

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE AGENDA



26th January 2007

at 2.00pm

in Committee Room “B”

MEMBERS: CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

Councillors Fenwick, Griffin, Hall, James, A Marshall, J Marshall, Preece, Tumilty,
Richardson and Young

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
3. **MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Constitution Committee held on 27TH November 2006 (attached)
 - 3.2 To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Constitution Working Group held on 12th January 2007 (attached)
4. **ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**
 - 4.1 Local Strategic Partnership – Partnership Scrutiny Investigation Action Plan –
Chief Solicitor
5. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

27th November 2006

Present:

Councillor Councillor Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors Gerard Hall, Ann Marshall, John Marshall, Arthur Preece and Victor Tumilty.

Officers: Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

61. Apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sandra Fenwick and Carl Richardson.

62. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

63. Confirmation of the minutes of the following meetings:

Constitution Committee – 6th October 2006 – confirmed.
Constitution Working Group – 10th November 2006 – confirmed.

64. Matters Arising – Local Strategic Partnership

The Chief Solicitor referred to minute 25 of the Constitution Working Group and advised Members that the inquiry undertaken by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum in relation to Partnerships had been completed. However, there was reference to establishing feedback mechanisms within the action plan from this inquiry and it was also proposed that this be included within the work programme for the Constitution Working Group. Members confirmed that they were aware that the inquiry was no longer being pursued, but confirmed the wish that the paper referred to in minute 25 should be referred to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee nonetheless.

Decision

That the Chief Solicitor submit a report to the next meeting of the Constitution Working Group to examine the feedback arrangements from the Local Strategic Partnership.

65. Co-option of Children and Young Persons to Children's Services Scrutiny Forum

The Chief Solicitor presented a report which invited the Committee to give consideration to the recommendation of the Constitution Working Group to amendments to the Constitution arising from the proposal to include children and young persons as co-opted members of the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum. These changes affect the following parts of the Constitution:

Part 3 – Responsibilities for Functions – Children's Services Scrutiny Forum
Part 4 – Rules and Procedure – Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules

The revised entries accommodating the alterations approved by the Working Group and, in respect of the changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, approved by the Chairman of the Working Group as directed, were attached by way of appendix.

Members suggested that Part 4, section 4.1 (b) be amended as follows:

- b) Six children and young persons' representatives, being members of and nominated by the Hartlepool Young Voices Group who shall be entitled to speak on any matter being discussed but not vote.

Provided that for each children and young persons' representative, a councillor member of the Forum will be identified by the Forum to act as a mentor.

Members discussed the representation from different faiths within the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum. The Chief Solicitor advised that the faiths included within the membership of the Forum were identified in the relevant Education Act.

Decision

The proposed changes to the Constitution be recommended to Council subject to the inclusion of the above amendment of section 4.1 (b).

66. Chairman – Absence from Council *(Chief Solicitor)*

The report invited the Committee to give further instructions regarding the statutory requirement that the Chairman must occupy when he is present at a

Full Council meeting. A discussion followed in which Members sought clarification whether this requirement applied to all Chairs of Committees or only Full Council.

The Chief Solicitor indicated that legislation was very clear in relation to the Chair of Council, however, he advised Members that he would need to clarify the situation with regard to Chairs of other Committees. Members were concerned at this situation and were of the view that until advised otherwise, this requirement would only apply to Full Council and not other committees.

Decision

It was agreed that the Chief Solicitor submit a report to clarify the following:

- (i) The statutory requirement that the Chairman must occupy the Chair when he is present at Full Council meetings.
- (ii) Whether the same requirement applies to Chairs of other Committees of the Council.

MARJORIE JAMES

CHAIRMAN

CONSTITUTION WORKING GROUP

12th January 2007

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

Present:

Councillor Richardson (In the Chair)

Councillors A Marshall, Preece and Tumilty

Also present: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2, Councillor R Cook as substitute for Councillor Griffin, Councillor Dr Morris as substitute for Councillor Young and Councillor M Waller as substitute for Councillor Hall.

