



SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Monday, 15th June, 2009 at 10.00 am

A pre-meeting will take place for ALL Members of the Board
in a Committee Room at 9.30 am

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

- B Anderson (Chair) - Adel and
Wharfedale;
- A Blackburn - Farnley and Wortley;
- A Castle - Harewood;
- D Coupar - Middleton Park;
- R Downes - Otley and Yeadon;
- D Hollingsworth - Burmantofts and
Richmond Hill;
- K Hussain - Hyde Park and
Woodhouse;
- G Hyde - Killingbeck and
Seacroft;
- J Jarosz - Pudsey;
- J Marjoram - Calverley and
Farsley;
- L Mulherin - Ardsley and Robin
Hood;
- M Rafique - Chapel Allerton;

Please note: Certain or all items on this agenda may be recorded on tape

Agenda compiled by:
Stuart Robinson
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR
Tel: 24 74360

Principal Scrutiny Adviser:
Angela Brogden
Tel: 24 74553

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded.)</p> <p>(*In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, written notice of an appeal must be received by the Chief Democratic Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting)</p>	
2			<p>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p> <p>No exempt items or information have been identified on this agenda.</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>To declare any personal / prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence.</p>	
6			<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</p> <p>To receive and approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th May 2009.</p>	1 - 6
7			<p>EXECUTIVE BOARD - MINUTES</p> <p>To receive the minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 13th May 2009.</p>	7 - 14
8			<p>CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO SCRUTINY</p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to Scrutiny.</p>	15 - 36
9			<p>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on Co-opted Members.</p>	37 - 40

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
10			<p>INPUT TO THE BOARD'S WORK PROGRAMME 2009/10 - SOURCES OF WORK AND ESTABLISHING THE BOARD'S PRIORITIES.</p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on an input into the Board's work programme for 2009/10 and to identify sources of work and establish the Board's priorities.</p>	41 - 56
11			<p>KPMG - SCRUTINY REVIEW - MAY 2009</p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on a recent KPMG external audit review of Scrutiny.</p>	57 - 96
12			<p>DETERMINING THE WORK PROGRAMME 2009/10</p> <p>To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on determining the Board's work programme for 2009/10.</p>	97 - 104
13			<p>INQUIRY INTO OLDER PEOPLE'S HOUSING - DRAFT REPORT</p> <p>To consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development seeking the Board's approval of the final report in relation to the above inquiry.</p>	105 - 144
14			<p>DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>To note the following dates and times:-</p> <p>Monday 13th July 2009 Monday 14th September 2009 Monday 12th October 2009 Monday 9th November 2009 Monday 14th December 2009 Monday 11th January 2010 Monday 8th February 2010 Monday 8th March 2010 Monday 19th April 2010</p> <p>All at 10.00 am (pre-meetings at 9.30 am)</p>	

Agenda Item 6

SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

MONDAY, 11TH MAY, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor B Anderson in the Chair

Councillors A Blackburn, A Castle,
D Coupar, D Hollingsworth and G Hyde

125 Late Items

In accordance with his powers under Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair consented to the submission of two late items of urgent business relating to the draft final report in relation to the Private Rented Sector Housing Inquiry and the draft Annual Scrutiny Report 2008/09 (Agenda Items 8 and 12) (Minutes 131 and 133 refer).

The reports were late due to the short timescale involved in producing the reports and consulting interested parties on their content.

126 Declarations of Interest

The following personal interests were declared:-

- Councillor B Anderson in his capacity as a Director of West North West Homes (Agenda Items 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12) (Minutes 130,131, 132, 133 and 136 refer)
- Councillor A Blackburn in her capacity as a Director of West North West Homes (Agenda Items 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12) (Minutes 130,131, 132, 133 and 136 refer)
- Councillor D Coupar in her capacity as a member on the Belle Isle North Estate Management Board (Agenda Items 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12) (Minutes 130,131,132,133 and 136 refer)
- Councillor D Hollingsworth in his capacity as a Director of East North East Homes (Agenda Items 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12) (Minutes 130,131, 132, 133 and 136 refer)and as a member on the Aire Valley Neighbourhood Renewal Board (Agenda Item 11) (Minute 132 refers)
- Councillor G Hyde in his capacity as a Director of East North East Homes (Agenda Items 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12) (Minutes 130,131,132,133 and 136 refer)

127 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Gabriel, Kirkland, Marjoram and Mulherin.

128 Minutes - 20th April 2009

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 20th April 2009 be confirmed as a correct record.

129 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Performance Report – Quarter 3 2008/09 (Min No 120 refers)

The Chair reported that the additional information requested by Members would be circulated in the next fortnight.

130 Draft Leeds Housing Strategy

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on the draft Leeds Housing Strategy, in line with the Budget and Policy Framework.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Strategic Theme 1: Increasing the supply of Affordable Housing (Appendix 1 refers)
- Strategic Theme 2: Improving Housing Quality (Appendix 2 refers)
- Strategic Theme 3: Promoting Independent Living (Appendix 3 refers)

The following officers were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

Bridget Emery, Head of Housing Strategy and Commissioning
Rob McCartney, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager

In brief summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The definition of affordable housing was discussed (Paragraph 2.5 of report refers);
- The need for sufficient green space to be built into all developments, and how this was proposed to be tackled locally;
- The likely effect of the current recession on the proposals outlined in the Strategy, especially the likelihood of attracting private investment, e.g. to improve the private rented sector. Reference was made to the need to develop other innovative means of attracting investment, for example the partnership approach developed in Liverpool, involving the Liverpool Health Trust;
- Initiatives to try to involve landlords in improving housing conditions, such as the Accreditation Scheme;
- Establishing a more localised approach towards housing allowances, which considered the location, type and condition of rented properties;

- Other initiatives, such as Housing Associations buying or leasing empty properties from developers, to let as social housing;
- Actions Plans (3- one for each strategic key theme identified in the Strategy) would evolve once the proposed Housing Strategy was approved, but these needed to be flexible and responsive to reflect the current volatile nature of the housing market;
- The proposed promotion of 'Warm Zones' was welcomed, but it was recognised that, again, it was a question of being able to secure sufficient funding to enable this initiative to progress.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the report be received and noted.
- (b) That the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser prepares and circulates to Members for comment a draft written summary of comments at today's meeting, for submission to the Executive Board in July, when it considers the draft Leeds Housing Strategy.
- (c) That the officers be thanked for all their hard work, and the manner in which they have supported the Board and responded to Members queries and comments, both today and throughout the last municipal year.

131 Scrutiny Inquiry - Private Rented Sector Housing - Draft Final Report

Referring to Minute 95 of the meeting held on 9th February 2009, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report seeking the Board's approval of the draft final report in relation to the above Inquiry.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Draft Private Rented Sector Housing Scrutiny Inquiry Report' for the information/comment of the meeting.

Andy Beattie, Head of Service, Pollution Control and Housing, was in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

In brief summary, the main points of discussion were:

- Andy Beattie distributed copies of the Spring 2009 edition of 'The Network', the newsletter of the West Yorkshire Association Partnership, which showed that many of the issues identified in the Board's report supported improvement initiatives already being undertaken in the area;
- The fundamental difference between the aims and objectives of an Accredited Tenants Scheme (ATS) and a Tenant Referencing Scheme were discussed. In terms of a Tenant Referencing Scheme, it would be more helpful if Recommendation 15 referred to the 'Leeds City Region' rather than just West Yorkshire;
- Andy Beattie made reference to an anticipated response from the Government by the autumn to the Rugg Review, the national review of the private rented sector (Paragraph 1.8 of the Board's final report refers)

RESOLVED –

- (a) That subject to the above suggested alteration in respect of Recommendation 15, the Board's draft Final Report on Private Rented Sector Housing be approved;
- (b) That Andy Beattie be thanked for all his hard work, and the manner in which he has supported the Board and responded to Members' queries and comments, both today and throughout the last municipal year.

132 Scrutiny Inquiry into the East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Regeneration Project

Referring to Minute 110 of the meeting held on 16th March 2009, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on evidence in line with session one of the Board's Inquiry into the East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Regeneration Project.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Inquiry into the East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Regeneration Scheme – Terms of Reference (Appendix 1 refers)
- Summary report of the working group meeting held on 6th April 2009 (Appendix 2 refers)

RESOLVED – That the Board notes the summary report of the working group meeting held on 6th April 2009.

133 Annual Report 2008/9

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report seeking approval of the Board's contribution to the Annual Scrutiny Report.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Draft Annual Report 2008/09 Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)' for the information/comment of the meeting.

RESOLVED – That approval be given to the Board's contribution to the composite Annual Report in accordance with the report now submitted.

134 Work Programme

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report on the Board's current work programme, including a list of provisional items for the Board's successor body to consider in respect of the 2009/10 municipal year.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Current work programme (Appendix 1 refers)

- Relevant extract of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for the period 1st May 2009 to 31st August 2009 (Appendix 2 refers)

Members felt that the successor Board should give priority to the Roseville Door Factory and ALMO inspections items. Reference was also made to an Inquiry next year into the City's Independent Living Projects – possibly a joint Inquiry involving the Adult Social Care Board.

RESOLVED – That subject to the above comments, the Board notes the current position with regard to the work programme which would be forwarded to the new Board for the 2009/10 municipal year for consideration.

135 Scrutiny Inquiry into Asylum Seeker Case Resolution - Draft Final Report

Referring to Minute 96 of the meeting held on 9th February 2009, the Head of Scrutiny Support and Member Development submitted a report seeking the Board's approval of the draft final report in relation to the above Inquiry.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Draft Asylum Seeker Case Resolution Scrutiny Inquiry Report' for the information/comment of the meeting.

Consideration was also given to initial comments on the draft report received from the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership (YHRMP) and the UK Border Agency (UKBA). In particular, the Board agreed to the suggested amendment to Recommendation 8, for a 'joint' action plan to be developed by the YHRMP and UKBA, aimed at strengthening communication links between all key partners across the region.

Sharon Haque, Leeds Refugee and Asylum Service Manager, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That subject to the above alteration in respect of Recommendation 8, approval be given to the Board's Inquiry report on Asylum Seeker Case Resolution.
- (b) That Sharon Haque be thanked for all her hard work and the manner in which she has supported the Board and responded to Members' queries and comments both today and throughout the last municipal year.

136 Scrutiny Inquiry into Street Cleaning - Draft Final Report

Referring to Minute 94 of the meeting held on 9th February 2009, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report seeking the Board's approval of the draft final report in relation to the above Inquiry.

Appended to the report was a copy of a document entitled 'Draft Street Cleaning Scrutiny Inquiry Report' for the information/comment of the meeting.

Andrew Mason, Chief Environmental Services Officer, and Stephen Smith, Head of Environmental Services, attended the meeting and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

- Recommendation 1 – It was agreed to amend this to make reference to fulfilling the Council's obligations under the Environmental Protection Act
- Recommendation 3 – Reference to an action plan to be deleted from this Recommendation and for this to be amended to include reference to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods taking immediate steps to strengthen communication links between the different street cleansing service areas
- Recommendation 2 – To add to this Recommendation, making reference to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods producing an action plan within 6 months aimed at bringing the Council's responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act, for keeping land clear of litter and refuse, into one single service area
- Recommendation 7 – To be expanded to include reference to training and induction for all relevant staff, e.g. estate caretakers, not just street cleaning operatives.

RESOLVED-

- (a) That subject to the above proposed amendments, approval be given to the Board's Final Inquiry Report into Street Cleaning.
- (b) That the officers be thanked for all their hard work, and the manner in which they have supported the Board and responded to Members' queries and comments, both today and throughout the last municipal year.

137 Chair's Closing Remarks

The Chair thanked Members and witnesses for their contribution and commitment to the Board during the past year. He also thanked the Board's Principal Scrutiny Adviser and Corporate Governance Officer for their support throughout the municipal year.

The meeting concluded at 11.26 am.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 13TH MAY, 2009

PRESENT: Councillor A Carter in the Chair

Councillors R Brett, J L Carter, R Finnigan,
S Golton, R Harker, P Harrand, J Procter,
S Smith and K Wakefield

Councillor J Blake – Advisory Member

254 Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information so designated as follows:

- (a) Appendix 1 to the report referred to in minute 258 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the appendix provides a brief overview of the anticipated costs and identified funding associated with the proposed acquisition. It is considered not to be in the public interest to disclose this information at this point in time as it could undermine the Council's position in negotiating with the building owner. The release of this information could also prejudice the Council's interests in relation to this or other similar transactions in that the land owner of this or other similar properties would have information about the nature and level of consideration which may prove acceptable to the Council. It is considered that whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, much of this information will be publicly available from the Land Registry following completion of any transaction and consequently the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information at this point in time.
- (b) Appendices 1, 2 and 4 of the report referred to in minute 261 under the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that:-
 - (i) Appendices 1 and 2 – The success of the scheme could potentially be prejudiced by speculative investors acquiring properties in advance of the Council's action;
 - (ii) Appendix 4 – The costs attributed to the purchase of private properties are purely estimates at this stage and their disclosure

could prejudice the Council's ability to reach an agreement on the purchase price with owners.

255 Declaration of Interests

Councillor Smith declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item relating to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009-2012 (minute 266 refers) due to his position as a Director of a Health and Wellbeing Centre.

Councillor Blake declared a personal interest in the item relating to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009-2012 (minute 266 refers) due to being a member of Leeds NHS Primary Care Trust.

256 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 1st April 2009 be approved.

DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

257 Football World Cup 2018

The Director of City Development submitted a report advising of the invitation received from the English Football Association for the City of Leeds to bid to become a 'host city' for the football World Cup 2018.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That Leeds investigate the submission of a Leeds City Region bid to become a host city for the Football World Cup 2018;
- (b) That the governance structure proposed in the submitted report be approved;
- (c) That the proposed Leeds City Region representatives for the Host City Briefing to be held in London on 18th May 2009 be noted;
- (d) That a report be brought back to this Board as soon as the likely human and financial resource implications of the project are known;
- (e) That dialogue with the City Region partners be opened at the earliest opportunity.

258 West Leeds Gateway Site - 2 Branch Road

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on an in principle proposal that Compulsory Purchase powers be used to achieve the acquisition of 2 Branch Road, Armley subject to a further report being brought to the Board for final approval.

Following consideration of appendix 1 to the report designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which was considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

RESOLVED – That the contents of the report be noted and that in principle approval be given to the use of Compulsory Purchase powers to achieve the acquisition of 2 Branch Road, should this be necessary, subject to a further report to this Board seeking full approval.

259 Response to the City Development Scrutiny Board's Inquiry into the A660 Corridor Transport Issues

The Director of City Development submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the recent Scrutiny Board (City Development) inquiry concerning A660 Corridor Transport Issues.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained in the report, be approved.

NEIGHBOURHOODS AND HOUSING

260 Response to the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) Inquiry into the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report in response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) with regard to the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement.

RESOLVED – That the Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships) inquiry report into the role of the voluntary, community and faith sectors in Council led community engagement be referred to Scrutiny Board (Children's Services) and Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) for consideration, with a further report being submitted to Executive Board in due course.

261 Regeneration of the Garnets, Beeston

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report on options for the regeneration of the Garnets area and on the proposed commencement of acquisition and clearance of 112 properties within the Garnets by utilising £3,000,000 of confirmed funding during 2009/11.

The report presented and appraised the options of:

- (a) doing the minimum to meet legal conformity;
- (b) undertaking group repair and internal remodelling;
- (c) property acquisition and redevelopment of the site.

Following consideration of appendices 1, 2 and 4 to the report, designated as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) which were considered in private at the conclusion of the meeting it was

RESOLVED –

- (a) That scheme expenditure to the amount of £3,000,000 be authorised.
- (b) That the option of acquisition and site redevelopment be progressed.
- (c) That a further report be brought to this Board when further funding is made available through successful bids for the residual £1,300,000 of funding.
- (d) That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and Director of City Development authorise and promote any Compulsory Purchase Orders which may become necessary.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wakefield required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this decision)

262 Update on Council Rents - 2009/10

Further to minute 236 of the meeting held on 1st April 2009, the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods submitted a report providing an update on the rent changes for 2009/10, and the cost implications for this change.

RESOLVED – That the contents of the report be noted together with the change in the 2009/10 average rent increase for Council dwellings from 6.2% to 3.1%.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

263 School Calendar 2010 - 2011

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report on the process of setting the school calendar in Leeds, providing an update on the consultation process and proposing one option for the approval of the Board.

The three options which had been the subject of the consultation were:

Option 1: The Easter bank holiday weekend falls at the end of the two-week school break. This option coincided with the recommendations of the Local Government Association.

Option 2: The Easter bank holiday weekend falls in the middle of the two week school break. Schools would not return to school until the day after May Day bank holiday, reducing the number of split weeks in school. However, the term would not be split equally resulting in a very short first half term after Easter.

Option 3: Schools have a separate Easter bank holiday weekend. They would experience three four-day weeks due to the occurrence of the May Day bank holiday the week after Easter Monday.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the extensive consultation undertaken to consider the implications for the 2010/11 school calendar in Leeds be noted.
- (b) That the school calendar dates associated with option 3, and as detailed in annex 3 to the report, be approved.
- (c) That subject to (d) below, the proposal for a fixed break between terms 2 and 3, irrespective of when Easter falls, with a corresponding adjustment to the summer vacation which ensures a two week Christmas break, be approved in principle;
- (d) That following the conclusion of the 2010/11 academic year, a report be submitted to the Board reviewing the success of the implementation of the school calendar schedule as detailed at option 3.

264 The Achievement of Looked After Children

The Chief Executive of Education Leeds submitted a report outlining the achievement of Looked After Children in Leeds and on strategies for the improvement of outcomes.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That the main findings of the report and its conclusions be noted.
- (b) That a further update report be brought to this Board in Autumn 2009.

LEISURE

265 Leisure Centre Refurbishment and Free Swimming Capital Modernisation

The Director of City Development submitted a report on proposals for the DCMS Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme, refurbishment of changing rooms at Scott Hall Leisure Centre, installation of sound and light systems in the pool halls at Scott Hall, John Smeaton and Pudsey Leisure Centres and the extension of the Bodyline Gym at Scott Hall.

RESOLVED –

- (a) That approval be given to the injection of £572,300 into the Capital Programme consisting of DCMS Free Swimming Capital Modernisation Programme pot 4 (£410,000), Prudential Borrowing (£30,000) and Leeds City Council budgets (totalling £132,300).
- (b) That authority be given to spend in the following amounts:
 - £512,300 on the refurbishment of the changing rooms at Scott Hall Leisure Centre
 - £90,000 on the installation of sound and light systems in the pool halls at Scott Hall, John Smeaton and Pudsey Leisure Centres, thus achieving the criteria set by DCMS for the award of this funding
 - £30,000 on the extension of the Bodyline Gym at Scott Hall Leisure Centre through Prudential Borrowing

ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

266 Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009 to 2012

The Director of Adult Social Services and Director of Public Health submitted a joint report presenting the final draft of the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan 2009 to 2012 for comment and agreement that it be submitted to Council for approval as part of the Budget and Policy Framework.

RESOLVED – That the final draft of the Health and Wellbeing Partnership Plan be agreed for submission to Council for approval.

(Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to this item due to being a Director of a Health and Wellbeing Centre, Councillor Smith withdrew from the meeting room during the consideration of this item)

- 267 Carers' Strategy for Leeds 2009-2012: 'Every Carer Counts'**
The Director of Adult Social Services submitted a report on the content of the Leeds Carers Strategy 2009-2012 and presenting the strategy for approval for its publication and dissemination.

RESOLVED – That the Carers' Strategy for Leeds 2009-2012 'Every Carer Counts', as appended to the report, be approved for implementation, subject to an addition which reflects the Board's comments concerning the provision of advice and guidance available to carers in Leeds.

CENTRAL AND CORPORATE

- 268 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Member Development**
The Chief Democratic Services Officer submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into Member Development.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 269 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Attendance Management**
The Director of Resources submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into attendance management.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 270 Response to the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board Inquiry into Procurement of Services**
The Chief Procurement Officer submitted a report in response to the recent Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions) Inquiry into the Procurement of Services.

RESOLVED – That the proposed responses to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations, as contained within the report, be approved.

- 271 Councillor Blake and Councillor Smith**
Councillors Blake and Smith were both thanked for their services to the Board, as it was noted that this would be the last meeting in which both would be in attendance as Executive Board members.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 15TH MAY 2009
LAST DATE FOR CALL IN: 22ND MAY 2009 (5.00 PM)

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00 noon on 26th May 2009)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Wednesday, 17th June, 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: Constitutional Amendments

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides the Board with information and guidance reflecting recent amendments of the Council's Constitution, as agreed by Council on 21 May 2009, which directly relate to and/or impact on the work of Scrutiny Boards.

2.0 Background

2.1 The Local Government Act 2000 introduced new models of governance and decision-making arrangements for local authorities in England and Wales. This included putting in place executive arrangements for decision-making through a smaller, more prominent, number of local Councillors (the Executive Board). Within the new arrangements, the overview and scrutiny function was established to hold the Executive Board to account for its decisions and to contribute to evidence-based policy development across the Council.

2.2 Through a number of legislative changes, for example the Health and Social Care Act 2001 which introduced local health scrutiny, the role and responsibilities of overview and scrutiny have expanded significantly; with the function now responsible for investigating the delivery of services provided by a wide range of public, private and third-sector partners.

