

# **Lancashire County Council**

## **Scrutiny Committee**

**Friday, 9th March, 2012 at 10.00 am in Cabinet Room 'B' - County Hall, Preston**

### **Agenda**

#### **Part 1 (Open to Press and Public)**

##### **No. Item**

##### **1. Apologies**

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

Members are asked to consider any Personal/Prejudicial Interests they may have to disclose to the meeting in relation to matters under consideration on the Agenda.

##### **3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 February 2012** (Pages 1 - 6)

##### **4. Lancashire Supporting People Programme** (Pages 7 - 16)

##### **5. Rail Improvement Schemes - Report of the Task Group** (Pages 17 - 22)

##### **6. Task Group Updates** (Pages 23 - 26)

##### **7. Recent and Forthcoming Decisions** (Pages 27 - 28)

##### **8. Workplan 2010/11** (Pages 29 - 38)

##### **9. Urgent Business**

An item of urgent business may only be considered under this heading where, by reason of special circumstances to be recorded in the Minutes, the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency. Wherever possible, the Chief Executive should be given advance warning of any Member's intention to raise a matter under this heading.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee will be held on 13 April at 10am at the County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston

# Agenda Item 3

## Lancashire County Council

### Scrutiny Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 10th February, 2012 at 10.00 am in Cabinet Room 'B' - County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor John Shedwick (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

Mrs R Blow	Mrs J Hanson
S Chapman	D O'Toole
Mrs F Craig-Wilson	Mrs L Oades
C Crompton	D Westley
M Devaney	B Winlow
K Ellard	

County Councillor R Blow replaced County Councillor P Malpas for this meeting only.

#### **1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor V Taylor.

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

None were disclosed.

#### **3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 January 2012**

**Resolved:** That, the minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **4. Presentation by United Utilities**

The Chair welcomed representatives from United Utilities (UU) Mark Donaghy, Public Affairs Manager, and John Webb, Highways Coordination Manager, to the meeting.

Mark Donaghy thanked the Committee for their invitation and stated that the County Council was an important stakeholder for United Utilities. It was hoped that feedback regarding their role and performance from Councillors and their constituents received at the meeting would be beneficial for them.

John Webb gave a presentation to the Committee on UUs role and performance since their last visit to the Committee in February 2011. He explained that all utilities companies had since signed up to the Highway Authorities Utilities Committee (HAUC (UK)) code of conduct which was issued in 2011. The code of conduct recognised the need to promote self regulation and to actively work together representing street authorities, highways and road agencies, utilities, contractors and other key stakeholders to manage and reduce disruption that such works cause to road users, businesses and residents within the UK. The code of conduct also promoted the following matters:

- Active participation at coordination meetings;
- Accepting the principles of permit schemes;
- To encourage advance planning with councils and other utilities;
- The use of minimum dig technology;
- To work outside peak hours where possible;
- Consider communications strategies;
- Improve inspection and compliance processes;
- Promote first time reinstatements; and
- To share good practice

It was reported that improvements were being made by UU in relation to their role and performance. The Committee was informed that UU had recently appointed a new Streetworks Transformation Manager to oversee performance in relation to issues such as re-instatements. A new Streetworks Board had also been established to review policy and performance and any suggestions taken to it. The Committee was also informed that Governance was now in place via an increased auditing regime of streetworks including re-instatements. It was also reported that coordination had improved with UU giving 100% attendance at all coordination meetings with the County Council.

It was also explained that communications by UU had improved with the implementation of new signage containing the new branding of the company. Positive feedback had been received in particular relating to the work on the Preston Scheme and the exemplary level of communication carried out by UUs Preston Project Team. It was highlighted that the Preston Scheme was UUs flagship process for communicating to those people who are affected by works being carried out.

In response to a question asked regarding the position of UU on the possible introduction of a permit scheme the Committee was informed that there were no schemes in place in the North West at present. Only three schemes were currently in existence across the Country being; London, Kent and Northamptonshire. The first to be rolled out in the North West would be in St Helens on 2 April 2012. The Committee was also informed that UU welcomed the opportunity to work closely with the County Council on fulfilling the requirements of a permit scheme. It was hoped that the scheme for Lancashire would be rolled out in April 2013.