Officers:- Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor
Amanda Whitaker, Democratic Services Team Manager

27. Apologies for Absence

The Mayor and Councillors Fenwick, Griffin, Hall, James, J Marshall and Young

28. Declarations of Interest

None

29. Minutes

(i) The minutes of the meeting held on 10th November 2006 were confirmed.

(ii) Minute 25(i) – Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) – the Chief Solicitor reminded Members that consideration of the above item had been deferred until the briefing paper had been considered by the appropriate Scrutiny Forum. It was noted that the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum would be considering this issue at its meeting on 23rd February 2006, following which a report would be submitted to this Working Group.

30. Briefing Paper (*Chief Solicitor*)

(i) Statement of Services

At the meeting on 6th November 2006, the working group had considered that it would be appropriate for a general Statement of Service to be compiled.

The Chief Solicitor had undertaken to provide a first draft of a Statement of Service dealing with the rights and responsibilities of both Members and Constituents in their relationships with each other. It was also noted that there were occasions when Members received correspondence on planning issues and it was questioned whether, within the Protocol, reference could be made to the limitations of Members who are members of the Planning Committee.

The Chief Solicitor circulated a first draft of such a statement. The statement sought to define the role of members in relation to constituents, explaining constraints that members of the public might sometimes find it hard to understand, but emphasising the freedom of choice on the part of members as to the extent to which they communicate with constituents. As the statement contained material that was relevant to the functions of other officers, such as the Members Services Officer, and Planning and Licensing officers, their comments have been requested.

In response to a number of issues highlighted by Members, following presentation of the report, the Chief Solicitor highlighted the clear distinction between the role and responsibilities of Members of the Planning Committee and those of Licensing Committee members. Discussion took place also in relation to the document's 'terms of reference' and guidance was sought, therefore, in relation to what the document aimed to achieve. Members made a number of comments on the potential for expansion of the document to cover issues such as member training and the position regarding substitutes. Following discussion, it was:-

- AGREED – (i) That Section 3 of the Statement of Service be amended to highlight the distinction between the Planning Committee and the Licensing Committee
- (ii) That the document be an 'inclusive' document
- (iii) that a further report be submitted to the Working Group following consideration by the Member Development Group.
- (iv) That the views of the Standards Committee be sought.

(ii) Chairman – Absence from Council

With reference to minute 66 of the meeting of the Constitution Committee held on 27th November 2006, the Chief Solicitor submitted a comprehensive report dealing with the statutory requirements relevant to the attendance of the Chairman of the Council at Council meetings and its application to any other Chairmanship.

AGREED – That the report be noted.

(iii) Review of Role of Contract Scrutiny Panel

At a previous meeting of the Working Group, Members had considered a briefing paper regarding the role of the Contract Scrutiny Panel and indicated that a full review of the role should be undertaken, with participation of the

Chair of the Contract Scrutiny Panel. By way of introduction to this process the Chief Solicitor had prepared a report for submission to the Contract Scrutiny Panel inviting the panel to express their views for consideration by this working group. A further report would be submitted to this working group following the receipt of the Contract Scrutiny Panel's views.

AGREED – That the report be noted.

(iv) Partnerships Scrutiny Investigation – Action Plan

Appended to the briefing paper were

- The report to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum meeting of 29th September 2006 comprising the Portfolio Holders Response to the Partnerships Investigation conducted by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum earlier in 2006, and
- The Partnerships Enquiry Action Plan, accepted by the Portfolio holder.

Members noted that the Action Plan included a number of entries which sought consideration by this Working Group, namely

- That the Council seeks to strengthen the feedback mechanisms (to the Local Authority) for its representatives on the Regional Assembly
- That the attendance records of all Members i.e. Councillors on partnerships be produced as a public document.
- That where possible Councillors attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the partnerships they are involved in.

Members were invited to discuss the recommendations with a view to determining whether the actions proposed could be accommodated in any way in the Council's Constitution. Members were reminded that at their last meeting they expressed the wish that a paper on the Local Strategic Partnership should be considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee before receiving further consideration by the working group.

AGREED – That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Working Group.

C RICHARDSON

CHAIRMAN

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

26th January 2007



Report of: Chief Solicitor

Subject: LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP -
PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION
ACTION PLAN

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to acquaint Members with issues considered by the Constitution Working Party and to invite their comments.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At a recent meeting of the Constitution Working Group, Members of the working group expressed concern regarding the role of Council representatives on the Local Strategic Partnership. Members were concerned that members of the Council's Executive were effectively committing to proposals considered by the LSP before any consideration was given to the proposals in their executive role.
- 2.2 Members expressed a desire to examine the current processes, together with accountability concerns and this matter had been included in the working group's work programme.
- 2.3 At the working group's meeting on 10th November 2006 consideration was given to a 'Preliminary Briefing Note' prepared by the Head of Community Strategy (Appendix 1 to this report). The Chief Solicitor suggested that Members take further opportunity to consider that briefing note and that a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Working Group. The Chief Solicitor drew attention, however, to the fact that the paper raised issues regarding the relationship of the Council and the Local Strategic Partnership which were of some importance but which were outside the remit of the Constitution Working Group. It was highlighted that issues associated with the Local Strategic Partnership had been included within an enquiry by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum and it was agreed that consideration of the issue by the working group be deferred until the briefing paper had been considered by the appropriate Scrutiny Forum.
- 2.4 The briefing paper is to be considered by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum at a meeting to be held on 23rd January 2006. The

outcome of the discussion at that meeting will be reported to the Committee at their meeting.

- 2.5 It is relevant to note that, at the meeting of the Constitution Working Group held on 12th January 2007, consideration was given to the Partnership Scrutiny Investigation Action Plan as approved by Cabinet (Appendix 2 to this report) which provided for consideration by the working group of the following issues, namely

- That the Council seeks to strengthen the feedback mechanisms (to the Local Authority) for its representatives on the Regional Assembly
- That the attendance records of all Members i.e. Councillors on partnerships be produced as a public document.
- That where possible Councillors attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the partnerships they are involved in.

- 2.6 The Working Group were invited to discuss the action plan with a view to determining whether the actions proposed can be accommodated in any way in the Council's Constitution and they agreed to receive a further report in due course.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Clearly, there is an inter-relationship between the concerns expressed by the working group regarding the decision making process affecting the Local Strategic Partnership, and the issues identified by the Partnership Scrutiny Investigation Action Plan. Taken together, the two areas of interest point towards a desire on members' part to have a clear understanding of the manner in which members participate in the activities of partner organisations and the accountability to the Council of members appointed to partner organisations.
- 3.2 The Constitution includes a statement of the members of the Council appointed to outside organisations (referred to as 'Outside Bodies' in the Constitution, but does not otherwise deal with the activities of members so appointed. However, the Constitution does include a section (Part 5 – Codes and Protocols) where a protocol for such activities could be located, if that were the Council's wish. Such a protocol could conveniently deal with all the issues referred to in this report. Clearly the production of such a protocol would involve a degree of time and effort, in which the Constitution Working Group would play a leading role.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Members views are invited

5. CONTACT OFFICER

Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor

Preliminary briefing note for the Constitution Working Group in response to discussions within Constitution Committee where the view was expressed that members of the Council's executive were effectively committing to proposals considered by the LSP before consideration had been given to the proposals in their executive role.

Introduction

The Hartlepool Partnership is the town's Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). It first met in July 1999 as an overarching town wide partnership with the remit to steer the preparation of Hartlepool Community Strategy and to provide leadership in its implementation. Following the publication of government guidance on LSPs in March 2001, the Partnership evolved to meet the new requirements and was formally established as the town's LSP.

The Hartlepool Partnership has a Board of 42 and is chaired by the town's MP. The elected Mayor is the Partnership's Vice Chair. The Board meets around eight times a year. Meeting agendas are structured with sections for presentations, items for decision and items for information.

The Hartlepool Partnership currently has accredited status (Audit Commission, 2004) and has been GREEN rated in each of its last three annual performance assessment by GONE. This has significant benefits for the authority and its partners.

The White Paper - Strong and prosperous communities (October 2006)

The proposals set out in the Local Government White Paper clearly strengthen the council's community leadership role and locality partnership working. It positions the local authority as a key player within the LSP and names key partners with a strengthened duty to cooperate to better meet the public's needs:

We will strengthen partnership working by placing a duty on the local authority and named partners to cooperate with each other to agree targets in the LAA.

We will (...) ensure that LSPs are accountable to local people by strengthening the involvement of elected members in both executive and scrutiny roles. (...) We place particular significance to in ensuring elected members are fully involved in the LSP process.

It is essential for local authorities to work constructively with the full range of local partners to fulfil their shared responsibilities.

The need to strengthen elected member involvement in the Partnership's work both at a Board and Thematic Partnership level was recognised in the recent Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Enquiry into Partnership Working.

Recommendation (k) set out:

That elected member involvement in Thematic and other partnerships be recommended.

The White Paper establishes a clear role for local authority leaders on LSP Boards and for executive portfolio holders on Thematic Partnerships. The implication of the White Paper for the Hartlepool Partnership will be discussed at its December meeting.

Decision Making

The LSP's decision making is required within a number of grant regimes and policy preparation processes. This however does not remove the need for statutory bodies including the Council to make decisions on matters related to their responsibilities and does not usurp their role or discretion.

The Hartlepool Partnership's Terms of Reference set out that the Partnership's business will be "conducted in the spirit of partnership and consensus will be sought without recourse to votes".

More precisely it states:

members should have the authority to take decisions and make commitments. However individual partners will remain responsible and accountable for decisions on their services and the use of their resources. The Partnership recognises that each partner has different mechanisms for their own decision making. In some cases decisions may be endorsed by the bodies or organisations from which members are drawn.

The Hartlepool Partnership is not a legal entity and will rely on its organisations represented on the Board to provide financial systems or a legal basis for decisions collectively supported.

What decisions does the Hartlepool Partnership take?

The decisions that the Partnership takes can be broadly categorised into three areas:

- Agreeing Strategy;
- Allocating funding;
- Strengthening the Hartlepool Partnership's own working arrangements

Agreeing strategy

Examples of strategies that the LSP has agreed in the last 12 months include:

- Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy (October 2006)
- Dyke House/Stranton/Grange Neighbourhood Action Plan (October 2006)
- Community Strategy – 1st consultation draft (September 2006)
- North Hartlepool NAP (June 2006)
- Public Health Strategy (December 2005)
- Social Inclusion and Mental Health (October 2005)
- Rossmere NAP (October 2005)

Agreeing funding

The Council acts as the accountable body for two funding streams that the Hartlepool Partnership delivers. These are the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and Neighbourhood Element (NE) Fund. Examples of decisions that the Hartlepool Partnership has made on funding in the last 12 months include:

- NRF Out-turn 2005/06 (June 2006)
- NRF programme 2006-2008 (April 2006, February 2006, December 2005)
- LAA 2006/09 (February 2006)
- LAA Delivery & Improvement Plan (July 2006)
- NRF programme 2005/06 (February 2006)
- Neighbourhood Element Funding 2006/2010 (February 2006)

Financial information and funding recommendations on NRF and NE funding are also taken to the Regeneration, Housing and Liveability portfolio holder for agreement.

In February 2006 Hartlepool signed a Local Area Agreement. LAAs are described by government as a:

a three year agreement, based on local (...) Community Strategies, that set out the priorities for a local area agreed between Central Government (..) and a local area, represented by the lead local authority and other key partners through Local Strategic Partnerships

The LAA came into effect in April 2006 and runs until March 2009. Government guidance (March 2006) indicates that:

The local authority is the accountable body for the financial management of the LAA and for ensuring that robust performance management arrangements are in place. (...) The LSP will be responsible for the overarching development and delivery of the LAA with lead partners accountable for the delivery of individual targets. It is expected increasingly to drive the delivery and implementation of LAAs.

In line with the new agreement, from April 2006 Hartlepool Borough Council has acted as the accountable body for Hartlepool's LAA. Financial information on interventions funded through the LAA pooled budget is reported to the Finance Portfolio Holder on a quarterly basis.

Decision Making Routes

Where the Hartlepool Partnership needs Hartlepool Borough Council to provide a legal basis for decisions collectively supported, custom and practice developed over the last seven years shows the favoured route to be decisions made first by the Hartlepool Partnership then taken by the appropriate Executive member or Cabinet.

