



**ARTICLE NO: 1A**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Borough Solicitor**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor Fowler**

**Contact for further information: Mrs. J.A. Ryan (Extn 5017)  
(E-mail: [jill.ryan@westlancs.gov.uk](mailto:jill.ryan@westlancs.gov.uk))**

---

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

**1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

**1.1** To advise Members of the Minutes in connection with Lancashire County Council's Health Scrutiny Committee held on 28 February 2012, 10 April 2012 and 22 May 2012 at County Hall, Preston for information purposes.

---

**2.0 BACKGROUND AND CURRENT POSITION**

**2.1** To keep Members apprised of developments in relation to Adult Social Care and Health Equalities Overview and Scrutiny in Lancashire.

**3.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

**3.1** There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this update.

**4.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

**4.1** There are no financial and resource implications associated with this item except the Officer time in compiling this update.

---

### **Background Documents**

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

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

The article does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

### **Appendices**

Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee – 28 February 2012

Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee – 10 April 2012

Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee – 22 May 2012

## **Lancashire County Council**

### **Health Scrutiny Committee**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 28th February, 2012 at 10.30 am in Cabinet Room 'C' - County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Maggie Skilling (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

K Bailey	M Otter
Mrs R Blow	N Penney
M Brindle	M Pritchard
J Eaton	M Welsh
C Evans	T Aldridge
A Kay	A Jones

#### **Co-opted members**

Councillor Brenda Ackers, ( Fylde Borough Council Representative) □ Councillor Mrs B Hilton, (Ribble Valley Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Tracy Kennedy, (Burnley Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Tim O'Kane, (Hyndburn Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Julie Robinson, (Wyre Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Rosemary Russell, (Chorley Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Mrs D Stephenson, (West Lancashire Borough Council representative) □ Councillor David Whalley, (Pendle Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Dave Wilson, (Preston City Council representative)

#### **1. Apologies**

County Councillor T Aldridge attended in place of County Councillor M Iqbal  
County Councillor T Jones attended in place of County Councillor P Mullineaux

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of Councillors L McInnes (Rossendale Borough Council), R Newman-Thompson (Lancaster City Council) and M Titherington (South Ribble Borough Council).

#### **Welcome**

The Chair welcomed Councillor Brenda Ackers from Fylde Borough Council who had been permanently appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Cheryl Little.

## **2. Disclosure of Personal / Prejudicial Interests**

None disclosed

## **3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 17 January 2012**

The Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee meeting held on the 17 January 2012 were presented and agreed.

**Resolved:** That the Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee held on the 17 January 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **4. Public Health Funding**

Gill Millward, Health Policy Officer, attended to present the report which explained that subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill, the NHS reforms would see responsibility for certain public health activities transfer from PCTs to upper tier local authorities. These functions would be funded through a new ring fenced specific grant and not from the main local government finance settlement.

Information on current levels of spending on public health functions during 2010/11 had been gathered by all PCTs and had been submitted to the Department of Health in September 2011. This information had been used to calculate 2012/13 baseline spending estimates for the new NHS and public health commissioning architecture, which were published on 7 February 2012.

A needs-based allocation formula for the public health ring-fenced grant was under development and a consultation draft of the formula was expected to be published at the end of February 2012. It was anticipated that local authorities would be notified of their public health ring-fenced grant allocation for 2013/14 in December 2012 alongside the main local government finance settlement.

It was emphasised that the County Council would want to ensure that, in responding to the consultation, the formula selected as the preferred choice would best meet the needs of the people in Lancashire.

Members raised a number of comments and questions and the main points are summarised below:

- There was concern that the estimated spend per person appeared to be reducing at a time of recession and when health and wellbeing was likely to be adversely affected. It was explained that there would be no new money; funds would transfer with the responsibility. Termination of pregnancy and sterilisation services would not be transferring to local authorities, which partly explained the reduced baseline figure.
- Clarification was sought about the comment in the report that "There will be stronger incentives for GPs so that they can play an active role in public health". An explanation would be provided separately by the report author.
- It was suggested that the County Council should not wait to see how much funding would be allocated by the government before deciding how to spend it, but should first decide what needed to be spent and then decide how to finance it.
- A question was raised about what appeared to be an excessively long time between the start of the consultation about the funding formula at the end of February, and notification of the grant allocation in December. It was explained that there would be a standard three month consultation, there were complications around the current PCT footprint and the local authority footprint, and also that the time frame had been set to fit with the local authority budget allocation and planning process.
- The Committee was assured that much planning work was already ongoing and it was recognised that this was a 'once in a generation' opportunity to address public health issues differently; the point was made that much of what the County Council delivered already contributed to public health.
- Currently some 70% of overall health funding went to the hospitals and 30% to public health; it was suggested that these figures needed to be turned around.
- Regarding the transfer of staff currently employed by the PCTs, it was explained that some would transfer to Public Health England and others, who work in public health departments would transfer to the local authority under TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment)) arrangements.
- It was suggested that currently the main issue for this Committee and indeed for all elected members was a need to understand:
  - the County Council's responsibilities;
  - the budget implications;
  - what it wanted to deliver (rather than deciding this after funding had been allocated); and
  - the role of elected members.
- The Committee sought assurance that there would be opportunities for member input into the process and asked that further information be provided about this.
- Members were reminded that as part of the series of events to support elected members and to help them understand the many changes to health and social care resulting from the health reforms the County Council would be hosting a full day conference on Monday 12 March: Developing a Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lancashire.
- The Chair suggested that a task group be established to look at these issues in more detail and to consider the County Council's priorities regarding public health.

**Resolved:** That:

- i. The report be received;
- ii. Comments made by the Health Scrutiny Committee be noted; and
- iii. A task group be established to consider the County Council's priorities regarding public health

## **5. University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust**

The Chair explained that Mr Tony Halsall, now former Chief Executive of University Hospitals Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust had been invited to attend this Committee meeting to enable members to raise matters of concern with him, in particular about services provided to Lancashire residents. Unfortunately he had been unable to attend and was therefore invited to the Steering Group on 21 February instead. Neither he nor the two clinical directors who had been expected to accompany him attended the meeting. Consequently it had been intended to arrange an extraordinary meeting of the Health Scrutiny to accommodate Mr Halsall. However, Mr Halsall resigned from his position as Chief Executive on 24 February and the Chair had since spoken with the interim Chair of UHMBT, Sir David Henshaw. Sir David was keen to engage with the Committee and keep members informed of action being taken to improve matters at the Trust. It was expected that he would attend the next meeting of the Health Scrutiny Committee on 10 April.

Members suggested that it would be helpful for the Medical Director and the Director of Nursing to attend also and they hoped that by 10 April there would be an interim action plan including target dates in place.

There had been some concern about the adequacy of the whistle blowing policy and comparison was made to arrangements within the Police Authority whereby rank and file staff have a serious platform from which to express their views.

**Resolved:** That the report be noted and that Sir David Henshaw be invited to the next meeting on 10 April together with the Medical Director and the Director of Nursing.

## **6. Report of the Health Scrutiny Committee Steering Group**

On 10 January the Steering Group had met with scrutiny members from Pendle Council to discuss issues identified during their review into the welfare of elderly people in care homes. A summary of the meeting was attached at Appendix A to

the report now presented. The follow up meeting to discuss actions had been deferred from 21 February to 13 March.

On 31 January the Steering Group had met with officers from the North West Air Ambulance. This meeting had been arranged at the request of County Councillor Malcolm Pritchard. A summary of the meeting was attached at Appendix B to the report now presented. Both members and officers from the NWAA had found the meeting interesting and useful and there had been an opportunity for members to offer advice about how the NWAA might access future funding. It was intended to invite the Ambulance Service to a future meeting of the Steering Group at which funding for the NWAA could also be discussed. Competing priorities for the agenda for the main Health Scrutiny Committee meant it unlikely that there would be an opportunity to have the NWAA to the main committee in the near future, however they had already indicated that they would be happy to make a presentation to members before or after a committee meeting should they wish to receive one.

Councillor David Whalley of Pendle Borough Council reported that a Motion had recently been passed by Pendle Borough Council about a previous decision by the board of the NHS East Lancashire Primary Trust that a capital reserve of over £10 million would be used for providing new health centres in Colne and Great Harwood and a community hospital in Clitheroe.

The board of the ELPCT was no longer functioning following the inclusion of the PCT in the temporary NHS Lancashire cluster of PCTs and the North West Strategic Health Authority had been incorporated into a new temporary North of England SHA. Assurances were sought that that this capital reserve would be used for the purposes intended by the ELPCT. The Scrutiny Officer agreed to research the history to this situation and include an item on the agenda for the Steering Group meeting on 13 March, which Councillor Whalley was already due to attend.

**Resolved:** That the report of the Steering Group be received.

## **7. Recent and Forthcoming Decisions**

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Forward Plan which briefly set out matters likely to be subject to Key Decisions over the next four month period. The Forward Plan was available on the County Council's Democratic Information System website at:

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/meetings/forwardPlanOfKeyDecisions.asp>

The report also provided information about decisions recently made by Cabinet Members in areas relevant to the remit of the Committee, in order that this could inform possible future areas of work.

**Resolved:** That the report be received.

## **8. Urgent Business**

No urgent business was reported.

## **9. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 10 April 2012 at 10.30am at County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston



## Lancashire County Council

### Health Scrutiny Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 10th April, 2012 at 10.30 am in Cabinet Room 'C' - County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Maggie Skilling (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

K Bailey	A Kay
Mrs R Blow	P Mullineaux
M Brindle	M Otter
C Crompton	N Penney
J Eaton	M Welsh
C Evans	

#### **Co-opted members**

Councillor Bridget Hilton, (Ribble Valley Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Liz McInnes, (Rossendale Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Richard Newman-Thompson, (Lancaster City Council representative) □ Councillor Julie Robinson, (Wyre Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Rosemary Russell, (Chorley Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Mrs D Stephenson, (West Lancashire Borough Council representative) □ Councillor M J Titherington, (South Ribble Borough Council representative) □ Councillor Dave Wilson, (Preston City Council representative)

#### **10. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of County Councillor M Pritchard and Councillors B Ackers (Fylde BC), T Kennedy (Burnley BC), T O'Kane (Hyndburn BC) and D Whalley (Pendle BC).

#### **11. Disclosure of Personal / Prejudicial Interests**

County Councillor N Penney disclosed a personal, non-prejudicial interest in Item 4 (University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust) on the grounds that she uses the services that the Trust provides. Councillor R Newman-Thompson also disclosed a personal, non-prejudicial interest in Item 4 on the grounds that a family member uses the services that the Trust provides.

## **12. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 28 February 2012**

The minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee meeting held on the 28 February 2012 were presented and agreed.

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee held on the 28 February 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **13. University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust**

The Chair welcomed senior officers from University Hospitals Morecambe Bay Foundation Trust:

- Sir David Henshaw, newly appointed Interim Chair of the Board
- Jackie Holt, Director of Nursing and Modernisation
- Eric Morton, Interim Chief Executive
- George Nasmyth, Interim Medical Director
- Juliet Walters, Chief Operating Officer

She also welcomed officers from the Directorate for Children and Young People:

- Ann Pennell, Director of Targeted and Assessment Services
- Karen Ennis, Head of Integrated Health Services

The report explained that the Steering Group of the Health Scrutiny Committee had arranged to meet the now former Chief Executive of University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust (UHMBT) on 21 February to discuss serious concerns about the performance of the Trust. The Steering Group had intended to report back to the Committee at its meeting on 28 February. Unfortunately the Steering Group meeting had not gone ahead because the Chief Executive and other colleagues did not attend. The then Chief Executive resigned his position from UHMBT on 24 February. The Committee had therefore been unable to discuss the item on 28 February and deferred it to this meeting on 10 April.

The report produced for Committee on 28 February included a comprehensive set of additional documentation for background information and the report and its appendices can be viewed via the link below:

<http://council.lancashire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=182&MId=573&Ver=4>

The main areas of concern to the Committee were:

- Ambulance waiting times at Royal Lancaster Infirmary
- Follow up appointments for out-patients
- Storage of and access to medical records

- Changes to maternity services

Since 28 February there had been a number of significant developments at the Trust including:

- Work on the development of a comprehensive recovery plan; and
- The appointment of a number of (some interim) senior officers.

At the Chair's invitation, Sir David Henshaw, Interim Chair of the Board, briefly set the current situation in context and summarised what actions had been taken and/or were planned to improve services at UHMBT. He explained that there had been a lack of connectivity between managers and clinical leaders and one of the key priorities now was to bring clinical leaders back into the heart of decision making. The Trust had also been absorbed by its mission to become a Foundation Trust and had lost its vision and strategy. It operated in a very challenging environment with a mix of rural and urban areas, and difficult geography. There were also issues around the modernisation of services; the Trust had not kept up with other parts of the country.

The Board would be having monthly meetings with Monitor (the independent regulator of NHS foundation trusts) about progress and had to agree with Monitor a recovery plan, and the financing of that plan by end of May 2012.

Sir David acknowledged that funding was a big challenge and that some difficult decisions would have to be made, but there was a clear intention to make those decisions in an open and transparent way that involved all stakeholders.

He emphasised that despite the problems at the Trust, every day thousands of people were receiving a high quality service and it was important to congratulate the staff who delivered that service. He had no doubt that the Trust would recover; this might mean that it would work with other foundation trusts to help deliver service provision together, for example vascular services, and back office services.

