

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>OLDER PEOPLE STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review ways in which all services contribute to the Older People Strategy and can ensure that planning for the changing needs of an ageing population are embedded within mainstream services. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Older People Strategy has only recently been agreed, with an action plan for the 2008-2011 period. Key to delivery of the strategy is ensuring that the needs of older people, beyond the traditional focus on health and care needs, are embedded within future service planning and delivery across all services and partnerships. • The need to embed this broader approach to older people has been identified as an area for development through the corporate assessment process. <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved coordination and monitoring of the Older People Strategy to ensure it is integrated within service planning and delivery. 	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changing demography of our area means that an increasing proportion of our communities need to be confident that services are addressing the life stage needs of an ageing population. 	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Older People Strategy is designed specifically to ensure that the social and economic needs of older people, and the environmental planning and design implications of an ageing population, are fully acknowledged and integrated in service planning, rather than concentrating on just their health and care needs. 	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified as an area for improvement through corporate assessment. 	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>N/A.</p>	
Signed: CESC	Date: March 08`
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

OBESITY

- To review initiatives aimed at addressing obesity.

Concerns:

- Increasing obesity levels will have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of our communities and on future demand for health and care services.
- There is considerable focus already nationally and locally on addressing childhood obesity (included in our LAA); need to consider the issue across all life stages.
- Developing healthier lifestyles is a key strand of the Healthier Communities & Adults theme of the Sustainable Community Strategy; obesity levels are one measure of the impact of health initiatives

Outcome:

- Improved understanding of the impact of obesity initiatives leading to a more coordinated strategy across services to address the issue.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

- Significant public health implications for all our communities.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

- Improved health across all communities can impact across social, economic and environmental wellbeing.

Council performance in this area if known:

- Levels of childhood obesity are now being established more accurately but less so amongst the whole population.
- The 'Population Health Needs' Public Health report for the Tees area states "The proportion of adults who are obese and/or physically inactive is increasing. Moreover, the difference in exposure to these risks between rich and poor is widening."

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

N/A.

Signed: CESC

Date: March 08

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

**PROPOSED SCRUTINY REVIEW TOPIC: REGISTERED SOCIAL LANDLORD (RSL)
– PERFORMANCE**

Background

RSLs work in partnership with the Council to deliver affordable housing (for sale and rent) within the Borough.

At the present time there are 12 RSLs in the Borough who rent social housing properties, this equates to approx. 3,150 properties as at (31.3.07). There stock is dispersed across the various townships (including rural locations). In addition, a number of other RSLs are entering into partnerships with private sector developers to deliver affordable housing for sale (secured through Section 106 Planning Agreements).

As the LA is currently unable to build new housing, we rely on our effective partnerships with RSL's to deliver much needed new housing for rent. New housing is funded through National Affordable Housing Programme (NAHP) monies, which are provided by the Housing Corporation. NAHP is allocated on a competitive bidding process and bids to the Housing Corporation will only be funded if they are supported by the LA in terms of delivering the LA strategic housing priorities (identified needs groups and location) and will delivery regional housing priorities as detailed in the Regional Housing Strategy (produced by the North East Assembly). To put this into context in the last round of bidding to the Housing Corporation (Nov. 07) the value of funding sort (for investment into the Borough) from our RSL partners was £93.4million. RSL's are also key partners in the wider 'place shaping agenda' and, in actively assisting the Council, deliver housing regeneration in the Hardwick, Mandale and Parkfield areas.

The proposed purpose of the scrutiny review:

- Ensure our partnership arrangements are effective in terms of addressing housing need i.e. nomination arrangements and complementary policies.
- Ensure that RSL partners are taking an active role in the communities, which they are present i.e. are they 'good' landlords and what additional community wide initiatives do they undertake/support.
- Ensure they are assisting the LA in terms delivering and supporting the wider 'homeless prevention agenda'.
- Evaluate recent new build schemes for rent and determine that they did and continue to address our stated objectives and provided value for money.
- Identify best practise in terms of developing a 'preferred list of partner RSL's' to work in partnership on S106 sites to deliver affordable housing.

Stockton is currently working in partnership with the other TV LA's to sign the first NE sub-regional protocol with the Housing Corporation. Scrutiny Committee could take an active role in ensuring the actions stated in the document are delivered.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Due to the current housing market (specifically house prices) demand for housing is high both in terms of social rented accommodation and accessing the affordable home ownership – subsequently the public will be interested in the role of RSLs as landlords and in delivering affordable housing solutions (i.e. shared ownership and equity share).

In addition, in some neighbourhoods of the borough RSLs are the predominant landlord.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

RSLs have a key role in:

- Investing in local neighbourhoods through property improvement programmes and maintaining/improving the local environment.
- Effective management of their properties (in terms of ABS issues etc).
- Are key regeneration agencies in terms of investing significant amounts of public (Housing Association) and private money (money they borrow) to build new properties – the effect on local neighbourhoods is transformational.
- Supporting local communities (i.e. some RSLs operate community investment funds).

Council performance in this area if known:

Information available (if required)

- RSL property numbers year on year within the Borough.
- Nomination details i.e. the number of applicants nominated to RSL's, the number nominations taking up tenancies and the number of unsuccessful nominations.
- The £ investment made by the Housing Corporation into the Borough over recent years.
- The number of new build homes for rent and sale (at a neighbourhood level) for example the period 2006/7 and 2007/9.

NB – unsure if the above would enable a 'score' to be made, may not be appropriate in this instance.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

- Housing Corporation has recently issued guidance to RSLs in terms of their role in the homeless prevention agenda.
- As stated previously the 5 TV LA's are current working with the Housing Corporation to deliver a sub-regional Protocol.

Signed: Julie Allport

Date: 03.03.08

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>AUDIOLOGY SERVICES</p> <p>Concerns over a number of years at the delay in seeing a consultant and even longer receiving a hearing aid.</p> <p>The loss of hearing contributes to a life of loneliness and exclusion.</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>The concerns have been expressed by residents and members of the medical profession.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>The impact is on individuals and their capability to take part in social and public activities.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>Not applicable to the Council but to the external organisation/partner PCT and Acute Foundation Hospital Trust.</p> <p>GPs tell me that it can be 18 months to 2 years before a patient with a hearing problem can be seen by an Audiologist and then another delay before provision of a hearing aid.</p> <p>Digital Hearing Aids delay when moving from analogue.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>Don't know of any but Adult Services and Health Select Committee was planning to conduct such a review prior to undertaking the urgent review of Parkview.</p>	
Signed: P A Cains	Date: 01.02.08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING/ NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH</p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Both the Neighbourhood Policing approach, and the Neighbourhood Watch movement, have the potential to make significant contributions to reducing levels of crime and ASB and fear thereof.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>The social benefits of reduced crime and ASB, to both victims and offenders, are obvious. To the extent that businesses are victims of crime, any reductions will be of benefit to the local economy. Many forms of crime and ASB involve environmental degradation.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>Both of these areas of activity are led by the Police but fully supported by the council, via the Safer Stockton Partnership. One particular point of significance is that Stockton Council has only limited Neighbourhood Management infrastructure, in selected areas of the borough, whereas other local authorities, including Hartlepool, have comprehensive Neighbourhood Management structures.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>Not to my knowledge, but the Home Office will be implementing the new APACS performance management system for the police and their partners later this year, and a further point to bear in mind is that it may be advantageous to invite one or more members of the Police Authority to take part in any review which is undertaken.</p>	
<p>Signed: Mike Batty Date: March 08</p>	
<p>Office Use:</p>	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

CUSTOMER FIRST

The Council's Customer First Programme started in 2003. Stage 2 of the programme was launched in June 2007 and, setting a higher standard than Stage 1, it aims to develop the Council's existing customer-focused culture into one that places exceptional customer service at the heart of all we do. The Programme applies to all services (not just those that are the first point of contact with customers) and includes services provided to both internal and external customers.

The programme comprises an extensive range of criteria, against which all Council services are assessed, and a set of customer service standards for reception areas and telephone, letter and e-mail communications.

A target date has been set for all services to Complete the Stage 2 Programme by 31st March 2009, however the road to customer service excellence is continuous and there is always room for further improvement. We need to consider how we continue after March 2009, not only maintaining the excellent standards we have achieved, but also building on them and delivering greater customer satisfaction. There are several options for the future, one worthy of consideration is the Corporate Charter Mark Scheme.

A Scrutiny Review could review and revise our published service standards to ensure that they are realistic, challenging and focus on what is important to customers. It could also examine "what next?" after the current Customer First scheme ends in March 2009 – does the scheme need to be amended/updated/revitalised as a vehicle to further drive up customer focussed improvements or should a different approach be adopted?

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

The development of the Council into a customer-centred organisation is a key commitment in the Council Plan, with the Customer First Programme acting as the current delivery mechanism.

The review would impact on all residents of the borough, visitors and those with whom the Council does business. Ultimately, it is the way that individual members of staff and teams understand, interact with and respond to a customer, that determines that customer's perception of the whole Council.

Members are ideally placed to provide valuable feedback about their own and their constituents' experiences of service delivery.

The review would therefore be of high public interest.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

The Customer First Programme includes requirements for services to consult and use customer feedback to improve service delivery and shape service planning. This ensures that resources focus on meeting identified customer needs and preferences. The Programme also focuses on making services accessible to all residents, and considering the needs of minority groups.

The review therefore impacts on social well-being.

Council performance in this area if known:

There are currently 13 services across the Council that hold Charter Marks for outstanding customer service. As at February 2008, six service areas have achieved Customer First Stage 2, with a further 24 teams at various stages of planning/implementation as they work towards completion of the programme by the March 2009 deadline.

The Cabinet Office recently announced a new customer service standard to replace Charter Mark during 2008. The new standard contains new concepts, which will require additional evidence. Existing Charter Mark holders will not be allowed to automatically move to the new standard. The 13 existing Charter Mark holders will have to go through a transition process if they want to retain the award.

Both the old and new Charter Mark Schemes provide for corporate assessments. Completion of Customer First Stage 2 by all services, coupled with existing corporate frameworks covering complaints, diversity and performance management means that most of the groundwork for a corporate Charter Mark will have been done. Nationally, nine local authorities are engaged in the Corporate Charter Mark programme.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

The need for a review and decision on what should follow Customer First Stage 2 has been identified. An officer group led by the Head of Taxation and Administration has started reviewing the options and scheduling exploratory meetings with the four Charter Mark assessment bodies. The need for Member input into the shaping of the Customer First Programme (or whatever might replace it) is recognised and it is believed that a Scrutiny review would provide the opportunity for Member participation.

Signed: Debbie Hurwood

Date: 26 Feb 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

TEES ACTIVE

Tees Active Leisure Trust started operating on 1 May 2004. It is therefore timely to review the operation of the contract, performance against the objectives and business plan set for the Leisure Trust prior to its conception, value for money and plans for the future.

It is also timely given developments at Billingham Forum, Olympic opportunities and the proposed extension of Splash.

**NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.**

Public interest justification:

This is a public facing service.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

The provision of sports and leisure facilities contributes to the healthier communities priority both for children and adults.

Council performance in this area if known:

No concerns regarding performance have been highlighted. Satisfaction with Leisure Centres and Swimming Pools has increased in MORI surveys from 2002.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

There has been no comprehensive review of the operation of the contract to date.

Signed: N Schneider / Cllr J O'Donnell

Date: February 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

REVIEW OF AREA PARTNERSHIPS & THEIR SUPPORT ARRANGEMENTS

Area Partnerships have an important role within Stockton Renaissance. Community Partnerships and Residents Associations feed into the Area Partnership Boards who underpin the Stockton Renaissance process. The Area Partnerships bring together representatives from the voluntary and community sector, local business, local agencies and residents associations to give local people a chance to influence services provided within their area.

Key concerns

The key concerns relating to this review are that we need to be able to support the Area Partnerships to fully represent their constituent areas and to operate effectively through:

- the election process;
- feedback mechanisms; and
- secretariat support arrangements.

This will help inform the future governance arrangements for each of the Area Partnerships.

Outcome for scrutinising the topic

The outcome for this topic should result in improved governance arrangements for the Area Partnerships and support arrangements for the future.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

The Area Partnerships cover a large geographical area, and represent a range of representatives from the Voluntary and Community sector, local business, local agencies and residents associations to give local people a chance to influence services provided within their area.

The Area Partnerships also have elected ward councillors on the partnership who represent both their constituents and the Council.

The Area Partnerships act as an advocate for their areas; therefore there is a public interest in the role of the partnership. The Area Partnership meetings are open to members of the public to attend if they wish to.

The Area Partnership's have also been involved in participatory budgeting, which has empowered them to commission interventions to address their Neighbourhood Renewal and Local Transport Plan priorities.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

The Area Partnerships are responsible for:

- Providing a local area based forum to consider regeneration issues to assist the LSP in the development and implementation of strategies for the borough;
- Providing a structure to link with the thematic partnerships and the opportunity for community and voluntary sector representatives, representatives from ward councillors and people from the private sector to work with service providers to improve service delivery in the Area Partnership areas.

The Area Partnerships have the potential to have a significant influence on strategy and service delivery in their areas for example their involvement in developing the Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-21 or when the Primary Care trust (PCT) introduced locality teams which are co-terminus with the Area Partnership boundaries.

The Area Partnership's have also been involved in participatory budgeting, which has empowered them to commission over £380,000 worth of interventions to address their Neighbourhood Renewal and Local Transport Plan priorities. In 2006/07, this included the Area Partnership Boards being allocated £20,000 of capital funding from the Local Transport Capital Programme to enable Board members to identify priorities. For 2007/08 this has increased to £25,000, to reflect the success of this initiative and to encourage increased participation in the process. This demonstrates the high level of impact that the Area Partnerships have within their areas.

Council performance in this area if known:

In 2007 an independent LSP Peer review also took place. Feedback concluded that Stockton Renaissance is absolutely clear that the ethos of the partners is focused around the Borough, its people and its future and this is reflected in the pride in their achievements and confidence in their ability to make further improvements in the future. The IDeA also noted "*Stockton Renaissance is a strong, outcome-focussed partnership, which is well led and has a clear short/medium and long-term vision*".

Stockton Renaissance achieved a Green rating in the Government Office North East 2006 LSP assessment.

Across the borough there is optimism about the future where 26% believe the borough will improve but in neighbourhood renewal areas this rises to 41%.

Nationally and locally there has been a dip in those that agree they can influence their local area- In 2001, nationally 44% of citizens agreed that they could influence their local area however; in 2004 this had dropped to 38%. (Source: Citizenship Survey.) Locally- In the IPSOS MORI Survey (2006) 23% of residents agreed that they felt that they could personally influence decisions affecting their local area compared to 25% in 2004.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

There are no other reviews of this nature-taking place with the Area Partnerships. A copy of the Councils consultation plan is a standard item taken to the Area Partnerships to avoid duplication and to provide an opportunity for members to comment on other areas of consultation where appropriate.

Signed: Helen Dean

Date: March 08

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT WORKS

Liaison with utilities.

Member involvement and notification.

There have been problems in the past regarding lack of notice for residents and businesses.

Review would be seeking to establish smarter working practices

**NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.**

**PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.**

Public interest justification:

Public facing service.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Contributes to liveability priority.

Council performance in this area if known:

There were 3 highway complaints during 07/08.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

No other planned reviews in this area.

Signed: N Schneider

Date: February 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

ROAD & FOOTPATH MAINTENANCE

Key concerns:

- The degree of deterioration of footpath surfaces and the number & severity of potholes in roads is a cause of great concern to residents.
- The criteria for judging when repairs are needed seem to be harsh, compared to when residents think they should be repaired. There seems to be nothing in the criteria about a general deterioration of the surface unless it gives rise to potholes or serious cracks.
- Wheelchair users and people with mobility impairments find travelling on rough pavements uncomfortable and frightening.

Outcomes:

- Either a better maintenance regime which deals with problems before they become as large as at present
- OR a regime which is better understood by the public and elected members so that perceptions of the problem change
- Possibly higher standards for areas with a lot of pedestrian traffic such as town centres, routes near medical centres or shopping areas particularly to address 3 above.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

As ward councillors we are constantly being sent complaints about the state of roads and pavements – rarely bad enough to fulfil the criteria for repair as currently extant. This seems to indicate that either the criteria are too strict or there needs to be a campaign of education for councillors as well as the general public. Experience of pushing wheelchairs and of travelling in them has indicated to councillors that the problems outlined in 3 above are real barriers to mobility and social inclusion

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Better maintained roads & footpaths contribute to the environmental well-being of the borough.
It would also improve customer satisfaction with the service and possibly encourage more use of cycles and walking for short journeys.

Council performance in this area if known:

Even if council is meeting current performance targets the perception of the public is that they are not getting good value so the criteria need to be examined.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

Not known.

