

## Select Committee Work Programme Suggested Review – Pro Forma

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

**The impact of, and potential responses to, child poverty.**

Child poverty rates are rising across the region. All 12 LAs, including Stockton, are included in the 20 LAs which saw the biggest increases between 2014/5 and 2018/9.

A review would:

- Collate and analyse data
- Identify potential solutions
- Focus on a range of linked issues including digital divide, FSM eligibility
- Review the approaches in other areas
- Result in the basis of a child / family poverty strategy for adoption by the Council

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:**

Child poverty rates as measured by the percentage of children living in households with below 60% median income, are rising.

- The North East has the second highest rate of child poverty in the UK at 35%
- The North East saw the UK's biggest increase in child poverty rising from 26% to 35%
- All 12 North East councils are included in the 20 UK local authority areas which saw the highest increases in child poverty
- Due to COVID there has been a 4.5% fall in median household income between May 2019 to May 2020 – this is the largest yearly fall since the 1970's
- It is estimated that another 300K children will have been pushed into poverty through the pandemic
- 35% of children living in poverty in the North East, of the 35% living in poverty 55% are aged 0 – 5 years

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

- Living in poverty has an impact on child development, attainment and future life chances.
- In 2015, 33 per cent of children receiving free school meals obtained five or more good GCSEs, compared with 61 per cent of other children
- Work does not provide a guaranteed route out of poverty in the UK. 72 per cent of children growing up in poverty live in a household where at least one person works
- In the most deprived areas, boys can expect to live 19 fewer years of their lives in 'good' health, and girls 20 fewer years, than children in the least deprived areas
- The poorest groups in society are dying almost a decade earlier than the richest – this has been exacerbated by welfare cuts and the rising cost of living (Imperial College London)

**The morale imperative of tackling rising child poverty levels is clear.**

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

Although the rate is amongst the lowest in the north east, the rate is rising

Local Authority	Child poverty in 2014/15	Child poverty in 2018/19	Percentage point increase
Middlesbrough	23.5%	36.8%	13.3%
Newcastle upon Tyne	19.6%	28.1%	8.5%
South Tyneside	18.7%	26.2%	7.5%
Hartlepool	19.7%	26.7%	7.0%
Gateshead	15.2%	21.4%	6.2%
Redcar and Cleveland	17.2%	23.3%	6.1%
County Durham	16.5%	22.3%	5.8%
Sunderland	18.7%	24.3%	5.6%
Darlington	16.6%	21.9%	5.3%
Northumberland	15.0%	20.0%	5.0%
<b>Stockton-on-Tees</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
North Tyneside	14.0%	18.7%	4.7%

Two wards feature in the top wards in the north east with the highest rates:

**Highest 20 NE wards child income poverty rates BHC out of 353 wards**

Middlesbrough	E05001497	Middlehaven	61.3%
Middlesbrough	E05001504	University	61.3%
Newcastle upon Tyne	E05001096	Elswick	56.9%
Newcastle upon Tyne	E05001091	Byker	54.6%
Middlesbrough	E05001489	Gresham	53.1%
Newcastle upon Tyne	E05001111	Westgate	50.5%
Newcastle upon Tyne	E05001113	Wingrove	49.2%
Newcastle upon Tyne	E05001108	Walker	48.6%
County Durham	E05007989	Horden	47.8%
Sunderland	E05001158	Hendon	46.9%
Stockton-on-Tees	E05001549	Stockton Town Centre	45.9%
Middlesbrough	E05001494	North Ormesby and Brambles Farm	44.6%
Hartlepool	E05001480	Stranton	44.0%
Darlington	E05001572	Northgate	43.3%
Redcar and Cleveland	E05001509	Grangetown	43.2%
County Durham	E05008017	Woodhouse Close	43.0%
Hartlepool	E05001474	Owton	42.9%
South Tyneside	E05001148	Simonside and Rekendyke	42.2%
County Durham	E05007998	Peterlee East	42.0%
Stockton-on-Tees	E05001544	Norton South	41.8%

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

This review will build on the 'cost of school uniform' review which was undertaken in 2020.