2.3 This report seeks to reflect on recent legislative changes, its impact on the scrutiny function and the subsequent amendments to the Council's Constitution, through changes to both the Scrutiny Board Procedural Rules and supportive guidance notes.

3.0 Constitutional amendments

- 3.1 Two recent Acts of Parliament, namely the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Police and Justice Act 2006, have had a direct impact on the scrutiny function and required amendments to the Council's Constitution. Such amendments were agreed at the Council meeting in May 2009 and summarised below.

Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) Provisions

- 3.2 The Local Government Act 2000 included provisions to allow Elected Members to raise matters for consideration by the Council's Scrutiny Boards. This was reflected in the Council's Constitution, Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 12 which made provision for dealing with such requests.
- 3.3 To supplement and strengthen the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000, the Government recently enacted provisions at Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Referred to as 'Councillor Call for Action', these provisions give Councillors the opportunity to ask for discussions at Scrutiny Boards where *local* problems have arisen and where other methods of resolution have been exhausted.
- 3.4 Specific guidance on the process for administering a CCfA is set out in Annex 1 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

Arrangements for the Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Functions and Local Crime and Disorder Matters

- 3.5 The Police and Justice Act 2006 extends the remit of local authorities to scrutinise crime and disorder functions¹, with Part 3 of the Act stating that every local authority shall ensure it has a 'Crime and Disorder Committee' to fulfill this role. At the Council meeting in May 2009, the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board was assigned to undertake this role.
- 3.6 Overall, in its capacity as a crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) has powers to:
- Review or scrutinise decisions made (or action taken), in connection with the discharge of crime and disorder functions by the 'responsible authorities'²;
 - Review or scrutinise any Member referred local crime and disorder matter;
 - Make reports and/or recommendations to the Council or the Executive;
 - Call an officer from a responsible authority to attend its meetings in order to answer questions or otherwise to provide information and to respond to reports or recommendations made by the Scrutiny Board;
 - Co-opt additional members to serve on the committee, either with or without voting rights³

These additional powers are reflected in the revised terms of reference for the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods).

¹ Set out in Sections 19, 20 and 21 of the Police and Justice Act 2006

² These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive

³ Details are set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards: Co-opted Members)

- 3.7 Alongside the additional scrutiny powers, in its capacity as the Council's crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) *must* meet at least once each year to fulfill its role in relation to the responsible authorities.
- 3.8 The Police and Justice Act 2006 also makes provision for elected members to refer local crime and disorder matters to the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Committee.
- 3.9 For this purpose, local crime and disorder matters should be considered to encompass all community safety issues that affect all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area, including:
- Antisocial behaviour;
 - Other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment;
 - The misuse of drugs, alcohol or other substances
- 3.10 While the Police and Justice Act 2006 clearly provides separate provision for the referral of local crime and disorder matters, in practice the principles and processes involved are essentially the same as for any Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral, however any crime and disorder referrals will be considered by the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods), in its capacity as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.11 Specific guidance on the process for administering a *Local Crime and Disorder referral* is set out in Annex 2 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

Local Involvement Networks (LINKS)

- 3.12 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK), to act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums (PPIF) but with an extended remit covering social care.
- 3.13 Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.
- 3.14 Specific guidance on the process for administering a *Health and Social Care referral* is set out in Annex 3 of the attached Guidance Note: *Requests for Scrutiny, Including Councillor Call for Action (CCfA), Local Crime and Disorder Matters, and Health and Social Care Matters*.

Responding to inquiry report and recommendations

- 3.15 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 also places a duty on the Council or Executive to consider and respond to any Scrutiny Board report and/or recommendations within two months of receipt of the report/recommendations. In referring any report / recommendations, a Scrutiny Board can require the Council or Executive to:
- Consider its report or recommendations;

- Respond, outlining any proposed action;
- Publish the response (if the Scrutiny Board has published its report and/or recommendations);
- Provide a copy of the response to the referring Member, where the matter originated from a “Councillor Call for Action”.

3.16 Where a Scrutiny Board sends its report or recommendations to another body, the body in question will also be asked to send its response to the Scrutiny Board within two months⁴, setting out:

- The views of the body
- Details of any action already taken in response to the recommendations;
- Proposed action and timescales; or
- Any reasons for inaction.

4.0 Other legislative changes

Scrutiny of Partners

- 4.1 Since its inception, it has been widely regarded as good practice for Scrutiny Boards to consider evidence/ information from a variety of sources, including partner and/or other outside organisations. The ability for Scrutiny Boards to require information from some outside organisations (relevant partners) is already covered in other legislation (i.e. NHS Act 2006 at Section 44 relating to Local NHS bodies for Health Scrutiny and section 20(5) of the Police and Justice Act 2006 for Crime and Disorder issues). However, with Scrutiny Boards having limited powers to require outside bodies to provide information, any requests for information have tended to be reliant on the cooperation or good will of the organisation involved.
- 4.2 However, Section 121 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 places a requirement on certain partner organisations⁵ to provide information to a relevant scrutiny committee when requested to do so.
- 4.3 While the information will relate to the partners responsibility for the delivery of LAA improvement targets, the Secretary of State has still to make regulations covering exactly what information relevant partner authorities must provide, and/or may not disclose to Scrutiny Boards. Clarity is also required on a number of issues including timescales and whether partners will be compelled to attend Scrutiny Board meetings or simply provide the information requested. Once issued, such regulations are likely to require further amendment(s) to the Council’s Constitution and associated guidance notes.

5.0 Recommendations

- 5.1 In fulfilling the role and function of the Scrutiny Board, Members are requested to note the amendments to the Council’s Constitution outlined in the report.
- 5.2 Members are also requested to note the likely changes resulting from the Secretary of State regulations regarding the provision of information from partner authorities.

⁴ For NHS bodies this time limit is 28 days (the Local Authority (Overview and Scrutiny Committee Health Scrutiny Functions) Regulations 2002. Where a Scrutiny Board has sent a report to a partnership the partnership is not required under these Rules to provide a response. Any partnership not otherwise required to provide a response will be invited to do so.

⁵ Set out in Part 5, Chapter 1 (Section 104).

6.0 Background Paper

The Council's Constitution

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

Police and Justice Act 2006

This page is intentionally left blank

GUIDANCE NOTE

REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY, INCLUDING COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCfA), LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER MATTERS AND HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE MATTERS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Local Government Act 2000 introduced new models of governance and decision-making arrangements for local authorities in England and Wales. This included putting in place executive arrangements for decision-making through a smaller, more prominent, number of local councillors (the Executive Board). The overview and scrutiny function was established to hold the Executive Board to account for its decisions and to contribute to evidence-based policy development in the council.
- 1.2. In recent years, the role and responsibilities of overview and scrutiny have expanded significantly, with the function now responsible for investigating the delivery of services provided by a wide range of public, private and third-sector partners. Scrutiny's unique remit and enhanced public profile means that it can be the focus of many requests and suggestions for detailed investigations/inquiries.
- 1.3. Currently, there are a number of avenues for making a request for scrutiny, some of which are specifically set out in legislation. The Council's Constitution, through its Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, makes provision for dealing with requests for scrutiny from a number of different sources and/or relating to different areas, including:
 - The Executive or Council;
 - Members of a Scrutiny Board;
 - Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA);
 - Local Crime and Disorder Matters;
 - Health and Social Care Matters;
 - Other sources, such as individual Members of Council, community groups and individual members of the public.
- 1.4. This guidance note seeks to provide general advice for Scrutiny Boards and Officers dealing with requests for scrutiny, along with more specific advice on:
 - Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA)¹;
 - Local Crime and Disorder Matters²;
 - Health and Social Care Matters;

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Scrutiny's unique remit means that it is often in an excellent position to examine the links between organisations and see where working collaboratively could deliver enhanced services for local people. As such, Scrutiny Boards are often well placed to:
 - Use a variety of tools to identify areas for review;

¹ As set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

² As set out in Section 19 of the Police and Criminal Justice Act 2006

- Obtain all the information required to identify any shortcomings in specific areas;
 - Discuss matters of concern with those both in receipt of services and those responsible for service delivery;
 - Produce reports and make appropriate recommendations for improvement.
- 2.2. As such, where areas for improvement have been identified and/or where matters remain unresolved, the ability to give an issue wider consideration by referring it to one or more of the Council's Scrutiny Boards should be regarded as a useful additional tool.

3. REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY

General requests for scrutiny

- 3.1. Requests for scrutiny can emerge from a variety of sources and/or relate to a range of different areas (as set out in paragraph 1.3).
- 3.2. In broad terms, the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules provide details of how requests for scrutiny from different sources should be administered. This can be summarised as follows:
- All requests for scrutiny received will be added to the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Board;
 - Interested parties will be notified of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where a request for scrutiny will be considered;
 - At that meeting, the Scrutiny Board will determine whether or not to undertake a specific inquiry.
- 3.3. When deciding whether or not to undertake a scrutiny inquiry, a Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:
- The matter raised relates The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
 - The matter raised relates solely to an individual and is being or should be pursued via the Council's and/or other existing complaints procedure.
 - A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the request for scrutiny to an existing work item.
 - The matter might more usefully be considered and referred to an alternative Scrutiny Board (i.e. as part of another inquiry and/or Scrutiny Board work programme).
 - The matter raised is of sufficient significance and has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to tangible improvements.
- 3.4. Where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a request for scrutiny, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:
- How the request meets the inquiry selection criteria;

- The impact on the Board's current work programme;
 - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
 - The level of resources required to carry out the work.
- 3.5. The decision whether or not to further investigate matters raised by a request for scrutiny is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.
- 3.6. Notification of the Scrutiny Board's decision (i.e. whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised) will be provided based on the source of the original request, as follows:
- The Executive or Council – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision;
 - Members of a Scrutiny Board – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision;
 - Individual Members of Council – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision, followed by a letter on behalf of the Scrutiny Board.
 - Community groups and individual members of the public – a detailed minute of the Scrutiny Board decision, followed by a letter on behalf of the Scrutiny Board.
- 3.7. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the notification provided will include the reason(s) for that decision.
- 3.8. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to investigate the matter(s) raised, the notification provided will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. Notification of any significant deviation from this timetable will subsequently be provided.
- 3.9. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be made publically available and provided to the relevant parties as soon as practicable³.

Specific requests for scrutiny

- 3.10. Guidance on specific types of requests for scrutiny are attached to this guidance note as follows:
- Annex 1 – Councillor Calls for Action (CCfA);
 - Annex 2 – Local Crime and Disorder Matters;
 - Annex 3 – Health and Social Care Matters;

³ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (CCfA)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Resolving concerns of the local community is an important element of a local councillor's role, and frequently these are resolved via a network of contacts within the organisation. However, where matters remain unresolved, the ability to give an issue wider consideration by referring it to an Overview and Scrutiny Board should be regarded as a useful additional tool.
- 1.2. In this regard, the Government has recently introduced provisions at Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 referred to as 'Councillor Call for Action', to allow Councillors the opportunity to ask for discussions at Scrutiny Boards where *local* problems have arisen and other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 1.3. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Councillor Call for Action* (CCfA)⁴ and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Under the provisions set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, a local member may raise a matter which relates to the discharge of any function of the authority that affects all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area, subject to the following exclusions,:
 - a matter which is a local crime and disorder matter within the meaning of section 19 of the Police and Criminal Justice Act 2006⁵;
 - individual complaints concerning personal grievances or commercial issues⁶;
 - any matter relating to a planning decision⁶;
 - any matter relating to a licensing decision⁶;
 - any matter relating to an individual or entity where a right of recourse, review or appeal already exists⁶;
 - any matter which is vexatious, discriminatory or not reasonable to be included on the agenda for, or to be discussed at, a Scrutiny Board meeting⁶;
 - any other matters specified in an order made by the Secretary of State from time to time.

⁴ As set out in Section 119 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

⁵ Guidance on *Arrangements for the Scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Functions and Local Crime and Disorder Matters* is provided in Annex B of this guidance note.

⁶ The Overview and Scrutiny (Reference by Councillors) (Excluded Matters) (England) Order 2008 defines an 'excluded matter' and came into force on 1 April 2009.

- 2.2. There is also provision for any matter to be referred to Overview and Scrutiny that consists of an allegation of systematic failure within the Council, notwithstanding the fact that the allegation specifies matters which would otherwise be excluded.
- 2.3. Best practice guidance on Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) has been published by the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the Improvement and Development Agency⁷. Whilst this guidance is not prescriptive it provides case study examples of good practice and local authorities that piloted CCfA arrangements. The key points emphasised in the guidance include:
- CCfA is a means of last resort and should be aimed at seeking resolution where other techniques have failed;
 - senior level officer and Member commitment to resolving issues is necessary for maximum effort;
 - any local CCfA guidance to be light touch;
 - the CCfA process should be developed through a consultation process involving Members and other local partners;
 - CCfA is designed to assist Members in dealing with local ward issues – problems which affect the whole Council area should be dealt with in another way;
 - Members will need to discuss what exactly will constitute the successful resolution of the issue;
 - the forum for discussion is less important than the fact that the issue should be discussed together in its entirety.

3. COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION – THE LOCAL PROCESS

Steps to be taken prior to making a Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral

- 3.1. The CCfA should be considered as a mechanism of last resort, where all other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 3.2. In using the CCfA provisions, a ward member (the referring Member) must have regard to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State, outlined in 2.1 above, paying particular attention to those matters deemed to be excluded.
- 3.3. Prior to referring a CCfA to a Scrutiny Board, the referring Member must have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter using all mechanisms and resources available to them as a ward councillor.
- 3.4. As a minimum, it is expected that the referring Member will have satisfied themselves that the issue is not an excluded matter and will have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter by approaching one or more of the following:
- the relevant Director(s) and/or Chief Officer(s)
 - the relevant Executive Board member(s)
 - any relevant partnership bodies or local groups

⁷ Available from the Publications section of the Centre for Public Scrutiny website: www.cfps.org.uk

Making a Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral

- 3.5. Any CCfA request should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, including details of any meetings and/or discussions that have taken place in an attempt to resolve the matter, along with any associated conclusions.
- 3.6. The purpose of providing such supporting evidence is to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted. As such, in providing any supporting evidence the referring Member should seek to demonstrate that:
 - All relevant internal routes of resolution have been followed, with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
 - The matter should not be pursued via the Council's complaints procedure.
 - All relevant partner organisations have been informed of the matter (for example, through formal letters written on behalf of constituents), with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
- 3.7. Where the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development deems that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that other methods of resolution have been exhausted then the request will be deemed invalid. In such circumstances, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will notify the referring Member in writing within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made.
- 3.8. Where a CCfA request has been deemed invalid, the referring Member shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development. Any such appeals shall be made in writing to the Chief Democratic Services Officer within 5 working days of the original notification provided by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.9. On receipt of such an appeal, the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall provide notification of the judgement made in relation to the CCfA request within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made. Such notification will be made in writing and provided to the referring Member and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.10. The decision of the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall be final and there will be no further right of appeal.

Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.11. Any valid CCfA request received will be included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board. This shall include all supporting evidence⁸ provided to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted.

⁸ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

- 3.12. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall notify the referring Member of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the request shall be considered.
- 3.13. At the discretion of the relevant Scrutiny Board Chair, the relevant member of the Executive Board, Area Committee Chair and/or appropriate officer will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting where a CCfA request is being considered.
- 3.14. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in reaching a decision on a CCfA request, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite other organisation(s) and/or individual(s) to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.

During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.15. All CCfA requests will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. The referring Member will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board when a CCfA request is being considered.
- 3.16. In considering whether or not to investigate the matter raised, the Scrutiny Board will have regard to:
- any powers which the referring Member may exercise in relation to the matter under consideration (i.e. exercise of functions by local councillors under local delegated decision-making arrangements);
 - any representations made by the referring Member as to why the matter should be investigated.
- 3.17. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.
- 3.18. When deciding whether or not to further investigate the CCfA, the Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:
- There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that:
 - All reasonable attempts have been made to resolve the matter by the referring Member.
 - The matter raised is not being progressed and all relevant service areas or partner organisations have been informed and allowed sufficient time to resolve the matter.
 - The matter is being or should be pursued via the Council's complaints procedure.
 - The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
 - A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the CCfA request to an existing work item.
 - The matter might more usefully be considered and referred to an alternative Scrutiny Board (i.e. as part of another inquiry and/or Scrutiny Board work programme).

- The matter referred has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to improvements for anyone living or working in the referring Member's ward.
- 3.19. Where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a CCfA, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:
- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
 - The impact on the Board's current work programme;
 - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
 - The level of resources required to carry out the work.
- 3.20. The decision whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

After the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.21. Where a Scrutiny Board has considered a CCfA request, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the referring Member, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.
- 3.22. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter raised, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.
- 3.23. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to further investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. The referring Member will be subsequently notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.
- 3.24. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be provided to the referring Member as soon as practicable⁹.

⁹ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER MATTERS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Provisions in the Police and Justice Act 2006, namely Section 19, 20 and 21, extend the remit of local authorities to scrutinise crime and disorder functions. As a result, the Council has been required to designate a Scrutiny Board to act as the Council's 'Crime and Disorder Committee'. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board has been assigned to fulfil this role.
- 1.2. Overall, in its capacity as a crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board has powers to:
- (a) Review or scrutinise decisions made (or action taken), in connection with the discharge of crime and disorder functions by the 'responsible authorities'¹⁰;
 - (b) Review or scrutinise any Member referred local crime and disorder matter;
 - (c) Make reports and/or recommendations to the Council or the Executive;
 - (d) Call an officer from a responsible authority to attend its meetings in order to answer questions or otherwise to provide information and to respond to reports or recommendations made by the Scrutiny Board;
 - (e) Co-opt additional members to serve on the committee, either with or without voting rights¹¹
- 1.3. In addition, the Scrutiny Board must meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, by the responsible authorities at least once a year.
- 1.4. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Local Crime and Disorder referral* and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The Police and Justice Act 2006 makes provision for elected members to refer local crime and disorder matters to the Council's designated Crime and Disorder Committee. Local crime and disorder matters should be considered to encompass all community safety issues that affect all or part of the ward for which the member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area including:
- Antisocial behaviour;
 - Other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment;
 - The misuse of drugs, alcohol or other substances

¹⁰ These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive

¹¹ Details are set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards: Co-opted Members)

- 2.2. While the Police and Justice Act 2006 makes separate provision for the referral of local crime and disorder matter, in practice the principles and processes involved are essentially the same as for any Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) referral.

3. LOCAL CRIME AND DISORDER REFERRALS – THE LOCAL PROCESS

Steps to be taken prior to making a local crime and disorder referral

- 3.1. A local crime and disorder referral should be considered as a mechanism of last resort, where all other methods of resolution have been exhausted and failed to deliver an appropriate outcome.
- 3.2. Prior to a referring a local crime and disorder matter to the Crime and Disorder Committee, the referring Member must have made reasonable attempts to resolve the matter using all mechanisms and resources available to them as a ward councillor. As a minimum, it is expected that the referring Member will attempted to resolve the matter by approaching the 'responsible authorities' represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

Making a local crime and disorder referral

- 3.3. Any local crime and disorder referral should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, including details of any meetings and/or discussions that have taken place in an attempt to resolve the matter, along with any associated conclusions.
- 3.4. The purpose of providing such supporting evidence is to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted. As such, in providing any supporting evidence the referring Member should seek to demonstrate that:
- All relevant internal routes of resolution have been followed, with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
 - The matter should not be pursued via an existing complaints procedure.
 - Relevant responsible authorities have been informed of the matter (for example, through formal letters written on behalf of constituents), with sufficient time allowed to resolve the matter.
- 3.5. Where the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development deems that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that other methods of resolution have been exhausted then the referral will be deemed invalid. In such circumstances, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will notify the referring Member in writing within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made.
- 3.6. Where a local crime and disorder referral has been deemed invalid, the referring Member shall have the right to appeal the decision of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development. Any such appeals shall be made in writing to the Chief Democratic Services Officer within 5 working days of the original notification provided by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.

- 3.7. On receipt of such an appeal, the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall provide notification of the judgement made in relation to the local crime and disorder referral within 5 working days, detailing the reason(s) for the decision made. Such notification will be made in writing and provided to the referring Member and the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development.
- 3.8. The decision of the Chief Democratic Services Officer shall be final and there will be no further right of appeal.

Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.9. Any valid local crime and disorder referral received will be included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board. This shall include all supporting evidence¹² provided to demonstrate that other appropriate methods of resolution have been explored and exhausted.
- 3.10. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall notify the referring Member of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the request shall be considered.
- 3.11. Where a local crime and disorder referral is being considered, the appropriate representative(s) from the relevant 'responsible authorities' represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.
- 3.12. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in reaching a decision on a local crime and disorder referral, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite other organisation(s) and/or individual(s) to attend the Scrutiny Board meeting.

During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.13. All local crime and disorder referrals will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. The referring Member will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board when a local crime and disorder referral, raised by that Councillor, is being considered.
- 3.14. In considering whether or not to investigate the matter(s) raised, the Scrutiny Board will have regard to:
- any powers which the referring Member may exercise in relation to the matter under consideration (i.e. exercise of functions by local councillors under local delegated decision-making arrangements);
 - any representations made by the referring Member as to why the matter should be investigated.
- 3.15. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.

