



ARTICLE NO: 1A

**CORPORATE OVERVIEW
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

MEMBERS UPDATE 2011/12

Article of: Director of People and Places

Relevant Head of Service: Borough Solicitor

Issue: 1 June 2011

Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor I. Grant

Contact for further information: Mrs. J Brown (Extn 5024)
(E-mail: julia.brown@westlancs.gov.uk)

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE
AND THEMATIC GROUPS**

1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE

1.1 To present to Members the notes/minutes of meetings of various LSP Thematic groups.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 To apprise Members of developments in relation to the Local Strategic Partnership Executive and Thematic Groups. I attach the following minutes of the LSP Environment Thematic Group (2 November 2010), Special LSP Executive Meeting (19 November 2010), Employment, Learning & Skills Thematic Group (26 January 2011) and Special LSP Executive Meeting (17 February 2011).

Background Documents

There are no background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) to this Report.

Equality Impact Assessment

There is no evidence from an initial assessment of an adverse impact on equality in relation to the equality target groups.

Appendices

1. Minutes of LSP Environment Thematic Group – Natural Environment Sub Group 2 November 2010
2. Minutes of the Special LSP Executive Meeting 19 November 2010
3. Minutes of Employment, Learning & Skills Thematic Group 26 January 2011
4. Minutes of the Special LSP Executive Meeting 17 February 2011

Minutes of meeting of the Environment Thematic Group of West Lancashire LSP

Natural Environment Sub Group

2nd November 2010

Present: Richard Small (Chair) – Liverpool John Moores University
Tina Iball – WLBC, Environment
Dominic Rigby – LCC, Countryside
Lindsay Beaton – Wildlife Trust
Joanne Hudson – LCC, Environment
Steve Kent – WLBC, Countryside and Leisure

	Action
<p>1. <u>Introductions and apologies</u></p> <p>RS welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. Joanne Hudson was introduced to the group. Joanne will attend the ETG meetings in future, replacing Fiona Cruchley who is now covering Lancashire North area.</p> <p>Apologies had been received from:</p> <p>Dave Dunlop – Wildlife Trust Tim Graham – Wildlife Trust Gillian Whitfield - WLBC, Planning Policy Peter Jepson – LCC, Ecology</p>	
<p>2. <u>Minutes of the last meeting</u></p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed to be a true record.</p> <p>Action plans from subsequent years have been checked and not found to include an action on archaeological works in the borough. It was agreed this should be investigated and built into the action plan when it is revised in March 2011, if appropriate.</p> <p>DR corrected an update in the progress report, with regards to Martin Mere. The public right of way access is still pending and hasn't gone through yet.</p>	TI
<p>3. <u>ETG Action Plan Progress Updates</u></p>	

Please see Progress Report June to November 2010 for details of progress made over this quarter.

Other issues discussed which require actions include:

Recent changes to the Higher Level Stewardship scheme but no details were known by members of the group.

Follow up – Details of spending have been confirmed until 2014. So farmers who have applied and waiting to learn if they have been successful, should soon receive start dates. Further details, including the grant spends available can be found here:

<http://ww2.defra.gov.uk/news/2010/11/16/hls-scheme/>

Action 2.h. – Purple Ramp Fumitory

Progress has dwindled over recent years, group members unsure if any work is being undertaken. RS to make enquires with a colleague at Martin Mere.

RS

Action 2.i. – Great Crested Newts.

Following recent visits to Pond Close, Tarleton, it was queried if there is any comeback on developers who are bound by conditions on a planning application to mitigate against impacts a development may have on wildlife, which are later found to have not worked?

TI

Action 5.d – Rufford Old Hall

A new site manager has been appointed. DR to enquire if any progress has been made with regards to grassland restoration.

DR

Action 6.c – New and Built Structures

WLBC have recently taken over a site in Scarisbrick which contains an underground bat roost, however we are currently unsure if bats still occupy the site. There is currently no means of monitoring or managing the site.

SK

Are Planners provided with enough information to ensure developers design buildings to help protect biodiversity? This needs to be incorporated in the core strategy or accompanying SPG and enforced at Planning Committees. Is there a best practice guide available? TI to investigate further.

TI

The group also discussed aspirational actions which could be progressed by the group to encourage community involvement:

Improved access to sites of interest

Designate and improve public rights of way and access routes between Martin Mere, Mere Sands Wood and the Coastal region.

Community Allotments in Hesketh Bank

Currently looking for funding to help deliver 40 – 50 new communal allotments and a permaculture site on land owned by the Parish Council, for community benefit.

- | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <p>4.</p> | <p><u>Lower Alt with Crossens Flood Risk Management Plan</u></p> <p>TI informed the group of an Environment Agency Strategic Environment assessment currently out for consultation, looking at future flood risk management within the Lower Alt with Crossens pumped drainage catchment. Any comments would be gratefully received and fed back to the EA.</p> <p>This can be viewed at: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/124390.aspx</p> | <p>TI</p> |
| <p>5.</p> | <p><u>LAA and National Indicators Update</u></p> <p>TI informed the group that Central Government have made quite a few changes to Local Authority Performance arrangements over recent months. Back in June they scrapped the Comprehensive Area Assessment to relieve Councils of reporting which diverts money away from the front line. In October they took further action in revoking all designations linked to Local Area Agreements and the National Indicator Set.</p> <p>They have also announced that the National Indicator Set will be replaced with a single comprehensive list of all data central government require. Further information on this is expected over the coming months and will be reported in due course.</p> | |
| <p>6</p> | <p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>No items were raised.</p> | |
| <p>7.</p> | <p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>TI to arrange electronically for mid February.</p> | <p>TI</p> |

Environment Thematic Group of West Lancashire LSP

Progress Report June to November 2010

Natural Environment Sub Group

Action 1.b – Lancashire Natural Environment Service

Since January 2010 the NI 197 team has surveyed and assessed the management of 94 Biological Heritage Sites across Lancashire, 8 of which are located in West Lancashire:

- Ferny Knoll Bog
- Holland Moss
- Nuck's Wood
- Crossens pumping station
- Sollom Erratics
- Scarisbrick Hall Woods and Dam Woods
- Hesketh Bank Brickworks (Alty's)
- Tawd Valley Woods
- Dickets Brook Woods

Writing up surveys and providing management advice to landowners/managers is ongoing and will be completed over the winter months before the next survey season starts.

Action 2.j. – Increase/ enhance access to Hunters Hill

A Phase 1 survey and NVC report has been undertaken and the Countryside Rangers are working on a management plan for the site. The lower area of the site is up for sale which if sold could cause difficulties with access. This will be monitored over coming months.

Action 2.k. – Increase/ enhance access – Ribble Coast and Wetland Regional Park

Booklet promoting cycling was published the last week in October. Development of an access strategy is underway but it's doubtful it will be completed by March 2011.

Action 2.l. – Increase/ enhance access – Martin Mere

Web cameras are now operational and available to view on line.

Action 2.m. - Increased provisions for visitors at Mere Sands Wood

Edge Hill has made a geomorphological tube for educational purposes. Camera links have been installed in the visitor centre and detailed interpretation of what can be seen is provided in the hides.

Action 4.a - Salt Marsh

Works have been completed but it will take many years for the salt marsh vegetation to establish.

Action 5.c – Gorse Hill Nature Reserve

Area of bracken has been cleared and heather planted.

Action 7.d – Community Woodland and Orchards

A site in Burscough has been selected by the Woodlands from Waste project, to establish native woodland over a 25 year period. Tree planting will be carried out by Global Renewables. Currently awaiting borehole survey results, expected in Feb/March 2011.

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL LSP EXECUTIVE MEETING
10am 19 November 2010, West Lancashire Investment Centre**

Present:

Cllr Ian Grant	Chairman		
Cllr Ashcroft	Chair of Community Cohesion Thematic Group	Louise Dawson	Skelmersdale & Ormskirk College
Dr Zakyeya Atcha	CLPCT	Dean Holden	Lancashire Constabulary (for Stuart Williams)
Cllr Blake	Vice Chair	Steve Igoe	Edge Hill University
John Buck	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service	Tracey Jardine	District Partnership Officer (LCC)
Stephen Costello	LCC	Alex McMinn	Older Peoples' Partnership Board
Ian Cropper	Parish Councils' representative	Greg Mitten	Chair of People and Communities Thematic Group
Cllr William Cropper	LCC	Kim Webber	WLBC (for Bill Taylor)

In attendance: Paul Cotterill (Bickerstaffe Children's Services), Cath McNamara (LSP Secretariat); Alison Grimes (LSP Secretariat)

Absent: Hugh Evans (Chamber of Commerce), Shaun Walsh (Performance Management Network Chair), Cllr Owens (Employment, Learning & Skills), Sheila Battersby (GONW), Angela Aspinwall-Livesy (Children & Young People)

1. Apologies

Jane Cass	NHS Central Lancashire	Dr Richard Small	Better Environment Thematic Group
Rodney Dykes	Southport and Ormskirk NHS Trust	Bill Taylor	Chair of Community Safety Partnership / WLBC
Cllr Forshaw	Chair of Integrated Transport Group	Stuart Williams	Lancashire Constabulary

2. Declarations of Interest

Item 9 – John Buck, as presenting a bid
Item 8 – Paul Cotterill, as treasurer to Homestart

The Chairman suggested Item 6 on the agenda should be brought forward.

For decision

6. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The Chairman introduced the item. There was one nomination for vice chair of the LSP, Cllr May Blake. The Chairman proposed her re-election. This was seconded.

AGREED: Cllr May Blake re-elected as Vice Chairman.

The Vice Chairman then introduced the item for election of the Chairman. The two

nominations Cllr Ian Grant and Paul Cotterill (Bickerstaffe Children's Services) left the room. Cath McNamara managed the process of the secret ballot for the position.

AGREED: Cllr Blake announced that Cllr Ian Grant had been re-elected as Chairman.