In response to a question regarding UUs views on the effectiveness of streetworks coordination and whether there was any room for improvement; the Committee was informed that UU felt that there was still room for improvement on coordination. UUs attendance at coordination meetings had increased to 100%. UU also recognised that the exchange of information regarding proposed works could be done sooner. Currently, UU sought to provide such information six months in advance. UUs aim was to extend this period of notice to 12 months with a view to extending to a further 18 months. It was hoped that extending the notice period would assist in improving coordination works.

UU provided a breakdown of summary data between April 2011 and the current date in response to questions relating to performance on re-instatements, signing, lighting and guiding. On safety performance (Category A – signing, lighting and guiding) UUs failure rate currently stood at an average of 11.2% which was beyond the trigger level of 10%. However, performance over the quarters had gone from 15% to 9% which meant that UU were improving their performance on these matters. The Committee was informed that failures relating to the total absence of signage and advance notices in Lancashire were rare.

On re-instatement performance (Category B) UUs failure rate stood at an average of 17.2% which was beyond the 10% tolerance. Quarterly performance figures for the current year ranged from 16% to 21% to 13%. UU recognised that there was a need for improvement on re-instatement works. The Committee was informed that UU would carry out further audits with contractors and their partners on compliance.

Councillors were invited to ask questions and raise any comments in respect of UUs role and performance. A summary of which is provided below:

- On road works and road closures a comment was made in relation to the Preston Scheme and the lack of perceived visible activity on site. It was reported that most of the work carried out in relation to that Scheme was being done underground.
- With regard to failure rates of re-instatement works it was suggested that the figures reported by UU didn't represent the matter fully as a number of failing works wouldn't have been reported. Councillors also felt strongly about the lack of post-inspection of re-instatement works. The Committee was informed that whilst UU did inspect works carried out both during and on completion it would be impossible to audit all of the work done. The figures quoted at the meeting had come from random sample inspections by LCC based on 30% of works carried out by UU.
- Another Councillor commented that UU should be analysing why certain works had failed and asked whether improvements would be made over the next 12 months. The Committee was informed that UU did not know the reasons why re-instatements in particular for the period July to September 2011 had dipped.
- One Councillor raised the issue of varying standards of communication from UU regarding intended works. It was explained that this was not the

image UU wanted to project and reassured the Committee that they would seek to improve communications.

- With regard to the Preston Scheme, one Councillor praised the communication and the work carried out by UU stating that it was an excellent model which had been beneficial for them in their role as a Councillor and their constituents.
- One Councillor raised the issue of many pavement re-instatements being unsatisfactory and unpleasing to the eye and whether it would instead be better for UU to re-instate an entire stretch of pavement. It was reported that UU would occasionally re-instate more pavement than it would need to do but could only do so in accordance with regulations. If streetworks were significant, UU would work with the County Council on re-instatement.
- In relation to communicating with councillors, UU stated that they do issue press releases when opportunities are available. However, it was not practical to do so when emergency works are carried out.
- Councillors recognised that it was the Sub-Contractors who carried out re-instatement work on behalf of UU. Councillors felt that the failure rates and the trigger points were high and asked how UU dealt with such matters in relation to the performance of its Sub-Contractors. It was reported that UU had addressed failing works with its Sub-Contractors and that improvements in the standard of work had been made as a result. However, it wasn't clear as to why 'dips' in failure rates had occurred and it was suggested that factors such as the weather and time constraints could have had an impact. The trigger of 10% was a statutory figure set out in legislation. UU's aim was to attain 100% compliance. Councillors encouraged UU to improve its failure rates with its Sub-Contractors.
- With regard to the recent mild-winter conditions experienced in the County, concern was expressed that failure rates could be further affected if the County experienced adverse weather conditions. It was suggested that UU reports back to the Committee on re-instatement performance with year-end results.
- Concern was raised by Councillors over the re-instatement of York Stone pavements. It was reported that in some cases work carried out involving such materials had not been completed to a satisfactory standard.
- In relation to Sub-Contractors, Councillors asked a number of questions including; how many sub-contractors were contracted to work for UU, what length contracts were for, and whether there was an opportunity to improve quality of work carried out by going to tender. The Committee was informed that contracts had been awarded to different companies according to the nature of work to be carried out and that the contracts were on a five year term currently 2010-2015. All Sub-Contractors were bound to the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991.
- One Councillor asked what responsibility UU had in relation to the provision and maintenance of fire hydrants. It was reported that legally all fire hydrants belonged to the Fire Service. Whilst minor works were carried out by the Fire Service, UU carried out any major works required at a cost.