¹² Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

3.16. When deciding whether or not to further investigate the local crime and disorder referral, the Scrutiny Board may usefully wish to consider and confirm whether:

- There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that:
 - All reasonable attempts have been made to resolve the matter by the referring Member.
 - The matter raised is not being progressed and all relevant service areas or partner organisations have been informed and allowed sufficient time to resolve the matter.
- The matter is being or should be pursued via an existing complaints procedure.
- The Board has considered a similar issue recently, and if so whether the circumstances and/or evidence has changed significantly.
- A similar or related issue is already included on the Board's current work programme, as it may be more appropriate to link the local crime and disorder referral to an existing work item.
- The matter referred has the potential for scrutiny to produce realistic recommendations that could be implemented and lead to improvements for anyone living or working in the referring Member's ward.

3.17. Where the Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a referral, the Scrutiny Board will also consider:

- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
- The impact on the Board's current work programme;
- The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
- The level of resources required to carry out the work.

3.18. The decision whether or not to further investigate the matter(s) raised is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

After the Scrutiny Board meeting

3.19. Where the Scrutiny Board has considered a local crime and disorder referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the referring Member, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.

3.20. Where the Scrutiny Board decides not to investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.

3.21. Where the Scrutiny Board decides to further investigate the matter(s) raised, this notification will include an outline of the agreed actions with an indicative timetable. The referring Member will subsequently be notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.

3.22. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the Council or the Executive Board will be provided to the referring Member as soon as practicable¹³.

¹³ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY: HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE MATTERS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave a duty to all 150 local authorities in England with social services responsibilities, to enable the formation of a Local Involvement Network (LINK). In summary, the LINK will act as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums (PPIF) but with an extended remit covering social care.
- 1.2. Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.
- 1.3. This part of the guidance note relates to the process for administering a *Health and Social Care referral* and aims to provide guidance and assistance for Members, Scrutiny Boards and Officers in the management and consideration of such requests.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. LINKs have been set up to give communities a stronger voice in how their health and social care services are delivered. Run by local people and groups, the role of a LINK is to promote involvement, to find out what people like and dislike about local services, monitor the care provided by services and use LINK powers to hold services to account.
- 2.2. Given the role and function of LINKs, the relation between the LINK and the Council's Scrutiny Boards will be key and more detailed information on this relationship is provided in a separate guidance note.
- 2.3. An important function of the LINK is the ability to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about the progress of any agreed actions.

3. HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE REFERRALS – THE LOCAL PROCESS

Steps to be taken prior to making a health or social care referral

- 3.1. Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Local Involvement Networks Regulations 2008, the local LINK has the right to refer any matter relating to the planning, provision and operation of health or social care services to the relevant Scrutiny Board.
- 3.2. This should not detract from the aspiration for relevant Scrutiny Boards to work closely with the LINK to ensure that knowledge about work programme items and emerging issues is regularly shared.

- 3.3. Any formal referral of such matters should be considered as a mechanism of last resort and occur in instances where the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner has failed to provide a satisfactory response to a report/ recommendations produced by the LINK within 20 working days.

Making a health or social care referral

- 3.4. Any health or social care referral should be made in writing to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and be accompanied with supporting evidence, which outlines the rationale for the referral and demonstrates that the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner has been given sufficient time to respond to the issue(s) raised.

Prior to the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.5. On receipt of a health or social care referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will ensure the matter, together with all the supporting evidence¹⁴ provided by the LINK, is included on the agenda of the next ordinary meeting of the appropriate Scrutiny Board.
- 3.6. On behalf of the relevant Scrutiny Board, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development shall acknowledge receipt of any health or social care referral within 20 working days of its receipt. Within this acknowledgement, details of the date, time and location of the Scrutiny Board meeting where the referral shall be considered will also be provided.
- 3.7. Where a health or social care referral is being considered, an appropriate representative from the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner will be invited to attend and contribute to the discussion at the Scrutiny Board meeting.

During the Scrutiny Board meeting

- 3.8. All health or social care referrals will to be looked at on their individual merits and on the basis of the evidence provided. Representatives from the LINK will be entitled to address the meeting of the Scrutiny Board where such a referral is being considered.
- 3.9. In order to assist the Scrutiny Board in deciding whether or not to act on the referral, the Chair of the Scrutiny Board may also choose to invite comments from any other organisation(s) or individual(s) deemed suitable.
- 3.10. When deciding whether or not to act on the health or social care referral, the Scrutiny Board will consider the impact of any proposed action. In particular, where a Scrutiny Board is minded to undertake an inquiry as a result of a referral, the Scrutiny Board will consider:
- How the referral meets the inquiry selection criteria;
 - The impact on the Board's current work programme;
 - The time available to undertake an inquiry; and,
 - The level of resources required to carry out the work.

¹⁴ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information

3.11. The decision whether or not to act on the referral is the sole responsibility of the Scrutiny Board. As such, any decision in this regard is final and there is no right of appeal.

After the Scrutiny Board meeting

3.12. Where a Scrutiny Board has considered a health or social care referral, the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development will provide written notification of the outcome of the Scrutiny Board's deliberations to the LINK, within 5 working days of the Scrutiny Board meeting.

3.13. Where a Scrutiny Board decides not to act on the referral, this notification will include the reason(s) for that decision.

3.14. Where a Scrutiny Board decides to act on the referral, this notification will include an outline of the proposed actions and an indicative timetable. The LINK will subsequently be notified of any significant deviation from this timetable.

3.15. A copy of any final report agreed by the Scrutiny Board and/or any recommendations made to the relevant health or social care service provider / commissioner will be provided to the LINK as soon as practicable¹⁵.

¹⁵ Subject to the provisions set out in the Local Government Act 2000 with regard to confidential and/or exempt information.

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Steven Courtney

Tel: 247 4707

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Environment and Neighbourhoods

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: Co-opted Members

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Scrutiny Board's formal consideration for the appointment of co-opted members to the Board.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 For a number of years the Council's Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards. For those Scrutiny Boards where co-opted members have previously been appointed, such arrangements have tended to be reviewed on an annual basis, usually at the beginning of a new municipal year. However, the appointment of co-opted members has not been considered consistently across all Scrutiny Boards.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Review (May 2009)

- 2.2 As part of their 2008/09 Audit and Inspection Plan, KPMG (the Council's external auditors) carried out a review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function. The outcome of that review is presented elsewhere on the agenda, however a specific aspect relates to the appointment of co-opted members to Scrutiny Boards.
- 2.3 The relevant extract and associated recommendation from the KPMG report is detailed below:

Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.

Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Six

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

- 2.4 In response to this recommendation, it was agreed that each Scrutiny Board would be formally asked to consider the potential involvement of co-opted members throughout the year.

3.0 Arrangements for appointing co-opted members

General arrangements

- 3.1 It is widely recognised that in some circumstances, in particular where there is some specialist knowledge or skill, co-opted members can significantly aid the work Scrutiny Boards. This is currently reflected in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution, which outlines the options available to Scrutiny Boards in relation to appointing co-opted members. In general terms, Scrutiny Boards can appoint:
- Up to five non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council ; and/or,
 - Up to two non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that relates to the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry.

Specific arrangements

- 3.2 In the majority of cases the appointment of co-opted members is optional and is determined by the relevant Scrutiny Board, however, there are some particular legislative exceptions. Such cases are also set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution and summarised below:

Education Representatives

- 3.3 In addition to elected Members appointed by Council, the Local Government Act 2000 states that the relevant Scrutiny Board dealing with education matters shall include in its membership the following voting representatives in accordance with statutory requirements:
- One Church of England diocese representative¹
 - One Roman Catholic diocese representative¹
 - Three parent governor representatives²

Where the Scrutiny Board deals with other non-educational matters the co-opted members may participate in any discussion but shall not be entitled to vote on those matters.

¹ Article 6 states this appointment shall be for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council

² Article 6 states these appointments shall be for a four-year term of office

Crime and Disorder Representatives

- 3.4 In accordance with the requirements of the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Council has designated the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) to act as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.5 The overall implications of this designation are detailed elsewhere on the agenda, however there are specific powers relating to the appointment of additional members detailed in Article 6. In this regard the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may co-opt additional members to serve on the Board, providing they are:
- An employee, officer or member of a responsible authority³ or of a co-operating person or body⁴; and,
 - Not an Executive Member
- 3.6 The Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may limit the co-opted member's participation to those matters where the Scrutiny Board is acting as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.7 As Leeds does not have a formal scheme to allow a co-opted member to have voting rights, any co-opted member will not have voting rights and the Board may withdraw the co-opted membership at any time.

4.0 Issue to consider when seeking to appoint co-opted members

- 4.1 Currently, there is no overarching national guidance or criteria that should be considered when seeking to appoint co-opted members. As a result, there is a plethora of methods employed within Councils for the appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards). For example, some Councils use "job descriptions", some carry out formal interviews and some advertise for co-optees in the local press, with individuals completing a simple application form which is then considered by Members.
- 4.2 In considering or seeking the appointment of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards may find it useful to consider that co-opted members should:
- Add value to the work of the Scrutiny Board and/or specific inquiry, by having some specialist skill or knowledge
 - Be considered as representatives of wider groups of people. For example, service user representatives, voluntary or community groups etc.
 - Not be seen as a replacement to professional advice from officers;
 - Be mindful about the extent of any potential conflicts of interest;
- 4.3 Despite the lack of any national guidance, what is clear is that any process for appointing co-opted members should be open, effective and carried out in a manner which seeks to strengthen the work of Scrutiny Boards.
- 4.4 In addition, when considering the issue of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards should also be mindful of the role of expert witnesses and seeking information /

³ These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies, as detailed in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 5. In Leeds, *Safer Leeds* is the city's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, therefore the 'responsible authorities' are those bodies represented on the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

⁴ People or bodies with whom the responsible authorities have a duty to co-operate as set out in the Police and Justice Act 2006, Section 19(2)(b).

evidence from a variety of different sources to help fulfill the objectives of the work programme and/or a specific inquiry.

5.0 Recommendation

5.1 In line with the options available outlined in this report, Members are asked to consider the appointment of co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board.

6.0 Background Papers

- The Council's Constitution
- Police and Justice Act 2006
- KPMG Scrutiny Review May 2009

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Environment and Neighbourhoods

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: Input to the Work Programme 2009/10 - Sources of Work and Establishing the Board's Priorities

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report provides information and guidance to assist the Board develop its work programme for 2009/10.
- 1.2 Relevant information from the following key sources have been extracted appropriate to this Board's responsibilities and attached to this paper to assist Members in this process (Appendix 1):
 - Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 – 2011 – Executive Summary
 - List of Scrutiny work undertaken in the past five years relevant to the Board's portfolio
- 1.3 Other sources of work will continue to be 'requests for scrutiny' and corporate referrals.
- 1.4 A copy of the Board's terms of reference is attached for reference purposes (Appendix 2).
- 1.5 The relevant extract from the latest forward plan is also attached for consideration (Appendix 3).

2.0 Guidance

- 2.1 Over the last few years of Scrutiny Board work, experience has shown that the process is more effective if the Board seeks to minimise the number of substantial inquiries running at one time. This view is echoed within the findings of the recent

KPMG external report on the Scrutiny function in Leeds, which is discussed elsewhere in this agenda.

2.2 The Board is advised to consider the benefits of single item agendas (excluding miscellaneous information and minutes) in order to focus on all the relevant evidence and complete an inquiry in a shorter period of time. There are various mechanisms available to assist the Board in concluding inquiries quickly, such as working groups and site visits.

2.3 The agreed Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny which sits within the Council's Constitution states;

"The responsibility of those setting scrutiny work programmes is, therefore, to ensure that items of work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest.

It is recognised that Scrutiny Boards have a 'watching brief' role. In addition information is required for members' own development process, particularly as membership of the Boards is changed annually.

However, it is also recognised that agendas are often filled up with reports for this purpose, which takes up time for both officers and Members. Where Scrutiny Boards wish to ask questions at a general or more strategic level and/or be updated on issues already considered in detail, the facility of Members' Questions – where a verbal exchange replaces written reports - should be used.

It is expected that where ever possible prior notification is given of the likely questions to be asked".

2.4 For the past couple of years the Children's Services Board in particular has developed the approach of devoting one meeting per quarter to 'horizon scan' issues and consider performance management. This includes discussing with Executive Members and officers relevant issues. This is acknowledged within the KPMG report as good practice.

3.0 Work programming

3.1 The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods and the Executive Members for Neighbourhoods and Housing and Environmental Services, or their nominees, have been invited to attend this meeting of the Board to contribute to discussions about the Board's work programme.

3.2 Following those discussions, the Board is asked to agree an outline work programme that prioritises the issues to be investigated.

4.0 Recommendations

4.1 Members are requested to use the attached information and the discussion with those present at the meeting to develop its work programme.

Background Papers

Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011

Executive Summary

About the Leeds Strategic Plan

The Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011 sets out the strategic outcomes – the real changes we want to see in people's lives and the city by 2011, and improvement priorities – the key areas where we want to focus our efforts over the next three years. Clear targets have been set to measure the progress we will make over the next three years. The contents of the Plan are aligned with the eight themes in the Vision for Leeds 2004 to 2020, the sustainable community strategy for Leeds. The Leeds Strategic plan can be seen as the delivery plan for the Vision for Leeds.

Working in partnership through the Leeds Initiative, Leeds' local strategic partnership, the Council and its key partners have agreed, following extensive consultation with councillors, stakeholder groups and the public across the city, a single shared set of outcomes and priorities for the city.

The targets in the Leeds Strategic Plan have been selected after thorough study of the prospects, opportunities and challenges facing Leeds and agreed with partners in the city and with central government. The Leeds Strategic Plan is also the Local Area Agreement for Leeds, a formal agreement with central government about how to improve outcomes on our shared priorities..

At the heart of the Leeds Strategic Plan is our ambition to transform the quality of life in Leeds to see:

- people happy, healthy, safe, successful and free from the effects of poverty;
- our young people equipped to contribute to their own and the city's future well being and prosperity;
- local people engaged in decisions about their neighbourhood and community and help shape local services;
- neighbourhoods that are inclusive, varied and vibrant offering housing options and quality facilities and free from harassment and crime;
- an environment that is clean, green, attractive and above all, sustainable; and
- a city-region that is prosperous, innovative and distinctive enabling individuals and businesses to achieve their economic potential.

Our long and successful record of partnership working is a sure foundation for the delivery of these ambitious targets for Leeds. Leeds is one of only three authorities nationally to have been awarded Beacon status for the quality of partnership working and, as a Beacon authority, we will help other authorities all over the country develop effective partnerships to represent local wishes and meet local needs.

How we will deliver this plan

Leeds City Council will play a key role engaging the public and other stakeholders to shape the contents of the Leeds Strategic Plan, managing performance and reporting progress to local people. The Leeds Strategic Plan is a partnership plan and Leeds Initiative and its groups, including the Strategy Group which brings together the major public sector partners in the city as well as key representatives from the business and voluntary, community and faith sectors, will monitor and manage progress and keep the contents of the Plan relevant to the needs of Leeds. Each partner will also integrate the targets and priorities in this Plan into their work plans. Leeds City Council has produced a Business Plan to support its contribution to the Leeds Strategic Plan.



Working in partnership through the Leeds Initiative



Strategic Outcomes The real changes we want to see		Improvement Priorities – our key focus for the next three years	
Culture			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased participation in cultural opportunities through engaging with all our communities. • Enhanced cultural opportunities through encouraging investment and development of high quality facilities of national and international significance. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable more people to become involved in sport and culture by providing better quality and wider ranging activities and facilities. • Facilitate the delivery of major cultural schemes of international significance.
Enterprise and the Economy			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased entrepreneurship and innovation through effective support to achieve the full potential of people, business and the economy. • Increased international competitiveness through marketing and investment in high quality infrastructure and physical assets, particularly in the city centre. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase innovation and entrepreneurial activity across the city • Facilitate the delivery of major developments in the city centre to enhance the economy and support local employment • Increase international communications, marketing and business support activities to promote the city and attract investment.
Learning			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An enhanced workforce that will meet future challenges through fulfilling individual and economic potential and investing in learning facilities. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the skill level of the workforce to fulfil individual and economic potential • Improve learning outcomes for all 16 year olds, with a focus on narrowing the achievement gap. • Improve learning outcomes and skill levels for 19 year olds. • Increase the proportion of vulnerable groups engaged in education, training or employment. • Improve participation and early learning outcomes for all children, with a focus on families in deprived areas.
Transport			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased accessibility and connectivity through investment in a high quality transport system and through influencing others and changing behaviours 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver and facilitate a range of transport proposals for an enhanced transport system, including cycling and walking. • Improve the quality, use and accessibility of public transport services in Leeds. • Improve the condition of the streets and transport infrastructure by carrying out a major programme of maintenance and improvements. • Improve road safety for all our users, especially motor cyclists, pedal cyclists and pedestrians.
Environment			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced ecological footprint through responding to environmental and climate change and influencing others. • Cleaner, greener and more attractive city through effective environmental management and changed behaviours. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the amount of waste reused and recycled and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. • Reduce emissions from public sector buildings, operations and service delivery, and encourage others to do so. • Undertake actions to improve our resilience to current and future climate change. • Address neighbourhood problem sites; improve cleanliness and access to and quality of green spaces. • Improve the quality and sustainability of the built and natural environment.

Strategic Outcomes The real changes we want to see	Improvement Priorities – our key focus for the next three years
Health and Wellbeing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced health inequalities through the promotion of healthy life choices and improved access to services. • Improved quality of life through maximising the potential of vulnerable people by promoting independence, dignity and respect. • Enhanced safety and support for vulnerable people through preventative and protective action to minimise risks and maximise wellbeing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce premature mortality in the most deprived areas. • Reduction in the number of people who smoke. • Reduce rate of increase in obesity and raise physical activity for all. • Reduce teenage conception and improve sexual health. • Improve the assessment and care management of children, families and vulnerable adults. • Improved psychological, mental health, and learning disability services for those who need it. • Increase the number of vulnerable people helped to live at home. • Increase the proportion of people in receipt of community services enjoying choice and control over their daily lives. • Improve safeguarding arrangements for vulnerable children and adults through better information, recognition and response to risk.
Thriving Places	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved quality of life through mixed neighbourhoods offering good housing options and better access to services and activities. • Reduced crime and fear of crime through prevention, detection, offender management and changed behaviours. • Increased economic activity through targeted support to reduce worklessness and poverty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of “decent homes”. • Increase the number of affordable homes. • Reduce the number of homeless people. • Reduce the number of people who are not able to adequately heat their homes. • Increase financial inclusion in deprived areas. • Create safer environments by tackling crime • Improve lives by reducing the harm caused by substance misuse • Reduce offending by managing offending behaviour better • Reduce bullying and harassment. • Reduce worklessness across the city with a focus on deprived areas. • Reduce the number of children in poverty. • Develop extended services, using sites across the city, to improve support to children, families and communities
Harmonious Communities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More inclusive, varied and vibrant communities through empowering people to contribute to decision making and delivering local services. • Improved community cohesion and integration through meaningful involvement and valuing equality and diversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased number of local people engaged in activities to meet community needs and improve the quality of life for local residents. • An increase in the number of local people that are empowered to have a greater voice and influence over local decision making and a greater role in public service delivery. • Enable a robust and vibrant voluntary, community and faith sector to facilitate community activity and directly deliver services. • An increased sense of belonging and pride in local neighbourhoods that help to build cohesive communities.

Partners who have helped to draw up this Plan

Arts Council
Education Leeds
English Heritage
Environment Agency
Health and Safety Executive
Highways Agency
Jobcentre Plus
Learning and Skills Council
Leeds chamber of Commerce and Industry
Leeds Colleges
Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust
Leeds Primary Care Trust
Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust
Leeds Voice
Museums, Libraries, Archives Yorkshire
Natural England
Re'new
Sport England
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
West Yorkshire Metro
West Yorkshire Police
West Yorkshire Police Authority
West Yorkshire Probation Service
Yorkshire Forward
Youth Offending Service

For enquiries about the Leeds Strategic Plan or to obtain a copy of the plan please:

Email: leedsstrategicplan@leeds.gov.uk

Telephone: **0113 224 346 2**

Visit our website: www.leedsstrategicplan.org.uk

Write to:
**Leeds Strategic Plan
Planning, Policy and
Improvement
2nd Floor East
Civic Hall
Leeds LS1 1UR**

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please phone: **0113 224 346 2** and state the name of your language. We will then put you on hold while we contact an interpreter. We can assist with any language and there is no charge for interpretation.

An audio cassette of the Leeds Strategic Plan can also be obtained by contacting us via one of the methods above.



