoing social and regular media releases reminding people of the need to continue to follow the messages around hands, face, space, fresh air. We also remind people of the need to isolate if positive or a contact of someone who is positive. We have also, this week, delivered a targeted messaging initiative to a particular hot spot in Hartlepool using door to door leafletting and digital ad vans.

We continue to operate an asymptomatic testing unit at Middleton Grange shopping centre which is also available as a Community Collect site for test kits. We are also setting up pop up collection points targeting hot spots in the town.

We continue to review the situation daily as cases rise in order to ensure that the measures we have in place remain effective and relevant.

## **2. SPECIAL URGENCY DECISION**

In accordance with the requirements of the Access to Information Procedure Rules included in the Council's Constitution, Full Council is informed that one special urgency decision was taken in the period February 2021 – April 2021 as set out below:-

**Decision** – Proposed Property Purchase

**Decision Route** – Finance and Policy Committee – 15 March 2021

**Reason(s) for Urgency** – To facilitate a time sensitive land and property purchase.

Council is requested to note the report.

## **3. OUTSIDE BODY APPOINTMENTS**

Following the appointments made to Outside Bodies at the Annual Council meeting on 25 May, the following vacancies remain:-

Northumbria Regional Flood and Coastal Committee – 1 vacancy  
Tees Esk and Wear Valley NHS Trust – subject to outcome of Member Champion referral to Constitution Committee

Local Joint Consultative Committee – 2 Coalition vacancies

Suez Recycling and Recovery UK Ltd – 1 vacancy

Tees Valley Local Access Forum – 1 vacancy

Age UK Teesside – subject to outcome of Member Champion referral to Constitution Committee

Preston Simpson Scholarship in Music – 2 vacancies – Mr Chris Simmons has expressed an interest in continuing on this body.

Teesmouth Field Centre – 1 vacancy

National Association of Councillors General Management Committee – 1 vacancy

North East Regional Employers Organisation – 1 vacancy

Teesside Pension Board – 1 vacancy

Furness Seaman's Pension Fund – 1 vacancy

Economic Regeneration and Tourism Forum – At the Annual Council meeting the following representation was agreed:-

Director or Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services

Chair of Finance and Policy Committee

Chair of Adults and Community Based Services

It has been noted following the Annual Council meeting that the above appointments do not reflect the new senior management structure and subsequent alignment of committee functions with that structure. The following changes to representation on the Forum is, therefore, proposed:-

Director of Resources and Development to replace Director or Neighbourhoods and Regulatory Services

Chair of Economic Growth and Regeneration Committee to replace Chair of Adults and Community Based Services

Chair of Finance and Policy Committee

Council is requested to consider the above appointments.

# Member questions for Council

Meeting: 8 JULY 2021

1.	From: Councillor Little
	To: Councillor Stokell Chair of Neighbourhood Services Committee
	<p>Question:</p> <p><i>“Many residential streets in Seaton are in a permit parking zone. Yes this was done after consultation and the agreement of the majority of residents. These past few months residents are having to park several streets away from their home. It’s bad enough having to pay to have your car outside your house. But to come home after a long shift at work or school run to see visitors cars taking up permits zones and they think they’ve done well by buying a parking ticket.</i></p> <p><i>What is being done to deter visitors from parking in permit zones to enable residents that have paid for permits to park close to their homes?”</i></p>

---

# CLEVELAND FIRE AUTHORITY

## MINUTES OF ORDINARY MEETING

12 FEBRUARY 2021

---



**PRESENT:**

**CHAIR**

Cllr Paul Kirton – Stockton on Tees Borough Council

**HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Marjorie James, Stephen Thomas

**MIDDLESBROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Teresa Higgins, Naweed Hussain, Jon Rathmell, Ashley Waters

**REDCAR & CLEVELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Billy Ayre, Adam Brook, Cliff Foggo, Mary Ovens

**STOCKTON ON TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Luke Frost, Lynn Hall, Jean O'Donnell, William Woodhead MBE

**AUTHORISED OFFICERS**

Chief Fire Officer, ACFO – Strategy, Policy & Resources, ACFO – Community Protection, Treasurer, Legal Adviser and Monitoring Officer

**APOLOGIES:**

Cllr Tim Fleming – Hartlepool Borough Council

**167. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

It was noted no Declarations of Interests were submitted to the meeting.

**168. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** - that the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting on 11 December 2020 be confirmed.

**169. MINUTES OF MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED** - that the Minutes of the Executive Committee on 22 January 2021 be confirmed.

**170. COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE CHAIR**

<u>NJC</u>	Covid-19 Support Agreement – New Activities
<u>HMICFRS</u>	Covid-19 Inspection

**RESOLVED** – that the communications be noted.

**171. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

**171.1 COVID-19 Briefing – Presentation**

The Chief Fire Officer (CFO) provided Members with a detailed presentation on the latest position of the Covid-19 pandemic which covered:



## 171.1 COVID-19 Briefing – Presentation cont.

### Situational Awareness

The CFO outlined a 7 day analysis of the figures for the Tees Valley up to 8 February 2021 which covered the rate per 100,000 population for Hartlepool (179), Stockton (235), Redcar & Cleveland (195) and Middlesbrough (343). He reported Middlesbrough and Stockton were in the top three highest rates in the North East. Despite this there had been some substantial reductions in the number of positive cases in the Authority area.

He reported the rate for the over 60s age group for Middlesbrough (202), Hartlepool (120), Redcar & Cleveland (122) and Stockton (120). He noted that while the rolling 7 day average is being driven down by the lockdown the Directors of Public Health believe it is too early to see the impact of the vaccination programme.

### Vaccination Programme

- 91% of over 80s in the Authority area have been vaccinated. As a profile there are just below 30,000 over 80s and 26,000 have received their 1<sup>st</sup> dose of the vaccine.
- Over 70s group – 73,000 and 70% of those have had 1<sup>st</sup> dose.
- Government target is for all over 50s to receive their first dose by May. There are 225,000 people in that profile in our area so still 145,000 still to vaccinate by May deadline.
- At this point in time 14% of population have been vaccinated and still 86% to vaccinate moving forward.

### Strategic Intentions

- These continue to be: to ensure statutory functions remain resilient and effective; support the broader public sector response; and maintain high standards of health, safety and wellbeing for staff.

### Operational Response

- 9,000 calls up until January - reduction of 16% on previous year.
- Total incidents 6,380 attended – reduction of 13% on last year.
- Causes for decline in calls and incidents could be due to the lockdown process
- Deliberate secondary fires (rubbish, grassland) reduced by 21% (over 600 incidents less).
- RTCs reduced by 23% due to less traffic on the roads.
- Unwanted Fire Signals 19% reduction.
- Accidental Dwelling Fires increased by 11% on previous year due to people spending more time at home.
- Home Fire Safety Visits (HFSVs) have reduced by 20% but 11,944 visits have still been completed to the most vulnerable people in the community and digital technology has been utilised to turn those trends around to support people in their homes.

Councillor Ovens passed on thanks to the crews who have continued to deliver HFSVs and Safe and Well Visits throughout the pandemic and passed on thanks to Brigade personnel volunteering with the vaccine programmes.

Councillor Luke Frost commended the positive picture but expressed concern that violence to staff incidents have not decreased despite the lockdown and limited contact with the community.

### **171.1 COVID-19 Briefing – Presentation cont.**

The CFO noted that 39 occasions of violence to staff had been reported which is unacceptable. As an Authority, Members have invested in CCTV on all appliances and body worn cameras for front line services. In addition the Brigade supports the appropriate agencies to assist in the prosecution of those who engage in violence to staff of those in the public sector. Councillor James suggested increased press coverage of violence to staff court cases may work as a deterrent.

Councillor Rathmell acknowledged the difficulties of community engagement for both fire and police due to the pandemic and hoped that these incidents would decrease next year. The CFO confirmed that the Brigade had launched a new targeted engagement strategy as a fundamental tool to tackle these issues. In addition funding had been secured for the next 2 years to run youth engagement initiatives which will benefit both the Brigade and the wider public sector.

#### Broader Role

- 734 essential items delivered to vulnerable people (prescriptions/food/medical equipment)
- 41 PPE and medical equipment collected/delivered to health partners
- 70 training sessions in care homes
- 401 hours of staff volunteering for vaccine programme

#### Staff Welfare

From a workforce of 550:

- 29 operational and 3 corporate staff currently absent from work
- 3 members of staff are currently Covid positive (less than 1%)
- 10 are self-isolating
- Very positive reflection of the Brigade's arrangements to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of staff.