- On emergency closures, one Councillor asked how long it was before instructions to proceed with repair were given. It was reported that UUs reactive network partners would respond to emergencies and contact UU staff to decide on extent of work required and other issues such as the severity of the road closure.
- One Councillor highlighted the issue of temporary traffic lights breaking down at weekends and whether UU had tightened up on its provision of emergency telephone numbers on such sites. The Committee as informed that the permit scheme coming forward would require UU to provide 24hour contact numbers in all instances. The Committee noted that apology boards should be present at every works site. The telephone number displayed would take callers to UUs 24 hour Call-Centre in Warrington.
- Councillors asked whether there were any good examples of working practices outside of Lancashire. It was reported that best practice was shared at board meetings. Two examples were mentioned being the use of new innovative patch repair systems and the trialling of new man-hole covers made from composite recycled plastic in Cumbria.

**Resolved:** That;

- i. United Utilities provide an update report on reinstatement performance to the Committee meeting to be held on 11 May 2012; and
- ii. United Utilities be invited to a future meeting of the Committee.

## **5. Task Group Updates**

The Committee received an update on current task groups and their proposed completion dates.

**Resolved:** That, the update on existing task groups be noted.

## **6. Recent and Forthcoming Decisions**

The committee had been given the opportunity to view and consider recent relevant decisions made and also forthcoming decisions including those set out in the current Forward Plan.

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

## **7. Workplan 2010/11**

The workplan for the committee was presented for noting and comments. The Chair gave an outline of the work to be carried out by the Committee over the coming months including the additional work agreed earlier in the meeting.

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

**8. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee will be held on 9 March 2012 at 10:00am at County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston



# Agenda Item 4

## Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on 9 March 2012

Electoral Division affected: All
-------------------------------------

## Lancashire Supporting People Programme

(Appendix A refers)

Contact for further information:

Sarah McCarthy, Head of Supporting People Programme, 07917 521919

Sarah.McCarthy@Lancashire.gov.uk

### Executive Summary

The Supporting People Partnership - comprising Lancashire County Council, District Councils, Probation Service, Lancashire Drug and Alcohol Team and the Primary Care Trusts - are responsible for commissioning housing related support services to provide vulnerable people with the skills required to live independently in the community, thereby promoting social inclusion and preventing homelessness. The report outlines the current profile of services and the positive outcomes for customers who receive this support.

### Recommendations

That the committee notes the work of the Supporting People Partnership

## Background and Advice

- 1.0 The Supporting People Programme is responsible for the planning, commissioning and procurement of housing related support services which enable people to develop independent living skills thereby:
- preventing homelessness;
  - promoting social inclusion;
  - reducing the need for health, community safety or social care services.
- The success of the Supporting People Programme is dependent on effective partnership working between the county council and other partners, especially district councils given their strategic responsibility in relation to housing.

Housing related support services assist people to:

- set up and maintain a home;
- develop domestic / life skills;
- develop social skills;
- manage finances and benefit claims;
- access other services;
- get involved in community activities;

- maintain their personal safety and security;
- find alternative accommodation;
- help find a job;
- access education and training;

Consequently, the following types of services are funded from the Supporting People budget:

- supported housing projects
- refuges for women at risk of domestic violence
- sheltered accommodation with a scheme manager
- home improvement agencies
- community alarms
- floating or visiting support where the support is flexible and can be delivered anywhere.

In order to illustrate the potential impact of services on an individual's life, information about three people who have used services is included below.