Cllr Grant accepted the position, and thanked Paul Cotterill for standing as a representative from Bickerstaffe Children's Services and invited him to stay for the remainder of the meeting. Cllr Grant stated that the future of the LSP needed to be about engaging not just with public sector but also with the private sector. Alex McMinn highlighted the importance of the third sector in the process.

For approval

3. Minutes of the Executive meeting, 23.09.10

AGREED: as an accurate record

4. Matters arising

N/a

5. Health and Wellbeing Thematic Group Action Plan

Zakyeya Atcha outlined that the action plan had been refreshed with four key areas of work. The asset-based community development work of the CVS was crucial to achieving them.

Dean Holden commented that the police would be keen to get involved with the elements surrounding alcohol use, as an increase in violent crime linked to alcohol problems were different between Ormskirk and Skelmersdale, with Ormskirk's having more possibilities of management/intervention where linked to its night-time economy which could be anticipated. Skelmersdale had more issues following eg. legal drinking at house parties, where police could only respond on demand. Partner working was needed as the police were called in at the end point. There were also issues about the marketing of alcohol by eg. supermarkets, which tended to follow national marketing campaigns by the chains, and that led to problems outside eg ASDA. Ian Grant raised the point that there was the potential for this to result in a licensing issue, so the borough council should be made aware. Louise Dawson offered the option of having an alcohol item on the weekly college tutorials.

Greg Mitten commented that a refreshing of the action plan had allowed refocusing on eg. alcohol issues, and working groups were carrying out actions, not just researching information. Linked with PRG project, things were being taken forward in this area.

A discussion was held about the Public Health White Paper expected at the end of November. It will outline the local authority involvement and how this will work in two tier areas. A meeting on 10 December with PCT, stakeholders, LCC and third sector to discuss implications will mean an LSP paper/presentation/discussion in January would be timely.

AGREED:

- Action plan noted.
- Zakyeya to bring a report to the January Executive on the White Paper Public

Health England.

6. Previously dealt with

7. Feedback from the Annual Forum meeting

The Chairman thanked attendees for their input and asked whether the LSP needed to review the frequency / purpose of future meetings.

A discussion was held about the methods used to engage with the private sector, who were unlikely to want to attend a half day meeting. Use of blogs, websites, twitter etc was raised. Kim Webber highlighted that there were already successful engagement mechanisms in use through the BC Regeneration Division. Previously a business portal established through the second homes fund was established, but had to cease operation due to lack of uptake within the private sector. The key was to offer assistance, rather than to burden, so that the private sector was getting something out of the process.

AGREED:

- The report was noted
- Any significant issues from meetings should be raised with the private sector via existing mechanisms and to request input where most relevant
- That the SCS 2007-17 should be refreshed to reflect the outcome of the LSP Annual Meeting and the PRG decision making process.
- That the LSP Secretariat will bring a report to the next meeting of the Executive containing a proposed addendum to the existing strategy, which, once agreed, would constitute a revised SCS.
- That the LSP Secretariat will bring a report to the next meeting of the Executive containing a proposed action plan to address issues raised at the Annual Forum Meeting.

8 Second Homes Fund – Monitoring

The Chairman stated that the LSP should be careful not to underspend by the end of the year. Any Thematic Group Chairs who knew of projects requiring funding should ensure that a bid was put to the January meeting.

Ian Grant commented that for a variety of reasons the Burscough Timebank project had not succeeded. The second/final stage payment report was therefore requesting a reduced payment - £3.5K rather than £4K. However, the request for second stage payment was essentially to defray debts and the LSP needed to be sure that there was value for the LSP in paying this. Greg Mitten stated that CVS involvement had been with the Burscough Community Cafe project rather than Timebank itself, but it was possible that the second stage payment would be needed to honour employment contracts, rather than simply for winding up costs. Discussion followed including comments that the LSP could have intervened before the decision to wind the project up was made, as the SLA states that any significant problems with a project should be reported to the LSP. The reason for the success of the Lancaster project should be investigated. There may be some mileage in having to link Timebank projects generally into those receiving benefits becoming involved in voluntary work. The value to the LSP from the payment may well be the learning process from the project.

The Chairman stressed that Executive meetings needed to be justified and give value. Potential for reports and progress on eg projects to be distributed via secretariat/website rather than requiring a meeting. The detail could be teased out in a paper in January. Tracey Jardine commented that there was value in having dialogue and debate face to face as it helped the creative process. Louise Dawson offered a committee room at the college if it was also a question of costs of meetings.

Greg Mitten outlined that the Community Food Growing Initiative was a great example of a second homes fund bringing in more resources. It was a borough-wide project with borough-wide involvement and benefits, on both practical and civic involvement levels.

AGREED:

- The report was noted.
- Release of the second stage payment to the Community Food Growing Initiative was agreed.
- The return of money to the pot was agreed for
 - £8,270.40 previously allocated to a CAA Evaluation Project;
 - £1,706.75 remaining unspent from monies previously allocated to the Welcome Pack;
 - £1,419.42 brought forward from a previous year's unspent general budget allocation;
 - £1,250 allocated from the 2010/11 budget for publication of the Annual Report;
 - £5,618.92 projected underspend in 2010/11 from conferences/meetings allocation.
- Greg Mitten to liaise with Cath McNamara and Age Concern to establish the purpose of the payment for the second/final Timebank project payment and to make sure the LSP is getting some value from the payment. Delegated authority was given to the Chairman to decide on the appropriateness of the payment in consultation with Greg.
- Cath McNamara to bring a paper on frequency/content of meetings to the January meeting.

9. Second Homes Bid – Raising Aspirations

John Buck presented the bid. The request was for £8k to extend a service for the remainder of the school year for years 7-11 at three schools in the borough. The project delivers a service outside of the core function of the fire service, thus contributing to the “big society” / “localism” agendas.

The Raising Aspirations programme focuses on delivering powerful role models for young people, exposing them to specific attitudes and outlooks, in which positive attitudes and lifestyles are embodied. The firefighters attend three schools 1 day per week to work with/mentor disengaged students, raising self esteem, confidence, and attendance levels, and be good role models for the students to aspire to whilst driving down anti social behaviour internally and externally. Reduction of risk taking behaviours will include education on fire safety and road safety.

A full and supportive discussion about the benefits of the project took place, with all partners fully supportive of the proposal. Subject to funding, the format can be rolled out further in the future. Louise Dawson suggested that Glenburn would be a potential future school (cited an interest) and a future development may be to target final year primary, as research suggested this is where the engagement needed to happen.

Ian Ashcroft commented that as everyone benefited from providing young people with aspirations it may be possible to get employers, council, education establishments to take on this type of work, to engage and inspire. Steve Igoe suggested that a lot of this work is already ongoing, eg at the university staff and students already had a large involvement with community and voluntary work, but there is no global picture of this. Organisations are committed to the values that

underpin the concept, but there needs to be a strategic review and report completed for the borough.

AGREED: to fund the bid

10 Performance Update

Report noted

11 PRG

Cath McNamara outlined that the SLAs for the agreed PRG projects (CCTV and West Lancashire Challenge) were currently under development. Progress was being made. Draft SLAs should be in place by end of November, and the next step was then for the Borough Council to ratify the agreements as long as the SLAs were robust.

Greg Mitten commented that the WL Challenge project had been highlighted as an example of good practice.

12. Regeneration Projects Managed by WLBC – Evaluation

Report noted.

13. Final Evaluation West Lancashire Investing in Business Regeneration Programme

Report noted.

14. Mid Lancashire MAA, Local Enterprise Partnerships, and Local Investment Plans

The Chairman outlined that in the summer, the secretary of state had invited submission of plans to establish LEPs in place of the regional development agencies. The main thrust of the LEP was that they were to be driven by the private, not public, sector.

Nationally, most authorities had gone with a big footprint. In Lancashire, there were three smaller footprints: East Lancashire & Blackburn, Fylde & Blackpool and Central Lancashire.

Both West Lancashire and LCC had preferred an option of a Lancashire-wide footprint.

The SoS did not support the fragmented bid, with the result that Lancashire has no LEPs in the first wave.

15. Forward Plan 2010

Noted, with the additions of:

- Neighbourhood Management
- Second Homes bids

16. Any Other Business

Kim Webber raised on behalf of the CSP Chair that the West Lancs bonfire strategy had resulted in a reduction of 165% incidents on last year. The Chair is working with the Chief Constable to try and secure funding for PCSOs. Dean Holden commented that a problem now was PCSOs leaving to find other work, and being unable to backfill into the posts. PCSOs have a significant part to play in police-community engagement.

Greg Mitten informed the Board that LCC had announced details of the Central Gateway Grants Scheme. However, from the information available there was a question as to whether West Lancs CVS could apply for funding for the provision of strategic and capacity building support to the VCFS in West Lancashire only. The scheme description issued by LCC indicated that applicants would need to provide this support over at least two LCC Boroughs or districts. The implications of this change, if confirmed would be major. It was

agreed that Greg Mitten and The LCC Partnership Officer Tracy Jardine would seek clarification from LCC.

17. Future Meetings

- Exec – 21 January, 1011, 10am WLIC
- Exec – 18 March, 2011 - subject to report at next meeting

West Lancashire Local Strategic Partnership
Employment, Learning & Skills Thematic Group

Minutes of the 26th January 2011 meeting

West Lancashire Investment Centre

Present:

Cllr Adrian Owens	Portfolio Holder Regeneration and Estates (Chairman)
Maureen Fazal	Exsel (Int) CIC (West Lancashire Community Recycling)
Greg Mitten	West Lancashire Council for Voluntary Service (WLCVS)
Greg Swift	WLCVS and Quarry Bank social enterprise
Phyllis Roberts	Lancashire Young Persons Service
Brett Winn	Skelmersdale and Ormskirk College
Steve Waters	Job Centre Plus
Jane Friend	Groundwork Wigan and West Lancashire
Carl Clarke	InTraining
Paula Huber	West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC)
Amy Kirby	WLBC
Alex Lambie	WLBC

In Attendance: Julie Hotchkiss and Paul Halfpenny, Deep Green Community CIC

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made around the table. The Chairman also offered a warm welcome to AK and AL and expressed how pleased he was that they were both in post.

The Chairman opened the meeting with information on Job Seeker Allowance figures, explaining that although we need to be careful, they were at their lowest in 2 years, which was a very positive sign.

2. Apologies

Karen Ingram, Skills for Health, Phillip Russell, Lancashire County Council and Ann Boocock, Lancashire Adult Learning.

3. Presentation from Deep Green Community CIC

The Chairman welcomed Julie and Paul and explained how the group were interested to hear the presentation and the new proposed development for Skelmersdale.

Julie outlined the background and values associated with the proposal, including her own personal circumstances and what led to the Deep Green Community CIC concept.

Julie explained the CIC would cater for 18-64 year olds with life affecting diseases, i.e. MS, motor neurone, Parkinsons and congenital disabilities. The CIC development would offer both temporary and permanent accommodation for family and friends as well as staff and student nurses, and links were being developed with Edge Hill University. It was also hoped there would be business ownership opportunities individuals with disabilities.

Paul explained how the CIC would be developed as a social enterprise and following extensive research across the north west, a site at Cobbs Clough in Skelmersdale had been identified. Paul briefly touched on 'Social Impact Bonds' and how this model would be explored further as a mechanism for funding. He gave an example of a case study involving 'Damien' who at a cost of £250k p.a. lived at home, whereas at a cost of £90k he and his family would be able to stay at Deep Green Community CIC. In response to a question from GS, Paul agreed to send on further information on Social Impact Bonds.

GM commented on the amount of work that had been undertaken and how there were potential links into the West Lancashire Challenge project. In response to GM's comment on Brookfields in Ormskirk, Julie explained they are very different target groups.

PH asked whether discussions had commenced with WLBC planning department and Paul responded that meetings had been held with both planning and the land owners Homes and Communities Agency.

PR explained that young people often undertake vocational training and can often experience barriers to accommodation and employment, in particular those young people who are cared for and she felt this development could assist.

The Chairman acknowledged the support of the group, but mindful of the scale and size of the development and the remit of this group. He asked all partners to keep in touch with Julie and Paul with relevant contacts or information. The Chairman also suggested they contact Jane Cass from the Primary Care Trust as the presentation may be useful to the LSP's Health and Wellbeing thematic group.

Full details of the presentation and prospectus to be attached to the minutes of the meeting. PH

4. Minutes of the Last Meeting, 20th October 2010

With the slight correction on page 3 (NI 171), the minutes were agreed as a correct record.

5. Matters Arising

The Chairman explained that the Work Programme would be an item on the next Agenda, where it was hoped PAR and CC would be able to provide an update. There were no additional matters arising.

6. West Lancashire Challenge Project

PH circulated the West Lancashire Challenge outcomes document and provided an update on progress. PH explained how we hoped to have the project up and running shortly, but this was likely to be 1st April 2011. There had been some delays in terms of finalising Service Level Agreements between the LSP Secretariat and WLCVS, but these issues would be resolved shortly.

PH also reported that the advert for the WLBC's Business Engagement Officer post had recently been issued and was available on the Council's website and the www.jobsgopublic.com website.

7. West Lancashire NEET Target Update

PR provided an update to the group and how fantastic the support had been from partners around the table, in particular WL Recycling Services, who provided 60 fork lift truck training places, and Skelmersdale and Ormskirk College who provided construction courses, involving tasters sessions of different trades, as well as the Skiing and food hygiene courses.

PR explained that there are three programmes designed specifically for young mums, but highlighted how difficult they were to engage with as they are content with their family circumstances.

PR also explained how difficult it is to engage young males and this is felt to be down to their night-time habits i.e. computer use late into the night affecting their daytime lives.

The Chairman invited AK and AL to input their thoughts on PR's update. AL explained how he fully understood the issues and problems and that he had found securing employment difficult before his apprenticeship with the Council. AK agreed with AL's comments and explained that she had used the Connexions service to help her to find the apprenticeship with the Council.

SW added how the JCP focus was on 18 year olds, but that there are additional mechanisms that are useful in attracting young people to employment opportunities. He went on to add that JSA figures are bucking the trend for 18-24 year olds in West Lancashire.

The Chairman complemented the work of the Young People's Service and partners around the table and confirmed he would report the positive feedback from PR to the LSP Executive.

8. Skills and Worklessness Strategy Action Plan

The group discussed updates on each of the items within the action plan. Key points included:

- A shared press release with LSP partners who have contributed to the success of the Future Jobs Programme.
- GS updated on the 'Wheels to Work' option that LCC and WLBC are investigating in relation to taxi operators and that a Burnley model was being looked at. The Chairman explained some of the S106 difficulties and that a report would be prepared by WLBC officers in the future to decide options. PR added that Connexions used to have 15 motorbikes that were loaned out to young people as well as the opportunity to complete the Compulsory Basic Training.
- MF reported on the bicycle recycling scheme and how this had developed from the collection of bulky goods. The Second Homes Funding application would help to finance a member of staff and it is hoped the project will secure a successful lottery bid. MF thanked the group for supporting the Second Homes bid.
- The Chairman and PH updated the group on item 10, explaining how, following discussions with Intraining, it was felt that by working closer together the outcomes of the Second Homes bid would be achieved and therefore the bid should be withdrawn. The group agreed to this action.

Action Plan to be updated with the above feedback (including an update on NEET's from PR) and circulated with the minutes. PH

The group agreed that this would be the final update on this particular action plan and that it would be replaced by the West Lancashire Challenge Outcomes document for the group to monitor.

9. Any Other Business

PH gave a brief update on recent activity undertaken by the Lancashire and Blackpool Tourist Board, including a 'Car Free Itinerary' that had been produced for Burscough town centre and which would feature as a tab on the front page of the visitlancashire.com website.

PH explained to the group that the 2011/12 Tourist Board membership (subvention) would be due 1st April 2011, but that timing issues would mean that the End of Year Report would be received after the next LSP Executive meeting and before the next meeting of the thematic group. The group expressed their support for continued membership post

March 2011 and PH agreed to circulate the End of Year Report to the group.

CC provided a brief update on the activity of InTraining in relation to the Work Programme, explaining how there are two prime contractor slots available for the Cumbria and Lancashire lot and that InTraining had been short-listed. The outcome was expected in the next few weeks, with a potential start of Summer 2011.

MF reported that the business was thriving and interest had been received from Housing Associations along the M62 corridor. MF also reported on the Social Enterprise Awards event that was taking place that evening, with over 100 attendees expected and 8 award categories.

GS reported on the Future Jobs Fund programme and how 21 young people had been placed within social enterprises across the Borough.

GM explained how they had worked on refining the SMART outcomes of the WL Challenge project and that they were keen for the project to move forward. GS also commented on how good it was to see AK and AL in post, which was seconded by BW.

SW updated the group on JCP activity, including targeting the 18-21 age group with work experience opportunities, which would be extended from 2 weeks to 2 months, without affecting benefits. He explained that De Vere Hotels and McDonalds had signed up to support this initiative.

SW commented that there had been no large-scale redundancy notifications in the Borough, but neither had there been an increase in employment opportunities either. New Deal would be in place until end June when the Work Programme would begin.

10. Date of Next Meeting

11th May 2011 at 10am, West Lancashire Investment Centre

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL LSP EXECUTIVE MEETING
10am 17 February 2011, West Lancashire Investment Centre**

Present:

Cllr Ian Grant	Chairman		
Cllr Ashcroft	Chair of Community Cohesion Thematic Group	Cllr Forshaw	Chair of Integrated Transport Group
Jane Cass	CLPCT	Dean Holden	Lancashire Constabulary (for Graham Coulston-Hermann)
Cllr Blake	Vice Chair	Steve Igoe	Edge Hill University
John Buck	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service	Cllr Owens	(Employment, Learning & Skills)
Stephen Costello	LCC		
Ian Cropper	Parish Councils' representative	Greg Mitten	Chair of People and Communities Thematic Group
Cllr Ruth Pollock	LCC (for Cllr Cropper)	Dave Tilleray	WLBC (for Bill Taylor)

In attendance: Gillian Whitfield (WLBC), Cath McNamara (LSP Secretariat); Alison Grimes (LSP Secretariat)

Absent: Hugh Evans (Chamber of Commerce), Shaun Walsh (Performance Management Network Chair), Sheila Battersby (GONW), Angela Aspinwall-Livesy (Children & Young People), Dr Richard Small (Better Environment Thematic Group)

1. Apologies

Louise Dawson	Skelmersdale & Ormskirk College	Rodney Dykes	Southport and Ormskirk NHS Trust
Alex McMinn	Older Peoples' Partnership Board	Bill Taylor	Chair of Community Safety Partnership / WLBC
Tracey Jardine	District Partnership Officer (LCC)	Cllr Bill Cropper	LCC
Acting Chief Supt. Graham Coulston-Hermann	Lancashire Constabulary		

2. Declarations of Interest

None

For decision

3. Minutes of the Executive meeting, 19.11.10

AGREED: an accurate record

4. Matters arising

NHS white paper on public health. Item 4 from 19.11.10:

Jane Cass explained that although Zakyeya Atcha was to bring back a report on the NHS white

paper on public health that the Health and Wellbeing Thematic Group are responding to this paper and intend to bring it back to the Executive so that the response can go out from the LSP. It was felt important that West Lancs had input into the consultation process at an early stage to help influence/contribute most effectively.

AGREED: Jane Cass to bring a report including HWB draft response to the next meeting

Central Gateway Grants Scheme. Item 16 under AOB from 19.11.10

Greg Mitten updated that there had still been no confirmation from LCC whether individual organisations are able to bid for the Central Gateway Grants Scheme. West Lancs CVS has made a single bid, as well as one in partnership bid with Preston, Chorley and South Ribble.

Mid Lancashire MAA, Local Enterprise Partnerships, and Local Investment Plans. Item 14 from 19.11.10

Ian Grant stated that there was still no clear way forward for Lancashire as areas seemed unable to work together to come up with a cohesive Lancashire bid. MPs have been asked to get involved to assist in joining up areas, but with little success to date. As it stands, Lancashire is therefore unable to bid into monies available through the arrangements and are potentially losing out whilst neighbouring areas such as Merseyside and Manchester are able to access these funds. Steve Igoe confirmed that although universities were not included in the initial proposals they have since become involved and Edge Hill is currently active in the Merseyside MAA/LEP.

For note

5. Performance Reward Grant – Draft Service Level Agreements Report of LSP Secretariat

The draft SLAs for the Lancashire Challenge and CCTV were tabled so that the Executive could raise any concerns with their contents, but provisionally agree them subject to amendments.

Ian Grant raised two proposed changes:

West Lancashire Challenge: p20, s.19 – Insurance, to refer to insurance 'at the inception of the agreement'

CCTV: p38, s.8.4 – a change so that dispute resolution is a fairer process:

From: In the event that the nominated representatives referred to in clause 8.3 above fail to resolve the said dispute the Chair of the LSP and the Chief Executive of WLBC shall meet....in a further attempt to resolve the dispute.

To: In the event that the nominated representatives referred to in clause 8.3 above fail to resolve the said dispute the Chair of the LSP or such person to be nominated by him and the Chief Executive of WLBC shall meet....in a further attempt to resolve the dispute.

AGREED: any further changes thought necessary by the Exec to be passed to Cath McNamara by 25th February and Ian Grant to have delegation to make minor amendments.

For decision

6. Second Homes Fund Update Report of LSP Secretariat

Cath McNamara outlined that there had been little change in the budget position since November. It was necessary to commit £9,329.52 of the remaining £17,881.52 before the year end to avoid having to return any monies to contributing authorities. Bids received (tabled in agenda item 7) would enable this commitment and indeed were in excess of the sum available.

Greg Mitten updated that he had carried out further investigation into Age Concern's November request for a reduced final payment from the second homes fund for the Timebank project, based on an early wind up. The early wind up was unexpected by the Executive as there had been no warnings raised by the project prior to the final report and this was acknowledged as not following the correct procedures. Greg outlined that although the project hadn't achieved the overall aim of establishing a Timebank in Burscough, there were other successes from the project. It had resulted in significant multi-agency partnership working, eg. train companies, WLBC, Age Direct, CVS. If an estimate of £8/hr volunteer time was factored in, there had been a three-fold return on investment. The Burscough Community Café was now a registered charity and will be sustained through the services it offers. It is currently employing two people from long term unemployment which is gaining them valuable catering experience which will assist in future employment prospects. The project had also benefitted from paid staff time from Age Concern, but no records of time had been kept. In conclusion, the previous report had only focussed on the failure of the Timebank project, rather than the broader benefits. A rewritten final report will be produced highlighting the benefits, and Greg recommended that the request for £3500 be released.

Ian Grant outlined that a decision about whether to approve the second stage payment for membership of the Blackpool and Lancashire Tourist Board would require delegated authority due to the timeframe for end of year reports and Exec meetings. From the update reports given to the Employment, Learning and Skills thematic group, the group believes that the membership gives good value for money, with quite a few hits being received on the website.

AGREED:

- the £3500 would be released to Age Concern for the Timebank project subject to no further objections from Exec members following email circulation of the report by the Secretariat.
- Delegated authority to decide on the funding of the second year of Tourist Board be given to Ian Grant and Ian Cropper following the submission of the second stage payment report by Paula Huber.

7. Second Homes Fund Bids (2010/11 allocation) Report of LSP Secretariat

Ian Grant queried with Steve Costello the long term plans for second homes fund. Steve confirmed that his understanding was that second homes funds have been confirmed for a further 12 months and no decision has been made yet for future years. It would therefore be unsound to try to use second homes money for match funding.

Ian commented that all the bids on the table could qualify for funding and that it was far in excess of what was available. To take this forward, a small subgroup was needed to review and prioritise the bids. This needed to be done by 31 March to avoid having to return monies.

Adrian Owens stated that although the LSP was rightly cautious about committing money early in the year, if all the bids were scoring highly then they should be approved.

Jane Cass raised whether it would be appropriate to convene groups to work on combining bids, similar to how collaboration had been achieved for the PRG money.

Greg commented that CVS would be withdrawing its newsletter bid for 10/11 funding having reviewed the bid's purpose and possible funding sources during the Community Cohesion theme group meeting. It should be the responsibility of thematic groups to ensure that bids put forward were appropriate for the funding type.

Ian queried with Dean Holden why the police body camera's shouldn't be considered as core work of the police, and therefore not require funding. Dean stated that it wasn't routine police issue equipment anywhere in Lancashire. It was useful particularly for domestic violence where

officer statements were often used in situations where complaints were withdrawn at a later date and also for 'night time economy' policing. Other divisions have received funding from eg. parish councils for limited cameras. There was no final figure available, but a worse case scenario was £4.5K for 100 cameras.

Ian then queried the same with John Buck, who explained that the Raising Aspirations was an extension to the bid made in November to extend the service into Glenburn. It provides mentoring to young people at a time in their lives where they are making choices about lifestyles. Recent feedback around the work included that Burscough Priory had received a surprise Ofsted visit and the reduction in secondary fires on the same period as last year was 3 down from 20.

AGREED: the small group to review bids would be Tracey Jardine, Ian Grant, Greg Mitten and Jane Cass. The Chairman would have delegated authority to approve the group's recommendations by 31 March.

8. Second Homes Fund Bid: IDVA (2011/12 allocation) Report of LSP Secretariat

Ian Grant stated that he was fully supportive of work surrounding prevention of Domestic Violence, but questioned whether the second homes fund was the correct funding stream, given the uncertainty surrounding funding beyond 12 months. Dean Holden queried whether this was something that LCC was going to pick up. Dave Tilleray felt that the match funding required by government may well be met by match funding 'in kind', so that sources already provided by WLBC/LCC may count. IDVA would be getting at best a reduced amount from the CSP this year.

Adrian Owens felt that second homes projects should really be of a defined length, and not something that would require ongoing funding. Greg Mitten stated that second homes funding will be in danger of being swamped by requests from organisations finding that existing funding for existing projects is being reduced/removed. Second Homes should be defined for new/innovative/payment in tranches of eg. £5K projects.

AGREED: Ian Grant would contact Eleanor Maddocks of the Women's Refuge and explain that despite overall support for the project concept, Second Homes funding was not a robust enough funding source for the project as it currently stood. A revision of the bid outline would be suggested that involved a smaller amount over a defined period and that potentially a bid into the PRG pot would be more appropriate.

9. Review of SCS Priorities / LSP Action Plan Report of LSP Secretariat

Ian Grant stated that the draft work plan hadn't had the feedback required. Cath outlined that if the Exec saw value in having the workplan then it needed to have input into it to make it a meaningful document. The paper presented the refresh of SCS at Appendix A. These were **AGREED.**

Steve Igoe commented that the action plan needed to be a plan that pulled things together that were already going on, and it was a question of how to give these things some visibility. Jane Cass stated that the workplan should reflect the value of working together – bringing areas of work together and adding value. Adrian Owens said that there was value in the workplan to ensure that there wasn't duplication of effort, and a method of working smarter. Otherwise the LSP was just a forum for approving second homes bids.

AGREED: Secretariat to send out the workplan again for comments/additions.

10. Second Homes Fund Applications – Revised Guidance, Application and Assessment Procedure Report of LSP Secretariat

The guidance/application/assessment had been refreshed to update with new terminology and LSP priorities. It also has more transparent assessment process which includes the required input of the Exec. Jane Cass suggested the inclusion of the public health outcomes/indicators as selection criteria.

Thematic groups should grade the bids themselves before getting to the Executive.

Adrian Owens commented that as the current bids had all scored quite highly, they should all put in early next year.

AGREED: that the revised documents be used for the time being.

11. Frequency and Content of Meetings Report of LSP Secretariat

Ian Grant commented that there was a cost of holding meetings and that it used second homes money, and therefore meetings should not be held for meeting's sake, but also acknowledged the value of partners having the face-to-face meetings.

Steve Igoe suggested rotating meetings around partner's venues.

Ian proposed having meetings every four months, including an Executive meeting after the annual forum meeting.

AGREED: meetings every four months, including an Executive meeting after the annual forum meeting. Required changes to the constitution outlined in the recommendations be made.

For information

12. Local Development Framework – Verbal report from WLBC

Gillian Whitfield outlined the developments of the LDF, in particular development of the core strategy. In May 2010, five strategic options were consulted on. Since then, work has been carried out on the preferred option. In March, WLBC Cabinet will be asked to approve consultation during May/June of two alternatives within that option. The final core strategy should be finalised by December 2011 and will be submitted in early 2012 for examination by the planning inspectorate, amendment and adoption. The aim is for the core strategy to be adopted during 2012.

13. PRG – verbal update from LSP Secretariat

Cath McNamara updated that subject to meeting certain criteria, there may be an additional 170K due for West Lancs LSP by 31 March 2011.

If approved by DCLG, it will be as a result of the further claim to DCLG made by LCC in December 2010 for achievement of LAA targets which had not been completed when the original claim was submitted in December 2009.

14. Infrastructure Task & Finish Group : ToR – Verbal report from WLBC

Gillian Whitfield outlined the establishment of the group and that it had already met.

15. Forward Plan 2011

Noted, with the additions of:

- Health outcomes

16. Any other business

- Membership of the LSP Forum by IDVA. Supported by Dave Tilleray and **AGREED.**
- Cabinet Office call for interest in local partners to become a Local Inclusion Lab area.

Discussion that the timeframe set by the Cabinet Office of two weeks for consideration was unhelpful. Dave Tilleray suggested DMT/SSCF/Skelmersdale Community Partnership having sight of the document. Ian Grant suggested that at this stage it may be better to opt to stay in as it was only expression of interest. **AGREED:** reminder email to Exec to see if any interest and Exec to reply within seven days to allow time for response/EOI by 28th if appropriate.

- Neighbourhood Management would report back as and when on costs/benefits. **AGREED**

17. Future meetings
Dates & venue tbc



ARTICLE NO: 1B

**CORPORATE OVERVIEW
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

MEMBERS UPDATE 2011/12

Article of: Director of People and Places

Relevant Head of Service: Borough Solicitor

Issue: 1 June 2011

Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor I. Grant

Contact for further information: Mrs. J Brown (Extn 5024)
(E-mail: julia.brown@westlancs.gov.uk)

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE WEST LANCASHIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY
PARTNERSHIP**

1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE

1.1 To present to Members the Minutes of the West Lancashire Community Safety Partnership.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 To apprise Members of developments in relation to the West Lancashire Safety Partnership through the minutes of its meeting held on 19 January 2011.

Background Documents

There are no background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) to this Report.

Equality Impact Assessment

There is no evidence from an initial assessment of an adverse impact on equality in relation to the equality target groups.

Appendices

1. Minutes of West Lancashire Safety Partnership on 19 January 2011.

WEST LANCASHIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

HELD: 19th January 2011

Commenced: 5.30 pm

Finished: 7.15 pm

PRESENT:

Andrew Hill	-	WLBC
William J Taylor MBE	-	Chairman, WLBC
Dean Holden	-	Lancashire Constabulary
David Tilleray	-	WLBC
Graham Coulston-Hermann	-	Lancashire Constabulary
Steve Mahon	-	WLBC
Colleen Martin	-	LCC
Mary Lyons	-	NHS Central Lancs.
Steve Wilson	-	LF&RS
Cllr Greenall	-	WLBC
Robert Rushton	-	Lancashire Police Authority
Gareth Dykes	-	West Lancs. PACT
Louisa Armitage Parkinson	-	WLBC
Eleanor Maddocks	-	DV Support Services
Greg Mitten	-	West Lancs. CVS
Cllr Una Atherley	-	WLBC
County Cllr Aldridge	-	LCC
Mike Lock	-	Lancashire Probation Trust
Roger Merry	-	Ormskirk Bench
Helen Slee	-	Victim Support
Louise Cropper	-	Help Direct
Cllr Ashcroft	-	WLBC
Jan Tyrer	-	GMW

IN ATTENDANCE:

Cliff Owens	-	WLBC
Barry Nolan	-	WLBC

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed members to the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from:

Sam Jones, William Cropper, Bruce Jassi, Colin Buckley, Jannine Burke, Christine Coleman, Grant Murdoch, Gail Stanley, Faye Kellett, Mel Ormesher

3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING/MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. PUBLIC SECTOR SPENDING

The Chairman provided the Partnership with a verbal update on the issue of Public Sector Spending.

The Chairman stated that it was currently difficult to provide an accurate update, as public authorities have not yet set their budgets. The Chairman advised that these are difficult times, which will require innovation to keep costs down whilst trying to ensure minimal impact against front line services public services. He continued by explaining that officers would respond by maximising on efficiency and exploring shared services options and developing partnership working where costs savings could be made. The Chairman emphasised however that it would then be down to elected members to take the difficult decisions of identifying where services need to be reduced or cut.

The Chairman provided an overview of the potential impact on CSP's, which in the past have received Government grants to support their work and provided the capital investment in CCTV as an example. He continued by stating that law and order remains a priority but the financial challenges still remain and at the next CSP meeting will have a clearer picture of the impact of spending reductions in this area. The Chairman added that we must avoid the risk of agencies returning to working in silos but cautioned this will be tempting for decision makers when considering costs.

Councillor Greenall supported the Chairman's comments adding that politically we will be faced with hard choices.

5. PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The Chairman advised partners that in previous meetings performance monitoring had taken up a substantial part of the meeting and added for this meeting would trial exception reporting only. The Chairman invited partner agencies to provide a verbal overview of their quarterly performance on this basis and highlighted as an introduction that performance across the board was stunning and remarked on the excellent reductions that had been achieved over the financial year against ASB and domestic burglary.

Dean Holden confirmed the reductions and added that across all categories we have seen significant improvement in performance against some very good baseline performance from the previous year. Dean thanked the Chairman for his comments and added that much of the reductions have been made possible through the support of the CSP and its partners. Dean highlighted the significant reductions achieved against domestic burglary, which have reduced by approximately 30% but cautioned that violent crime remains the main area for concern with regards to performance indicators and added that Domestic Abuse accounts for approximately a third of all violent crime figures which is an upward trend but remains difficult to police from a patrol point of view.

The Chairman acknowledged the good performance and added that domestic violence remains a double-edged sword with pressures for the police to both reduce violent crime but encourage the reporting of domestic violence offences.

Cllr Ashcroft raised concerns regarding criminality affecting the Northern Parishes and highlighted a number of incidents in Tarleton and Hesketh Bank, which have seen an increase in burglaries other than a dwelling. Cllr Ashcroft stated that he felt investment in CCTV in public areas and in ANPR in other areas would be impactful.

Dean acknowledged the increased in none dwelling burglaries and explained this was a likely consequence of displacement with offenders changing their tactics to reduce the risk of severe custodial sentences if caught. Dean added that proactive targeting has led to some positive results and added that these types of offences have shown a reduction. Dean continued by adding that the Safer Lancashire Board are looking at potential sites that could benefit from ANPR and that the Northern Parishes have been proposed for possible inclusion. Dean added that a bid has also been submitted to the West Lancashire LSP for funding to enable the police to equip all front line officers with body cameras, which will assist in tackling cross border crime.

The Chairman acknowledged that the Northern Parishes was the least connected area for CCTV. He added that the LSP funding for CCTV is primarily for the sustainable of the system but added that if funding is available from this pot for the extension of CCTV provision the Northern Parishes could be considered if supported by Police evidence.

In request to a question on police resources Graham Coulston-Hermann advised the Partnership that the constabulary currently has a freeze on recruitment as there maybe future funding cuts. He advised that Neighbourhood Policing and Response structures are under review but added that the impact in this area is likely to be less than was thought. Graham added that we would review current vacancies across the division once the review is completed.

Cllr Nolan stated that performance in his ward is currently very good and he is keen for this to be sustained.

Steve Wilson advised the CSP that a significant increase in deliberate primary fires has been recorded and this is directly attributable to wheelie bin fires. Steve advised that this issue would be highlighted with the Strategic Assessment as an emerging threat.

Dave Tilleray advised the Partnership that the Council is working closely with its colleagues in Fire and Rescue to address this issue and added that a meeting has recently being held and a robust action plan has been developed to tackle this issue.

Mike Lock highlighted the improved performance against NI 30, which has seen a 33% reduction in the first quarter of 2010/11, which is above target. Mike continued by providing an overview on key performance areas.

The subject of community payback was debated and Dave Tilleray advised the Partnership that a meeting has been arranged for the 28th January 2011 between officers from the Borough Council and Lancashire Probation Trust to examine the potential for the development of a formal Service Level Agreement. Dave added that discussion with Chorley and Preston Council has taken place to assess the arrangements in these areas. Dave stated that fundamental steps will have to be taken to examine how this will impact on staff relations and consultation with the union will also have to take place.

Jan Tyrer advised the Partnership that GMW were awarded the contract for managing substance misuse services in Central Division on the 1st October 2011. Jan highlighted that the service is currently receiving a massive amount of alcohol referrals. Jan advised the partnership that a sub contract is in place with Lifeline for delivering brief interventions and recovery. Jan added that Domestic voice is an area that the service is currently looking at developing and are conscious that they currently undertake more work with perpetrators than victims.

6 FUNDED INTERVENTIONS UPDATE

Andrew advised the Partnership that a written progress report for funded interventions for 2010/2011 was enclosed in members meeting packs. Andrew advised that all interventions are currently on track and the Partnership expects to spend its full ABG allocation. Andrew added that £1,000 remained in the LPG pot and partners were currently drawing up potential bids.

Andrew provided the group with a brief overview of the Domestic Abuse Christmas Campaign stating that there are early indications of reductions in offences during the Christmas period, which historically sees a seasonal spike in these types of offences. The campaign was supported by a press release and promotional literature and Louisa added that the campaign also linked in with the Divisional Police lead campaign entitled Operation Harmony. Lou thanked colleagues for all their support in the delivery of the campaign.

Andrew advised that the next Task and Time Group developed through the Local Priorities Group would look at Domestic Abuse issues in West Lancashire. This is in response to its high profile in the West Lancashire Strategic Assessment and its impact on violent crime performance.

Cliff provided a brief overview of the progress made by the Motorcycle Nuisance Task & Time Group. Cliff advised that the LPG had authorised the purchase and erection of Section 59 signage and a K barrier to support police activity in key areas associated with high levels of motorcycle nuisance. The campaign was supported by the production of a motorcycle nuisance leaflet and press release. Other multi agency activities included joint visits by the police and Trading Standards to all of the petrol station managers in Skelmersdale to promote responsible retailing. Early indications show that there have been significant reductions in motorcycle nuisance during January and the group will meet at the end of January to fully assess the campaigns impact.

7 THE POLICE REFORM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BILL

Chief Inspector Dean Holden, Lancashire Constabulary, provided a brief verbal summary on the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill. The Bill covers five distinct policy areas: police accountability and governance; alcohol licensing; the regulation of protests around Parliament Square; misuse of drugs; and the issue of arrest warrants in respect of private prosecutions for universal jurisdiction offences. The proposed bill can be accessed on the link below:

[Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill \(new window\)](#).

Colleen Martin stated that there was still some debate to be had over how this reform will be managed within a two-tier authority. Colleen added that the Police and Crime Commissioner who will hold a crime reduction grant would manage future community safety funding. ABG grants will go directly to the Police and Crime Commissioner and this will impact on community safety delivery. Colleen added that officers are currently looking at several proposals.