This decision making route has enabled decisions to be taken in an open, transparent and inclusive way with input from a broad range of partners across the public, private, community and voluntary sectors. It enables executive members to hear a wide range of opinions and significantly informs the decision making process. Decisions taken by the Partnership at this point are not statutorily binding as the Partnership is not a statutory body.

It is significant that both Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and Neighbourhood Element Funding grant determination reports set out that funding decisions must be taken in Partnership. The NRF Grant Determination 2006 states that:

The purpose of the grant is to provide support to certain local authorities in England to enable them, in collaboration with their Local Strategic Partnership, to improve services in their most deprived areas.

The recipient authority shall agree the use of the grant in 2006/7 with its Local Strategic Partnership.

Instalments of the pre-set main grant (...) shall be payable in full only where the recipient authority is working with and as part of an LSP that remains accredited and the LSP has met any criteria as have been specified by the Minister of State.

Neighbourhood Element Implementation Guidance 2005 states that:

Although the Local Authority will be the Accountable Body they should work through the LSP and utilise other partners, including community and voluntary sector organisations to deliver certain outcomes through Community Empowerment Networks (CENs) where they exist.

If the current established decision making route was reversed, with decisions taken by the Council's Executive in advance of Partnership meetings the dynamics of the Partnership's work would shift significantly. Practically, the council would be unable to comply with the conditions set out in the grant determinations above unless additional arrangements were put in place to ensure that partners views were sought, recorded and formally fed into the executive decision making process.

In addition, the reversal of current practice would change the nature of Partnership meetings with decision making effectively a "fait accompli" or "rubber stamping" exercise. The Partnership's ability to shape and influence decision making will have been, to all intents and purposes, removed.

A key part of the Partnership's accreditation and annual assessment is the extent to which key players are involved in decision making and it is likely that future assessments carried out by Government Office would reflect the change in procedure and any reduced formative partnership input into decision making.

Overall any decision related to the matter raised has considerable and complex consequences for how the LSP as a whole would work, its arrangements and dynamics and how effective and successful it is likely to be. The increased involvement and leadership of the LSP by primary local authorities appears to be the intention of the White Paper and this appears to be the expectation of civil servants. It is suggested that this matter needs to be considered as part of the wider consideration of the White Paper

This informal arrangement of decision making by the Partnership then by the Council has worked well during the Partnership's 7 years of operation and over 50 meetings. I have worked with the Partnership since 2001 and I am not aware that during this time Executive Members have felt constrained by decisions taken by the Hartlepool Partnership or that the decision making route has prevented them from effectively discharging their responsibilities.

Prepared by:

Joanne Smithson
Head of Community Strategy
Department of Regeneration and Planning Services

Tel. (28) 4147
e-mail joanne.smithson@hartlepool.gov.uk

9th November 2006

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

29 September 2006



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing.

Subject PORTFOLIO HOLDERS RESPONSE TO THE PARTNERSHIPS INVESTIGATION

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum with feedback on the recommendations from the investigation into Partnerships which was reported to Cabinet on 15 May 2006.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The investigation into Partnerships conducted by this Forum falls under the remit of the Regeneration and Planning Services Department and is, under the Executive Delegation Scheme, within the service area covered by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder.
- 2.2 On 15 May 2006 Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum into Partnerships. In addition, this action plan was approved by Cabinet on 29 August 2006. This report provides feedback from the Portfolio Holder following the Cabinet's consideration of, and decisions in relation to, this Forum's recommendations.
- 2.3 In addition to this report a further progress report will be produced for Member's consideration (detailing progress to the end of March 2007) to monitor the implementation of their recommendations.

3. SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXECUTIVE DECISION

- 3.1 Following consideration of the Final Report, Cabinet approved the recommendations in their entirety. Details of each recommendation, proposed

actions to be taken and progress to date are provided in the Action Plan attached at **Appendix A**.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to this report (**Appendix A**) and seek clarification on its content where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer:- Joanne Smithson
Head of Community Strategy
Regeneration & Planning Services Department
Hartlepool Borough Council
Telephone Number: 01429 284147
E-mail – joanne.smithson@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (i) The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Final Report – Scrutiny Investigation into Partnerships considered by Cabinet on 15 May 2006.
- (ii) Decision Record of Cabinet held on 15 May 2006.

