

Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

6 October 2016

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

Church Representative
Rev M Vine

Others in attendance
Councillor E Hodson
Councillor B Pickard

OV026/10/16 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from
Councillors J Wallace and C Johnson
Mr O'Hanlon – Church Representative,
Mrs J Little & Mrs M Ord - School Governor Representatives

OV27/10/16 Substitute Members

Pursuant to the Council's constitution the appointment of the following substitute Member was reported:-
Councillor E Hodson for Councillor J Wallace

OV28/10/16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of Interest reported.

OV29/10/16 Minutes

A Member sought clarification to if it was recorded when Members leave the meeting. An officer informed the Committee that during the meeting a record of the number of Members who leave the meeting was noted to ensure that a quorum was always in place. However the minute would only detail this when a meeting became inquorate.

Resolved that minute of the meeting held on 5 September 2016 be confirmed;

Members asked that for an item in relation to Wallsend Customer First Centre be provided to the next meeting of the Committee on the 7 November 2016.

It was stated that following receipt of further information circulated following the meeting held on the 5 September in relation to the item on Accommodation Review Update, that the information received did not fully provide the explanation requested.

3 October 2016

Agreed that an Item in relation to Wallsend Customer First Centre be requested for the meeting to be held on the 7 September 2016.

OV30/10/16 Creating a Brighter Future – update

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

Although there were 14 Business Cases, some required more than one project to deliver the required aims and objectives, there were 28 projects in total and the report provided key milestones and any risks to their delivery.

In response to Members comments a new approach had been adopted and demonstrated both the project status and savings delivery. Each project had been given a Red, Amber, Green 'RAG' rating for both project and savings delivery.

A summary was provided that showed that status across the 28 projects contained within the CBF Programme

RAG Rating	Project Status	Savings Delivery
Complete	9 projects	12 projects fully realised savings
Green	17 projects on track with no risks identified	5 projects expect to fully realise savings
Amber	2 projects had risks to delivery identified	11 projects had risks to savings identified or savings will accrue throughout the year
Red	0 projects had major risks to delivery identified	0 projects had major risks to savings realisation identified

The Committee reviewed each project and made the following comments:

BC07: Support to Schools

It was noted that the project was complete, however there was concern that as savings had been made through staffing changes and how this could affect the support that could be provided. The Committee was reassured that the savings that had been made were through the deleting of vacant posts.

BC12: Supporting Young People & Adults into Employment

It was noted that the project had a Green rating and the savings status was complete it was asked if this was due only to staff reduction.

It was stated that a portion of savings had been made by the deletion of vacant posts and that there was a need to undergo a restructure for the long term. It was recognised that a long term strategy would need to be put in place once a review of implications of the white paper on the future of educational services was complete.

BC09/ASC7: Tier 4 Drug Services

A Member stated that with raised concerns to the levels of reported drug use reported in the press, to what effect making saving to this project would have on service delivery.

It was stated that the Authority had the responsibility in co-ordinating the delivery of the service and that there had been no decrease in budget and the business case had been completed through the use of alternative provision available and realignment from the Adult Social Care budget.

BC09/ASC1: Independent Supported Living

A Member enquired to the type of approach provided to adults with autism.

It was stated that the Authority approach focused on an individuals requirements and a support package would be built around those needs.

A Member requested information to the number of people with autism in long term care and the difference to that prior to the revised approach.

BC09/ASC8: Review of Day Services

It was asked and confirmed that individual personal budget was means tested.

BC11: Looked after Children Services

Clarification was sought to the work undertaken by the Edge of Care team.

The service works with individuals who were on the boundary of the care system with the purpose to stop children needing to be taken into care.

BC01 Citizen Interaction & Delivery of Service

A Member stated the business case had the greatest saving need and had an amber rating on both project and savings delivery. It was asked if officers were confident that both aspects of the business case would be delivered.

In response it was stated that there was confidence that the majority would meet the targeted delivery, however there had been some procurement delay with some IT systems that might effect delivery.

A Member enquired if the running the counts for the national and local elections could be integrated into this business case. It was stated that there was prescribed regulations to how to conduct election counts and any change would needed to be made by a act of parliament.

Agreed that the Creating a Brighter Future programme Progress Report be noted

OV31/10/16 NECA Update

The Chief Executive attended the meeting at the Committee's request to provide an update to the devolution agreement for the North East Combined Authority (NECA).

As a result of the outcome of the EU referendum the NECA Leadership Board had sought further assurances from Government. The Leadership Board then met on the 6 September to review the additional assurances received from Government and decided not to publish and consult on the Governance Review and Scheme. The Committee heard that the Leadership Board had reiterated its support for the

principle of devolution, it was not able to reach a majority decision to proceed with the deal and launch the consultation.

On the 8th September the Government announced that the deal had been withdrawn and the implementation work being conducted by central government had come to an end.

The NECA's work would continue on projects relating to transport, employability and inclusion and economic development and regeneration.

North Tyneside would continue to make contributions through the transport levy through NEXUS, Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and to NECA investment team.

It was highlighted that there were expected changes to the level of contributions the Council would make during the budget process in January 2017 and these changes would feed into the Councils budget.

It was highlighted to the Committee that if agreement had been met on the 6 September this would have realised a transfer of significant powers for employment and skills, transport, housing, planning, business support and investment from central government to the North East in order to deliver the funding and responsibilities that are required to accelerate the area's economic growth.

Not taking the opportunity for devolution would have major effects for North Tyneside and the region. It was stated that NECA had £600m planned devolution projects that would have been funded through the £1.5bn investment fund, however these now needed to be prioritised to what could be delivered. The region would continue to receive Local Growth Funding (LGF) of approximately £65m. It was stated that local businesses had £80m of planned projects that were now at risk.

Other areas affected were:

- Business growth/inward and foreign investment
- Business 5G connectivity
- Landboard for housing
- Metro improvement projects
- The ability for bus franchising
- Ashington/Blyth/Newcastle rail line

It was stated that demand for services will increase and there was a need to understand that without the devolution deal these would take longer to deliver.

A Member asked what possible alternatives were available for North Tyneside now to try and deliver projects. The Chief Executive stated that the Mayor had asked that discussions take place with neighbouring authority's to see how projects could be progressed. It was also explained that the potential for a North of Tyne devolution deal would be explored with officers of Northumberland and Newcastle City Council's and that discussions with government would follow.

The Committee was informed that before entering into any North of Tyne deal, a decision would be required by Cabinet to proceed and consultation with members would take place before any potential decision would be made.

A Member stated that it looked like a missed opportunity for the region and asked who would be responsible for the management of the Local Growth Fund. The Committee was informed that it was probable that control of the LGF would be given to the LEP.

A Member asked if assurances were given by the Government that the £30m per year funding would continue for the full 30 years of the devolution deal and not just up until 2020. The Chief Executive reassured the Committee that guarantees had been written into the deal that the funding would be in place for the full 30 year period.

A Member stated that it was the belief of some that funding could be withdrawn after 2020 and stated that Government has made changes to other local government funding after giving similar guarantees.

The Chief Executive stated that there were some EU Funding concerns, however, the £30m for 30 years had been guaranteed by Government.

A Member enquired and was informed that the Government had not guaranteed to reimburse possible EU funding losses for any other combined authorities.

A Member asked what North Tyneside resources had been used since the NECA Chief Executive had left the post. The Chief Executive stated that he had acted as the NECA Head of Paid Service in the interim period, however, this position had been taken over by Helen Golightly from the LEP and North Tyneside were reimbursed appropriately for period he was interim.

Agreed that the NECA update be noted.

OV32/10/16 Cabinet response to Parking Permit Sub-group report

The Committee received the response report from Cabinet to the recommendations submitted by the sub group of the Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee in relation to its study into permit parking in North Tyneside.

Appended to the report was the action to be taken and timescale for completion of each of the recommendations.

Agreed that the recommendation response from Cabinet in relation to the work of the Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee work into permit parking in North Tyneside be noted.

OV33/10/16 Cabinet response to Future Construction Options Report

The Committee received the response from Cabinet to the recommendations submitted by the sub group of the Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee in relation to its study into the long term construction requirements of North Tyneside Council and to what delivery options should be considered post 2019.

Appended to the report was the action to be taken and timescale for completion of each of the recommendations.

Agreed that the recommendation response from Cabinet in relation to the work of the Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee into the long term construction requirements of North Tyneside Council and what delivery options should be considered post 2019 be noted.