Working in partnership through the [Leeds Initiative](#)



List of Scrutiny work undertaken in the past five years relevant to the Environment and Neighbourhoods portfolio

The following list summaries key areas of scrutiny work carried out over the last five years that are relevant to the Board's portfolio (this list excludes the standard performance management and recommendation tracking items)

Municipal year 2008/09 – Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

Review of Dog Fouling Enforcement in Leeds
 Street Cleaning Inquiry
 Asylum Seeker and Case Resolution Inquiry
 Private Rented Sector Housing Inquiry
 Review of Miscellaneous Properties
 Draft Leeds Housing Strategy
 Grounds Maintenance Draft Service Improvement Plan
 Sustainable Communities Act
 Revised Lettings Policy
 Monthly performance updates on the Dog Warden service
 Quarterly updates on the Supporting People Programme
 Briefing on the role of Police Community Support Officers

Municipal year 2007/08 – Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

Housing Lettings Pressures Inquiry
 CO2 Emissions Inquiry
 Safer Leeds 2006/07 Annual Performance Report
 Recycling Strategy
 Consultation on Strategic Outcomes and Improvement Priorities for the Leeds Strategic Plan
 Voids and Empty Properties Update
 Street Cleansing and Britain's Cleanest City Award Update
 Outcomes of Research into the Housing Market in Leeds
 Rodent Control in Leeds
 Integrated Waste Strategy – Waste Solution for Leeds
 Integrated Waste Strategy – The role of the Voluntary and Community Sector
 Safer Leeds Partnership Plan

Municipal year 2006/07 – Scrutiny Board (City Services) and Scrutiny Board (Neighbourhoods and Housing)

Implementation of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005
 PFI Street lighting – visit to the Scottish Electric Contracting Ltd Headquarters at Swillington
 City Services EMAS and actions taken to reduce CO2 Emissions
 Review of the Leeds scheme to control litter from flyers and free printed material
 Regeneration in Beeston Hill and Holbeck Inquiry
 Supporting People
 Respect Agenda
 Emergency Accommodation for young people
 PCSO Evaluation
 EASEL update
 Lettings Policy
 Area Management Review
 Social Enterprise

Asylum Seekers
 Prostitution Strategy
 Single Regional Housing Pot

Municipal year 2005/06 – Scrutiny Board (Environment and Community Safety) and Scrutiny Board (Thriving Communities)

Anti-social Behaviour Interventions Inquiry
 Evaluation of Police Community Support Officers
 Closure of Public Rights of Way for the Purposes of Crime Prevention
 Streetlighting Private Finance Initiative
 Streetscene Grounds Maintenance Contract Inquiry
 Waste Solution Inquiry
 Contaminated Land
 Affordable Housing for Families Inquiry
 ALMO Performance Information
 Empty Properties
 Community Cohesion
 Leeds Tenants Federation and Tenant Involvement in ALMOs
 Fitness of Private Sector Housing
 Asylum Seekers
 Gypsies and Travellers
 Hostel Closures
 ALMO Review
 ALMO Enforcement of Tenancy Conditions
 Implementation of the Housing Act 2004

Municipal year 2004/05 – Scrutiny Board (City Services) and Scrutiny Board (Neighbourhoods and Housing)

Streetscene Revisited: A Critical Assessment
 Bulky Items Collection Inquiry
 Review of Enforcement
 Recycling Inquiry
 Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme
 Gypsies and Traveller Sites
 Asylum arrangements in Leeds post 2005
 Area Management – progress and implementation
 Lettings Policy and Local Lettings Policy
 Introductory Tenancies
 Licensing of Private Landlords
 Community Centre Review
 SRB Exit Strategies
 Evaluating the use of Enforcement Powers
 Allocation of PCSOs and Wardens
 Community Safety and Enforcement Operations
 External Audit Report – Community Safety Partnerships
 Energy and Fuel Poverty
 Leeds Tenants Federation
 Alley Gating Schemes
 Hostel Closures

Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

1. In relation to **Environment and Neighbourhoods**¹, to exercise the functions of a Scrutiny Board including the following:
 - (a) to review or scrutinise the exercise of any council or executive function, or any other related matter²;
 - (b) to make reports or recommendations to Council or the Executive in connection with the exercise of any functions of the Council or the Executive including proposals for changes to policies and practices;
 - (c) to receive and review external audit and inspection reports;
 - (d) to act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board³ in relation to the Executive's initial proposals for a plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework; and
 - (e) to review corporate performance indicators and to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate;
 - (f) to review outcomes, targets and priorities within the Leeds Strategic Plan and to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate; and
 - (g) to review or scrutinise executive decisions made but not implemented.⁴

2. To exercise the functions of a **crime and disorder committee**⁵, including the following:
 - (a) to review or scrutinise the exercise of crime and disorder functions⁶ by responsible authorities⁷;
 - (b) to review or scrutinise any local crime and disorder matter in relation to a Member⁸;

¹These are the functions delegated to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, the Chief Officer (Environmental Services), the Chief Officer (Housing Services) and the Chief Officer (Regeneration) under the officer delegation schemes (council functions) and the officer delegation scheme (executive functions), and the functions which the authority has agreed that another person should exercise as agent of the authority (Section 27 of the Housing Act 1985).

² including matters pertaining to outside bodies and partnerships to which appointments have been made by the authority

³ under the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules

⁴ which have been called-in under Rule 22 of the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules.

⁵ In accordance with Section 19 Police and Justice Act 2006

⁶ As defined by Section 6 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (formulating and implementing crime and disorder strategies).

⁷ These are the authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies (Section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998)

⁸ This is any matter concerning-

(a) crime and disorder (including in particular forms of crime and disorder that involve anti-social behaviour or other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment) or

- (c) to make a report or recommendations to the Council or the Executive about the exercise of crime and disorder functions⁹ or any local crime and disorder matter in relation to a Member¹⁰.
- 3. To receive and monitor formal responses to any reports or recommendations made by the Board.

(b) the misuse of drugs alcohol and other substances in that area which affects all or part of the electoral area for which the Member is elected or any person who lives or works in that area.

⁹ See footnote 6 above

¹⁰ See footnote 8 above

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL**FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

For the period 1 June 2009 to 30 September 2009

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Request for approval to vary the existing Supporting People Service Contract with Care and Repair (Leeds) Approval to vary the existing Supporting People Service Contract with Care and Repair (Leeds) by increasing the value of the contract by a cost of £178,190.11 to provide an expanded Handyperson service and to provide funding for an Asian Outreach Worker post to expiry of the current contract on 27.2.10.	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods	1/6/09	N/A	Report to be presented to the Delegated Decision Panel prior to the decision being taken.	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods neil.evans@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Contract Extension To grant the extension of Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan for Morley Greaseworks, Gamblethorpe and Middletonbroom Disused Landfill Sites	Chief Officer Environmental Services	1/6/09	N/A	Extension of Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan for Morley Greaseworks, Gamblethorpe and Middletonbroom Disused Landfill Sites	Chief Officer Environmental Services christopher.o'brien@leeds.gov.uk
Request to enter into a Supporting People service level agreement with Leeds City Council Adult Social Care for the Neighbourhood Network Service Authorisation to enter into a Supporting People service level agreement with Leeds City Council Adult Social Care for the Neighbourhood Networks service	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods	1/6/09	N/A	Report to be presented to the Delegated Decision Panel	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods neil.evans@leeds.gov.uk
Award of contracts under the Skilled for Success Programme To award contracts with an approximate value of between £100-£350k per contract. Up to £724k is available within the tender opportunity.	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods	15/6/09	Procurement Unit and the Worklessness Strategic Outcomes Group	Report to award contracts with delegated decision notification will be submitted in July 2009	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods tracey.phillips@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
South Leeds Investment Partnership Agreement to progress the establishment of a South Leeds Investment Partnership, which will be led by the Council but will include a number of Private and Voluntary sector partners and stakeholders.	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	17/6/09	The partnership will include a Partnership Engagement Group which will oversee Community Engagement as the partnership progresses its work	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods christine.addison@leeds.gov.uk
ALMO annual review 2008-09 For information to June Executive Board, not decision.	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	17/6/09	Previously undertaken	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods maureen.boyle@leeds.gov.uk
Area delivery Plans 2010/11 Endorsement of 10 Area Delivery Plans	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	17/6/09	Elected Members, Area Committees, Regeneration Management Teams	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods liz.jarmin@leeds.gov.uk

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
Review of Area Functions Endorsement of the review of Area Functions for 2010/11	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	17/6/09	Elected Members, Area Committees, Regeneration Management Teams	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods liz.jarmin@leeds.gov.uk
51-57 Chapel Hill, Morley: Acquisition, demolition and development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the project brief and scheme design Give authority to spend £1,474,800 from Town and District Centre Regeneration Scheme: Morley Bottoms 12154/MOR/000. 	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	17/6/09	Consultation has already been undertaken with Local Councillors, Morley Town Centre Manager, Cabinet Member – Regeneration and local traders.	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods franklin.riley@leeds.gov.uk
Bangladeshi Community Centre for a 50 Years lease at peppercorn rent Approval for Legal progress and complete a 50 year lease at peppercorn rent	Executive Board (Portfolio: Neighbourhoods and Housing)	22/7/09	Elected members, Area Committee, Regeneration Management Team, community group	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods jas.panesar@leeds.gov.uk

NOTES

Key decisions are those executive decisions:

- which result in the authority incurring expenditure or making savings over £250,000 per annum, or
- are likely to have a significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards

Executive Board Portfolios

Executive Member

Central and Corporate

Councillor Richard Brett

Development and Regeneration

Councillor Andrew Carter

Environmental Services

Councillor Steve Smith

Neighbourhoods and Housing

Councillor John Leslie Carter

Leisure

Councillor John Procter

Children's Services

Councillor Stewart Golton

Learning

Councillor Richard Harker

Adult Health and Social Care

Councillor Peter Harrand

Leader of the Labour Group

Councillor Keith Wakefield

Leader of the Morley Borough
Independent Group

Councillor Robert Finnigan

Advisory Member

Councillor Judith Blake

In cases where Key Decisions to be taken by the Executive Board are not included in the Plan, 5 days notice of the intention to take such decisions will be given by way of the agenda for the Executive Board meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Peter Marrington

Tel: 39 51151

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Environment and Neighbourhoods

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: KPMG – SCRUTINY REVIEW – MAY 2009

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report presents the findings of the recent KPMG external audit review of the Scrutiny function in Leeds. (Appendix 1). The report also details management's response to the reviews recommendations.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 The objective of the KPMG review was to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in addressing the improvements areas identified by the Corporate Assessment in early 2008.

3.0 Background Information

3.1 As part of their 2008/09 Audit and Inspection Plan, it was agreed that KPMG would carry out a review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function. The audit objective was to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in the improvement areas identified by the Corporate Assessment, specifically:

- The extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision;
- The extent to which the skills of the Members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfillment of their role;
- How scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards;
- The extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions;

- The design of the Call-In arrangements in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment' report;
- The extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements;
- The extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards;
- The extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council; and
- The extent to which Scrutiny provides effective challenge and adds value to the Council.

4.0 Main Issues

4.1 The key findings of the review are set out below:

The recognition that in light of the recent Corporate Assessment the Council has been in the process of continuing to strengthen its Scrutiny function and that a number of aspects of good practice were identified, such as:

- Professional relationships have been developed between the Scrutiny Board Chairs and the Principal Scrutiny Advisors;
- A wide range of training tools are used in providing training resources for Scrutiny Board Members;
- Personal development plans are available for all Members which assist in the identification of individual training needs; and
- Inquiry selection criteria forms are used to determine whether full scrutiny Inquiries items will be added to the work programme of the Scrutiny Boards.

4.2 The key learning points were as follows:

That whilst the Council continues to develop its Scrutiny function it should ensure that the following areas are strengthened:

- An overall vision for the Scrutiny function should be developed, documented and published;
- The trust between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to be maintained and developed in order to reinforce the importance of joint working;
- The relationship between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to continue to develop and political views need to be kept separate from the Scrutiny function;
- There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide to not undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so as to prevent any misunderstandings arising;
- The Scrutiny Boards Procedure Rules Guidance Notes should be strengthened to incorporate that the Scrutiny Boards strive for enhanced lines of internal communication; add value to the Council through the Scrutiny reviews undertaken and incorporate innovation into the approach for challenging the way the Council operates;
- The process of selecting Scrutiny Chairs should be reviewed and a 'job specification' introduced;

- Scrutiny Boards should review whether co-opted Members should be invited to join in their Board;
- All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item so that Scrutiny Boards can scan the horizon to identify any emerging issues;
- The efficiency of Scrutiny Board meetings needs to be improved. To achieve this timed or single item agendas should be encouraged where appropriate and pre-meetings used more effectively;
- Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon;
- Reports of Members attendance at Scrutiny meetings should be made to each of the political groups. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political party to take appropriate action to address this;
- Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and highlight if they feel this should direct any area of their annual work programme;
- Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery; and
- The Scrutiny annual report should be strengthened to clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition its format should be standardised to clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings and to clearly display the outcomes of the previous years recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

4.3 These recommendations will be reported to all Scrutiny Boards for consideration. The Scrutiny Advisory Group will play a role in monitoring the implementation of the recommendations

4.4 In line with the Council's protocol for receiving external audit reports, the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee will also receive the audit report and may chose to refer particular issues to other committees, including Scrutiny Boards, for further detailed consideration.

4.5 Unfortunately, the author of the report is unable to attend today's meeting, therefore the Board may wish to consider the recommendations again at a future meeting when any points requiring clarification can be discussed. However, it was considered appropriate to bring the report to the first meeting of the Board as some of the recommendations refer to the running of Scrutiny Board meetings.

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 Members are asked to consider the review's recommendations and accompanying management response and refer any comments to the Scrutiny Advisory Group.

Background Papers

KPMG Scrutiny Review May 2009

This page is intentionally left blank



INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT AND HEALTHCARE

Leeds City Council
Scrutiny Review
May 2009

AUDIT

AUDIT ■ TAX ■ ADVISORY

Contents

1	Executive summary	2
2	Introduction	5
3	Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships	7
4	The vision and resources for scrutiny	11
5	Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles	13
6	Development of Scrutiny work programmes	16
7	Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards	18
8	Call-In arrangements	20
9	Service delivery, service improvements and added value of scrutiny	22
10	Policy development	24
11	Performance Management	26
	Appendix 1 – Recommendations and action plan	28

This report is addressed to the Authority and has been prepared for the sole use of the Authority. We take no responsibility to any officer or Member acting in their individual capacities, or to third parties. The Audit Commission has issued a document entitled *Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies*. This summarises where the responsibilities of auditors begin and end and what is expected from the audited body. We draw your attention to this document.

External auditors do not act as a substitute for the audited body's own responsibility for putting in place proper arrangements to ensure that public business is conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards, and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

If you have any concerns or are dissatisfied with any part of KPMG's work, in the first instance you should contact Adrian Lythgo, who is the engagement director to the Authority, telephone 0113 231 3054, email adrian.lythgo@kpmg.co.uk who will try to resolve your complaint. If you are dissatisfied with your response please contact Trevor Rees on 0161 246 4000, email trevor.rees@kpmg.co.uk, who is the national contact partner for all of KPMG's work with the Audit Commission. After this, if you still are dissatisfied with how your complaint has been handled you can access the Audit Commission's complaints procedure. Put your complaint in writing to the Complaints Team, Westward House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SU or by e mail to: complaints@audit-commission.gov.uk. Their telephone number is 0844 798 3131, textphone (minicom) 020 7630 0421.

1 Executive summary

1.1 Introduction

Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs” by the press aiming to ensure that Council Tax payers get the best out of their public services. For Scrutiny Boards to provide this service they should have at least two components:

- Ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions previously taken by the Executive; and
- Forward looking contributions to policy and improvement across the Council.

This review has focused on the ability for the Scrutiny function at Leeds City Council (LCC) to challenge the Council both in terms of ongoing and retrospective consideration of decisions and forward looking contributions to policy and improvement. We have also reviewed the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards and the information available to Members of the Boards in carrying out their work and drawing their conclusions.

1.2 Key findings

We recognise that in light of the recent Corporate Assessment the Council has been in the process of continuing to strengthen its Scrutiny function and during our review we identified a number of aspects of good practice across the Council, such as:

- Professional relationships have been developed between the Scrutiny Board Chairs and the Principal Scrutiny Advisors;
- A wide range of training tools are used in providing training resources for Scrutiny Board Members;
- Personal development plans are available for all Members which assist in the identification of individual training needs; and
- Inquiry selection criteria forms are used to determine whether full scrutiny inquiries items will be added to the work programme of the Scrutiny Boards.

Whilst the Council continues to develop its Scrutiny function further and reflect best practice it should ensure that the following areas are strengthened:

- An overall vision for the Scrutiny function should be developed, documented and published;
- The trust between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to be maintained and developed in order to reinforce the importance of joint working;
- The relationship between Scrutiny Members, Executive Members and Officers needs to continue to develop and political views need to be kept separate from the Scrutiny function;
- There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide to not undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so as to prevent any misunderstandings arising;

1 Executive summary continued

- The Scrutiny Boards Procedure Rules Guidance Notes should be strengthened to incorporate that the Scrutiny Boards strive for enhanced lines of internal communication; add value to the Council through the Scrutiny reviews undertaken and incorporate innovation into the approach for challenging the way the Council operates;
- The process of selecting Scrutiny Chairs should be reviewed and a 'job specification' introduced;
- Scrutiny Boards should review whether co-opted Members should be invited to join in their Board;
- All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item so that Scrutiny Boards can scan the horizon to identify any emerging issues;
- The efficiency of Scrutiny Board meetings needs to be improved. To achieve this timed or single item agendas should be encouraged where appropriate and pre-meetings used more effectively;
- Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon;
- Reports of Members attendance at Scrutiny meetings should be made to each of the political groups. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political party to take appropriate action to address this;
- Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and highlight if they feel this should direct any area of their annual work programme;
- Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery; and
- The Scrutiny annual report should be strengthened to clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition its format should be standardised to clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings and to clearly display the outcomes of the previous years recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

1 Executive summary continued

1.3 Way forward

We will discuss the findings of the review with Officers and Members to agree an action plan to address the key issues going forward.

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

The current constitutions of Local Authorities give selected Councillors an important role in scrutinising the decisions of the Executive. The role of Scrutiny at LCC has evolved over the years and the Council now have established seven Scrutiny Boards whose responsibilities are to examine the decisions, policies and overall performance of the Council, making recommendations for improvement where necessary. The seven Scrutiny Boards cover:

- Adult Social Care;
- Central and Corporate Functions;
- Children’s Services;
- City and Regional Partnerships;
- City Development;
- Environment and Neighbourhoods; and
- Health.

The Scrutiny Boards are often referred to as the Council “watchdogs”, and are made up of Councillors from all political parties and some include Co-opted Members from outside the Council. Legislation requires that to ensure independence there are no Executive Members on any of the Scrutiny Boards.

2.2 Objectives and scope of our review

Our objective is to provide the Council with assurance around the progress made in the improvement areas identified by the Corporate Assessment. We specifically focused upon:

- The scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council’s leadership and the Executive Board;
- The extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision;

2. Introduction continued

- The extent to which the skills of the Members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role;
- How scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards;
- The extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions;
- The design of the Call-In arrangements in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment' report;
- The extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements;
- The extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards;
- The extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council; and
- The extent to which Scrutiny provides effective challenge and adds value to the Council.

2.3 Audit approach

Our approach has been to:

- Review key documents;
- Interview key contacts;
- Observe scrutiny meetings;
- Share best practice; and
- Provide constructive challenge and support.

2.4 Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all those staff at the Council who have supported this review.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the scope and role of the Scrutiny Boards, their independence and the relationship with the Council's leadership and the Executive Board.

3.2 Scope and role of Scrutiny Boards

Each of the seven Scrutiny Boards have their own terms of reference which all outline the functions of the Boards. Within their terms of reference, all Scrutiny Boards state they will:

- Review or scrutinise the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or any other matter;
- Make reports or recommendations to Council or the Executive either in connection with the exercise of any function of the Council, Executive or on any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- Receive and review external audit and inspection reports;
- Act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board in relation to the Executive's initial proposals for a plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- Review corporate performance indicators; and
- Exercise the right to Call-In decisions made but not yet implemented by the Executive.

In addition all Scrutiny Boards may assist the Council and the Executive in the development and review of policies.

Having compared the terms of reference of the Scrutiny Boards at LCC with those of other Local Authorities it is evident that at LCC these are set within the legal framework whereas at other Authorities they also detail roles outside of this framework.

The softer roles referred to within other Local Authorities terms of reference include being innovative in the approach to Scrutiny; adding value through the reviews completed; striving for greater public involvement in Scrutiny; and improving communication within the Council and wider community. Whilst the role around engaging with the public is expressed within other documentation at LCC there is potential to enhance the procedural notes further by explicitly outlining additional functions / activities that Scrutiny could undertake.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation One

The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:

- Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates;
- Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and
- Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community.

3.3 Independence of the Scrutiny Boards and wider relationships

By law no Members of scrutiny boards may be from the Council's Executive Board. However to ensure that an effective Scrutiny function is in place it is essential that a two way relationship is developed between the Executive Board and the Scrutiny Boards. In essence the relationship between the Executive Board Member and the Chair of the Scrutiny Board will impact on how issues are raised and dealt with.

A number of the Scrutiny Chairs feel that relationships with other Members and Officers is a continually evolving process and needs to continue to develop. Executive Board Members also acknowledge that whilst relationships have improved with Scrutiny Chairs there is still further work to be done.

As a result of the need to continue to develop the relationships between Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Board Members and Officers there is an acknowledgment that Scrutiny is not as effective as it could be at LCC and all political groups appear accepting of this.