Members raised a number of questions and comments, the main points are summarised below:

- In order to deal with the backlog of 19,000 out-patient appointments, 1,200 extra clinics had been held and the majority of patients had now been seen. There were still 300 outstanding, some of which were due to patient availability. The backlog was expected to be fully cleared within the next few weeks.
- Members felt strongly that there should be a 'failsafe' in the appointments system to ensure that people, some with potentially serious health problems, did not fall through the net.
- It was considered by the Trust important to identify the cause of the problems that existed and investigations and reviews were ongoing.

- Some training and development would be required and the Trust was looking at research and development, and training provision with partners in a way that had not been done previously.
- There was also a belief that some of the Trust's problems would not have occurred had clinicians been more involved, as they would now be, going forward. The clinicians would be supported by managers.
- Governors also would be more involved than previously.
- It was acknowledged that issues flagged up by staff had not always been responded to and a culture which encouraged suggestions and comments from staff would need to be developed. It was important to empower staff to come forward.
- There was to be a reminder in the May payslips for Trust staff to report issues and 'near misses' and that all staff had a responsibility to preside over good quality care. It was suggested that encouraging groups of staff to come forward, rather than individuals, could sometimes elicit more information.
- It was recognised that there were deep cultural challenges, however the senior management team now in place, brought with it significant experience of bringing about cultural change. Whilst some of the senior managers were temporary appointments, the Committee was assured that good foundations would be laid for the new permanent team to build on.
- Meetings held with staff had already been very encouraging and had introduced a new dynamic. Poor HR decisions previously taken had been reversed and a communication strategy put in place to ensure that staff were properly informed in a timely way.
- There was a need to work closely with GPs and clinical commissioning groups, including nurses and other health professionals to shape service provision for the future.
- The Committee was assured that the Trust was committed to working with all stakeholders including the Health Scrutiny Committee. There would likely be occasions when members would take a different view from the Trust, but there would be opportunities for open and transparent debate.
- The state of patient records at Royal Lancaster Infirmary (RLI) was a particular concern. Members were informed that more storage space had now been provided and that the Trust was looking to digitise records in the next 12-18 months, a system onto which records would be loaded over time. Members were keen to visit the RLI site and see for themselves the improvements that had been made.
- Regarding ambulance turnaround times, the Committee had been most concerned about the high volume of ambulances that took longer than 30 minutes to turnaround at RLI. The Trust had requested a meeting with the Ambulance Service. 'Bottlenecks' were often the cause of delays and a large project to review the emergency pathway was already underway. £1.5m had been set aside to improve the emergency department and temporary additional capacity had been put in place at the RLI site. The Committee was assured that excessive waiting times were regarded as unacceptable and a very important issue. Patient flow had already begun to improve resulting in a significant improvement in handover times and patient feedback.

- The Committee was informed that the Trust were looking at small capital works to improve the efficacy of sites and some decisions had already been taken about how some sites could be reconfigured. Ideas had been invited from staff about how physical spaces could be improved to increase efficiency and effectiveness.
- Regarding the Committee's concerns about Maternity Services and the apparent 'postcode lottery' that existed, it was reported that there had been significant investment in 11 additional midwives, seven of whom were very experienced. They would rotate around all three sites in the Trust area. Clinical guidelines for the three sites had been standardised and would be launched in the very near future.
- In response to a question whether the Trust's governors had been sufficiently challenging, Sir David said that governors were now becoming more involved and he assured the Committee that they were presenting high quality challenges.
- There was some concern about arrangements in place for the transfer of patients from hospital to home in partnership with Age UK, which appeared to be causing some 'bed blocking'. The Trust was asked to look at this issue.
- There was concern that vulnerable people should be identified and 'flagged' in a sensitive way to ensure that they received appropriate care. Royal Blackburn Hospital was cited as a good example of where effective arrangements were in place.
- Unsatisfactory waiting arrangements at the fracture clinic at RLI were also raised as a matter requiring attention by the Trust.
- A recent inspection by Ofsted regarding safeguarding and looked after children's services in Lancashire had indicated one of the areas for immediate improvement related directly to services provided by UHMBT. A subsequent report from the Care Quality Commission was due to be published also. Safeguarding was considered by members to be a most important issue which would be addressed in detail at the Committee's next meeting on 22 May. In the meantime officers from both UHMBT and the county council informed the Committee that actions had already been taken to address safeguarding issues.
- A health action plan had been developed and was being monitored via a multi agency continuous improvement group which was chaired by NHS Lancashire and action had already been taken to address the immediate areas for action identified in the Ofsted report. An extract from the Ofsted report had been circulated to members and is appended to these minutes.

**Resolved:** That:

- i. A copy of UHMBT's Recovery Plan be provided to the Health Scrutiny Committee as soon as possible
- ii. Officers from UHMBT report back to the Committee at appropriate intervals to update and evidence progress;

- iii. Members of the Committee be invited to see the new arrangements at Royal Lancaster Infirmary for the storage of medical records: and
- iv. Issues relating to safeguarding arrangements for children and young people be considered in detail at the Committee's meeting on 22 May 2012.

#### **14. Report of the Health Scrutiny Committee Steering Group**

On 21 February the Steering Group had been due to meet with Tony Halsall, then Chief Executive of University Hospitals Morecambe Bay Trust and colleagues from UHMBT. However no-one attended from the Trust and the meeting did not go ahead.

On 13 March the Steering Group had met for a second time with councillors from Pendle Borough Council to further discuss the actions that had been identified following their previous meeting with the Steering Group on 10 January. The actions were in response to their scrutiny review they had recently undertaken on the "Welfare of Elderly People in Care Homes". A summary of the meeting was attached at Appendix A to the report now presented.

**Resolved:** That the report of the Steering Group be received.

#### **15. Recent and Forthcoming Decisions**

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Forward Plan which briefly set out matters likely to be subject to Key Decisions over the next four month period. The Forward Plan was available on the County Council's Democratic Information System website at:

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/meetings/forwardPlanOfKeyDecisions.asp>

The report also provided information about decisions recently made by Cabinet Members in areas relevant to the remit of the Committee, in order that this could inform possible future areas of work.

**Resolved:** That the report be received.

#### **16. Urgent Business**

No urgent business was reported.

### **17. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 22 May 2012 at 10.30am at County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston





## **Lancashire County Council**

### **Health Scrutiny Committee**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 22 May 2012 at 10.30 am in Cabinet Room 'C', County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Maggie Skilling (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

K Bailey	P Mullineaux
Mrs R Blow	M Otter
M Brindle	N Penney
J Eaton	M Pritchard
C Evans	M Welsh
A Kay	

#### **Co-opted members**

Councillor Bridget Hilton, (Ribble Valley Borough Council representative)  
Councillor Liz McInnes, (Rossendale Borough Council representative)  
Councillor Richard Newman-Thompson, (Lancaster City Council representative)  
Councillor Tim O'Kane, (Hyndburn Borough Council representative)  
Councillor Mrs D Stephenson, (West Lancashire Borough Council representative)  
Councillor M J Titherington, (South Ribble Borough Council representative)  
Councillor Dave Wilson, (Preston City Council representative)

#### **18. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of Councillors B Ackers (Fylde BC), J Robinson (Wyre BC) and D Whalley (Pendle BC).

It was reported that Councillor T Kennedy of Burnley BC was no longer a member of the Committee and it was requested that the thanks of the Committee be placed on record for her contribution to its work over the past year.

## **19. Disclosure of Personal / Prejudicial Interests**

County Councillor Michael Welsh disclosed a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 4 (Inspection of Safeguarding and Looked After Children's Services) on the grounds that he was a Governor of Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust.

## **20. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 10 April 2012**

The minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee meeting held on the 10 April 2012 were presented and agreed.

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee held on the 10 April 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **21. Inspection of Safeguarding and Looked After Children's Services**

The Chair welcomed Jim Gardner, Medical Director NHS Lancashire, Jane Carwardine, Designated Nurse East Lancashire, and Helen Denton, Executive Director of the Directorate for Children and Young People.

The report explained that at the last meeting of the Health Scrutiny Committee on 10 April 2012, officers from University Hospitals Morecambe Bay Foundation Trust (UHMBT) had attended to discuss the development and implementation of their recovery plan. Part of that discussion had included an aspect relating to the findings of a recent Ofsted report into Safeguarding and Looked After Children's services in Lancashire. Members were informed that an Action Plan had been developed and was being monitored via a multi agency continuous improvement group which was chaired by NHS Lancashire. However, due to the scope and complexity of safeguarding issues, and the fact that services are provided by a range of partners, including both the NHS and Lancashire County Council, it was agreed that this Health Scrutiny Committee meeting would look at the outcome of the Ofsted report in greater detail.

In terms of children's social care services all had been judged in the report as performing well, with some areas judged as excellent.

The Ofsted inspection was conducted jointly with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) who had produced a separate report. The CQC report was not yet published; the inspection had been complicated owing to the inspection including Cumbria and Blackburn with Darwen. The final draft of the CQC report, which took account of comments previously fed back to them, had only been received the day prior to this meeting.

The Action Plan referred to above was at Appendix B to the report now presented. It was noted that the Action Plan was continually being updated.

It had been developed from evaluations contained within the whole Ofsted report and not just from its main recommendations. It also captured recommendations by the CQC contained in its earlier draft report.

Jim Gardner explained that the inspection had taken place during a complex re-organisation to bring five Primary Care Trusts together to form the NHS Lancashire cluster and at a time when clinical commissioning groups and support services were being established. He pointed out however that the re-organisation had enabled considerable skill mixing and some opportunities to re-design medical aspects of safeguarding services. There were some proposals that had yet to be worked through with the clinical commissioning groups and it was considered probable at this stage that one CCG would be invited to host safeguarding services. It was important to acknowledge also that UHMBT had, at the time of the inspection and since October 2011, been subject to special 'Gold Command' arrangements as a result of serious concerns about the quality of services it was providing. (The role of Gold Command was to support the Trust to maintain patient safety and to build a sustainable base for safe and sound services going forward, pending further action by the regulators).

The areas for immediate improvement contained within the Ofsted report related to UHMBT:

- Urgently and comprehensively review the governance and safeguarding arrangements for children and young people within UHMBT and Royal Lancaster Infirmary to ensure children are effectively safeguarded.
- Urgently and comprehensively review the safeguarding arrangements across out of hours, walk-in and accident and emergency health services across Lancashire to ensure children are effectively safeguarded.

On receipt of the recommendations a committee had been established immediately to produce and begin delivering the Action Plan. It was chaired by Gary Hardman, Director NHS North Lancashire and Executive Lead for Safeguarding.

Councillors were invited to ask questions and raise any comments in relation to the report, a summary of which is provided below:

- It was felt important to recognise that there were many good points in the Ofsted report and to acknowledge that some elements of the assessment were scored as 'outstanding', including "ambition and prioritisation".
- It was noted that the Action Plan involved a number of partners and many different people were named as lead officers against the actions listed. It was considered important for Gary Hardman, Executive Lead for Safeguarding, to be seen as overall lead and for him to be able to reassure the Committee in future that progress was being made and that the Plan matched the challenges faced in terms of ability to deliver improvements.

- It also needed to be clear against every action who was responsible, how improvement was going to be achieved and what the reporting lines were.
- In terms of governance Helen Denton confirmed that she was the accountable officer for LCC safeguarding services, reporting to the Cabinet Member for Children and Schools and the Chief Executive, and that Janet Soo Chung, Chief Executive of NHS Lancashire, was the accountable officer with overarching responsibility for the health aspects.
- It was reiterated that a high level multi agency continuous improvement group, chaired by Gary Hardman was monitoring and reporting progress at regular intervals. The Action Plan had been sent regularly to the NHS Lancashire Board and also to the non-executive directors.
- It was explained that in terms of a budget for the Action Plan not all of the actions had cost implications, however there were multiple providers who would have to consider and address their own cost issues.
- The Committee was assured, however, that the safeguarding team within NHS Lancashire responsible for commissioning had an identified budget, which would be increased if necessary; safeguarding was considered to be a priority. The point was made that whilst NHS Lancashire could set and audit standards within the provider arm of the organisation there was no role for them to "micro-manage" providers.
- It was considered by members essential for the NHS to have enough staff in the right places with appropriate training.
- It was suggested that GPs were not always adequately trained in child protection and safeguarding matters. In response, it was explained that the eight CCGs come together in a CCG Chair's Network allowing such issues to be discussed.
- The local office of the National Commissioning Board would have responsibility for overseeing the authorisation and performance management of the CCGs and would manage the contracts. Every general practice had a statutory obligation in its contract to address safeguarding and the local office of the National Commissioning Board, working in partnership with CCGs, would ensure safeguarding responsibilities were addressed.
- It was considered sensible for the health aspects of safeguarding to rest with an NHS body and the recommendation at this stage was that one CCG would be invited to host safeguarding services. Further information about which CCG this would be and the name of the lead practitioner was expected to be known in the next 6-8 weeks.
- It was noted that the Audit Tool (Appendix B1 to the report), designed to give assurances to Lancashire Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) and NHS Lancashire that A&E departments, Out of Hours providers and walk-in centres across Lancashire effectively safeguarded children, indicated that all A&E departments should have a specialist paediatric nurse present at all times. Members were assured that this principle should apply to urgent care centres also depending on how they were aligned to the A&E department.
- The Action Plan referred to the establishment of a multi-agency steering group which would monitor the progress of governance and safeguarding

arrangements at UHMBT. The first on-site visits were expected to be made before the end of June. The Committee was informed that the hospitals had been very co-operative and supportive and keen to receive external scrutiny.