Signed: Maureen Rigg (for Lib Dem Group)
2008

Date: 5 March

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

PAVEMENT PARKING –

- effect on surface & foundations of footways
- obstruction to pedestrians, wheelchair, scooter & pushchair users
- benefits where carriageway is too narrow
- lack of public awareness of rights & wrongs
- enforcement – police/SBC
- cost of providing alternative parking in some places (e.g., council estates, grass verges)
- effect of Planning policies on no. of in-curtilage parking spaces

Outcomes –

- Reduction of obstructive parking & damage to footways
- Clearer policy guidelines for remedies
- Greater public awareness of what is & is not acceptable

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Cost to public money of remedial works to footways / alternative parking provision

A frequent cause of complaints to councillors from all types of housing

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Clearer guidelines for resolving neighbour disputes over parking

Improved, less hazardous routes for pedestrians, wheelchair, scooter & pushchair users

Improved street scene

Council performance in this area if known:

No measurement of pavement parking known, but costs of alternative provisions should be available & cost of attributable footway repairs could be estimated.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

Current Regeneration & Transport Select Committee scrutiny of school travel has touched only slightly on pavement parking.

Signed: J A Fletcher

Date: 7 March 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>TAXIS</p> <p>There have been representations from Taxi firms, both private hire and hackney carriages, on the Council's licensing and operational requirements.</p> <p>A scrutiny exercise to allow evidence to be presented on the whole taxis operation would be advantageous.</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Public safety in ensuring suitable vehicle provision and testing arrangements is essential.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Public transport is crucial to the mobility of disadvantaged residents and to the social and economic viability of town centres.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>Not known</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>No</p>	
Signed:	Councillor Ken Lupton
Date: 3 March 2008	
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>DIAL A RIDE SERVICE</p> <p>This is a responsive service that is currently delivered by Community Transport. The concerns I have heard are from blind and partially sighted residents. The first person to get through each morning sets the pattern for the day. Other routes cannot then be covered.</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Applicable to residents who are unable to access the regular bus service through disability, age or infirmity.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Required to improve the inclusion agenda and reduce social isolation.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>Not known</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p>	
<p>Signed: Councillor Ann Cains Date: 6 March 08</p>	
<p>Office Use:</p>	
<p>Pick score:</p>	<p>Considered by SLF:</p>

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

ANIMAL WELFARE SERVICE

Provision of 24/7 collection service for stray dogs
Dog Fouling Enforcement
Disposal of Stray Dogs – kennelling facilities and non destruction policy
Animal Welfare Act 2007
Prosecution
Publicity and Advice

**NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.**

**PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.**

Public interest justification:

Environmental Health receive about 2,000 requests for service each year regarding dogs and 300 regarding other animals.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Enforcement includes stray dogs, dog fouling, dangerous animals, welfare and cruelty, inspection of animal establishments, neutering and micro chipping services, advice and education all of which are aimed at restricting the adverse impact of pets on the local environment.

Council performance in this area if known:

Environmental Health investigate complaints and carry out investigations and inspections. Enforcement action is taken including provision of advice, warning letters, fixed penalty notices and prosecution.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

The Animal Welfare Service incorporates dog fouling enforcement which has also been proposed for inclusion in the scrutiny process.

From April 2008 dealing with stray dogs will be the sole responsibility of the Council as was previously a shared responsibility with the Police. Provision of a 24/7 service for receiving stray dogs is currently being developed and the structure of the Animal Welfare team is being reviewed to incorporate these duties which will include increased staffing.

This review will include development of an Animal Welfare Service Plan for 2008/9 to address these new responsibilities as well as those in the Animal Welfare Act 2007 and Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.

The Pest Control Service which works alongside the Animal Welfare Service is currently going through scrutiny.

Signed: Environment Select Committee

Date: February 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>DOG FOULING</p> <p>Number of prosecutions, warning letters sent out, unaccompanied dogs that have been impounded. Siting and provision of dog litter bins and signs. Vandalism of dog litter bins. Reluctance of neighbours to have dog litter bins near to their property. Adoption of provisions in Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Number of complaints to ward councillors from irate residents who have trodden in or narrowly missed treading in piles of dog mess. Dog fouling of SBC owned green spaces.</p> <p>Environmental Health receive about 350 Complaints a year about dogs fouling in public places. Dog fouling is regularly identified as one of the main concerns of the residents of Stockton.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>We now know that dog mess is devoured by rats. Children are deterred from playing on open green spaces because of dog fouling. Dog waste carries disease</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>Data is produced. Environmental Health investigate complaints and carry out patrols of areas (6-800 a year) leading to issuing 100+ warning letters and fixed penalty notices (about 20 a year).</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>Enforcement of dog fouling is mainly carried out by Animal Enforcement Officers working in the Animal Welfare team of Environmental Health. Other duties of the officers include dealing with stray dogs and from April 2008 this will be the sole responsibility of the Council as was previously a shared responsibility with the Police. Provision of a 24/7 service for receiving stray dogs is currently being developed and the structure of the Animal Welfare team is being reviewed to incorporate these duties which will include increased staffing. Dog fouling enforcement will be retained as a function of these officers.</p> <p>The Pest Control Service which works alongside the Animal Welfare Service is currently going through scrutiny.</p>	
Signed: R Cains	Date: 28.02.08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

YOUTH ASSEMBLY

Key concerns:

1. Although an election has been advertised this year there is no evidence that young people in the borough outside a small number of organisations have any knowledge or understanding of the Assembly.
2. The information sheet circulated talks of young people acquiring the citizenship knowledge and skills to enable them to make a lasting contribution to local democracy but there is no mechanism for them to contribute to the local democratic process outside of one or two Area Partnership Boards.
3. There seems to be no requirement for members of the Youth Assembly to report back to those whom they represent
4. There are no apparent requirements for schools or youth organisations to participate, nor (perhaps due to resource shortage) any plans to encourage such participation. Consequently the Assembly membership cannot reflect properly the range of young people in the borough.

Outcomes:

1. A meaningful on both sides process for engagement of the Youth Assembly with Stockton Borough Council.
2. The membership to be as representative as possible of the youth of the borough
3. A proper reporting back procedure, not just to the members of the school or organisation who elected the representative, but trying to find ways of informing others who aren't yet engaged.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Young people are a high proportion of the population of the borough
Positive activities for young people are high on the list of things which residents tell us as ward councillors are important for the good of the borough
Encouraging the young people to fully participate in the process of standing for and electing the youth assembly will encourage them to take part in the democratic process at age 18+

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Positively engaged young people contribute to the social cohesion of the borough.
A higher than average proportion of young people express an interest in the environment and a desire to do things to improve it. This can be harnessed better than at present via a fully representative and functioning Assembly.

Council performance in this area if known:

Performance Figures in this area don't tell the whole story. There is a significant number of young people involved and those involved enjoy what they do and achieve satisfaction & sometimes accreditation. But there is a much higher number who don't feel involved because they don't know it exists, have never cast a vote for a member and so on.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

Changes are taking place, but that doesn't mean that a scrutiny couldn't add value to the process.

Signed: Maureen Rigg (for Lib Dem Group)

Date: 5 March 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

ENGAGEMENT WITH YOUNG PEOPLE

- To review current PIC (participation, involvement and consultation) strategy for children and young people and identify ways for further developing active engagement of young people in the development of services.

Concerns:

- Current arrangements for engaging with young people (co-ordinated through the PIC network) are well developed and have been recognised as including many areas of good practice by external inspection / assessment.
- However, further development of these arrangements remains a key priority in the Children & Young People's Plan as there is an acknowledgement that there is scope to further develop these arrangements, especially to ensure:
 - young people are directly engaged in the review and evaluation of existing services;
 - the diversity of needs and interests of young people are fully reflected in the PIC strategy.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

- Feedback from public consultations and surveys frequently highlight concerns relating to the need for young people to be more actively engaged in their local communities.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

- Effective engagement with young people will support planning and delivery of services to meet needs, securing greater involvement of young people in positive activities.

Council performance in this area if known:

This is an area for which measurable performance outcomes are difficult to identify. As noted above, inspection / assessment has identified many strengths and much good practice in current arrangements. However, there is an identified need to continue to build on the good practice, especially to ensure arrangements are fully inclusive, and that young people are more actively engaged in the review and evaluation of services (links to an issue identified in the Joint Area Review of Children's Services regarding the need to ensure processes are applied consistently to evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives targeted at vulnerable groups).

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

Not aware of any.

Signed: CESC

Date: March 08

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

CARERS

- To support delivery of the Carers Strategy and improve access to support and services for carers.

Concerns:

- High profile nationally, following recent issue of national Carers Strategy.
- Work currently underway to revise Stockton Carers Strategy.
- Need to improve performance for proportion of carers receiving service (inspection issue; also included in LAA).

Outcome:

- Improved support for carers, impacting on improved independence and quality of life for adults and older people with care needs.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.
PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

- Many members of our communities, of all ages, act as carers.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

- Significant impact on quality of life for carers themselves, both socially (e.g. improved opportunities for respite etc) and economically (training and employment): impacting in turn on quality of care for those with health and social care needs – promoting independence and community based care.

Council performance in this area if known:

- Performance in proportion of carers receiving services (a performance indicator in national framework) has been improving slowly but remains behind that of comparator groups; and has been identified as an area for improvement through the annual adult social care inspection process.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

- Revision of local Carers Strategy has involved review of current arrangements and consultation on a draft strategy is currently underway.

Signed: CESC

Date: March 08

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>DRUG TREATMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review drug treatment services. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to address the implications of the new national Drug Strategy 2008-2018. <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify future commissioning needs, particularly to support children and families. 	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant public concern over substance misuse and its impact on community safety, community cohesion and health and wellbeing. 	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving drug treatment services will have a positive impact on community safety, community cohesion and health and wellbeing. The new strategy focuses more on families, gives a stronger role to communities, proposes to target money and effort where it will make the most difference, emphasises joint working on shared problems across institutional boundaries, and stresses the responsibility of drug users to engage in treatment in return for the help and support available. 	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>A highly rated DAT by the national performance framework, with good improvement in performance relating to substance misusers receiving treatment. However, there is an identified need to improve strategy in relation to children, young people and families, and to link approaches to dealing with substance misuse within a broader preventative agenda, including links to the developing Parenting Strategy and the work of the Hidden Harm Partnership.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>Not aware of any other reviews.</p>	
Signed: CESC	Date: March 08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>TOURISM</p> <p>The Stockton tourism ‘product’ and its relationship within Tees Valley and the North East. Are we effectively promoting ourselves to attract new visitors and resulting economic benefits? The relationship between our tourism work and that of Visit Tees Valley – is it effective and are we being portrayed to the best effect within that context to grow our share of the market.</p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>The tourism sector is an important part of our local economy. It provides a significant number of jobs and visitor spend brings important money in to the economy. Attractions, venues, town centres, events and leisure facilities are important to our residents and are essential parts of our tourism product. Visitors to the Borough are customers for those facilities and so aid viability and the case for investment which brings employment opportunities. Information services such as those provided through the Tourist Information Centre are also used by residents and visitors alike.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Tourism enhances pride in the area and creates an economic benefit through additional visitor spend brought into the area along with new business and job opportunities. It is important part of changing perceptions of the area and so helping to attract investment.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>There are no formal KPIs set for this area of work. Regular, consistent and appropriate performance data at a local level is not readily available. Industry specific surveys tend to be carried out at a sub-regional level and are costly. Local measures tend to be around engagement with tourism businesses, visitor guides produced and distributed and enquiries received particularly through the Tourist Information Centre.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>River based leisure scrutiny review – use of the river will form one of the strands of our tourism offer.</p>	
Signed:	Date: Feb 08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>STOCKTON COUNCIL COMMUNITY CENTRES AND HALLS</p> <p>The rundown state of the facilities and lack of energy saving insulation and double glazing.</p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>To encourage public use of up to date and energy efficient buildings.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Reduce the carbon footprint of centres. Encourage all age groups to contribute to the running of the Centres. The use by all groups of the facilities.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>To make the centres a centre of the local community with a well maintained and attractive building.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>A current task and finish group of the CSI Select Committee is reviewing the Community and Voluntary Sector. Although considering wider issues, this issue has been highlighted – awaiting outcome of review.</p>	
<p>Signed: C Leckonby Date: 19.02.08</p>	
<p align="center">Office Use:</p>	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

PLANNING APPEALS

In the last few years a scrutiny of Planning by the Environment & Regeneration Select Committee was told that causes of concern included the number of cases in which Planning Committee made decisions against Officer recommendations and the number of planning appeals lost by SBC.

I am not aware that there has ever been any analysis of the extent to which lost cases were on decisions taken against Officer advice.

All planning appeals cost SBC money & a lot of officer time, whoever wins – costs can be awarded only against a party who has behaved unreasonably. SBC does not normally seek costs, but occasionally appellants successfully apply for costs against SBC.

A poor record on appeals can affect not only the reputation of the Local Planning Authority but also the score for Planning Grant from cen. Government.

Outcomes:

- Identification of any common themes on lost appeals;
- If there is any correlation between going against Officer advice & losing appeals, whether there is a training need for Planning Committee;
- Possibility of improvements to appeal handling, which can involve Planning, Legal, Technical Services & outside consultants in varying proportions.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Public money spent / at risk.

Unnecessary expense/inconvenience/delay to appellants who are ultimately successful

Slowing down of other Planning work due to diversion of resources to appeals

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Risk that unsuitable planning applications may be allowed for fear of the impact on SBC resources of appeals & of possibly losing them.

Delay to economic regeneration if desirable developments are hindered by refusals & waiting for appeal outcomes

Council performance in this area if known:

See above

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

None known

Signed: Councillor John Fletcher

Date: 7 March 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

LIAISON WITH PARISH COUNCILS:

- Since the 1995 LGR, SBC has had charter(s) & agreement(s) with parish & town councils.
- However, there are frequent complaints from some PCs that they have not been kept informed of matters site-specific to their areas (just 1 example is recent discussion by Arts, Leisure & Culture Select Committee of proposals by Yarm TC for development in Egglecliffe & Eaglescliffe Council's area).
- Except for statutory consultations (e.g., Planning) little use is made of PCs as the local eyes & ears of local government.
- Some officers fail to use PCs & TCs as means of disseminating information (e.g., they were not told about the recent inaugural meeting of the 'Bus Users Forum).
- So far as I am aware, SBC has no Officer overseeing liaison between SBC & PCs/TCs.
- No meeting of the Parish Councils Liaison Forum was called for several years by SBC. Since its revival it has been poorly attended by PCs/TCs.
- PCs frequently receive short notice communications which they cannot fit into a (say) monthly cycle of their meetings.
- Cleveland Local Councils Association (CLCA) was never used a channel between SBC & PCs/TCs. Some PCs (large & small) lost confidence in CLCA & have left. A better way of communicating with PCs/TCs & of their mutual communication among themselves is needed.

Outcomes:

- Reduction of unnecessary friction
- More useful Parish Council Liaison Forum meetings & other means of communication
- Better fulfilment of central & local government policies to engage with local communities
- Sharing of good practice (e.g., SBC & some TCs & PCs are allotment authorities in different areas of this Borough)
- Giving TCs & PCs a more fulfilling role would encourage a greater degree of democratic participation in these bodies at local level & turnout when they have contested elections.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

People in some outlying areas of the Borough feel that SBC is not interested in them.

Those people's reps on PC/TC share their frustration (for reasons above).

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Improved involvement of local people in the democratic process.

More opportunities for environmental improvement by both levels of authority working together (PCs & TCs precept for their own budgets to spend).

Better care for areas through better flow of information from local "eyes & ears"

Council performance in this area if known:

With a few notable exceptions, lamentable. As the right-sounding policies are in place, it is difficult to show statistically the standard of performance.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

None immediately relevant.

Signed: J A Fletcher

Date: 7 March 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT –

- Many members of the public who contact me feel that there is no effective enforcement.
- The law on this seems weighted in favour of the developer & of all the delay in enforcement. The public cannot understand how law-breaking can be so protected in this sphere when there are thousands of other breaches attracting penalties & prosecution.
- How much is just not being enforced, either as a result of lack of resources or of the weakness of the law?
- How can we communicate better to the public the obstacles to rapid enforcement while not at the same time providing a route-map to evaders?
- Can we publicise more other deterrents to unauthorised development, e.g., difficulty with a purchaser's solicitors on a subsequent sale?
- Are there better ways of making larger developers finish off their developments (e.g., public open spaces, landscaping, adoption-standard roads & sewers) more quickly? They tend to lose interest in completing an estate once the income flow ceases on the sale of the last house.
- Would it be legal/feasible to fast-track enforcement against persistent offenders – developers with a track record of unauthorised work who exploit the delays inherent in the system?

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

At any one time in my ward there are usually 1 or 2 developments on which enforcement is pending but has not taken effect.

The ability of developers to defy the law brings SBC & the law into disrepute.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Enforcement can stop developments or features of them which would be refused planning permission because they would not be good for the environment.

Authority would be seen as controlling the "big boys" & not just those in positions of less economic power.