Some Scrutiny Chairs feel that the role of Scrutiny is under valued by some of the Executive Board and as a result Scrutiny has not been as successful as it could be. Whilst some Executive Board Members felt that Scrutiny has added value to the Council, a couple were unable to give any specific examples of this. Scrutiny Chairs feel that they have tried various techniques to engage with Executive Members including inviting them to meetings; asking for assistance to develop work programmes; having regular update meetings; and sharing Scrutiny recommendations although still there is a recognised need to continue to engage further.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation Two

The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.

The need to further develop the relationships between some Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers is clearly highlighted by a quote from one Scrutiny Chair "Executive Members will punish Officers for co-operating too fully with Scrutiny requests."

The 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' was devised to address the subtleties and nuances required to establish successful and robust Scrutiny. This should be re-distributed to facilitate professional working relationships and should be introduced on an Annual basis within the Members induction programme.

Recommendation Three

The Council should raise the profile of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.

3.4 Public engagement

From the Scrutiny Board meetings attended it was noted that attendance by members of the public is poor. Advertising of Scrutiny Board meetings is principally done on the Council's internet site and if a Scrutiny meeting is to be held outside of the Civic centre then fliers will be produced to leave at the place of the new venue. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit has a mailing list to communicate with people who have previously attended meetings. The Council should consider whether it may be appropriate to try and encourage greater public engagement and as part of this they could look at different methods of advertising their Scrutiny Board meetings.

In order to encourage greater engagement with members of the public and other partners the Council should consider having single item agendas. There have been a number of occurrences within some of the Scrutiny Boards where agenda items have been given disproportionate amounts of time and as a result attendees have been left waiting sometimes not being able to present their given agenda item.

3 Scrutiny Boards scope and role, independence and wider relationships continued

Recommendation Four

Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.

In addition to encourage greater engagement with the public, witnesses and co-optees the Council should remind Members that Scrutiny Board meetings are not the appropriate forum to raise political views as there is a risk that by doing so these individuals may feel alienated.

Recommendation Five

Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views.

3.5 Co-opted Members

Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.

Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Six

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

4 The vision and resources for scrutiny

4.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Council has a clear vision for the contribution of scrutiny and the resources to deliver that vision.

4.2 Vision for effective Scrutiny

By having an overall vision, aim or objective for a particular function it can serve to provide a clearer understanding of that function and demonstrate the added value that that function can bring.

From the documentation reviewed relating to Scrutiny at LCC there was no reference to what the Council see as their vision for Scrutiny. Following discussions with the Scrutiny Board Chairs, it was also clear that they each had their own personal visions for Scrutiny with there being no overarching Council wide vision. The visions from speaking to various Scrutiny Board Chairs included “holding the executive to account”; “getting involved in pre-policy decisions”; and “improving services for members of the public”.

Recommendation Seven

The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.

4.3 Resources for effective Scrutiny

Whilst there is no overall vision as to the role of Scrutiny at LCC all Officers and Members interviewed felt that the financial resources available to the Scrutiny function were adequate to enable it to fulfil its role. The actual expenditure relating to the Scrutiny support function totalled £574,312 in 2007-08; £585,247 in 2006-07; and £503,875 in 2005-06.

One area of concern that was raised by a Scrutiny Board Chair related to whether members of the Scrutiny Boards fully understand the totality of issues being discussed. Whilst the Scrutiny Boards have access to independent research facilities this

4 The vision and resources for scrutiny continued

Member felt that these were predominately internet based and did not allow for specialist expertise to always be obtained on a particular topic area. The Scrutiny Support Unit does however provide a newspaper clipping service for Scrutiny Board Chairs which enables Members to gain further information relating to topic areas and facilitates some horizon scanning to be undertaken and potential emerging issues identified. In addition the Scrutiny Support Unit keep track of up and coming legislation, current consultations, departmental forward plans, publications by pressures, quangos and national bodies and attend numerous seminars and conferences and report back on all of these.

In addition there are a number of web based forums which Scrutiny Members are encouraged to access to gain further information or identify emerging issues. There has also been a Regional Chairs Forum although Members from LCC have not accessed this facility.

Recommendation Eight

Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles

5.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the skills of the members on the Scrutiny Boards are matched to and are appropriate for the fulfilment of their role.

5.2 Matching of members skills against the requirements of their role

The Scrutiny Boards are composed of elected Members who are selected to represent the political balance of the Council. As a result each political group has its own method of selection for appointing Chairs and Members to the Scrutiny Boards. However there is no formal matching undertaken by any of the political groups of the skills of Chairs and Members and the skill requirements of a particular Board. Given that there is no formal matching there is a risk that the most suitable candidate in terms of skills, experiences or even interest in the subject matter is not appointed as a Chair or Member of a Scrutiny Board.

5.3 Attendance

The table below highlights the percentage of members for each of the Scrutiny Boards that have attended 50% or less of the Scrutiny Board meetings in the time period 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009:

Scrutiny Board	Percentage of members who have attended 50% or less of the meetings held between 1 June 2008 – 19 March 2009
Adult Social Care	23%
Central and Corporate	14%
Children's Services	27%
City Development	8%
City and Regional Partnerships	17%
Environment and Neighbourhoods	40%
Health	36%

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

This table clearly highlights that there are a large number of Scrutiny Board Members who are not attending meetings on a regular basis. In addition not only is there a poor attendance rate by some but there are other Members who are either late or who leave meetings early. Poor attendance rates, arriving late or leaving meetings early does not enable all Members to fully engage in the Scrutiny process.

Currently the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development sends reports to the Scrutiny Board Chairs and group Whips highlighting attendance rates for their Members. There is now a need for this to also be sent to each of the political groups for them to take action. For Scrutiny to be seen as effective across the Council it is paramount that Members who sit on each of the Boards attend and contribute to as many meetings as possible.

Recommendation Nine

Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.

It is recognised by some Executive and Scrutiny Members that the Scrutiny function at LCC could be strengthened. Having attended a number of Scrutiny meetings it has been evident that the chairing styles of the Boards does differ and this can lead to there being a lack of clarity over what information the Board actually requires; to agenda items being given disproportionate amounts of time; and the engagement with other partners and members of the public being weak. The Council should therefore look closely at the methods used in appointing Scrutiny Chairs. Due to the differences previously highlighted in the selection methods employed by each of the political groups there is a risk that the Members appointed as Chairs of the Scrutiny Boards are not the most suitable. The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

Recommendation Ten

The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.

5 Matching of skills to Scrutiny Board roles continued

There appears to be a range of methods used within the Local Government sector in terms of appointing individuals as Chairs of Scrutiny. These methods include:

- An informal process of nomination, dealt with by each political group and endorsed by full Council;
- Having job specifications, against which each political party appoints the most suitable candidate; and
- Using job specifications for the leader of each political party to formally interview candidates against.

6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

6.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses how scrutiny enquiries and public challenge feed into the work programme of Scrutiny Boards.

6.2 Development of Scrutiny work programmes

The first meeting of the year for Scrutiny Boards is held in June where the work programmes for the year are developed. Work programmes are developed having had access to a wide range of information including key performance indicators, external audit and inspections reports and financial data etc. Work programmes are not finalised documents as they are seen to evolve throughout the year.

As work programmes are evolving documents and to ensure that all Members continually identify new areas for inclusion in the work programme each Scrutiny Board should have a standing agenda item which allows for real time monitoring of issues, so that any emerging issues can be identified. This will enable any current issues to be added where appropriate to the work programme and will facilitate the Scrutiny Board being perceived to be having greater impact by continually scanning the horizon for potential issues.

Recommendation Eleven

All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.

For a detailed inquiry area to be added to the work programme it will be considered against the Council's 'inquiry selection criteria' and the Scrutiny Board will consult with the relevant Director and Executive Member. The ultimate decision of whether to add an inquiry area to the work programme lies with the Scrutiny Board.

The Council also have a 'request for scrutiny' form that anyone can complete and submit to the relevant Scrutiny Board, this is subject to the same selection criteria above.

6 Development of Scrutiny work programmes continued

At one of the Scrutiny Board meetings attended there was debate about whether or not to add a particular inquiry area to the work programme. Whilst Members of the board spent a considerable amount of time debating whether or not to add this to their work programme it was incorrectly pointed out that this had not been discussed with either the relevant Director or Executive Member. It was therefore decided to move this agenda item to the next meeting. This action was not actually required and could potentially lead to alienation of Members, partners and members of the public if meetings are not conducted in an efficient manner. By ensuring that all Scrutiny boards hold effective pre-meetings this will help to ensure that similar situations are limited.

7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards

7.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the information available to Members enables them to reach appropriate conclusions.

7.2 Quality / Quantity of information

There is a general feeling amongst the Scrutiny Board Members that the quality of information they receive to enable them to reach appropriate decisions is to a high standard. This is felt to be facilitated by the strong relationships that the Scrutiny Board Members have developed with their Principal Scrutiny Advisors.

Across all Council meetings, not just Scrutiny, there is a trend for very large agenda packs. The risk of having such large agenda packs is that people do not get sufficient time to read the contents fully. Having reviewed all Scrutiny agenda packs for March 2009 there are only two with less than one hundred pages and there are four Scrutiny Boards with agenda packs greater than one hundred and fifty pages. The quantity of information that is presented and the number of agenda items may be a contributing factor as to why the contribution within some Scrutiny Board meetings of some Members is limited. The Council should consider whether the agenda packs could be limited in size as this could potentially lead to greater engagement by both Members and other attendees.

At one of the Children's Services Scrutiny Board meetings however, some Members felt that insufficient information was presented to decide if to go ahead and hold an inquiry hence adding an item to their work programme. As a consequence the agenda item had to be carried forward to the next meeting.

All Scrutiny Boards should ensure that they use their pre-meetings more effectively as this should be the forum for Members to voice concerns over the sufficiency of information presented. Chairs should ensure that at pre-meetings all Members are focused upon the forth coming meeting and they should ensure all Members identify which agenda item they will lead on. By having more focused pre-meetings this should lead to more efficient Scrutiny Board meetings.

7 Information for Members of Scrutiny Boards continued

Recommendation Twelve

Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.

8 Call-In arrangements

8.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the design of the Call-In arrangements specifically in response to the Council's recent 'Corporate Assessment'.

8.2 Call In arrangements

Within the Local Government Act 2000 there is a requirement that Overview and Scrutiny Committees are given the power to recommend that a decision made but not implemented be reconsidered, 'Called In'. As 'Calling In' of a decision can lead to a period of delay before a decision is implemented it was envisaged that this mechanism is used sparingly.

The recent Corporate Assessment made the following observations in relation to Call in arrangements:

".... Call-In arrangements need to be reviewed to support a fair and effective approach.... Call In arrangements are considered ineffective by many Councillors as two political parties have to agree which has resulted in few Call Ins in recent years."

Following this observation the Council approved changes to its constitution in May 2008. Call In arrangements must now be signed by:

- Two Non Executive elected Members (who are not from the same political party); or
- Any five Non Executive elected Members.

Following the changes implemented above another review of the Call In arrangements was undertaken in October 2008 and the following arrangements implemented:

- Scrutiny Board Members should no longer be signatories to Call Ins which they will hear;
- A substitute Member is entitled to attend the Scrutiny Board meeting where the Call In is received in place of a regular Member; and
- Call in meetings can be adjourned up to a maximum of five working days to allow information not available at the time but considered crucial by the Scrutiny Board in order to reach a decision.

8 Call-In arrangements continued

As a consequence of these changes there has been an increase in the number of Call Ins received, which now appear in line with the level of Call Ins at other Local Authorities. These changes have also led to the view that Call Ins are becoming increasingly more effective.

One of the decisions recently Called In was at the City Development Scrutiny Board and related to a decision made around cemeteries and crematoria fees. Whilst this decision was released for implementation, it was noted that under the Officer Delegation, the decision had been implemented before the Call In period had expired. Internal Audit at the Council have recently highlighted this issue and included a recommendation within one of their reports.

Recommendation Thirteen

The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.

9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny

9.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in changes in service delivery and service improvements and the extent to which Scrutiny adds value to the Council.

9.2 Service delivery and service improvements

Historically Scrutiny Boards have had no comprehensive system for tracking the implementation of recommendations. Hence it has not always been clear to demonstrate service delivery or improvements following recommendations made. To address this the Council have recently implemented a formal tracking system so that Scrutiny Boards can monitor the implementation of their recommendations in a more systematic way.

In addition on an annual basis a report is produced of the work undertaken by the Council's Scrutiny Boards. This highlights in detail the areas of focus of each Board and highlights some of the recommendations made. This could be further strengthened by outlining the service benefits of these recommendations as a demonstration of the impact Scrutiny can have.

Recommendation Fourteen

Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.

Whilst not having had a formalised monitoring system in place for a long period of time, the Council is still able to highlight a wide range of examples of where the recommendations of the Scrutiny Boards have resulted in service delivery or improvements. A selection of examples are highlighted below:

- In November 2005 the Children's Services Scrutiny Board established a Young People's Scrutiny Forum to carry out scrutiny on topics chosen by the young people themselves. In their second year the Young People's Scrutiny Forum reviewed transport arrangements in Leeds for Young People and a local campaign has been launched for free bus travel for young people.

9 Service delivery, service improvements and added value of Scrutiny continued

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board have been involved in steering the Council's approach to the development of Trust Schools to enable a proactive strategic approach to maximise the potential that Trust Schools might have in improving outcomes for children in deprived communities.
- The Scrutiny Boards also provide an important function to ensure that all parties have their views heard and comprehensively reflected. This has recently been evidenced where staff at a local school agreed to call off strike action after it was decided that Scrutiny would undertake an inquiry into a school based issue.
- The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards have previously been acknowledged as being instrumental in improving the negotiations and working relationships between the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and the LGI Kidney Patients Association.
- Some of the funding awarded by the Centre for Public Scrutiny has been used to achieve one of the objectives of the Healthy Leeds Partnership's 'Health and Wellbeing Plan' which was to establish a Community Development Network for Leeds.
- Following a recommendation made by the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards being implemented, for a representative from the Council's Development Department to become a member of the Leeds Childhood Obesity Strategy Group, it is recognised that they have played an active part in developing the action plan for tackling childhood obesity.
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into the Council's own CO2 emissions. From reviewing this it is highly commendable to see the Board had factored into their inquiry future legislative changes relating to the Carbon Reduction Commitment.

All of the examples highlighted above have been identified by Scrutiny Members. None of the Executive Members interviewed were able to say when questioned any areas where Scrutiny has added value or where Scrutiny recommendations had led to service improvements. When asked as to why the Executive Members felt this was the case, some stated that they felt Scrutiny had become "cosy" and the enquiries held were "not very challenging". Some Executive Members felt that Scrutiny recommendations were ones that predominately had been generated by Officers themselves. Having reviewed a large number of Scrutiny recommendations this does not always appear to be the case although it does highlight the need for all Scrutiny Members to ensure they act with professional scepticism in all they do.

10 Policy development

10.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the seven Scrutiny Boards challenge policy development and the consistency of actions taken by these Boards.

10.2 Policy development

Policy development can take the form of being involved in the development of a new policy area or can involve suggesting modifications to previous policies. Across the Council there are examples that a number of Scrutiny Boards are involved in some form of policy development, even if at the out set the area of review was not badged as policy development. Whilst there is still room for improvement in ensuring all Scrutiny Boards are more involved in policy development there is a consensus that there is a shift in the right direction and increasingly more work is being done in this area. From a review of the 2007/08 annual report which categorises the different types of work that the seven Scrutiny Boards have been involved in, it is clear to see that 33% of their total work in 2007/08 involved some form of policy review or development compared to 24% in 2006/07.

There are however, a number of Scrutiny Board Members who feel that they would like to be more involved in policy development. Following discussions with both Scrutiny Chairs and Executive Members there are a small number of inconsistencies in how the role of Scrutiny in policy development is viewed. From the feedback we received some Scrutiny Chairs do feel bypassed in policy development. Some Executive Members however felt that despite providing direction to Scrutiny Boards in terms of useful areas of work and policy development that they would like Scrutiny to get involved in, this is often ignored. During our review, however, we found limited evidence of this. In addition Executive Members stated that no rationale was provided as to why these areas were not felt to be priorities for the Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Fifteen

There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.

10 Policy development continued

From a review of this years and prior years' work programmes it is evident that one example of where the Culture and Leisure Scrutiny Board (as it was previously called) could have been more involved in policy development was in regards to the proposals to establish a Sports Trust. The Board did however identify this as a potential area of work although following discussions decided against taking this forward.

There are a number of examples however of where the Scrutiny Boards have been able to demonstrate involvement in policy development. Examples include:

- The Children's Services Scrutiny Board where they have been actively involved in policy development relating to the services for 8 – 13 year olds; the development of an inclusion Strategy; and the education and training provision in Leeds for 14 – 19 year olds;
- The City Development Scrutiny Board have commented on a number of ongoing plans and strategies which has included the Local Development Framework;
- The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board have been involved in an inquiry into housing lettings which examined the Council's current housing lettings policy; and
- The Health Scrutiny Board have recently commenced an inquiry looking at teenage pregnancy and sexual health.

The Council's Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report is an excellent forum to highlight the examples of where the Scrutiny Boards have been involved in policy development or service enhancements. However other than in the introductory section - 'Work of the Boards' which shows the different types of work Scrutiny has been involved in, and the Children's Services section which shows the areas where they have been involved in the review of existing policy and the development of new policy, the remaining report sections make it difficult to identify which areas of work relate to policy development or review. The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development is looking to make changes to the 2008/09 Annual Report to make the identification of policy development work streams easier.

Recommendation Sixteen

Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.

11 Performance Management

11.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the Scrutiny function fits within the wider performance management arrangements of the Council.

11.2 The role of performance management within Scrutiny

At the start of the year when the work programmes for the Scrutiny Boards are developed (June) performance management information is shared with each Board to enable this to shape the direction of their work.

Performance management information is then presented on a quarterly basis to enable the Board to challenge the information and ask questions where appropriate to either the Executive Member, a corporate performance management Officer or the relevant Services Director. This should then provide some assurance that adequate progress is being made and where this is not the case provides a mechanism to challenge performance further.

Concern was raised by one Scrutiny Board Member that consistent poor performance against a particular key performance indicator (KPI) is not identified by Officers as being a potential area where the Scrutiny Board can provide insight and add value to the Council. Some Members, however have to take greater ownership and accountability here and not rely upon others to direct their work programmes but should feel empowered to proactively identify this themselves.

Recommendation Seventeen

Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.

Some Scrutiny Board Members also raised concern that whilst they are presented with data relating to KPIs on an exception basis they often do not fully understand the impact of this. Some organisations actually present information relating to what the impact is on the organisation of not achieving a particular KPI, this may be something the Council should consider for particular KPIs that have had historical poor performance.

11 Performance Management continued

Recommendation Eighteen

Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.

There are good examples however of where some Scrutiny Boards are clearly using performance information to shape their work programmes. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board are one such board which have identified areas where performance was not meeting the required targets and used this to request more detailed information which lead to an inquiry being undertaken.

11.3 Performance Management of Scrutiny

Within the Scrutiny Annual Report there is detail provided of the work that is undertaken by each of the seven Scrutiny Boards. Each Scrutiny Board provides a brief summary of the work they have undertaken and the recommendations raised however it is difficult given the current format of the report to monitor the actual outcomes. Each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the outcomes of the recommendations recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable. This will ensure that the impact of Scrutiny is clearly identifiable. This is to be incorporated into the 2009/10 Annual Report.

Recommendations and action plan

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk *	Little residual risk *	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
1	<p>The Council should review the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Guidance Notes and add that the Scrutiny Boards will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be innovative in their approach to challenging the way the Council operates; • Add value to the Council through the reviews they do; and • Strive to improve communication channels within the Council and the wider community. 	*	Agree.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009
2	<p>The Council should publish and distribute local and national examples of where Scrutiny has added value and impact within the Annual Report. This should be seen by full Council and Officers. This will continue to convey the message that by engaging fully with Scrutiny the Council as a whole will benefit through improved public services.</p>	***	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Annual report is already presented to full council.</p> <p>A number of scrutiny case studies have featured in national toolkits and studies. In addition some scrutiny reviews were featured in the 'Picture of Leeds' series produced for the CPA in 2007.</p> <p>We will look at strengthening this aspect by incorporating such messages into our overall 'communications strategy'.</p>	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development September 2009

Recommendations and action plan

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	Little residual risk *	
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	
			Responsibility and timescale	
3	The Council should raise the profile of the 'Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny' and should encourage further engagement between the Scrutiny Chairs, Executive Members and Officers. On an annual basis this document should also be included within the Members induction programme.	***	Agree. The development of a Council vision for scrutiny (recommendation 7) will be a good tool to develop this engagement further. The 'Memorandum of Understanding' will be refreshed and re-circulated annually.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards
4	Single item agendas should be introduced for Scrutiny Board meetings to improve their efficiency.	**	Agree. Scrutiny Boards will be encouraged to focus on single item agendas wherever possible and appropriate when developing their work programmes.	Scrutiny Chairs/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards
5	Scrutiny Members should be reminded that Scrutiny Board meetings are not a forum to voice personal political views	**	Agree. This will first take place at the June meeting, but Group whips will be reminded via the publication of this report. We accept that whilst party politics should be left at the door, Members will rightly be influenced by their political views but will make recommendations based on evidence.	Scrutiny Chairs/Group Whips/Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	* Management response	Little residual risk Responsibility and timescale
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
6	Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.	**	Agree. This will be a formal item on the June Scrutiny Board meeting agendas.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009
7	The Council should ascertain what their overall vision is for the Scrutiny function, formally document this and then publicise it, potentially within the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule Guidance Notes.	*	Agree. We would suggest that the CfPS five principles of scrutiny are used as a starting point. This will require sign up by the Leaders and should involve a wide range of stakeholders.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Administration Leaders/Scrutiny Chairs October 2009
8	Scrutiny Members should continue to be encouraged to access web based Scrutiny forums so that they have an additional network of resource to draw upon and it will enable further horizon scanning of emerging issues to be undertaken.	*	Agree. Members will be reminded of these resources on an annual basis at the start of the municipal year, as well as on an ongoing basis.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	* Management response	Little residual risk Responsibility and timescale
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
9	Regular reports should be made to the political parties highlighting the attendance rates for their Members. Where attendance rates fall below an acceptable level then it should be the responsibility of each political group to take appropriate action to address this. Alternatively the number of members on Scrutiny Boards could be reduced if there are too many competing demands on Members' time.	**	Agree. We currently do this to political groups.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/ Group Whips Ongoing
10	The Council should consider introducing a 'job specification' outlining the required competencies of a Scrutiny Chair. Each political group should then select the individuals who best meet this specification and this should be approved by the Leader of each group.	**	We shall be introducing 'job specifications' as part of our bid to achieve 'CharterPlus' for Member Development. Whilst the competencies required for the role will be made available to the political groups, the groups need to consider the requirements for the role within the context of national party rules.	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development October 2009 Political Groups

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk	* Little residual risk	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility and timescale
11	All Scrutiny Boards should have 'real time monitoring' as a standing agenda item.	*	<p>Agree.</p> <p>All Scrutiny Boards have a standing item where they review their work programme, and receive the Forward Plan and Executive Board minutes to assist them in any reprioritisation of work. This is required by the Council's constitution.</p> <p>All Scrutiny Boards also have the facility to engage in general discussions with the appropriate Executive Member and Director about service issues. We would not envisage this being a standing item but a facility available to Scrutiny Boards when appropriate.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
12	Scrutiny pre-meetings should be more effectively used. They should be a forum to provide real focus in advance of the Scrutiny meeting.	**	<p>Agree.</p> <p>We believe that there is scope to improve on the current use of pre-meetings.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/Scrutiny Chairs</p> <p>June 2009 onwards</p>
13	The Scrutiny Support Unit should remind Officers of the processes that need to be adhered to relating to Call Ins.	*	<p>Agree.</p> <p>We will work with colleagues in Governance Services to ensure officers across the council are aware of the stages and timescales involved in the decision-making process, particularly in relation to the call-in requirements.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development/Head of Governance Services</p> <p>September 2009</p>

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk **	Some residual risk *	Little residual risk	
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	
			Responsibility and timescale	
14	<p>Within the Scrutiny annual report each Scrutiny Board should clearly outline the service benefits of the recommendations made. In addition each Scrutiny Board should consider using a consistent table or graph to clearly display the impact of their recommendations and the outcomes recording them as implemented; partially implemented; work in progress; not accepted; and no longer applicable.</p>	**	<p>Agree. This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report. The progress of recommendations will relate mainly to those recommendations made the previous year. We will use our existing recommendation tracking system to provide this information.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2010</p>
15	<p>There is a continuing need for Executive Members, Scrutiny Board Chairs and Officers to work together to identify areas where the Scrutiny Boards can add value to policy development work streams. Where Scrutiny Boards decide not to undertake work areas suggested by Executive Members a brief rationale should be provided so to prevent any misunderstandings arising.</p>	**	<p>Agree. The success of this will depend on the relationship between Scrutiny and Executive Board Members. The work programme setting meeting in June will be crucial for this to be a success. The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules already require the Board to provide an explanation where it turns down a suggestion from the Executive Board.</p>	<p>Head of Scrutiny and Member Development June 2009 onwards</p>

Recommendations and action plan (Cont.)

***	Significant residual risk	**	Some residual risk	* *	Little residual risk
	Recommendation	Priority	Management response		Responsibility and timescale
16	Templates for the layout of the Annual Report should be provided to Scrutiny Chairs so to increase the consistency and to enable greater comparability between the work of each of the Boards. Within the Annual Report each Scrutiny Board should clearly categorise the work using a consistent series of headings.	**	Agree. This will be introduced for the 2009/10 Annual Report. The use of categories of work has been introduced for the 2008/09 annual report	*	Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2010
17	Scrutiny Board Members should be reminded of the need to assess the performance of key indicators throughout the year and use this to direct any area of their annual work programme.	**	Agree. A training session, facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny will take place in June and the messages reinforced throughout the year.		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development May 2009 onwards
18	Where there are key performance indicators with historical poor performance the Council should report to Scrutiny Boards the actual impact of this poor performance on service delivery. This may help identify areas where the Council could involve Scrutiny Boards further.	**	Agree. This will be fed into the quarterly performance monitoring reports received by all Scrutiny Boards		Head of Scrutiny and Member Development and Head of Policy, Planning and Improvement October 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Environment and Neighbourhoods

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: Determining the Work Programme 2009/10

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to determine the Board's work programme for 2009/10.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 The previous Agenda item provided inputs to the development of the Board's work programme. Having considered the written information and having discussed relevant issues with those present at the meeting, the Board is now asked to consider formulating a draft work programme.

2.2 In formulating the work programme, the Scrutiny Board shall determine;

- how the proposed inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time by the Scrutiny Advisory Group (Attached as Appendix 1)
- whether the programme can be adequately resourced and timetabled. A draft work programme highlighting existing commitments and potential areas of Scrutiny work is attached as Appendix 2.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 Members are requested to consider the Board's work programme.

Background Papers

SCRUTINY BOARD PROCEDURE RULES GUIDANCE NOTE 7

INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules require Scrutiny Boards, before deciding to undertake an Inquiry, to:

Consider how a proposed Inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time; and

Consult with any relevant Director and Executive Member

- 1.2 This is to ensure that Scrutiny Boards, when agreeing to undertake an Inquiry, have considered carefully the reasons for that Inquiry, its objectives, whether it can be adequately resourced in terms of Member and Officer time and have sought the views of the relevant Director and Executive Member.
- 1.3 The decision whether to undertake an Inquiry or not rests with the Scrutiny Board.

2.0 INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

- 2.1 At the time of deciding to undertake an Inquiry, the Scrutiny Board will refer to the Inquiry Selection Criteria within this Guidance Note and formally identify which of the agreed criteria the proposed Inquiry meets. The Board will also record the comments of the relevant Director and Executive Member. This process will be recorded in the Scrutiny Board minutes.

INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

Scrutiny Board _____

Inquiry Title _____

Anticipated Start Date _____

Anticipated Finish Date _____

The Inquiry meets the following criteria

- It addresses the Council's agreed Strategic outcomes by reviewing the effectiveness of policy to achieve strategic outcomes as defined by the Leeds Strategic Plan
- Shaping and developing policy through influencing pre-policy discussion

It fulfils a performance management function by

- Reviewing performance of significant parts of service
- Addressing a poor performing service
- Addressing a high level of user dissatisfaction with the service
- Addressing a pattern of budgetary overspends
- Addressing matters raised by external auditors and inspectors

- Addresses an issue of high public interest
- Reviews a Major or Key Officer decision
- Reviews an Executive Board decision
- Reviews a series of decisions which have a significant impact _____
- Has been requested by the Executive Board/Full Council/Scrutiny Advisory Group
- looks at innovative change

Comments of relevant Director and Executive Member (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Suggested Areas for Scrutiny Currently Unscheduled			
Roseville Door Factory	To monitor the current position in relation to the Roseville Door Factory	This was a referral from the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board in April 2009.	RFS
Inquiry into Anti-social Behaviour			
Performance of Enforcement			
ALMO inspections	To consider the outcomes of the ALMO inspections		
Future options for Council Housing	To monitor developments in relation to future options for Council Housing.	This was a referral from the Central and Corporate Functions Scrutiny Board.	RFS
Progress report on the Golden Triangle Partnership	To receive a progress report on the Golden Triangle Partnership	This issue had arisen from the earlier Scrutiny Inquiry into Affordable Housing and the Board agreed to continue monitoring progress with the Partnership.	MSR
Progress report in developing 'Housing Solutions'	To receive an update on progress in developing 'Housing Solutions' and any available performance data.	This had also arisen from the earlier Affordable Housing Scrutiny Inquiry. A recommendation was made for the Board to receive progress reports.	MSR

SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

Appendix 2

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Meeting date: 13th July 2009			
Performance Management	To consider Quarter 4 information for 2008/09	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Review of Dog Fouling Enforcement	To consider the formal response to the Board's recommendations and any progress made in implementing the recommendations.		
Meeting date: 14th September 2009			
Performance Management	To consider Quarter 1 information for 2009/10	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Recommendation Tracking	This item tracks progress with previous Scrutiny recommendations on a quarterly basis		MSR
Formal Responses to Previous Scrutiny Inquiries	To consider the formal responses to the Board's previous inquiries into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private Rented Sector Housing • Street Cleaning • Asylum Seeker Case Resolution 		
EASEL Inquiry	To consider evidence in line with session 2 of the Board's Inquiry	This Inquiry commenced in May 2009.	
Meeting date: 12th October 2009			
EASEL Inquiry	To consider evidence in line with session 3 of the Board's Inquiry		

SCRUTINY BOARD (ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS)

Appendix 2

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	NOTES	TYPE OF ITEM
Meeting date: 9TH November 2009			
Meeting date: 14TH December 2009			
Performance Management	To consider Quarter 2 information for 2009/10	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Recommendation Tracking	This item tracks progress with previous Scrutiny recommendations on a quarterly basis		MSR
Meeting date: 11TH January 2010			
EASEL Inquiry	To agree the Board's final report		
Meeting date: 8th February 2010			
Meeting date: 8TH March 2010			
Performance Management	To consider Quarter 3 information for 2009/10	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Recommendation Tracking	This item tracks progress with previous Scrutiny recommendations on a quarterly basis		
Meeting date: 19TH April 2010			
Annual Report			

Key:

CCFA / RFS – Councillor call for action / request for scrutiny

RP – Review of existing policy

DP – Development of new policy

MSR – Monitoring scrutiny recommendations

PM – Performance management

B – Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)

SC – Statutory consultation

CI – Call in



Originator: A Brogden

Tel:2474553

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)

Date: 15th June 2009

Subject: Inquiry into Older People's Housing – Draft Report

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At the beginning of the municipal year, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) agreed to carry out an inquiry into Older People's Housing.
- 1.2 This Inquiry has now concluded and the Board is in a position to report on its findings and recommendations resulting from the evidence gathered. The Board's draft report is attached for the Board's consideration.
- 1.3 Scrutiny Board Procedure Rule 14.3 states that "where a Scrutiny Board is considering making specific recommendations it shall invite advice from the appropriate Director(s) prior to finalising its recommendations. The Director shall consult with the appropriate Executive Member before providing any such advice. The detail of that advice shall be reported to the Scrutiny Board and considered before the report is finalised".
- 1.4 Any advice received will be reported at the Board's meeting for consideration, before the Board finalises its report.
- 1.5 Once the Board publishes its final report, the appropriate Director(s) will be asked to formally respond to the Scrutiny Board's recommendations within three months.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to agree its inquiry report on Older People's Housing.

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank



Leeds
CITY COUNCIL

Draft

**Older People's Housing
Scrutiny Inquiry Report**

Introduction and Scope



1.0 Introduction

1.1 It is recognised nationally that the ageing society poses one of the greatest housing challenges. The Government now predicts that by 2026 older people will account for almost half (48 per cent) of the increase in the total number of households, resulting in 2.4 million more older households than there are today. Within Leeds, the proportion of residents aged 60 or over is likely to rise by approximately 18% in the period up to 2021.

1.2 As well as increasing population figures, the expectations and aspirations of older people are also evolving in terms of the quality and choice of housing and housing support services available to them. In particular, many older people are wanting to remain independent in their homes, for as long as they are able. The Government's vision is therefore focused around supporting older people to live independently within their own homes and to exercise greater choice and control over their lives.

1.3 As the housing needs of older people are not homogenous, the housing options available to older people need to reflect this. In view of this, we agreed to conduct an inquiry into older

people's housing in Leeds to explore how the Council and its partners are responding to the national vision for older people's housing at a local level.

1.4 As well as considering the housing options available for older people, we also recognised the need to explore the development of housing related support services for older people. We noted that such support services would need to be rooted in the evolving national 'personalisation' agenda: that recipients of social care services should play an integral role in shaping or choosing the services they use so that they can be empowered to live independently. One of the guiding principles therefore is to promote a strategic shift away from residential care and acute settings into community-based housing and support services, including extra care provision.

1.5 The provision of personalised services that maximise prevention opportunities will clearly contribute to the objective of reducing the need for placements into residential care and therefore we recognised that services such as housing support, adaptations and assistive technology can all play a crucial role in reducing dependency on day care

Introduction and Scope

services, residential care placements and hospital placements.

1.6 In acknowledging the significant role of Adult Social Care in this area of work, we invited Members of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board to contribute to our inquiry. Whilst it was noted that there was already a crossover of membership between the two Scrutiny Boards, the Chair of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board had taken up this invitation on behalf of the Board.

1.7 When determining the scope of our inquiry, we learned that the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board had already agreed to conduct an inquiry into adaptations. In view of this, we decided not to focus on adaptations as part of our inquiry in order to avoid duplication. However, both inquiries refer to the Government's vision to build more accessible homes in the future in line with its criteria for Lifetime Homes, as set out in the national Strategy 'Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods' (2008). Further reference to this matter is made later in our report.

1.8 At the time of conducting our inquiry, we also acknowledged

that the Council was in the process of revising its Leeds Housing Strategy and therefore attention was given to ensuring that the needs of older people in Leeds were being recognised and addressed within the updated Strategy and in line with other strategic outcomes and priorities.

Scope

1.9 The purpose of the Inquiry was to make an assessment of and, where appropriate, make recommendations on the following areas:

- Links between the national 'personalisation agenda' and the future development of flexible and bespoke housing related services for older people;
- Implications of the increasing older people population on housing related services and the identification of future planning needs;
- The current review of the Leeds Housing Strategy and its need to respond to the relevant strategic outcomes and priorities within the Leeds Strategic Plan and Leeds Local Agreement;

Introduction and Scope

- The Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy and accompanying action plan;
 - The condition of sheltered housing stock in Leeds and proposals for improvement, with particular reference to the Supporting People Programme and PFI bid proposals for modernising housing provision for older people;
 - Issues surrounding affordable housing for older people;
 - Ensuring that older people have a safe and secure environment to live in, with a sense of belonging to and participating in communities;
 - The role and development of Assistive Technology, Telecare and Telehealth services in promoting the capacity of older people to live independently;
 - Methods of addressing social isolation when promoting the capacity of older people to live independently;
 - Problems relating to fuel poverty and older people.
- 1.10 In acknowledging the increased emphasis around extra-care provision, we were particularly interested in exploring the extra-care housing model. We therefore held our February 2009 meeting at the Moor Allerton Care Centre in Leeds, which is based on the extra-care model, and combined this with a tour of the Centre. We also conducted a visit to Sheffield's Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village as this is one of only a few extra care 'villages' in England. We were therefore keen to learn more about the benefits of developing a scheme of this size and to take back any lessons for future developments in Leeds.
- 1.11 In discussing the expectations and aspirations of older people, it was also vital that we considered the views of older people themselves. We therefore welcomed the contribution of the Leeds Older People's Forum to our inquiry. The Forum currently has over 120 members from older people's voluntary sector organisations in Leeds and during our inquiry, particular reference was made to the valuable work conducted by the Forum around older people and social isolation.
- 1.12 We would like to sincerely thank everyone for their contribution

Introduction and Scope

and commitment to our inquiry, and particularly to the staff and residents at Moor Allerton Care Centre and Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village for their kind hospitality.

- 1.13 Our inquiry has clearly demonstrated that housing is not just about bricks and mortar, it is about providing an environment where older people can be supported to live independently by a range of services. Quality housing and housing services promote the capacity of vulnerable people to live independently and to exercise choice and control over their lives. As far as practicable, older people should be supported in their housing choices. However, it is equally important to ensure that the drive towards promoting independent living and the use of modern assistive technology does not lead to social isolation as a consequence.
- 1.14 We acknowledge that the Council and its partners have already committed a lot of time and resources in developing older people's housing and housing support services. Many of our recommendations therefore seek to build upon existing activities to help meet current aspirations for older people's housing provision.

Conclusions and Recommendations



2.0 National and local policy drivers for improving older people's housing.

2.1 We acknowledge that the expectations and aspirations of older people are evolving in terms of the quality and choice of housing and housing support services available to them. In particular, many more older people wish to remain independent in their homes, for as long as they are able, and to exercise greater choice and control over their lives.

2.2 We therefore recognise that the development of affordable and accessible housing, including new housing, will be a key element of the drive to promote independent living. Housing support services will also play a critical role in delivering the wider social care agenda around promoting the capacity of older people to live independently within their own homes and to exercise greater choice and control over their lives.

2.3 However, this strategic shift in social and health care policy for older people, from a dependency culture towards an enabling and promoting independence culture, where support and care is provided at home or close to home as opposed to institutional or

residential based care, is not a recent development.

2.4 We understand that the Government first published its Strategic Framework around Quality and Choice for Older People's Housing in January 2001. This Strategic Framework promoted the interdependence between housing, social care and health in delivering services for an increasingly ageing population.

2.5 The more recent Government Strategy 'Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods' (2008) continues to highlight the key aspirations of older people's housing and acknowledges that good housing is critical if we are to manage the mounting pressures of care and support expenditure and provide the best possible help and support to an aging society. However, this particular Strategy places more emphasis on designing and building homes that are generally accessible to a wide range of people, than to build homes that are not future-proof, so become inappropriate to our changing needs. Further reference to the development of such Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods is made in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.15 within our report.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 2.6 During our inquiry, we were pleased to note that in response to the national policy drivers for improving older people's housing options and support services, the Council, and its partners, developed the Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy 'Home Not Alone' (2005 – 2010). This was the first housing and support strategy for older people in Leeds.
- 2.7 The overall vision of the Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy is to improve the quality of life of older people through providing a range of housing options, care and support services which will promote independence for all older people in Leeds. It's aim therefore is to help integrate housing, support and care to promote the independence and well being of older people and to influence and deliver improvements to the quality and choice of housing available for older people in the city.
- 2.8 We learned that the Action Plan accompanying the Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy is in the process of being updated to ensure that it corresponds with the relevant key themes and improvement priorities identified within the current Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 - 2011 and also the revised Leeds Housing Strategy 2009 – 2012.
- 2.9 The Leeds Strategic Plan is one of the key strategic documents for the city and we acknowledged that the Thriving Places theme within the Plan includes the strategic outcome: 'Improved quality of life through mixed neighbourhoods offering good housing options and better access to services and activities'. Both the Thriving Places and Health and Wellbeing themes contain improvement priorities relating to improving housing decency, increasing the supply of affordable housing, reducing homelessness and fuel poverty, and increasing the number of vulnerable people helped to live at home.
- 2.10 At the time of our inquiry, the Leeds Housing Strategy was in the process of being updated. In May 2009, we were given the opportunity to consider and comment on the draft updated Leeds Housing Strategy. We noted that the updated Strategy is also closely aligned to the improvement priorities, strategic outcomes and themes included within the Leeds Strategic Plan and that its vision is to 'create opportunities for people to live independently in quality, affordable housing'.

Conclusions and Recommendations



2.11 Whilst we acknowledge the need to update the Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy Action Plan to ensure that it corresponds with both the Leeds Strategic Plan and Leeds Housing Strategy, we would also emphasise the importance of this Action Plan being seen within the context of other key strategies aimed at promoting the wider health and wellbeing agenda for older people. Such strategies include the recent national Dementia Strategy; the Leeds Mental Health Strategy; and the Older Better Strategy. This will help to avoid duplication and provide a more coherent approach in enabling and promoting independent living for older people.

2.12 Once available, we would like the updated Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy Action Plan to be brought back to Scrutiny for consideration.

Recommendation 1
That the updated Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy Action Plan is seen within the context of other key strategies aimed at promoting the wider health and wellbeing agenda for older people, such as the Dementia Strategy, Leeds Mental Health Strategy and Older Better Strategy.

Recommendation 2
That the updated Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy Action Plan is brought back to the relevant Scrutiny Board for consideration once available.

3.0 Addressing fuel poverty and improving decency standards.

3.1 Links between the quality of housing, health and wellbeing is compelling. In particular, we noted that excess cold is a major cause of increased winter mortality, especially amongst older people, and exacerbates conditions such as rheumatism, arthritis, bronchitis and cardiovascular illness, which older people are also more likely to experience. In view of this, we explored the measures being taken to address fuel poverty and improve decency standards within older people's housing in Leeds.

3.2 We were pleased to note that one of the key actions identified in the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy is to reduce the number of older people living in fuel poverty. The official definition of fuel poverty is where a household is spending more than 10% of their household income on meeting energy costs. As the

Conclusions and Recommendations



Council and other housing-related services have limited power to control energy prices, it is clear that the focus needs to be around promoting energy efficiency measures as a means of reducing energy costs and eliminating excess cold.

- 3.3 During our inquiry, we acknowledged the good work already carried out by the Council's Fuelsavers Team in monitoring the incidence of fuel poverty in the city; providing a free and impartial advice service about energy efficiency; and taking a lead role in delivering the Council's Affordable Warmth Strategy (2007 - 2016).
- 3.4 The Fuelsavers Team works with a range of partners, including NHS, the ALMOs, Environmental Health, Adult Social Services and the Energy Providers to implement interventions to meet the Government's Fuel Poverty Targets. In addition, the Fuelsavers Team has developed a number of initiatives designed to tackle fuel poverty amongst the most vulnerable households, such as 'Health through Warmth' and 'Warm Front'. However, we noted that the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy now recommends that the Council looks beyond these initiatives to

turn Leeds into a 'Warm Zone' area. We understand that there are currently 13 'Warm Zone' areas in the UK, including one covering the Kirklees authority area.

- 3.5 Warm Zones give every household in the catchment area the opportunity to insulate their homes better and to make their homes warmer, reduce energy consumption and cost, reduce carbon emissions and to make a positive contribution to the environment. The scheme works on a ward-by-ward basis, by carrying out initial doorstep assessments and then more detailed surveys to establish the improvements required. All households are entitled to loft and cavity wall insulation, with households in fuel poverty, on income related benefits or occupying hard to treat homes offered improvements to heating systems. All households also receive benefit entitlement and energy efficiency advice.
- 3.6 We understand that Warm Zones are operated on a not-for-profit basis and typically funded through partnerships with local government, European Union agencies, energy companies and other supporters. Whilst we acknowledge that there will be resource implications for

Conclusions and Recommendations



developing this initiative across the city, the existing neighbourhood analysis of fuel poverty rates will enable the Council to prioritise the delivery of the 'Warm Zone' in the council wards with the highest levels of fuel poverty.

- 3.7 We support the development of an area based initiative for Leeds based upon the Warm Zone model and recommend that the Executive Board also commits to the development of such an initiative in Leeds over the next 12 months.

Recommendation 3
That the Executive Board commits to the development of an area based Initiative for Leeds based upon a 'Warm Zone' model over the next 12 months as a method of addressing fuel poverty, particularly amongst vulnerable households such as older people.

- 3.8 We are aware that the Government has already set a target to bring all social housing (stock managed by local authorities, ALMOs and housing association) up to the decency standard by 2010/11 and therefore the Council and the Leeds ALMOs are committed to ensuring that all social housing meets the decency standard by 2010/11. However, we recognise that such properties

are likely to fall out of decency if investment is not maintained or enhanced post 2011. We are therefore pleased that this has been acknowledged within the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy and that the Council and the Leeds ALMOs are now exploring options for maintaining and enhancing the level of investment in council housing post-2011.

- 3.9 In acknowledging that just under 70% of older people live in the private sector, it is clear that measures to improve decency standards in this tenure will also have a significant impact on the lives of older people in the city.

- 3.10 Running alongside this inquiry, we also conducted a separate inquiry into Private Rented Sector Housing in Leeds and found that both locally and nationally, the private rented sector is seen to be the tenure where the greatest proportion of vulnerable households live in non-decent homes. We therefore recognised the importance of addressing excess cold and fuel poverty across all tenures and stressed that this must remain a key future priority, with a particular focus on the older housing stock, where many private sector tenants, including some

Conclusions and Recommendations



of the most vulnerable members of society, reside.

3.11 However, we were pleased to learn that an overall approach for enhanced action is intended through a refresh of the actions to deliver the Private Rented Sector Strategy. This will include the development of the Strategy to reflect new themes such as the Leeds Affordable Warmth Strategy; the Regional Fuel Poverty Strategy and Home Energy Conservation Act recommendations.

3.12 We also noted that NHS Liverpool had given funding of around £9 million to improve private sector housing conditions in Liverpool. Whilst acknowledging that the Liverpool model needs to be tested to identify whether comparable investment can be made in Leeds, we still recognised the need for the Council to work more closely with key partners and also central government to continue developing innovative approaches towards addressing poor housing conditions and to maximise on available resources. We therefore made a recommendation to the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods to this effect.

4.0 The challenge of providing housing related support services.

4.1 It is clear that rising life expectancy and the growing number of older people will increase the need for additional services or support to maximise the capacity of elderly or vulnerable people to continue living independently.

4.2 Supporting People is the national programme for commissioning housing related support services for vulnerable adults. This programme is managed through a Commissioning Body, which comprises representatives from the Council, NHS Leeds and the West Yorkshire Probation Service. The programme is administered on a day-to-day basis by the Housing Strategy and Commissioning section, which sits within the Environment and Neighbourhoods Directorate. We understand that all proposals made by the administering authority, relating to the commissioning of services, need to be unanimously approved by the Commissioning Body and that the three partner agencies have an equal decision making capacity.

Conclusions and Recommendations



- 4.3 The Supporting People programme currently commissions 371 services, through 68 organisations, for approximately 12,000 people and we noted that such services range from sheltered warden services for older people, homeless hostels and supported housing for people with learning disabilities. have been achieved through competitive tendering and contract management.
- 4.4 In addition to the information provided during our inquiry, we also received quarterly update reports on the Supporting People programme as part of our 2008/09 work programme.
- 4.5 We learned that in 2008/09, the Leeds Supporting People programme received a grant settlement of £32.9 million, a reduction of £3 million from the position in 2003/04. As a result, we noted that efficiency savings of approximately £7.5 million have needed to be generated since 2003 in order to balance the budget, given the real increases in costs, and to also commission new strategically relevant services. Such services have formed part of the Partnerships for Older People's Projects (POPPs) which aim to assist vulnerable older people with mental health problems to achieve and maintain independent living arrangements. It was reported that such efficiency savings
- 4.6 We were also made aware that whilst the Supporting People grant settlement will be maintained at £32.9 million in 2009/10, it is now expected to be reduced by a further £1 million in 2010/11, which will need to be found from existing services. Given the level of efficiencies already achieved to date, we acknowledge the challenge of achieving this additional saving through the application of value for money measures without compromising service quality.
- 4.7 In addition, we also learned that during 2009/10, Supporting People funds will be paid to the Council as a 'named' grant under section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003. This will allow local authorities more flexibility to allocate funding according to local need, but will still be viewed as housing related support. However, it is expected that Supporting People funding will be absorbed into the Area Based Grant from April 2010 onwards, following this transitional year, and can therefore be used for any purpose the Council believes is appropriate.

Conclusions and Recommendations



4.8 We acknowledge that since the start of the Supporting People programme, the Government has been clear about its intention to mainstream the commissioning of housing related support services within local authorities. Whilst the allocation of funding now rests with local authorities, there are still clear expectations by Government and the Audit Commission that housing related support services will continue to be delivered to vulnerable groups of people to enable them to achieve independent living outcomes. It is vital that the removal of the ring-fenced funding for housing related support services does not have a detrimental affect on existing services. The Council should ensure that from April 2010, housing related support services receive sufficient funding through the Area Based Grant to at least maintain existing services, with a view to enhancing provisions in the future.

4.9 We learned that the Leeds Commissioning Body has agreed to commission a piece of research into the wider benefits and outcomes that are generated through the provision of housing-related support services. We welcome this research and would like the

findings to be brought back to Scrutiny once available.

Recommendation 4

That the Council ensures that from April 2010, housing related support services receive sufficient funding through the Area Based Grant to at least maintain existing services, with a view to enhancing provisions in the future to meet with any increased demands for such services.

Recommendation 5

That the findings of the research commissioned by the Leeds Commissioning Body into the wider benefits and outcomes generated through the provision of housing-related support services, is brought back to Scrutiny for consideration.

4.10 We understand that local authorities are also expected to have local housing related support policies in place to take forward their commissioned services. We therefore noted that a local housing related support strategy will be developed for Leeds under the umbrella of the updated Leeds Housing Strategy. We would also like this strategy to be brought back to Scrutiny for consideration once available.

Conclusions and Recommendations



4.11 As the allocation of funding now rests with local authorities, we were pleased to learn that the Supporting People Commissioning Body has agreed that decisions relating to service commissioning will be made within the context of the Leeds Strategic Plan and the Leeds Local Area Agreement so that all new and re-commissioned services will contribute directly to the delivery of these strategic outcomes.

4.12 However, during our inquiry we noted the implications of the national personalisation agenda for social care and associated services on the commissioning of housing related support services. The personalisation agenda is focused around enabling clients to design, choose and control the services that they use. Whilst this encompasses a number of elements, particular reference was made to the Individual Budgets element. This is where a client receives an indicative funding value, which could be comprised of several funding sources, and uses this funding to purchase services from selected providers, whether they are from the public, private or voluntary sectors.

4.13 With regard to housing related support, which is commissioned

through the Supporting People programme, this will be included within Individual Budgets if the client is also in receipt of a social care service. As the Supporting People programme block purchases sheltered warden services, by scheme, we noted that this potentially conflicts with the principle of individuals purchasing services and also the concept of creating a genuine 'open market' so that clients have a real choice in how they buy a service. There may also be a conflict between promoting choice and safeguarding vulnerable people as clients may decide to purchase a service outside of the Supporting People commissioned services, which may not have been subjected to the same levels of rigorous testing. We believe that this will need to be taken into consideration in the development of the Leeds Housing Related Support Strategy.

Recommendation 6
That the implications of the personalisation agenda and the role of Individualised Budgets in the commissioning of housing related support services is taken into consideration in the development of the Leeds Housing Related Support Strategy.

Conclusions and Recommendations



Recommendation 7
That the Leeds Housing Related Support Strategy is brought back to the relevant Scrutiny Board for consideration once available.

5.0 The effective use of Assistive Technology.

5.1 During our inquiry, we acknowledged that the use of assistive technology will play an increasingly important role in promoting the capacity of vulnerable people to live independently.

5.2 In 2004, the Audit Commission defined assistive technology as *“any item, piece of equipment, product or system that is used to increase maintain or improve the functional capabilities and independence of people with cognitive, physical or communication difficulties”*.

5.3 We learned that community equipment, Telecare and Telehealth services are three of a range of services providing assistive technology intended to support people to live as independently as possible. Other assistive technology services include adaptations services, wheelchair services and environmental controls.

5.4 The Leeds Community Equipment Service is an

integrated (between the Local Authority and NHS Leeds) service delivering all aspects of equipment provision for health and local authority service users in Leeds. Under its umbrella, Leeds Community Equipment Service oversees all aspects of relevant staff training; information and advice to actual and potential users of community equipment; service development; and the storage, delivery, fitting, collection, maintenance and cleaning of community equipment.

5.5 We learned that the service holds an average of 600 core stock items of equipment and orders large numbers of individual “one off” specialised items. The type of equipment provided by the service includes: bath boards, bath seats, raised toilet seats, toilet frames, riser recliner chairs, specialist cutlery, zimmer frames, walking sticks, wheelchairs, commodes, urinals, bedpans, hoists, specialised beds and pressure relieving mattresses.

5.6 With regard to Telecare, we learned that this is a service that supports older and vulnerable people to live independently in their own home through the use of simple sensors. Telecare provides 24 hour monitoring of an individual,

Conclusions and Recommendations



ensuring an alert is raised if the sensor detects any problems.

5.7 Telecare in Leeds builds upon the already existing Care Ring pendant alarm system to offer added security at home. Telecare sensors are discretely placed around the home on ceilings, doors and walls or may be worn by the service user in the form of a pendant, watch or belt. They can be of benefit to those who are having difficulties maintaining their safety at home due to physical or mental impairments.

5.8 We noted that Care Ring service users ordinarily need to nominate two key holders who can be contacted in the event of an emergency. However, it has been identified that a significant number of potential Telecare service users do not have access to such a resource and therefore the Supporting People Commissioning Body has agreed to commission a citywide mobile response service, provided through the Council's security service, from April 2009, for an initial two-year term. It is assumed that the service will be working with 600 service users by the end of 2010/11.

5.9 We were informed that if a Telecare sensor activates in an individual's home, an alert is

automatically raised to a 24 hour response centre who will maintain contact with the service user to check on their safety. Often, practical advice and reassurance is all that is required but on some occasions physical help may be needed. On these occasions the response centre staff will arrange the appropriate support by contacting a family member, mobile response, or if necessary an emergency service. The response centre have access to information on the service user and can identify what sensor in the home has activated to ensure the appropriate responses are arranged promptly.

5.10 It was reported that since its introduction in October 2006, Telecare equipment has been provided to over 2,500 people. We acknowledge that the use of Telecare systems have enabled people to be supported at home for longer, preventing untimely admission to hospital and promoting early discharge. Telecare therefore aims to provide reassurance to carers and family and also promotes confidence in service users.

5.11 We learned that Telehealth monitoring is the remote exchange of physiological data between a patient at home and remote health care staff to assist

Conclusions and Recommendations



in diagnosis and monitoring. This could include support for people with chest/breathing problems, heart conditions, or diabetes. It includes a home unit to measure and monitor temperature, blood pressure and other vital signs for clinical review at a remote location, (for example, a hospital site), using phone lines or wireless technology.

5.12 It was highlighted that Telehealth provision is led by NHS Leeds who are currently conducting pilot programmes to assess the effectiveness of the systems. The money to run these programmes has come from the Preventative Technology Grant allocated to Adult Social Care by the Department of Health.

5.13 We were pleased to learn that a Leeds Telecare / Telehealth Development Group has been set up to ensure that there are close links between the agencies leading on all related initiatives. We learned that a wide range of stakeholders are members of this Development Group and include representatives from the Local Authority, NHS Leeds, service users, practitioners and equipment suppliers.

5.14 In March 2009, we were also pleased to learn that funding for

Telecare services would become mainstreamed from April 2009. Whilst acknowledging that this funding will help to maintain current services, it was hoped that such services could be expanded further in the future. We learned that a piece of research had been commissioned to assess the impact of Telecare services in Leeds, which will take into account the cost benefits of providing this service in terms of reducing the need for residential placements and preventing untimely admissions to hospital. It is hoped that this research will assist in identifying potential additional funding bids to expand the service further. In welcoming this piece of research, we would also advise that further analysis around future projections for Telecare services in Leeds is included in this research to help determine the level of service capacity required to meet future demands.

Recommendation 8
That further analysis around future projections for the demand of Telecare services in Leeds forms part of the wider piece of research work commissioned to assess the impact of Telecare services in Leeds.

Conclusions and Recommendations



5.15 Within the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy, it also states that actions will be taken to identify the contribution Telecare services, and more specifically the mobile response service, has made to promoting independent living. One of the key actions identified is to use the Supporting People contract management process to monitor the effectiveness and long-term requirement of the mobile response service and to carry out an options appraisal to determine whether the service should be remodelled and/or subject to competitive tender. We therefore welcome these proposed actions.

6.0 Delivering Lifetime Homes and Neighbourhoods.

6.1 We believe that well designed, inclusive housing will help to meet housing needs, improve health, reduce discrimination and create more balanced and inclusive communities. It is clear that it will be more cost effective to build new homes that are generally accessible to a wide range of people than to build homes that are not future-proof, so become inappropriate to our changing needs.

6.2 We learned that the 'Lifetime Homes' standard is a set of 16 design criteria that aim to

promote mobility within the home. This standard will therefore have an impact on the size of accommodation (allowing for wheelchair use and access and space for lifts and hoist in the future), layout of accommodation (allowing for direct access from bedroom to bathroom if required), access to the home and parking space. We understand that to meet these standards, new homes would need to be designed and constructed to be able to be readily adapted to meet future needs and for flexibility in use.

6.3 We acknowledge that by adhering to these design standards, this will increase the cost of housing production, ranging from around £165 to £545 per unit. However, we also recognise that this is a small fraction of the cost of adapting a property or placing a person into residential care.

6.4 We noted that the Leeds Older People's Strategy (2005-2010) already makes reference to the Lifetime Homes standards, stating that all developers should be encouraged to develop Lifetime Homes in order to build in flexibility of use.

6.5 However, we are pleased to learn that within its Strategy 'Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods' (2008), the

Conclusions and Recommendations



Government now makes a commitment to ensure that all public housing will be built to Lifetime Homes standards by 2011. This is reflected within the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy, which states that all housing developed through the Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership will now conform to the Lifetime Homes standards and that all new social housing developments are to conform to the Lifetime Homes standard from 2011.

6.6 With regard to the private sector, we noted that the Government's aspiration is for all new housing to be built to these standards by 2013. We understand that the Lifetime Homes standards will be made a mandatory part of the Code for Sustainable Homes. However, as this Code is voluntary, it is difficult for planning policy to insist on such higher standards and therefore the focus has been around encouraging take-up on a voluntary basis from private developers.

6.7 We are aware that the Government intends to support industry to encourage take-up on a voluntary basis over the next few years and will review take-up in 2010, with a view to bringing forward regulation in 2013 if take-up in the private

sector has not matched market need or expectations. However, we believe that the Council should be proactive now in exploring opportunities for adopting a consistent approach towards all new housing regardless of its tenure in relation to Lifetime Homes Standards. We understand that during its inquiry into Adaptations, the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board also felt that the Council should be exploring possible routes of adopting these standards across all tenures without the need to wait for any national regulations to be enforced.

6.8 The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board was advised that the use of Supplementary Planning Guidance could be used as a way to place greater material weight on planning applicants to create more accessible housing. We understand that this approach is not unprecedented, as this has been adopted in London.

6.9 The document 'Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment. The London Plan Supplementary Guidance' states that *'The Mayor will and boroughs should seek to ensure that all residential units in new housing developments are designed to Lifetime Home standards. These standards*

Conclusions and Recommendations



should be applied to all new housing, including conversions and refurbishments, and including blocks of flats, for both social housing and private sector housing, and should cater for a varying number of occupants'.

6.10 In acknowledging the positive impact of this approach in London, the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board agreed to recommend that the Director for Development also investigates and reports on the viability of adopting a model to be implemented, which reflects the spirit of the London Supplementary Planning Guidance for mandatory development to Lifetime Homes Standards, but suits the diversity and specific requirements of the City of Leeds, reporting findings to the Executive Board before 31 December 2009.

6.11 In recognising the need for the Council to adopt a more consistent approach towards Lifetime Homes Standards across all tenures, we too appreciate the importance of conducting a viability appraisal on how this will best meet the needs of the city. We would therefore echo the recommendation made by the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board.

Recommendation 9

That the Director for Development investigates and reports on the viability of adopting a model to be implemented, which reflects the spirit of the London Supplementary Planning Guidance for mandatory development to Lifetime Homes Standards, but suits the diversity and specific requirements of the City of Leeds, reporting findings to the Executive Board before 31 December 2009.

6.12 We also recognise that it is not just lifetime homes that are needed, but lifetime neighbourhoods, where the built environment offers 'age-proofed' communities. This would mean that the provision of accessible local amenities, such as community centres and shops, and the transport and street environment would be consciously planned for people of all ages and conditions in mind and therefore not exclude people as they age or become more frail or disabled. We believe that such inclusive planning can only help to achieve an increased sense of belonging and pride in local neighbourhoods that will help to build cohesive communities.

6.13 We acknowledge that the concept of Lifetime Neighbourhoods is not a new

Conclusions and Recommendations



one, but it has been recognised nationally that this is yet to make a significant impact on planning and neighbourhood design. It is therefore vital that local planning policy takes account of ageing and the needs of older people. Within its Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods Strategy, the Government has stated that it will incentivise good design by introducing a new Beacon theme on inclusive planning to recognise local authorities providing leadership in this area.

6.14 We understand that the new Homes and Communities Agency will also be charged with supporting the continued well-being of communities in England and ensuring that all new planning policies and initiatives give an explicit priority to design and quality. The Government also gives a commitment that future planning policy reform will fully reflect the high priority now given to address the challenges of an ageing society.

6.15 We would very much like to see Leeds be at the forefront of promoting innovative and inclusive planning design and quality across the city in line with the Lifetime Neighbourhoods concept and work towards achieving Beacon

status for leadership in this area.

6.16 We recommend that the Director of Development reports back to Scrutiny within 3 months on the existing and planned policies and guidance aimed at promoting innovative and inclusive planning design and quality across the city in line with the Lifetime Neighbourhoods concept, and how Leeds can work towards achieving Beacon status for leadership in this area.

Recommendation 10

That the Director of Development reports back to Scrutiny within 3 months on the existing and planned policies and guidance aimed at promoting innovative and inclusive planning design and quality across the city in line with the Lifetime Neighbourhoods concept.

Recommendation 11

That the Director of Development reports back to Scrutiny within 3 months on how Leeds can work towards achieving Beacon status for inclusive planning.

7.0 Developing the extra care housing model.

7.1 The development of extra care housing for vulnerable older

Conclusions and Recommendations



people is a key strategic and service transformation objective for the Council. In view of this, we were interested in exploring the benefits of the extra-care housing model as an alternative to residential care.