- The Chairs of both the Lancashire and Cumbria Children's Safeguarding Board, and the Directors for Children's Services in both authorities had together written to UHMBT when concerns about its services first emerged. They had asked to visit to see how safeguarding in the health setting fitted with other aspects of safeguarding. Whilst the offer had initially had not been taken up, the recently appointed board at UHMBT had been receptive to the request.
- Regarding the communication of information to stakeholders, it was confirmed that 'Gold Command' arrangements were still operating at UHMBT and would continue until the Board felt it was ready to end; open and honest communication with the public was a standing item on the agenda.
- Regarding systems for capturing data of safeguarding training, it was explained that each NHS contract would include a responsibility to report levels of training to the LSCB. It was expected that all organisations would be 'on board' by the end of the year.
- The Committee was assured that Lancashire Constabulary was further ahead than any other constabulary regarding its safeguarding work. The Service had made efficiencies but had strengthened its work on child protection.
- 'Care Connect', a central point of contact for social care enquiries, enabled checks to be made with agencies such as the police, health and education to quickly provide a comprehensive picture of a potentially vulnerable child and its family.
- It was considered important for children to receive education about their own vulnerabilities.
- Inadequate record keeping arrangements at Royal Lancaster Infirmary had been highlighted as a concern previously and members were still awaiting reassurance and a visit to RLI to see for themselves that matters had improved.
- The Committee acknowledged that UHMBT was currently undergoing significant review and monitoring and that this together with ongoing Health Service reforms were both contributing to the difficulties facing the Lancashire NHS Board.
- It was suggested that Gary Hardman, Director NHS North Lancashire and Executive Lead for Safeguarding, be invited to attend the Committee in three months time with an updated Action Plan to include progress and a named lead against each item.

**Resolved:** That Gary Hardman, Director NHS North Lancashire and Executive Lead for Safeguarding, be invited to attend the Health Scrutiny Committee in three months time to present a further update of the Action Plan including progress and a named lead against each item.

## **22. Report of the Health Scrutiny Committee Steering Group**

On 3 April the Steering Group had met to discuss work planning and a project to develop public engagement with the Committee. A summary of the meeting was presented at Appendix A to the report.

On 24 April the Steering Group had met to discuss their feedback following the Telemedicine Service visit to Airedale Hospital and Cravenside Home for the Elderly. A summary of the meeting was presented at Appendix B to the report.

**Resolved:** That the report of the Steering Group be received.

## **23. Recent and Forthcoming Decisions**

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Forward Plan which briefly set out matters likely to be subject to Key Decisions over the next four month period. The Forward Plan was available on the County Council's Democratic Information System website at:

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/meetings/forwardPlanOfKeyDecisions.asp>

The report also provided information about decisions recently made by Cabinet Members in areas relevant to the remit of the Committee, in order that this could inform possible future areas of work.

**Resolved:** That the report be received.

## **24. Urgent Business**

No urgent business was reported.

## **25. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 3 July 2012 at 10.30am at County Hall, Preston.



**ARTICLE NO: 1B**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of:** Borough Solicitor

**Relevant Managing Director:** Managing Director (People and Places)

**Relevant Portfolio Holder:** Councillor I. Grant

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

---

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP – THEMATIC GROUPS**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

**1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

1.1 To present to Members the notes/minutes of meetings of various LSP Thematic groups. I attach the following minutes of Community Cohesion Thematic Group held 23 September 2011 and Integrated Transport Thematic Group held 9 November 2011.

---

---

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 To apprise Members of developments in relation to the Local Strategic Partnership's Thematic Groups.

**3.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

3.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. The article has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

**4.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no significant financial or resource implications arising from this article.

## **5.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

5.1 This item is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this report.

---

---

### **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**

The Article does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

### **Appendices**

1. Minutes of Community Cohesion Thematic Group held on 23 September 2011.
2. Minutes of Integrated Transport Thematic Group held on 9 November 2011.



Community Cohesion Thematic Group Meeting

2.00 pm, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2011, Council Chambers, WLBC

Present:

Cllr Iain Ashcroft	Chair
Cllr Bob Pendleton	WLBC
Cllr John Mee	WLBC
Jill Bradley	WL CVS
Cerys Smye-Rumsby	WL CVS
Louise Cropper	Help Direct
David Tilleray	WLBC
Jonathon Mitchell	WLBC
Shaun Walsh	WLBC
Jeanette Hickey	Lancashire Constabulary
Puala Jones	West Lancashire Disability Support
Phyllis Roberts	Young People's Service
Claire Pollard	Ashurst Residents Association

**1. Apologies**

Gina Moran – West Lancashire College

**2. Individual Introductions**

Those at the meeting briefly introduced themselves

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.

**4. Matters Arising**

Item 4 – It was noted that the provision of information about 2<sup>nd</sup> homes funding will be included in the strategy that is produced

BP – There is a need to gain an understanding of where the LSP underspends are.

**ACTION – DT indicated that there is a report due to go to the next LSP Executive on the 7<sup>th</sup> October and following this, the Chair will feed back to this meeting.**

Item 4 – Councillor Grant was unable to attend this meeting but has indicated that he will attend the next meeting.

Item 6 – The group was asked to note that David Bellamy attended the opening of the allotments in Hesketh Bank.

Item 8 – PJ to feed back to next meeting on the developments with “Text Live”.

Item 9 – LCC couldn’t provide a representative to talk about social transport at this meeting, so this will be covered at the next meeting.

## **5. Update on CCTV from the Community Safety Partnership**

DT gave an update on CCTV project in West Lancashire. The LSP has provided funding to upgrade CCTV across the Borough. There are currently 2 systems – fibre optic and microwave technology and some of the kit is now around 10 years old, so this is an opportune time to replace the system. It is also hoped that there will be some money left to install a few new cameras (around 6). At the same time the current monitoring suite will be moved from Westec House, as part of the redevelopment of the site, to a new location. PPQs have been sent out to 27 contractors that may be interested in the contract and this list will then be reduced to around 10 for the tendering process. The deadline for submission is the 21<sup>st</sup> November and it is envisaged that the contract will be agreed after Christmas. Continuity of CCTV coverage will take place whilst the upgrade is being progressed.

IA – Will the placing of any new cameras be based upon police intelligence?

DT – Yes, consideration will be given to crime hotspots and advice will be taken. The new monitoring suite will allow greater coverage and may even include private businesses.

BP – Has there been any consultation with business estates?

DT – Not as yet because the inclusion of these areas is just a possibility for the future at the moment. The priority for this funding is to replace the existing system.

BP – Has any consideration been given to the use of a mobile CCTV unit?

DT – This was something that was used around 8 years ago, however, it deteriorated with age and became damaged and is now obsolete. Mobile units are good in theory but they are not widely used due to the vandalism risk.

JH – Police use an ANPR system in West Lancashire and also have access to a mobile CCTV unit, which they use from time to time.

BP – Perhaps there could be a review of the placing of CCTV cameras on the main routes in and out of industrial estates?

DT – It all comes down to cost, if there was more then this could be a strategic approach.

BP – Perhaps this is something that could be considered through the LDF planning process.

## **6. Joint Venture Capital**

SW updated the group on the development of the JVC – One Connect Ltd, which is being introduced to deliver savings and safeguard jobs. It goes live on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October with ICT and revenue and benefits and will eventually be located in Greetby Buildings. The refurbishment isn’t quite complete so, in the meantime, staff will continue to work from the Derby Street office. It is envisaged that savings of around 15% will be realised against the current cost for services. This is the biggest contract

that WLBC have and SW will be responsible for contract delivery and overseeing business improvements.

BP – Some areas of the contract aren't clear and will need to be closely monitored.

SW – Agrees that the contract does contain an element of risk and work will be undertaken to minimise the risks and continually monitor them. Staff will be protected and seconded to OCL, meaning that the jobs will be retained within West Lancashire. In the longer term, there is no guarantee that the service will continue from Greetby Buildings, however, the company has invested circa £1m which they will want to protect.

## **7. Self Financing Housing**

JM gave an overview of self financing housing – each year a subsidy is provided by central government through the Housing Revenue Account, this is redistributed from rental income. A proportion of the rental receipt is sent to central government and redistributed, however, the Localism Bill allows councils to opt out of this, to take on debt and manage it.

Next steps – negotiations have started with CLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) and they have been invited to visit West Lancashire. Stock and asset management analysis is taking place to develop a variety of business models. There is a need to be aware of the implications of taking on debt in the General Revenue Account.

Self financing would allow local authorities to plan for their long term future and create a platform for regeneration of certain areas. It would also allow access to private finance – PFI.

BP – There could be an opportunity to develop a social enterprise, this has happened in Rochdale. The funding will need to be used strategically and not purely focussed on refurbishments etc.

JM – Consideration will be given to the re-investment of any surplus and processes for this decision making. Asset mapping is crucial to inform this process.

CP – Consultation with tenants on this issue is crucial

BP – Agreed, that it is important to consult with tenants on the debt management model.

## **8. Action Plan**

- **Action No. 2 – Community Food Growing**

Feedback will be provided on the Glenburn project when known. Hesketh Bank allotments were opened by David Bellamy and 64 plots have now been taken up.

- **Action No. 3 – Timebanks**

Help Direct invested money in Tanhouse and Digmoor through Oaks Church but the timebank covers the whole of Skelmersdale. The scheme has been well received and to date 67 people have joined and 845 hours have been utilised on various activities e.g. baking, baby sitting, ironing etc.

CSR – Intergenerational work has started with the Portugese community, as there has been a request for ‘stand-in grandparents’ for children whose own grandparents are abroad.

ASK would like to come to a future meeting of this group to tell members what they are involved in.

- **Action No. 4 – LGBT**

There was no update available for this meeting.

- **Action No. 5 – Disabilities**

JH gave an overview of ASBRAC (Anti-Social Behaviour Risk Assessment Conferences), which are a similar model to the DV MARAC’s. They have been created following the introduction of ASB minimum standards and the need to assess and manage the most vulnerable victims of ASB. They are a very useful format for managing ASB and vulnerable victims. JH wants to use this model to include all minority groups.

- **Action No. 6 – Tensions Monitoring**

JH provided an update on the local impact of the recent national disorder. Asda in Skelmersdale closed early as disorder was expected. A petrol bomb was thrown at police and forensics were recovered and there were a number of other small incidents – windows smashed, small fires lit etc. Social networking was monitored and visits took place to give warnings about riot incitement. Throughout this period meetings with key contacts took place. To date three people have been arrested for disturbances at the Concourse and three regarding their involvement in disturbances at Asda, one is still being sought. Some of these people gave themselves up after a poster campaign showing the faces of those who the police wanted to talk to. Also 76 officers from Lancashire were sent to assist the Met during the riots.

The company Cuadrilla have started investigative drilling in Hesketh Bank which could lead to the site being used for fracking – this is a method used to extract natural gas from shale. It can cause environmental issues and a number of protesters (inc. Friends of the Earth) held a weekend of events. There was a police operation to ensure no disorder took place but there were no issues.

DT – Senior police officers will be meeting with executives from the company to find out what happens next.

- **Action No. 7 – People and Communities**

The People and Communities page on the LSP website is currently being updated to reflect the fact that People and Communities is now an event based sub-group of Community Cohesion.

There is a schedule of training courses being held between September 2011 and June 2012. Details can be found on the CVS website – [www.wlcvvs.org](http://www.wlcvvs.org). Anyone interested in attending should contact Greg Swift at West Lancs CVS on 01695 733737.

## 9. Exchange of Information

DT – Preparation is underway for a “Freedom of West Lancashire Parade” through Ormskirk on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October. Soldiers from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Battalion, based at Weeton Barracks near Preston, will march through the town centre ahead of the special service at Ormskirk Parish Church. Officers from West Lancs Borough Council are working with the police to review security arrangements for the day.

BP – There has been another successful beat sweep with over 100 children involved, 6 skips were filled in 3 hours. From the 24<sup>th</sup> October in the run up to bonfire night, more beat sweeps are planned as part of the “Bright Sparx” initiative. It was first launched last year to combat anti social behaviour, promote fire prevention messages and reduce fire callouts.

PJ – The development of a health passport is underway with the NHS, and ways of making it available electronically are being reviewed so that it can go on the internet. A Small Sparks grant has been applied for, for a keep fit DVD for wheelchair users and it is hoped that a library can be set up so it can be borrowed. The group has been invited to join with GPs next week to launch their toolkit. West Lancs Young Carers will come under the umbrella of Barnados from the 30<sup>th</sup> September.

#### **10.A.O.B.**

There were no items under A.O.B.

#### **11. Proposed Items for Next meeting**

The group agreed on the following agenda items for the next meeting (in addition to the standard agenda items):

- Social transport - LCC
- Update on the LEP – Cllr Grant

#### **12. Dates for Future Meetings**

It was agreed that the next meeting will be held after Christmas and group members would be notified of the date.



Integrated Transport Thematic Group Meeting

Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2011, 2pm, Cabinet Room 1

Attendance

Chair: Cllr Martin Forshaw (WLBC), Denise Nowell (LCC), Roger Bell (OPSTA), , Dominic Carr (WLBC), Tim Gornall (LCC), Jacqueline Day (LCC), Julia Dickinson Edge Hill University, Jill Bradley CVS

1. Apologies

Tony Moreton (LCC), Andrew Varley (LCC), Geoff Wilding (Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust), , Francis Carragher (Edge Hill),, Richard Watts (LCC),, Ian Gill (WLBC), Gillian Whitfield (WLBC), Martin Trengove (CVS), Steve Coveney (CLPCT)

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Minutes of the previous meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> January 2011 were agreed as an accurate record

3. Matters Arising

- Skelmersdale rail link business case development.

Dominic Carr gave an update and explained that following on from the last meeting officers were still waiting on a final version of the report being published. Officers have seen a draft copy of the document and are waiting for the document to be published. .

Merseytravel have approached Network Rail to review the results to examine any differences between the study and Network Rail's Merseyside RUS Officers have been and will continue to press Merseytravel to get the results of this work. However, as Network Rail are conducting this work for Merseytravel free of charge and have their own workloads they have not given a definite deadline for when they expect the work to be completed.

When this additional piece of work has been completed the report will be published and reported back to Members.

**Action- When the Feasibility Study has been published a report be taken to Members explaining the results of the study**

4. Community Rail Designation of the Preston to Ormskirk Line

Dominic Carr and Roger Bell explained that, following the hard work of the Community Rail Partnership, the Ormskirk to Preston rail line has now been designated as a Community Rail line. They further explained that the Community Rail Partnership is currently working hard to finalise an Action Plan for the line.

Importantly a new, more regular timetable for the line should be in place in December. The new timetable is looking to make the service more regular with services every one and a half hours. It is hoped that a more regular service will improve passenger numbers. Ultimately it is hoped that Community Rail designation can help deliver an hourly service on the line as well as many other improvements.

5. Action plan progress: review and update

Dominic Carr explained that he had been looking at the action plan and suggested there was a need to update and review the action plan. He made a number of suggested changes and sought the views of the group.

In particular he wanted to change contact details of lead officers and some of the actions. (Please see enclosure 2). There was general agreement within the group.

In addition Roger Bell made a number of suggestions including investigating if LSTF funding can be used to possibly pay for new leaflets to be produced to promote public transport.

**Roger Bell to attend meeting with Merseytravel to push for marketing strategy for rail info in West Lancs**

6. Skelmersdale Demand Responsive Transport System Update

Dominic Carr and Jacqueline Day gave an update of the current position explaining that, following the disappointment of West Lancashire CVS to secure Kick Start funding from the DfT making the previous Phoenix scheme unviable, officers at the County Council had been working with officers at the Borough Council to develop an alternative demand responsive transport scheme which should provide an alternative cheaper option than using minibuses. It is hoped that this scheme can be financed through available S106 money the Council has for improvements to transport infrastructure in Skelmersdale.

He explained that although officers were hopeful a scheme could have been set up and running by now due to a restructure at LCC officer support had been withdrawn and therefore the development of the scheme had been delayed. There had also been some issues regarding using S106 money for this scheme in meeting the exact requirements of the S106 agreement.

However we have now been able to take the scheme forward and officers believe that we are almost in a position to take a report to Cabinet to seek approval to release the funds to develop a pilot scheme serving the Pimbo Industrial Estate which if successful can be rolled out across Skelmersdale. We are hoping to get a scheme in place before summer 2012.

**Action- Offices to continue to work with LCC to develop the alternative Demand Responsive Transport System and get a pilot operation running before summer 2012**

7. Information Exchange- LSTF discussed in detail in AOB8. Any Other Business

## Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF)

Dominic Carr explained that the Council had been successful in being part of a successful Joint Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid with Sefton MBC. Jointly we were successfully awarded £1.55 million between both authorities to be spent over a 4 year period. The aim of the project is to develop and support sustainable forms of transport to promote the visitor economy in both Boroughs.

Julia Dickinson said that Edge Hill University have been approached by LSTF officers and that the University are supportive of the bid. They are looking to work with officers to encourage students to use sustainable means of transport.

**Action- Officers to work with local representatives to develop a range of schemes to promote the visitor offer**



The main areas the bid covered are:

- Cycle Hire
- Southport Eastern park & Ride
- Leisure Routes and Facilities
- Improving facilities for Walking and cycling
- Developing and Promoting the visitor offer.

There was a recent meeting of the Steering Group which was well attended and well received in Southport.

Following the meeting project groups were looking to meet with local representatives about priorities and possible schemes for different areas.

#### Car Park Review

Dominic Carr made the group aware of the recommendations arising from the Environmental and Overview Scrutiny committee Car Parking in West Lancashire.

#### Public Transport Promotional Literature

Roger Bell explained that there is a current issue with bus literature in Burscough. Residents now need 3 separate bus leaflets in order to understand the bus times. Roger explained that some time ago the County Council launched an easy to use, user guide in Newburgh and Burscough and that the results of the Burscough leaflet were not known. Roger explained that he believed these leaflets did encourage passenger numbers to increase and that he was aware that County no longer had the resources to produce similar leaflets.

Roger asked if Denise could provide passenger figures for Burscough regarding the promotional leaflet.

**Action- Denise Nowell to provide passenger information figures for Burscough regarding the promotional leaflet**

#### 9. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Meeting to be before summer 2012

**Action- Dominic Carr to schedule the next meeting**





**ARTICLE NO: 2A**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Transformation Manager**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (Transformation) and Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Portfolio Holder: Councillor David Westley**

**Contact for further information: Ms A. Grimes (Extn. 5380)  
(E-mail: [alison.grimes@westlancs.gov.uk](mailto:alison.grimes@westlancs.gov.uk) )**

---

**SUBJECT: BUSINESS PLAN 2011-15 – Q3 DELIVERY PLAN MONITORING REPORT**

Wards affected: Borough wide

**1.0 PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE**

1.1 To apprise of the progress that has been made towards the implementation of the Business Plan Delivery Plan, highlight any areas of concern, where action may need to be taken or commentary provided.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the content of Appendix A be noted.

---

**3.0 BACKGROUND AND CURRENT POSITION**

3.1 In April 2011, the Council formally adopted a Business Plan 2011-15. The purpose of this plan is to deliver the Council's priorities whilst realising the efficiencies and savings that will be necessary for the effective financial and operational management of the Council. The action that will be taken to achieve this goal is detailed in the Business Plan Delivery Plan.

3.2 In order to ensure that the Council achieves its goal, progress against the Business Plan Delivery plan must be monitored to ensure the effective management of its implementation. Through the Business Plan decision-making process, it was agreed that the BPWG should receive quarterly monitoring reports against the Delivery Plan.

3.3 Appendix A shows that excellent progress is being made in most areas. This monitoring process enables action to be taken or explanations to be provided at the earliest opportunity, ensuring the most effective performance management of the Council's Business Plan.

3.4 One of the most significant aspects of the Business Plan is the Major Service Review Programme, as this will deliver significant savings for the Council. The process that was undertaken in 2011 was successful in identifying a significant proportion of the savings that are likely to be needed in 2012/13. In order to continue to achieve savings for the subsequent two years, work is underway to continue to develop policy options.

#### **4.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

4.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. The article has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

#### **5.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this article.

#### **6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

6.1 It is essential to the effective management of the Council that sufficient time and consideration is given to the business planning process. The risk of non-achievement of the aims of the Business Plan is mitigated through strong and effective performance management arrangements.

---

---

#### **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**

The Article does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

#### **Appendices**

Appendix A: Q3 Business Plan Delivery Plan Monitoring Report


# Business Plan: Workstream Delivery Plan – 2011/12 Q3 Update


Action Status
Cancelled
Overdue; Neglected
Unassigned; Check Progress
Not Started; In Progress; Assigned
Completed

## Description Priority Delivery Projects workstream

Service	Housing & Regeneration: Regeneration	Senior manager	Jayne Traverse		
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
		Round 1 RGF bid submitted	21-Jan-2011	21-Jan-2011	£6.8M bid submitted by St Modwen supported by WLBC, LCC, HCA
		LEP in place	31-Mar-2011	13-Apr-2011	Government sign off of a Lancashire LEP was delayed due to the ongoing negotiations with all relevant partners. The Lancashire LEP was signed off by HM Government on 13.04.11.
		LIP in place (subject to LEP being in place)	31-May-2012		Original due date of 31.08.11 brought forward to 30.06.11. Ongoing negotiations with all LEP partners and the delay in LEP sign off by Government had a knock on effect on developing a LIP. Mid Lanc's partners are now working towards completing by August 2011.  06.09.11 - Previous due date of 31.08.11 changed to 31.12.11. LIP currently at draft stage  18.01.11 - LIP at draft stage. Discussions continue with Mid Lancashire local authorities and the Homes & Communities Agency regarding its development. Anticipated completion date now May 2012  March 2012 – Draft LIP being considered by Mid Lancashire Leaders.
		Further RGF bids with Lancashire Authorities (future submission dates tbc by Government)	31-Mar-2014		June 2011: Private sector developer partner for Skelmersdale Town Centre confirmed it did not wish to pursue a Regional Growth Fund bid at the current time.


		Further RGF bids with Lancashire Authorities (future submission dates tbc by Government)	31-Mar-2014		June 2011: Private sector developer partner for Skelmersdale Town Centre confirmed it did not wish to pursue a Regional Growth Fund bid at the current time.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Peter Blakey		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
PDP_02	Changes to Revenues & Benefits System following Government White Paper <i>Universal Credit: Welfare that Works</i>	Review detail of Welfare Reform Bill	29-Apr-2011	29-Apr-2011	Initial report considered by Cabinet 19.01.11. Work on the implications of the Bill is ongoing. No further action required at this stage.
		Produce Action Plan to implement changes	30-Dec-2011		As of 3 October 2011, responsibility for this area of work transferred to OCL
		Report update as Members Update article	31-Dec-2012		As of 3 October 2011, responsibility for this area of work transferred to OCL
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	As of 3 October 2011, responsibility for this area of work transferred to OCL - who will be bringing forward further reports to DSH and Members accordingly. Future progress will be monitored through Quality of Service meetings and reports to Cabinet as appropriate. The action is therefore "cancelled" for WLBC workload although the area of work remains current through OCL.		

<b>Service</b>	Corporate	<b>Senior manager</b>	John Ryding		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
PDP_03	Skelmersdale Vision	Round 1 RGF bid submitted	21-Jan-2011	21-Jan-2011	£6.8M bid submitted by St Modwen supported by WLBC, LCC, HCA
		Employment / Skills Initiative commences			Original due date 29.04.11. Revised due date pending formal agreement to construct new offices and subsequent discussions.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Housing & Regeneration: Housing	<b>Senior manager</b>	Bob Livermore		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
PDP_04	Self-financing Business Plan	Assess financial impact	28-Feb-2011	28-Feb-2011	
		Establish monitoring group	29-Apr-2011	29-Apr-2011	

		Prepare detailed implementation timetable	31-May-2011	31-May-2011	
		Complete implementation	30-Apr-2012		Implementation on track with timetable as at October 2011
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	Budget set on 29th Feb 2012. The treasury management strategy will allow investment in Findon and Firbeck and should, with careful management, allow all the work identified by Savills to be rectified by 2018 subject to a full asset management review		

<b>Service</b>	Planning Services	<b>Senior manager</b>	John Harrison		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
PDP_05	Local Development Framework	End of consultation on Core Strategy Preferred Options	30-Jun-2011	24-Jun-2011	Consultation period 12 May - 24 June 2011
		End of consultation on Local Plan Preferred Options	17-Feb-2012	17 Feb 2012	Report to Cabinet on 15 November 2011 and O&S on 24 November, regarding move to Local Plan and subsequent revised timetable/milestones. Previously "End of consultation on DM Policies DPD by 31 Oct 2011."
		End of consultation on Local Plan Publication	31-Aug-2012		Report to Cabinet on 15 November 2011 and O&S on 24 November, regarding move to Local Plan and subsequent revised timetable/milestones. Previously "publication of core strategy by 23.12.11"
		Submission of Local Plan	31-Oct-2012		Report to Cabinet on 15 November 2011 and O&S on 24 November, regarding move to Local Plan and subsequent revised timetable/milestones. Previously "submission of Core Strategy by 30.03.12"
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Housing & Regeneration: Housing	<b>Senior manager</b>	Bob Livermore		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
PDP_06	Housing Service Improvement Plan	Housing Service Improvement Plan agreed by Council	19-Jan-2011	19-Jan-2011	
		Plan monitored by Overview & Scrutiny (and future meetings tbc)	26-Apr-2011	23-Jun-2011	Report to Cabinet on 14.06 and then Overview & Scrutiny Committee 23.06.11
		Update to be sent to TSA	08-Jun-2011	08-Jun-2011	Awaiting comments from TSA
		Progress considered by Cabinet	14-Jun-2011	14-Jun-2011	No adverse comments

		Plan monitored by Tenants & Residents Forum (and future meetings tbc)	23-Jun-2011		Report to Cabinet will be monitored by the Landlord Services Committee W/C 06.06.11 and then reported to the Tenant and Resident Forum.
		Progress considered by Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee	23-Jun-2011	23-Jun-2011	No adverse comments
		Progress considered by Landlord Services Committee/Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny Committee	30-Sep-2011	30-Sep-2011	No adverse comments
		Progress reported to TSA	31-Oct-2011	31-Oct-2011	TSA have confirmed that voluntary undertaking has been met.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	It has been agreed not to report on this further		

**Description** Resource Management workstream; Balancing the budget & best possible services within resources


Service	Housing & Regeneration: Regeneration	Senior manager	Paula Huber; Rachel Kneale		
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
RM_01	Strategic Asset Management	Annual Business plan in place	31-Mar-2011	07-Apr-2011	Annual Business Plan not now appropriate due to the need to have a medium/long-term strategy to address future housing priorities, maximise use of assets and appropriate disposals and to allow external funders 'ring-fenced' income to be committed for the next 10 years, e.g. Langtree. Revised due date for 10year Draft Business Plan of December 2011
		Burscough West ward pilot project completed	31-Mar-2011	07-Apr-2011	
		Full project commences (subject to March Cabinet approval)	29-Apr-2011	13-Apr-2011	Approved by Cabinet 15.03.11 and Council 13.04.11
		Knowsley Ward completed	30-Sep-2011	03-Oct-2011	Approved by Cabinet 13.09.11 and Executive O&S Committee 29.09.11
		Subsequent Ward identified	30-Sep-2011	03-Oct-2011	Wrightington and Birch Green wards identified to proceed with.
		Collect economic data associated with commercial property portfolio every two years. Commencing September 2011.	31-Mar-2012		Original due date of 31.12.11 delayed. Action target delayed due to a vacant post within the Economic Regeneration team. Commence March 2012. Action target delayed due to a vacant post within the Economic Regeneration team. Post expected to be filled April / May, activity to commence June 2012.



