

CABINET ITEM COVERING SHEET PRO-FORMA

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

1 FEBRUARY 2007

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION

**Housing-Lead Cabinet Member – Councillor Leonard
Community Safety - Lead Cabinet Member – Councillor Kirton**

REVIEW OF CONCIERGE SECURITY SERVICE – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION

1. Summary

This report presents the outcome of consultation on proposed changes to the Concierge Security Service and proposes a way forward.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Cabinet approve the proposal to move to 'single crewing' at selected sites (Thornaby, Queen's Park and Kennedy Gardens/Dawson House) between 1 am and 7 am.

2.2 That applications for voluntary redundancy be processed in accordance with the Council's new redundancy policy, and subject to the usual checks and balances, including approval by the Cabinet Member for Resources.

3. Reasons for the Recommendations/Decisions

3.1 To achieve the necessary savings on the Housing Revenue Account, and to reflect the results of consultation with residents.

3.2 To ensure equitable treatment of applications.

4. Members' Interests

Members (including co-opted members with voting rights) should consider whether they have a personal interest in the item as defined in the Council's code of conduct (paragraph 8) and, if so, declare the existence and nature of that interest in accordance with paragraph 9 of the code.

Where a Member regards him/herself as having a personal interest in the item, he/she must then consider whether that interest is one which a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgment of the public interest (paragraph 10 of the code of conduct).

A Member with a prejudicial interest in any matter must withdraw from the room where the meeting is being held, whilst the matter is being considered; not exercise executive functions in relation to the matter and not seek improperly to influence the decision about the matter (paragraph 12 of the Code).

Further to the above, it should be noted that any Member attending a meeting of Cabinet, Select Committee etc.; whether or not they are a member of the Cabinet or Select Committee concerned, must declare any personal interest which they have in the business being considered at the meeting, and if their interest is prejudicial, they must also leave the meeting room during consideration of the relevant item.

AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO CABINET

1 FEBRUARY 2007

**REPORT OF CORPORATE
MANAGEMENT TEAM**

CABINET DECISION

**Housing-Lead Cabinet Member – Councillor Leonard
Community Safety - Lead Cabinet Member – Councillor Kirton**

REVIEW OF CONCIERGE SECURITY SERVICE – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION

1. Summary

This report presents the outcome of consultation on proposed changes to the Concierge Security Service and proposes a way forward.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet approve the proposal to move to 'single crewing' at selected sites (Thornaby, Queen's Park and Kennedy Gardens/Dawson House) between 1 am and 7 am.
- 2.2 That applications for voluntary redundancy be processed in accordance with the Council's new redundancy policy, and subject to the usual checks and balances, including approval by the Cabinet Member for Resources.

DETAIL

1. At its meeting on 2 November 2006 Cabinet endorsed in principle a proposed change to the Concierge Security Service, i.e. 'single crewing' at selected sites between 1 am and 7 am, and agreed to receive a further report on the outcome of consultation with residents and with workforce and trade unions.
2. The results of the consultation process for residents are attached in summary as Appendix A, and in more detail as Appendix B. The five main headings ('Strongly Support' to 'Strongly Oppose') show responses to the key question about how residents felt about the 'Single Crewing' proposal and the three sub-headings 'Yes', 'No', and 'N/A' show responses (or lack of response) to the supplementary question about willingness to pay an increase in the service charge of approximately £4 per week as an alternative to single crewing. Responses were received from 269 households of the 754 consulted, a response rate of 36%. Members will note that a clear majority of respondents supported the 'single crewing' proposal, with:
- 153 respondents (56%) expressing support
 - 50 respondents (19%) expressing a neutral position
 - 66 respondents (25%) expressing opposition