#### ***Your Skills are Never Wasted***

*"Martin moved in to sheltered accommodation, in 2008, at the age of fifty five years old. He was referred by LCC Social Services after a period of rehab following a serious traffic accident that had lead to Martin having a leg amputated at the knee. Martin moved into one-level accommodation on a temporary basis to see if he could successfully live independently, he was very withdrawn and depressed following the accident. This scheme has lots of social activity and gradually Martin began to join in. Prior to his accident Martin was a chef. He now cooks breakfasts for residents once a week and leads the luncheon club; this makes an enormous contribution to the lives of residents at the scheme and has helped to restore Martin's feelings of self worth . The Scheme Manager helps with paperwork and encourages him to get involved in the scheme"*

#### ***A Place in Society***

*"In 2006 I was released from prison having served four years and eight months of a seven year sentence. There was some uncertainty about what would happen to me when I left prison. One of the options was to move to supported accommodation, this is in fact what happened. Having been socially isolated for many years I was somewhat apprehensive, not only about the move to supported accommodation, but also about the future in general. I found that the staff were very supportive and they helped me a lot, particularly by helping me feel that I had a place in society. After about twelve months living in the main house, I moved in to the annexe, which provides semi independent accommodation. I feel that the skills I gained while living in the annexe helped me a great deal in preparation for moving in to the community. I think that without this it would have been much more difficult to make the transition to independent living. I feel that*

*my time here has had a huge impact on my life and that without this experience I think I would still be the person I was before I went to prison".*

### **Feeling Welcome and Supported**

*"When I split up with my partner who I had been living with I became depressed and ended up going to hospital. Not being able to return home I came to supported accommodation. I was made to feel welcome and supported from day one. They have helped me get back on my feet and I know that there is always somebody to talk to if I ever feel down".*

## **2.0 Funding**

The Supporting People Programme was implemented by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) in 2003. Initially the funding was ring fenced for housing related support services. However, subsequently, it was transferred into the Area Based Grant and then became part of Lancashire County Council's mainstream funding in 2010.

## **3.0 Preventative Services**

There is no statutory duty to provide housing related services. Supporting People funded services tend to be preventative in nature; consequently the social care eligibility criteria (i.e. Fair Access to Care) don't apply.

## **4.0 Governance Structure**

In 2003, when the Supporting People Programme was introduced, CLG defined the partnership arrangements to ensure that Supporting People funding contributed to a range of strategic agendas i.e. community safety, housing, social care and health. Following the decision by CLG to remove the ring-fence and associated grant conditions, leading to local discretion in relation to governance, it was decided by the county council to retain the partnership arrangements as the benefit of multi-agency decision making in meeting the needs of vulnerable people was recognised.

Consequently, the county council determines the Supporting People budget and then the Supporting People Partnership makes decisions within the defined budget. The Supporting People Team, based within the county council, co-ordinates and administers all the associated activity.

The Supporting People Commissioning Board is responsible for:

- maximising linkages with other strategic partnerships;
- ensuring that the housing support needs of vulnerable people have been appropriately mapped and that robust plans have been put in place to fill identified gaps;
- scrutinising and approving the commissioning plans developed by the Locality Groups including any associated funding commitments;
- identifying opportunities for joint commissioning at a county level;

- understanding the impact on vulnerable people of the services which have been commissioned and ensuring that services are operating to a high standard.

In addition to the Commissioning Board, there are locality based groups (North, East and Central) attended by commissioners and provider representatives. Provider forums also meet on a quarterly basis.

## 5.0 Current Profile of Services

The current budget is £27.5 million per year reducing to £26.5m in 2012/13. Up to 20,000 vulnerable people can receive support in services commissioned through the Supporting People Partnership, although some of those individuals will be self funders. Approximately 100 contracts are in place with 85 support providers to deliver 125 services. A service can range from around 6 units in a refuge for women at risk of domestic violence to over 1000 units in some sheltered housing services.

Whilst the table below shows the number of contracted units funded in services with the primary client groups listed below, it must be stressed that people have multiple needs so will access a range of services e.g. an individual with a substance misuse issue might also access supported accommodation for people who are homeless or for offenders.

	<b>Supported Accommodation Number of Units (i.e. capacity)</b>
Frail Elderly	655
Homeless Families with Support Needs	86
Mentally Disordered Offenders	2
Offenders or People at risk of Offending	51
Older people with support needs/community alarms	13111(4503)
People with a Physical or Sensory Disability/Learning Disability	35/1011
People with Drug Problems	22
People with Mental Health Problems	334
Single Homeless with Support Needs	91
Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	61
Young People at Risk	244
Teenage Parents	15

In addition to the above supported housing services where individuals are generally required to move into the accommodation to receive the support, three large contracts exist for the provision of floating/visiting support: in North Lancashire approx 220 people are supported at any one time; in South Lancashire around 340 people and in East Lancashire about 280 people.