		Develop a new Regeneration Strategy for the Borough	01-May-2012		To be informed by Housing Business Plan and consultants report due April 2012.
		Develop Asset Disposal Strategy for the Borough	01-May-2012		To be informed by Housing Business Plan and consultants report due April 2012.
		10 year draft business plan	30-Jun-2012		Original due date of 31.12.10. Business Plan development has been delayed, however it will be a wider encompassing document due to the merger with Housing Services. June 2012
		Increase commercial property income and reduce Empty Property Rates liabilities by £150,000	31-Mar-2015		
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Housing & Regeneration: Housing	<b>Senior manager</b>	Phil Holland		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
RM_02	52 Derby Street Project	Planning approval granted	13-Jan-2011	13-Jan-2011	Refurbishment programme agreed Council 15 Dec 2010
		Quotations/prepare tenders & send out for phase 1	28-Feb-2011		Tenders to be returned 18 March
		Work starts on site	31-May-2011	31-May-2011	
		Work completed	18-Nov-2011		Overall project delayed from October until November by poor weather conditions. Work on registrars' office now underway and expected to be completed by January 2012. Single story extension work timetabled to be finalised by August 2012.
		Home Care Link / CCTV Suite (final stage of project) Complete	01-Jul-12		Expected to be completed Autumn 2012
<b>Action status</b>					


<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Shaun Walsh		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>


RM_03	HR Partnership Development & Delivery	Develop partnership proposals/options for future delivery	15-Dec-2011		Recommendations regarding the preferred model for service delivery will be/have been reported to Cabinet on 13/3/12
		Revise/negotiate service schedule	15-Dec-2011		Draft specification shared with LCC. PQQ document prepared should tender exercise be required. Original DD 31.03.11 postponed due to work around corporate restructure and business plan.  Awaiting final schedule from LCC/OCL regarding 12 month extension to current arrangements via the JVC contract.
		Cabinet report to Members			Original DD 29.07.11
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Treasurer	<b>Senior manager</b>	Marc Taylor		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
RM_04	Income Generation, Fees & Charges Strategy	Review existing fees and charges and consider potential for new, extended or increased charges	01-Sep-2011	01-Nov-2011	A number of changes to fees and charges were agreed through the MSR process and all fees and charge have been reviewed as part of the budget setting process for 2012-13.
		Report detailed findings from project work to Council including proposals for change	19-Oct-2011	29-Feb-2012	A new fees and charges policy was approved by Cabinet in January 2012. Proposals for further changes to fees and charges were agreed by Council in February 2012.
		Implement fees and charges strategy with consultation where appropriate	01-Apr-2012		On course to be achieved.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

**Description Shared Services Programme workstream**


<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Shaun Walsh		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
ShS_01	Shared Services with LCC/the LCC Strategic Partnership / JVC	Explore scope for partnership agreements in relation to ICT, Revenues and Benefits, Finance, Estates, Member Services.	30-Dec-2010	28-Feb-2011	Target of 10% plus saving on each arrangement

		Develop business case	23-Feb-2011	23-Feb-2011		
		Member decision on MoU (Council)	23-Feb-2011	23-Feb-2011		
		Final Member decision	13-Apr-2011	13-Apr-2011	Members noted that the Memorandum of Understanding has been signed, that Legal documentation is being worked on.	
		Prepare legal documentation for ICT, Revenues & Benefits	06-May-2011	28-Jul-2011		
		Contract commencement date approved	20-Jul-2011	20-Jul-2011		
		Go live on early projects (contract commencement)	01-Oct-2011	03-Oct-2011	Original DD 01.07.11	
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>COMPLETE</b>			


<b>Service</b>	Community Services	<b>Senior manager</b>	David Tilleray		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
ShS_02	Whole Leisure Trust	Options/recommendations report to Cabinet	15-Mar-2011	07-Mar-2011	Consideration of a Whole Leisure Trust option is being taken forward as part of the MRS process.
		Completion of feasibility appraisal for a new leisure facility in Skelmersdale	30-Sep-2011	On Hold subject to review of town centre scheme.	Initial appraisal information was undertaken as part of the town centre regeneration project; this element of the town centre regeneration scheme is on hold and subject to finance being made available in the future. On Hold subject to review of town centre scheme.
		Partnership delivery arrangements/documentation agreed	31-Dec-2011	On Hold subject to MSR 2012 process	Original dd of 31.12.11. The Whole Leisure Trust option was not taken forward as part of the 2011 MSR process, this option will be considered again as part of the 2012 MSR review. On Hold subject to MSR 2012 process.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>Completed, subject to MSR options for 2013/14 and 2014/15. See linked actions VfM_01_i and VfM_01_ii.</b>		

<b>Service</b>	Directorate of Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Shaun Walsh		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
ShS_03	Locality Working with LCC	Produce Borough Proposal	31-Aug-2010	30-Sep-2010	
		Hold Leadership Discussions (i)	30-Nov-2010	30-Nov-2010	

		Produce Cabinet briefing report	05-Sep-2011	05-Sep-2011	
		Consultation on areas for Locality Working	30-Nov-2011	30-Nov-2011	Cabinet to suggest priority areas for Heads of Service to pursue with LCC
		Establish three-tier forum with LCC	30-Nov-2011	30-Nov-2011	Three Tier Forum now in existence
		Identify Locality Working projects	28-Feb-2012		These areas to be agreed as part of the Three Tier Forum process
		Formally agree areas for Locality Working	03-Apr-2012		
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	In 2009, LCC reviewed Locality Working. Officer level discussions held in Nov 2010 between LCC-WLBC around potential areas for development within the Lancashire Locality Working Initiative. Three Tier Forum will now move this process forward in terms of agreeing joint areas of collaborative working.		


<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Solicitor	<b>Senior manager</b>	Gill Rowe		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
ShS_04	Partnership working with Sefton MBC on elections	Discussions held with Sefton MBC	01-Sep-2011	01-Sep-2011	Elections teams at Sefton and West Lancashire to work more closely together to increase resilience and capacity. Original dd of 20.05.11 was for update on situation
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

**Description Value for Money workstream**

<b>Service</b>	Corporate	<b>Senior manager</b>	Gill Rowe; Kim Webber		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
VfM_01	Major Service Reviews				
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Corporate	<b>Senior manager</b>	MDs		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
VfM_01_i	MSR 12/13	Develop / consult on methodology	31-Mar-2011	25-Mar-2011	Methodology reviewed at CMB and BPWG. Briefings with staff groups took place from w/b 28.03
		Reviews: commence	01-Apr-2011	01-Apr-2011	Service Heads briefed on methodology by end of March.


		Reviews: complete	30-Jun-2011	07-Jul-2011	Initial draft submitted to BPWG on 27.06.11.
		Report findings to July Council	29-Jul-2011	25-Jul-2011	Following Council, consultation with key stakeholders July 29-Sept 23. New management restructure in place from 1 August. Managing Director Structure from 1 November.
		Consultation following Council report with staff/unions	31-Oct-2011	28-Oct-2011	Consultation period during July-October
		Rework structures	31-Oct-2011	31-Oct-2011	Work carried out July-October
		Fill structures	31-Jan-2012	31-Jan-2012	
		New structures operational	29-Feb-2012	29-Feb-12	
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>COMPLETE</b>		

Service	Corporate	Senior manager	MDs		
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
VfM_01_ia	Implement MSR Work Programme 12/13	Agree policy for fees and charges (RM_04)	30-Nov-2011		A new fees and charges policy was reported to Cabinet in January 2012. Anticipated for agreement by Council in February 2012.
		Incorporate into budget preparations a streamlining/ tightening of budgets	29-Feb-2012		
		Incorporate MSR savings into budget for 12/13	29-Feb-2012		The draft estimates reported to Cabinet in January 2012 incorporated the agreed MSR savings.
		Implement VfM_02	31-Mar-2012		
		Implement RM-04	30-Apr-2012		
		Produce quarterly budget reports for Cabinet, highlighting any significant issues	30-Sep-2012		
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			


Service	Corporate	Senior manager	MDs		
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
VfM_01_ii	Major Service Reviews 13/14	Revise methodology	31-Dec-2011		


		Heads of Service provide MDs with new or emerging policy options	31-Mar-2012		
		MDs report to Cabinet Briefing/BPWG	30-Jun-2012		
		Report findings to Council	31-Jul-2012		
		Council to adjust Policy Options as per consultation.	31-Oct-2012		
		Rework structures	31-Oct-2012		
		Fill structures	31-Dec-2012		
		New structures operational	28-Feb-2013		

<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			
----------------------	---	--------------------	--	--	--


<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Shaun Walsh		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
VfM_02	Organisational Re-engineering / LEAN Programme	Draw up tender documents	17-Dec-2010	07-Jan-2011	
		Tender for Partner / delivery	17-Dec-2010	17-Dec-2010	
		Tender close	14-Feb-2011	14-Feb-2011	
		Complete tender evaluations	15-Apr-2011	18-Apr-2011	Evaluation period 14.02.11 - 15.04.11
		Framework contract award	30-Jun-2011	30-Jun-2011	Original DD revised from 29.04.11 due to high number of tenders received.
		Pilot project starts	7-May-2012		Agreed area of pilot project to be Sheltered Housing provision followed by Planning Services, then the Landlord Services function
		Pilot project concluded	6-July-2012		
		Implementation			10% savings target. Original DD 30.03.12 under revision and new DD yet to be set (see earlier milestones). Discussions to begin with tenant groups w/c 7.11.11
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	VfM_02i deleted (content covered by VfM02)		


<b>Service</b>	Community Services	<b>Senior manager</b>	Steve Jones; John Nelson
----------------	--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
VfM_03i	Effective Procurement: HomeCare Link	Tender return	28-Jan-2011	11-Feb-2011	Delay due to requirement of additional clarification on TUPE transfer data, which extended the tender submission by 2 weeks to 11.02.11. Tenders opened 16.02.11. Seeking to have a meeting with the evaluation panel week commencing 14.03.11.
		Tender evaluation	31-Mar-2011	03-Jun-2011	Tender Evaluation Panel meeting 03.06.11. Cabinet Report 14.06.11
		Contract award / begin mobilisation period	31-Jul-2011	Not completed, no further action. See note	Agreed not to take the tender process forward and to review the services in line with the MSR process, services transferred to Community Services for review and production of a business plan. Original dd of 01.04.11.
		Mobilisation period concluded / Contract commencement	01-Sep-2011	Not completed, no further action. See note	Agreed not to take the tender process forward and to review the services in line with the MSR process, services transferred to Community Services for review and production of a business plan. Original due date of 01.06.11.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	<b>Completed. Cabinet agreed not to take this procurement process forward and that a separate piece of work to produce a business plan was required.</b>		

Service	Description	Senior manager			
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
VfM_03ii	Effective Procurement: Garage Tender	1. Tender return	14-Jan-2011	14-Jan-2011	Four tenders received
		2. Tender evaluation	10-Feb-2011	10-Feb-2011	
		3. Contract award / begin 7 week mobilisation period			Following extensive discussions it is hoped that the contract award can be made before the end of December 2011 for April 2012 start date. This will be confirmed by the end of November 2011 following meetings taking place over the next two weeks. Original due date 11.02.11
		4. Mobilisation period concluded / Contract commencement			Original due date 01.04.11
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>	Ongoing legal complexities with several contract clauses have impacted on original timelines. Until conclusion of the issues, revised due dates for the remaining milestones cannot be assigned.		