Council performance in this area if known:

Stats of numerical performance must be kept for cen. Government purposes. It would be useful to compare policies with other (similar) Local Planning Authorities.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

None. It is some years since the last scrutiny of Planning, which did not look at Enforcement in depth.

Signed:
2008

Councillor J A Fletcher

Date: 7 March

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>ADULT EDUCATION PROVISION</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification: Members of the public have approached councillors about the lack of classes in The Education Centre, The free courses on offer are for level 2 qualifications at a basic level that are for young adults then nothing much for the bulk of the population until full day sessions on Saturdays in high class venues like Judges Hotel. Local people miss the opportunity of courses lasting several weeks covering vocational subjects.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area: Older adults particularly appreciate short session classes once a week to prevent loneliness and social exclusion.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known: The adult Education service has been awarded many accolades for quality of service but still seems to be excluding a whole raft of the population.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?): ?</p>	
Signed: Corporate and Social Inclusion Select Committee	Date: March 08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

Officer Comments:

QA Research is undertaking research with users and non users. Key Stakeholders will be conducted by telephone, 1,000 learners research by postal ballot and 400 local residents interviewed in the streets of Stockton, Billingham, Thornaby and Yarm. The survey will be completed by early May this year in readiness for our Inspection.

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

AUDIT OF SERVICES TO YOUNG PEOPLE IN “TRANSITION” BETWEEN CHILDHOOD AND ADULTHOOD

Parents of children with physical or learning difficulties report a reduction in services once the child moves to adult services.

Need to point out the facts to Health Partners and Social Care and encourage improvement in services for service users in “transition”.

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Concerns voiced by parents and carers, as referred to above.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Potential for positive impact on:

- independence and economic well-being of individual young people with disabilities;
- quality of life for parents / carers.

Council performance in this area if known:

Parent / carer concerns have been identified and acknowledged through internal monitoring and review arrangements. As a result ‘Transitions’ has been a service planning priority during 07-08 and remains so for 08-09. The priority attached to this issue has enabled resources to be identified for a Transitions Manager post (currently in recruitment process) that will enable the recent internal review of transition arrangements to be developed and implemented. In addition, considerable attention has been given over the past year to improving the planning for young people’s transition. Progress made, and the effectiveness of current practice, has resulted in positive outcomes from both the Children and Adults external assessment / inspection processes.

For example the 2007 Adults Annual Performance Assessment report comments: “There is close working between Adult and Children’s social work teams to provide seamless transition for young people who will require the support of adult services. Adult and children’s social care is provided within a single corporate directorate and this helps to ensure consistent and continuous support. All young people in transition go through a Person Centred Planning process. “

This report also acknowledges the strength of arrangements for supporting vulnerable adults into employment opportunities, e.g: “The council has an established team of workers who promote opportunities for disabled people and people with mental health problems to access work and to prepare them for work. The team works in conjunction with the Shaw Trust. The council has helped a better than average number of people with learning disabilities into paid work

and a much better than average number into voluntary work. There have been substantial achievements in securing work opportunities for people with mental health problems and in supporting them in work. There has also been considerable success in promoting work opportunities for people with physical disabilities.”

The 2007 JAR (Joint Area Review) of Children’s Services* acknowledged the priority given by the council to this issue due to the experiences of a minority of young people, and has highlighted much good practice, for example:

- the very good quality of local post-16 provision for young people with learning difficulties / disability;
- a high proportion of young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities in education, employment or training (increased by 5% in 2006/07 to 80%, higher than the national figure);
- the council-run Workstep programme provides very good support and good progression opportunities for those young people needing additional support at the age of 18;
- strong transition planning and effective work by the multi-agency Transition Group take place to ensure families are well supported through change;
- a multi-agency Complex Needs Panel closely monitors the needs of all young people moving towards transition, including those young people placed out-of-area.

** N.B. final JAR report is still at the confidential pre-publication stage so extracts from report not given here.*

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

There has been an internal review undertaken over the past year, to identify areas for improvement – Transitions Manager post has been created to assist with implementation of review.

Signed: Scrutiny Liaison Priority

Date: Jan 2007

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>CONGESTION CHARGING</p> <p>The Government has dropped its plans for national congestion charging but says that it will encourage congestion charging locally.</p>	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification: Number of complaints about congestion around schools at start/ finish times and on local roads at peak times.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area: Further encourage the use of public transport, car sharing etc.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known: -</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?): I doubt if there are any but Marton Road in Middlesbrough must be the best publicised in Tees Valley. There are several contenders for the prize of worst congested in Stockton. IBIS claim their roads are the worst.</p>	
<p>Signed: Councillor R Cains Date: 5 March 2008</p>	
<p>Office Use:</p>	
<p>Pick score:</p>	<p>Considered by SLF:</p>

Officer Comments:

The Council is in the process of preparing a new policy document 'Network Management Plan' in response to statutory duties placed upon it resulting from the traffic management act 2004. This policy sets out the Councils strategy for managing the highway network including dealing with congestion.

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?	
DIRECT PAYMENTS, take up and use of.	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
Public interest justification: Making sure that the public are making the best use of this service. Issues already raised by constituents. Also survey as reported at http://www.sense.org.uk/campaignnews/campaigns/deafblind_direct/consultation.htm	
Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area: Important impact on the social, health and well being of individuals who could benefit from this service that may not already do so. Also ensuring that individuals that are using the service are doing so to the best advantage to improve their lives and live more independently.	
Council performance in this area if known: Not Known	
Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?): Not known	
Signed: Councillor S Fletcher	Date: March 08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

Officer Comments:

Progress in developing Direct Payments (DPs) has been measured through an indicator in the national social care framework, based on the proportion of DPs per 100,000 population aged 18+.