<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p>This review supports the work on inequality as outlined under the people theme.</p>
<p><b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b></p> <p>A review of evidence A review of potential solutions The basis of a child poverty strategy for adoption in early 2022.</p>
<p><b>Signed:</b> CYP Select Committee/ Cabinet Member                      <b>Date:</b> February 2021</p>
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>



## Select Committee Work Programme Suggested Review – Pro Forma

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

### **Potholes**

Potholes are present on roads across the Borough. The increasing number of potholes which are not being repaired is causing concern. It has been recognised that some potholes are getting deeper and are a real hazard to road users, vehicles, and pedestrians. A review is needed to ascertain the extent of the problems caused by potholes and how this is to be tackled.

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

There is a national outcry about the state of our roads and the lack of upkeep and repair. This is a public concern as well as a concern voiced by motoring organisations.

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

This review would hugely impact on the public's perception of how Stockton Borough Council takes its responsibility for the upkeep of its road systems. There would also be an economic impact on the vehicle owners who use the Borough's road system.

### **Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

This review would document the response of Stockton Council to the ever growing impact of potholes. An early response would cut the long term impact of neglect.

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

Not known.

### **How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?**

#### Economic Regeneration and Transport

- Our vision of the Borough is of an economically prosperous Borough that is dynamic, exciting and inviting with infrastructure to support the development of business start-ups, business growth, new jobs and skills.

### **What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

To reassure the public that this extensive problem is being reviewed and tackled.

**Signed:** Ken Dixon

**Date:** February 2021 (re-submitted)

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158

## Select Committee Work Programme Suggested Review – Pro Forma

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

**Day opportunities for adults** has its origins in legislation introduced under the National Assistance Act 1948 and further developed under the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and the National Health Service Act 1977 (now superseded in the 2014 Care Act).

Through Stockton Council's duty to provide services to people with eligible and assessed needs, day opportunities services have constantly evolved to meet local requirements and meet national guidelines. This includes service provided by the Council, commissioned through the independent or Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector and those people who choose to purchase their own support through a Direct Payment.

However, the profound and continuing impact of COVID-19 has fundamentally changed the way it has been able to deliver this service during 2020/21: closing building-based day opportunities for long periods, building based offers to individuals prioritised by risk, restricted access, different activities and more "remote" support. This has required the Council, people who access our services and key stakeholders to reflect and review what, who and how day opportunities are offered in Stockton on Tees.

Specifically, this includes:

1. Understanding the needs of all the different people who access our services, including young people who are transitioning to adult services;
2. How we utilise existing assets across Stockton on Tees, including services offered by other departments of the Council, partners, VCSE and volunteers;
3. How we maximise independence of the people who access services;
4. Alternatives to a traditional building-based day opportunities offer with greater choice;
5. The expectations and involvement of families and informal carers in delivering meaningful day opportunities; and
6. Where technology can be a key solution to enhance the experience of people who access day opportunities provision.
7. How we focus upon inclusion, community assets and social enterprise
8. Exploring and putting in place meaningful ways of continuously seeking and responding to the voices of the people we support

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:

Number of people directly impacted by the review is relatively low (818) and shared across a wide range of services offering different levels of support and engagement. However, the individuals affected are generally some of our most vulnerable residents and very often have families and carers whose own wellbeing is directly impacted. Day services are largely utilised by individuals affected by old age, mental ill health, learning disabilities and dementia and autism which drive some of our greatest inequalities.

<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>For the people who access these services and their families / informal carers day opportunities are a key service that are essential to their wellbeing.</p>	
<p><b>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</b></p> <p>Service performs well, although the efficiency and scope has been impacted by the need to close / restrict access to existing services during 2020/21 as a result of national restrictions due to COVID-19.</p>	
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p> <p>No know other reviews taking place or planned.</p>	
<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p><i>2021-24 Council Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Develop more services to help people to remain safely and independently in their homes for as long as possible and to make sure that they are not lonely.</i></li><li>• <i>Improve the quality of care within adults' residential homes in the Borough and to support them as they continue to adapt to dealing with the challenges arising from COVID-19.</i></li><li>• <i>Increase skills and employment prospects including a new Employment and Training Hub to support people back to work and through programmes that target those furthest from employment or employability.</i></li></ul>	
<p><b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b></p> <p>To provide further options for the remodelling Day Opportunities Services: primarily to move away from traditional building based 'service driven' provision to a 'needs led' community-focused service which clearly articulates the role of the Council, independent / VCSE assets, stakeholders and volunteering in delivering this model.</p> <p>A Day Opportunities offer that reflects national good practice that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is developed based upon the needs and views of the people we support and their carers' and families;</li><li>• Maximises independence;</li><li>• Is based upon national best practice;</li><li>• Will help reduce levels of isolation;</li><li>• Provide people who access our services with the choice of how they would want to meet their assessed needs;</li><li>• Makes full use of existing community facilities and can act as a signposting mechanism to other services;</li><li>• Provides an offer that enables early intervention and preventative services as part of their person centre support;</li><li>• Is person centred; and</li><li>• Makes full use of the opportunities that technology can offer.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Signed: Cllr Ann McCoy</b></p>	<p><b>Date: 02/03/21</b></p>



**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**Multi-Agency Support to Care Homes during Pandemic**

The Adult Social Care and Health Select Committee requests that it undertakes a reflective review to consider multi-agency support provided to care homes / nursing homes across the Borough during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Upon the lifting of current national COVID-19 restrictions, the Committee is keen to consider and understand the interplay between the local health and care sector during what has been a very difficult and sensitive time. Whilst it is proposed to examine this from a holistic perspective rather than at an individual care home / nursing home level, the ability to assess key data in relation to local care home providers (pertaining to both residents and staff) would give a useful overview of the past and present situation across the Borough. However, it is acknowledged that figures alone do not give a full picture, and that care homes and wider partners deal with differing circumstances regarding the health status / needs of residents and the varying types of care settings.

This review would allow the opportunity to showcase the support provided by the Council and its partners to care homes / nursing homes, as well as raise any previous or current issues / concerns. Such information would assist in further strengthening partnerships with local care providers as all agencies continue to manage the ongoing impact of the pandemic.

Engagement with stakeholders such as SBC (Public Health, Environmental Health, Adult Social Care, Procurement), local NHS Trusts, the CCG, the CQC, and care home providers would be necessary to address the following key areas:

- National guidance (inc. changes over time)
- Communication mechanisms
- Data and intelligence
- Funding
- Managing outbreaks
- Accessibility (professionals, visitors)
- PPE provision
- Testing
- Managing discharges from hospital
- Impact on residents and staff
- Best practice and future support

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 health and wellbeing of residents and staff in care homes has gained a high degree of national attention since the emergence of COVID-19, and this proposed work will enable all stakeholders to reflect on partnership-working between local care providers and wider support agencies. This review may also help provide assurance to residents and their

<p>families of the measures that have been / are being put in place to safeguard all those within a setting.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>COVID-19 has impacted, and continues to impact, all aspects of life, and the care sector has been particularly affected. From challenges around increased costs to restrictions on visiting, this work is relevant to a range of social and economic factors.</p>	
<p><b>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</b></p> <p>The Council (and its wider health partners) has established strong partnership-working principles over a number of years, much of which has been tested to the maximum since the pandemic emerged. The need to adapt to the ever-changing COVID-19 scene has meant being flexible and innovative in terms of the support provided (sometimes within the confines of funding restrictions / uncertainties), and this work can consider how any new approaches / practices have been received by local care providers.</p>	
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p> <p>The Adult Social Care and Health Select Committee has undertaken two recent reviews on Care Homes for Older People (pre-COVID-19) and Hospital Discharge (Phase 1) (discharge to care homes during the COVID-19 pandemic). Care would therefore be needed that this work does not duplicate previously completed reports and does not make duplicate requests of relevant stakeholders for evidence they may have already given.</p>	
<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p><i>A place where people are healthy, safe and protected from harm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continuously improve quality of care within adult residential homes, and in response to the specific issues arising from Coronavirus.</li></ul>	
<p><b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b></p> <p>Understanding the multi-agency support that has been / is being given to care homes / nursing homes and the impact upon them.</p>	
<p><b>Signed:</b> Cllr Evaline Cunningham</p>	<p><b>Date:</b> 01/03/21</p>
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>	

**Select Committee Work Programme**  
**Suggested review of take-up of the Local Government Pension Scheme**

<p><b>Summary of issue you wish to be scrutinised, including key concerns and outcome for scrutinising the topic?</b></p> <p><b>Local Government Pension Fund</b></p> <p>A task and finish review to look into the reasons why 15% of the SBC workforce have chosen not to be members of the Teesside Local Government Pension Fund and to consider what steps may be needed to increase participation.</p> <p>We are concerned that membership of the Local Government pension fund is falling and that this is more pronounced amongst the younger and lower paid members of the workforce. There have been many changes to local government pensions over recent years and also media coverage of the impact of the £95k cap proposals and the McCloud and Sargeant Supreme Court cases about age discrimination on transitional arrangements in the scheme. We have anecdotal evidence that these issues and also alterations in working patterns particularly in the younger workforce (such as less of an expectation of a long term career with one employer) has led to an impression that the LGPS is of reduced value.</p> <p>We are keen to understand the causes of the fall in membership so that, as far as possible, we can address any issues and encourage members of the workforce to put in place suitable pension arrangements. Possible outcomes may include campaigns to increase awareness and understanding of the benefits of the scheme or changes to the scheme to offer new arrangements, for example more flexibility.</p>
<p><b>Public interest justification:</b></p> <p>Direct public interest does not provide the primary justification for this task and finish proposal. There is however a broad public interest in ensuring that younger and lower paid employees (regardless of their employer) are provided with suitable pension arrangements and that all public funds are directed to maximum effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>Ensuring that employees retire with adequate pension arrangements has a direct economic and social impact on the Borough as 70% of the workforce also live in the Borough.</p>
<p><b>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</b></p> <p>The provision of a suitable pay and reward package (including pensions) for all employees is part of ensuring that we maintain and support an effective and efficient workforce who can deliver excellent services to the people of the Borough.</p>
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p>The review indirectly supports delivery of all the Council Plan objectives as it is <u>part</u> of the delivery of the specific Council Plan objective of ensuring that we have dedicated and resourceful employees who can deliver Council services.</p>

<b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b>	
A fuller understanding of the issues of the reduced pension membership and either increased take-up of the current scheme or proposals to change the scheme to make it more suitable to the needs of the workforce.	
<b>Signed:</b> Councillor Bob Cook	<b>Date:</b> 3 March 2021
Please return to:  Judy Trainer Scrutiny Section Democratic Services Municipal Buildings Church Road Stockton on Tees TS18 1LD  Email: <a href="mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158	

**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**How the council can contribute to a more disability inclusive borough**

The vision for the borough set out in the council plan is that Stockton-on-Tees will be ‘a place where people are healthy, safe and protected from harm’ and ‘a place with a thriving economy where everyone has opportunities to succeed’. I propose the council scrutinises the barriers disabled people in the Borough face to achieving this vision.

Further suggested questions the review could explore are:

Do the council communicate with and implement recommendations from disability groups and how can this be improved?

How can the council improve services for those with hidden disabilities?

How can the council go beyond statutory minimum standards and beyond providing wheelchair access?

Are there any quick wins the council can implement to support a more disability inclusive borough?

What have other local authorities done to improve disability inclusion?

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

Disabled people have been one of the most disproportionately affected groups by Covid-19 and going forward, it is important they are no longer marginalised and have equal opportunity to participate in the social, cultural and economic activities within the borough.

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

In the UK, approximately 1 in 5 people have a disability. If disabled people face less barriers, the social and economic well-being of the area is likely to improve.

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

Not known

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

Not known

**How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?**

See section 1

**What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

- A policy for all council directorates and service areas to consider disability inclusion in their work which could potentially be trialled in one service area first.
- For all new council policies and projects to consider disability inclusion.
- Better engagement with disability groups to understand barriers disabled people face going forward and a process for the council to consider and implement recommendations from these groups.
- Where relevant, for Stockton-borough-council to champion disability inclusion in its partnership work with its public, private and voluntary sector stakeholders.

**Signed:** Lauriane Povey

**Date:** 01/03/2021

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158

**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**Care at Home**

This review would focus on the provision of care at home for Stockton residents. Currently, there are a range of domiciliary care providers, and CQC ratings vary across the region. Some providers have achieved an ‘outstanding’ rating or ‘good’. However, several providers have received a ‘requires improvement’ rating.

The following lines of enquiry could be covered by this review:

- Assessment of CQC report for care at home
- Contract enforcement
- Standards set by providers
- Training available to employees

The overall outcome for this review would be to understand the quality of domiciliary care for residents and the value for money from current providers. It will also evaluate if there are any options to offer additional services through Stockton Council.

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

A significant proportion of residents across the Stockton-on-Tees Borough will have or could have a direct experience of domiciliary care during their lifetime. Consequently, this is a highly emotive issue. Members of the public would be interested in uncovering more information on the quality of domiciliary care in this region.

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

Providers who have achieved ‘outstanding’ ratings may be willing to provide guidance to those who have received ‘requires improvements’ ratings. The review could influence the future provision of domiciliary care and thereby improving the well-being of residents.

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

The review would determine if this current system is value for money or if SBC have the resources to bring this in-house.

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

Unknown.

**How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?**

Adult Services

Our vision is that people get the right level and type of support at the right time to help, prevent, reduce or delay the need for ongoing support and maximise their independence.

Key objectives

- Focus on prevention and early intervention.
- Work in partnership.
- Work individuals, their families and carers.
- Deliver our statutory duties.

**What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

A full understanding of the care at home system and the quality of care provided. The review would uncover if standards are being met and if the current approach is value for money.

**Signed:** Luke Frost

**Date:** February 2021 (re-submitted)

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158



**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Tees Credit Union**

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

**Tees Credit Union**

Tees Credit Union merged with Moneywise Credit Union Ltd in September 2017. The aim of this review would be to consider the operation of the Credit Union since the merger to ensure that it is serving the needs of the people of the borough and specifically supporting the vulnerable who rely on it for the provision of loans, banking services and savings accounts at reasonable rates. The review is timely because it would be approximately two years after the merger and this would be a good time to ensure that the changes made to support the merger have been completed successfully.

It should also be noted that in December 2018 Moneywise Credit Union Ltd was appointed to operate the new Community Bank in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland. The review would provide a good opportunity to consider whether any opportunities for collaboration arise from this new operation which may generate further benefits for the Moneywise customers in Stockton on Tees.

The review would also provide an excellent opportunity to consider whether increased support and collaboration can be achieved with businesses and VCSE organisations in the borough in terms of payroll giving and collaborative working. The opportunity through the scrutiny process to illicit the views of partners and businesses would be valuable.

The review could also consider opportunities for generating greater take up of the Moneywise services with Council employees.

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 review has a strong public interest justification as the Credit Union provides an important high street banking service in the borough, but of particular importance is that it offers its services to those in financial hardship who might sometimes be turned away from a traditional bank. The Credit Union is therefore a vital service provided to the vulnerable in the borough.

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

The Credit Union clearly has an important role to play in making a difference to the social and economic well-being of the area. Money that is repaid to more expensive lenders is money that is not circulating within the local economy thus potentially impacting on the Council's regenerating policies. Importantly this is a review where a Council Scrutiny Committee can realistically expect to influence policy and practice at the Credit Union as a strong collaborative relationship exists between the two organisations, and I am confident that the Credit Union would respond positively to a Scrutiny Review. Joint work is already underway to make use of advice from business expert support provided through Tees Valley Community Foundation. The Council and the Credit Union worked closely on the relocation of the Credit Union to Dovecot Street in 2018 and continues to work together on the promotion and marketing of services to employees, schools and businesses in the borough.

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

Whilst the Credit Union has performed solidly since the merger there is value in undertaking a review to ensure that all possible opportunities for development are fully explored and exploited. The continued success of high cost lenders in the borough suggest that there is still significant potential for growth and expansion of the Credit Union.

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

The financial probity and operation of the Credit Union is subject to oversight by the Prudential Regulation Authority for prudential purposes and the Financial Conduct Authority for conduct purposes. It is not proposed that this review would not consider these aspects of the operation of the Credit Union. This review would specifically focus on whether all opportunities are being pursued for the commercial success of the organisation in the borough and therefore the provision of a good service to residents.

**Which of the Council's four policy principles does the proposed scrutiny topic support? (see page 3)**

The review would seek to support vulnerable people through targeted intervention, particularly those people in our communities who are subject to, or at risk of harm, people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless and those who are financially excluded or whose circumstances make them vulnerable. The review would also support the promotion of equality of opportunity through targeted intervention, specifically in relation to financial inclusion.

**What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

Reassurance that the Credit Union is operating well following the merger in 2017 and that all opportunities associated with the creation of the new Community Bank in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland have been explored.

Reassurance that the Credit Union business model is clear, robust and future proofed

A consideration as to whether the Credit Union is maximising the opportunities available for advertising its products and that the message being given is clear

Confirmation that the Credit Union is clear about what its customer base is and that the products available are appropriate e.g. for asylum seekers/refugees

Improved connections and connections with businesses and VCSE organisations in the borough.

Confirmation that all opportunities for collaborative working with the Council are being explored.

**Signed:** Councillor Steve Nelson

**Date:** 29/01/19

**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**Residents Parking Zones (RPZ)**

The Council has only a “high level” policy regarding RPZ’s which has not been fully reviewed since 2004. There are regular requests for them from residents living near town and local shopping centres as well as near traffic generating facilities such as hospitals and schools. Many residents think that RPZ’s are a panacea with no downsides. The reality is that there are a range of issues that arise out of them e.g. costs to residents and visitors, no guarantee of a parking space for residents or visitors, issues with enforcement, potential loss of parking spaces as a result, simply moving the problem to areas immediately outside any residents parking zone etc.

To fully investigate the need for a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) requires a reasonable amount of staff resources and has a financial impact on the council but ultimately leads to the majority of requests being turned down either because there are no justifiable reasons to implement a scheme or they are not supported by the majority of residents.

There is limited publicly available information on how the Council assesses a request and further clarity is required as to the role of ward councillors in the initial process to determine if they need to be consulted and supporting a scheme before it is progressed or whether they merely need to be informed of a request. Councillors can find themselves in an invidious position if they are asked whether they support a request without having the results of the investigation arising from the request itself.

**OUTCOMES**

Updated clear and transparent policy and procedures for assessing the need and implementing RPZ’s.

Full information available to residents on the pros and cons of a RPZ so that they can make informed decisions about whether to request one in the first place.

Minimise the cost to Council of investigating, introducing, enforcing and ongoing administration of RPZ’s .

Assessment of their efficacy where in place currently.

Clarification of the role of ward councillors in the process for determining whether a scheme is progressed or not.

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

Residents have understandable desire to be able to park near their homes however the full consequences of implementing a RPZ to residents are not always clear when initially requesting a scheme.

<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>Ties in with Council's town centre regeneration proposals. Important interface between encouraging businesses and customers and impact on residents living nearby requiring a balance to be struck. Areas where demand on parking is over scribed can lead to road safety and accessibility issues especially to those who are mobility impaired.</p>
<p><b>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</b></p> <p>To determine the need for a scheme utilises valuable Council resources and finances however many schemes get rejected through the process. An updated and more detailed policy and procedure might result in fewer resident requests and a more efficient way of dealing with these requests and thus saving both money and officer time. The ongoing administration, maintenance and enforcement of these schemes are also an ongoing burden on Council resources.</p>
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p>RPZ's can help keep people safe and healthy by managing parking in areas where it is over scribed to ensure roads and pavements are safe to use by all.</p> <p>By correctly balancing the needs of residential and business-related parking can help support jobs and the economy.</p>
<p><b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b></p> <p><b>OUTCOMES</b> Updated clear and transparent policy and procedures for assessing the need and implementing RPZ's. Full information available to residents on the pros and cons of a RPZ so that they can make informed decisions about whether to request one in the first place. Minimise the cost to Council of investigating, introducing, enforcing and ongoing administration of RPZ's . Assessment of their efficacy where in place currently. Clarification of the role of ward councillors in the process for determining whether a scheme is progressed or not.</p>
<p><b>Signed:</b> Steve Nelson <b>Date:</b> 12.01.2021</p>
<p>Please return to:</p> <p>Judy Trainer Email: <a href="mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk">judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01642 528158</p>

## Select Committee Work Programme Suggested Review – Pro Forma

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

#### Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs)

Community Safety in Stockton on Tees is of paramount concern to the Council, which is why we have continued to prioritise resources in this service area. The Council are proud to have a team of Enforcement Officers, who exercise a wide range of powers in the execution of their duties with the overall objective of ensuring a safe place for residents to live and businesses to flourish.

Councils also know the issues that affect their localities the most and are well placed to identify how best to respond. Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs), introduced in 2014, sit amongst a broad range of powers and tools to help tackle anti-social behaviour locally. PSPOs are aimed at ensuring public spaces can be enjoyed free from anti-social behaviour.

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 introduced several new tools and powers for use by councils and their partners to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) in their local areas. These tools, which replaced and streamlined a number of previous measures, were brought in as part of a Government commitment to put victims at the centre of approaches to tackling ASB, focussing on the impact behaviour can have on both communities and individuals, particularly on the most vulnerable. PSPOs are one of the tools available under the 2014 Act. These are wide-ranging and flexible powers for local authorities, which recognise that councils are often best placed to identify the broad and cumulative impact that ASB can have.

The Act gives councils the authority to draft and implement PSPOs in response to the issues affecting their communities, provided certain criteria and legal tests are met. Councils can use PSPOs to prohibit specified activities, and/or require certain things to be done by people engaged in particular activities, within a defined public area. PSPOs differ from other tools introduced under the Act as they are council-led, and rather than targeting specific individuals or properties, they focus on the identified problem behaviour in a specific location.

Used proportionately and in the right circumstances, PSPOs allow local areas to counter unreasonable and persistent behaviour that affects the quality of life of its residents. They can send a clear message that certain behaviours will not be tolerated and help reassure residents that unreasonable conduct is being addressed. However, PSPOs will not be suitable or effective in all circumstances, and it is important to carefully consider the right approach for identifying and addressing the problem behaviour. The introduction of PSPOs in some other local authority areas around the country has attracted significant criticism, it is therefore important that any future use of PSPOs in Stockton on Tees is carefully framed, considered and scrutinised as to whether or not this is a viable option to consider.

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

#### Public interest justification:

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 provides a broad legal framework within which PSPOs can be implemented. Orders can be introduced in a specific public area where the local authority is satisfied on reasonable grounds that certain conditions have been met. A single PSPO can be used to target a range of different ASB issues. Orders allow councils to introduce reasonable prohibitions and/or requirements regarding certain behaviours within the specified public area

<p>Used proportionately and in the right circumstances, PSPOs allow local areas to counter unreasonable and persistent behaviour that affects the quality of life of its residents. They can send a clear message that certain behaviours will not be tolerated and help reassure residents that unreasonable conduct is being addressed. Whilst Stockton on Tees has both the lowest crime and ASB rate in the Tees Valley, there is still more work to do to support communities to live and thrive without the fear of crime and ASB.</p> <p>Community safety is about helping communities to be and feel safe. It is important that our residents feel safe where they live, work and spend leisure time. Whilst a great deal of work has been done to date, further improvements and scrutiny in this area is absolutely in the interest of every resident in Stockton on Tees in order to continue and drive high standards of community safety.</p>
<p><b>Impact on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area:</b></p> <p>Given the nature of this topic, the impact on society and the overall wellbeing in terms of safety is high. Every resident, business owner and visitor to Stockton on Tees is directly and indirectly affected by how safe our communities are. This is an area in which the council can have a positive impact for society through influencing policy and procedure.</p>
<p><b>Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:</b></p> <p>With ever increasing demand on council resources, it is prudent to ensure that working arrangements are continuously reviewed to ensure the maximisation of resources. As demand on community safety related services increases, a review in this area will look at potential areas of tackling key issues in our communities in an efficient way.</p>
<p><b>Keep in Context (are other reviews taking place in this area?):</b></p> <p>There are no previous, current or pending reviews that cover this topic both directly or indirectly.</p>
<p><b>How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?</b></p> <p>Making the Borough a place where people are healthy, safe and protected from harm means creating a place where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• People live in cohesive and safe communities</li><li>• People are supported and protected from harm</li><li>• Supports the economic regeneration of our town centres</li></ul>
<p><b>What would you want the outcome of the review to be?</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To understand the requirements of introducing a PSPO and the process which needs to be followed.</li><li>2. To explore further what a PSPO can be used for and whether the introduction of a PSPO in Stockton on Tees would have a benefit in reducing anti-social behaviour and crime in our borough.</li><li>3. To explore the benefits and potential challenges of introducing a PSPO within the boundary of Stockton on Tees including benefits to our wider partners i.e. Police, Fire.</li><li>4. The exploration of any new and innovative ways of using a PSPO improve community safety and address key issues in our communities.</li></ol>
<p><b>Signed:</b> Councillor Steve Nelson <b>Date:</b> 26/02/2021</p>

**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**Flooding on pavements and in public carparks is an issue across the Borough**

In Billingham, there are several areas where flooding is a concern. On Sandy Lane, the problem was resolved but flooding has now returned. In Billingham Town Centre, flooding occurs on the roads, i.e. entering the library car park, and further along so that pedestrians wanting to walk along the footpath towards the job centre etc could come across flooding. This is not acceptable for people who need to use walking aids etc. The flooding does not occur in the library car park itself. John Whitehead Park also suffers terrible flooding on pathways and the grassed areas. There are also cases of flooding on the cycle paths that run alongside Billingham Road.

This review would seek to address this issue so that a longer-term solution to flooding can be found in the areas where it is most needed.

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

Most of the areas that are subject to flooding are in public places and could pose health and safety risks, especially in disabled areas of public car parks.

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

Dealing with flooding will result in positive social and environmental outcomes in the Borough's public places.

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

Tackling the issue now might reduce Council spending in the long term.

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

No other reviews are currently taking place on this issue or related issues.

**How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?**

Making the Borough a place that is clean, vibrant and attractive means creating:

- Great places to live and visit
- Clean and green spaces

**What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

To assess the worst areas of flooding in Billingham and across the Borough and to find the

most effective and financially viable solution.

**Signed:** Cllr Helen Atkinson

**Date:** 12 February 2021

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158



**Select Committee Work Programme  
Suggested Review – Pro Forma**

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

**Numbers of Large Bonfires on run up to November 5<sup>th</sup> and how to manage them on the night**

Last year there were significant issues relating to these bonfires, including:

- Damage to grassed areas
- Fly-tipping including refrigerators, old mattresses, kitchen units etc.
- Public disorder
- Obstructive parking
- Attacks on public sector workers when intervening

Desired outcome:

- Either prohibit unofficial bonfires
- Provide hard standing areas for fires to prevent damage to grassland
- Agree a number of official community bonfire sites and produce a proactive management plan

**Please be clear about the focus of the review and desired outcome.**

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:**

- Prevent lawlessness
- Reducing damage to the grassland
- Enhanced public safety
- Promoting community cohesion
- Creating a consistent plan so everyone knows what is permitted

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

- Promoting community cohesion
- Reducing crime and disorder
- Protecting green space

**Council performance, efficiency (identification of savings and reducing demand) in this area:**

- Reducing ground maintenance costs
- Reducing cost of removing fly tipping
- Reducing costs to Civic Enforcement

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

- None to our knowledge

**How does the topic support delivery of the Council Plan?**

A place where people are healthy, safe and protected from harm:

- Reduction in crime and disorder leading to a safer place

A place that is clean, vibrant and attractive

- Cleaning up and protection of green spaces

**What would you want the outcome of the review to be?**

A future policy with regards to the management of community bonfires.

**Signed:** Cllr Norma Stephenson

**Date:** 24 February 2021

Please return to:

Judy Trainer  
Scrutiny Section  
Democratic Services  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees  
TS18 1LD

Email: [judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:judith.trainer@stockton.gov.uk)

Tel: 01642 528158