8. FACE THE PEOPLE

Andrew Hill briefed the CSP on the planned agenda and subject matter for this year's Face the People event, which will take place on the 2nd March 2011 at 7pm in the Ecumenical Centre, Skelmersdale.

Andrew advised that the event would be themed on anti-social behavior and feature three presentations, which will cover the areas of prevention, detection, prosecution, diversionary activities and the criminal justice system. The event will include two joint presentations to demonstrate to the community that agencies are working together to tackle ASB, which would best reflect the ethos of partnership working in West Lancashire. A third presentation will be delivered on the work of the Lancashire Youth Offending Team. Andrew advised that invites have gone out to partner agencies, councilors and the event will be advertised in the local press and on the councils website. Andrew requested Councillors promote the event in their local communities.

9. BREAKING THE CYCLE GREEN PAPER

Mike Lock, Mike Lock, Probation Service Area Director introduced this topic and delivered a summary on the key elements of the Green Paper entitled 'Breaking The Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders.' The Green Paper sets out plans for fundamental changes to the criminal justice system and the full document can be accessed on the link below:

<http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm79/7972/7972.asp>

10. IDENTIFYING THE PERPETRATORS OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

Dave Tilleray introduced the agenda item identifying the Perpetrators of ASB and provided the Partnership with a brief background on the subject matter, which were debated at the Councils Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The debate centred on the issue of individuals being named in a

council report, which are held electronically, who have been successfully prosecuted and the appropriateness of keeping these named individuals in the public domain. Dave advised that this issue was referred to the CSP for debate and a decision regarding formal policy and invited comments from Partners agencies.

The Chairman supported the view that the names of the individuals who have been prosecuted will already be in the public domain and highlighted that the Borough Council have always been very balanced in the way we publicise peoples names in relation to crimes.

Councillor Greenall supported The Chairman's comments and added that part of the sanctions is the publication of named individuals who commit criminality and therefore the information automatically becomes public knowledge. This view was supported widely by members of the CSP and Steve Mahon advised that this approach is encouraged the in the paper written by Louise Casey entitled Justice Seen, Justice Done.

Mike Lock stated that offenders need to be brought to the attention of the public but added that there also has to be a continued focus on the rehabilitation of offenders.

The debate concluded that the Partnership support are supportive of the policy of publicising the names of individuals in a reasonable and balanced way who are prosecuted, which is the approach advocated by Louise Casey.

11. DRAFT COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

Andrew Hill introduced this agenda item stating that the draft Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment was included within the CSP Meeting pack. Andrew added that the document, which is still in draft form, was included on the agenda for endorsement by the CSP. Andrew added that a number of amendments had been requested which included reference to the growth of Edge Hill University and the subsequent impact on the Town Centre Night Time Economy as an emerging threat and the issue of public finance and its potential impact on CSP's.

The West Lancashire Strategic Assessment document and process was endorsed by the CSP subject to the inclusion of the additional information noted above. It was agreed that the draft assessment would be sent out to partners for a short consultation period before the final draft is produced.

12. IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

Mike Lock, Probation Service Area Director provided the CSP with a brief verbal progress report on the plans for the implementation of Integrated Offender Management in Southern Division.

Mike stated that there are delays around the funding and team structures in relation to funding but added that the plan is in place. Mike added that there is a South Lancashire IOM briefing planned in March 2011 to enable practitioner to better understand the principles of IOM. Mike advised that the workshop to support the development of the Reducing Re-offending strategy has been held and officers will meet to write up the findings and complete the document. Mike stated that the group will be focusing on the criminogenic needs of offender and added that we will be looking at involving the third sector and substance misuse services more in this area of work.

13. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR RISK ASSESSMENT CONFERENCES

Dean Holden provided the CSP with an overview of the objective of the Anti-Social Behaviour Risk Assessment Conferences (ASBRAC), which are a similar model to the DV MARAC's. Dean advised that they have been created following the introduction of ASB minimum standards and the need to assess and manage the most vulnerable victims of ASB. Dean requested support from partner agencies for the West Lancashire ASBRAC adding that there was currently less attendance than the Partnership envisaged. Steve Mahon stated that ASBRAC's are a very useful format for managing ASB and vulnerable victims and added that the work continues outside of the meeting and provided partners with a recent example of a successful outcome.

Dean advised the partners that although repeat ASB callers are an indication of possible vulnerability he highlighted that it is sometimes that people that are too scared to call who are the most vulnerable and the ASBRAC process will aim to identify these individuals and put support mechanisms in place.

14. MULTI AGENCY BONFIRE PERIOD INITIATIVE 2010

Steve Wilson provided a brief verbal report on the multi-agency bonfire initiative held in November, which produced unprecedented reductions in deliberate fires and anti-social behaviour during this seasonal period. Councillor Aldridge praised the work of the Skelmersdale Fire and Rescue Team and the initiative, which was a great success. The Chairman stated that the effort that Lancashire Fire and Rescue put into prevention is very commendable and added that West Lancashire was one of the first areas to support this approach. Eleanor Maddocks requested that her thanks be recorded to the LF&RS for their support to the Women's Refuge during the period of bad weather.

15. IDVA FUNDING 2011/12

Eleanor Maddocks provided the position with an overview of the current picture for IDVA funding for the next financial year. Eleanor advised the CSP that the Government have announced the potential for 4 years of matched funding but bids must be submitted before the end of February 2011.

Colleen advised the group that the Home Office have relaxed the criteria on what constitutes matched funding and this could now potentially include value in kind and added that it would be better if matched funding could be identified

over the 4 year period. Colleen added that a meeting would take place on Friday to discuss the funding issue with potential bidders within Lancashire to look at the best deal for the Lancs. The Chairman advised Eleanor to speak to officers with respect to next year's budgets.

The Chairman emphasised the issue of finance and the very difficult decisions, which members will have to be make when identifying our priorities for 2011/12. Colleen added that officers are working hard on trying to identify matched funding or resources to enable the Home Office funding to be accessed. It was emphasised however that the date for submissions for funding is before the date that Local Authorities set their own budgets and therefore makes applications at this stage very challenging.

Greg Mitten stated that he appreciated the effort of partners in trying to access funding but added that he gets the clear message that domestic abuse is a key priority and stated that we therefore need to ensure the LSP understands this area is a key priority for the CSP when considering funding applications.

16. COMMUNITY SAFETY ISSUES

Councillor Nolan request information on new legislation announced for fast tracking tenant responsible for ASB. Steve Mahon advised that he is aware of new legislation on this subject and advised that he would provide a briefing note to Councillor Nolan.

The Chairman raised the issue of the challenging weather period we endured during December 2010. He stated that lessons had been learned from the previous year and although the response is still not perfect staff within the borough and across the County put in more and more effort and resources.

The Chairman advised the CSP that due to financial constraints we would no longer be in a position to provide a buffet at future CSP meetings.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business raised.

18. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on the 20th April 2011 at 6pm in the Council Chamber, 52 Derby Street.



ARTICLE NO: 1C

MEMBERS UPDATE 2011/12

**CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Article of:	Borough Planner
Issue	June 2011
Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor M. Forshaw
Contact for further information:	Ann Veevers (Extn. 5346)

SUBJECT: INTRODUCTION OF PLANNING CHARGES FOR PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE, SPECIALIST ADVICE AND FOR THE DRAFTING, NEGOTIATING AND MONITORING OF LEGAL AGREEMENTS

Borough-wide Interest

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform Members of the response to a public consultation exercise on the proposed introduction of planning charges for pre-application advice, specialist advice and for the drafting, negotiating and monitoring of legal agreements.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Planning Control team has historically not charged for pre-application advice, specialist advice regarding trees, Listed Buildings, conservation or sustainability, or for the drafting, negotiating and monitoring of associated legal agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It has always been a free service for professional agents, architects and for members of the public. The current system allows potential applicants to submit plans to Planning Control Officers for informal advice on their proposals. Some face to face pre-application advice also occurs in the Derby Street reception, either by appointment or by virtue of our duty planner rota system. This allows members of the public to come into reception and ask questions directly of an officer. This system tends to deal with more general planning advice. For specific schemes, customers are encouraged to write in with further details.

2.2 The Local Government Act 2003 and specifically Section 93 gives Local Planning Authorities discretionary power to charge for services such as pre-

application advice. Where a fee is charged, it must be on a not for profit basis and over the course of each year, the income from charges for such services must not exceed the cost of providing them.

- 2.3 In the current economic climate, charging for pre-application advice could be seen as a further burden on the applicant/developer. However, recent Government suggests that pre-application engagement is important and charging for that advice is appropriate. What is important to developers is that they are receiving timely, responsive, constructive and reliable advice. In turn, this can save developers significant resources by not pursuing schemes which are unacceptable or have to be modified once submitted. The resources needed to give such advice can be significant and that cost is borne by the local authority and ultimately a cost to its citizens. Charging for pre application advice will ensure the resource is used to provide a well managed and constructive process that will add value at all levels and that the beneficiary of that service pays for it.
- 2.4 It is evident from benchmarking that many authorities now charge for pre-planning advice. Locally, the Merseyside Authorities do not yet charge for pre-application advice although a number are actively researching the possibility. In Lancashire, Chorley, Hyndburn, Preston, Ribble Valley and Wyre and South Ribble charge.
- 2.5 This principle also applies to the negotiating, drafting and monitoring of legal agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, which take a significant amount of officer time. Such legal agreements (also known as planning obligations) often involve complex negotiations with several interested parties over a number of weeks. At present this is ultimately at a cost to the citizens of the area as no costs are currently recovered from the applicant. It is considered that the beneficiary of this service should be the one to pay for it. A number of other local authorities also charge for this service.
- 2.6 In March 2011, cabinet agreed that the charging regime set out in Appendix 1 be consulted upon and that the Borough Planner, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, adopt a finalised charging regime taking account of any consultation responses, and to make subsequent modifications in the future.

3.0 CURRENT POSITION

- 3.1 The consultation process ran from 23rd March 2011 and 4th May 2011 with local house builders, local planning agents, Councillors, Parish Councils and members of the public. The proposal drew a small number of comments, which are summarised in the schedule below. A number of minor revisions will be undertaken as set out in the schedule below to reflect the comments made following consultation.

4.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND PROPOSED REVISIONS

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
------------	---------	----------

Newburgh Parish Council	<p>It is crucial that charges do not deter people from seeking pre-application advice. In accordance with Appendix 1, other Councils in Lancashire, apart from one, do not charge for householders. West Lancs is proposing a £50 charge (Hyndburn £35) and this seems out of line with the others.</p> <p>It is not clear whether a householder in a Conservation area or residing in a Listed Building would have to pay extra for advice about these subjects, or if advice about trees was also required.</p>	<p>Most other Councils set their fees over a year ago and are now reviewing charges for householders. The £50 fee is a small proportion of the overall development cost of most householder proposals.</p> <p>Householders would only pay for specialist advice if it was not directly related to a potential planning application.</p>
Parbold Parish Council	<p>Very concerned that this proposal will put ordinary householders off seeking advice regarding conservation issues, TPO's, Listed Buildings etc. and before making alteration to their own property.</p> <p>The level of charges are not clear, in that no hourly rate is specified; nor are they fair, as they are higher than those of other local authorities.</p> <p>This Council feel that there should always be free access to proper advice for all householders. Therefore, it is crucial that helpline questions should be answered for free (or rather, covered by the amount paid by householders in council tax) and any visit or in-depth enquiry be charged at a reasonable rate.</p>	<p>It is strongly recommended that specialist advice is sought prior to making changes to buildings or trees in the conservation area, to a listed building, or to a tree covered by a TPO in order to avoid potential prosecution and to gain proper advice on the sensitive treatment of historic assets.</p> <p>The hourly rate varies depending upon who is providing the advice, it is typically around £50. Please see response above regarding charges for householders and other local authorities.</p> <p>General advice such as how to submit a planning application, what the process involves etc. will still be provided for free and a duty planning officer will always be available to assist in general enquiries.</p>
North Meols Parish Council	Require more details of the charges before making any comments, e.g. how much time does a customer get for his money and what the hourly rates thereafter, and how do these compare with other authorities?	Any advice provided is not time limited in the first instance. Please see response above regarding hourly rates and the comparison with other authorities has been provided at Appendix 1 of the original consultation document.
Wrightington Parish Council	It is fair to charge professionals and professional organisations however, ordinary residents with no knowledge or expertise in this field should not be charged.	Please see response above regarding charges for householders.
Federation of Small	Introducing charges for these services will impact upon the recovery and growth of	In the current economic climate, charging for pre-application

Businesses	<p>small businesses following the recession. The construction industry is vital to return to growth in the economy. Many small businesses work directly in this sector whilst many more provide indirect support via all manner of services and products, from catering to equipment hire, from temporary accommodation to local retail. Furthermore, the construction industry itself has always been a major employer, and allowing the industry to get back to business will kick-start job opportunities once more, a vital need in the current climate. Recent increases in VAT, the increasing cost of fuel and the overall lack of confidence in the small business sector are all issues which are delaying any return to growth and the FSB feels strongly that business costs and bureaucracy need to be kept in check and reduced to assist businesses to move forward.</p> <p>Many local authorities provide these charges without fees and the FSB urges the Council to work in the wider interest of the small business community and not add these additional barriers and charges at a time when business can least afford it.</p>	<p>advice could be seen as a further burden on small businesses. However, the PAS paper, the recent Government response to Killian Pretty (made in the full knowledge of the current economic climate) and draft PPS on Development Management suggest that pre application engagement is important and charging for that advice is appropriate. What is important to businesses is that they are receiving timely, responsive, constructive and reliable advice. In turn, this can save businesses significant resources by not pursuing schemes which are unacceptable or have to be modified once submitted.</p>
Andrew Cunningham (architectural technician and agent)	<p>Pre-app responses with fees attached will also require time scales. Clients will not be prepared to pay and wait the length of time they do at present for pre-app comment.</p> <p>Fees need to be proportionate to the application. A full app for a single dwelling is £335 so there will be little saving if the pre-app is a further, say £250. Ideally, pre-app fees need to be offset against full application fees.</p> <p>Pre-app responses need to be clear – not “the proposal will be acceptable it is complies with policy”.</p>	<p>The Guidance Note issued with the fee charging proposal explains how the scheme will be implemented. It indicates the timescales involved – eg. a written reply or meeting will be arranged within 28 days and a written reply following a meeting would be made within 14 days. The pre-app fee for a single dwelling would be £100 (£150 were a meeting requested) and not £250. The fee schedule will be amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>The Guidance Note explains what type of response can be expected from the Council.</p>
Peter Dickinson (architect and agent)	<p>What will be the cost of a written pre-app and will there be a standard form for the application?</p> <p>Will there be a statutory timescale for the response? Anything longer than 5 days is a waste of time.</p>	<p>Please refer to proposed fee schedule. Yes there will be a standard form – see Guidance Note.</p> <p>Please see response above regarding timescales. In most cases it is not possible to</p>

	<p>Are meetings with planners at an early stage to be considered as pre-application and therefore charged on a time basis, and if so at what rate?</p> <p>Will Planners be prepared to undertake site visits to assess a potential scheme prior to a planning submission and if so, would this incur a charge and at what rate?</p> <p>Will the advice given be checked by the Team Leader?</p> <p>Will pre-app advice apply to policy as well as development control?</p> <p>I assume that meetings with Planners following validation of a scheme will not be charge.</p> <p>What is specialist advice?</p> <p>Charges for drafting and negotiating legal agreements up to signing stage are commonplace and providing the charges are fair and reasonable and consistent I have no objection.</p>	<p>provide detailed responses within 5 days as other consultees may be required to comment (eg. highways).</p> <p>Yes- please refer to fee schedule.</p> <p>Yes- please refer to fee schedule.</p> <p>Yes – in order to achieve consistency.</p> <p>Yes, if it relates specifically to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>Once a planning application is valid, the case officer will only negotiate minor issues of concern as part of dealing with the application and this will not incur a charge.</p> <p>Advice regarding development within a conservation area, relating to a listed building, trees and landscaping and sustainability issues.</p>
Mrs Liptrott (resident)	<p>Strongly objects to the proposal. Planning officers have always offered an initial consultation to assess the potential for a planning application at no charge. This valuable practice should continue as part of the job description for planning officers who are salaried to provide a service. Failure to maintain this service may result in an increased workload for the planning department as unrealistic submissions are entered and then withdrawn, rather than being informally assessed prior to the application.</p>	

	<p>Will planning applications not reviewed prior to submission be refused? This could lead to the planning department being brought into disrepute by acquiring the reputation for placing money above service.</p> <p>Who monitors the quality of the advice? If a planning officer advises one course of action and the planning committee disagree, will the charge be refunded?</p> <p>These are just examples of potential problems, there are many more. If the Borough Council wishes to follow this course of action, it should consider establishing an independent planning consultancy rather than charging for a service that the ratepayers already fund. Even the most prestigious law practices grant an initial consultation without charge. Charging for planning advice is “the thin end of the wedge”. Where does it stop? Will we have to pay to see our local councillor or housing officer, as I am sure they would argue that their time is valuable?</p> <p>This proposal should be revisited to comply with Annex B of the letter to Chief Planning Officers (March 31st, 2011) that</p>	<p>Only proposals which do not comply with the development plan will be refused.</p> <p>The Planning Control Manager and Principal planning Officers will monitor advice, which is always made on a “without prejudice” basis, based upon professional opinion. Planning Committee Members may not always agree but no charge will be refunded.</p> <p>The Local Government Act 2003 and specifically Section 93 gives Local Planning Authorities discretionary power to charge for services such as pre-application advice. Where a fee is charged, it must be on a not for profit basis and over the course of each year, the income from charges for such services must not exceed the cost of providing them. Pre-application discussions are seen as a significant and important part of the development management process, and an opportunity to further enhance services to our customers. They can save time and money for developers as a result of early engagement and result in better schemes and a smoother passage through the planning process. The resources needed to give such advice can be significant and that cost is borne by the local authority and ultimately a cost to its citizens. Charging for pre application advice will ensure the resource is used to provide a well managed and constructive process that will add value at all levels and that the beneficiary of that service pays for it.</p> <p>The Local Government Act 2003 and specifically Section 93 gives Local Planning</p>
--	---	---

	local planning authorities should ensure that they do not impose unnecessary burdens on development.	Authorities discretionary power to charge for services such as pre-application advice. What is important to businesses is that they are receiving timely, responsive, constructive and reliable advice. In turn, this can save businesses significant resources by not pursuing schemes which are unacceptable or have to be modified once submitted.
--	--	---

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 It is clear that many authorities charge for pre-application advice and whilst some do not include a charge for householders, the small fee involved is generally a minor proportion of the overall benefit of the proposed development and is made on a not for profit basis and over the course of each year, the income from charges for such services would not exceed the cost of providing them.
- 5.2 Government advice suggests that pre-application engagement is important and charging for that advice is appropriate. What is important to developers (including householders) is that they are receiving timely, responsive, constructive and reliable advice. In turn, this can save applicants significant resources by not pursuing schemes which are unacceptable or have to be modified once submitted. The resources needed to give such advice can be significant and that cost is borne by the local authority and ultimately a cost to its citizens. Charging for pre application advice will ensure the resource is used to provide a well managed and constructive process that will add value at all levels and that the beneficiary of that service pays for it.
- 5.3 It will be necessary to review the scheme when the Government proposals for planning Authorities to set their own fees come into effect later this year. Until that date, it is concluded pre-application charging is introduced in accordance with fee schedule set out at Appendix A from 1st July 2011.

6.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Further process work will need to be undertaken to identify possible efficiencies, whilst maintaining and improving services to the customer by raising additional income, which will enable these services to be funded but given the extent of pre-application advice the Council currently gives out for free, the possibility of charging will assist the Council's revenue position over the medium term. It is anticipated that the recommended charging for pre-application advice will create an additional projected income generation in the region of £10,000-15,000 per annum with charging for Section 106 planning obligations generating around £10,000 per annum.

7.0 COMMUNITY STRATEGY/SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The introduction of pre-application charging will provide clarity for all those involved in the planning process.

8.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

8.1 There may be an increased risk or perception that a planning approval will automatically be forthcoming in respect of a scheme which has been subject of full pre-application discussions. However, it will be made clear to applicants that advice given cannot guarantee success and will not fetter the decision making powers of the Local Planning Authority in respect of the subsequent planning application. There may also be an increased risk of complaints that the advice given was not of an acceptable standard. However, protection against claims can be afforded by the appropriate use of exemption clauses to exclude or restrict liability (subject to the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 and/or Unfair Terms in Customer Contract regulations).

Background Documents

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>
15 th March 2011	Cabinet report

Equality Impact Assessment

There is no evidence from an initial assessment of an adverse impact on equality in relation to the quality target groups.

Appendices

Appendix A Fee Schedule

APPENDIX 1

PLANNING FEE SCHEDULE

	FEE
Site history requests	£30 per hour or part thereof
Advice for Officer time regarding trees/listed buildings/conservation areas	£50 per hour or part thereof
Fee for drafting and negotiating a Unilateral Undertaking	£500
Fee for drafting and checking a S106 Agreement	£750
Planning Obligations Management Fee (for monitoring Obligations)	2% of the value of the community benefit or £500, whichever is the higher
Householder development	£50
Minor development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less than 3 dwellings • all non-residential schemes with a floor space less than 500sqm or sites less than 0.5ha • adverts • change of use of building(s) with a floor space less than 500sqm or sites less than 0.5ha • single wind turbines/telcoms mast with mast height under 17m 	£100 to cover one site visit and one letter; An additional £50 if meeting requested; Hourly rate thereafter
Intermediate development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 to 9 dwellings • All non-residential schemes with a floor space between 500sqm and 1,000sqm or on sites between 0.5ha and 1ha • change of use of building(s) with a floor space between 500sqm and 1,000sqm or sites between 0.5ha and 1ha • other single wind turbines/telecoms mast with mast height over 17m 	£200 to cover one site visit and one letter; An additional £50 if meeting requested; Hourly rate thereafter
Major development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 to 49 dwellings • All non-residential schemes with a floor space between 1,000sqm and 2,000sqm or on sites between 1ha and 2ha • change of use of building(s) with a floor space between 1,000sqm and 2,000sqm or sites between 1ha and 2ha • 2 to 9 wind turbines 	£500 to cover one site visit, one letter and meeting; Hourly rate thereafter
Significant development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 50 dwellings • All non-residential schemes with a floor space over 2,000sqm or on sites over 2ha • change of use of building(s) with a floor space over 2,000sqm or sites over 2ha • more than 10 wind turbines • any scheme requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment 	£1,000 to cover up to two site visits and two meetings; Hourly rate thereafter



ARTICLE NO: 2A

MEMBERS UPDATE 2011/12

**CORPORATE OVERVIEW &
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Article of:	Director of Transformation
Issue 1	June 2011
Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor D. Westley
Contact for further information:	Chris Isherwood (Extn. 5083) E-mail: chris.isherwood@westlancs.gov.uk

SUBJECT: BENCHMARKING THE ICT SERVICE

District Wide Interest

1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE

- 1.1 To inform Members of the findings of the ICT Services benchmarking exercise.
-

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 During 2007 the ICT Service completed an exercise to benchmark the ICT Service using the Society of Information Technology Managers (SOCITM) benchmarking service. The survey looked at the performance, resourcing and cost of the service. Twenty-six local authorities participated in the exercise (including eight district councils).
- 2.2 To ensure that the ICT Service is continuing to provide an efficient and effective service that provides value for money, the benchmarking exercise was undertaken again in September 2010, with the results being published in December 2010. Thirty-one local authorities participated (including eleven district councils) over two surveys during 2010, with the results collated. Whilst, there are a small sample of district councils, we were not able to find out the names of all those participating, but we were able to identify that there was a mixture of sizes of district councils. However, we have given ratios, e.g.

ICT staff to users, as well as absolute numbers, in a number of measures, therefore allowing meaningful conclusions to be drawn from the results.

3.0 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1 The ICT Service strive to get value for money on all purchases, with the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) buying power used extensively in purchasing hardware, software and voice and data networking. Purchasing of goods and services takes place using the Council's tendering and quotation procedures, with ICT Services working closely with the Council's Procurement and Project Manager as well as with other local authorities to achieve economies of scale.

3.2 A selection of the results are listed below. The figures are based on costs in 2009/10. A more detailed breakdown of results is listed in Appendix A.

- a) The ICT Service had the second highest level of service availability with an index rating of 93% against a median of 78%. This rating is calculated based on up-time of a range of systems together with network availability.
- b) The acquisition cost of PCs was £474 (including 3 years maintenance and setup costs by ICT Support) against a median cost of £510.
- c) The acquisition cost of a laptop was £426 (including 3 years maintenance and setup costs) against a median cost of £632. The specification for PCs and laptops varied slightly across councils resulting in minor price anomalies, however, the Council's specification for both PCs and laptops were of a high level.
- d) The cost of supporting a workstation was £119 compared with a median figure of £144.
- e) The ICT technical support staff supported nearly double the number of workstations for a district council, supporting 278 against a median figure of 144.
- f) The annual cost of ownership of a laptop was the lowest of the district councils with a cost of £327 against a median of £446. The annual cost of ownership of a PC was the second lowest of the district councils with a cost of £339 against a median of £401.
- g) The cost of a connection to the voice network was £139 against a median of £134. This figure is likely to be slightly higher due to the number of satellite offices from Derby Street being on the internal switchboard. Further improvements are planned in the next 12 months which should result in a reduction of voice network costs.
- h) The cost of a connection to the data network is £101 against a median of £117. Improvements and savings have been made over the last 12

months and it is expected that further significant savings will be made over the next couple of years.

- i) The survey indicates that high investment in ICT Services is seen as top quartile. The Council's ICT spend is around the median figure with the percentage of the Council's revenue budget spent on ICT at 9.23%, slightly higher than the median figure of 9.18%. The investment in ICT per user and per workstation supported is slightly below the median figure.
- j) The Council scored less well on the measure of ratio of users to printer supported, having the lowest ratio of 2 users to each printer against a median ratio of 8.4:1. A tender exercise was undertaken in 2009 to look at the replacement of existing printer infrastructure with multi-functional device (MFD) printers, thus reducing the number of printers required. The results of the tender were inconclusive at the time and savings difficult to identify due to lack of printing statistics. It is understood that the printer infrastructure be reviewed following the results of the survey.
- k) The Council had the highest ratio of ICT staff to users of the district councils surveyed, with a ratio of 1:50 against a median of 1:38.
- l) The User Satisfaction measure (KPI 1) was included in the survey for authorities who had completed the SOCITM user satisfaction survey in 2009 and 2010. We last completed the user satisfaction survey in 2008. For comparison purposes the Council's 2008 KPI 1 measure of 5.46 (out of 7) was top quartile in the 2008 survey and also in the new survey. The median figure in the new survey was 5.14 (out of 7).

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 The benchmarking of the ICT Service survey suggests that the Council fares well in terms of investment in technology with computer hardware being purchased at low cost. In comparison to other local authorities in the survey, the ICT Service supports more staff and workstations per ICT specialist than the other district councils surveyed.
- 4.2 The overall conclusion of the survey suggests that in comparison to other authorities taking part in the survey, ICT Services provide an efficient and effective high quality service that offers value for money to the Council.

5.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial or resource implications relating to this report.

6.0 COMMUNITY STRATEGY/SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no community strategy or sustainability implications relating to this report.

7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 The evaluation of feedback from the ICT benchmarking exercise will enable ICT Services to assist the Council to deliver on its commitment of ensuring that local services offer the best possible value.

Background Documents

There are no background documents (as defined in Section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act 1972) to this report.

Equality Impact Assessment

There is no evidence from an initial assessment of an adverse impact on equality in relation to the quality target groups.

Appendices

Appendix A Benchmarking the ICT Service results

Appendix A

Benchmarking the ICT Service

Measure	West Lancs	Median	Notes
Service Desk hours per week	50	47	
KPI 15 - weighted index of service availability	93%	78%	
Cost of PC (including procure and install)	£474	£510	The standard specification of PCs vary across authorities, therefore they will be minor price anomalies
Cost of laptop (including procure and install)	£426	£632	The standard specification of laptops vary across authorities, therefore they will be minor price anomalies
KPI 7 - support costs per workstation	£119	£144	
KPI 8 - workstations supported per support specialist	278	144	
KPI 17 - cost per voice connection	£139	£134	
KPI 17 - cost per data connection	£101	£117	
Cost of mobiles as % of total ICT spend	2.3%	2.5%	
KPI 18 - total cost of ownership per PC per annum	£339	£401	
KPI 18 - total cost of ownership per laptop per annum	£327	£446	
Ratio of users per printer supported	2:1	8.4:1	This was the lowest ratio of users to printers in the survey
% revenue budget spent on ICT	9.23%	9.18%	Top quartile indicates high spending
KPI 14 - investment in ICT per user	£2,665	£2,695	As above
ICT spend per workstation supported	£2,874	£3,003	As above
KPI 90 - investment in ICT by head of population	£16	£16	As above
Ratio of users per ICT staff	50:1	38:1	
Cost per ICT staff	£38,235	£40,023	
KPI 1 - User Satisfaction (score out of 7)	5.46 (in 2008)	5.14	