- 7.2 We understand that extra care housing schemes are designed to offer more independent living for residents than residential care, with fully self contained accommodation (usually 1 or 2 bedroom apartments and sometimes linked bungalow properties) with access to shared communal facilities often termed a 'resource centre'. We have already established the importance of service users being given opportunities to exercise choice and be involved in influencing the services that they receive. Choice and involvement are in many ways integral to the whole model of extra care housing since the status of people as tenants gives them rights and potentially a level of control over their own lives that would often be lacking in other service settings.
- 7.3 As part of our inquiry, we were keen to visit an existing extra care housing scheme within Leeds and the Moor Allerton Care Centre was highlighted as one of the exemplar schemes. As part of our inquiry, we also agreed to conduct a visit to

Sheffield's Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village, which opened in March 2008 and consists of 217 one and two bedroom units of mixed tenure. As this is one of only a few extra care 'villages' in England, we were keen to learn more about the benefits of developing a scheme of this size and to take back any lessons for future developments in Leeds.

- 7.4 In February 2009, we held our public Board meeting at the Moor Allerton Care Centre and this was followed by a tour of the Centre, which gave us the opportunity to speak with the staff and residents.

- 7.5 The Moor Allerton Care Centre was established in December 2004 by MHA Care Group, a leading national charity that works to improve the quality of life and independence of older people through the provision of care homes and a range of housing and support services. This particular scheme is regarded as purpose built housing with care and day care facility for older people including those with dementia.

- 7.6 The Moor Allerton Care Centre comprises of:

- Yew Tree Court providing 45 units of housing with care, 28 of which are two-

Conclusions and Recommendations



bedroom flats and 17 of which are one-bedroom flats; plus five flats commissioned by the local Primary Care Trust (PCT) to provide Intermediate Care.

- Rosewood Court providing 20 one-bedroom units of housing with dementia care, which can be occupied by a single person, or a couple.
- Bay Tree Resource Centre offering dementia day care services for up to 20 older people per day
- Suffer from depression or some other mental illness, which is managed through appropriate treatment and support, and be likely to derive psychological benefit from living in this setting rather than a more specialist one;
- Have a degree of learning disability; again provided they will be able to cope with the independent living aspects of extra care housing;
- Have or be willing to have a Social Services assessment completed for required care needs.

7.7 We learned that to be eligible for a tenancy in Yew Tree Court, the Centre requires people to fit a number of the following criteria:

- Be aged 55 or over;
- Have a requirement for sheltered housing;
- Be frail or physically disabled;
- Exhibit some cognitive dysfunction, possibly with short term memory loss and some disorientation, provided they will be able to cope with the independent living aspects of extra care housing and be likely to derive psychological benefit from living in this setting in preference to, for example, residential care;

7.8 For allocation of a flat in Rosewood Court, as well as some of the above criteria, we learned that people must also meet the following requirements:

- Dementia is the primary care need.
- A potential service user will have a diagnosis of dementia from an appropriate source - for example: Consultant Psychiatrist.

7.9 We were particularly interested to learn that the local Primary Care Trust funds five of the flats in Yew Tree Court as Intermediate Care places. These Intermediate Care flats

Conclusions and Recommendations



are used to provide an alternative to hospital admission, or to facilitate earlier hospital discharges, for people who require short-term support to remain in their own homes.

7.10 During our tour of the centre, we noted the range of communal facilities on site to assist with daily living tasks, socialising and making friends. Yew Tree Court has a communal lounge; a dining room/restaurant; a hairdressing salon; communal laundry; guestroom and assisted bathrooms, all of which are open to all who reside at the centre. Within Rosewood Court, we noted that there is a specially designed lounge, dining area and a fully enclosed garden to enable those individuals living with dementia to safely enjoy their living environment.

7.11 We also visited the Bay Tree Dementia Day Care Centre, which offers care and therapeutic services to older people living with dementia.

7.12 In terms of security and safety measures, we noted that the door-entry system enables residents to speak to visitors from within their own apartments before opening the front door. Pull cords are also located in all apartments and

communal areas to summon staff if needed, which are responded to 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Overall we believe that the provision of care provided within the Centre met with the philosophy of the extra care model in terms of promoting independent living within a safe and secure environment.

7.13 In January 2009, a working group of the Scrutiny Board and senior officers from the Environment and Neighbourhoods and Adult Social Care Directorates, conducted a visit to Sheffield's Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village. Brunswick Gardens is an extra care housing scheme developed in partnership by Arena Housing Group (landlord), the ExtraCare charitable Trust (care and support provider) and Sheffield City Council. It opened in March 2008 and consists of 217 one and two bedroom units of mixed tenure. It is one of only a few extra care villages in England.

7.14 Whilst extra care villages operate in a similar manner to the smaller schemes, there is considered to be greater scope for developing communal facilities. We were therefore keen to learn more about the

Conclusions and Recommendations



benefits of developing a scheme of this size.

- 7.15 During the visit, the working group met with the Village's Manager, senior officers from Sheffield Council, the Cabinet Member for Independent and Healthy Living, and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Sustainable, Safer Communities. Two of the residents also kindly accompanied the working group around the premises, including their own accommodation, and shared their experiences of living within the village. A summary of the working group's visit was reported back to the full Scrutiny Board in March 2009.
- 7.16 In relation to the communal facilities on site, the working group was very impressed by the wide range of facilities available, which included a gymnasium, Jacuzzi, well-being suite, hair salon, various craft rooms, bar, coffee bar and lounge, restaurant and village hall.
- 7.17 It was noted that many of the facilities are run by volunteers, often the residents themselves, or include local businesses which have relocated on site, such as the hair salon. It was also highlighted that non-residents aged 55 and over and

living within the local community could choose to become 'friends of the village' and make use of the facilities for an annual membership fee of £25. We learned that in January 2009, there were 270 registered friends of the village.

- 7.18 The working group also observed the accommodation facilities and was given the opportunity to observe a two bedroom apartment. Details of all the apartment layouts were also provided as additional background to the visit.

- 7.19 The working group was impressed with the quality of the apartments but understood that a number of maintenance issues had been reported by residents, which were considered to be initial 'teething' problems with the scheme. However, overall it was felt that the apartments were spacious, comfortable and met the needs of the residents.

- 7.20 It was noted that the lifts and corridors within the premises were also very spacious, which helped with wheelchair access, and that all the corridors within the village were also referred to as 'streets' and given names to help residents distinguish them easier. This was a very welcome approach by the residents. On each floor, there

Conclusions and Recommendations



were also communal areas where residents could meet up with their neighbours as an alternative to the larger communal areas within the village centre. This again helped to promote a sense of community, which the working group was able to observe during its tour of the village.

- 7.21 The visit to Sheffield proved to be extremely helpful in terms of demonstrating the benefits of developing an extra care scheme of this size. With regard to the lessons learned from this particular development, we identified a number of key issues which we believe are important factors to consider in any future development of extra care housing schemes in Leeds and therefore recommend that these are taken into account by the Council.

Recommendation 12

That the following factors are taken into account by the Council in the future development of extra-care housing schemes:

- i. To have a very clear strategic position before embarking on a new scheme;**
- ii. That the scheme fits in with the needs of the wider community and integrates with and complements what already exists locally;**

Recommendation 12 - continued

- iii. To look at what is practicable and deliverable before consulting the wider community on the scheme;**
- iv. To project-manage the scheme so that the lead-in time from the development stages to completion is kept as short as possible;**
- v. To be more inventive with the name of the scheme, such as 'retirement village', rather than use the term 'extra care housing' which may not attract residents;**
- vi. To have a transparent allocations criteria and procedure (making use of an independent body to act as mediator) and to be clear from the outset that not all applicants will receive a place;**
- vii. To accept that new schemes will continue to evolve as technology develops and expectations change.**

- 7.22 Whilst we appreciate that the number of accommodation units within the Brunswick Gardens Village development is significantly higher than that envisaged for Leeds, we would

Conclusions and Recommendations



recommend that this development be considered by the Council as an example of good practice, particularly in relation to the development of communal facilities.

Recommendation 13
That the Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village in Sheffield is considered by the Council as an example of good practice for extra care provision, particularly in relation to the development of communal facilities.

8.0 Modernisation of sheltered housing in Leeds.

8.1 The majority of the Council's sheltered housing stock was built prior to 1979 and predominantly comprises one bedroomed bungalow or low-rise flatted accommodation. However, we understand that the recent Housing Market Assessment identified a strong preference amongst older people for two bedroomed accommodation, so that family or live-in carers could stay over. We also noted that there are approximately 480 units of bed-sit accommodation, many of which have communal washing facilities, which the ALMOs are often having difficulty letting due to low level of demand.

8.2 In view of this, we learned that the Council had submitted a bid to Central Government for £271 million of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits to contribute towards the modernisation of sheltered housing and build 471 new units for social renting and demolish/replace 639 units of outmoded stock.

8.3 We were informed that the bid proposes the development of 600 units of extra-care housing and 510 units of Lifetimes Homes housing (although this has since been scaled back to 540 units of extra-care housing and 280 units of Lifetimes Homes housing at the request of the Homes and Communities Agency as the PFI programme had been significantly oversubscribed nationally).

8.4 However, we noted that the extra-care model included in the Council's initial Expression of Interest was based on an average scheme size of 60 units, with 60% two bedroom accommodation and 40% one bedroom accommodation. We therefore questioned why the proposal had included one bedroom accommodation when national and local research indicated a greater demand from older people for two bedroom accommodation. In response, it was explained that the proposal

Conclusions and Recommendations



was based around the initial advice about the proportions needed. However, we were pleased to learn that this has since been changed and the proposal for extra care provision is now based on two bedroom accommodation.

- 8.5 We were also very pleased to note that the proposal is also framed around the concept of Lifetime Neighbourhoods, as the location of the Lifetime Homes will be in close proximity to transport links, shops, green spaces and leisure facilities.
- 8.6 We acknowledged that although initial assessments have been undertaken on a range of sample locations, in terms of suitability, location and delivery, these have yet to be the subject of full assessment including user consultation and comparison with alternative sites that may become available within the vicinity. It was noted that this detailed analysis will take place as part of the preparation of the Outline Business Case. During this process, we would again emphasise the importance of ensuring that any new extra care scheme fits in with the needs of the wider community and integrates with and complements what already exists locally.
- 8.7 We acknowledge that the Council's PFI funding bid is for

capital funded works and does not include revenue funding such as housing-related support. In acknowledging that extra care housing tends to be more expensive than traditional warden services, we understand that this additional cost will need to be identified as part of the Supporting People budget management. However, we have already established the existing challenges facing the Supporting People budget in terms of finding further efficiency savings. It was reported that the support and care model for the PFI bid will be developed as part of the Outline Business Case, taking account of budgetary pressures and the move towards personalisation of care and support arrangements.

- 8.8 We recommend that the Directors of Adult Social Care and Environment and Neighbourhoods conduct an urgent piece of work to establish the potential costs of providing housing-related support services to the proposed schemes outlined within the Council's Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding bid for the modernisation of sheltered housing.

Conclusions and Recommendations



Recommendation 14
That the Directors of Adult Social Care and Environment and Neighbourhoods conduct an urgent piece of work to establish the potential costs of providing housing-related support services to the proposed schemes outlined within the Council's Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding bid for the modernisation of sheltered housing.

people's housing irrespective of the outcome of the PFI funding bid.

Recommendation 15
That the details of the options appraisal into the future investment/management of council housing, with specific reference to older people's housing, is brought back to Scrutiny for consideration at the earliest opportunity.

8.9 In acknowledging the value of the PFI proposal, we questioned whether the Council had put in place any contingency plans if the bid proved not to be successful.

Recommendation 16
That a dedicated Strategy is put in place to take forward the Council's plans for the development of Older People's Housing irrespective of the outcome of the PFI funding bid.

8.10 We were informed that the PFI bid was only a partial solution to the modernisation of sheltered housing and that the Council and the Leeds ALMOs would need to consider future investment options for sheltered housing as part of the options appraisal into the future investment /management of council housing. In view of this, we recommend that the details of the options appraisal, with particular reference to older people's housing, be brought back to Scrutiny for consideration at the earliest opportunity. In particular, we would expect to see a Strategy put in place for taking forward the Council's plans for the development of older

8.11 It was reported that the Council believes there is an identified need for more extra-care housing than can be secured through the PFI bid, especially in relation to other tenure forms. We therefore identified the need to accurately quantify demand and required supply across tenures and locations and to prioritise schemes across the city according to need.

8.12 We noted that one of the proposed actions set out within the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy is to develop an extra-care housing plan that will quantify demand and required

Conclusions and Recommendations



supply across tenures and locations. We therefore support this proposed action and request that this Plan is brought back to Scrutiny for consideration once available.

Recommendation 17
In supporting the development of an Extra-care Housing Plan to quantify the demand and required supply of extra care provision across tenures and locations, we recommend that this Plan be brought back to Scrutiny for consideration once available.

8.13 At the time of concluding our inquiry, the Council had still not received a decision from the Communities Local Government (CLG) on the funding bid. We therefore look forward to receiving this confirmation over the coming months.

9.0 Providing housing support and advice services to older people.

9.1 It is recognised nationally that for older people, there is a prior and paramount need to improve information and advice services so that they know how to make the right choice for them, and are not forced to leave their homes before they are ready, or need to do so.

9.2 We are therefore pleased to note that the Government has made a commitment to work with partners across Government and in the voluntary and community sector to provide a new approach to a national housing advice and information service. The Government intends to strengthen local housing information services to provide a first class information service, whether at the end of a telephone line or online, as well as a local one stop shop where anyone can find out the full range of options that might be available locally. In time, this resource is to be developed so that it covers social care, health and benefits and links together all the services that older people need to know about.

9.3 We acknowledged that the Leeds Older People's Housing Strategy also recognises that older people want to see a holistic advice service that provides advice and information to help them make informed choices about housing options and to determine whether they are better able to remain in their current homes or be supported to make planned, timely moves to alternative housing. We learned from the Leeds Older People's Forum that this continues to be a priority area of need and therefore we

Conclusions and Recommendations



recommend that the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods leads on producing an action plan over the next 6 months aimed at enhancing existing housing support and advice services targeted at older people across the city.

Recommendation 18
That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods leads on producing an action plan over the next 6 months aimed at enhancing existing housing support and advice services targeted at older people across the city.

10.0 Addressing social isolation

10.1 During our inquiry, we recognised the need to ensure that the drive towards promoting independent living and the use of modern assistive technology, such as Telecare Services, does not lead to social isolation as a consequence.

10.2 In February 2009, we learned that Adult Social Care had commissioned the Leeds Older People's Forum to lead the delivery of a multi-agency programme of work to tackle social isolation as part of delivering the city's Older Better Strategy. A summary of the

actions delivered by the Forum this year included:

- Delivery of a social isolation learning conference to 100 frontline workers including housing staff;
- Ongoing support to the social isolation peer support group, which includes housing staff;
- Published a conference report including a practical action plan for this annual year, and a proposed action plan for next year which has been presented to the assistant Director of Adult Social Care to ask for support in delivering it;
- Setting up a pilot befriending scheme in care homes;
- Promoting the Infostore to older people;
- Delivering training on social isolation to front line staff including ALMO sheltered housing staff;
- Promoting lifelong learning opportunities to all older people and coordinating the Gladys

Conclusions and Recommendations



Roberts life long learners award;

- A second edition of the Social Isolation resource pack has been printed and 700 copies have been disseminated;
- The library service has developed a reminiscence pack and are delivering reminiscence sessions.

10.3 The Leeds Older People's Forum highlighted that social isolation and loneliness are complex issues, and as such, have complex solutions.

10.4 We acknowledge that social isolation is, by its nature, not something that is easily measurable, or indeed, something that many people feel comfortable disclosing. Feelings of isolation and loneliness are very personal and may affect individuals in different ways. It was also noted that to some older people, increased isolation may be accepted as 'part and parcel' of the ageing process, and might not be challenged.

10.5 The Leeds Older People's Forum explained that what is clear from the Older Better strategy for Leeds is that older people want to be actively involved in the services and

developments that affect their lives. In view of this, it was noted that when planning services for older people who are socially isolated, perhaps the most important step is to ask people what they actually want.

10.6 Whilst concerns were expressed about older people living alone in private accommodation, it was highlighted that social isolation can also affect those in shared and sheltered accommodation.

10.7 We learned that the Leeds Older People's Forum had provided training to front line staff on tackling social isolation and produced a Resource Pack intended to help individuals think about the various issues that affect older people who may be socially isolated.

10.8 However, we understand that the funding allocated to the Leeds Older People's Forum for its work on tackling Social Isolation has now ceased. In view of this, there is a need to ensure that their valuable work has been embedded into existing training mechanisms for all front line staff working with older people.

Conclusions and Recommendations



Recommendation 19

That the Directors of Environment and Neighbourhoods and Adult Social Care ensure that the work conducted by the Leeds Older People's Forum around addressing social isolation amongst older people is embedded into existing training mechanisms for all relevant front line staff delivering services to older people.

11.0 Delivering integrated services within local neighbourhoods.

11.1 In delivering housing and housing related support services to older people, it is vital that the Council and its partners adopt a 'whole system' rather than a fragmented approach.

11.2 However, during our inquiry we also discussed the potential benefits of delivering such integrated services at a more local neighbourhood level and highlighted services which already adopt this approach.

11.3 Particular reference was made to the positive work carried out by the Neighbourhood Network Schemes in Leeds, which are primarily funded by Leeds Adult Social Care and some are supported by NHS Leeds. These Schemes provide a range of activities that promote independence, health and

wellbeing, including advice and information, help around the home, healthy living activities, leisure and recreation, transport and general support. The Schemes work with some of the most isolated and vulnerable older people in Leeds. Each Neighbourhood Network Scheme is managed by a committee of local people and team of staff and volunteers, including many older people. The Schemes are therefore responsive and flexible, working within communities to meet local needs and provide the services, activities and opportunities that older people want.

11.4 Neighbourhood Network Schemes were created to improve the lives of older people in Leeds and there are now over forty Schemes working throughout the city, supporting over 25,000 people each year.

11.5 We also acknowledged the valuable contribution made by programmes such as Keeping House, which is sponsored by Adult Social Care and has assisted over 2,000 older and disabled people in Leeds to find practical support and help in the home.

11.6 Keeping House creates new ways of developing and

Conclusions and Recommendations



supporting local organisations to provide domestic services in Leeds that can help older people and disabled people to maintain their independence in their own home for as long as possible. The central idea is that these services are run as social enterprises, charging for work done but putting any profit back into the business for the benefit of the community and those using the service. These are also run by local people who know what is needed in their area.

- 11.7 We therefore recommend that the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods takes a lead role in developing a working model aimed at delivering integrated housing and housing support services to older people at a neighbourhood level.

Recommendation 20
That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods takes a lead role in developing a working model aimed at delivering integrated housing and housing support services to older people at a neighbourhood level.

Evidence



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- Summary report of working group meeting in December 2008;
- Summary of the Scrutiny visit to Sheffield's Retirement Village in January 2009;
- Report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods on the updated Housing Strategy (February 2009);
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services on Community Equipment Telecare and Telehealth Services to Support Older People in the Community (February 2009);
- Executive Summary of Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods: A national strategy for housing in an ageing society (2008);
- Report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods presenting the updated draft Leeds Housing Strategy (May 2009);
- Extract from the Older People and Social Isolation Resource Pack

Evidence



Witnesses Heard

- Bridget Emery, Head of Housing Strategy and Solutions
- Tom Wiltshire, Project Adviser, City Project Office
- Phil Charlton, Project Manager, City Project Office
- Martin Kennard, Adult Social Care
- Andrew Cross, Finance Manager, Adult Social Care
- Rob McCartney, Housing Strategy and Commissioning Manager
- Dennis Holmes, Chief Officer, Commissioning, Adult Social Care
- Tim O'Shea, Head of Commissioning, Adult Social Services
- Mark Phillott, Commissioning Manager, Adult Social Services
- Liz Ward, Disability Service Manager
- Paul Langford, Chief Housing Services Officer
- Alan Jones, Fuel Savers Manager
- Mick Ward, Head of Strategic Partnerships and Development (Older People & Disabled People)
- Iain Kyles, PFI Project Adviser
- Christine Addison, Head of City Projects
- Susan Chesters, Chair of the Older People's Forum
- Caroline Starkey, Deputy Manager of the Leeds Older People's Forum
- Bill Rollinson, Director of Care and Repair Leeds and Member of the Leeds Older People's Forum
- Wesley Grant, Manager of the Leeds Older People's Forum

Sheffield City Council

- Councillor Steve Ayriss, Cabinet Member for Independent and Healthy Living
- Councillor Bob McCann, Cabinet Member for Housing and Sustainable, Safer Communities
- Liz Cook, Programme Director for Services for Vulnerable People, Health and Social Care Partnership
- Sharon Marriott, Commissioning Officer, Older People, Neighbourhoods and Community Care
- Jackie Ainsworth, Project Co-ordinator, Neighbourhoods and Community Care

Evidence



Dates of Scrutiny

- 8th September 2008 – Scrutiny Board Meeting (agree terms of reference)
- 1st December 2008 – Scrutiny Working Group Meeting
- 8th December 2008 – Scrutiny Board Meeting
- 9th January 2009 – Visit to Brunswick Gardens Retirement Village, Sheffield
- 9th February 2009 – Scrutiny Board Meeting (held at Moor Allerton Care Centre)
- 11th May 2009 – Scrutiny Board Meeting
- 15th June 2009 – Scrutiny Board Meeting (agree final inquiry report)

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank