

Minutes

Scrutiny Committee

Venue: Committee Room

Date: 23 April 2013

Present: Councillors W Nichols (Chair), R Price (Vice Chair), I

Chilvers, M Dyson, M Hobson, C Pearson, D

Mackay and D Peart.

Apologies for Absence: Councillors R Sweeting.

Also Present: Councillor G Ivey, Councillor Carl Les – North

Yorkshire County Council, Ray Busby – North Yorkshire County Council and Helen Hugill – North

Yorkshire Ambulance Service.

Officers Present: Keith Dawson – Director of Community Services,

Karen Iveson – Executive Director (s151), Rose Norris – Executive Director and Palbinder Mann -

Democratic Services Officer.

Press: None

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

50. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

i) To APPROVE the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 26 March 2013 and that they are signed by the Chair.

51. CHAIR'S ADDRESS TO THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chair informed the Committee that the report from the Task and Finish Group looking at National Non Domestic Rates would be circulated to the Committee when ready and that there was a timetable proposed for consultation.

52. CALL IN

No items had been called in.

53. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Councillor Carl Les, Chair of the Police and Crime Panel, Councillor Mrs Ivey, Vice Chair of the Police and Crime Panel and Ray Busby, Support Officer to the Police and Crime Panel were present to provide a presentation about the work of the Panel.

The following key points were explained to the Committee:

- The Panel was a joint Committee of the nine local authorities in the North Yorkshire Police Area who scrutinised the actions and decisions of the Police and Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire.
- The Panel was comprised of ten Councillors with at least one from each of the nine local authorities along with two independent members co-opted by the Panel. The Chair for 2012/13 was Councillor Carl Les and the two Vice Chairs were Councillors Fiona Fitzpatrick and Gillian lvey. It was explained that the Panel met in public and that the Chair and Vice Chairs would rotate on a yearly basis.
- The Committee were also informed that the Panel had to be politically balanced with their being provision for additional co-options if necessary.
- The Panel's responsibilities included reviewing the Commissioner's Draft Police and Crime Plan, Draft Precept and Annual Report. The Panel were entitled to make recommendations to the Commissioner who then had to consider them and publish a response.
- The Panel also held confirmation hearings for the Commissioner's proposed Chief Constable, Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and any Deputy Commissioner. Additionally, it was explained that the Panel had a power of veto, by two-thirds majority over the Commissioner's first Draft Precept and first candidate for Chief Constable.

It was queried how the Panel was funded. Mr Busby explained that funding was provided through a grant from the Home Office of around £53,000 which was spent mainly on staffing costs. Councillor Mrs Ivey explained that it had been made clear to the Panel that they had to work within their budget. It was also stated that the mileage for Panel members was paid through their individual Councils with the only exception being expenses for community representatives on the Panel. The Committee were informed that there was only a special responsibility allowance for the Chair of the Panel and Vice Chairs and not the other Panel members.

Mr Busby explained that the Panel published key messages and it was important that the Scrutiny Committee received these messages. It was suggested that any messages published could be passed onto the Democratic Services Officer who could then circulate these to the Committee.

Mr Busby explained that there was an important relationship between the Scrutiny Committee and the Panel as the Committee would have local knowledge of crime and community safety issues at a local level which would be useful to the Panel.

A query was raised with regard to how the Panel engaged with the public. Mr Busby explained that information was made available through the press however as the Panel concentrated on more focused work then more people could be invited for these meetings.

A query was raised concerning why a booklet had not been produced this year explaining how the precept figure had been arrived at. It was explained this may have been missed however this would be raised with the Commissioner's office.

RESOLVED:

- i) To receive and note the report.
- 55. ACCESS SELBY 3RD INTERIM KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR PROGRESS REPORT: APRIL 2012 TO DECEMBER 2012 AND SLA DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Councillor Mrs G Ivey, Deputy Leader of the Council and Keith Dawson, Director of Community Services presented the report which provided details of Access Selby key performance indicators following the third quarter of reporting for the financial year 2012/13

The Committee were informed that the data was for this quarter was reported up to September 2012. There was currently one amber indicator relating to Council Tax recovery and one red indicator relating to processing benefit claims. The Committee were informed that a recovery plan had been implemented for this.

Concern was raised with regard to the waiting times at the customer contact centre and on the phone to customer services. It was noted that an item on customer services had been brought forward on the work programme to discuss this issue.

Councillor Dyson left the meeting at this point.

RESOLVED:

i) To receive and note the report.

54. HEALTH SERVICE PROVISION - YORKSHIRE AMBULANCE SERVICE

Helen Hugill, Service and Quality Improvement Manager, Yorkshire Ambulance Service presented the report which provided an overview of services provided by Yorkshire Ambulance Service.

Ms Hugill explained that there had been a 5% over demand with regard to calls received with 71.54% red calls indicating the most serious being in North Yorkshire and 76.4% red calls being in York and Selby. The Committee were informed that North Yorkshire had been commissioned to achieve 71.2% and not the 75% national standard.

It was explained that there were three stations, York, Haxby and Selby with there also being two call centres, one in York and another in Wakefield. Ms Hugill explained that should there be an over demand, calls flowed between the two centres. The Committee were also informed that Selby had two 24 hour ambulances.

A query was raised around the difference between the R1 and R2 indicators. Ms Hugill explained that when a call came in, they were categorised depending on the severity and R1 was the most serious.

A query was raised concerning the availability of ambulance vehicles. Ms Hugill stated that there was a finite number of vehicles on the road and if an ambulance left the area, another vehicle could be pulled in from surrounding areas. The Committee were informed that discussions were taking place with Clinical Commissioning Groups about attendance responses and whether in non emergencies, patients could be taken to the Doctor instead of the hospital.

In response to a query concerning the cost of one callout, Ms Hugill explained that the cost per callout was around £285. The Committee were informed that a new pathway had been launched where the Passenger Transport Service could collect patients and this would cost less.

RESOLVED:

i) To receive and note the report.

55. COMMUNITIES SELBY SERVICE PROVISION

The Executive Director presented the report which outlined progress made since the Communities Selby project was set up in 2011 and invited proposals from the Scrutiny Committee on how the various new support arrangements could be reviewed.

The Executive Director explained that the Council had decided against setting up a Third Sector Organisation (TSO) to deliver community engagement and

had decided to consider the different options available for it to deliver the Communities Selby concept. The Committee were informed that a successful pilot of a new Employer Sponsored Volunteering (ESV) scheme had been undertaken and there were new arrangements in place for administering the Community Engagement Forums (CEFs) with four of them now being supported by Selby AVS.

The Executive Director outlined other projects that had been supported by Communities Selby including the Olympic Torch Relay and bringing in new arrangements for the Countryside Management and third sector management of the area's nature reserves. It was explained that the team had now been disbanded however there was still an aim to commission and oversee outcomes and services and the relevant Executive Member along with the Executive Director were looking at ways in which this could be done.

Concerns were raised with regard to the current administration with the CEFs and it was stated that there were mistakes such as the wrong agenda being sent out along with irrelevant information. Members felt that the Tadcaster CEF which was administered by an independent person was more efficiently run and best practice could be shared to improve the other CEFs.

RESOLVED:

i) To receive and note the report.

57. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13

The Committee considered the Scrutiny Annual Report 2012/13 which provided an update of the work done by the Scrutiny Committee in the past year.

RESOLVED:

i) To receive and note the annual report submitted by the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee.

The meeting closed at 5:47pm