#### Covid Key Dates

- 15 February - half term and opening of testing site at QMC for Brigade staff
- 22 February - Government Review detailing pathway out of lockdown.
- 8 March – Earliest date for children to return to work
- Early March – South Tees vaccine centre to open – staffed by Brigade personnel
- Mid-March – North Tees vaccine centre to open – staffed by Brigade personnel
- End of March – Easter holidays
- May – Local Elections – supported by Brigade facilities

#### Finance

The CFO confirmed that a Covid grant of £587,000 already received from government and the total forecasted cost to the end of financial year is £734,000 (overspend £157,000). A bid for further grant funding has been submitted to government.

#### Other Issues

The CFO informed Members that nationally, the Tripartite Agreement ended on 11 January 2021 and there was currently no national agreement in place. Locally, risk assessments, guidance, PPE, training and health surveillance provisions were in place to protect staff.

### 171.1 COVID-19 Briefing – Presentation cont.

#### QMC Test Centre

From 15 February, a two-pod test centre for staff would be piloted at the Brigade's Training & Technical Hub with the intention of rolling this out to all operational stations in the near future. The CFO thanked Hartlepool Borough Council's Director of Public Health for providing support to establish the testing facility.

#### Vaccine Centre Support

There is currently a training programme underway for fire-fighters to become vaccinators with the intention they will be deployed at North and South Tees Hospital sites. A number of staff are also volunteering for support roles at other vaccination sites.

The CFO reported that as there was no programme to vaccinate front line fire service staff, an arrangement was in place with vaccination centres to offer any spare vaccinations to crews at the end of the day on a planned priority basis.

Councillor Ayre asked what the impact of not having a national agreement in place was for operational crews. The CFO confirmed that local agreements were in place with local FBU to deliver the additional activities required during the pandemic.

Councillor James referred to the establishment of a testing site at the QMC and asked if this could be used by other businesses. The CFO noted that the workplace testing regime is to compliment the community testing sites and reduce their burden and while the intention of the pilot is to offer testing to staff initially it may be extended wider in the future.

**RESOLVED – that the presentation be noted.**

### 171.2 HMICFRS: COVID-19 Inspection 2020 - Cleveland Fire Brigade

Members received details of the Brigade's COVID-19 Inspection Report which covered the first wave of the pandemic and was published by HMICFRS on 22 January 2021. The CFO outlined the following key findings which demonstrated that the Brigade:

- adapted and responded to the pandemic effectively by prioritising the health, safety and wellbeing of both the community and staff;
- displayed good governance by adapting its pandemic flu plan and business continuity arrangements into a Covid pandemic plan;
- carried out all statutory responsibilities – prevention, protection and response services
- staff wellbeing was a clear priority for senior leaders and the Brigade promoted wellbeing services throughout the period;
- engaged with partners through the local resilience forum, local authorities, NEAS and NHS to offer support and assistance where requested;
- managed resources well in relation to £500k Covid grant received from government;
- Members of the Authority were actively engaged in discharging core functions; and
- services were adapted and staff were quick to adapted to new ways of working, particularly home working.

The CFO concluded that this report provided a positive reflection of the Authority and Councillor Frost praised the Brigade for its outstanding performance with limited financial support from Government. He also highlighted the area of the report which referred to the productivity of whole-time fire-fighters.

### 171.2 HMICFRS: COVID-19 Inspection 2020 - Cleveland Fire Brigade cont.

The CFO confirmed that this was a general issue within the service rather than specific to the Brigade and that throughout the pandemic the Brigade continuously fulfilled its core role. Councillor Higgins passed on thanks and admiration for what all staff achieved daily throughout the pandemic.

Councillor Ovens queried how the additional cost of Covid would be recovered by the Brigade. The CFO reported an estimated £157,000 overspend up to end on March 2021 due to Covid and that a grant bid had been submitted to cover that cost which would otherwise have to be absorbed into the revenue budget.

Councillor Ovens asked whether the vaccine marshals were seconded and what shifts they worked. The CFO confirmed they were not seconded but volunteered around their own work schedule and while volunteers were required 8am – 8pm this was split down into two 6 hours shifts.

#### **RESOLVED:-**

- (i) **That the outcomes of Cleveland Fire Brigade's HMICFRS COVID-19 Inspection 2020, as detailed at Appendix 1, be noted.**
- (ii) **That Members noted that any identified areas of improvement/development will be captured and progressed within the Brigade's Corporate Internal Operating Plan.**

### 171.3 HMICFRS: Responding to the Pandemic

The CFO outlined the findings of the HMICFRS inspection of all 45 fire and rescue services in England in relation to their response to Covid-19, as detailed at Appendix 1.

He reported that the inspectorate had been specifically tasked with considering: what is working well and what is being learnt; how the fire sector is responding to the Covid-19 crisis; how fire services are dealing with the problems they face; and what changes are likely as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The CFO referred Members to section 5 of the report which contained the headline findings and how they related specifically to Cleveland, with the Brigade fairing positively in most outcomes. Section 6 listed other findings referenced by HMICFRS within the report.

The CFO referred Members to HMI Zoe Billingham's conclusion that: *"the fire and rescue service can be proud of how it responded during the initial stages of the pandemic, and the support it gave communities. Our comments on the barriers to doing more shouldn't detract from our recognition of the important and significant contribution fire and rescue services made and continue to make. Fire and rescue services, firefighters and staff stepped up and supported their communities well beyond what they would normally do."*

*"Nonetheless, now is a pivotal time for the country in terms of the fight against the virus. The fire service has much more to offer in supporting the mass vaccination programme and other pandemic activities; thereby matching the ambition of fire service leaders and the commitment of their staff. The barriers dominating the sector need to be overcome or resolved. The sector should look to the good work outlined in this report and continue to serve its communities to the best of its ability. I know there is a desire to do more, and I hope that all those vested with the power to enable this to happen will do so."*

### **171.3 HMICFRS: Responding to the Pandemic cont.**

**RESOLVED – that the findings of the HMICFRS inspection in relation to how well all fire authorities in England responded to the COVID-19 outbreak as detailed in the ‘Responding to the Pandemic’ report at Appendix 1, be noted.**

### **171.4 Information Pack**

- 173.4.1 Employers Circulars
- 173.4.2 National Joint Council Circulars
- 173.4.3 Campaigns
- 173.4.4 Local Pension Board Firefighter Pension Schemes: Annual Business Report

**RESOLVED – That the information pack be noted.**

## **172. JOINT REPORT OF THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER AND TREASURER**

### **172.1 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/22 – 2023/24**

The Treasurer provided Members with a detailed report outlining the MTFS Strategy for 2021/22 -2023/24. This covered:

- Spending Review and Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2021/22
- 2020/2 Budget Position
- Financial Impact of Covid-19 on 2020/21 Resources
- 2021/22 Budget and Future Years Financial Outlook
- Financial Outlook 2022/23 and 2023/24
- Reserves Strategy
- Asset Management Plan (AMP)
- Robustness Advice

The Treasurer outlined the background to the ongoing financial challenges that the Authority has faced over the past nine years resulting in the significant Government funding shift from 62% of total funding to 47% and the increase in reliance of council tax from 32% to 46%.

The Government Spending Power chart at Section 3 of the report highlighted significant divergence in cumulative Spending Power Increases for FRAs with Cleveland having the lowest increase of 0.1%.

The Treasurer referred Members to Lord Greenhalgh’s letter at Appendix A which confirmed a settlement funding increase in line with inflation for 2021/22. In addition, Core Spending Power across standalone FRAs would increase by 2.6% and the £115m pensions grant will continue to be paid next year at the same allocation as last year and baseline into the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2022/23.

The Treasurer highlighted the economic impact of COVID-19 which has resulted in a Collection Fund Deficit £462,000. One-off resources of £400,000 were previously earmarked to manage this risk and the report recommends funding the remaining shortfall of £62,000 from the Budget Support Fund to avoid this impacting resources into 2021/22.

The Treasurer noted that the one year settlement for 2021/22 created an uncertain financial environment for 2022/23 and future years which would be challenging to budget planning and highlighted the following areas of uncertainty:

## 172.1 Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 – 2023/24 cont.

- the outcome of the 2021 Spending Review;
- the impact of delayed major reforms of the funding system until 2022/23;
- the overall level of grant funding in the settlement for 2022/23 and future years;
- national pay awards for 2022 and 2023;
- Pensions costs and funding arrangements; and
- the trigger level for the 2022/23 council tax referendum limits

Councillor Woodhead thanked the Treasurer for presenting the strategy which demonstrated the efficiency of the Authority and asked whether local MPs had responded to concerns about the grant settlement. The CFO confirmed that all local MPs were appraised on the Authority's financial position but the government's decision to change the formula had been deferred. Therefore it was timely for Members to actively lobby MPs on the Authority's behalf ahead of the 2022/23 settlement.

Councillor James suggested it would be helpful if the MTFS itemised increases in Council Tax Collection Fund income from new house builds across the 4 local authority areas. The Treasurer noted that the budget was set based on an estimated council tax base of each local authority and any variations would be reported as a council tax surplus/deficit and explicitly reported in the following years' MTFS. He added that extra income from new house builds was one of many reasons for a variance to the estimate, which was based on a complex calculation.

Councillor Foggo asked whether new fleet was procured under a regional framework. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer – Strategic Planning and Resources confirmed that the Authority used a national fire-specific framework for procurement of appliances.

Councillor Hall referred to Appendix D of the report and queried why prudential borrowing was used to fund many items on the Capital Programme. The Treasurer noted that historically vehicles were predominantly leased however now prudential borrowing is used to spread the cost long term with low interest rates which provides a revolving finance facility to replace fleet and keep appliances on the run.

A formal vote was taken and Members unanimously voted in favour of the Statutory Budget and Council Tax Calculations for 2021/22 and the Asset Management Plan for 2021/22 to 2026/27.

**RESOLVED – That as recommended by the Executive Committee on 22 January 2021 the report be noted and the following proposals be approved:**

- (i) **That Members noted that the economic impact of Covid-19 has resulted in a forecast Collection Fund deficit of £462,000, which exceeds the one off resources previously earmarked to manage this risk by £62,000 and approved the proposal to fund the shortfall from the Budget Support Fund;**
- (ii) **That Members noted that the Government's forecast Spending Power increases are predicated on authorities increasing Council Tax, which for this Authority will provide recurring additional Council Tax income of £234,000, compared to an increase in Revenue Support Grant of £29,000;**



**172.1 Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 – 2023/24 cont.**

- (iii) That Members approved the proposal to balance the 2021/22 budget from a combination of using £336,000 of the Budget Support Fund and a 1.9% Council Tax increase, and approved the supporting statutory calculations detailed Appendix E and 2021/22 Revenue Budget detailed in Appendix F;
- (iv) That Members noted the following resulting Council Tax levels for 2021/22;

2020/21 Annual Council Tax £	Property Band	2021/22 Annual Council Tax £	Weekly Council Tax £	Annual increase £	
52.55	A	53.55	1.03	1.00	Approximately 64% of households are in Band A or B
61.31	B	62.48	1.20	1.17	
70.07	C	71.4	1.37	1.33	
78.83	D	80.33	1.54	1.50	
96.35	E	98.18	1.89	1.83	
113.87	F	116.03	2.23	2.16	
131.38	G	133.88	2.57	2.50	
157.66	H	160.66	3.09	3.00	

- (i) To address the forecast deficits for 2022/23 (£577,000) and 2023/24 (£198,000) Members instructed the Chief Fire Officer to develop a contingency plan to address future funding reductions.
- (ii) Members approved the updated Asset Management Plan detailed in Appendix D.

**173. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**173.1 Stockton Safer Partnership Representative**

The CFO informed Members that there was currently a vacancy for an Authority representative on Stockton Safer Partnership group following a change to Stockton's membership on the Authority. As no nominations were received it was agreed the Chair would take the position until the CFA Annual Meeting in June when a representative would be appointed for 2021/22.

**RESOLVED – that Councillor Paul Kirton be Cleveland Fire Authority's representative on Stockton Safer Partnerships until the Authority's Annual Meeting on 4 June 2021.**

(1554) Councillor Cliff Foggo left the meeting.

**174. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION ORDER) 2006**

**RESOLVED - "That under Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 4 below of Part 1 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006", namely information relating to any financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority) holding that information and namely information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority."**

**175. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the confidential minutes of the Ordinary Meeting on 11 December 2020 be confirmed.

**176. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

**RESOLVED** – that the confidential minutes of the Executive Committee on 22 January 2021 be confirmed.

**177. ANY OTHER CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**

**177.1 Confirming Minutes in Confidential Session**

Members discussed whether it was necessary to move into private session to confirm minutes on occasions when no other confidential business is on the agenda. Agreed that the Chair could use discretion to establish if Members wished to raise any issues with the confidential minutes and if there are none they can be confirmed in open session.

**COUNCILLOR PAUL KIRTON**  
**CHAIR**



---

# CLEVELAND FIRE AUTHORITY

## MINUTES OF RECONVENED ORDINARY MEETING

16 APRIL 2021

---



**PRESENT:**

**CHAIR**

Cllr Paul Kirton – Stockton on Tees Borough Council

**HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllr Marjorie James

**MIDDLESBROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Teresa Higgins, Naweed Hussain, Ashley Waters

**REDCAR & CLEVELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Billy Ayre, Adam Brook, Cliff Foggo, Mary Ovens

**STOCKTON ON TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Cllrs Luke Frost, Lynn Hall, Jean O'Donnell, William Woodhead MBE

**AUTHORISED OFFICERS**

Chief Fire Officer, ACFO – Strategy, Policy & Resources, ACFO – Community Protection, Treasurer, Legal Adviser and Monitoring Officer

**APOLOGIES:**

Cllr Stephen Thomas – Hartlepool Borough Council

This meeting was deferred from 26 March 2021 – min. no. 195. refers.

**196. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

It was noted no Declarations of Interests were submitted to the meeting.

**197. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED - that the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting on 12 February 2021 be confirmed.**

**198. MINUTES OF MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED - that the Minutes of the Audit & Governance Committee on 26 February 2021 and the Executive Committee on 5 March 2021 be confirmed.**

**199. COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE CHAIR**

Home Office

Leadership Changes

Grant Funding for Fire Safety Officers

Response to the Fire Safety Consultation

**RESOLVED – that the communications be noted.**

## **200. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER**

### **200.1 COVID-19 Briefing – Presentation**

The Chief Fire Officer (CFO) provided Members with a detailed presentation on the latest position of the Covid-19 pandemic which covered:-

- National Infection / Death rate over last 7 days
- Covid cases for Brigade area last 7 days
- National / Regional Vaccinations to date
- Brigade support to regional vaccination programme
- Staff wellbeing / sickness absence rates

The CFO reported that the Brigade had moved from Response to a Recovery position in relation to the pandemic and all services will continue to be delivered within covid-secure guidelines. The Queens Meadow Complex at Hartlepool continues to be used to deliver lateral flow testing to staff and it is anticipated this will be replaced by home testing kits in the near future.

**RESOLVED – That the presentation be noted.**

### **200.2 HMICFRS State of Fire and Rescue: Annual Assessment of Fire and Rescue Services (FRS) in England 2020**

Members received details of the annual HMICFRS report on the state of the fire service in England, attached at Appendix 1, which was produced by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Fire and Rescue Services, Sir Thomas Winsor.

The CFO referred Members to section 4 of the report which stated that 'the practical implications of outdated and inflexible working arrangements' in the fire service had become apparent during the COVID-19 pandemic and reinforced the need for national reform.

The six recommendations for national reform previously made by Sir Thomas Winsor were confirmed as necessary and needing to accelerate in particular in connection with the lack of race and gender diversity, need for operational independence for Chief Fire Officers and a review of the allocation of government funding.

Positives recognised within the report included the building safety progress in the wake of the Grenfell Tower fire and the introduction of a code of ethics.

Councillor Frost expressed disappointment that despite Sir Thomas' previous call for the fire service to improve in areas of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion his report failed to reference neurodiversity or any disability. He called on the Chair and CFO to write to Sir Thomas to highlight this failure. The CFO agreed to raise this issue with the new inspector for the northern region Andrew Cooke at his meeting on 22 April and agreed to write to Sir Thomas.

Councillor James supported Councillor Frost's view and highlighted that the region had a greater proportion of disabled residents than other areas of the country.

**200.2 HMICFRS State of Fire and Rescue: Annual Assessment of Fire and Rescue Services in England 2020 cont.**

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That Members noted the report and further reports be received as necessary.
- (ii) That Members noted that any areas for development identified by the CFO would be captured within the Authority's Internal Operating Plan for 2021/22 onwards.
- (iii) That Members noted that the Chief Fire Officer would provide updates on the HMICFRS second round of inspections to the Executive Committee, in line with current arrangements.
- (iv) That the Chief Fire Officer write to Sir Thomas Winsor on behalf of the Authority, to express their disappointment at the absence of any reference to disability in his State of Fire in England 2020 report.

**200.3 Service Plan 2021/22**

Members considered the Service Plan 2021/22 which contained the improvement priorities for implementation to complete the final year of the Authority's four-year Community Integrated Risk Management Plan (CIRMP) 2018-22. The CFO reported that these priorities were the result of strategic, risk and financial planning activities undertaken by the Executive Leadership Team which would also monitor their progress and report back to the Executive Committee for further review.

**RESOLVED – that Members considered and approved the 2021/22 priorities for inclusion in the Service Plan 2021/22, to be published on the Brigade website with immediate effect.**

**200.4 Information Pack**

- 200.4.1 Campaigns
- 200.4.2 LGA Fire Conference 2021

**RESOLVED – That the information pack be noted.**

**201. REPORT OF THE CLERK**

**201.1 Calendar of Meetings 2021/22**

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer – Strategic Planning and Resources (ACFO – SPR) sought Members views on the proposed Cleveland Fire Authority (CFA) meeting schedule for 2021/22, attached at Appendix 1.

Members discussed the issue of dates coinciding with LGA Fire Commission meetings. The Chair noted that the CFA dates were set to align with the business calendar of the Brigade and the diaries of the four constituent councils. This view was supported with Members suggesting should dates clash in the future, only one representative of the Authority should attend the LGA Fire Commission meeting to minimise any disruption to CFA business.

## **201.1 Calendar of Meetings 2021/22 cont.**

The Legal Adviser and Monitoring Officer (LAMO) addressed concerns about the return of face-to-face meetings following the expiration on 6 May 2021 of the current legislation allowing local authorities to hold meetings virtually. He agreed to write to Members informing them of the decision of the High Court on this matter following the hearing on 21 April 2021.

### **RESOLVED:–**

- (i) That the Cleveland Fire Authority Calendar of Meetings for 2021/22 be deferred to the Annual Meeting**
- (ii) That the Legal Adviser and Monitoring Officer writes to Members informing them of the High Court judgement on local authorities continuing to hold virtual meetings, to be held on 21 April 2021.**

## **202. REPORT OF THE TREASURER**

### **202.1 Treasury Management Strategy 2021/21**

Members considered the Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 which had been scrutinised by the Audit and Governance Committee on 26 February 2021 and recommended for approval by the Authority (Appendix A refers).

The Strategy included:

- Economic background and outlook for interest rates
- Treasury Management Outturn Position 2019/20
- Treasury Management Strategy 2020/21 Mid-Year Review
- Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22
- Borrowing Strategy 2021/22
- Investment Strategy 2021/22
- Minimum Revenue Provision and Interest Costs and Regulatory Information 2021/22

The Treasurer reported that this confirms the previously approved strategy for managing interest risks to ensure borrowing can be funded from the available revenue budget of £0.87m and capital funding reserve. In addition he recommended a very prudent approach to manage investment strategy aligned to the one adopted by the Authority over recent years.

**RESOLVED – Members approved the following recommendations from the Audit & Governance Committee on 26 February 2021:**

- (i) That the 2019/20 Treasury Management outturn detailed in Section 5 and Appendix A be noted.**
- (ii) That the 2020/21 Treasury Management mid-year position detailed in section 6 be noted.**
- (iii) That the prudential indicators outlined in Appendix B be approved.**
- (iv) Borrowing Strategy 2021/22  
That in the event of a change in economic circumstances Members noted that the Treasurer may take out additional borrowing in advance of need if this secures the lowest long term interest cost.**
- (v) Investment Strategy 2021/22  
That the Counterparty limits as set out in paragraph 9.8 be approved.**

**202.1 Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22 cont.**

**(vi) Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement**

**That the following MRP statement be approved:**

- For capital expenditure incurred before 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008 the Authority's MRP policy is to calculate MRP in accordance with former CLG Regulations. This is 4% of the Capital Financing Requirement except where the Authority makes Voluntary Revenue Payments which is in excess of the amount required by these regulations, based on asset life;
- From 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008 the Authority calculates MRP based on asset life for all assets or where prudential borrowing is financed by a specific annuity loan, MRP will be calculated according to the actual annuity loan repayments.

**203. REPORT OF THE LEGAL ADVISER AND MONITORING OFFICER**

**203.1 Pay Policy Statement 2021/22**

The LAMO reported that in line with the provisions set out in the Localism Act 2011, the Authority had a statutory duty to prepare a Pay Policy Statement for each financial year relating to:

- the remuneration of its chief officers
- the remuneration of its lowest paid employees
- the relationship between:
  - the remuneration of its chief officers and
  - the remuneration of its employees who are not chief officers

The LAMO outlined the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 at Appendix 1 and highlighted the remuneration of the lowest paid employees which was:

- Firefighter (Development) - £25,323
- Non-operational employees Grade B (Development) - £18,933

He reported that the Government's National Living Wage sets a minimum wage for all workers aged 25 years and over which equates to £17,191, which was lower than the Authority's lowest paid employees Grade B (Development) which was £18,933.

The LAMO noted that the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 had been considered by the Executive Committee on 5 March 2021.

**RESOLVED - That Cleveland Fire Authority's Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 be approved, as recommended by the Executive Committee on 5 March 2021, and published on the website.**

**204. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**204.1 Retirement of Councillor Marjorie James**

Members and officers congratulated Councillor James on her retirement and gave thanks for her outstanding support and contribution to the Authority spanning many years. Councillor James thanked the Authority and officers for the support she has received and acknowledged the very worthwhile work of the Brigade in making a difference to its communities. On behalf of the leadership team and staff, the CFO recognised Councillor James' contribution in challenging the Brigade to strive to improve and thanked her for her commitment.

- 205. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION ORDER) 2006  
RESOLVED - “That under Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006”, namely information relating to any financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority) holding that information.”**
- 206. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF COMMITTEES  
RESOLVED – that the confidential minutes of the Executive Committee on 5 March 2021 be confirmed.**

**COUNCILLOR PAUL KIRTON  
CHAIR**

## **Cleveland Police and Crime Panel**

A meeting of Cleveland Police and Crime Panel was held on Tuesday, 2nd February, 2021.

**Present:** Cllr Tony Riordan (Chair), Cllr Lee Cartwright, Cllr Barrie Cooper, Cllr Graham Cutler, Cllr Lynn Hall (Substitute for Cllr Stefan Houghton), Cllr Chris Jones, Paul McGrath, Cllr Steve Nelson, Mayor Andy Preston, Cllr Carl Quartermain, Luigi Salvati, Cllr Norma Stephenson OBE and Cllr Matthew Storey.

**Officers:** Julie Butcher, Gary Woods, Peter Bell, Nigel Hart, Michael Henderson, Sarah Whaley, Gareth Aungiers (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council).

**Also in attendance:** Lisa Oldroyd (Acting Police and Crime Commissioner), Elise Pout, Rachelle Kipling, Hannah Smith, Michael Porter, Kimberly Walker (Commissioner's Office), Chief Constable Richard Lewis (Cleveland Police).

**Apologies:** Cllr Stefan Houghton.

### **PCP 46/20      Declarations of Interest**

In relation to item 8 (Precept Proposals) the legal adviser advised the Panel, following discussion with all authorities, that all members of the Panel either had a dispensation or their authority relied on government guidance that the matter did not give rise to a disclosable pecuniary interest and therefore all members could participate and vote on the item and did not need to declare individual interests as council tax payers.

### **PCP 47/20      Minutes**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings held on 17 November 2020.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2020 be agreed as a correct record.

### **PCP 48/20      Members' Questions to the Commissioner**

The following question had been submitted by Mayor Preston for response by the Acting PCC:-

"I support the PCC and Cleveland Police 100%. I want the public to play an active role in our force's ongoing improvement. Progress and collaboration requires the setting of easily understood targets that measure performance and success. I want to see our performance assessed vs forces with similar demographic profiles. What metrics and targets do you think we should adopt and readily share with the public?"

The Acting PCC responded with:-

"Thank you for your support of the OPCC and Cleveland Police. In terms of setting targets I'm currently stewarding the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan that was agreed by the Panel last year. As you eluded to specific targets, I'm

unable to set or issue a new Police and Crime Plan, this includes introducing new performance targets. This would be very much a matter for the newly elected PCC in the development of a new Police and Crime Plan. However, from a Force perspective performance is assessed against other similar Forces.”

The Chief Constable added:-

“There are a number of metrics that Cleveland Police were assessed by to ascertain how they were performing. Cleveland Police were also assessed by HMICFRS. I take Mayor Preston’s point about how we translate that to the public for the public to see how well the Force is performing. It is impossible to judge a Force just against just crime figures alone and whether the figures had gone up or down as some many other agencies are involved. I have had many constructive conversations with Mayor Preston over recent weeks about this very issue.

Following the HMICFRS PEEL Inspection Report that was published in September 2019 which reported that Cleveland Police were inadequate across all 3 areas of the inspection, HMICFRS have revisited Cleveland Police and undertaken an integrated vulnerability inspection ,the results which would be published over the next few weeks and this would tell Cleveland Police whether we are improving or not in the area of vulnerability.

Cleveland Police were seeing a drop in crime, but this was also reflected in similar Forces, this may be because of the COVID19 situation and for example burglaries had reduced which would probably be down to the fact that people were working from home. Cleveland Police had increased productivity, including large seizures of drugs, possession of illegal substances and offensive weapons. This was due to Cleveland Police being more proactive using powers such as “stop and search”. Cleveland Police have lots of regular meetings to check on their performance and are outperforming many other Forces.

At this point the public withdrew from the meeting while the Chief Constable gave details of an operational incident.

At this point the public returned to the meeting.

The following question had been submitted by Councillor Lee Cartwright for response by the Acting PCC:-

“I would like to ask if the Council are being charged for floor space in Hartlepool Police Station?”

The Acting PCC responded with:-

“In 2018 as part of the Community Safety Integration Project there was a licence agreed that the Council along with the Fire Service to move staff into the Police Station. This was expected to total around 35 full time equivalent officers. The first payment is expected in February this year as part of that agreement.”



The Chief Constable added:-

“There is a mechanism in which we can charge Hartlepool Council for that floorspace but we haven’t for the last 3 years and that is in the spirit of partnership working and that we are in this for the same reasons and it would seem foolish for us to charge the Council when we are working together.”

Councillor Lee Cartwright asked the following supplementary question:-

“Is it fair to say that we are indicating that if we continue to work in partnership that we won’t be charged? I ask this question as many Council staff are now working from home and may continue to do so, so we may not need the additional floorspace.”

The Acting PCC responded with:-

“We will come back to you in writing regarding this issue.”

The following question had been submitted by Councillor Lee Cartwright for response by the Acting PCC:-

“Is there future plans to reopen Hartlepool custody suite now the force has its new (70) officers? I believe this will drive down associated indirect police hours with travelling time to Middlesbrough and keep the allocation of Hartlepool officers in the town.”

The Acting PCC responded with:-

“This matter has been discussed with the Chief Constable and I understand that the Force are undertaking a review of the current situation with regard to Hartlepool Custody Suite, that is against operation plans and priorities.”

The Chief Constable added:-

“A report has been done and there are recommendations in there about what the future should be for Hartlepool. There will be significant costs attached to several of those proposals. This will be discussed with the Acting PCC over the next few weeks and then be shared with the Panel as a matter of urgency.”

**PCP  
49/20**

### **Commissioner’s Update**

Consideration was given to a report that provided an overview of the activity of the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) since the last meeting held on 17 November 2020.

The report highlighted specific updates aligned to the priorities of the Police & Crime Plan, as agreed by the Panel in July 2020.

The report was considered in conjunction with progress detailed in the PCC Scrutiny and Decisions of the PCC reports. Collectively, these reports provided

progress in all areas of the Police & Crime Plan delivery.

The report covered the following key areas:-

COVID19

Investing in Our Police

A Better Deal for Victims and Witnesses

Tackling Offending and Reoffending

Working Together to make Cleveland Safer/Securing the Future of Our Communities

A member asked a question around the control room contact centre and if officers on light duties or amended duties were supporting call centre staff and if they receive additional training. In response it was noted that the specifics were not known as that was an operational issue for the Chief Constable however it was known that there was a mix of police staff and police officers operating in that environment.

A question was asked if additional funding be available to elected members to make bids for to use in their wards. It was noted by Members that there was a round 2 of funding that would be available, and this could be linked in with community safety partnerships. The criteria would be quite strict in that certain levels of crime were taking place in that area.

A member made a comment that front-line police officers should be vaccinated against COVID19 as one of the priority groups.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
50/20**

**Decisions of the Commissioner and Forward Plan**

Consideration was given to a report that provided an update on decisions made by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and the Forward Plan.

The Police and Crime Commissioner made all decisions unless specifically delegated within the Scheme of Consent/Delegation. All decisions demonstrated that they were soundly based on relevant information and that the decision-making process was open and transparent.

In addition, a forward plan was included and published on the PCC website which included items requiring a decision in the future. This was attached to the report.

Each decision made by the PCC was recorded on a decision record form with supporting background information appended. Once approved it was published on the PCC website.

Decisions relating to private/confidential matters would be recorded; although, it may be appropriate that full details were not published.

Decisions made since the last meeting of the Police and Crime Panel were attached to the report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP**      **Commissioner's Scrutiny Programme**

**51/20**

Consideration was given to a report that provided an update on the PCC's scrutiny programme.

Holding the Chief Constable to account was the key duty of the Police & Crime Commissioner and must encompass all the functions of the Chief Constable and functions of those who were under the Chief Constable's direction and control.

The PCC had a range of scrutiny approaches in place to engage with the Chief Constable and hold Cleveland Police to account. These take place on a daily, weekly and monthly schedule and include a range of meetings, data and feedback from partners and the public.

The processes would continue to develop and it had been made clear that there would be greater use of independent scrutiny approaches such as Internal Audit (Joint Independent Audit Committee), internal scrutiny panels such as the Out of Court Disposals, the Use of Force and Domestic Abuse Scrutiny Panels as well as identifying those services which would benefit from a wider multi agency scrutiny approach.

During 2020/21 the Cleveland Police Service Improvement Programme (SIP) continued to be a key feature of the scrutiny programme, where SIP programme control documents would be routinely reviewed, and progress tracked against the programme stage plan.

Members of the public were invited to submit questions to Chief Constable Richard Lewis for a special scrutiny session on the challenges facing Cleveland Police as they entered 2021. The Scrutiny Programme would be opened up to the public in order to seek their questions to put directly to Mr Lewis at a dedicated session which would be recorded and shared with the public.

During December/January the OPCC collated views from partner agencies across Cleveland who worked with vulnerable clients to gain a partnership insight as to how the Force was engaging with them and whether they felt improvements had been made in protecting vulnerable people, questions on this would be put to the Chief Constable at the Scrutiny, Delivery and Performance meeting in February.

Assurance would also be provided by linking the scrutiny programme to the various internal and external forums and on a quarterly basis. Wider scrutiny arrangements were also in place including (and not limited to):

- Ethics Committee

- Feedback from complaints
- Issues raised at community meetings and focus groups and consultation

Since the previous Police and Crime Panel meeting the following meetings had taken place:

- 2 November 2020
- 7 December 2020

The Acting PCC continues to monitor on a regular basis, the following:

- Force Control Room
- COVID
- The return of Sopra Steria
- Brexit Preparedness

The Acting PCC's Working Together meeting took place on:

- 9 December

In addition to the meetings above, the Commissioner continued to attend the following to complement the scrutiny programme:

- Daily review of the Control Room and Serious Incident Logs;
- Weekly accountability meetings with the Chief Constable;

A member raised an issue around IT capabilities and that because of the COVID19 situation, Councillors were being asked to use conference calling when having meetings with local police officers. It was felt that Teams and Zoom were a lot better medium for holding meetings. In response it was noted that updates were being sought as part of the National Enabling Programme, this would allow a full roll out of the Teams functionality across the Force. On the same point a member pointed out that there was a Task and Finish Group already looking at the communications of the Force so this issue could be included within that review. A member felt that consultation was another area that could be tied in with the communications review.

With regard to the surveys that were included within the report and the low take up, the OPCC had noted the low take up and felt that a lot of this was due to the COVID19 restriction that were in place and the fact that officers could no longer go door to door. This was now a key priority for Communications Strategy for the OPCC to drive forward and increase their digital capability and any other methods.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
52/20**

#### **Task and Finish Group - Budget Setting**

The Task and Finish Group was established to understand the key issues and financial pressures as part of the budget setting process in order to inform the

work of the Cleveland Police and Crime Panel and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The Group met on the 18 January 2021 to receive information about the Police and Crime Commissioner's overall budget strategy for 2021-2022. Discussion took place about funding and planning assumptions, total funding projections and funding pressures.

The Group reconvened on the 26th January 2021 to receive further updates from the Chief Finance Officer as well as input from the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner.

A final meeting of the Group took place on the 29th January 2021 to consider potential alternative options to the proposed 1.99% precept increase.

The report provided details of the evidence considered and questions that were raised for discussion prior to consideration of the proposals by the Police and Crime Panel on the 2nd February 2021, when the precept would be set for 2021-2022.

Key Findings and Conclusions were:

- Police settlement for 2021-2022 was a good one, though there was an expectation that certain elements had to be addressed within the 5.3% (£413.6m) core grant increase.
- However, the capital grant remains cash flat, and there would be a need to earmark some funding to support capital requirements around the maintenance of buildings, provision of equipment, etc.
- A significant deficit in Council Tax collections was expected due to the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Coupled with the lack of growth in the underlying tax base, this could lead to a deficit pressure against original plans of around £1.9m.
- Expected that the financial plans would balance based on a 1.99% increase in precept, and that future years would also balance (based on a number of assumptions that carry risk). A 1.99% (£5.19) precept increase (in line with previous plans) would equate to around 10p extra per week for a Band D property in 2021-2022.
- A £15 precept increase (maximum level without triggering a referendum) would equate to around 29p extra per week for a Band D property in 2021-2022 – this would provide £1.5m additional funding (in comparison to a 1.99% increase) to invest in additional policing services on a recurring basis.
- Pay awards could have a significant impact on expenditure – suggested figures noted for the next few years are indicative only as there was no firm information available.
- There were no significant levels of reserves available. Prudent not to go below 3% of Net Budget Requirement – projected to be 3.6% in 2021-2022, so no scope within reserves to provide additional support.
- Close to achieving the required Officer uplift in Cleveland (72) by March 2021. Expect the Government to continue funding the Officer uplift programme as it was a key aspect of their election manifesto.
- OPCC challenged this year in not being able to get out into the community to

ascertain what the public is thinking around funding for the Force. Only 181 responses to the online survey, with over 50% supporting an increase in the precept (of 1.99% or more), and around 20% supporting the maximum £15 increase.

- OPCC acknowledged the need to look at the way it conducted the consultation on the precept to ensure more robust representation from across the Cleveland area.
- The plan inherited by the Acting PCC was on the basis of a 1.99% precept increase for 2021-2022. Without having a currently elected PCC, the OPCC were trying to stick to the previous plan.
- Significant current demands on the Force, not just due to COVID-19 but also in response to the agreed actions following the 2019 HMICFRS report.

The Group concluded that Cleveland Police had made very good progress under the current Chief Constable and were keen to support the Force in meeting demand, as well as helping to ensure that service improvements were maintained and further strengthened. However, concerns remained as to the allocation of resources across the whole of Cleveland, in particular Hartlepool and East Cleveland. The Group strongly urge the Force to ensure, as far as possible, that any additional funding made available through a precept rise benefits all four Local Authority areas, and that the public can see tangible evidence of a return on their investment.

The recommendation from the Task and Finish Group to the Panel was therefore as follows:-

That the proposal of the Police and Crime Commissioner to set the Band D Police Element of the Council Tax within Cleveland for 2021-2022 at £265.73 (an increase of £5.19, or 1.99%, over the 2020-2021 level) should be endorsed.

## **PCP 53/20      Precept Proposals for 2021/22**

A report from the Acting Commissioner regarding the proposed precept for the financial year 2021/22 was considered by the Panel.

The Commissioner indicated that she had considered the following in making her proposal on the precept for 2021/22:-

- The plans that the Acting Commissioner was Stewarding through to the next PCC elections.
- The views of the public of Cleveland
- The financial impact on the people of Cleveland and the current financial environment.
- The financial needs of the organisation as currently projected both for 2021/22 and in the future.
- The limits imposed by the Government on a precept increase before a referendum would be triggered in Cleveland.

The Commissioner also indicated that she had discussed her proposals with the

Chief Constable and had engaged and consulted with the public on the options available to her.

The 2021-22 Police Finance Settlement was announced on 17 December 2020 in a written statement by the Policing Minister, Kit Malthouse.

Unlike last year, the Home Office had opted to do a provisional settlement rather than proceeding straight to final settlement in order to obtain feedback from stakeholders. The deadline for submissions to the provisional was 15 January.

This settlement followed the one-year SR and took place with a backdrop of severe economic difficulties due to the ongoing Coronavirus Pandemic as well as uncertainty around Brexit. GDP for the year was down 11.3%, the largest recession recorded.

Prior to the publication of settlement, the sector was expecting an additional £400m for the recruitment of 6,000 officers (towards the 20,000 total). Kit Malthouse confirmed that there would be an increase of £415m for PCCs to continue to recruit officers. The document went on to state that “to ensure...progress in recruitment is maintained, and to track the use of this investment efficiently, the Government will continue to ringfence £100 million of the additional funding”. This ring-fenced grant would be akin to the previous settlement grant of £168m and would be split according to funding formula allocation.

Part of this funding allocation would go to the recruitment of Regional Organised Crime Unit officers through the same mechanism.

Additionally, the sector was expecting last year’s Police Uplift Programme (PUP) funding (£700m) to be rolled into the baseline.

However, the Written Ministerial Statement stated that in total PCCs would get an increase of £703m assuming that the full precept flexibility was taken. As confirmed in SR2020, the council tax referendum principles would be £15 per PCC, which, assuming every PCC maximised the increase, meant an extra £288m for policing in 2021-22.

Furthermore more, PCCs would receive a portion of the £670m additional grant funding announced for the local council tax support as part of SR2020.

Given the recent publication of the 2020 spending review (published much later in the year than previous Spending Review’s), some of the settlement was already known. The headlines below build upon headlines from SR2020:

- Core Grant (including the PUP grant) increases from £7.8bn to £8.2bn, a difference of £413.6m an increase of 5.3%.
- £15 precept flexibility for all PCCs, or equivalent.
- 75% of council tax losses (due to Covid-19) to be compensated.
- £87.4m (8%) decrease in reallocations from £1.1bn in 2020-21 to £1.03bn in 2021-22.
- Flat cash pension grant allocations compared to 2020-21.

- Capital grant remains cash flat for PCCs at £12.3m
- £52.3m capital funding for national priorities and infrastructure

According to the statement, the Government expected the police to continue to build on the progress that had been made in terms of efficiency and productivity. The statement laid out three targets:

- Forces to recruit another 6,000 officers by the end of March 2022 (some of these officers are expected to go into Counter Terrorism Policing, ROCUs and the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau).
- £120m efficiency savings from across the law enforcement sector (reflected as part of this funding settlement). These are expected to be delivered through a combination of improved procurement practises as well as savings in areas such as estates, agile working and shared services. They were broken down as follows:
  - £95m against core grant
  - £8m against CT policing
  - £2.8m from the NCA
  - £14.2 programmes within reallocations.
  - High quality data should be collected and used to support local delivery, identify efficiencies and support the National Policing Board's drive to deliver the best possible outcomes within policing.

This mean for Cleveland in 2021/22:

- An increase in of Core Police Grant plus Police Uplift Grant of £4,961k or 5.3%
- This includes up to £1,199k from the ring-fenced grant for the officer uplift – linked to the recruitment of 70 additional FTE Police Officers by the end of March 2022.
- Police Pension Grant remains at £1,324k
- Capital Grant remains at only £138k
- A challenge to deliver £1,065k of savings and efficiencies during 2021/22, towards the £95m of savings that have been factored into the National Core Grant allocations.

Based on the precept being proposed, of £265.73 for a Band D property, then the overall impact on the Core funding for the organisation was set to increase by 4.5%, or nearly £6.5m.

All Police Force Areas had received the same Headline increase in Core funding of 5.3%. However, the increases in precept, in percentage terms, were determined by the current level.

If each PCC increased their precept by £15, combined with tax base assumptions, there would be an additional £288m of resources for policing from council tax alone. Due to historic differences in council tax, increases for individual PCCs range from 5.4% in Surrey to 10.8% in Northumbria. The unweighted average for all PCCs is 6.6%.



A £15 increase in Cleveland would have equated to an increase of 5.76%. This would be the fifth lowest percentage increase in England, which results from Cleveland having the fifth highest Policing Precept level in England and a current Precept level that was over 15% higher than the National average.

If each PCC took the £15 precept, the average band D police precept in England and Wales would be £240.92 (in Cleveland this would be £275.54) with an average of 38% (in Cleveland this would be 26% of total funding coming from council tax (including precept grant and legacy council tax support grants).