PARTNERSHIPS ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX A

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration & Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Partnerships Enquiry

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 15 May 2006

DECISION ON ACTION PLAN: Cabinet 29th August 2006

PRESENTATION TO SCRUTINY FORUM: 29th September 2006

RECOMMENDATION		PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
(a)	That the Council seeks to strengthen the feedback mechanisms (to the Local Authority) for its representatives on the Regional Assembly and	The Constitution Working Group should consider establishing feedback mechanisms from its representatives on Partnerships to Council. No progress to date	Tony Brown Constitution Working Group	December 2006	Work programme of Constitution Working Group. Officer time to support group.
	(Direct link with recommendation (s)) that substitute arrangements for those representatives should be clarified.	Contact the Regional Assembly and clarify substitute arrangements. Initial enquiry made	Angela Hunter Democratic Services	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(b)	That the Council seeks clarification from the RDA around the selection process for representatives on this body.	The Mayor to write to the RDA to request this information Initial enquiry made	Paul Walker	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(c)	That the Council produces further information about the LAA process for a wider audience, and that this should incorporate summary sheets and diagrams.	Produced a LAA information sheet Initial enquiry made	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services Support from	October 2006	Officer time to prepare summary sheet. Photocopying /distribution costs

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
----------------	-------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---

			Corporate Strategy		
(d)	That Scrutiny continues to be involved in the LAA process, and that in the next round of negotiations all Scrutiny Fora are involved at the formative stage.	None – note for negotiation of new LAA in 2008 for implementation in 2009/10	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	-	-
(e)	That increased levels of community and voluntary sector representation be examined on the Lifelong Learning Partnership and the Children and Young People Partnership, including the Executive.	Review Community and Voluntary Sector representation on the Children's Trust Review community and voluntary sector representation on new Partnership structures for Lifelong Learning Discussion on governance arrangements scheduled for October meeting of Hartlepool Partnership.	Adrienne Simcock Children's Services Support from Peter Scott, Regeneration & Planning Services and Adult & Community Services.	April 2007	Officer time to review arrangements and consult on options.
(f)	That the levels of voluntary sector representation be increased on the Tees Valley Partnership and also direct Local Strategic Partnership representation on the TVP. In addition, the Town's MP and Mayor should be invited to support the strengthening of the representation on the TVP.	Mayor to write to the Tees Valley Partnership requesting update on voluntary sector representation in new proposed structures. No progress to date MP to write to the Tees Valley Partnership requesting update on voluntary sector representation in new proposed structures No progress to date	Paul Walker Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	September 2006 September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(g)	That an appropriate measure be put in place for the election of voluntary representatives on the Tees Valley	Head of Adult & Community Services to write to enquire as to current arrangements	Nicola Bailey Adult & Community Services	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements

	RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
	Partnership through the Voluntary Sector Forum.	Mechanisms for elections now revised – recommendation no longer required.			
(h)	That the need for infrastructure organisation offering support to the wider VCS be recognised by the Council and be appropriately funded.	Continue to support the NE Centre of Excellence funded Building Links Programme. Review the funding of infrastructure organisations by the Community Pool as part of COMPACT re-launch Scrutiny inquiry into voluntary sector funding progressing	Nicola Bailey Adult & Community Services Geoff Thompson Regeneration & Planning Services	March 2007	Funding from the NE Centre of Excellence secured to March 07
(i)	That discussions are held with the Mayor, the MP and Council to support the issue of voluntary representation on the thematic partnerships.	Hold meeting to discuss the issue of voluntary representation on the thematic partnerships No additional resource implications	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Schedule meeting for October 2006	No additional resource implications
(j)	That Scrutiny's involvement in the on-going review of the Community Strategy be strengthened across all Scrutiny Fora.	Scrutiny Co-ordinating committee to review 1 st draft and final draft of the Community Strategy 1st draft of Community Strategy to be considered by Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 15th September	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	September 2006 February 2007	Officer time to support process
(k)	That Elected Member involvement in Thematic and other partnerships be recommended.	To be considered following publication of the Local Government White Paper and revised guidance on the role of LSPs due in Autumn Recommendation discussed with all Theme Partnerships.	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Unable to be set	Unable to determine at this point