3. When analysed by type of residents, there was a majority in favour of the proposal among each of the three groups, i.e. tenants in receipt of full Housing Benefit, rent-paying tenants, and leaseholders. When analysed by block, a majority of respondents in seven of the eight blocks included in the consultation process (Anson House, Hudson House, Hume House, Nolan House, Kennedy Gardens 1, Kennedy Gardens 3 and Dawson House) were in favour of the proposal. Respondents in the remaining block (Kennedy Gardens 2) were equally divided between supporters and opponents of the proposal (14 of each).
4. In relation to the consultation with the workforce, all employees within the Service (including the four supervisors) were individually surveyed about their preferences. In addition, letters were sent to UNISON (representing 22 of the 43 individuals concerned) and GMB (representing five individuals), and two briefing sessions were held, which all employees were invited to attend.
5. No formal responses were received from the two trade unions. A meeting had been held with the Unison Branch Secretary, who indicated that he was likely to leave the issue in the hands of the UNISON Steward within the Service. At the time of writing, responses have been received from all but four of the individuals concerned, and, of these, seven have indicated a provisional interest in voluntary redundancy (on a 'no commitment' basis, subject to detailed figures) and a further two have expressed an interest in reducing their working hours.
6. The position in respect of voluntary redundancy is complicated, given that the Council's redundancy policy is under review currently, and is likely to be the subject of a report to the February meeting of Cabinet. Until a new policy is approved, no further action can be taken in relation to discussing figures and options with individual employees.
7. If all seven expressions of interest in voluntary redundancy were to develop into firm expressions of interest and be approved, the direct workforce would then reduce to 36 (including four supervisors). It is proposed to process any such applications under the current scheme of delegation, once a new redundancy policy has been approved.
8. In order to improve the resilience of security systems covering the blocks of flats concerned, it is also proposed to draw up and implement a programme of linking the CCTV, door entry and intercom systems for each block to the Council's Security Centre. Detailed proposals will be included in a full report covering the housing element of the Capital Programme.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial

9. The 'single crewing' proposed will produce annual savings of approximately £140,000, and will therefore achieve the objective set for the review, as reported to Cabinet on 2 November 2006. Individual decisions on applications for voluntary redundancy will be subject to a business case test, in terms of the 'payback' period of the costs involved via receiving annual savings, and any

applications approved would be funded from Housing Revenue Account resources.

Legal

10. Any selection for voluntary redundancy will be undertaken in accordance with Council Policy and the requirements of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

RISK ASSESSMENT

11. The proposed course of action is categorised as low to medium risk. Existing management systems and daily routine activities are sufficient to control and reduce risk.

COMMUNITY STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

12. The proposed approach is intended to complement the Council's policies and objectives in respect of housing provision and community safety.

CONSULTATION INCLUDING WARDS AND COUNCILLORS

13. The report in draft has been submitted to all Ward Councillors, as listed below:-

Village	Councillor Dalgarno and Councillor Robinson
Stockton Town Centre	Councillor Coleman and Councillor Kirton
Billingham Central	Councillor Teasdale and Councillor Woodhouse
Billingham East	Councillor Cunningham and Councillor Stoker

Name of Contact Officer: Mike Batty
Post Title: Head of Community Protection
Telephone Number: 01642 527074
E-mail Address: mike.batty@stockton.gov.uk

Property

No change is proposed to the Council's Corporate portfolio.

APPENDIX A

	Strongly Support 71			Support 82			Neither/Nor 50			Oppose 29			Strongly Oppose 37			TOTAL	
£4 Extra		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	
	Total	3	35	1	8	43	2	8	21	1	11	5	1	12	14	0	165
	Total	0	26	0	5	21	0	1	15	0	6	4	0	3	6	0	87
	Total	0	5	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	13
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
TOTAL	-	3	66	2	13	67	2	9	39	2	17	10	2	16	21	0	269

APPENDIX B

	Strongly Support			Support			Neither/Nor			Oppose			Strongly Oppose			TOTAL	
£4 Extra	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A		
Tenant – H.B.	K1	0	4	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	6	0	0	22
	K2	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	1	2	4	0	18
	K3	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	Daw	1	5	0	1	6	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	22
	Anson	0	2	0	1	9	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	18
	Hud	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	1	2	0	18
	Nol	0	8	0	2	6	0	4	5	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	30
	Hume	1	8	0	1	9	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	26
Total	3	35	1	8	43	2	8	21	1	11	5	1	12	14	0	165	
Tenant Paying	K1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
	K2	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	13
	K3	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	9
	Daw	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
	Anson	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	12
	Hud	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	13
	Nol	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	13
	Hume	0	3	0	1	6	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Total	0	26	0	5	21	0	1	15	0	6	4	0	3	6	0	87	
Leaseholder	K1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	K2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
	K3	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Daw	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Anson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hud	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hume	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	5	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	
No Answer	K1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	K2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	K3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Daw	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Anson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Hud	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Nol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Hume	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	
TOTAL	3	66	2	13	67	2	9	39	2	17	10	2	16	21	0	269	