Service	Description	Senior manager			
Action	Description	Milestones	Due Date	Completed Date	Milestone Note
	Community Services	David Tilleray			

VfM_03iii	Effective Procurement: CCTV	Committee approval for project (Council)	15-Dec-2010	19-Jan-2011	Report to extraordinary council in January. Further report to Cabinet in June 2011.
		Commence tender	31-Jul-2011	30-Aug-2011	Original due date of 31.01.11 postponed. Tender documentation now progressing.
		Appoint builder / commence works	30-Nov-2011		This element of the project is being led by Dave Griffiths and building work will commence once the relocation of staff to Greetby buildings is complete.
		Appoint partner	01-May-2012		Original due date 31.5.11 postponed due to delay in tender.
		Complete building works	01-Apr-2012		Original due date 31.01.12 postponed due to delay in tender.
		Go live	02-Feb-2013		Original due date 30.4.12 postponed due to delay in tender and delay in room availability.
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			

<b>Service</b>	Corporate Services: Transformation	<b>Senior manager</b>	Chris Isherwood		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Completed Date</b>	<b>Milestone Note</b>
VfM_04	ICT Development Programme	Installation of Wireless Network	31-May-2010	10-May-2010	
		Server virtualisation: start implementation	15-Oct-2010	07-Jan-2011	
		CRM/EDM/Back office integration	31-Mar-2011		This work is ongoing as an integral part of the OR development programme
		Government Connect / Infrastructure Security	31-Mar-2011	31-Mar-2011	Planned work complete. Work ongoing to ensure future compliance.
		Installation of Voicemail; start implementation	31-Mar-2011	05-Aug-2011	System installed. Training and testing underway. Ongoing work to rollout to service areas during 2011/12
		Web improvement programme	31-Mar-2011	31-Mar-2011	
		Server virtualisation: completion	30-Mar-2012		Transfer of servers to the virtualised environment continues, with completion planned by the due date.
		Voicemail completion	31-Mar-2012		Installation of Voicemail into all areas that have requested it
<b>Action status</b>		<b>Latest Note</b>			





**ARTICLE NO: 2B**

**CORPORATE  
AND ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW  
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Assistant Director Community Services**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor A. Fowler**

**Contact for further information: Mr S Kent (Extn. 5169)  
(E-mail: [stephen.kent@westlancs.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.kent@westlancs.gov.uk))**

---

**SUBJECT: Green Flag Results Coronation Park and Beacon Country Park**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE**

1.1 To inform Members of the outcome of the applications for Green Flag status for Coronation Park, Ormskirk and Beacon Country Park for 2011/2012

---

---

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The Green Flag Award, co-ordinated by Keep Britain Tidy, is a quality management recognition scheme which is being widely adopted as a national performance indicator in relation to green public open spaces.

2.3 Assessment is undertaken by professional park and open space managers appointed by Keep Britain Tidy utilising two main assessment methods. A Desk Assessment, which represents scrutiny of the management plan and links to corporate strategies and policies, and a Field Assessment, which is based upon site visits, both accompanied and unaccompanied.

2.4 To achieve Green Flag Award status applicants must score a minimum of 50% on the desk assessment ( minimum 15 out of 30 ) and 60% on the field evaluation ( minimum 42 out of 70 ), with a combined total of 66 or above.

2.5 In 2010/11 it was decided that all applicants which were successful with a score of 70 and above would only be subject to a full inspection and judging every two

years, although they could be subject to “mystery shopper” inspections which could result in the award being lost if standards were not maintained.

- 2.6 In 2010/11 Beacon Country Park achieved a score in the band 75-79 which put it into the higher category which would only be fully judged every two years.

### **3.0 CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 The 2011/2012 Awards were judged between February and June 2011, and details of the results were announced in August.

- 3.2 **Beacon Country Park** retained its status and score achieved in 2010/2011 without further judging

Desk assessment – a band score of 20 -24

Field Assessment – a band score of 55 – 59

Total score – a band score of 75 – 79

#### **3.2.1 Beacon Country Park Mystery Shopper Feedback**

A Mystery Shopper visit to Beacon Country Park was undertaken in October 2011 and feedback from the visit was provided to the Council. Aspects assessed included access and welcome, safety and security, cleanliness and maintenance, facilities and staffing.

In all aspects Beacon Country Park received very favourable responses with comments including :-

“I was very pleased to see a good country site well managed and staffed with people who feel dedicated to their responsibilities. West Lancashire Borough Council should be proud of the work they are doing. The public were pleased with the site and felt part of it as well.”

“Very pleased with this site and it should be used as how a country park should look and be managed.”

- 3.3 **Coronation Park** has been successful in achieving the award in 2011/2012 and a summary of the main points of the Judges Report follows.

Desk assessment – a band score of 20 -29

Field Assessment – a band score of 50 – 53

Total score – a band score of 70 – 74

#### **3.3.1 Coronation Park Desk Assessment**

The band score indicates a very high rating desk assessment (maximum score being 30).

Strengths included :-

Good cross departmental and multi agency working

Identification of main management issues

Good service standards and inspection regimes

Good community consultation and engagement with excellent events programme

Clear management responsibilities

Recommendations included:-  
Producing “smarter” targets that would be easier to measure  
More positive targets  
Further details on inspection regimes  
Further financial information  
Develop community involvement

### **3.3.2 Coronation Park Field Assessment**

Strengths included :-  
Impressive new entrance feature  
Welcoming and safe feel to the park  
Excellent play area and fitness equipment  
Clean and well maintained, especially in formal area  
Good wildflower area and wildlife conservation  
Friends group  
Staff, users, and members value the site as a flagship  
Park ranger

Recommendations included:-  
Woodland area and woodland edges need improvement  
Formal shrub beds need improving  
Path markings need attention  
Improve bin locations  
Develop role of friends group  
More co-ordinated publicity

## **4.0 ISSUES**

- 4.1 The score achieved by Coronation Park puts it in the same high category as Beacon Country Park where formal judging and inspections will only be required every two years. Feedback has been generally very good, and areas of improvement identified will be focussed upon in work programmes and in the new management plan, due for production in 2012.
- 4.2 Beacon Country Park has been able to maintain its high standards with additional very positive comments from a “mystery shopper” visit.

## **5.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 5.1 Achievement of the Green Flag Award recognises good practice in sustainability and quality leisure and environmental provision, contributing towards the objectives of protecting our environment and improving leisure provision.

## **6.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The standards of management achieved at these two main parks has been achieved utilising capital funding made available by the Council in previous years, and from existing revenue provision within Community Services and Street Scene. Maintaining these standards requires this level of revenue funding to be maintained, and added to wherever possible from external sources.

## **7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

7.1 The attainment of a Green Flag Award for a site is a recognised indicator of quality management, a future loss of this status would reflect negatively on the Council.

---

---

### **Background Documents**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>
July 2010	Beacon Country Park : Green Flag Award Judges Report 2010/11
October 2011	Beacon Country Park : Mystery Shopper – Interim Quality Assessment
July 2011	Coronation Park : Green Flag Award Judges Report 2011/12

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

There is a significant direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and /or stakeholders. Therefore an Equality Impact Assessment is required. A formal equality impact assessment is attached as an Appendix to this report, the results of which have been taken into account in the Recommendations contained within this report.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Equality Impact Assessment

Green Flag Awards : Beacon Country Park and Coronation Park  
Date of EIA 22nd February 2012 Completed By S. Kent

**Question 1**

Using information that you have gathered from service monitoring, surveys, consultation, and other sources such as anecdotal information fed back by members of staff, in your opinion, could your service/policy/strategy/decision (including decisions to cut or change a service or policy) disadvantage, or have a potentially disproportionately negative effect on, any of the following groups of people:

- People of different ages – including young and older people
- People with a disability
- People of different races/ethnicities/nationalities
- Men
- Women
- People of different religions/beliefs
- People of different sexual orientations
- People who are or have identified as transgender
- People who are married or in a civil partnership
- Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave or men whose partners are pregnant or on maternity leave
- People living in areas of deprivation or who are financially disadvantaged

**Q1 response**

Feedback from Green Flag Awards will be used to inform and influence current and future management of the parks involved, including the production and amendment to management plans which will take into consideration the needs of all sectors of the community therefore NO the achievement of these awards will not disadvantage or have a disproportionately negative effect on the above groups of people

**Question 2**

What sources of information have you used to come to this decision?

**Q2 response**

Green Flag Awards have been developed nationally, following extensive consultation with the environmental sector to represent indicators of good management of green open space.

**Question 3**

How have you tried to involve people/groups in developing your service/policy/strategy or in making your decision (including decisions to cut or change a service or policy)?

Direct consultation with the local community plus liaison with specialist groups e.g. Tidy

Britain Group and Green Flag management staff.

Assessments are undertaken by sector professionals and include consultation with the general public and user groups.

#### **Question 4**

Could your service/policy/strategy or decision (including decisions to cut or change a service or policy) help or hamper our ability to meet our duties under the Equality Act 2010? Duties are to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity (removing or minimising disadvantage, meeting the needs of people)
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it

#### **Q 4 response**

Achievement of a Green Flag Award indicates that consideration of the needs of all the community have been considered as part of the management planning and operational process, which helps our ability to meet our duties under the Equality Act 2010.

#### **Question 5**

What actions will you take to address any issues raised in your answers above?

#### **Q5 response**

All feedback from Green Flag judging will be used to influence management plans and site operations. Any equality impacts issues that may arise will be considered and measures taken to mitigate any negative impacts.



**ARTICLE NO: 2C**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

<b>Article of:</b>	<b>Borough Treasurer</b>
<b>Relevant Managing Director:</b>	<b>Managing Director (People and Places)</b>
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder:</b>	<b>Councillor D.Westley</b>
<b>Contact for further information:</b>	<b>Mr M Kostrzewski (Ext 5320)</b> <a href="mailto:Mike.kost@westlancs.gov.uk">Mike.kost@westlancs.gov.uk</a>

---

**SUBJECT: ANNUAL VAT REPORT 2011/2012**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

**1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

- 1.1 To inform Members of developments and performance in relation to Value Added Tax (VAT).

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Accountancy Service has the following objectives for accounting for VAT:
- minimise the Council's VAT liabilities
  - raise the profile of VAT within the Authority
  - develop and improve VAT processes and procedures.
- 2.2 One of the means of achieving these objectives is the production of an Annual VAT Report for Members.

**3.0 ACCOUNTING FOR VAT**

- 3.1 The Council pays VAT to its suppliers for most of the goods and services it procures. The Council also charges VAT for most goods and services provided to its customers for business reasons. Any VAT paid to suppliers is recovered from

Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) and any VAT received on the Council's supplies is paid to HMRC. This is done by the completion of a monthly VAT Return.

- 3.2 Responsibility for the Council's VAT function is incorporated within the Accountancy team and its staff aim to continually minimise the Council's VAT liabilities. This includes ensuring fines, interest, and assessments are minimised and VAT recovery is maximised. To achieve this, every effort is made to ensure that VAT is accounted for correctly throughout the Authority and that all staff are aware of relevant changes in VAT Regulations.

#### 4.0 VAT MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

##### VAT Returns

- 4.1 The Council generally expends more on VAT than it collects from its own activities. This is because most of its own activities are not classed as being carried out for business purposes and VAT is, therefore, not applicable. As such, the monthly VAT Returns reclaim the net VAT from HMRC by the Council. During 2011/2012, the Council paid a total of £4,050,778 to suppliers and received a total of £896,543 VAT from its own customers. This resulted in a net total of £3,154,235 being reclaimed from Revenue and Customs. The average VAT return for 2011/2012 was £262,853 comprising, on average, £337,565 due from Revenue and Customs and £74,712 due to them. Table 1 shows how these values compare to the previous financial year of 2010/2011:

<b>Table 1 - VAT Return Comparison: 2011/2012 to 2010/2011</b>		
	2011/2012 £'000	2010/2011 £'000
<b>Total VAT:</b>		
Paid to Suppliers	4,051	3,845
Received from our own Customers	897	524
Reclaimed from Customs and Excise	3,154	3,321
<b>Average Monthly VAT:</b>		
Paid to Suppliers	338	320
Received from our own Customers	75	44
Reclaimed from Customs and Excise	263	276

##### VAT Penalties

- 4.2 If there are mistakes within the VAT return or if something is missed from it the Council is liable to fines, interest charges, and other financial penalties. A voluntary disclosure is declared when errors are above a threshold of £10,000. This limit has been increased by HMRC from £2,000 as from 1 July 2008. To date



we have not been required to register a voluntary disclosure as the Council has not breached this threshold. As from 1 April 2009 a new penalty regime has been implemented by HMRC, which could have an impact on the Council due to the way that fines, interest charges and other penalties are to be calculated, as this could result in a greater percentage of fine being levied to the Council. However, currently this new regime has had no impact on the Council, which is due to no fines etc being imposed.

### **De Minimis Calculation (Partial Exemption)**

- 4.3 Exempt activities for VAT purposes are defined in the VAT Act 1994 and cover 15 categories. Local Authorities can only reclaim VAT paid to their suppliers for its exempt activities providing that this is less than 5% of the total VAT paid to suppliers. For this Council, this is usually in the region of £200,000 per year. If this threshold is exceeded, the Council would be liable to pay the full value of its exempt VAT to Revenue and Customs, i.e. around £200,000.
- 4.4 The Vat team monitor exempt expenditure throughout the year to ensure that the Council does not exceed the 5% margin. In recent years the percentage has not been greater than 2% and for 2011/12 the vat de minimis level was 1.3%.
- 4.5 The Council will take specialist advice, if appropriate, when projects that may affect its vat position substantially are undertaken, for example large scale capital projects. In addition such issues are raised with HMRC to inform them of the project and the proposed vat approach the Council is undertaking.

### **VAT Manual and Training**

- 4.6 The Council has a VAT manual, which is available on the Council's intranet, updated as at February 2012. Details on vat issues are also included in the Finance Budget Manual which is published on the Intranet.

### **Overall Performance**

- 4.7 Management of the VAT function within the Authority is a well established process. For 2011/12 the monthly vat return to HMRC was always completed on time. HMRC inspections in previous years have been undertaken with the result that the Council's processes and procedures have been given a clean bill of health. The Authority is part of a Lancashire wide Council networking group whereby, Vat topics and issues of a common interest can be raised. This promotes good practice across the Councils and the latest VAT topics are discussed in order to maximise performance.

## **5.0 RECENT VAT DEVELOPMENTS**

- 5.1 The Vat Team continually review developments in the sector in order to identify any implications for the Council. Some of the current issues are highlighted below.

## **VAT on Off-Street Car Parking**

- 5.2 Local Authorities can provide off-street parking where for the purpose of relieving or preventing congestion of traffic it appears to be necessary to provide within their area suitable parking places for vehicles. The output VAT levied for this function has been subject to legal proceedings by a group of Councils, commonly referred to as the Isle of Wight case. It is a complex and technical issue, which may result in the Council not levying output VAT for this service area. This may mean that the amount of Vat levied to date by the Council may be repaid to the Authority at some future date. Protective claims are submitted to HMRC annually to safeguard the Council's Vat position, and the sum involved to the end of the 2011/12 financial year is £1.218m.
- 5.3 This case has recently been heard in the Royal Courts of Justice and it is expected that decision will be made around September or October 2012. Once the decision is known, it will be analysed and any financial implications will then be taken into account.

## **Trade Refuse – January 1978 to March 2010**

- 5.4 The Council has submitted a VAT claim to HMRC for a sum in the region of £180,000 plus interest, in respect of Trade Refuse Collection income. This activity has been reclassified as non business, as advised by HMRC and therefore vat is not chargeable to Clients. A decision on the claim is expected over the coming months.

## **6.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 6.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts or Community Strategy implications associated with this Update.

## **7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 7.1 The formal reporting of performance on VAT is part of the overall management and control framework that is designed to minimise the financial risks facing the Council.

## **8.0 SUMMARY**

- 8.1 Value Added Tax is a technical and complex area and mistakes can be costly to the Council. The Accountancy team strive to ensure that the Council's VAT liabilities are minimised and VAT recovery is maximised by developing and improving VAT processes and procedures.
- 8.2 The possibility of recovering VAT in relation to car parking and trade refuse claims, would, if successful, provide a significant benefit for the Council in these difficult financial times.

**Background Documents:**

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

**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:**

None





**ARTICLE NO: 2D**

**CORPORATE AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW AND  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS UPDATE  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Borough Solicitor**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Contact for further information: Mr M Jones(Extn. 5025)  
(E-mail: mathew.jones@westlancs.gov.uk)**

---

**SUBJECT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN – PROVISIONAL STATISTICS  
2011/12**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

1.1 To inform Members of the Council's performance in respect of the Local Government Ombudsman provisional statistics 2011/12.

---

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) produces annual reports giving details of complaints made against individual Councils during the preceding year. The Council's response to LGO enquiries and complaints are co-ordinated by the Legal and Member Services Manager.

2.2 The provisional figures have now been produced for 2011/12 and details of these are given below. The figures are subsequently incorporated into and published as part of the Ombudsman's Annual report later in the year.

2.3 I am pleased to advise that of the 5 cases that proceeded to an investigation during 2011/12 in each case the LGO decided to discontinue the investigation as the LGO found insufficient evidence that the Council was at fault. Therefore there have been no cases of Maladministration during the year. The 5 cases in which investigations were discontinued included 2 planning matters (both concerning planning applications) and 2 housing matters (one concerning Council house allocations and another concerning Council house repairs). The remaining case concerned an allegation that the Council had failed to maintain land and woodland it owns.

2.4 The total number of enquiries and complaints received by the LGO about the Council in 2011/12 was 27. As indicated above only 5 enquiries and complaints

actually proceeded to an investigation decision during 2011/12. The remaining number were considered by the LGO to be outside of jurisdiction, premature, or not warranting investigation.

- 2.5 By way of comparison in 2010/11 the total number of enquiries and complaints stood at 25. In that year 10 matters were forwarded to the investigative team but in each case there were no findings of maladministration. Of those 10 cases, 8 cases were discontinued, 1 case was considered to be outside jurisdiction and 1 was classed as "local settlement" (i.e. the investigation was discontinued because the actions suggested by the Council had been accepted as satisfactory by the Ombudsman)
- 2.6 The LGO record figures for the average time the Council takes to respond to their first enquiries on a complaint. This is measured in calendar days from the date the LGO sends their letter to the date that a substantive response is received. The LGO records response times by way of three categories: more than 36 days, 29 to 36 days and under 28 days. I am pleased to advise that the average response time for the Council for 2011/12 is shown as 22 days. In both 2008/9 and 2009/10 the average response time was also 22 days. In 2010/11 the response time was 19 days.

### **3.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 3.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. This article has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

### **4.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 Investigating and co-ordinating responses to enquiries and complaints made by the LGO takes up a significant amount of officer time both for the Legal and Member Services Manager and for the service area to which the complaint or enquiry is directed. Given the importance to the Council in satisfactorily resolving enquires and complaints made by the LGO this work steam will continue to receive a high priority.

### **5.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 5.1 This article is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this article.

---

---

### **Background Documents**

\*The following background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing this Report.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>
April 2012	LGO Provisional Complaint Statistics (non-confidential information)

## **Equality Impact Assessment**

This article, concerning provisional LGO complaint statistics, does not have any direct impact on Members of the public, employees, elected Members and/or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

## **Appendices**

None.







**ARTICLE NO: 2E**

**CORPORATE AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW &  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of:** Transformation Manager

**Relevant Managing Director:** Managing Director (Transformation)

**Relevant Portfolio Holder:** Councillor I Ashcroft

**Contact for further information:** Ms S Lewis (Extn. 5048)  
(E-mail: Sharon.lewis@westlancs.gov.uk)

---

**SUBJECT: Equality Act 2010 - Progress Updated**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

1.1 To inform Members of the Council's progress in relation to it's duties under the Equality Act 2010.

---

---

## **2.0 BACKGROUND – THE EQUALITY ACT 2010**

2.1 The Equality Act, which came into force from October 2010, places a number of duties on public authorities. The Act supersedes a raft of previous equality legislation, including the Equal Pay Act (1970), the Race Relations Act (1976), The Disability Discrimination Act (1995) and the Sex Discrimination Acts (1975 and 1986), making the law simpler and more consistent in the way that it treats groups of people that are at risk of discrimination.

2.2 The Act requires public authorities to comply with three general duties. These are to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity (removing or minimising disadvantage and meeting the needs of people)
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

2.3 Protected characteristics are those characteristics by which a person might be subject to discrimination. The Act specifies nine of these. They are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment (people who have, or are in the process of changing their gender, or people who live their lives in a different gender to the one they were born)
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or Faith
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

2.4 In order to carry out its equality duties, the Act identifies a number of key functions that public authorities should focus on. These include:

- Monitoring the use of, and satisfaction with, services across the protected characteristics and analysing that information to identify if there are any particular groups of people not using services.
- Engaging with all sections of the community when developing services and policies
- Carrying out actions to plug any gaps in terms of service needs for particular groups and monitoring these actions as part of the performance management of business and service plans
- Ensuring contractors are compliant with the legislation
- Providing evidence that 'due regard' for equality issues has been considered when developing services and policies and when making decisions that impact on the community and staff and that any negative impacts are addressed and/or mitigating actions are carried out where possible.

### 3.0 WEST LANCASHIRE'S RESPONSE TO ITS EQUALITY DUTIES

3.1 To deliver its response to the Equality Act, the Council established an officer working group – the Equality and Diversity Strategic Steering Group, which, with the approval of Cabinet, has developed and implemented the following processes and activities:

- **West Lancashire Equality Scheme 2011 - 2015** – the Scheme brings together in one place, the activities that the Council will undertake over the next four years. The Scheme includes the Authority's equality and diversity commitments and how these will be implemented and monitored, as well as a more detailed action plan upto 2015.
- **Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)** – the Council has committed to carrying out EIAs across its services, policies and strategies in order to be sure that they are fair and meet the needs of all sections of the community. An EIA toolkit, based on five simple steps, has been developed to help officers with the process. To support the implementation of EIAs, a series of training sessions for team leaders was carried out. The Council's reporting template now prompts officers to respond to a question about whether EIAs have been carried out or not and what mitigating actions will be undertaken in the case of any negative

impacts identified. In addition, the Council has audited its services and prioritised the ones that will be assessed imminently.

- **Monitoring form** – to help provide the information required to carry out EIAs, the Council has developed an equality monitoring form. Based on Stonewall's\* equality monitoring form, and the recent national census categories, the purpose of the form is to identify which groups of people are using and not using Council services, and those satisfied and less than satisfied with services. This is so that remedial action to promote and improve services can be carried out where necessary.
- **Community engagement protocol** – this has been developed to help strengthen the Council's formal and semi-formal consultation and engagement activities. The protocol is a series of steps which help to ensure that consultation and engagement is as representative as possible of the communities in the borough.
- **Awareness-raising for Elected Members** – a briefing session for Elected Members, on the Equality Act and implications for West Lancashire Borough Council, was held in July 2011.
- **Staff briefings** –in addition to training on EIAs for specific members of staff, a more general briefing paper on the Equality Act and West Lancashire's response to its duties under the Act, has been produced and has been circulated to all staff via the Intranet and through Team Briefing discussions.
- **Equality web page** – to demonstrate its commitment to equality, and to make it easier to access documents for audit purposes, the Council has introduced an equality page on its web site. The page shows links to national policy websites and documents as well as its own procedures.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS**

Through its work on equality and diversity, the Council has improved, and will continue to improve, the quality of life for all its residents. Officers and Elected Members have shown a commitment to responding to the Council's legislative duties, and the approach taken is a straight forward one, and one that empowers all officers to take responsibility for equality in their areas of work.

The next steps are for the Council to ensure the delivery of its Equality Scheme action plan, and to continue to carry out equality impact assessments as agreed.

#### **5.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 5.1 Processes and tools to support the Equality Scheme are already in place or will continue to develop over the next 3 years. Arrangements to review actions and the Scheme annually are in place and monitored by the Equality and Diversity Strategic Steering Group.

## **6.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The majority of the work associated with the action plans developed within the Equality Scheme have been undertaken and absorbed within Services without additional resources being required. It is envisaged that an external consultant will be brought into the Council during 2012 to undertake a full audit of actions undertaken and review the Scheme and actions to ensure the council is still legislative compliant and progressing satisfactorily. This will require additional funding which will be absorbed from within existing budgets current held within the Human Resources Services.

## **7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 7.1 The authority must comply with the legislation and failure to do so has implications in respect of vulnerable protected groups who are resident within the community and also leaves the authority open to challenge by the Equality and Human Rights Commission and court proceedings.

---

### **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**

The update provided in this report does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. This is a report for information for which there is no Equality Impact Assessment required.

### **Appendices**

None.



**ARTICLE NO: 3A**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (Transformation)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor V. Hopley and Councillor A. Owens**

**Contact for further information: Mr W Berkley (Extn. 5259)  
(E-mail: [William.berkley@westlancs.gov.uk](mailto:William.berkley@westlancs.gov.uk))**

---

**SUBJECT: EXCEPTION TO CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULE NUMBER 6 -  
ENGAGING SAVILLS TO PRODUCE A NET PRESENT VALUE ANALYSIS OF THE  
HOUSING STOCK**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

**1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the exception to contract procedure rule number 6 granted by the Managing Director (Transformation) to appoint Savills to produce a net present value analysis of the Councils retained housing stock.
- 

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Savills were appointed in 2011 to produce a 25% housing stock condition survey in readiness for self-financing. This project was completed on time and in budget.
- 2.2 Officers in consultation with tenants the LSC and Cabinet have produced a housing sustainability model. Officers feel the model developed needed to include the Net Present Value (NPV) of properties as an additional sustainability indicator.

**3.0 CURRENT POSITION**

- 3.1 Officers proposed to engage Savills, who are experts in this field and are familiar with our housing stock having carried out the recent stock condition survey, to produce this NPV analysis.

- 3.2 Savills are experts in the housing finance field and having reviewed samples of their work, officers considered it to be of a very high quality.
- 3.3 It is essential the correct investment decisions be made to ensure the sustainability of the housing stock and the long-term robustness of the housing business plan.
- 3.4 Obtaining quotations from various consultants was considered in addition to awarding the work directly to Savills. However, as a Professional Services Hub of which the Council is a member, was in place, which Savills won, this was considered to be inappropriate.
- 3.5 On balance it was decided to grant an exception to contract procedure rule number 6 and engage Savills to carry out the piece of work.

#### **4.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 4.1 There are no additional significant sustainability impacts associated with this article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. However, the decision recorded in this article will work to ensure sustainable investment in the Councils retained housing stock.

#### **5.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Budget provision for Asset Management work was made at Council on the 29<sup>th</sup> February 2012.
- 5.2 A fee proposal has been received from Savills to carry out this work, which totals £24,750, which will be met from the established budget.
- 5.3 The fee for the work is calculated based on the rates set out in the Professional Services Hub of which the Council is a member. This was tendered competitively by 'Places for People', which Savills won. Documents relating to this and an independent duty of care document are held within Property Services.

#### **6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 6.1 This item is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this report.

---

---

#### **Background Documents**

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

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

The article does not have any additional direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

### **Appendices**

None.







**ARTICLE NO: 3B**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13  
ISSUE: 1**

---

**Article of: Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (Transformation)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor V. Hopley and Councillor A. Owens**

**Contact for further information: Mr P Holland (Extn. 5065)  
(E-mail: phil.holland@westlancs.gov.uk)**

---

**SUBJECT: HOUSING RESPONSE REPAIRS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT  
DURATION**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

- 1.1 To inform members of the urgent decision made by the Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Portfolio Holder for Housing Finance to let the repairs maintenance contracts for duration of 5 years
- 

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 An Officer and Tenant Working Group was established to review the current response maintenance contracts with a view to re-letting the contract for commencement on the 1st of April 2012.
- 2.2 A report was presented to Cabinet on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2011 seeking approval to retender the response maintenance contracts for an initial period of 3 years.
- 2.3 The Officer and Tenant Working Group considered that letting the contract for an initial period of 5 Years would be the best approach based on the exceptional value for money currently being achieved on other contracts and to ensure long term investment was forth coming from contractors to ensure a good level of performance.

2.4 Contract documents were therefore drafted on the basis of an initial 5 years duration with an option to extend for a further 3 years.

2.5 There was cross party representation on both the contract appraisals and contractor interviews. All parties were in agreement with the 5-year contract approach.

### **3.0 CURRENT POSITION**

3.1 In order to progress the signing of the contracts the Assistant Director of Housing and Regeneration operated his delegated authority under 4.2 of the Constitution paragraph 5.21, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Housing and the Portfolio Holder for Housing Finance to agree to the awarding of the response maintenance contracts on an initial 5 Year basis.

### **5.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

5.1 There are no additional significant sustainability impacts associated with this article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. The article has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

### **6.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no additional significant financial or resource implications arising from this article in addition to those identified to Cabinet on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2011. However, as detailed in 2.3 it was felt that a 5 year contract duration represented the best value for money.

### **7.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

7.1 This item is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this report.

---

---

### **Background Documents**

The following background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing this article.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>File Ref</u>
14 June 2012	Cabinet Report	Agenda Item 7(a)

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

The article does not have any additional direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

### **Appendices**

None.





**ARTICLE NO: 3C**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13**

**ISSUE 1:**

---

**Article of: Assistant Director Community Services**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor D Sudworth**

**Contact for further information: Mr D P Tilleray (Extn. 5202)  
(E-mail: david.tilleray@westlancs.gov.uk)**

---

**SUBJECT: FORMAL CONSULTATION – DELIVERING THE PUBLIC HEALTH  
REFORMS IN LANCASHIRE**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

1.1 To advise Members of the formal response made on behalf of West Lancashire Borough Council.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The Borough Council was advised, at the end of February, of formal proposals for 'Public Health Lancashire' as part of the reforms arising out of the transfer of responsibility for public health from PCT's to the County Council, subject to the passage of the Health & Social Care Bill.

2.2 The proposals related to the functions that LCC will undertake, together with some timescales for implementation.

2.3 Unfortunately, due to the relatively short deadline involved, there was no opportunity to go to Cabinet before submitting comments. I therefore formulated the Response in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, (attached as Appendix A) having first given all Members the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

### **3.0 CURRENT POSITION**

3.1 The Response was sent to the Local Director of Public Health for the Transition, at the Public Health Network, on the 20<sup>th</sup> March, thereby meeting the deadline of 22<sup>nd</sup> March.

### **4.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

4.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this Article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder, but does have clear potential implications for the health of our community.

### **5.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no significant financial or resource implications arising from this Article.

### **6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

6.1 This item is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this Article.

---

---

### **Background Documents**

The following background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing this Article.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>
21 <sup>st</sup> February 2012	Formal Consultation – Delivering the Public Health Reforms in Lancashire

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

The decision does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

### **Appendices**

1. Formal Response to the Consultation on Delivering the Public Health Reforms in Lancashire

Public Health Consultation  
Lancashire Public Health Network  
Room 178, Preston Business Centre  
Watling Street Road  
Fulwood  
Preston  
PR2 8DY

01695 585126  
david.tilleray@westlancs.gov.uk

16<sup>th</sup> March 2012

DT/LM

D P Tilleray  
01695 585202

Dear Sirs

**RE:- FORMAL CONSULTATION – DELIVERING THE PUBLIC HEALTH REFORMS IN LANCASHIRE – RESPONSE OF WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL TO THE PROPOSALS**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for implementing the public health reforms (subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill).

Please find detailed below, the comments from West Lancashire Borough Council.

2. **Functions and Offer**

Discussions have been held with Borough Councils to specify the public health support they require (and can provide), but this needs to be formally documented, so that the linkages are clearly understood by all parties.

Whilst it is clear that many public health functions will not be transferred to 'Public Health Lancashire', specifically those sitting at Borough level, many of the functions going to the County Council would be better delivered at local (Borough) level.

3. **Health Protection**

Whilst it is pleasing to see the immediate recognition of the impact of a 'healthy environment' (together with references to E.H.O.'s), on health protection, it is disappointing that there are no further references elsewhere in the document to healthy environments. Health Protection seems to subsequently only be concerned with screening, immunisation and emergency planning and consequently the necessity for closer working relationships (or at least an intention to develop those linkages) are conspicuous by their absence.

The specific reference to Environmental Health Officers is welcomed and appropriate in relation to Health Protection, however in highlighting their role

there is a danger of belittling the role of the many other Borough Council functions and Officers who work across Health Protection and Health Improvement & Equality, including Housing Officers, Leisure Officers, Community Safety Officers, Regeneration Officers and Planning Officers.

### 3.2 **Health Improvement, Health Equality and the Marmot Review**

The achievement of these priorities requires implementation at a local level. The local Health & Wellbeing partnerships are best placed to lead this, however, greater alignment with other local groups including the Childrens Trusts and possibly the Community Safety Partnerships, will be required for a comprehensive approach to health improvement and reduction in inequalities.

### 4.0 **Implications**

It isn't clear what the purposes of having a 2 year transitional period are. Is this a test of the role of the Director of Public Health or the functions and their position and efficiency of delivery across the County Council and the County area? What are the implications for public health delivery and support at a borough level beyond the 2 year period?

### 4.3 **Integration with other LCC functions**

The emergency planning links will need to be transparent and efficient, not only across the County Council, but also across and with the Boroughs and the Lancashire Resilience Forum. We would welcome the opportunity to be represented in the appropriate Task and Finish Group to ensure this is delivered.

### 4.5 **Public Health support to District Councils and CCG's**

With a number of groups being established in recent times to look at various aspects of the reforms, it isn't clear which group has developed the public health support at Borough Councils, or which group has been established to develop the public health offer to CCG's. It would be helpful, therefore, if these groups could be identified, together with confirmation that there is Borough Council representation on them.

We certainly agree that a workstream should be mobilised, with Borough Councils, to agree implementation of the public health 'support'. We certainly feel that there is a clear role for some sort of 'Health Partnership Officer' working at a senior level, in each Borough Council, with linkages across the County and Borough Council's functions, the CCG and relevant LSP groups, with a remit to co-ordinate, influence and implement a Local Public Health Strategy for each Borough, influenced by a County Public Health Strategy.

There also needs to be a mechanism for facilitating the ability of local Health and Wellbeing partnerships (sitting under local LSPs, or otherwise) to have some influence on the Health and Wellbeing Board.



#### 4.6 **Relationships with the wider public health system**

We fully agree with the proposal for a workstream to agree respective roles and responsibilities across the system, including Public Health England, Borough councils and other parties.

Borough Councils, in particular, will wish to be integral to the discussions on the relationships between public health and community safety.

#### 4.7 **Physical location of Public Health staff**

Fully agree with the principal of locating public health staff within or alongside Borough Councils, as we would want to see a senior/specialist regularly involved with our senior management and political structures.

#### 5.0 **Financial Resources**

We welcome the opportunity to discuss accommodation requirements over the next few months.

#### 5.0 **Human Resources**

It isn't clear why the posts will only be recruited on an interim basis. What is the purpose of this period? Are Borough Councils to expect further changes to the public health support following this interim period?

#### 5.0 **Public Health Officer**

Working up and providing an 'offer' by April seems an incredibly short timescale for a very important issue and we would not wish to see this unnecessarily rushed. How will Borough Councils be involved in this process?

#### 5.0 **Recommendations**

West Lancashire Borough Council would ask to be directly involved in several of the Task and Parish Groups mentioned. Please could you clarify how WLBC can be directly included, rather than simply represented by a (single) Borough Council person or (cluster) representative.

### **Appendix 3 – Description of Public Health Functions**

Under 'Health Protection' the development of maintenance and linkages to Borough Councils and particularly (but not exclusively) their healthy environment roles should be a specific function.

Under 'Health Improvement' the addressing of health inequalities should be a specific priority across each of the services mentioned (not just their commissioning and delivery).

We would recommend that Borough Councils be allowed to deliver and commission (using the LCC funding) local services, perhaps in conjunction with their local CCG, across the broad range.

As regards to the 'support' for the Thematic Groups, this should be a stronger role than simply supporting (which could mean just attending meetings). There is an opportunity here for some leadership, drive and real change, if the 'support' comes with authority and access to funding.

#### **Appendix 4 – Transitional Function Structure**

The offer of Public Health Support to Borough Councils is not clear, as mentioned above, and it would be helpful to understand if that 'box' is proposed to have within it single function support officers – as we feel this wouldn't be effective use of their (or our) time. These persons will need to have a broad range of specialist skills, with either direct linkages into the other 'boxes', or better still, the functions in these boxes are reallocated into the Public Health Support box. For example, the 'Public Health Contribution' list of functions would be better sitting in the Support box.

The Borough Council Support box might be better if it was aligned with the CCG support box, as Borough Councils will want to work closer with their CCG's anyway.

The 'Drugs and Alcohol' function seems to be misplaced by being in Health Protection – and would perhaps sit better in the Wellbeing Services.

The Health Protection functions, should, as mentioned above, also have formal linkages to the 'healthy environment' functions sitting at Borough Council level.

We hope that these comments are helpful and we look forward to working closely with you as the Reforms develop.

Yours sincerely

**D P TILLERAY**  
**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR COMMUNITY SERVICES**



**ARTICLE NO: 3D**

**CORPORATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**MEMBERS UPDATE 2012/13**

**ISSUE: 1**

---

**Report of: Assistant Director Community Services**

**Relevant Managing Director: Managing Director (People and Places)**

**Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor D Sudworth**

**Contact for further information: Mr D P Tilleray (Extn. 5202)  
(E-mail: david.tilleray@westlancs.gov.uk)**

---

**SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION – PLANS TO BECOME A  
FOUNDATION TRUST**

---

Wards affected: Borough wide

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF ARTICLE**

1.1 To provide Members with the details of the formal response made to the Public Consultation from the Southport & Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust, on their plans to become a Foundation Trust.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 In March of this year, we were advised of the Hospital Trust's Public Consultation. Members were immediately advised by e-mail of their proposals to apply to become a Foundation Trust.

2.2 Members were advised that Foundation Trusts were created to put decision-making about health care into the hands of local people. They are run as membership organisations and their members perform several significant functions, including:-

- Influencing, through greater involvement and ownership, how the health services that the Trust is responsible for, are run;
- contributing to developing new services or improving existing ones;
- becoming a Trust Governor and working with the Board of Directors to deliver the best health care for local people.

2.3 The full document and further details were provided at [www.southportandormskirk.nhs.uk](http://www.southportandormskirk.nhs.uk). Unfortunately the relatively short deadline for responding did not provide an opportunity to take the matter before Cabinet. Members were therefore asked to submit any comments to me, so that I could then take them into consideration when responding on behalf of the Council, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder. No comments were received from Members.

2.4 Members were also advised of the Trust's intention to hold a series of public meetings, as part of the consultation process. Details of dates, times and venues were provided for these events in Ormskirk, Tarleton and Skelmersdale.

### **3.0 CURRENT POSITION**

3.1 Appendix A provides this Authority's response to the specific questions asked in the Consultation Document.

### **4.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS/COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

4.1 There are no significant sustainability impacts associated with this Article and, in particular, no significant impact on crime and disorder. The Article has no significant links with the Sustainable Community Strategy.

### **5.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no significant financial or resource implications arising from this Article.

### **6.0 RISK ASSESSMENT**

6.1 This item is for information only and makes no recommendations. It therefore does not require a formal risk assessment and no changes have been made to risk registers as a result of this Article.

---

---

## **Background Documents**

The following background documents (as defined in Section 100D (5) of the Local Government Act 1972) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing this Article.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Document</u>
March 2011	Southport & Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust 'Have your say'

## **Equality Impact Assessment**

This Article details a response to a Consultation, to assist the Hospital Trust with their decision-making process. This Article, in itself does not have any direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders. Therefore no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

## **Appendices**

1. Response by WLBC to Public Consultation



**Response to Public Consultation from Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS  
Trust on their plans to become a Foundation Trust**

- Do you agree with our aims and objectives set out in this document?
  - to simplify the organisation of care **Yes**
  - to transform the way we work **Yes**
  - to enable transformation change **Yes**
  - to strive for excellence in all we do **Yes**
- What one thing would you like us to achieve in our first year as a foundation trust?

***Provide a noticeable improvement in Community engagement.***

- Do you believe that becoming a foundation trust will help us to meet our vision for the future? **Yes**
- What would you prefer us to be know as when we become a foundation trust? (choice of two)

***Southport and Ormskirk NHS Foundation Trust***

- Do you agree with a minimum age of 16 for members? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our proposals to have three membership levels? **Yes**
- Do you agree with a minimum age of 18 for governors? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our plans for staff membership? **Yes**
- Do you agree the membership constitutencies we propose are right? **Yes**
- Do you think we are representing the right staff groups? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our proposal to have 11 public governors? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our proposal to have 4 staff governors? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our proposal to have 5 appointed governors?  
AND
- Do you agree with the organisations we have chosen for our appointed governors?

**No. Whilst we understand the rationale behind appointing governors from Sefton MBC and Lancashire County Council, we strongly believe that a further place should be offered to West Lancashire Borough Council. We can improve your engagement with West Lancashire residents, through our many and varied community links.**

- Do you think we have the right number of public governors from each constituency? **Yes**
- Do you agree with our composition for the Board of Directors? **Yes**
- Have you any suggestions to help us recruit members?

***Use our network links with community groups, parish councils and the Local Strategic Partnership (and its various thematic groups).***