PARTNERSHIPS ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS	
(l)	That roles and responsibilities for <u>ALL</u> members of Theme Partnerships be encouraged as part of good practice.	Prepare a Hartlepool Partnership good governance guide that incorporates this recommendation Governance Standard produced and meetings have taken place will all Theme Partnership lead Officers	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	October 2006	Officer time to prepare guidance, review good practice, liaise with individual Theme Partnerships.
(m)	That an annual review of both the levels of community representation and the compact be reviewed as part of the Best Value Performance Review.	Collate information on the level of community representation on Theme Partnerships annually No progress to date. Initiate a re-launch of the COMPACT as set out in the Strengthening Communities Best Value Review Strategic Improvement Plan Strengthening Communities Best Value Review Strategic Improvement Plan to be considered by Cabinet 25th September.	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services Geoff Thompson Regeneration & Planning Services	April 2007 October 2006	Officer time to prepare prof oma, issue to Theme Partnerships, analyse results. A review of the COMPACT will require additional resources including staff time and identification of a budget to support community and voluntary sector engagement
(n)	That the Council emphasises the importance of continued partnership working, and supports co-terminus arrangements between the Council, Police and PCT.	No further actions proposed			
(o)	The level of officer time committed to partnerships be examined in order to ensure it is tailored to the appropriate requirements.	CMT review officer time committed to partnerships No progress to date	Chief Executive / CMT	March 2007	CMT time to carry out review
(p)	That the attendance records of all Members i.e. Councillors on	Constitution Working Group examine the feasibility of this	Tony Brown Constitution Working	April 2006	Working group members time and

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
	partnerships be produced as a public document.	Group / Democratic Services		officer support
(q)	That in relation to communication and information dissemination an internal and external communication protocol should be developed. In this respect the Forum welcomed the development of a 'Tool Kit' for resident's use as part of the review of the Community Strategy.	No progress to date No further actions proposed as Hartlepool Partnership Communications Strategy agreed and Community Strategy Toolkit produced		
(r)	That a section be included in the State of the Borough Debate to feedback the work and success of the Hartlepool Partnership and the Theme Partnerships.	The Mayor to include a section on the work and success of the Hartlepool Partnership and the Theme Partnerships in his State of the Borough presentation. Initial discussions on format taken place	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Autumn 2006 Officer time to collate required information
(s)	That where possible Councillors attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the partnerships they are involved in.	No further actions in addition to action identified at recommendation (a) No progress to date	Tony Brown Constitution Working Group	December 2006 Working group members time and officer support
(t)	That informal (quarterly) meetings are arranged to enable elected representatives sitting on Partnerships to feedback on their involvement in these partnerships to other Elected Members and resident representatives.	Constitution Working Group examine the feasibility of this recommendation No progress to date	Tony Brown Constitution Working Group	December 2006 Working group members time and officer support
(u)	That the development of a 'map' outlining how the Council's departments, political structures, LSP and Theme Partnerships are aligned be explored.	Ensure recommendations are included in conclusions of Governance Review No progress to date	Peter Scott Regeneration & Planning Services	December 2006 Significant Officer time to review implications of White Paper and set out proposed response
(v)	Members recommend that a summary of this report be produced as a guide to	Produce a guide to partnership working.	Joanne Smithson Regeneration &	April 2007 Staff time to collate information, prepare,

PARTNERSHIPS ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
----------------	-------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---

	partnership working. In addition, the guide should be produced in an accessible format for circulation to a wider audience, with the PR office.	No progress to date	Planning Services with input from Scrutiny Support and Public Relations		draft and produce. Publishing and distribution costs
(w)	That the Cabinet produce an Action-Plan in response to these recommendations detailing both timescales for action if approved and responsible officers. In addition the Forum recommends that Cabinet report back to the Forum within 3-6 months of receipt.	Action Plan to Scrutiny Forum on 29 September Update on Plan implementation to be presented in March 07 Action Plan agreed by cabinet 29 August.	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Action Plan to Scrutiny Forum on 29 September 2006 Update on Plan implementation to be presented in March 2007	