

PLEASE NOTE VENUE AND TIME

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE AGENDA



Tuesday 13th March 2007

at 5.00 pm

**West View Community Centre,
Miers Avenue, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE:

Councillors S Allison, Barker, Clouth, R W Cook, Fleet, Gibbon, Hall, James, Laffey, A Marshall, J Marshall, Preece, Shaw, Wallace, Wistow and Wright.

Resident Representatives:

Ian Campbell, Iris Ryder and Linda Shields

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

- 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 19th January 2007 and 9th February 2007.

4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO REPORTS OF THE SCRUTINY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

None

5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS FROM COUNCIL, EXECUTIVE MEMBERS AND NON EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

- 5.1 Scrutiny Topic Referral from the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum – 'Current Operation of the Door to Door Recycling Collection Scheme' –
Scrutiny Manager

PLEASE NOTE VENUE AND TIME

6. FORWARD PLAN

6.1 The Executive's Forward Plan - *Scrutiny Manager*

7. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

7.1 Corporate Plan 2007/08: Proposed Objectives and Actions – *Assistant Chief Executive/Chief Solicitor/Chief Personnel Officer/Chief Financial Officer*

8. CONSIDERATION OF FINANCIAL MONITORING/CORPORATE REPORTS

8.1 Your Business at Risk – Audit Commission Survey – *Assistant Chief Executive*

8.2 Data Quality – Audit Commission – *Assistant Chief Executive*

9. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

9.1 **Scrutiny Forums – Progress Reports:-**

- (a) Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee – *Chair of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee;*
- (b) Children's Services Scrutiny Forum – *Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Forum;*
- (c) Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum - *Chair of Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum;*
- (d) Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum – *Chair of Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum;* and
- (e) Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum – *Chair of Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum.*

9.2 Current Status of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2006/07 – *Scrutiny Manager*

10. CALL-IN REQUESTS

11. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of Next Meeting Friday 23rd March 2007 at 1.30pm in the Main Hall, Owton Manor Community Centre, Wynyard Road

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

19th January 2007

The meeting commenced at 1.30 pm in West View Community Centre,
Miers Avenue, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Steve Gibbon, Sheila Griffin, Gerard Hall, Pauline Laffey, Geoff Lilley, Ann Marshall, Arthur Preece and Gerald Wistow.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2, Councillor Sheila Griffin attended as substitute for Councillor Rob Cook

Resident Representatives:
Iris Ryder

Officers: Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive
Joanne Machers, Chief Personnel Officer
John Mennear, Assistant Director, Adult and Community Services
Bart Johnson, Principal Economic Development Officer
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Jonathan Wistow, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also Present: John Lowther, Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (TVJSU)
Donald Dempsey, European Structural Funds Voluntary Organisation Northern (ESFVON)

174. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stephen Allison, Caroline Barker, Rob Cook, Mary Fleet, Jane Shaw and Stephen Wallace. Also from resident representatives Ian Campbell and Linda Shields.

175. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

176. Minutes of the meeting held on 19th December 2006.

Confirmed.

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

None.

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

None.

179. Forward Plan

None.

180. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents - Corporate Plan (BVPP) 2007/08 – Proposed Objectives *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

The Assistant Chief Executive submitted a report outlining proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the Council's Corporate (Best Value Performance) Plan for 2007/08. The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee was asked to consider whether the proposed objectives and actions, each of which was split into one of the following areas, reflected the Council's priorities for the year ahead:-

Jobs and the Economy
Lifelong Learning and Skills
Health and Care
Community Safety
Environment
Housing
Culture and Leisure
Strengthening Communities
Organisational development

Consideration was given to each area and during the course of discussions the following issues were raised:-

- 1) Members noted that some actions did not have a responsible officer identified. The Assistant Chief Executive indicated that the plan was at a very early draft stage and as the level of detail was built upon the gaps would be completed.
- 2) Members felt that the plan contained mainly aims as opposed to objectives. The Assistant Chief Executive informed Members that the objectives and actions would be included in the next draft with the 3rd stage including performance measures, both to be reported to be appropriate scrutiny forum.
- 3) A Member suggested that the objectives of the plan be linked to the Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAP) as well as the local partnership. The Assistant Chief Executive indicated that the Plan was directly linked to the Community Strategy through the Local Area Agreement (LAA) column, but would explore the possibility of identifying links to the NAP.

It was noted that the Corporate Plan would be reported with more detail to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the appropriate Scrutiny Forums and that Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee would co-ordinate a response at the 3rd stage of consultation in early March.

Decision

- (i) The report was noted.
- (ii) The identification of the objectives linked with the Neighbourhood Action Plan be examined.
- (iii) Further more detailed reports be submitted to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the appropriate Scrutiny Forums with Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to co-ordinate a response to be submitted to Cabinet.

181. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents – 2007/08 Budget and Policy Framework Proposals: Feedback from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees *(Scrutiny Manager/Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees)*

The Scrutiny Manager sought approval of a report containing the draft responses from the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the four standing Scrutiny Forums to the Budget Consultation: Draft Budget and Policy Framework Proposals 2007/80, prior to its submission to Cabinet on the 5th February 2006.

In addition to the collective response outlined in Section 3 of the report, a discussion followed in which the following issues were raised:

- (i) Although there was some concern raised in relation to the closure of the public toilets at the Historic Quay, the Chair of the Neighbourhood

Services Scrutiny Forum indicated that this issue had been examined in detail during the inquiry into the public convenience provision across the town. It was noted that this facility required a substantial upgrade to ensure it was at the appropriate standard and the Scrutiny Forum felt that the resources needed for this could be utilised elsewhere as the toilets within the Museum of Hartlepool were open to the public and free of charge. However, it was noted that the signage to the facility provided within the Museum could be improved.

- (ii) In relation to a query raised at the previous meeting of this Committee, it was confirmed that the Informal Scrutiny Chairs meetings were held regularly and looked at issues across all four Scrutiny Forums as well as the Co-ordinating Committee. It was noted that the decision to hold these meetings arose from a Joint Cabinet/Scrutiny Event which was endorsed by Cabinet and Members.
- (iii) It was noted that there was strong opposition from a Member present in relation to the closure of Eldon Grove Sports Centre. However, Members were reminded that the decision to close Eldon Grove had been taken by full Council as part of last year's budget proposals, prior to the Member in question being elected. It was also noted that where council-owned buildings were surplus to the Council's needs, a report would be submitted to the relevant Portfolio Holder containing all the appropriate options for disposal or future usage, including demolition and clearance of the site.
- (iv) In relation to the proposals for Seaton Bus Station, Members were informed that Officers were optimistic that additional funding would be available to enable the full refurbishment to take place.

In light of concern shown by a Member, the Scrutiny Manager indicated that the collective response submitted to Cabinet by the Overview and Scrutiny Committees was based on the individual responses received from the Forums respectively. Members were informed that a copy of the final report would be sent to all Members once endorsed by the Scrutiny Chairs.

The report requested that delegated authority be given to the Chair of this Committee along with the Chairs of the four Scrutiny Forums to approve the content of the formal response prior to submission to Cabinet.

Decision

The Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee along with the Chairs of the four Scrutiny Forums be given delegated authority to approve the formal response to the Executive's Budget and Policy Framework proposals for 2007/08 for submission to Cabinet on 5th February 2007.

182. Consideration of financial monitoring/corporate reports

None.

183. Interpretation and Translation Services *(Chief Personnel Officer)*

The Chief Personnel Services Officer presented a report (in line with the undertaking of the Scrutiny Referral) which provided Members with an opportunity to consider and comment on the draft strategy for the Council's interpretation and translation services for the Performance Management Portfolio Holder's consideration. It was noted that the strategy, attached by way of Appendix attempted to anticipate and prevent any difficulties in accessing services provided by the Council. Through consultation undertaken during the last year, several problems were identified by people from ethnic minorities and people with varied disabilities and these were detailed within the report.

During the discussions that followed, Members congratulated Officers on the report but raised the following concerns:

- (i) How would the resources be found as the need for translating services for more languages arose? The Chief Personnel Officer responded that the language line was a service that the Authority already subscribed to and this was available for residents whose first language was not English.
- (ii) There was some concern that mothers may feel pressured into speaking English to their children and the importance of children learning to speak in their own language for the first 5 years of their life was commented upon. It was also noted that it was important that children were able to communicate in English prior to commencing school. The Chief Personnel Officer noted these concerns and indicated that this issue would be raised with the Talking with Communities Group.
- (iii) Members asked what facilities would be provided in the Council's newly refurbished reception area which was due to be opened shortly. The Chief Personnel Officer indicated that the new reception area, known as Hartlepool Connects would open on 5th February and would enable full access including language lines and mini-coms.
- (iv) Members felt very strongly that the whole community should be involved and integrated with no-one feeling isolated. It was suggested that a branding logo be used on all Council documentation as this would easily identify to everyone that this information was available in other languages.

Decision

That the Members' comments in relation to the draft Access strategy be submitted to the next meeting of the Performance Management Portfolio as the formal response to the Scrutiny Referral and that it be recommended that where appropriate future consideration be given by this Committee to key aspects of the Draft Access Strategy prior to its approval.

184. Withdrawal of European Structural Funding to the Voluntary Sector within Hartlepool Scrutiny Referral – Evidence from External Agencies – Covering Report (*Scrutiny Manager/Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer introduced the representatives from the European Structural Funds Voluntary Organisation Northern (ESFVON) and the Tees Valley joint Strategy Unit (TVJSU) who had been invited to the meeting to provide evidence to help the Committee with its investigation into the Withdrawal of European Structural Funding to the Voluntary Sector.

The representative from ESFVON indicated that they had held numerous meetings with various organisations in order to provide a response to the Government in relation to this issue with the main aim being to continue to maintain advice and support services for the region. A paper was submitted to the Committee which detailed the regional perspective from 1991 to 2006. It was highlighted that although there had previously been sufficient funding to meet the needs of the voluntary sector within the region this would reduce substantially in the future with the focus needing to be on fewer bigger projects. In addition, 'co-financing' now means that CVS bodies cannot put forward their own ideas to tender for funding. Rather, Job Centre Plus and the Learning and Skills Council have to invite the CVS to tender for specific projects. There has been a desire from Central Government for fewer bigger projects, which it is anticipated will lead to consortia developing in the future.

Members were concerned that the most relevant areas need to be clearly targeted within any recommendations made and suggested that the local authority could work with the local authority movement in Europe as a whole and lobby Central Government in relation to this issue.

The representative from the TVJSU tabled a document which detailed the objectives and priorities across the north east with regard to European funding. It was reported that the JSU and the voluntary sector had endeavoured to persuade the Government Office (GONE) and One North East (ONE) to transfer underspend from Priorities 1 and 2 (sector development and business support) to Priority 4 (community regeneration). Although there was a great deal of support for this, there was stout resistance from GONE and ONE. It was highlighted that the resources for community regeneration were being reduced substantially through the loss of Single Regeneration Budget, reductions in Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, the unwillingness of ONE to fund community regeneration and the loss of European funding would compound the problem. It was noted that the prospects for community organisations obtaining European funding for Priority 4 projects were bleak with the only possibilities being:

- a) Enhanced national programme of Job Centre Plus and the Learning and Skills Council
- b) Commissioning by Business Link North East to run projects which help

- disadvantaged groups back into enterprise
- c) Employability and skills projects would in future need to be funded by Job Centre Plus or the Learning and Skills Council.

There was concern that some developments undertaken, for example Queens Meadow, may not be in the best interests of the residents of the town. The key issue with community regeneration was to make the town a better place for residents to live and a town to be proud of. The representative from the TVJSU indicated that to transform the economy of the town, large scale developments that can make a difference, including the provision of jobs, needed to be considered. The representative from ESFVON indicated that the need for a mixture of opportunities should be accepted in order to continue the regeneration of the town and by the very nature of big projects, there would be some areas that do not benefit directly. However, he suggested that the National Strategy Framework should be exploited in relation to sustainable communities.

The Principal Economic Development Officer informed Members that the European Social Fund (ESF) was primarily directed at the delivery of skills, whilst the key aim of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) was creating jobs. It was noted that this Authority had previously worked in partnership with other authorities to create successful bids for this funding. Members felt that the papers submitted were valuable in helping to identify priorities with the projects on the list contributing to the fabric of the local communities. It was added that if the current sources of investment were not available, a funding strategy should be produced to replace this.

Members were concerned that under the ESF regime, organisations were actively discouraged to build assets which left the organisations with nothing to borrow against. It would be difficult for the community sector to survive without the support from strategic organisations like local authorities. It was noted that the Authority could have a clear role to lobby Central Government with regard to the loss of European funding.

The representatives from ESFVON and TVJSU were thanked for their attendance and for answering Members questions.

Decision

The discussions above would be used to inform the Committee's inquiry.

185. Call-In Requests

None.

186. Any Other Business

The Chair of the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum informed Members that he had received a letter from the Secretary of State confirming that the view of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel was accepted and that consultant-led maternity services would be delivered at North Tees Hospital in Stockton. It was also noted that investment would be put into primary care and services provided within the community or home with a new state of the art hospital being built in 6-10 years time servicing Hartlepool, Stockton, Sedgfield and Easington. This would result in the closure of the University Hospital of Hartlepool and North Tees Hospital in Stockton. The Chair of the Scrutiny Forum indicated that several questions remained unanswered including whether the planned investment in the North Tees Hospital would still go ahead to create a centre for excellence in women's health. In conclusion, it was noted that the implications of the closure of the University Hospital of Hartlepool for employment in the town were grave and would compound the base employment figures.

Members continued to have major concerns with regard to the provision of consultant-led maternity services outside of Hartlepool. It was suggested that GP surgeries may consider providing birthing centres to ensure that the best facilities were offered for the residents of the town.

MARJORIE JAMES

CHAIR

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

9th February 2007

Present:

Councillor: Jane Shaw (In the Chair)

Councillors: Mary Fleet, Steve Gibbon, Gerard Hall, Pauline Laffey, Ann Marshall, John Marshall and Arthur Preece

In accordance with Paragraph 4.1 of the Council's procedure rules Councillor Carl Richardson attended as substitute for Councillor Marjorie James

Resident Representatives:

Ian Campbell, Iris Ryder and Linda Shields

Officers: John Mennear, Assistant Director, Adult and Community Services
Paul Briggs, Assistant Director, Children's Services
Sue Rybak, Grants Officer
Bart Johnson, Principal Economic Development Officer
Pat Usher, Sports and Recreation Manager
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Jonathan Wistow, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also Present: Kevin Cranney, Owton Fens Community Association
Keith Bailey, Hartlepool Voluntary Development Agency
Alex Sedgewick, Belle Vue Community Sports and Youth Centre

187. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stephen Allison, Caroline Barker, Rob Cook, Marjorie James, Stephen Wallace, Gerald Wistow and Edna Wright.

188. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

189. Minutes of the meeting held on 5th January 2007

Confirmed.

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

None.

191. Consideration of Request for Scrutiny Reviews from Council, Executive Members and Non Executive Members

None.

192. Forward Plan

The Executive's Forward Plan for February 2007 – May 2007 was submitted for the Committee's consideration. Members were asked to identify any issues in the Forward Plan that they felt should be considered by the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee or one of the four forums. Although Members felt that there had been a slight improvement in the content of the Forward Plan, they still had concerns at the level of information it contained.

193. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents

None.

194. Consideration of Financial Monitoring / Corporate Reports

None.

195. Building Schools for the Future – Stage Two Consultation (*Director of Children's Services*)

The Assistant Director presented a report which informed Members of the nature and purpose of the second stage of consultation on Hartlepool's involvement in the national Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. The outcomes of the BSF Stage One Consultation were reported to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 24th November 2006 and Cabinet had now approved the second stage of consultation to run from Monday 29th January 2007 until Friday 2nd March 2007. The consultation document was attached by way of appendix.

A number of meetings and events had been organised and these included roadshow events at supermarkets, Middleton Grange Shopping Centre and

the Central Library.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- A member suggested that education villages separated geographically across the town in the North/Central/South areas of the town be examined. The Assistant Director indicated that the current options included a four school model and any suggestions for additional options would be considered by the Project Board and Cabinet.
- There was some concern that residents may feel over-consulted. The Assistant Director responded that this was a difficult issue to balance while keeping in mind the effective use of resources.
- Was there any opportunity for respondents to receive any feedback from the consultation? Members were informed that the once the consultation process has closed, interim reports will be submitted to the Shareholder and Project Boards as well as Cabinet. These reports would include a summary and analysis of the consultation. This information was also available on the website which was widely publicised.
- Members sought clarification on who attended the Stakeholder and Project Boards. The Assistant Director reported that the Stakeholder Board included Head Teachers, Chairs of Governors from both primary and secondary schools and undertook an advisory role and was used as a discussion forum. The Project Board included the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and was given delegated authority from Cabinet to make certain decisions, although the fundamental decisions were still taken by the Cabinet.
- What had the response been to the public meetings? The Assistant Director indicated that everyone who had attended a public meeting had the opportunity to either speak in the meeting or see a member of staff at the end of the session for a one-to-one discussion or residents could submit their response on forms which were distributed.
- Concern was expressed about the transport issues that were likely to be faced by young people. The Assistant Director indicated that any decision taken would be mindful of the related transport issues.
- Was it a good decision to name Brierton School and the possible school for closure? The Assistant Director informed Members that the suggestion that Brierton School close was made at Stage One of the consultation. The Project Board had made the decision to name the school, for the reasons as set out in the BSF consultation document.
- Would there be any feedback to members of the analysis of the Stage Two consultation? The Assistant Director indicated that this could be arranged.
- Did the Stage One consultation suggest the 3 options put forward at Stage Two? The Assistant Director informed Members that Cabinet had authorised that Stage Two consultation be commenced and the Project Board had proposed the 3 options.

Decision

- (i) Members noted the nature and purpose of the second stage of consultation in preparation for the Building Schools for the Future
- (ii) The views stated above would be fed into this consultation.
- (iii) A report be submitted to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee with an analysis of the Stage Two consultation.

196. Withdrawal of European Structural Funding to the Voluntary Sector within Hartlepool Scrutiny Referral – Evidence from Community and Voluntary Sectors Organisations *(Scrutiny Manager/Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer informed Members that a representative from Hartlepool Voluntary Development Agency (HVDA), the Owton Fens Community Association (OFCA) and the Belle Vue Community Sports and Youth Centre were in attendance today to provide the forum with verbal evidence regarding the local perspective in relation to this issue and the likely impact on the Community and Voluntary Sector (CVS). The representative from the Headland Development Trust (HDT) was unable to attend and provided a paper which was distributed to Members at the meeting.

The representative from HVDA informed Members that previously, the voluntary sector had received a good share of European funding and that since the withdrawn of this funding, 5 jobs had been lost. It was acknowledged that voluntary organisations in Hartlepool work very hard with 55 groups across the town helping approximately 132,000 people at a cost of £7m.

The representative from OFCA advised members that the Association had been established for over 20 years and had been accessing European funding for over 10 years. Wherever possible, match funding had also been sought. OFCA had accessed around £300,000 per year creating jobs for local people with the key objective being to help disadvantaged people into employment. The Youth Opportunities Project worked with disaffected young people and had given over 30 people who may not otherwise have had the opportunity to pass qualifications at NVQ levels 1 and 2. There was concern among the voluntary sector that One North East would not consider the voluntary sector when distributing European funding.

The representative from the Belle Vue Community Sports and Youth Centre indicated that European funding had contributed to the cost of building of the Centre. The main income for the Centre was through rental charges to groups using the centre, the majority of which were themselves resourced by European funding. If this funding was to cease, the Centre suffer in the form of reduced income.

- A Member sought clarification on what the representatives felt that the Authority could do to help this situation? The representative from OFCA indicated that the voluntary sector had already established an excellent partnership working with the Authority and he hoped this could be strengthened. The issue needed to be looked with a more strategic approach, which he hoped the Local Authority could provide, particularly through the Economic Development Division.
- The level of pay to voluntary sector staff was questioned. The representative from OFCA responded that some organisations may have what was considered highly paid staff, but the staff needed to be highly qualified and motivated to work with the most disadvantaged people who require one-to-one support.
- The representative from HVDA advised Members that the European funding would still be available, although it was how this funding was administered that was changing. Partnership working could be considered where the Authority were having to cut services, the voluntary sector may be able to provide these services in a more cost effective way.
- Members were concerned that the re-routing of funding through regional organisations was another step to regionalisation and felt that lobbying the Government about this was an option.
- A Member asked if lottery funding had been considered to fund the short-fall? The representative from HVDA indicated that the allocation of lottery funding was currently being scrutinised and it appeared that the north east did not do as well as other parts of the country. He added that the Local Authority representatives on regional bodies may be able to influence this.
- Members felt that the voluntary sector in Hartlepool provided a first class service and made a huge difference across all age ranges.

The Principal Economic Development Officer informed Members that consultation was currently being undertaken by One North East in relation to the allocation of European funding and the Local Authority will respond. It was suggested that this response be circulated to all Members of this Committee for their information. The Scrutiny Support Officer circulated a note of the findings from the Focus Group which met on 1st February 2007 to consider this issue along with invited groups from the Community and Voluntary Sector.

The representatives from HVDA, OFCA, BVCSYC were thanked for their attendance and for answering Members questions.

Decision

The views of the external agencies and findings of the Focus Group would be used to inform the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's final report.

197. Withdrawal of European Structural Funding to the Voluntary Sector within Hartlepool Scrutiny Referral – Evidence from Local Authority Representatives *(Scrutiny Manager/Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer informed Members that the Assistant Director of Adult and Community Services and Principal Economic Development Officer had been invited to attend this meeting to provide the Committee with evidence regarding the local perspective in relation to this issue. The Assistant Director indicated that a lot of the most pertinent issues had been raised under the previous items. The Principal Economic Development Officer advised Members that in order to bid for European funding in the future, only large bids would be considered. This was a more cost effective way to the organisations administering the funding. Therefore, he added that co-financing and working in partnership with other organisations may prove more successful as they had in the past.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- There was concern among Members that small organisations may not be able to provide Service Level Agreements and would therefore need to look at partnership working with other groups. The HVDA representative indicated that this was the advantage of the Community Pool budget as it provided value for money and met the corporate objectives of the local authority.
- Could groups amalgamate to ensure they were cost-effective administratively? The Assistant Director of Adult and Community Services informed Members that there was potential for this to happen which would also reduce any duplication of service.
- Were there valid reasons behind One North East requesting large bids for funding only? The representative from HVDA indicated that the Government were undergoing many reviews in order to reduce the level of Civil Servants employed, reducing their administrative processes would be included within this.
- A Member suggested that the Community Pool be split across geographical areas, ie North/Central/South areas of the town? The Assistant Director indicated that this grant supported groups that work with others and have a wide remit as opposed to supporting groups on a geographical basis.

Decision

The views of the local authority representatives be used to inform the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's final report.

198. Railway Approaches – Final Report (*Chair of Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum*)

The final report of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum into Railway Approaches was submitted for the Committee's consideration, amendment and subsequent approval for submission to Council. The report set out the terms of reference, the methods utilised and the findings of the investigation.

Members commended the report and highlighted that it identified clear recommendations. The Scrutiny Manager reminded Members that an action plan would be compiled by the service area following the approval/non approval of the recommendations by the Cabinet and a 6-monthly progress report on the delivery of the agreed recommendations would be considered by the Scrutiny Forum as a matter of standard practice.

Decision

That the final report of the inquiry into Railway Approaches be approved for submission to Cabinet.

199. New Scrutiny Powers on Crime and Disorder (*Scrutiny Manager*)

The Scrutiny Manager presented a report which informed Members of the new powers and responsibilities available to Overview and Scrutiny Committees brought in by the Police and Justice Act 2006, to be introduced during 2008. As Members were aware, the Local Government White Paper, 'Strong and prosperous communities', published in October 2006, proposed a further extended role for Council Scrutiny in England, alongside the Police and Justice Act 2006 which became law in November 2006. There were two specific roles for local Overview and Scrutiny Committees as follows:

- (i) The power to scrutinise the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (Safer Hartlepool Partnership); and
- (ii) The duty of Ward Councillors to respond to community concerns about local government/crime and disorder issues through what is called a 'Community Call for Action'.

The Scrutiny Manager informed Members that the regulations and guidance would not be available until the end of this year, however, a Members Seminar (also repeated on an evening to accommodate those Members with work commitments) would be held to assist Members in their understanding of the new extended scrutiny powers.

Members queried whether there were any extra resources being allocated in order that these extended powers could be carried out effectively. The Scrutiny Manager responded that as this new power was seen as a duty, as

opposed to the health powers which were permissive, Central Government had again made no reference to the availability of additional resources and that it was highly likely that such new arrangements were to be accommodated within our current Overview and Scrutiny structure.

A resident representative asked if the police complaints process would still operate. The Scrutiny Manger responded that the new powers were not intended to replace any existing complaints system but were aimed at providing a route for local people to demand a response to issues of local concerns that had not been resolved through other channels, with all cases being resolved in the earliest part of the process and with the vast majority of cases not reaching the scrutiny process.

Decision

- (i) That The extended powers and responsibilities to be available to Overview and Scrutiny Committees during 2008 were noted.
- (ii) That further briefing papers be submitted on the implementation proposals for the extended powers upon receipt of guidance from the Home Office which was expected to be received during late 2007/early 2008.
- (iii) That Members note that the new powers would form one of a series of Members Seminars in the near future in response to the White Paper Members Seminar held on 22nd January 2007 and 6th February 2007

200. Requests for Items for Discussion – Joint Cabinet/Scrutiny Event – 28th February 2007 *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager reported that the next meeting of the Joint/Cabinet Scrutiny Event was to be held on 28th February 2007. Items for discussion were sought from Members of this Committee, which would then form the basis of the Joint Agenda in conjunction with the issues received from the Cabinet.

Decision

That any suggested topics for discussion be forwarded directly to the Scrutiny Manager no later than 19 February 2007.

201. Call-In Requests

None.

202. Scrutiny Topic Referral from Council – ‘NHS Proposals for Hartlepool following the decision of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager presented a report which informed Members of the recent scrutiny topic referral from Council to the Overview and Scrutiny Function. As outlined within the Authority's Constitution, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee has a mandatory obligation to consider referrals from Council, Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members within the timescale prescribed.

As such at the Extraordinary Council meeting on 8th February 2007, Members approved the following resolution:-

"That the Council joins the Labour Group in deploring the decision of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel in respect of University Hospital Hartlepool and to totally condemn the broken promises of the Blair Government. We demand that this decision be urgently reconsidered so that those promises, made by both the Prime Minister and the former Health Secretary John Reid, can be delivered in full.

Furthermore the Council reaffirm its commitment to health services that are accessible, accountable and of the highest quality in Hartlepool, for Hartlepool. It is vital that we resist any further migration of both jobs and services out of the town to Stockton and fight any downgrading of services at University Hospital Hartlepool.

Health services in Hartlepool must be both maintained and indeed improved. We need increased funding, better transport links, improved primary care in our communities, an immediate development of new and equipped health centres and improved terms and conditions for all health sector workers in the town. We must seek a full and comprehensive understanding of the NHS proposals for Hartlepool and a timetable for its investment programs.

The Council therefore resolve that the full powers of this Council's scrutiny process be employed to deal with these issues and that the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee urgently set out a timetable for investigation, reporting back to Council at the earliest opportunity."

Members were concerned that it would be difficult to scrutinise the issue of transportation links to the new Hospital site, when this was not known yet. Officers were congratulated on being able to produce this report from the Council meeting held the previous night. It was noted that Members wished to scrutinise how the membership of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel was decided upon.

The Scrutiny Manager further reported that as outlined in the Authority's Constitution, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee had a mandatory

obligation to consider the referral from Council within the prescribed timescale.

Whilst the majority of Members were party to discussion at the extraordinary meeting of Council held the evening before, discussion ensued on the nature of the referral which was twofold:-

- (a) to undertake a scrutiny investigation into the transportation links to the new Hospital site' and
- (b) to undertake a scrutiny investigation into the development of primary and community services in Hartlepool.

The Scrutiny Manager suggested that a briefing note be submitted to the next meeting as the current workload of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees may need to be re-prioritised.

Decision

That the two part referral be accepted and a briefing note be submitted to the next meeting of this Committee in relation to the practicalities of undertaking the two investigations along with the earlier referral made (Minute 203 above refers) either within the 2006/07 Municipal Year which is drawing to a close or the forthcoming 2007/08 Municipal Year.

203. Scrutiny Topic Referral from the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum – ‘Proposed Service Mix of Primary Care Services in Hartlepool in Particular Wynyard Road Primary Care Centre *(Scrutiny Manager)*

The Scrutiny Manager presented a report which informed Members of the recent scrutiny topic referral from the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum to the Overview and Scrutiny Function. As outlined within the Authority's constitution, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee has the discretion to consider the appropriateness of undertaking a scrutiny investigation following a referral from the Authority's regulatory panels and other committees.

At the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum it was agreed that the service mix being proposed at the Primary Care Centres in Hartlepool should be reflective of local needs and aspirations starting with the Wynyard Road Primary Care Centre in the first instance and that this issue should be referred to the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum as soon as possible.

Decision

That the referral from the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum be accepted and subject to further discussion at the next meeting of this Committee.

MARJORIE JAMES

CHAIR

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Scrutiny Manager

Subject: SCRUTINY TOPIC REFERRAL FROM THE NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM – ‘CURRENT OPERATION OF THE DOOR TO DOOR RECYCLING COLLECTION SCHEME’

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the recent scrutiny topic referral from the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum to the Overview and Scrutiny Function.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 As outlined within the Authority's Constitution, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee has the discretion to consider the appropriateness of undertaking a scrutiny investigation following a referral from the Authority's regulatory panels and other committees.

2.2 The Constitution clearly states that should the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee decide not to examine a particular 'referral', the decision must be justified and reported to Council and the referring body.

2.3 At a meeting of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum held on 31 January 2007, a Councillor raised concern about the current operation of the Authority's door to door recycling collection scheme.

2.4 After an in-depth discussion it was subsequently resolved that this issue should also be referred to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to determine its appropriateness of re-directing the issue for further consideration by the relevant Scrutiny Forum (Minutes 62 refers) with the following suggested remit/areas for consideration:-

- (a) to look at the way in which contractors carry out the work of recycling; and
- (b) to review the procedure specification on door to door collection of recycled material in light of the perception of dissatisfaction from Ward Councillors and Members of the public

2.5 During the consideration of the issue during this meeting, Members should be aware that the Authority's Recycling Contract is currently out to tender, working on the basis of procuring a new contract from June 2007.

3. RECOMMENDATION

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

- (a) considers the appropriateness of undertaking a scrutiny enquiry into this matter taking into account the additional information provided in paragraph 2.5 of this report; and
- (b) should it be felt appropriate to undertake a scrutiny enquiry into this matter, consideration should be given to timing of its undertaking as the 2006/07 Municipal Year draws to a close.

Contact:- Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

- (i) Minutes of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum held on 31 January 2007.

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Scrutiny Manager

Subject: THE EXECUTIVE'S FORWARD PLAN

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide the opportunity for the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee (SCC) to consider whether any item within the attached Executive's Forward Plan should be considered by this Committee or referred to a particular Scrutiny Forum.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As you are aware, the SCC has delegated powers to manage the work of Scrutiny, as it thinks fit, and if appropriate can exercise or delegate to individual Scrutiny Forums.
- 2.2. One of the main duties of the SCC is to hold the Executive to account by considering the forthcoming decisions of the Executive and to decide whether value can be added to the decision by the Scrutiny process in advance of the decision being made.
- 2.3 This would not negate Non-Executive Members ability to call-in a decision after it has been made.
- 2.4 As such, the most recent copy of the Executive's Forward Plan is attached as **Appendix 1** for the SCC's information.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee considers the content of the Executive's Forward Plan.

Contact Officer:- Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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



HARTLEPOOL
BOROUGH COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN

MARCH 2007 – JUNE 2007

CONTENTS

		<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION	3
SECTION 2	SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS	
Part 1	Chief Executive's Department	5
Part 2	Adult & Community Services Department	7
Part 3	Children's Services Department	10
Part 4	Neighbourhood Services Department	15
Part 5	Regeneration & Planning Services Department	21
APPENDICES		
1	Details of Decision Makers	39
2	Cabinet Timetable of Decision	40

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The law requires the executive of the local authority to publish in advance, a programme of its work in the coming four months including information about key decisions that it expects to make. It is updated monthly.
- 1.2 The executive means the Mayor and those Councillors the Mayor has appointed to the Cabinet.
- 1.3 Key decisions are those which significantly modify the agreed annual budget of the Council or its main framework of policies, those which initiate new spending proposals in excess of £100,000 and those which can be judged to have a significant impact on communities within the town. A full definition is contained in Article 13 of the Council's Constitution.
- 1.4 Key decisions may be made by the Mayor, the Cabinet as a whole, individual Cabinet members or nominated officers. The approach to decision making is set out in the scheme of delegation which is agreed by the Mayor and set out in full in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.

2. **FORMAT OF THE FORWARD PLAN**

- 2.1 The plan is arranged in sections according to the Department of the Council which has the responsibility for advising the executive on the relevant topic:

Part 1	Chief Executive's Department	CE
Part 2	Adult & Community Services Department	ACS
Part 3	Children's Services Department	CS
Part 4	Neighbourhood Services Department	NS
Part 5	Regeneration and Planning Department	RP

- 2.2 Each section includes information on the development of the main policy framework and the budget of the Council where any of this work is expected to be undertaken during the period in question.
- 2.3 It sets out in as much detail as is known at the time of its preparation, the programme of key decisions. This includes information about the nature of the decision, who will make the decisions, who will be consulted and by what means and the way in which any interested party can make representations to the decision-maker.

3. **DECISIONS MADE IN PRIVATE**

- 3.1 Most key decisions will be made in public at a specified date and time.
- 3.2 A small number of key decisions, for reasons of commercial or personal confidentiality, will be made in private and the public will be excluded from any sessions while such decisions are made. Notice will still be given about the intention

3.3 to make such decisions, but wherever possible the Forward Plan will show that the decision will be made in private session.

3.4 Some sessions will include decisions made in public and decisions made in private. In such cases the public decisions will be made at the beginning of the meeting to minimise inconvenience to members of the public and the press.

4. **URGENT DECISIONS**

4.1 Although every effort will be made to include all key decisions in the Forward Programme, it is inevitable for a range of reasons that some decisions will need to be taken at short notice so as to prevent their inclusion in the Forward Plan. In such cases a minimum of 5 days public notice will be given before the decision is taken.

4.2 In rare cases it may be necessary to take a key decision without being able to give 5 days notice. The Executive is only able to do this with the agreement of the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee or the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the local authority. (Scrutiny committees have the role of overseeing the work of the Executive.)

5. **PUBLICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

5.1 All decisions which have been notified in the Forward Plan and any other key decisions made by the Executive, will be recorded and published as soon as reasonably practicable after the decision is taken.

5.2 The Council's constitution provides that key decisions will not be implemented until a period of 3 days has elapsed after the decision has been published. This allows for the exceptional cases when a scrutiny committee may 'call in' a decision of the Executive to consider whether it should be reviewed before it is implemented. 'Call in' may arise exceptionally when a Scrutiny Committee believes that the Executive has failed to make a decision in accordance with the principles set out in the Council's constitution (Article 13); or that the decision falls outside the Council's Policy Framework; or is not wholly in accordance with the Council's budget.

6. **DETAILS OF DECISION MAKERS**

6.1 Names and titles of those people who make key decisions either individually or collectively will be set out in Appendix 1 once they are determined.

7. **TIMETABLE OF KEY DECISIONS**

7.1 The timetable as expected at the time of preparation of the forward plan is set out in Appendix 2. Confirmation of the timing in respect of individual decisions can be obtained from the relevant contact officer closer to the time of the relevant meeting. Agenda papers are available for inspection at the Civic Centre 5 days before the relevant meeting.

PART ONE – CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S DEPARTMENT

A. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

A report is to be submitted to Cabinet that begins the main budget consultation process with the Council's Scrutiny Committees, Political Groups, Hartlepool Trade Unions and Business representative and other groups. Cabinet will need to determine whom it wishes to consult with. Consultation will be undertaken by issuing the consultees with a copy of the Cabinet's report and through a series of presentations with the various groups.

A report will be produced to commence the budget process for 2007/08. This process will continue over the coming months and will be concluded in February 2007 when the Cabinet determines the final Budget and Policy framework proposals it wishes to submit to full Council for consideration. The report to be submitted in October will outline the financial position facing the Council and proposed measures to balance the budget for 2007/08. The report will include details of the proposed Council Tax increase for 2007/08, budget pressures, priorities, efficiencies and savings. In addition, the report will consider capital investment needs and how these might be funded.

CORPORATE (BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE) PLAN 2007/08

The production of the Corporate (Best Value Performance) Plan by 30 June each year is a national legal requirement.

The purpose of the Plan is to describe the Council's priorities for improvement for 2007/8, including how weaknesses will be addressed, opportunities exploited and better outcomes delivered for local people. It will include targets for future performance.

Preparation of the Corporate Plan for 2007/8 commenced in December 2006. The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will consider the proposed Council priorities identified in the Plan at its meetings on 19 January, 16 March, late April (to be arranged) and 18 May 2007 (to be confirmed). All other Scrutiny Forums will consider the proposals between 19 February and 6 March 2007 (Neighbourhood Services 19 Feb, Regeneration and Planning 23 Feb, Children's Services 26 Feb and Adult & Community Services & Health on 6 March). Cabinet will consider the Plan on 8 January, 19 February, 16 April and 14 May 2007 respectively. Final approval of the Plan will be by Council on 21 June 2006.

B. SCHEDULE OF KEY DECISIONS

DECISION REFERENCE: CE23/06 – PAY AND GRADING STRUCTURE

Nature of the decision

To approve a pay and grading structure for employees employed under NJC for Local Government Employees and associated changes in terms and conditions to achieve single status and satisfy equal pay requirements

Who will make the decision?

The Council will make the decision, following considerations by Cabinet.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made after negotiations with trade union representatives are completed between November 2006 and March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

- Negotiations will be held with representatives of the recognised trade unions.
- A working group of Members from Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will be briefed and consulted during the negotiation period.
- A report to the Performance Management Portfolio Holder will set out the negotiation programme

Information to be considered by the decision makers

Members will be provided with information and guidance on:

- Compliance with equality legislation. The Council's pay and grading structure and other terms and conditions must satisfy equal pay legislation. An assessment will be made at the time of recommendation together with a programme for future equal pay audits.
- Options for the best negotiated settlement, which will secure endorsement by local trade union representatives and their national officers.
- Options for implementing without trade union support, should a negotiated settlement not be achievable.
- Financial implications of a revised pay and grading structure, associated protection arrangements and any other changes to terms and conditions.

How to make representation

Representation should be made to Joanne Machers, Chief Personnel Officer, Level 3, Civic Centre, Hartlepool TS24 8AY. Telephone: (01429) 523003.

Email: Joanne.machers@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further Information

Further information can be obtained from Joanne Machers, as above.

PART TWO – ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT

A. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

Annual Library Plan 2007/8

The draft Annual Library Plan for 2007/8 will be presented for approval to consult at Cabinet on 14 May 2007. This is earlier than in previous years and will incorporate the opportunity for Library users and stakeholders to contribute as part of the draft.

The Consultation Draft will then be presented for review and amendment at the Neighbourhood Forums in June at the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum in July. The finalised plan will then return to Cabinet for endorsement.

The Annual Library Plan, as part of the Budget and Policy Framework of the Council, describes the proposed aims and objectives of the town's Library Service and the actions required for delivery.

B SCHEDULE OF KEY DECISIONS

DECISION REFERENCE: SS44/07 ADULT EDUCATION FEES

Nature of the decision.

To set the level of fees for Adult Education courses for the 2007-2008 Academic Year.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health

Timing of the decision

To be determined, but expected to be in June 2007

Who will be consulted and how?

- i) Other providers by consultation at the Adult Providers Group
- ii) Local Community and Voluntary sector organisations through the Community Network.
- iii) Other Council departments through individual meetings.
- iv) Learning and Skills Council through review meetings.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

A report will be presented indicating the current levels of fees, changes in Learning and Skills Council requirements and options for a new fee levels.

How to make representations

Representations should be made to Maggie Heaps, Adult Education Co-ordinator at Hartlepool Adult Education, Golden Flatts, Seaton Lane, Hartlepool TS25 1HN .Telephone 01429 292340 e-mail maggie.heaps@hartlepod.gov.uk

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Maggie Heaps at the above address

DECISION REFERENCE: SS45/07 ADULT EDUCATION 3 YEAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Nature of the decision

To endorse the submission of the update of the Adult Education three year development plan to the Learning and Skills Council.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in June 2007

Who will be consulted and how?

- v) Other providers by consultation at the Adult Providers Group
- vi) Local Community and Voluntary sector organisation through the Community Network.
- vii) Other Council departments through individual meetings.
- viii) Learning and Skills Council through review meetings.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

The Hartlepool Adult Education Three Year Development Plan update forms the basis of an agreement between Hartlepool Borough Council and The Learning and Skills Council in relation to the delivery of vocational and non vocational training. This agreement will secure the funding from the LSC for the academic year 2007-2008.

How to make representations

Representations can be made to Maggie Heaps Adult Education Co-ordinator at Hartlepool Adult Education, Golden Flatts, Seaton Lane, Hartlepool. Tel 01429 292340 or via e-mail Maggie.Heaps@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Maggie Heaps as above.

PART THREE – CHILDREN’S SERVICES DEPARTMENT

A. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

NONE

B. SCHEDULE OF KEY DECISIONS

DECISION REFERENCE: ED32/07 PLAY STRATEGY

Nature of the decision

To approve the Play Strategy.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services.

Timing of the decision

The decision is due to be made in March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

- Play Partnership
- Consultation with young people taken place October 2007
- Initial consultation with Stakeholders taken place Sept 06 - Dec 06
- Consultation with Stakeholders on draft strategy to take place Feb 06

Information to be considered by the decision-makers

Children's Services Play Strategy.

How to make representations

Representations should be made to Danielle Swainston, Early Years Manager, Level 3, Civic Centre, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY, 01429 523671, e-mail danielle.swainston@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Danielle Swainston who can be contacted as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: ED33/07 ADMISSIONS POLICY 2008/09

Nature of the decision

To determine the Admissions Policy for community and controlled schools in Hartlepool for the academic year 2008/2009.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in March 2007

Who will be consulted and how?

A consultation exercise involving all schools in Hartlepool and the local authorities in surrounding areas ended on 31st December. Further consultation was required as a result of changes in the Admissions Code of Practice which will end 1st March 2007. A consultative body, the Hartlepool Admissions Forum will consider the proposed policy and comments from the consultation exercise in their meeting on 1st March 2007.

Information to be considered by the decision-makers

The Portfolio Holder will receive a report setting out comments made by school governing bodies and others on the proposal for the school admission policy for 2008/09.

How to make representations

Representations should be made to Anne Smith, Head of Information, Planning and Support Services at the address below by 1st March 2007.

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Anne Smith, Head of Information, Planning and Support Services, Children's Services, Civic Centre, Level 3, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY or telephone (01429) 523724, email: anne.smith@hartlepool.gov.uk

DECISION REFERENCE: ED34/07 SCHOOLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME OF WORKS 2007/2008

Nature of the decision

To approve the Schools Capital Programme of Works for the Children's Services Department for 2007/08.

Who will make the decision?

Children's Services Portfolio Holder.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

- Officer meetings to consider condition issues and determine priorities;
- Headteachers and school representatives on issues relating to funding and priorities.

Information to be considered by the decision-makers

The portfolio report will outline the funding available for 2007/08 and put forward a list of proposals/projects for inclusion in the works programme for that year.

How to make representations

Representations should be made to Alan Kell, Asset Manager, Children's Services Department, Level 4, Civic Centre, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY. Telephone: 01429 523051. E-mail: alan.kell@hartlepool.gov.uk.

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Alan Kell as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: ED35/07 BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE: OUTCOMES OF STAGE 2 CONSULTATION

Nature of the decision

To decide next steps in the Building Schools for the Future process in the light of outcomes of the Stage 2 Consultation.

Who will make the decision?

Cabinet will make the decision.

Timing of the decision

The decision is due to be made on 19th March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

- All schools and colleges;
- Parents;
- Children and young people;
- Neighbourhood Forums;
- Ward Councillors;
- Lifelong Learning Partnership;
- Hartlepool Partnership;
- Key stakeholders and partner organisations;
- Voluntary and community sector.

Information to be considered by the decision-makers

Report on Stage 2 Consultation outcomes with recommendations for further progress.

How to make representations

Representations should be made to Paul Briggs, Assistant Director of Children's Services, Level 4, Civic Centre, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY, 01429 284192, e-mail paul.briggs@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information on this matter can be sought from Paul Briggs who can be contacted as above.

PART FOUR - NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENT

A. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

NONE

B. SCHEDULE OF KEY DECISIONS

DECISION REFERENCE: NS100/06 MIDDLETON GRANGE SHOPPING CENTRE MULTI STOREY CAR PARK

Nature of the decision

To consider potential further phases of maintenance requirements of the Multi Storey Car Park and the possibility of future ownership and operation.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by Cabinet with referral to Council in relation to funding and future arrangements.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

Full Council
Shopping Centre Owners

Information to be considered by the decision makers

At its meeting on 15 May 2006 Cabinet was advised of the Council's liability in respect of repairs at this property and the risk of substantial funding being required to remedy the situation. Urgent Phase 1 works amounting to £179,000 were agreed and subsequently approved by full Council. Cabinet now need to consider further works identified in the original report, together with a business case on the future of the multi-storey car park and its relationship with the shopping centre. There is an allowance included in the capital programme for the next two years and the content and phasing of the necessary works will be highlighted together with associated risks and development / ownership issues both now and in the future.

How to make representation

Representations should be made to Graham Frankland, Head of Procurement & Property Services, Neighbourhood Services Department, Leadbitter Buildings, Stockton Street, Hartlepool. Tel 01429 523211. E Mail graham.frankland@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Graham Frankland, as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: NS101/06 SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN II

Nature of the decision

To examine the complete SMP II document and consider whether to adopt the outcomes of the strategy document as they affect the Hartlepool coastline. Under Defra guidelines, SMP plans are updated and amended every five years.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by Cabinet.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in April 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

Consultation will be extensive: All Members
Public Town wide
All Statutory Consultees
All interested Organisations and parties

Information to be considered by the decision makers

Background will be provided in respect of the SMP II and how it would affect Hartlepool. The SMP II will be a large document that looks at the overall strategic management of the coastal processes over the next hundred years and covers the area from the river Tyne in the north to the Humber estuary in the south. There will be a need to focus in on those parts of the document that only affects the Hartlepool coastline.

How to make representation

Representations should be made to Alastair Smith, Head of Technical Services, Neighbourhood Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool. Tel: 01429 523802. Email: alastair.smith@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Alan Coulson, Engineering Manager, Neighbourhood Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool. Tel: 01429 523242. Email: alan.coulson@hartlepool.gov.uk or Dave Thompson, Principal Engineer, Neighbourhood Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool. Tel: 01429 523245. Email: dave.thompson@hartlepool.gov.uk

DECISION REFERENCE: NS103/06 TEES VALLEY AND SOUTH DURHAM NHS LIFT.

Nature of the decision

To consider further the services to be located and the relevant land transactions on the Town Centre NHS LIFT site including methods of funding and the Council's involvement in this process.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by Cabinet with possible referral to full Council if there are any budget and policy framework implications.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

NHS LIFT Company and Hartlepool PCT.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

At its meeting on 14 August 2006 Cabinet considered outstanding land transactions and potential funding options. This report will look at the progress of the land transactions, including the Hoardings site on the corner of Park Road and Waldon Street, the arrangements for the former Barbws and St Benedicts Hostel Site and consider how any potential funding options could work. Hartlepool PCT and the LIFT Company have now advanced their plans on services to be located on the site and a revised timetable. The planning and development processes will also be covered.

How to make representation

Representations should be made to Graham Frankland, Head of Procurement & Property Services, Neighbourhood Services Department, Leadbitter Buildings, Stockton Street, Hartlepool. Tel 01429 523211. E Mail graham.frankland@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Graham Frankland, as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: NS106/06 REVIEW OF CONCESSIONARY FARE PAYMENTS TO BUS OPERATORS FOR 2007-2008

Nature of the decision

To agree a revised re-imbusement arrangements with local bus operators for the provision of free concessionary travel for the over 60's and disabled for the period 1st April 2007 to 31st March 2008.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by Cabinet.

Timing of the decision

The decision will be made in March 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

Consultation will take place with the bus operators and will be co-ordinated on a Tees Valley level with a local agreement determined from this dialogue.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

Information on the operation of the existing concessionary local travel scheme and details of the proposed revised re-imbusement arrangements negotiated with local bus operators.

How to make representation

Information on the operation of the existing concessionary local travel scheme and details of the proposed revised re-imbusement arrangements negotiated with local bus operators.

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Ian Jopling as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: NS108/06 5-YEAR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME FOR 2007-2012

Nature of the decision

To agree the 5 year Highway Maintenance Programme for 2007-2012

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Leisure, Culture and Transportation Portfolio Holder

Timing of the decision

The decision will be made in March 2007

Who will be consulted and how?

There will be no direct consultation. The programme is established using the results of condition survey that are undertaken on an annual basis. This means that those roads and footpaths that are in most need of repair are prioritised and receive that most cost effective treatment to prevent their further deterioration and thus reduce the possibility of third party liability claims at a future date.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

The report will provide the background as to the testing methods utilised to identify the condition of a highway and identify which highways in the town will be included in the five-year programme based on the test results

How to make representation

Representations should be made to Mike Blair, Transportation and Traffic Manager, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone: 01429 523252. Email: mike.blair@hartlepool.gov.uk.

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Mike Blair as above.

PART FIVE - REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES **DEPARTMENT**

A. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

1. THE PLANS AND STRATEGIES WHICH TOGETHER COMPRISE THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North East is currently under preparation. A Public Examination was held between 7th March and 7th April, 2006. The Panel appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination in Public (EiP) has submitted its report, which is now published for information only. The report, which can be downloaded from the Government Office website (www.go-ne.gov.uk), has been printed and circulated to local authority officers and libraries by the Northeast Assembly, and was reported to Cabinet and the Hartlepool Partnership in October. Any proposed modifications which the Secretary of State wishes to make will subsequently be published (originally scheduled for January 2007, but apparently now delayed until February/March), and there will be a 8 week period of consultation on these changes thereafter. It is anticipated that the RSS will now be formally adopted in the Summer of 2007.

The Hartlepool Local Plan review has now been completed, the new plan being adopted by Council on the 13th April 2006.

With the enactment of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, a new development plan system has come into force. There are still two tiers of development plan, but in due course the Regional Spatial Strategy will replace the structure plan, and development plan documents contained within a local development framework will replace the local plan. However, the new local plan will be saved for a period of at least three years after adoption.

The Local Development Framework will comprise a 'portfolio' of local development documents which will provide the framework for delivering the spatial planning strategy for the borough. Local development documents will comprise:

- a) Development plan documents – (part of the development plan) which must include
 - o A core strategy setting out the long term spatial vision for the area and the strategic policies and proposals to deliver the vision
 - o Site specific allocations and policies
 - o Generic development control policies relating to the vision and strategy set out in the core strategy, and
 - o Proposals Map
- b) Supplementary planning documents

In addition, the Local Development Framework will include Minerals and Waste Development Plan documents. Cabinet on the 12th April 2006 endorsed the principle of

the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee taking responsibility for the initial preparation of Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents on behalf of the Borough Council and the other four Tees Valley authorities. It is likely that the JSC will consider the initial Issues and Options Report in March, 2007, with public consultation on these in May.

Work has started on two supplementary planning documents (SPD's) one on Transport Assessments and Travel Plans and the other on Planning Obligations. Drafts of these SPDs will be presented to Cabinet for approval for public consultation purposes in June and in October respectively.

Initial preparatory work has also started on The Core Strategy DPD, and various studies including the Local Housing Assessment and the Open Space and Sports Facilities Audit which will provide the evidence base for developing the issues and options for the Core Strategy are currently being undertaken. Regular reports will be made to Cabinet on progress on the Core strategy and approval will be sought for the Issues and Options Report for public consultation in September/October 2007. As the key spatial planning objectives for Hartlepool to be set out in the Core Strategy should be fully aligned with the priorities identified in the Community Strategy, it is proposed to co-ordinate this consultation with the consultation on the final draft of the Community Strategy.

The other documents within the local development framework which must be prepared but which do not form part of the development plan are:

- a) Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) setting out how and when the Council will consult on planning policies and planning applications;
- b) Local Development Scheme (LDS) setting out a rolling programme for the preparation of local development documents, and
- c) Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) assessing the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which current planning policies are being implemented.

- a) The Statement of Community Involvement was adopted by the Council on the 26th October, 2006.
- b) The first Local Development Scheme (LDS) as approved by Cabinet came into effect on 15th April 2005. The Scheme was updated and the revised LDS came into effect on 28th July 2006.

The Local Development Scheme will continue to be updated annually as necessary to take into account completion of documents, the need to revise timetables and the need to include new documents. The next update reflecting the adoption of the SCI, the revision to the timetables for the Core Strategy DPD and Planning Obligations SPD on Transport Assessments and Travel Plans will be submitted to the Government Office (GONE) before 1st April 2007.

- c) The first two Annual Monitoring Reports (for 2004-5 and 2005-06) as agreed by Cabinet are available on the Hartlepool website. Cabinet agreement to the third AMR covering the period 2006-07 will be sought in November 2007..

2. THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY

Background

Part 1 of the Local Government Act 2000 places on principal Local Authorities a duty to prepare "Community Strategies" for promoting or improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of their areas, and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the UK.

Government guidance issued in December 2000 stated that Community Strategies should meet four objectives. They must:

- Allow local communities (based upon geography and/or interest to articulate their aspirations, needs and priorities;
- Co-ordinate the actions of the Council, and of the public, private, voluntary and community organisations that operate locally;
- Focus and shape existing and future activity of those organisations so that they effectively meet community needs and aspirations; and
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development both locally and more widely, with local goals and priorities relating, where appropriate, to regional, national and even global aims.

It also stated that a Community Strategy must have four key components:

- A long-term vision for the area focusing on the outcomes that are to be achieved;
- An action plan identifying shorter-term priorities and activities that will contribute to the achievement of long-term outcomes;
- A shared commitment to implement the action plan and proposals for doing so;
- Arrangements for monitoring the implementation plan, for periodically reviewing the Community Strategy and for reporting progress to local communities.

The Hartlepool Partnership, the town's Local Strategic Partnership, and the Council agreed a draft Community Strategy in April 2001 and adopted a final version in April 2002.

Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy Review 2006

The current Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy is part of the Community Strategy though published as a separate 70 page document. The Strategy sets out the boundaries of Hartlepool's disadvantaged neighbourhoods – and establishes a Neighbourhood Renewal Area. Neighbourhood Renewal is about narrowing the gap between conditions in the disadvantaged communities and the rest of the town. It is therefore important that the Neighbourhood Renewal Area is kept as tightly defined as possible and is based upon the statistical level of disadvantage.

The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy sets out the intention to prepare Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) in the Borough's disadvantaged Neighbourhoods and provides a policy framework for this development. These NAPs are now in place and provide a more detailed policy framework for improvements in the disadvantaged neighbourhoods than was available in 2002.

Review 2006

Hartlepool's Community Strategy set out a timetable for review in five years. In line with this agreement, the Community Strategy Review 2006 was launched on 5th May 2006.

The timetable and structure for the Community Strategy Review 2006 was agreed by the Regeneration & Liveability Portfolio Holder and the Hartlepool Partnership in April 2006:

	Timetable	Task
Phase 1	5 th May 06 – 31 st July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review current Strategy and prepare a new Strategy • Members' Seminar
Phase 2	Sept – 17 November 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet 11th September • Hartlepool Partnership 5th September • Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee 15th September
Phase 3	Jan-March 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members' Seminar 12th Sept • Hartlepool Partnership 19th January • Cabinet 22nd January • Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee 9th February • Cabinet 19th March • Hartlepool Partnership 23rd March • Council 19th April

Phase 2

The 1st consultation draft of the revised Community Strategy, *Hartlepool's Ambition*, was published in September 2006. Consultation on the draft ran until 17th November. The revised strategy builds on the 2002 strategy and sets out a revised policy framework for Hartlepool. Key revisions include:

- The strategy now incorporates the previously separately published Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (2002) and the Sustainable Development Strategy (2001);
- The vision has been revised along with many of the Priority Aims and Objectives;
- Housing and Environment are established as Priority Aims in their own right and as a result the number of priority aims has increased from 7 to 8;
- Changes to the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy boundary, including the addition of the disadvantaged part of Throston ward.

Phase 3

Consultation on the first draft has now closed with a wide range of responses being received including feedback from residents, Theme Partnerships, public bodies and statutory consultees. Initial analysis shows strong support for the revised vision, aims and objectives. More detailed analysis is currently being carried out.

The first draft set out the intention to carry out a number of appraisals on the draft strategy to highlight practical ways to enhance the positive aspects of the Strategy and to remove or minimise any negative impacts. The appraisals outlined were:

- Sustainability Appraisal
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC)
- Health Impact Assessment
- Section 17
- Rural Proofing
- Diversity Impact Assessment.

The European Directive 2001/42/EC requires assessments for plans which “set a framework for future development consent of projects”, “determine the use of small areas at a local level” or which “are minor modifications to plans only where they are determined to be likely to have a significant environmental effects”. At the time of writing the first draft Community Strategy, it was not clear if a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) would be required and an undertaking was made to seek further advice as to potential compliance with the Directive.

This initial advice has now been sought, and it is clear that where a plan or policy sets a framework for future development consent of projects the Directive applies. The draft Community Strategy does indeed identify development areas including Hartlepool Quays and the Southern Business Zone and as a result, it is likely that the Directive will apply to the Strategy’s preparation.

Carrying out a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not a simple or quick process and as a result, it will not be possible to keep to the original timetable of adoption of the revised Community Strategy by April 2007. A revised timetable, agreed by Cabinet is now:

- Preparation of SEA Environmental Report May 2007
- Consultation on report May– July
- Testing of draft Community Strategy against SEA objectives August 2007
- Publication of revised draft Community Strategy September 2007
- Adoption of new Community Strategy December 2007

3. LOCAL AGENDA 21 STRATEGY

Hartlepool Borough Council agreed its Local Sustainable Development Strategy (Local Agenda 21 Strategy) in January 2001. The Strategy aimed to:

“achieve improvements in the quality of our lives without causing irreversible damage to the environment or preventing our children from being able to enjoy the benefits we have today”.

In 2005 the Government published Securing the Future - UK Government sustainable development strategy, updating the 1999 Strategy. The new Strategy outlines a pivotal role for local authorities and their partners, through Local Strategic Partnerships, in delivering sustainable communities. The Strategy states that:

Making the vision of sustainable communities a reality at the local level means sending the right signals to local Government about the importance of sustainable development, supporting strong local leadership and developing the right skills and knowledge. Government will work with its partners to develop toolkits and other materials to support Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) in developing and delivering Sustainable Community Strategies which help deliver sustainable development in the UK.

In response to this guidance, the revised Community Strategy incorporates a revised local Sustainable Development Strategy. As a result it is proposed to remove the Local Agenda 21 Strategy from the Council's Budget and Policy Framework at the point when the revised Community Strategy is adopted by Council.

4. THE ANNUAL YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN

The Annual Youth Justice Plan is required to be submitted to the Youth Justice Board by 30th April 2007. Therefore, an Issues paper will be submitted to Cabinet on 19th February 2007. Consultation with statutory organisations and other partners will be presented to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 16th March 2007 for their consideration. Cabinet will consider the final draft Plan, which will have incorporated consultation comments, on 2nd April 2007. Final approval of the Plan will be sought from Council on 19th April, 2007.

B SCHEDULE OF KEY DECISIONS

DECISION REFERENCE: RP89/05 DEVELOPMENT AT HARTLEPOOL COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

Nature of the decision

Cabinet are requested to consider further details of the HCFE expansion and development plans, including the potential proposed land take at the Council owned, Albert Street Car Park, design issues, funding sources and project timetable. The report will also provide details of the most recent HCFE Property Strategy, due to be completed June 2006, which will shape the College's future development options.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by Cabinet.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in March 2007, or following the completion of the HCFE Property Strategy.

Who will be consulted and how?

Officers have been working closely with Hartlepool College of Further Education (HCFE) and other partner organisations including University of Teesside and the Learning and Skills Council.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

The report will expand on information presented in two previous reports to Cabinet on the 04/04/05 and 22/07/05, and also extracts from the Town Centre Strategy, in order to progress the development of the Collegescheme.

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone 01429 523401, email peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Peter Scott as above.

DECISION REFERENCE: RP113/06 RIFT HOUSE/BURN VALLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP) UPDATE

Nature of the decision

To endorse the Rift House/Burn Valley Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) Update.

Each of the Neighbourhood Action Plans across the town (Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, Burbank, Rift House/Burn Valley, Owton, Rossmere and North Hartlepool) are being updated, in the order in which they were developed. In addition to this, it should be noted that the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme is currently developing a NAP for the NDC area.

The Rift House/Burn Valley Neighbourhood Action Plan is the third NAP to be updated following the completion of the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange NAP Update in November 2006, and the completion of the Burbank NAP Update in January 2007.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in April 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

The first draft of the Neighbourhood Action Plan Update will be developed following the initial community consultation event which is to be held in February 2007. The community consultation event will be crucial in identifying the community's priority concerns and the actions required to address the concerns. Household survey data (MORI 2006) and other baseline data and statistics will also be examined in order to provide an understanding of the conditions in the Rift House/Burn Valley area. These statistics will also be included within the plan.

To complement this, comprehensive consultation will also be undertaken to ensure comments are received from key stakeholders and residents on the first draft of the NAP. Further consultation will include:-

- Delivering a newsletter to every household in the area;
- Visiting Residents Associations in the Rift House/Burn Valley area;
- Visiting the Rift House/Burn Valley Forum;
- Visiting Youth Groups operating throughout the area;

Holding community drop-in sessions at various community buildings; in both the Rift House Ward and the Burn Valley Ward;

- Visiting and working with pupils from local schools;
- Liaising with Hartlepool Community Network and Housing Hartlepool;
- Meeting with key service providers including; Hartlepool Borough Council Officers, Housing Hartlepool, Cleveland Police, Voluntary / Community Groups, Ward Councillors and representatives from the Theme Partnerships; and
- Taking the first draft of the plan to the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder, Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership for comment.

The final draft will then be circulated for comment to ensure that all amendments have been incorporated and reflected accurately.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

A copy of the Rift House/Burn Valley Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) Update along with a summary document highlighting the priority concerns, and the actions to address these will be available for consideration by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder. The Rift House/Burn Valley NAP Update will also be considered for endorsement by the Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership.

The document will be structured in a way that is intended to give a clear picture of the strong themes running through the Neighbourhood Action Plan back to the Community Strategy and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

The introductory section will cover the background to Neighbourhood Action Plans, a brief description of the Rift House/Burn Valley neighbourhood, how the Rift House/Burn Valley NAP Update has been developed, a summary of the community's main concerns and how the NAP will be monitored.

The plan will comprise the seven theme areas:- Jobs and Economy; Lifelong Learning and Skills; Health and Care; Community Safety; Environment and Housing; Culture and Leisure and Strengthening Communities. Each theme will include key statistics, the strengths and weaknesses, of the neighbourhood and the gaps in service delivery which need to be addressed. Alongside this will be a table which identifies the community's priority concerns, the actions that are required to address the concerns, a timescale to address each action, the organisations who need to be involved in delivering the actions, possible funding and resources, and, how the actions will contribute to addressing strategic targets (such as the Local Area Agreement Indicators).

The plan will also include a section which outlines the key resources and programmes delivered in the area/accessible to residents of the Rift House/Burn Valley area. The last section of the plan will be a Jargon Buster.

Neighbourhood Action Plans are important in encouraging local people and organisations to work together to narrow the gap between the most deprived wards and the rest of the country, and they should be influential in the future allocation of resources. The objective of the (NAP) is to integrate policies at the local level to improve the way that services are provided.

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel. 01429 523401, e-mail. peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk.

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Gemma Clough, Principal Regeneration Officer, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel. 01429 523598, e-mail. gemma.clough@hartlepool.gov.uk.

DECISION REFERENCE: RP 115/06 HARTLEPOOL COMPACT REVIEW

Nature of the decision

To agree a revised Compact between the Council and the Hartlepool Voluntary and Community Sector

The Compact will build on the Compact previously agreed by Cabinet in January 2003 and the findings of the Best Value Review of Strengthening Communities, the Strategic Improvement Plan for which was agreed by Cabinet in September 2006.

Who will make the decision?

The Compact is to be approved by Cabinet and will need to be prepared and agreed in partnership with the Voluntary and Community Sector.

Timing of the decision

Early drafts of the revised Compact could be available by June 2007. However the formal Cabinet decision making process thereafter will formally be dictated by the Project Plan timetable (see below).

Who will be consulted and how?

A Project Plan for reviewing, revising and re-launching the Hartlepool Compact will be drawn up with the Voluntary and Community Sector including the proposed consultation mechanisms. Preliminary discussions on the proposed Compact Review have already commenced with the Hartlepool and Voluntary Development Agency (HVDA) and will be extended to the Community Network including involvement of Council Members and Officers.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

A draft version of the proposed new Compact will be prepared for consideration by Cabinet. The revised Compact will represent a Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and the voluntary & community sector in Hartlepool concerning working relations and priority commitments

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration & Planning Services, Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone: 01429 523401, Email: peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration, Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone: 01429 523597, Email: geoff.thompson@hartlepool.gov.uk

DECISION REFERENCE: RP116/06 TEES VALLEY UNLIMITED

Nature of the decision

To endorse the proposed decision-making structures for Tees Valley Unlimited.

In May 2006 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government asked the Tees Valley Local Authorities to prepare a City Region Business Case based on the City Region Development Programme (CRDP) produced in 2005. The document was closely aligned to the requirements of the Northern Way Growth Strategy with the intention of improving economic competitiveness within the Tees Valley.

The Business Case, and then a more detailed supporting Tees Valley Investment Plan providing further details of the proposed programmes and projects and associated funding requirements, was agreed by Cabinet at its meetings on 11th September and 9th October 2006 respectively.

To help deliver the intended improved economic performance within the Tees Valley there are proposals for the creation of a Tees Valley Metropolitan Economic Partnership, with the current working title Tees Valley Unlimited. These new arrangements in the Tees Valley could also have a critical role in negotiating any future Metropolitan Area Agreement to set the resources available and the outcomes and outputs expected to be achieved.

Tees Valley Unlimited would then provide leadership and co-ordination to drive forward the CRDP and arrangements for the management and delivery of the projects within the Metropolitan Area Agreement. This would be done through a Leadership Board comprising Mayors and Leaders of the Tees Valley Authorities plus representatives from the private/third sector. Other supporting component groups of Tees Valley Unlimited may include an Executive/Programme Group, plus Member/Officer Groups for the functional areas of Planning & Economic Strategy, Transport, Employment & Skills, Housing and Tourism. There may also be a Private Sector Business Group and City Region Policy Forum to provide private sector input and shared policy direction with County Durham and North Yorkshire authorities respectively.

Who will make the decision?

The creation of Tees Valley Unlimited will need to be supported by Central Government and approved potentially by the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee. Cabinet will be requested to endorse the proposed decision-making structures for Tees Valley Unlimited – along with other Tees Valley Authorities – as part of the overall adoption process.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in April 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

The proposals for Tees Valley Unlimited are being prepared within the overall context of production and development of the Tees Valley Business Case and developed in consultation with the Tees Valley local authorities, the Joint Strategy Unit, ONE NorthEast, GO-NE and other relevant agencies.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

A draft version of the proposed new Tees Valley Unlimited Structures, including Terms of Reference, Composition and Accountability will be prepared for consideration by Cabinet.

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration & Planning Services, Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone: 01429 523401, Email: peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration, Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone: 01429 523597, Email: geoff.thompson@hartlepool.gov.uk

Please note that this key decision has now transferred over to the Regeneration and Planning Services Department

DECISION REFERENCE: NS104/06 SELECTIVE LICENSING OF PRIVATELY RENTED HOUSES

Nature of the decision

To consider the merits of introducing selective licensing for landlords and managers or privately rented houses.

Who will make the decision?

The Cabinet will make the decision.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in May 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

- Residents in the North Central and West Central regeneration areas – individual questionnaires and drop-in sessions.
- Residents in appropriate areas of private housing outside those areas – individual questionnaires.
- Residents groups through presentations at their meetings plus completion of questionnaire on behalf of the group.
- Landlords – questionnaires.
- Agencies – NDC, Hartlepool Revival, Housing Hartlepool.
- HBC sections dealing with housing and anti-social behaviour.
- Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum is currently investigating the performance and operation of private sector rented accommodation and landlords. Recommendations are expected to be finalised by spring 2007.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

- The data concerning the criteria which must be met to designate selective licensing, i.e. to show that an area is in 'low demand' or likely to be in 'low demand', or that significant or persistent anti-social behaviour, requires action through licensing.
- The information collected from residents, landlords and officers on the extent of the problems and the suitability of selective licensing to tackle them.
- Formulate a guide as to which areas might be appropriate for licensing.

How to make representation

Representations should be made to John Smalley, Principal EHO (Housing), Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel: 01429 523322. Email: john.smalley@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Joanne Burreley, Senior EHO (Housing), Regeneration & Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel: 01429 523324. Email: joanne.burreley@hartlepool.gov.uk

DECISION REFERENCE: RP117/06 CENTRAL HARTLEPOOL AREA NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP)

Nature of the decision

The Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder will be asked to endorse the Central Hartlepool Area Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) for the New Deal for Communities (NDC) Area.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in April 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

The first draft of the Neighbourhood Action Plan has been developed following the initial community consultation event and the community drop-in sessions in October 2007. The community consultation event and drop-in sessions were crucial in identifying the community's priority concerns and the actions required to address the concerns. Household survey data (MORI 2006) and other baseline data and statistics have also been examined in order to provide an understanding of the conditions in the Central Hartlepool Area (New Deal for Communities Area). These statistics will also be included within the plan.

To complement this, comprehensive consultation will also be undertaken to ensure comments are received from key stakeholders and residents on the first draft of the NAP. Further consultation will include:-

- Information in the NDC Newsletter delivered to every household in the Central Hartlepool area;
- Meetings with all Residents Associations in the Central Hartlepool area;
- Consideration by the NDC Youth Forum;
- Consideration by the NDC Neighbourhood Panel and NDC Steering Group;
- Meeting with key service providers including; Hartlepool Borough Council Officers, Housing Associations, Cleveland Police, Voluntary/Community Groups, Ward Councillors and representatives from the Theme Partnerships; and
- Taking the first draft of the plan to the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder, Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership for comment

The final draft will then be circulated for comment to ensure that all amendments have been incorporated and reflected accurately.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

A copy of the Central Hartlepool Area Neighbourhood Action Plan will be available for consideration by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder. The Central Hartlepool Area NAP will also be considered for endorsement by the Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership.

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel. 01429 523401, e-mail. peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk.

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Malcolm Walker, Programme Director, New Deal for Communities, 79 Park Road, Hartlepool, TS24 7PW. Tel. 01429 894046, e-mail. mwalker@ndc-hartlepool.org.uk.

DECISION REFERENCE: RP118/06 SEATON CAREW TOURISM STRATEGY REVIEW

Nature of the decision:

To endorse the review of the Seaton Carew Tourism Strategy.

Who will make the decision?

The decision will be made by the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing.

Timing of the decision

The decision is expected to be made in April 2007.

Who will be consulted and how?

The Seaton Carew Tourism Strategy was completed in 2003 to cover the period 2003 to 2008 and endorsed by Cabinet in Oct 2003. As part of the development of the Strategy a wide ranging consultation process took place including:

- meetings to discuss the development of the Strategy with the Seaton Carew Advisory Group (SCRAG);
- a questionnaire distributed to all Seaton Households; and
- information events to allow the public to feed in ideas and comments.

The Strategy review will involve a similar consultation process.

Information to be considered by the decision makers

The Strategy identifies a vision which is underpinned by eight key objectives; these objectives have been translated into a series of action points within the document. The decision makers will be asked to consider the progress made in delivering these action points and endorse any further proposals to support the vision and objectives of the strategy.

How to make representation

Representations can be made in writing to Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Telephone 01429 523401, email peter.scott@hartlepool.gov.uk

Further information

Further information can be obtained from Andy Golightly, Principal Regeneration Officer, Regeneration and Planning Services Department, Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT. Tel 01429 284099, email andrew.golightly@hartlepool.gov.uk.

APPENDIX 1

DETAILS OF DECISION MAKERS

THE CABINET

Many decisions will be taken collectively by the Cabinet.

- The Mayor, Stuart Drummond
- Councillor Cath Hill
- Councillor Ray Waller
- Councillor Pamela Hargreaves
- Councillor Victor Tumilty
- Councillor Robbie Payne
- Councillor Peter Jackson

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

Members of the Cabinet have individual decision making powers according to their identified responsibilities.

Regeneration, Liveability and Housing	-	The Mayor, Stuart Drummond
Without Portfolio	-	Councillor Cath Hill, Deputy Mayor
Adult and Public Health Portfolio	-	Councillor Ray Waller
Children's Services Portfolio	-	Councillor Pamela Hargreaves
Culture, Leisure and Transportation Portfolio	-	Councillor Victor Tumilty
Finance Portfolio	-	Councillor Robbie Payne
Performance Management Portfolio	-	Councillor Peter Jackson

APPENDIX 2

TIMETABLE OF KEY DECISIONS

Decisions are shown on the timetable at the earliest date at which they may be expected to be made.

1. DECISIONS EXPECTED TO BE MADE IN MARCH 2007

1.1 19 MARCH 2007

ED35/07 (Pg 14)	BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE: OUTCOMES OF STAGE 2 CONSULTATION	CABINET
-----------------	---	---------

1.2 DATE NOT YET DETERMINED

CE23/06 (Pg 6)	PAY AND GRADING STRUCTURE	CABINET
ED32/07 (Pg11)	PLAY STRATEGY	CABINET
ED33/07 (Pg 12)	ADMISSIONS POLICY 2008/09	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
ED34/07 (Pg 13)	SCHOOLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME OF WORKS 2007/2008	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
NS100/06 (Pg 16)	MIDDLETON GRANGE SHOPPING CENTRE MULTI STOREY CAR PARK	CABINET
NS103/06 (Pg 18)	TEES VALLEY AND SOUTH DURHAM NHS LIFT	CABINET
NS106/06 (Pg 19)	REVIEW OF CONCESSIONARY FARE PAYMENTS TO BUS OPERATORS FOR 2007 – 2008	CABINET
NS108/06 (Pg 20)	5 YEAR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME FOR 2007 – 2012	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
RP89/05 (Pg 27)	DEVELOPMENT AT HARTLEPOOL COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION	CABINET

2. DECISIONS EXPECTED TO BE MADE IN APRIL 2007

2.1 DATE NOT YET DETERMINED

NS101/06 (Pg 17)	SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN II	CABINET
RP113/06 (Pg 28)	RIFT HOUSE/BURN VALLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP) UPDATE	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
RP116/06 (Pg32)	TEES VALLEY UNLIMITED	CABINET
RP117/06 (Pg 36)	CENTRAL HARTELOOL AREA NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
RP118/06 (Pg 38)	SEATON CAREW TOURISM STRATEGY REVIEW	PORTFOLIO HOLDER

3. DECISIONS EXPECTED TO BE MADE IN MAY 2007

3.1 DATE NOT YET DETERMINED

NS104/06 (Pg 34)	SELECTIVE LICENSING OF PRIVATELY RENTED HOMES	CABINET
------------------	---	---------

4. DECISIONS EXPECTED TO BE MADE IN JUNE 2007

4.1 DATE NOT YET DETERMINED

SS44/07 (Pg 8)	ADULT EDUCATION FEES	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
SS45/07 (Pg 9)	ADULT EDUCATION 3 YEAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN	PORTFOLIO HOLDER
RP115/06 (Pg 31)	HARTLEPOOL COMPACT REVIEW	CABINET

SCRUTINY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Assistant Chief Executive, Chief Solicitor, Chief Personnel Officer and Chief Financial Officer

Subject: CORPORATE PLAN 2007/08: PROPOSED OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide the opportunity for the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee to consider the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the Corporate Plan 2007/08.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Government introduced the Best Value regime as part of its programme to modernise local government and the Corporate (Best Value Performance) Plan for 2007/8 must be approved and published by the Council by 30 June 2007. This is the Council's top-level corporate plan. It sets out the Council's top priorities and contributions for delivering the Community Strategy aims in 2007/8.
- 2.2 The Corporate Plan is an important document because it formally communicates the council's vision and priorities. The process for producing the plan has been designed to ensure the risk is minimised and that the Corporate Plan is fit for purpose.
- 2.3 The focus of the Corporate Plan for 2007/8 is on priority activities for improvement at a strategic level rather than day to day service delivery objectives. The operational service delivery objectives are picked up through Departmental service plans which are reported to individual portfolio holders.
- 2.4 At a meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 19 January 2006 it was agreed that the Corporate Plan proposals should be considered by each of the Scrutiny Forums. Each Scrutiny Forum will see the proposals relating to the Community Strategy themes that fall under their remit.
- 2.5 There are a number of objectives that do not fall under the remit of the Scrutiny Forums and are attached at **Appendix A**, to give Coordinating Committee the opportunity to consider and comment on the proposals.

- 2.6 The Council's CPA Corporate Assessment report is due to be published on the 13th March. The proposals, at appendix A, may be changed to reflect any improvements identified in the report. Cabinet and Scrutiny Coordinating Committee will be given further opportunities to comment on the proposals prior to the Corporate Plan being agreed by Council in June.
- 2.7 The comments/observations of each Forum will be fed back to the meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to be held on 23 March and will be used to formulate the formal Scrutiny response to Cabinet on 16 April 2007.

3 THE CORPORATE PLAN

- 3.1 As in previous years the plan will be produced in two parts. Part 1 describes the Council's overall aim, contributions to the Community Strategy aims and organisational development priorities.
- 3.2 Part 2 will continue to contain the detailed supporting information relating to performance statistics which the Council is required to publish. This will include the Best Value performance indicators for 2006/07 and targets for 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10. This information can not be collected until after 31 March 2007, and is therefore not available at present.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee:-
- (a) considers the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the 2007/08 Corporate Plan as attached at **Appendix A**.

Contact Officers: - Andrew Atkin – Assistant Chief Executive
Tel: 01429 523003
Email: andrew.atkin@hartlepool.gov.uk

Tony Brown – Chief Solicitor
Tel: 01429 523003
Email: tony.brown@hartlepool.gov.uk

Joanne Machers – Chief Personnel Officer
Tel: 01429 523003
Email: joanne.machers@hartlepool.gov.uk

Mike Ward – Chief Financial Officer
Tel: 01429 523003
Email: mike.ward@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

Appendix A – Proposed Objectives and Actions for inclusion in 2007/08 Corporate Plan

Strengthening Communities

Ref	Objective	Actions	Responsible Officer	Associated PIs
SCO4	Increasing financial resources within family environments to provide improved lifestyle opportunities	Undertake community engagement programme to raise awareness and accessibility to financial support	John Morton	LAA SC16 LAA SC17 LAA SC18

Organisational Development

Ref	Objective	Actions	Responsible Officer	Associated PIs
ODO1	Continued development of service planning and performance management arrangements	Complete updated 2008/09 Corporate Plan		
		Procure and implement new Performance Management Database		
		Propose improvements to service planning process for 2008/09		
		Manage achievement of continuous improvement		
ODO2	Implement Risk Strategy to ensure robust risk management arrangements are in place	Maintain and review risk management arrangements		
ODO3	Develop and improve the effectiveness of the overview and scrutiny process	To continue to raise the profile of the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Function	Charlotte Burnham	
		Compilation and Delivery of the Scrutiny Work Programme 2007/08	Charlotte Burnham	
		To implement the extended powers to Scrutiny as outlined in the Police and Justice Act 2006	Charlotte Burnham	

Ref	Objective	Actions	Responsible Officer	Associated PIs
		To further enhance the knowledge of Non-Executive Members serving on the Overview and Scrutiny Committees	Charlotte Burnham	
		Evaluate the work/added value to the Overview and Scrutiny arrangements in Hartlepool	Charlotte Burnham	
ODO4	Development of Statement on Internal Control and Governance arrangements	Co-ordinate SIC Work Programme	Noel Adamson	
ODO5	Put in place arrangements to ensure the structure of the authority and support arrangements are fit for purpose	Identify and implement structures appropriate to delivering high quality efficient services	Joanne Machers	
		To ensure a strategic approach to the control and management of property through the change management process and beyond	Graham Frankland	
ODO6	Ensure arrangements in place to deal with new and existing legislation	Implement new and existing legislation	Tony Brown	
		Continue to develop and implement the ethical framework through revisions to the Member code of Conduct and the introduction of an Officers Code	Tony Brown	
ODO7	Develop and Implement Efficiency Strategy	Implement 5 year Procurement Plan	Graham Frankland	
		Review and further develop integrated Efficiency Strategy	Mike Ward	
ODO8	Develop the Contact Centre to increase the range of services provided	Develop the single point of access	Christine Armstrong	
		Develop links with partner organisations including voluntary and community sector	Christine Armstrong	
		Develop and agree communication arrangements	Christine Armstrong	

Ref	Objective	Actions	Responsible Officer	Associated PIs
ODO9	Implement the Communicating with your Council plans	Implement Corporate Communications Strategy Action Plan	Alastair Rae	
		Implement the Corporate Consultation Strategy Action Plan	Liz Crookston	
		Implement the Corporate Complaints Strategy Action Plan	Liz Crookston	
		Improve Customer Care and Service Delivery	Christine Armstrong	
ODO10	Enhance Equality and Diversity arrangements and mainstream into all council activities	Improve Equality and Diversity Leadership and Corporate Commitment	Vijaya Kotur	BVPI 2a BVPI 2b
		Improve Consultation, Community Development and Scrutiny	Vijaya Kotur	
		Improve Service Delivery and Customer Care	Vijaya Kotur	
ODO11	Implement Elected Member Development Strategy	Further develop the skills and knowledge of Elected Members	Julie Wilson	
		Assess and develop the ICT skills of Elected Members to support e-democracy??	Julie Wilson	
		Continue the commitment made to working towards the North East Charter for Member Development	Joanne Machers	
ODO12	Implement the People Strategy and the Workforce Development Strategy	Implement plans to Develop & Promote Active, Visible and Effective Leadership	Lucy Armstrong	BVPI 11a-c BVPI 12 BVPI 16a+b NEW HR1 NEW HR2
		Implement plans to Continually Improve What We Do	Wally Stagg	
		Implement plans to Develop Skills of the Workforce	Lucy Armstrong	
		Implement plans to Promote Healthy Working	Rachel Clark	

Ref	Objective	Actions	Responsible Officer	Associated PIs
		Implement plans to Effectively Recognise, Engage and Reward the Workforce	Wally Stagg	
		Implement plans to Effectively Use Resources & Invest in the Future	Lucy Armstrong	
ODO13	Implement Pay and Grading and Single Status arrangements	Implement Revised Pay and Grading Structure	Joanne Machers	
		Implement revised Single Status Conditions of Service	Joanne Machers	
ODO14	Delivery of the ICT Strategy to support corporate objectives	Review of ICT Strategy to ensure links with other corporate objectives	Joan Chapman	NEW CS1 NEW CS2 NEW CS3
		Identification and delivery of programme of priority projects	Joan Chapman	
ODO15	Develop Strategic Financial Plans	Develop robust Strategic Planning Framework	Mike Ward	

Associated Performance Indicators

Reference	Description
LAA SC16	Number of Council Tax Disabled Reliefs (performance expected with reward)
LAA SC17	Number of Council Tax Carer Reductions (performance expected with reward)
LAA SC18	Number of Council Tax Severely Mentally Impaired Reductions (performance expected with reward)
BVPI 2a	The equality standard for local government in England
BVPI 2b	Duty to promote race equality
BVPI 11a	Percentage of top 5% earners that are women
BVPI 11b	Percentage of top 5% earners from black and minority ethnic communities

Reference	Description
BVPI 11c	Percentage of top 5% earners who has a disability
BVPI 12	Number of working days lost due to sickness absence
BVPI 16a	Percentage of disabled employees
BVPI 16b	Percentage of economically active disabled community population
NEW HR1	Age
NEW HR2	Gender
NEW CS1	Number of website hits
NEW CS2	Number of online transactions
NEW CS3	Number of permanent and ad hoc home workers established

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Assistant Chief Executive

Subject: YOUR BUSINESS AT RISK – AUDIT COMMISSION SURVEY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Portfolio Holder with background to the Councils information security work and the results of the Audit Commission's survey on information security.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Information security is the term given to a range of processes that help protect information from unauthorised use. With the Council's ever increasing reliance on the availability of information coupled with the need to ensure information is held securely a requirement to audit the Councils approach to information security was identified. Because of this the Audit Commission were invited to review the Council's information security arrangements, late in 2005. In response to the findings of the review a number of policies and procedures were developed and rolled out across the Council.

2.2 This year the Audit Commission have carried out a follow up survey relating to Council staff knowledge of information security and associated policies and procedures. In addition due to its importance in ensuring information remains confidential and available, information security has also recently been integrated into the planning and performance management arrangements for the Council.

3. FINDINGS OF THE AUDIT COMMISSION SURVEY

3.1 Attached, as **Appendix 1**, is the Audit Commission report on the your business at risk survey. The main conclusions of the report were:

3.1.1 That overall "there appears to be a high level of understanding by IT users of IT risks and information security"

3.1.2 That council staff scored highly and better than the national average in most areas of the survey.

3.1.3 That “systems, policies and procedures are in place to minimise IT risks”.

3.2 In summary the findings are that the majority of Council staff are familiar with the issues around information security.

4. COUNCIL RESPONSE

4.1 For the Audit Commission survey the Council scores higher than the national average. There are, however, a small number of policy areas where staff awareness could be an issue and we are continuing to raise awareness of the policies through user groups, Management Matters, Newline and the Intranet.

4.2 Ensuring information is held securely and is available when needed, is inherent in the authority’s overall approach to planning and performance management and in the portfolio holder’s portfolio. The information security policies and procedures, in conjunction with the Councils risk management strategy will ensure that members and staff will have information available to support them in their roles. The Audit Commission report confirms that the process the Council has adopted in informing staff about information security and its impact is being effective. To ensure that awareness of information security issues continues at this level and indeed increases, support for the information security process is sought from the Portfolio holder.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 That the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee:

- i. notes the report of the Audit Commission;
- ii. notes that information security is an inherent part of the Performance Management Portfolio; and
- iii. supports the Councils current approach to information security

Your Business @ Risk Survey

Hartlepool Borough Council

Audit 2006-2007

External audit is an essential element in the process of accountability for public money and makes an important contribution to the stewardship of public resources and the corporate governance of public services.

Audit in the public sector is underpinned by three fundamental principles:

- auditors are appointed independently from the bodies being audited;
- the scope of auditors' work is extended to cover not only the audit of financial statements but also value for money and the conduct of public business; and
- auditors may report aspects of their work widely to the public and other key stakeholders.

The duties and powers of auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are set out in the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1999 and the Commission's statutory Code of Audit Practice. Under the Code of Audit Practice, appointed auditors are also required to comply with the current professional standards issued by the independent Auditing Practices Board.

Appointed auditors act quite separately from the Commission and in meeting their statutory responsibilities are required to exercise their professional judgement independently of both the Commission and the audited body.

Status of our reports to the /Council

The Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies issued by the Audit Commission explains the respective responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body. Reports prepared by appointed auditors are addressed to members or officers. They are prepared for the sole use of the audited body. Auditors accept no responsibility to:

- any officer in their individual capacity; or
- any third party.

Copies of this report

If you require further copies of this report, or a copy in large print, in braille, on tape, or in a language other than English, please call 0845 0560566.

© Audit Commission 2006

For further information on the work of the Commission please contact:

Audit Commission, 1st Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SW1P 4HQ

Tel: 020 7828 1212 Fax: 020 7976 6187 Textphone (minicom): 020 7630 0421

www.audit-commission.gov.uk

Contents

Introduction	4
Main conclusions	4
Appendix 1 – Detailed survey results	8

Introduction

- 1 The growth of the e-agenda, the anticipated increase in the use of new technologies, greater public access and more joined up working also means increased risks for public sector bodies. Computer viruses, IT fraud, hacking, invasion of privacy and downloading of unsuitable material from the internet remain real threats to many organisations. Confidence in technologies that are influencing the way we live and work is being eroded and organisations must address these issues if the increased use of new technology is not to be matched by a similar increase in IT abuse.
- 2 An Audit Commission's report, published in 2005, concluded that although organisations have got better at establishing anti-fraud frameworks, cultures and strategies, failures in basic controls are still a problem and the upsurge in the use of newer technologies has not been matched by enhanced security measures.
- 3 The Audit Commission has developed an online survey, designed to help organisations to:
 - raise awareness of the risks associated with their increasing use of technology;
 - gauge the level of knowledge within their organisations of such risks;
 - highlight areas where risks are greatest; and
 - take positive action to reduce risks.
- 4 In partnership with Hartlepool BC, we ran the online survey in late July 2006. This brief report summarises the responses by staff at Hartlepool (see Appendix 1) and indicates where further action is necessary.

Main conclusions

- 5 Our conclusions are based upon responses from around 350 staff at Hartlepool BC. Overall results are very positive. In many of the areas covered by our survey, there appears to be a high level of understanding by IT users of IT risks and security.
- 6 In most areas, the council scores highly and better than the national average - as indicated by the Commission's national database which currently contains almost 15,000 responses from around 80 public sector organisations. The key message from the survey is that, systems, policies and procedures appear to be in place to minimise IT risks.
- 7 Key messages are also shown below (see Table 1) together with those areas where Hartlepool might improve its current arrangements. These have been discussed and agreed with officers.

Table 1 Key messages

A brief summary of responses to our survey.

Positive messages	Areas requiring attention	Suggested action
Business disruption risk		
<p>Most users (92 per cent) think that the council takes the threat of virus infection very seriously. Virus protection software is installed on machines and regularly updated. Procedures for reporting virus infections are clear and only 3 per cent (nationally 13 per cent) claim to have suffered a virus infection on their machine.</p>	<p>Virus protection software is updated automatically when staff log on. Fewer staff are aware of this process.</p> <p>An ICT Noticeboard on the council's intranet has been used in the past to alert staff when new viruses are discovered but 40 per cent of staff are unaware of this.</p>	<p>Inform staff.</p>
<p>Password use and maintenance follows best practice. Individual machines and the council's network require the use of username and password for access. Password changes are enforced.</p>	<p>None.</p>	

Positive messages	Areas requiring attention	Suggested action
Financial loss risk		
<p>A high percentage (80 per cent) claim they have access to the information they need to do their job (national average 78 per cent).</p> <p>The council has been clear in telling staff what rules exist regarding private use of IT facilities – 96 per cent say they have been informed (national average 88 per cent).</p> <p>Staff are prevented from copying software from and to their machines.</p>	<p>Over half of respondents are not aware of the existence or content of the council's anti-fraud strategy.</p> <p>A small minority (3 per cent) of users are allowed – they claim – to copy software onto or from their machines.</p>	<p>Inform staff.</p> <p>Check this out.</p>
Reputational damage risk		
<p>A very high proportion of IT users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • know that their internet activity is monitored; • know that the downloading of unsuitable material and misuse of personal data is a disciplinary matter; • have access to internet and email usage protocols; and • know that the use of unlicensed software is prohibited. 	<p>Over half of respondents are not aware of the procedures that prevent very large files and executable programs from reaching them through email or how these files may be released.</p> <p>Over half of respondents do not know that HBC has a data protection officer.</p> <p>Levels of awareness of information related legislation vary.</p>	<p>Review quarantine processes and inform staff.</p> <p>Inform staff.</p> <p>Review whether staff training programmes provide appropriate coverage.</p>

Positive messages	Areas requiring attention	Suggested action
Loss of user confidence risk		
An Information Security Policy is available on the council's intranet.	Only half of respondents are aware of the existence of an information security policy and their responsibilities.	Improve communication.

Source: Audit Commission

Appendix 1 – Detailed survey results

Table 2 Which Department do you work in? (only complete if agreed by your Authority/Trust)

Department name	Percentage (%)
Department 1	32%
Department 2	18%
Department 3	0%
Department 4	19%
Department 5	16%
Department 6	2%
Department 7	12%
Department 8	0%
Department 9	1%

Table 3 The risk of business disruption

Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Not Applicable (%)
My organisation takes the threat of a virus infection very seriously.	92%	0%	8%	0%
Virus protection software is installed on my machine.	91%	0%	8%	0%
Virus protection software is regularly updated on my machine.	40%	3%	57%	0%
I have been given clear instructions about dealing with emailed files from external sources.	77%	14%	9%	0%
I am sent an alert when new viruses are discovered and am told what to do and what not to do.	57%	23%	17%	2%
I know how to report a virus infection if I suffer an infection on my machine.	78%	16%	6%	0%
I have suffered a virus infection on my machine.	3%	91%	5%	1%
Whenever I have suffered a virus infection, my machine was cleansed and restored quickly.	4%	1%	7%	88%
To log on to my machine I must enter a user name and password.	99%	0%	0%	0%
To log on to my organisation's network I must enter a user name and password.	94%	4%	1%	0%
I am forced to change my password by the system on a regular basis, for example, every month.	99%	1%	0%	0%
To access the computers and systems I use to do my job I must remember more than two passwords.	86%	13%	0%	0%
I have not written my password(s) down.	75%	25%	0%	0%
I am not authorised to enter our computer rooms.	34%	15%	37%	14%

Table 4 The risk of financial loss

Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Not Applicable (%)
My organisation has an anti-fraud strategy.	40%	0%	59%	0%
I know what the key elements of the strategy are.	18%	31%	44%	7%
I only have access to the information I need to do my job.	80%	11%	8%	1%
I am prevented from installing any software on my machine.	84%	3%	12%	0%
I am prevented from copying software from my machine.	72%	3%	25%	0%
My computer is clearly security-marked.	83%	6%	11%	0%
I know what are my organisation's rules are covering private use of IT facilities and in particular what is and what isn't acceptable.	96%	1%	2%	1%

Table 5 The risk of reputational damage

Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Not Applicable (%)
I am allowed access to the internet only by connections provided by my organisation.	91%	5%	4%	0%
I have been informed that my access to the internet will be monitored.	91%	5%	3%	0%
It has been made clear to me that my organisation's policy is that accessing or storing unsuitable material is a disciplinary matter.	99%	1%	0%	0%
Emails sent to me from outside my organisation that contain very large files or executable programs etc are prevented from reaching me.	39%	10%	50%	1%
I have access to written protocols covering email usage and language.	87%	4%	9%	0%
I have been informed by my organisation that the use of unlicensed software is prohibited.	86%	7%	6%	0%
I am prevented from installing software on my machine.	83%	3%	14%	1%
Internal Auditors or IT staff in my organisation have checked the software on my machine.	50%	4%	46%	1%
My organisation has a documented data protection policy.	85%	0%	15%	0%
My organisation has appointed a data protection officer.	51%	1%	49%	0%
I have been required to sign a confidentiality undertaking as part of my conditions of service.	59%	23%	18%	1%
My responsibilities under the Data Protection Act have been explained to me.	76%	16%	7%	0%

Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Not Applicable (%)
I have been informed that the misuse of personal data will be treated as a disciplinary offence by my organisation.	87%	6%	6%	1%
My PC is automatically timed out after a short period of inactivity and my password and user name must be entered to resume the session.	97%	3%	0%	0%

Table 6 I am aware of the implications of the following legislation

Legislation	Percentage (%)
The Computer Misuse Act	40%
The Freedom of Information Act	90%
The Human Rights Act	67%
The Public Interest Disclosure Act	29%
The Data Protection Act	93%

Table 7 Loss of public or user confidence

Statement	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Not Applicable (%)
My organisation has an Information Security policy.	64%	0%	36%	0%
I have been provided with a copy of the policy.	39%	31%	26%	4%
I have been informed about the policy and what I must and must not do.	50%	26%	21%	4%
Senior management in my organisation is committed to the policy and its observance.	49%	1%	48%	1%
I know where to find written procedures for reporting a security incident.	47%	31%	22%	0%
Someone in my organisation is specifically responsible for IT security.	63%	1%	35%	0%

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Assistant Chief Executive

Subject: DATA QUALITY – AUDIT COMMISSION

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide scrutiny co-ordinating committee with the results of the Audit Commissions work on data quality.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Audit Commission have, this year, introduced an audit of data quality. This is a new development for the Audit Commission but data quality, due to its importance in demonstrating and measuring success, has always be integrated into the planning and performance managements arrangements for the Council.

3. FINDINGS OF THE AUDIT COMMISSION

3.1 Attached, as **Appendix 1**, is the Audit Commission report on data quality. The findings of this are covered on page 6 of the attached report.

3.2 In summary the findings are; that management arrangements, with identified roles and responsibilities and systems are in place; operational guidance is in place, updated and communicated; there is some inconsistency in approach between departments; there is no stated data quality policy.

4. COUNCIL RESPONSE

4.1 The Audit Commission report identifies one recommendation which we will implement in a manner which is consistent with our overall approach, which is to ensure that our data is accurate.

4.2 It is worthwhile bearing in mind that whilst there are developments identified in the report from the Audit Commission that as an authority our Best Value Performance Plan (Corporate Plan) has never been

qualified and whilst there are developments required each year (both in terms of definitions of performance measures and additional mandatory measures) that these are incorporated smoothly and effectively.

- 4.3 A report dealing with this matter and actions to address the recommendations of the Audit Commission will be submitted to the Portfolio Holder for Performance Management.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 That Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee:
- i. note the report of the Audit Commission
 - ii. note that there will be a report to the Performance Management Portfolio holder to address the identified recommendation.

Audit Summary Report

November 2006



Data Quality

Hartlepool Borough Council

Audit 2006/2007

External audit is an essential element in the process of accountability for public money and makes an important contribution to the stewardship of public resources and the corporate governance of public services.

Audit in the public sector is underpinned by three fundamental principles:

- auditors are appointed independently from the bodies being audited;
- the scope of auditors' work is extended to cover not only the audit of financial statements but also value for money and the conduct of public business; and
- auditors may report aspects of their work widely to the public and other key stakeholders.

The duties and powers of auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are set out in the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1999 and the Commission's statutory Code of Audit Practice. Under the Code of Audit Practice, appointed auditors are also required to comply with the current professional standards issued by the independent Auditing Practices Board.

Appointed auditors act quite separately from the Commission and in meeting their statutory responsibilities are required to exercise their professional judgement independently of both the Commission and the audited body.

Status of our reports to the Council

The Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies issued by the Audit Commission explains the respective responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body. Reports prepared by appointed auditors are addressed to members or officers. They are prepared for the sole use of the audited body. Auditors accept no responsibility to:

- any member or officer in their individual capacity; or
- any third party.

Copies of this report

If you require further copies of this report, or a copy in large print, in Braille, on tape, or in a language other than English, please call 0845 056 0566.

© Audit Commission 2006

For further information on the work of the Commission please contact:

Audit Commission, 1st Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SW1P 4HQ

Tel: 020 7828 1212 Fax: 020 7976 6187 Textphone (minicom): 020 7630 0421

www.audit-commission.gov.uk

Contents

Summary report	4
Introduction	4
Background	4
Audit approach	5
Main conclusions	5
The way forward	5
Detailed report	6
Stage 1 - Reviewing management arrangements for data quality	6
Stage 2 - Completeness check	7
Stage 3 - Data quality checks	8
Appendix 1 - Data quality checks	9
Appendix 2 - Dimensions of good quality data	11
Appendix 3 - Action plan	12

Summary report

Introduction

- 1 Good quality data is the essential ingredient for reliable performance and financial information used to support decision making. The data used to report on performance must be fit for purpose, representing an organisation's activity in an accurate and timely manner. At the same time there must be a balance between the use and importance of the information, and the cost of collecting the required data to the necessary level of accuracy.
- 2 The purpose of this report is to provide feedback following our assessment of Hartlepool Borough Council's (the Council) corporate management arrangements for data quality.
- 3 The results of this work will contribute to our conclusion under the Code of Audit Practice on the Council's arrangements to secure value for money. The work relates specifically to the arrangements for 'monitoring and reviewing performance, including arrangements to ensure data quality'.

Background

- 4 This review represents a significant change in our approach to the audit of performance information. There are a number of underlying reasons for this change, as follows.
 - Increasing reliance is being placed on performance information, eg to manage services, inform users, account for performance, and as a basis of taking decisions. The weight attached to published performance indicators as the basis for reducing the burden of regulation has increased and the need for reliable data has therefore become more critical. There remains however a prevailing lack of confidence in much performance data.
 - The quality of financial information is higher than for performance information. Finance data is collected according to professional accounting rules, and subjected to strong internal controls and a formal audit regime. Conversely the internal controls for recording and preparation of the underlying performance data are often less developed.
 - There is often less ownership of performance information by those charged with governance.

Audit approach

- 5 Our review of management arrangements for data quality has three stages:
 - Stage 1 Management arrangements;
 - review of overall management arrangements to secure data quality.
 - Stage 2 Completeness check;
 - arithmetic check (variance, plausibility and range) of calculations for a sample of BVPIs; and
 - the timing, number and extent of these checks will be determined nationally by the Audit Commission following their review of the data.
 - Stage 3 Data quality spot checks; and
 - In-depth review of a sample of performance indicators.

Main conclusions

- 6 The Council has overall arrangements in place to ensure data quality, particularly in respect of BVPIs but there is a need to formalise arrangements.
- 7 Our detailed data quality checks have found that the processes in place to secure good data quality for the PIs we reviewed are generally effective.

The way forward

- 8 The issues raised within this report will be discussed with officers to provide them with timely feedback and to assist them in formulating an action plan to further improve data quality arrangements in future years.

Detailed report

Stage 1 - Reviewing management arrangements for data quality

Key questions

- 9 Stage one of the approach is the review of management arrangements. The review considered five areas, as follows.
 - **Governance and leadership:** is there a corporate framework of management and accountability for data quality, with a commitment to securing a culture of data quality throughout the Council?
 - **Policies and procedures:** are there appropriate policies and procedures in place to secure the quality of data recorded and reported by the Council?
 - **Systems and processes:** has the Council put in place systems and processes which secure the quality of data as part of the normal business activity of the Council?
 - **People and skills:** has the Council put in place arrangements to ensure that staff have the appropriate knowledge, competencies and capacity for their roles in relation to data quality?
 - **Data use:** has the Council put in place arrangements that are focused on ensuring that data supporting performance information is also used to manage and improve the delivery of services?

Findings

- 10 Management arrangements are in place to secure the quality of data supporting performance information at a corporate level. This is achieved through the definition of key roles and responsibilities at a corporate and departmental level and the establishment of systems and processes to produce required outcomes.
- 11 Operational guidance, in place to support performance information, is updated on a regular basis and communicated to responsible officers in an effective manner. Performance data is sourced mainly from operational systems which provide a sound basis for good quality data.
- 12 The requirement for good data quality is embedded within established procedures at an operational and corporate level and as such is not explicitly stated. However, there is no data quality policy and there is little or no specific reference to data quality in any corporate documents. The lack of a corporate framework for data quality has led to some inconsistency of approach across the various departments. There are examples of very good practice (Children's Services) where data quality standards are clearly stated and enforced. In some other areas of the Council the approach is not so robust.

Recommendation

- R1 The Council needs to ensure that minimum data quality standards are in place and consistently applied in all areas. This needs to incorporate:*
- specifically stated data quality responsibilities at member, senior officer and operational level; and*
 - defined data quality objectives and monitoring processes to be applied consistently across all departments.*

Stage 2 - Completeness check

- 13** This stage was completed in two parts. The Audit Commission centrally specified a number of PIs, which are shown in Appendix 1.
- 14** The first part of the work undertaken included local auditor's carrying out checks on the specified PIs. This included:
- a variance analysis against previous years' data; and
 - review of the data and comparison against our audit knowledge.
- 15** The second part of the work undertaken at this stage was the Audit Commission's central PI team carrying out completeness checks on all of the BVPI data not reviewed by the local auditors. This included the following.
- a variance analysis against;
 - previous years' data held on EDC (where available);
 - the authority's peer group;
 - plausibility checks on the submitted data; and
 - a range analysis.
- 16** The Audit Commission will centrally raise and follow up any queries arising from their own checks.
- 17** We undertook the work to be carried out locally and fed the results into our selection of PIs for detailed data quality checks at stage three.

Stage 3 - Data quality checks

- 18 Stage 3 of the approach involved reviewing a number of PIs in detail. They were selected from the list of PIs specified by the Audit Commission, as shown in Appendix 1, based on a risk assessment and the local work we undertook at stage two.
- 19 The objectives of testing a particular PI are to determine whether it has been fairly stated in accordance with the Audit Commission's criteria. That the:
 - source data has been assessed against the six data quality dimensions as shown in Appendix 2 (completeness, accuracy, reliability, validity, relevance and timeliness) as applicable;
 - source data is correctly represented in the PI;
 - correct definition has been used; and
 - correct calculation method has been used.
- 20 The outcome of our work at stage three is summarised in Appendix 1. Overall, our findings at stage three supported our findings and conclusions at stage one of the work that the processes in place for the PIs reviewed are generally effective.

Appendix 1 - Data quality checks

Table 1 Specified PIs and work undertaken at stage 3

The table shows the PIs specified centrally by the Audit Commission for stage 2 completeness testing by local auditors, and also the outcome of our work at stage 3.

PIs specified by the Audit Commission centrally for local completeness checks at stage 2	Work at stage 3 undertaken on this PI?	Outcome of work at stage 3
BVPI 109 a/b/c: Speed of processing planning applications	Yes	We did not identify any data quality issues in our audit of this PI.
BVPI 215: Speed in fixing traffic lights	No	~
BVPI 165: Pedestrian crossings suitable for the disabled	Yes	We did not identify any data quality issues in our audit of this PI.
BVPI 102: Bus patronage	No	~
BVPI 82 a/b: Recycling/composting of waste	Yes	We did not identify any data quality issues in our audit of this PI.
BVPI 184a: Non decent homes	No	~
BVPI 183 a/b: Use of B&B/Hostel accommodation	Yes	We did not identify any data quality issues in our audit of this PI.
PLS: Library satisfaction users 16 and over	No	~
PLS: Library stock turn	No	~
PLS: Library stock level	Yes	Our work identified that the definition had not been followed in the calculation of this PI. The incorrect cell on the CIPFA return was used in part of the PI calculation meaning that the PI reported was misstated. Officers agreed and the PI was amended.

10 Data Quality | Appendix 1 - Data quality checks

PIs specified by the Audit Commission centrally for local completeness checks at stage 2	Work at stage 3 undertaken on this PI?	Outcome of work at stage 3
IPF: Cost per library visit	No	~
HIP BPSA: Average re-let times	No, the Council is not required to calculate this PI.	~
HIP BPSA: Planned to responsive repairs	No, the Council is not required to calculate this PI.	~
KP12: Service users moved on in a planned way	No	~
HIP HSSA: Private sector homes vacant for more than 6 months	No	~
HIP HSSA: Repeat homelessness	Yes	Our work included agreeing the data underpinning the calculation of this PI to the Council's P1E returns. This found that the P1E returns had been superseded by more accurate data and as such the P1E returns submitted to the government department are now not accurate. As such the data submitted should be revised.
HIP HSSA: Private sector unfit properties made fit	No	~

Appendix 2 - Dimensions of good quality data

There are six dimensions of good quality data that is fit for purpose (Table 2). These dimensions can be used by public bodies and their partners to assess the quality of their data and address potential weaknesses.

Table 2 Dimensions of data quality

There are six key characteristics of good quality data

Dimension	
Accuracy	Data should be sufficiently accurate to present a fair picture of performance and enable informed decision-making at all appropriate levels. The need for accuracy must be balanced with the costs and effort of collection. A prerequisite is that definitions for data should be specific and unambiguous. The data must be at an appropriate level of detail to influence related management decisions, and must be within a reasonable margin of error.
Validity	Data should represent clearly and appropriately the intended result. Where proxy data is used, bodies must consider how well this data measures the intended result.
Reliability	Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods across collection points and over time, whether using manual or computer based systems or a combination. Managers and stakeholders should be confident that progress toward performance targets reflects real changes rather than variations in data collection methods.
Timeliness	Data must be available for the intended use within a reasonable time period. Data must be available frequently enough to influence the appropriate level of management decisions: for example, it may be appropriate to accept a small degree of inaccuracy where timeliness is important.
Relevance	The data reported should comprise the specific items of interest only. Sometimes definitions for data need to be modified to reflect changing circumstances in services and practices, to ensure that only relevant data of value to users is collected, analysed and used.
Completeness	All the relevant data should be recorded. Monitoring missing or invalid fields in a database can provide an indication of data quality and can also point to problems in the recoding of certain data items.

Source: Audit Commission

Appendix 3 - Action plan

Page no.	Recommendation	Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High	Responsibility	Agreed	Comments	Date
7	<p>R1 The Council needs to ensure that minimum data quality standards are in place and consistently applied in all areas. This needs to incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specifically stated data quality responsibilities at member, senior officer and operational level; and defined data quality objectives and monitoring processes to be applied consistently across all departments. 	2	Assistant Chief Executive	Y		31 January 2007

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

Subject: SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE –
PROGRESS REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the progress made to date of this Committee, since my last progress report to this Committee on 5 January 2007.

2. PROGRESS ON THE SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2006/07

2.1 I am pleased to report that following consultation with the Scrutiny Chairs and the Scrutiny Support Team, substantial efforts are being continued by the Overview and Scrutiny Committees to ensure the work programme for 2006/07 is delivered to the prescribed timescales.

2.2 Discussions have recently been held in relation to the practicalities of undertaking the additional referrals from Full Council and the North and South Neighbourhood Consultative Forums which will be subject to further discussion during this meeting.

3. GENERAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ISSUES

3.1 Scrutiny Members Development Programme for 2006/07 – To complete our Scrutiny Members Development Programme for 2006/07, a final training sessions was held for Officers on 25 January 2007. The purpose of the session was to introduce the role of the Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Function together with what would be expected of an Officer should they be subject to scrutiny involvement in the near future. The session was most informative, with approximately 21 officers in attendance.

3.2 Reflecting back on the four training sessions which were all very well attended, I feel this year's programme provided by INLOGOV has been very successful. Although it has been quite evident throughout the running of the programme that

there is a need to balance the academic view point against that of the practitioners.

- 3.3 Informal Meeting of the Scrutiny Chairs – Whilst the meeting scheduled for 9 February 2007 was cancelled, I am pleased to report that a further informal meeting of the Scrutiny Chairs was held on 27 February 2007. To ensure openness and transparency is maintained, I am pleased to inform Members that the following issues were discussed during the meeting:-
- (a) Recent referrals from Council/North and South Neighbourhood Consultative Forums – possible time-table and information gathering procedures;
 - (b) Progress / completion of the 2006 / 07 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme;
 - (c) Discussion on the criteria / usage of the dedicated budget to support the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Function in 2007/08;
 - (d) Discussion on the content of the 2007/08 Scrutiny Training and Development Programme 2007/08;
 - (e) Attendance at NEREO Joint Members/Officers Scrutiny Network by Scrutiny Chairs;
 - (f) Civic Centre Refurbishment / Use of Committee Rooms Update;
 - (g) CPA report and how best to carry the agenda forward; and
 - (h) CfPS Scrutiny Champion's Network – February 2007 Bulletin (Information Item).
- 3.4 Final Reports Recently Considered / Awaiting Consideration – At the time of writing this report the following Final Reports/Formal Responses were either awaiting consideration or had already been considered by the Authority's Cabinet or other Committees:
- (a) Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum's Formal Response to the Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) Consultation (Considered by the Cabinet on 5 February 2007);
 - (b) Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Formal Response to the Executive's Budget and Policy Framework Proposals for 2007/08 (Considered by the Cabinet on 5 February 2007);
 - (c) Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Formal Response 'Language Translation and Interpretation Services Scrutiny Referral - (Considered by the Performance Management Portfolio Holder on 26 February 2007); and the

- (d) Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Final Report 'Railway Approaches' (Considered by Cabinet on 5 March 2007).
- 3.5 Joint Cabinet/Scrutiny Event held on 28 February 2007 – You will recall that a further joint event was held successfully on 28 February 2007, issues discussed are as outlined overleaf:-
- (a) Managing Referrals from Cabinet / Council and other bodies to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the four standing Scrutiny Forums; and
 - (b) The discontinuation of the Authority's LGIU Membership / Extension to PublicNet Free Trial (in replace of an informal meeting being held between the Scrutiny Chairs, the Elected Mayor and the Portfolio Holder for Performance Management to determine what information was available to Elected Members and how Members were able to access it);
- 3.6 Members will have received under separate cover a brief note that reflects the discussion held during this event. As agreed the next meeting is to be held in May 2007 and Members will be notified in due course of the proposed date.
- 3.7 Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee Single Status Working Group - The Working Group is now meeting on a more frequent basis (13, 19 and 27 February 2007 and 7 March 2007) to gain an understanding / awareness on the Single Status Agreement Issues as they continue to progress and I will verbally report upon such progress made during the presentation of this report.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee notes the content of this report.

**COUNCILLOR MARJORIE JAMES
CHAIR OF SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Chair of the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum

Subject: CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM –
PROGRESS REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the progress made to date by the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum.

2. PROGRESS OF THE SCRUTINY FORUM

2.1 Since the Forum's last progress report to this Committee on 5 January 2007, the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum has undertaken the following work:-

2.2 The Children's Services Department: Budget and Policy Framework Consultation Proposals for 2007/08 – Following consideration of scrutiny's views on the initial consultation proposals for the Children's Services Department the Executive referred its finalised Budget and Policy Framework Proposals for 2007/08 back to scrutiny. Repeating the process previously indicated the proposals for each service department were referred to the appropriate scrutiny Forum.

2.3 The Children's Services Scrutiny Forum on the 8 January 2007 considered the Children's Services Department: Budget and Policy Framework Consultation Proposals for 2007/08. The views expressed were relayed to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 19 January 2007 and taken into consideration in the report submitted to Cabinet on the 5 February 2007.

2.4 Sex and Relationship Education – The Forum at its meeting on the 8 January 2007 scoped the process for consideration of its investigation into 'The Provision of Sex and Relationship Education in Hartlepool' and approved the Aim, Terms of Reference and Timetable for the investigation.

- 2.5 The Forum as part of its investigation has to date received evidence on the background of provision in Hartlepool and evidence from the UK Youth Parliament, Teesside Positive Action, PATCH and Relate. Work still to be undertaken includes the completion of a site visit to North Tyneside Council and a Focus Group Session with a selection of young people and teachers on the 15 March.
- 2.6 The timetable for completion of the investigation is on track with the investigation to be concluded at the meeting of the Forum on the 16 April 2007.
- 2.7 The Corporate Plan – At a meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 19 January 2007 it was agreed that the Corporate Plan proposals should be considered by each of the Scrutiny Forums. Each Scrutiny Forum will review the proposals relating to the Community Strategy themes that fall under their remit. Thus, the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum considered the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the Corporate Plan 2007/08 at its meeting on 26 March 2007. The views of the Forum are to be reported back to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 23 March 2007 and Cabinet on the 16 April 2007.
- 2.8 Six Monthly Progress Report - The Children's and Young People's Plan – The Children's Services Scrutiny Forum, at its meeting on the 7th February 2006, considered the second draft of the CYPP. During the course of this meeting a number of interim findings/conclusions were reached and the on the 26 February 2007 the Forum considered the first 6 monthly monitoring exercise on the outcomes of the finding/conclusions reached in relation to the Children & Young People's Plan (CYPP).
- 2.9 Following consideration of the information provided the Forum noted progress against its findings/conclusions.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee notes the progress of the Children's Services Scrutiny Forum.

**COUNCILLOR JANE SHAW
CHAIR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Chair of the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum

Subject: ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES AND HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM - PROGRESS REPORT

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To inform the Members of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the progress made to date by the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum.

2. PROGRESS OF THE FORUM

2.1 Since the last progress report was presented by the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 5 January 2007, the Forum has been involved in the following issues:-

(a) Scrutiny Investigation into Social Prescribing: The Forum has continued its in-depth investigation into Social Prescribing. Members received evidence from the Director of Adult and Community Services and the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health Services. The Forum has now concluded its evidence gathering and is due to consider the draft final report at its meeting on 29 March 2007.

(b) Health Scrutiny Support Programme – Foundation Status Seminar: The Forum has secured via the Centre for Public Scrutiny, five free days of support for Health Scrutiny. Following on from the successful delivery of the Annual HealthCheck training, a further element of Hartlepool's allocation was utilised in requesting the Centre to provide a facilitator to deliver a foundation trust seminar. The objective of the session was to enable Members to enhance their knowledge of what a Foundation Trust is and to highlight areas that the Forum would like to probe further during the scrutiny of the Trust's application. This session took place on 20 February 2007 and was facilitated by Linda Pepper, an independent consultant.

(c) Response to the Executive's Initial Budget and Policy Framework Consultation Proposals for 2007/08 –The Adult and Community Services

and Health Scrutiny Forum considered the Executive's finalised budget proposals for the Adult and Community Services Department on the 16 January 2007 and fed back to SCC according to the stipulated timescale. However, following contact from concerned members of the public, representation from ward councillors and other Forum Members, the Forum re-examined, with the agreement of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee, the budget proposal relating to the closure of Eldon Grove Community Sports Centre at its meeting on the 29 January 2007. Following debate and representations to the Forum from over 25 Members of the public, the Forum modified its recommendation in respect of closure and submitted an additional report to Cabinet at its meeting on 5 February 2007.

- (d) Response to the Executive's Consultation on Community Care Eligibility Criteria:- In January 2006 Cabinet agreed to consult on raising the Fair Access to Care Services eligibility criteria to "substantial" needs. This issue was referred to the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum for consideration. The Forum's views were fed into Cabinet on 5 February 2007.
- (e) Response to Hartlepool PCT's Consultation on HPCT's Proposed Management Arrangements: - The Forum submitted an interim report to Cabinet and HPCT on 9 October 2006 in relation to the PCT's proposed management arrangements. A formal response to this report was received by the Authority on the 18 December 2006. Forum Members considered the response at a meeting on 29 January 2007 and determined the basis for their response in the form of a final report. This will be considered at the Forum's meeting on the 29 March 2007.
- (f) HPCT Stakeholder Engagement on the Procurement of Additional Primary Medical Services: - The Forum received a presentation on this issue from HPCT at its meeting on 29 January 2007. A number of issues were raised in relation to the proposal and Members invited the PCT back to a future meeting of the Forum to present formal consultation proposals which will be received on the 29 March 2007. This consideration of Additional Primary Medical Services complemented a referral received by the South Neighbourhood Forum, which will be encompassed within the Forum's existing investigation.
- (g) Response to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Consultation on Corporate Plan (BVPP) 2007/08 – Proposed Objectives:- At a meeting of SCC held on 19 January 2007 it was agreed that the Corporate Plan proposals should be considered by each of the Scrutiny Forums. Each Scrutiny Forum will review the proposals relating to the Community Strategy themes that fall under their remit. Thus, the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum will consider the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the Corporate Plan 2007/08 at its meeting on 6 March 2007.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee notes the progress of the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum and approves the Forums request to encompass the South Neighbourhood Forum referral within its existing review.

COUNCILLOR GERALD WISTOW

**CHAIR OF ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES AND HEALTH SCRUTINY
FORUM**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM
– PROGRESS REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the progress made to date by the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

2. PROGRESS OF THE SCRUTINY FORUM

2.1 Since the Forum's last progress report to this Committee on 5 January 2007, the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum has undertaken the following work:-

2.2 The Corporate Plan – At a meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 19 January 2007 it was agreed that the Corporate Plan proposals should be considered by each of the Scrutiny Forums. Each Scrutiny Forum will review the proposals relating to the Community Strategy themes that fall under their remit. Thus, the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum considered the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the Corporate Plan 2007/08 at its meeting on 19 February 2007. The views of the Forum are to be reported back to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 23 March 2007 and Cabinet on the 16 April 2007.

2.3 Scrutiny Investigation into Public Convenience Provision in Hartlepool - The Forum, at its meeting on the 14 February 2007, received a report outlining progress against each of the recommendations made as part of its Public Convenience Provision investigation. Following consideration of the information provided the Forum noted progress against each of its recommendations.

- 2.4 The Neighbourhood Services Department: Budget and Policy Framework Consultation Proposals for 2007/08 – Following consideration of scrutiny's views on the initial consultation proposals for the Neighbourhood Services Department the Executive referred its finalised Budget and Policy Framework Proposals for 2007/08 back to scrutiny. Repeating the process previously indicated the proposals for each service department were referred to the appropriate scrutiny Forum.
- 2.5 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on the 10 January 2007 considered the Neighbourhood Services Department: Budget and Policy Framework Consultation Proposals for 2007/08. The views expressed were relayed to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the 19 January 2007 and taken into consideration in the report submitted to Cabinet on the 5 February 2007.
- 2.6 Private Sector Landlords – The Forum at its meeting on the 25 October 2006 commenced examination of the performance and operation of private sector rented accommodation, and landlords. At this meeting the Forum approved the Aim, Terms of Reference and Timetable for the investigation and received a brief 'Setting the Scene' report and presentation.
- 2.7 During the course of the investigation the Forum has received evidence from a wide variety of sources, including Housing Hartlepool, New Deal for Communities and the Rent Office. A focus Group was also held with residents, landlords and tenants and a site visit undertaken to Gateshead Council to observe their processes.
- 2.8 The Forum's final evidence gathering meeting was held on the 28 February 2007 and the timetable for completion of the investigation is on track with the Final Report to be considered for approval by the Forum on the 21 March 2007.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee notes the progress of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

**COUNCILLOR GERARD HALL
CHAIR OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services
Scrutiny Forum

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES
SCRUTINY FORUM - PROGRESS REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To inform the Members of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the progress made to date by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum.

2. PROGRESS OF THE FORUM

2.1 Since the last progress report from the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 5 January 2007:-

(a) The Forum met on 18 January 2007 to discuss the following items:-

(i) Railway Approaches – the Forum considered verbal evidence from Network Rail in response to the recommendations of its Draft Final Report. Members felt it was important to question representatives of Network Rail about the Forum's recommendations prior to agreeing their final report. Following discussions with Network Rail Members considered the Draft Final Report on Railway Approaches and made a couple of amendments to it. It was agreed that these amendments could be incorporated with the Chair's approval and that the Final Report should go to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 9 February 2007. Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee subsequently approved the report and it is scheduled to be considered by Cabinet on 5 March 2007.

(ii) Youth Unemployment – the Forum considered a Scoping Paper for its investigation into this issue. Following discussions by Members the Remit, Terms of Reference, Timetable and Sources of Evidence for the investigation were approved by the Forum.

(iii) Finalised Budget Proposals Consultation – following Scrutiny's consideration of the initial Budgetary Proposals (earlier in the Municipal Year) Members of the Regeneration and Planning

Services Scrutiny Forum were given the opportunity to comment on the Executive's finalised Budgetary Proposals 2007/08. Members of the Forum considered the proposals and the views expressed were referred to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 19 January and the views of Scrutiny were referred to Cabinet on 5 February 2007.

(b) The Forum met on 23 February 2007 to discuss the following items:-

- (i) Corporate Plan (BVPP) 2007/08 – Proposed Objectives – at a meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 19 January 2007 it was agreed that the Corporate Plan proposals should be considered by each of the Scrutiny Forums. Each of the Forums would comment on the Community Strategy themes that fall under their remit and feed these back to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, which in turn would form part of Scrutiny's formal response to Cabinet on 16 April 2007. Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum were supportive of the proposed objectives and actions for inclusion in the 2007/08 Corporate Plan.
- (ii) Role of Council Representatives in Decision Making on the Local Strategic Partnership – the Forum was requested to consider this item by the Constitution Committee given the work the Forum had undertaken in the previous Municipal Year through its Partnerships Investigation. Members of the Forum considered a briefing paper prepared by the Head of Community Strategy and agreed that they shared some of the concerns of the Constitution Committee in terms of the timing of decisions between the LSP and the Council. It was agreed that the Forum's comments would be forwarded to the next meeting of the Constitution Committee.
- (iii) Youth Unemployment – as part of the Forum's ongoing investigation into this issue representatives from Job Centre Plus and the Community and Voluntary Sector attended this meeting and made presentations to the Forum. In addition, written submissions of evidence were received from the Learning and Skills Council and Connexions. In addition, the Council's Economic Development service commissioned a detailed report on *Youth Unemployment in Hartlepool: Developing an evidence base*, which was fed into the Forum's evidence gathering. All the evidence gathered at this meeting will be fed into the Forum's draft final report.

2.3 The next meeting of the Forum on 22 March 2007 will include:

- (a) A discussion of the draft final report of the Forum on the Youth Unemployment Investigation;
- (b) Partnerships Investigation Six Monthly Progress Report; and
- (c) Youth Justice Plan.

3. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee notes the progress of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum.

**COUNCILLOR STEPHEN WALLACE
CHAIR OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- (i) Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum Agenda - 18 January 2007
- (ii) Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum Agenda 23 February 2007

SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

13 March 2007



Report of: Scrutiny Manager

Subject: CURRENT STATUS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2006/07

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of the current status of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2006/07 as the current Municipal Year draws to a close.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As Members will recall, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the four standing Scrutiny Forums set their individual annual work programmes back in June 2006. As per good practice, the Scrutiny Forums selected two investigations to form the basis of their work programmes, resulting in the flexibility to accommodate scrutiny referrals and budget and policy framework documents throughout the year, if required.
- 2.2 Whilst it has been extremely challenging to accommodate the additional scrutiny referrals along with the undertaking of the agreed work programmes, significant progress has been made in the overall delivery/completion of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2006/07.
- 2.3 As the end of the 2006/07 Municipal Year is nearing, the remainder of this report solely deals with the work currently being undertaken to deliver the overall Work Programme together with the consideration of the recent referrals to the Overview and Scrutiny Function.

3. STATUS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2006/07

3.1 Attached as **Appendix A** is a colour coded chart that outlines the current status of the Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for the 2006/07 Municipal Year.

3.2 Whilst the current capacity of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee and the four standing Scrutiny Forums is extremely tight in light of their current workload commitments, it is likely that the delivery of the four standing Scrutiny Forums' work programmes is achievable. With the exception to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, which currently has two scrutiny investigations outstanding as outlined below, as a result in the increase of the number of referrals undertaken by the Committee throughout the year:-

(a) Service Improvements – To consider how the Council's services are being improved in conjunction with the Efficiency Strategy; and

(b) The Authority's Use of Agency staff - To review the Authority's approach to the long-term use of agency workers.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE RECENT SCRUTINY REFERRALS TO THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY FUNCTION

4.1 As Members are aware, recent referrals have been made to the Overview and Scrutiny Function by the North and South Neighbourhood Consultative Forums and more so recently from the Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council as outlined below:-

(a) Referral made by the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum on 31 January 2007 in relation to the concerns raised about the current operation of the Authority's door to door recycling collection scheme, with the following remit (Note - acceptance / none acceptance of this referral is to be determined during this meeting):-

(i) to look at the way in which contractors carryout the work of recycling; and

(ii) to review the procedure specification on door to door collection of recycled material in light of the perception of dissatisfaction from Ward Councillors and Members of the public

(b) Referral made by the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum on 2 February 2007 in relation to ensuring the service mix being proposed at the Primary Care Centres in Hartlepool, starting with the Wynyard Road Primary Care Centre is reflective of local needs and aspirations; and the

- (c) Two-part Referral made by Full Council on 8 February 2007 in relation to the Acute Services Review:-
 - (i) The transportation links to the new Hospital site; and
 - (ii) The development of primary and community services in Hartlepool.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 Having outlined the current status of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme for 2006/07 together with the recent referrals made to the Overview and Scrutiny Function, it is recommended that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee:-
 - (a) Considers the practicalities of undertaking the recent Scrutiny Referrals during either this 2006/07 or the 2007/08 Municipal Year; and
 - (b) Determines whether the two outstanding work programme items of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee (Use of Agency Staff / Service Improvements) are still a priority for future consideration.

Contact Officer:- Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