The funding position for 2022/23 would be set out and determined as part of the Spending Review that will be undertaken in 2021.

Given the expected financial challenges that were likely to result from the costs incurred during the pandemic then the assumptions within the revised MTFP was that Core Government Grant would be frozen for the next 2 years.

The plan did however assume that the Police Uplift Programme would continue to be fully funded to deliver the 20,000 National Uplift.

There were no references within the settlement to the Funding Formula and any review of this.

At the same time as reassessing the projections on Government Grant increases the 2021/22 MTFP also reflected on the financial landscape for future pay awards. The previous plan assumed that pay awards would be at 2.5% throughout the plan, which was in line with the pay award that was expected, and ultimately paid, in September 2020.

Since then the Government had indicated that it intended to freeze the majority of public sector pay for 2021-22. Exceptions apply to NHS doctors, nurses and others and those who earn less than £24,000 (who will receive a pay rise of at least £250).

The MTFP assumed that this was delivered in 2021/22 and thereafter assumed a gradual increase in pay awards as follows:

- 2022/23 – 1%
- 2023/24 – 1.5%
- 2024/25 – 2%

It was however important to recognise that neither the PCC nor the Chief Constable had any control over the level of pay awards. These were determined at a national level.

The impact of pay settlements that vary from those forecasted within the MTFP would have a significant impact on the finances of the organisation and would need to be closely monitored.

Based on these revised assumptions, and the information received and forecast around other areas of funding, then the entire funding expected to be available

for the next 4 years, in comparison to 2020/21.

To be able to receive the £1,199k specific grant that was included within these financial plans, for the additional Uplift of Police Officers, Cleveland would need to have recruited 142 additional FTEs, as part of the National Uplift programme, by the end of March 2022 and have at least 1,388 FTEs by this point (including 50 FTEs that are funded by a Specific Grant and working in the Historical Investigation Unit).

The PCC continued to challenge and fund the Chief Constable to recruit Police Officers more quickly than the national targets and had worked with the Force to develop plans that should deliver 1,453 FTE Police Officers within 2021/22.

If achieved this would mean that the Force would have delivered all the expected additional Uplift Police Officers, and slightly more, a year earlier than expected. It would also mean that the number of Police Officers within the Force would have increased by over 250 FTEs in 3 years, which was an increase of over 20%.

In addition to this the Force had been undertaking detailed analysis of their demand and assessing and quantifying the Police Officer resources to be able to meet the expected levels of demand within the Force. This resourcing level was expected to be achievable within the medium term of the financial plan, based on current assumptions and based on the proposed 1.99% increase in precept in 2021/22.

The Force was well positioned to deliver the Police Officer recruitment with expectations that it would start 2021/22 with around 40 FTE more Officers in Force than its National target.

This was clearly both a significant challenge and opportunity however the Force had done an excellent job in delivering against their Police Officer recruitment plans over the last 2 years.

While the focus of Operation Uplift was the increase in Police Officers there was recognition that 'just' funding the salary costs of the Officers won't be sufficient.

The national work that was overseeing this project were clear that to enable this to happen would require funding to support the following areas:

- It was estimated that 6,500 FTE staff would be required to enable initial recruitment and then deal with the extra work generated from having 20,000 additional officers.
- More Officers would require more capital expenditure in terms of vehicles, IT (laptops, phones, body worn video etc) and having 26,500 additional staff would require more estate.
- All of these capital assets would incur revenue running costs.
- More officers would require uniforms, they would work overtime and un-social hours, they would need training and would generate additional costs in areas such as custody and forensics, while also increasing general costs of 'doing business' and employing people, such as insurances.

The Force had assessed their needs within these areas and funds had been allocated within the Capital Programme to meet the additional IT equipment and the additional vehicles required for a larger Force, while the staff requirements had been assessed and posts created and funded to meet the additional demands here too.

Clearly a key area of focus of the Force would be the continued journey on their 'Towards 2025' improvement plan, addressing the 6 causes of concern raised by the HMICFRS and striving to deliver outstanding policing for the communities of Cleveland.

The Force would also continue to invest and develop many areas during 2021/22, many of which would be in line with the Minister's priorities identified in the last couple of years around IT and data quality.

The investment should then help to better understand demand, inform future ways of resourcing and working and really underpin the Towards 2025 journey.

To further inform the decision around the proposed precept for 2021/22 consultation had been undertaken with the public to ascertain their feedback and thoughts on this subject.

The consultation was conducted via an online survey and in total 181 responses were received via the open online survey. The open survey was published on the PCC website and promoted widely via social media. Regarding the quality / reach of the survey, the OPCC recognised that some work needed to be done in this area to increase participation.

The four local Councils had notified the Acting Commissioner of their tax bases for 2021/22 which totalled 156,110 Band D equivalent properties. This was a decrease of 8 Band D equivalent properties from 2020/21.

A reduction in the overall tax base was highly unusual and was completely unexpected. This had therefore had an impact on the finances of the organisation. This small reduction, versus an expected 1% increase, equates to an overall reduction in precept income of nearly £415k. This impact had however been compensated for by an increase in the Local Council Tax Support Grant of £1,395k from the Government.

This funding was expected to be a one-off grant as it was hoped/assumed that the Tax Base would recover over the next 2/3 years. The financial plans assume quicker tax base growth of 1.5% next year and then 1.25% in each of the next 2 years. This would however be dependent on many factors which were clearly outside of the control of the organisation

As expected, the biggest financial challenge, resulting from COVID-19, for the organisation was likely to materialise in 2021/22 with a likely recurring, but smaller impact in the years thereafter. The impact was expected to result from less Council Tax than planned to be collected during 2020/21 and a further impact on the overall tax base in future years in comparison to previous plans.

The Government recognised this challenge and had provided the flexibility to all billing and major precepting authorities (including police and fire authorities) to phase the deficit over a fixed period of three years.

- The phased amount would be the entire collection fund deficit for 2020-21 as estimated on the 15 January 2021 for council tax and in the 2021-22 NNDR1 for business rates.
- The deficit would be phased in three equal and fixed amounts across the financial years 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24.
- The amounts to be paid off during 2021-22 will therefore be only 1/3rd of each authority's share of the estimated 2020-21 deficit.

The Councils had indicated an overall deficit on their collection funds, of which £1,325k related to Policing.

Of this overall deficit of £1,325k, there was a £142k deficit that related to years prior to 2020/21 and was therefore treated normally. Of the £1,182k deficit that related purely to 2020/21 this would be phased across 3 years in line with the changed legislation. This would result in a £394k charge in each of the next 3 years.

The precept calculation needed to take account of the net surplus and deficit on the billing authority collection funds. Projected surplus/deficits on the individual funds were shown within the report.

The deficit that had arisen needed to be returned through the precept. The final precept to be levied would reflect the position on each council's collection fund.

The precept calculations were set out within the report based on the proposed 1.99% increase.

The 'basic amount' of council tax was the rate for a Band D property. It was calculated by dividing the Council Tax Requirement by the total tax base i.e. £41,483,110 by 156,110 giving a council tax rate for Band D properties of £265.73.

The proposed council tax rate for each property band was determined in accordance with the statutory proportions and was set out within the report, it also showed the increases for each Band in comparison to 2020/21. It was advised that the tax rates should be calculated to more than 2 decimal places.

The proposal to increase the Police precept by 1.99% would increase a household council tax bill by 10 pence per week for a Band D property.

Although Band D was set by law as the benchmark for council tax calculations, Members were aware that only a small minority of properties in Cleveland fall into Band D or above. The majority, around 80%, were in Bands A-C, and in such properties, households would pay less than the Band D tax.

The impact of the proposal to increase the Police precept by 1.99% for a Band D property would, in the vast majority of cases, equate to an increase of 7-9p

per week in a household council tax bill.

In conclusion the Acting Commissioner had considered various options and various factors in deliberating on her proposal for precept in 2021/22. The Acting Commissioner had reflected on the financial plans that she was stewarding through in her role as Acting Commissioner and she had considered the needs for the continued delivery of Policing and Crime services within Cleveland. The Acting Commissioner had spoken with the Chief Constable and had consulted with the public. Based on these views and the financial needs of the organisation over the medium term the Acting Commissioner formally proposed a precept increase of 1.99% or £5.19 on a Band D property for 2021/22.

The option for an increase was supported by just over half of people who responded to the consultation on the proposed increase. This option should provide sufficient funding to underpin the financial needs of the organisation for 2021/22 and continue the accelerated recruitment of Police Officers into the Force, in comparison to the Governments timeframes, with 65 FTE more Police Officers being recruited by the end of 2021/22 than the Government were initially funding.

The proposed precept increase would enable the Acting Commissioner, amongst other things, to provide sufficient levels of funding to the Chief Constable to support the plans and structures that the Force had articulated to her that they need through their analysis of demand and to support the delivery of the Police and Crime Plan, this included all of the posts that the Chief Constable had indicated as required to provide the necessary support and resilience to address the concerns raised within the HMICFRS report.

To aid the Panel in considering the proposal on Precept the following were attached to the report:

- Draft Budget based on a 1.99% of £5.19 Precept Increase
- Draft Capital Budget

The Panel had already considered a report from its Task and Finish Group. The Task and Finish Group was established to understand the key issues and financial pressures as part of the budget setting process in order to inform the work of the Panel and Acting Commissioner.

The Task and Finish Group supported the proposal of the Acting Commissioner to set the Band D Police Element of the Council Tax within Cleveland for 2021-2022 at £265.73 (an increase of £5.19, or 1.99%, over the 2020-2021 level).

Members considered the precept report regarding the Commissioner's proposal and following a vote the Panel concluded by agreeing unanimously that the proposal should be supported.

RESOLVED that the Panel supports the Commissioner's proposal to set the

Band D Police Element of the Council Tax within Cleveland for 2021/22 at £265.73. This is an increase of £5.19, or 1.99% over the 2020/21 level.

**PCP  
54/20**      **Public Questions**

Members were informed that there were no Public Questions.

**PCP  
55/20**      **Forward Plan**

Members were presented with the Forward Plan. It was noted that a special meeting of the Panel had been arranged for 4 March 2021 to consider an update on the HAT Programme. As it there was quite a long gap before the meeting of the Panel that was scheduled for July 2021, the APCC agreed that further scrutiny work could take place at 4 March 2021 meeting.

The Chief Constable took the opportunity to thank Lisa Oldroyd as Acting PCC for her stewardship over recent months and for helping to stabilise Cleveland Police. This was echoed by members of the Panel.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan be noted.

**PCP  
56/20**      **Minute's Silence**

The Panel held a minute's silence as a mark of respect for the recent passing of Captain Sir Tom Moore.

## Cleveland Police and Crime Panel

A meeting of Cleveland Police and Crime Panel was held on Thursday, 4th March, 2021.

**Present:** Cllr Tony Riordan (Chair), Cllr Graham Cutler (Vice-Chair), Cllr Lee Cartwright, Cllr Barrie Cooper, Cllr Stefan Houghton, Cllr Chris Jones, Mr Paul McGrath, Cllr Steve Nelson, Mayor Andy Preston, Cllr Carl Quartermain, Mr Luigi Salvati and Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E.

**Officers:** Gary Woods, Peter Bell, Nigel Hart, Gareth Aungiers (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council).

**Also in attendance:** Lisa Oldroyd (Acting Police and Crime Commissioner), Elise Pout, Rachelle Kipling, Hannah Smith (Commissioner's Office), Chief Constable Richard Lewis, Daniel Ahmed (Cleveland Police), Professor Tammi Walker, Hannah Poulter, Dr Helen Moore (Teesside University), Client (HAT Programme).

**Apologies:** Cllr Matthew Storey.

### **PCP 57/20**      **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Norma Stephenson declared a personal non prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 4 - Heroin Assisted Treatment (HAT) Programme - Evaluation Feedback as her son worked for one of the partners that deliver the HAT Programme.

### **PCP 58/20**      **Minutes and Attendance Matrix**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2021.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2021 be agreed as a correct record.

### **PCP 59/20**      **Heroin Assisted Treatment (HAT) Programme - Evaluation Feedback**

The Panel received a presentation on Heroin Assisted Treatment (HAT) Programme - Evaluation Feedback. The presentation covered the following key areas:-

- Introduction Evaluation and Impact Team
- Project outline
- Background to evaluation
- Objectives
- Methodology
- Results and early findings including:-
  - Engagement and retention
  - Street drug usage
  - Biopsychosocial outcomes
  - Crime
  - Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the pilot
  - Early findings were HAT is likely associated with substantial behaviour change and psychosocial stabilisation:
    - substantial reduction of the consumption of street heroin for most people
    - reduction of risky injecting practices

- improvements in self-reported physical and psychological health indicators
- reductions in homelessness
- reductions in criminal behaviour and associated costs
- All of these benefits delivered within an uncertain backdrop of a global public health crisis
- Limitations were:-
- Low sample size, affects the confidence around the results and prohibits statistical testing
- No comparative control group, due to ethical and funding restrictions
- No face to face contact with participants

A client from the HAT Programme was in attendance at the meeting and made the following comments with regard his journey with heroin addiction and the HAT Programme:-

- Started using drugs at 16 years old and used crime to fund his drug use.
- Introduced to heroin while in prison.
- Shoplifting was his main source of income to fund his heroin addiction.
- Lived in very poor living accommodation.
- Started the HAT Programme in November 2019 and it has given him a totally different option and now would like to lead a normal everyday life. He hasn't been involved with crime since he started the HAT Programme.
- Himself and his partner have now completed the HAT Programme and they now have better living accommodation and his life had never been better. This was down to the overall support that the HAT Programme provided.

The Panel was given the opportunity to discuss the presentation. The key points of the discussion were as follows:-

- Heroin addicts should be looked at victims rather than criminals. The process for setting up a HAT Programme in the Redcar and Cleveland Borough had been looked and was extremely complicated.
- The HAT Programme had proved value for money and because less crimes were being committed there were less victims of crime.
- The Cleveland Police Force area could be pivotal in the leading the country with other HAT Programmes.
- HAT Programmes should be rolled out into other areas. If the HAT Programme is stopped it would be devastating for the clients that were involved in the process.
- The HAT Programme is not a 'catch all' for all heroin users. It is used when other interventions haven't worked. The figure would be around 5-10% of heroin users who would be suitable for consideration for the HAT Programme.
- The client hadn't received any pressure from drug dealers to try to get him to start using again. More users would come forward to be included in the HAT Programme as word spread of its success.
- The HAT Programme should be continued once the current funding had finished.
- The final report of the evaluation would be published around the end of March and a separate pilot study scientific document was also being prepared and would be available in 3-6 months.



- A national conversation had started about using the proceeds of crime to fund initiatives like the HAT Programme.
- The HAT Programme had saw and continued to see clients break their relationship with street heroin. There hadn't been any influx of individuals to Middlesbrough to access the HAT Programme, this was a misnomer that had been seen in some press coverage. The HAT Programme requires some extreme commitment.
- The cost of the HAT Programme for the 12 months (October 2020 – September 2021) was £283k. One of the most significant costs was the medication, this cost fluctuates in the market. The cost benefits of the HAT Programme were substantial.
- If other centres were set up for the HAT Programme in other Borough areas within the Cleveland, the providers would need to look at issues around having all the other wrap around services in one location as they did in Middlesbrough. The cost would be elevated because of this issue, another way of providing the HAT Programme in other areas of Cleveland would be to use the Glasgow model in that a travel service would be provided to bring clients into one location, this would be a financially smarter way of widening the geographical area of the HAT Programme.

RESOLVED that:-

1. The presentation be received.
2. The comments made by the Panel be noted.

**PCP  
60/20**

### **Commissioners Update**

The last meeting of the Police and Crime Panel was held on 2 February 2021. As a result the Panel was provided with a holistic PCC update including:

- Activity against the Police and Crime Plan since the last reporting period
- Overview of decisions made by the Acting PCC since the last reporting period.

There has been no formal scrutiny meeting since the last meeting, with the next one taking place on 17 March 2021.

The report covered the following key areas:-

Investing in Our Police

A Better Deal for Victims & Witnesses

Tackling Offending and Reoffending

Working Together to Make Cleveland Safer/Securing the Future of Our Communities

Transparency Quality Mark

Summary of Decisions made by the Acting PCC (from February 2021 to date)

A member raised a question around the scrutiny programme priorities and its

links to the HMICFRS inspection update. In response it was noted a new scrutiny programme would be developed with the approval of the new Commissioner who would be elected in May 2021. A visual schematic of the on-going work and future work would be provided to members of the Panel.

It was noted that the recent Safer Streets - Newport had been a success, Cleveland Police and the Street Wardens were providing a fast response to any incidents. The APCC reported that they would be linking in with local authorities when the next round of funding becomes available.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**PCP  
61/20**

**Forward Plan**

Consideration was given to the Forward Plan.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan be noted.