Good progress has been made locally, with the LPSA target (which covered indicators for both DPs and for Carer services) being met in 2007. Performance at the end of the 06-07 period was 122 per 100K, above the England average of 103.1, and close to the average of 123.4 for our comparator group of LAs (ranked 7th of our 16 comparator LAs). At the end of Feb 08, Stockton performance has improved to 190.5.

The new National Indicator Set includes a modified version of this indicator which will assess performance in improving the proportion of social care clients receiving self-directed support (i.e. direct payments and individual budgets). Inclusion of this indicator in the national set reflects the importance attributed to the whole 'personalisation' agenda in the future development of social care. The priority attached to this area locally is reflected in this measure being included within our LAA (subject to final outcome of LAA negotiations).

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR CONSULTANTS AND AGENCY STAFF.</p> <p>Costs reduction?</p>	
<p align="center">NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <p>Need for systematic approach and transparency in the process.</p>	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <p>Creation of permanent jobs.</p>	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p>	
<p>Signed: D Coleman Date: 12.02.08</p>	
<p align="center">Office Use:</p>	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

Officer Comments:

The Corporate procurement group has completed an assessment of the deployment of external resources and is currently preparing a report regarding the use of agency staff and Consultants which is due for completion by July 2008. That report will provide information and an analysis of the effectiveness of the use of such external resources, in line with the Council's overall "Use of Resources" as evaluated under CPA/CAA. Given that the work is already advanced it would be sensible to allow this report to conclude and not include the topic as a scrutiny review.

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2007/08
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

<p>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</p> <p>RATIONALISATION OF MUSEUM COLLECTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be a short and focused review aimed at ensuring that the history and heritage of the area is reflected and preserved in the rationalisation of museum collections. 	
<p>NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.</p>	
<p>Public interest justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To preserve the area's heritage for the present and future population of the area. 	
<p>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling residents and visitors to explore collections for inspiration, learning and enjoyment contributes to social and emotional wellbeing, economic regeneration and a sense of pride in our area. 	
<p>Council performance in this area if known:</p> <p>There is no specific measure of performance to address, but recent change in policy of national Museums governing bodies means that rationalisation of collections is necessary to meet the revised policy direction. Rationalisation is consistent also with priorities within the Stockton Museum Service Strategy.</p>	
<p>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</p> <p>N/A.</p>	
Signed: CESC	Date: March 08
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

EXTENDED SCHOOL DAY

Extended School Day (Its impact on out of school provision, success measured by the number of children participating in these activities, range of activities providing, location and access to those activities)

NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.

PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.

Public interest justification:

Members feel that the Extended School Programme is not working in the way in which it was hoped (perhaps in some areas more than others) and feel that this area is worth investigating to scrutinising some of the concerns expressed by members of the public.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Members acknowledge that the Extended School Day should have a big impact on the provision of an active programme of activities which children (and parents) could participate in around the Borough, not always at the school they are educated. Members have expressed doubt that perhaps the programme is not working as well in some areas as it could be.

Council performance in this area if known:

SBC does receive a large sum of money for this programme (Extended School Day Grant?) to pay for this initiative. The Grant was split between 5 areas within the Borough. Training was provided to governors and staff at various training sessions around the Borough. Given that Members are accountable for public money, what reporting structure is in place and how are the children benefiting from the Extended School Programme?

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

The Extended School Day was the idea of the current government to provide a range of activities to children (and parents) outside of the normal school day. To my knowledge, the ESD is not part of any inspection programme, although commented on in OFSTED Inspections.

Signed: Councillor David Harrington

Date: 9.3.08

Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF:

Officer Comments:

The key national performance target for the Extended Schools programme is for all schools to be meeting the full 'core offer' by 2010. Delivery of the Extended School Programme, and the associated target, has been a priority within the Council Plan and has, therefore, been subject to monitoring through the corporate performance cycle including twice yearly monitoring reports to CMT and Cabinet. As reported in the last performance report, progress towards the target remains on track in Stockton, with well over 50% of schools already meeting the requirements. In addition, there is a monthly progress report to DCSF via an on-line database which records the position for each school within the LA area.

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?

STOCKTON BC JOB EVALUATION

Concern: How is the process working in practice is it fair and transparent and is all communication being relayed to staff on scoring criteria and the decision making process for grading?

Outcome: SBC would display a good governance procedure and be seen to treating their employees openly and fairly which will in turn give greater confidence about this sensitive process amongst employees. It should also encourage employees in carrying out their job function.

It is important not to damage relationships with our key resource (employees) by the Job Evaluation process and ensure total transparency especially with the Council partnership arrangement with Darlington.

**NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK
PROCESS.**

**PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER
INFORMATION.**

Public interest justification:

The public will see SBC as a good employer and are operating the system correctly and fairly. Recent bad press regarding this issue has caused great concern especially with examples of how it was (or was not handling well) at Redcar & Cleveland Council.

Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:

Impact on our employees well being and their perception of the process. It obviously affect their economic situation. Depending on their perception will also depend on the performance!

Council performance in this area if known:

There have been concerns raised about the Job Evaluation process and its transparency. Fairness and openness is vital when dealing with employees careers. Communication seems to be lacking with regards details of individual employees.

Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):

Not that I am aware of but would like to know if this is the case?

Signed: Cllr Andrew Larkin

Date: March 2008

Office Use:

Pick score:

Considered by SLF:

**SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09
SUGGESTED REVIEW – PRO FORMA**

Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?	
PUBLIC TRANSPORT	
NOTE: ENTRIES BELOW RELATE TO ISSUE CATEGORIES OF THE PICK PROCESS. PLEASE REFER TO THE EXPLANATION NOTES TO THIS FORM FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.	
Public interest justification:	
Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:	
Council performance in this area if known:	
Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):	
Signed: Cllr Jim Beall	Date: March 2008
Office Use:	
Pick score:	Considered by SLF: