

Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

5 July 2016

Present: Councillor S Graham (Chair)
Councillors J Allan, A Austin, B Burdis, S Cox,
N Craven, P Earley, Janet Hunter, C Johnson,
T Mulvenna, J O'Shea, and M Rankin

School Governor Representatives
Mrs J Little
Mrs M Ord

Others in attendance
Councillor P Mason

OV08/07/16 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs S Day, J Wallace and Rev M Vine - Church Representative

OV09/07/16 Substitute Members

Pursuant to the Council's constitution the appointment of the following substitute Member was reported:-

Councillor P Mason for Councillor J Wallace

OV10/07/16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest reported.

OV11/07/16 Minutes

Resolved that minute of the meeting held on 6 June 2016 be confirmed;

OV12/07/16 Creating a Brighter Future programme Progress Report

The Committee received a progress report to key Business Cases of the Creating a Brighter Future (CBF) Programme for the first quarter of the 2016/17.

The Committee was reminded that Cabinet had agreed 14 Business Cases that would go towards achieving the priorities set out in Our North Tyneside Plan, the CBF Programme and the Target Operating Model.

The 14 Business Cases totalled 29 individual projects and the information presented provided key milestones, delivery points and financial savings needed to achieve the

required aim. Each project was given a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) rating to provide assurance progress was being made.

Across the 29 projects contained within the CBF Programme, the RAG ratings were:

- 6 projects were complete
- 8 projects were rated Green
- 15 projects were rated Amber
- 0 projects were rated as Red

A Member commented to how information on progress was presented. It was viewed that the emphasis was on financial savings and not service delivery to customers.

The Head of Commercial Services & Business Redesign stated that the presentation of information would be reviewed to possibly change the format to show a dashboard showing RAG status for both- financial and customer outcomes.

A Member sought assurance that those projects rated Amber would achieve the required aim by the end of the year.

The Committee was informed that as projects progress into the second quarter (Sept – Oct), there would be a clearer understanding and confidence to, which projects would achieve their aims and which if any would need further work.

The Committee reviewed each project and made the following comments:

BC06a Community Provision of Family Services

It was commented that although the project status was green, it was thought some facets of this project had been withdrawn and it was requested for the position to be clarified.

BC06b Community Provision of Family Services

It was questioned if Locality Teams would be located in the Whitley Bay CFC.

BC12 Supporting Young People & Adults into Employment

It was noted that the project had an Amber rating and it was asked if the rating was only for making the saving. It was questioned if evidential data was available to give assurance that the support being provided was successful in getting young people/ adults into employment. It was declared if the service was not providing the required outcomes, should funding continue.

It was also questioned to the consequences of the EU Referendum and would the necessary savings identified in year be affected in relation to the Big Lottery European funding.

It was stated that it was too early to understand what effect would arise as a result of the EU Referendum, however, it was expected that committed funding would be safe although there had been no confirmation to date.

ASC9: Integrated Disability Team

A Member stated that although the project was complete and the savings had been realised, it was questioned to the effect this had on service delivery.

ASC10 Glebe/Wilson Terrace

Clarification was sought to what the reference to Glebe was.

BC14 Review of Our Estate

It was questioned to the position for the usage of the top floor to the Wallsend CFC. It was agreed that an item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting September 2016 to receive an updated position.

BC01 Citizen Interaction & Delivery of Service

Reassurance was sought that the systems in place to deliver the TOM were appropriate to provide necessary services. Members were informed that significant investment was taking place to procure a Citizen Portal to do this.

With regards to progress on Deprivation of Liberty it was asked what effect the redesign had/may have on timescales (e.g. 7 days for urgent authorisations).

Difficulties in the use of voice recognition telephone services were highlighted and it was stated that its use was frustrating to use. It was believed this would discourage customers to use this method of communication.

It was requested that data to the level of calls diverted to call handlers when the system fails be provided.

BC02: Workforce Change

Members noted that this project was on targets but questioned what the effect this would have on the workforce.

BC05: Payment Strategy (Fees & Charges)

Members noted that Chip and Pin options were to be evaluated and asked for the reason why this was being done. It was stated that increasing fees and costs to using chip and pin was being realised through banking changes.

Agreed that (1) the Creating a Brighter Future programme Progress Report be noted; (2) an item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting September 2016 to the updated position for the usage of the top floor to the Wallsend CFC;(3) information requested through questioning be provided to all members of the committee.

OV13/07/16 The Operation of Planning Obligations (s106 agreements) in North Tyneside

The Committee received a presentation to the Operation of Planning Obligations (which is also referred as Section 106 agreements) in North Tyneside.

A planning obligation is a formal document that identifies, relevant land, the person entering the obligation and the relevant Local Authority who would be responsible for its enforcement. The obligation becomes a land charge and remains with the land even if it is sold and would only be removed when the obligation has been fulfilled.

Planning legislation sets the parameters within, which planning obligations can be sought and the Committee was provided information to the background of the Community Infrastructure Levy introduced in 2010 and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

There are a range of circumstances (9 key topic areas) a planning obligation might be sought for essential infrastructure or appropriate financial contributions and examples of the provision standards and expected contributions were provided for each topic area. The 9 topic areas being:

1. Health facilities
2. Greenspace and children's play
3. Active sports space and outdoor recreation facilities
4. Education
5. Employment and training
6. Affordable housing
7. Sustainable transport
8. Community services and facilities
9. Culture, public art and the public realm.

The Committee was informed of the process undertaken to securing a planning obligation and that the decision to enter into a legal agreement is made by the Authority's Planning Committee.

Where the obligation is financial, the payments were index linked, developments were monitored and invoices raised for sums due when payments triggers set out in the obligation are reached. Funds would then only be transferred to the spending service when works were completed.

The Committee believed all Members of the Council would benefit receiving the presentation. It was also stated that all Members would benefit and should be encouraged to undertake the Planning training (online module).

It was requested that Ward Members be contacted at the earliest time when applications or pre-applications were received for the wards that they represent to enable their views to be taken into account.

The Committee was informed that for major applications (10+ units), Ward Members were notified and this issue would be investigated to how Members could be notified at the earliest opportunity.

Agreed that the presentation relating to the Operation of Planning Obligations be noted.

OV14/07/16 Parking Permit Sub-group Report

The Committee received a report produced by the Parking Permit Sub-group.

The Parking Permit Sub-group was established in November 2015 by the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, on the request of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport.

The Sub-group was asked to review the current permit system and identify ways to improve and simplify the permit system across the borough.

The review was structured in a way that divided the permit parking issues into the following three sections; resident permits; business permits and other /miscellaneous permits.

The Sub-group held discussions with officers, residents and business representatives to gather views on the current system and areas of improvement.

The Sub-group made 18 recommendations that revised the three elements of the permit system: resident permits; business permits and other/miscellaneous permits and if implemented would simplify and provide a more consistent/effective permit system.

Agreed that (1) the Parking Permit Sub-group report and recommendations listed be referred to Cabinet for consideration:

R1. That a virtual permit system be introduced for the administration of parking permits, subject to consideration of the most appropriate model/software to meet the Council's needs.

R2. That initially a hybrid virtual permit system should be introduced, with non transferable resident permits being virtual, and transferable permits, such as residents' visitor permits, being paper-based. Both options would have an on-line application facility to improve the service to the customer. The hybrid system would be reviewed at the end of the first year to see if a fully virtual option was recommended.

R3. That the virtual permit system be implemented across the borough simultaneously, with support for residents available via customer service centres as required.

The Sub-group recommend that the following revised scheme be adopted in relation to resident permits:

R4. That resident parking permits be made available as follows:

- An annual charge of £25 to be introduced for all resident permits, with the charge reviewed on an annual basis to ensure the costs of the service can be met;
- To allow a maximum of 3 non-transferable resident permits per household, plus 1 transferrable residents visitor permit, each at an annual cost of £25;
- Households with an appropriate off-road parking facility to be restricted to 2 resident permits per household, plus 1 transferrable residents' visitor permit;
- Resident permits to be virtual permits registered by vehicle registration number and implemented via a virtual system;
- All permits to be renewed on an annual basis with the charge implemented at the next renewal;
- One transferrable residents visitor permit to be available per household at a charge of £25 – this would be a transferable paper based permit;
- One transferrable residents visitor permit to be made available to households within shared use permit schemes at a charge of £25
- The current paper-based scratchcard system for multiple visitors be discontinued and replaced with a virtual system, with an option for residents to telephone the parking services team who would be able to book time online. This option would continue to be specific to permit only restrictions and charged at £1 for a maximum of 3 hours.

R5. That the Council only consider shared use schemes (i.e. limited waiting with an exemption for permits or pay and display with an exemption for permits) in areas that have a high level of commercial demand, to support the vitality of these areas. This should apply to all schemes moving forward, but would not be retro fit to such areas that already have a resident-only permit scheme.

R6. That the income generated from permits to be used to support the operational costs of the permit parking system and consideration be given to any surplus generated to be used to fund new permit parking schemes that meet the Council's criteria and wider network management objectives.

R7. That the following modified parking assessment criteria be adopted:

Criteria	Level
1. Amount of on-street parking available	at least 85% of parking space occupied for at least 3 hours per day
2. Amount of on-street parking used by non-residents	at least 30% of parked vehicles estimated to be non-residents

3. Only shared use restrictions to be implemented in areas that have commercial demand	-
4. Hours of restriction to be appropriate to the parking problem identified	-
5. Level of resident support for scheme	at least 51% of households in the street to respond in favour

R8. That the introduction of the new system will include a guarantee that permit areas will be monitored for enforcement at least once per day.

R9. That existing permit schemes can be withdrawn in instances where a majority of households within a scheme do not wish the scheme to continue.

The Sub-group recommend that the following revised scheme be adopted in relation to business permits:

R10. All businesses to be permitted to apply for one transferable business permit, at a charge of £250 per annum, with no requirement for the vehicle to be for essential operational use.

R11. Permits to be transferable paper-based permits, limited by area rather than zone, with an on line application process and eligibility checked against business rate information or other verification criteria.

R12. The impact of this revised system to be reviewed after a year.

R13. All current scratchcards for business use to be discontinued, with the exception of:

- Tradesman permit – £1 for 3 hours, only applicable in permit only restrictions;
- Bed and breakfast permit - to be continued but charge to be increased to £5 for 24 hours, valid in shared use and permit only restrictions.

In line with other proposals, these permits will be temporary virtual permits with an on-line application system.

The Sub-group recommend that the following be adopted in relation to other/miscellaneous permits:

R14. Care home resident permits be retained with the charge increased to £25 in line with the recommended charge for resident permits. These would be transferrable paper-based permits.

R15. That the community workers permit and clock system be retained, with the charge increased from £20 to £25 in line with the recommended charge for resident permits, and the maximum length of stay reduced to 2 hours.

R16. That Council permits be retained with the charge increased from £20 to £25 in line with the recommended charge for Resident permits.

The above permits options would all have an on-line application process.

R17. That the current company car resident permit be discontinued, with residents able to use their transferable residents' visitor permit, or to register a change of registration number via the virtual system, as required.

R18. Church and community centre permits be discontinued as current take up is low.

OV15/07/16 Future Construction Options Sub-group Report

The Committee received a report produced by the Future Construction Options Sub - group.

The Sub Group was established by the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, on the request of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport.

The sub-group was asked to review the delivery model options available to the Authority, in light of its current 10 Year contract with Kier North Tyneside (KNT JVCo) that was due to end in March 2019.

The committee was made aware that the Authority has an option to extend the contract for a further 5 years, however it was thought beneficial to investigate all possible options and to provide an informed view to the options that should have further appraisal after taking into account views of various stakeholders.

The sub-group held discussions with KNT Limited, tenants and unions officials (to receive the views of the KNT JVCo workforce). It also made reference to the body of work that had been undertaken in 2015/16 in relation to 'Kier North Tyneside Joint Venture – Future Priorities'.

The sub-group made one recommendation and raised specific areas that it believed that Authority should consider in making its final decision to its future construction option.

Agreed that (1) There was a need to fully evaluate the effects of any proposed central government policy that would impact on all services delivered through the contract;

(2) Detailed financial analysis is required on the future budget expectations and impact to service delivery for each work stream within the contract to provide a greater understanding the most appropriate delivery model for each work stream;

(3) It is essential that analysis be undertaken to ascertain the cost saving to the services that have been centralised away from North Tyneside and the effect on the Authority, the workforce, tenants, suppliers and the wider community;

(4) It is essential to understand the effect of having (what was viewed) a 2 tier workforce, where employees were required to work to different terms and conditions for fulfilling the same duties and to what effect this would have financially to achieve parity; and

(5) Cabinet instruct officers to undertake further detailed appraisal of each of the 3 options selected by the Scrutiny Sub-group as the most appropriate future options available:

- Option 2 - Extend the current Joint Venture partnership incorporating variations to the existing contract (with no material change)
- Option 6 - Retender the service on the basis of multiple non-exclusive framework contracts
- Option 8 - Bring the Repairs and Maintenance service back in house supported by a non-exclusive framework arrangement for major capital works