## **6.0 Commissioning Plans**

Multi agency groups have been considering how sheltered housing can provide a more personalised service and offer a support service to people living in the local community. The county council are intending to offer more flexible contracts in order to enable this to happen.

In relation to most other client groups listed above, a significant amount of consultation was undertaken prior to issuing new contracts. Revised specifications have sought to better reflect the feedback received from customers and stakeholders in terms of the required skills/attributes of staff, softer outcomes (e.g. development of self esteem) than those included in the national framework (see section below), local operational arrangements to support partnership working e.g. joint working with local Housing Options Teams where tenancies are at risk of breaking down.

## **7.0 Impact of Services**

The impact of services is outlined in Appendix A. Table 1 shows the outcomes for people using services as defined by the national Supporting People outcome measures which were developed by CLG using the Outcome Domains from Every Child Matters (Economic Wellbeing, Enjoy and Achieve, Be Healthy, Stay Safe, Make a Positive Contribution).

Given the wide ranging mixture of needs amongst people accessing services, it is recognised that all indicators do not apply to every individuals. Consequently the outcomes figures focus on showing the number of people achieving a positive outcome and the proportion of people with an identified need who achieve an outcome.

- 1309 people maintained accommodation
- 1427 people secured/ obtained settled accommodation
- 1928 people maximised their income (91% of people with a need for support)
- 158 people have participated in paid work (31.35% of people with a need for support)
- 659 people accessed training and education (64.04% of people with a need for support)

- 404 people were better able to manage substance misuse issues (64.33% of people with a need for support)

Tables 2 and 3 show where people move to when leaving the service e.g. independent tenancies, returning to family, moving to residential care

The figures demonstrate that services are having a significant impact on the lives of individuals; however, there are also still barriers e.g. in relation to accessing work.

## 8.0 Conclusion

The Supporting People Partnership and budget are facilitating the commissioning of valuable preventative services which support a range of local strategic objectives in relation to the prevention of homeless, community safety and maintaining independence.

### Consultations

N/A

### Implications:

Risk management: none

Financial

### Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

#### List of Background Papers

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A		

## APPENDIX A

**Table 1 Outcomes for people leaving short term services and floating/visiting support services during 2010/11**

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Number of people achieving a positive outcome</b>	<b>% of those people with an identified need who achieve a positive outcome</b>
<b>Economic Wellbeing</b>		
Maximised income, including receipt of the correct welfare benefits	1928	91%
Reduced overall debt	872	73%
In paid work	126	25%
Participated in paid work whilst in receipt of the service	158	31%
<b>Enjoy and Achieve</b>		
Participated in training and/or education	659	64%
Achieved desired qualification	171	54%
Participated in leisure/cultural/faith and/or informal learning activities	688	80%
Participated in any work-like activities, e.g. unpaid work/work experience/work-like experience/ voluntary work	286	56%
Established contact with external services/ groups	1295	93%
Established contact with friends/ family	655	92%
<b>Be Healthy</b>		
Better manage physical health	975	85%
Better manage mental health	805	77%
Better manage substance misuse issues	404	64%
Assistive technology/aids and adaptations helping the client to maintain their independence	110	88%
<b>Stay Safe</b>		
Maintain accommodation and avoid eviction	1309	83%
The client has secured / obtained settled accommodation	1427	72%
Comply with statutory orders and related processes, in relation to offending behaviour	249	77%

Better manage self harm	172	80%
Avoiding causing harm to others	138	79%
Minimise harm/risk of harm from others	579	88%
<b>Making a Positive Contribution</b>		
Developing confidence and ability to have greater choice and/or control and/or involvement	1778	89%

**Table 2: Where do people move to when leaving short term services 2010/11?**

Destination	Number of People
Staying with friends	109
Staying with family members	158
Bed & breakfast	9
Supported housing	161
Sheltered housing	6
Moved into a care home	2
Owner occupier	2
Renting privately owned accommodation	135
RSL tenancy	182
Local authority tenancy	118
Returned to previous home	99
Entered hospital (not long term care)	7
Committed suicide	0
Taken into custody	15
Sleeping rough	1
Entered a long stay hospital/hospice	2
Entered an acute psychiatric hospital	6
Not known	98

**Table 3: Where do people move to when they leave long term supported accommodation or floating support/visiting support ceases (2010/11)?**



<b>Destination</b>	<b>Number of People</b>
Completed support programme (i.e. remain in property but can live independently)	1,591
To independent housing	327
To sheltered housing/ To long-term supported housing	260/54
Died	601
Committed suicide	1
Taken into custody	20
To a long-stay hospital /hospice/ To an acute psychiatric hospital	11/ 4
To a care home/ To a nursing care home	115/203
To short-term supported housing	26
Evicted/Abandoned Tenancy	7/17
Not Known	183



## Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on 9 March 2012

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## Rail Improvement Schemes – Report of the Task Group

(Appendix A refers)

Contact for further information:

Josh Mynott, (01772) 534580, Office of the Chief Executive,

josh.mynott@lancashire.gov.uk

### Executive Summary

The Rail Improvement Schemes Task Group produced its original report in March 2010, and an update report in January 2011. As agreed at the time, it reconvened in January 2012, and the final update report of the reconvened task group is attached at Appendix A.

### Recommendation

That the Scrutiny committee accept the further recommendations of the task group that:

- i. the schemes remain in the categories originally agreed and the positive progress to date is noted
- ii. Lancashire County Council continue to play an active role in the development and promotion of rail schemes in the county in accordance with the priorities set by the task group
- iii. the importance of rail improvements continue to be part of the work of the LEP
- iv. Lancashire County Council continues to seek investment in the rail network in Lancashire, including via a response to the forthcoming government consultation based on the McNulty Report and as electrification of the Lancashire Triangle is progressed.
- v. That the task group work is complete and no further meetings are required

### Background and Advice

The Rail Improvement Schemes Task Group produced its original report in March 2010.

It was agreed at that time that the task group should reconvene after six months to consider several developments that were anticipated in relation to the rail schemes considered. The task group reconvened in January 2011 to receive an update on all of the schemes considered

At that meeting, it was agreed to arrange one final meeting of the task group to consider some outstanding issues. The final meeting took place in January 2012, and the final report is attached as Appendix A

The original report can be accessed here:

<http://www3.lancashire.gov.uk/council/meetings/displayFile.asp?FTYPE=A&FILEID=45501>

The January 2011 update can be found here:

<http://council.lancashire.gov.uk/documents/s1407/Appendix%20A.pdf>

## **Consultations**

N/A

## **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

## **Risk management**

There are no significant risk management implications

## **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
-------	------	-------------------------

N/A

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

### **Rail Improvements Task Group**

The report of the Rail Improvements Task Group was produced in March 2010. The report considered a number of schemes proposed around Lancashire to improve the rail network in a variety of ways.

The task group considered eight major schemes, taking into account a wealth of evidence about the costs and benefits, and receiving presentations from supporters of each scheme. The task group's conclusion was that the schemes should be divided into three categories: those which the County Council should take a lead on; those which the county council should identify as a priority for further development work; and those which the county council should monitor but not actively engage in.

A full list of schemes and categories is as follows:

#### **County Council Lead**

- Todmorden Curves

#### **Priority for development**

- Burscough Curves
- Skelmersdale Link
- Poulton to Fleetwood
- South Fylde
- Clitheroe / Blackburn to Manchester

#### **Monitor, but not actively engage**

- Colne to Skipton
- Rawtenstall to Bury and Manchester

Full details of all of the schemes, and the reasoning for the task group's conclusions, can be found in the original report.

A review and update took place in February 2011. The task group agreed that the categorisation of the schemes should remain the same, but that certain potential developments made a further review necessary. This report takes into account those updates.

#### **Todmorden Curve**

Good progress has been made with this scheme, with a successful bid to the Government's Regional Growth Fund made by Burnley Borough Council announced in October 2011, subject to Due Diligence. Network Rail was now progressing with the detailed design work for the scheme, which is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year. At this point final costs will be known.

A key issue remains in relation to revenue funding. The Government has confirmed that the previous arrangements for revenue funding will remain in place, that is that it will be the promoting councils who will have to meet any revenue deficit in the first three years. At that point, the Government will take over that funding, provided the benefit to cost ratio is sufficient high – over 1.5 for full government funding. Work is underway between local authorities to fully understand the likely costs and risks that this will bring.

The target date for the scheme is 2014, which will link the scheme into wider developments around Manchester and the Refranchising of the franchise currently held by Northern Rail. Another factor is that work going on with the electrification of the “Lancashire Triangle” should mean that there are more diesel units available, a significant factor given ongoing shortages or rolling stock.

### **Skelmersdale Rail Link**

Studies have shown that significant benefits would be gained from this scheme. However, the costs of the scheme would also be very high. Work is underway by Merseytravel to compare their findings with those of Network Rail, whose high level study suggested a stronger case. The scheme remains a longer term priority for the council, although the issue of the high cost is crucial.

Work is ongoing with West Lancashire BC to ensure that this is linked in with Skelmersdale Town Centre development, and that the potential for this rail link remains part of the plans. Consideration is also being given to park and ride schemes near the motorways. The task group were keen to ensure that momentum was maintained, and that the wider benefits were fully considered in any analysis.

### **Poulton to Fleetwood**

A Network Rail study is underway, funded jointly by Wyre BC and Lancashire CC, looking at how a heritage service could be accommodated. There are some possible concerns about how such a service could link in with the rest of the network, and whether this might require a third platform at Poulton. The impact of electrification will also need to be considered.

### **Burscough Curves**

A recent study by Merseytravel has found that there is presently no viable business case for restoring either the north or south curves. This conclusion concurs with a number of previous studies, although it is still the intention to review this from time to time should there be a change in circumstances.

### **Clitheroe / Blackburn to Manchester**

This scheme is being taken forward by Blackburn with Darwen, and involves a number of different issues. Platforms have now been lengthened at Clitheroe,

allowing greater capacity, if not greater frequency. Double tracking south of Darwen and upgrading the level crossing at Turton are also part of the scheme.

The business case is being developed, looking especially at the economic benefits to Blackburn itself, and there has been a debate in Parliament on the scheme, which has had some favourable response from the government.

### **South Fylde Line**

Blackpool Council are leading on this work, using European Funding to consider better use of the various transport links in the area. In particular, this means considering train-tram links up through Lytham St Annes to Blackpool and on towards Fleetwood. A report is due in mid-2012, which will give recommendations on where further research could most usefully be done.

### **Colne to Skipton**

Some indications last year suggested that Balfour Beatty were giving serious consideration to this scheme. However, this does not appear to have come to pass, and it remains the case that this scheme, although well publicised and widely supported, is some distance from being a practical possibility. It is understood that SELRAP, the main body supporting this scheme are seeking funding for a business case study, but that even this would represent a significant cost owing to the many difficulties faced by the scheme.

### **Rawtenstall to Manchester**

It is understood that the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive (GMPTE) have completed their study, but it has not yet been released. The County Council will continue to seek a copy of the work in order to inform its work on both rail and bus transport in the area.

### **Other issues**

In considering developments in these particular schemes, a number of core themes were identified by the task group.

1. Electrification. The electrification of the “Lancashire Triangle” may open up significant opportunities for improved rail services in Lancashire, both directly to those areas and stations served and more widely in, for example, the availability of diesel rolling stock.
2. Rolling Stock. The availability of rolling stock will very likely remain an issue. Although some will become available through electrification, there is the likelihood that 2019 will see a number of trains being taken out of service due to the new Rail Vehicle Accessibility Regulations. It will be essential for Lancashire to continue to ensure its needs are recognised.
3. McNulty report. The Government’s response to the McNulty “Rail Value for Money” Report is due shortly. The report concluded that efficiency savings of

30% could be found in the operation of the rail network. One of the opportunities this could bring may be for more local control of local services, and this is expected to form part of the consultation the government will launch. This presents great opportunities for local government, although the high financial cost of rail means that this would not be without significant risk.

4. Local Enterprise Partnership. The task group is keen to ensure that the schemes it has considered continue to be supported and promoted by the council in accordance with its original priorities. In addition, the link between the economic development of Lancashire and the transport network is recognised as crucial, and the task group is therefore keen to see the rail improvement schemes continue to feature highly in the work of the Lancashire LEP.

**Recommendations:**

That

- i. the schemes remain in the categories originally agreed and the positive progress to date is noted
- ii. Lancashire County Council continue to play an active role in the development and promotion of rail schemes in the county in accordance with the priorities set by the task group
- iii. the importance of rail improvements continue to be part of the work of the LEP
- iv. Lancashire County Council continues to seek investment in the rail network in Lancashire, including via a response to the forthcoming government consultation based on the McNulty Report and as electrification of the Lancashire Triangle is progressed.
- v. That the task group work is complete and no further meetings are required

February 2012



## Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on 9 March 2012

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## Task Group Update

(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:

Claire Evans 07917 836 698, Office of the Chief Executive,

[claire.evans@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:claire.evans@lancashire.gov.uk)

### Executive Summary

This report has two purposes:

1. To update members on progress with existing Task and Finish Groups and impact of completed Task Group reports
2. To allow the Committee to consider any new proposals for Task Groups

There are no requests for new task groups this month.

### Recommendation

That the Committee note the list of existing task groups, and comment as appropriate.

### Background and Advice

In order to ensure that the Scrutiny Committee is kept informed of progress on Task Groups, this item will appear on each agenda.

For information, a list of existing Task Groups is attached as Appendix 'A' to this report. It is not intended that members feed back on all existing task groups, but members are invited to comment on any issues of particular significance.

All new requests for task groups will be considered under this item. As a standing item, this should ensure that there is always a timely response to requests without the need to resort to the Urgent Business Procedure.

### Consultations

N/A

### Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

## **Risk management**

There are no significant risk management implications.

**Financial, Legal, Equality and Diversity, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder, Personnel, Property Asset Management, Procurement, Traffic Management, CIA (policies and strategies only):**

N/A

## **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

### **List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
-------	------	-------------------------

N/A

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

## Overview and Scrutiny – Task and Finish Groups

March 2012

## Current

Committee/Task Group	Chair	Proposed Completion Date
<b>Scrutiny Committee</b>		
Member Development	CC John Shedwick	Standing Group
Arts Funding in Lancashire	CC K Ellard	May 2012
<b>Health Scrutiny Committee</b>		
Steering Group	CC Maggie Skilling	Standing Group
Standing Joint Lancashire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	CC Keith Bailey	Standing Group
Dementia Pathway	CC F Craig-Wilson	May 2012
<b>Education Scrutiny Committee</b>		

## Completed

Committee/Task Group	Completed	Next Steps
<b>Scrutiny Committee</b>		
Cross Boundary Looked After Children – "Who Cares?"	September 2011	Formal/final response April 2012
Young People – Employment and Employability	July 2010	Exec response delivered January 2011
Museums	Sept 2010	Exec Response delivered April 2011
Rail Improvement Schemes		Final meeting 30 January 2012
<b>Health Scrutiny Committee</b>		
Fylde Coast Health Economy Strategy	Nov 2011	Consultation proposals due to come to April Health Scrutiny Committee
<b>Education Scrutiny Committee</b>		



## Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on 9 March 2012

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## Recent and Forthcoming Decisions

Contact for further information:

Claire Evans 07917 836 698 Office of the Chief Executive,  
[claire.evans@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:claire.evans@lancashire.gov.uk)

### Executive Summary

To advise the committee about recent and forthcoming decisions relevant to the work of the committee.

### Recommendation

Members are asked to review the recent or forthcoming decisions and agree whether any should be the subject of further consideration by scrutiny.

## Background and Advice

It is considered useful for scrutiny to receive information about decisions in the Forward Plan and decisions recently made by the Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members in areas relevant to the remit of the committee, in order that this can inform possible future areas of work.

Recent decisions taken by Cabinet Member or the Cabinet can be accessed here:  
<http://council.lancashire.gov.uk/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx?bcr=1>

Forthcoming decisions are included in the Forward Plan, which can be accessed here:  
<http://council.lancashire.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=244&RD=0>

The Forward Plan is published each month. It briefly describes matters likely to be subject to Key Decisions over the next four-month period. A Key Decision for this purpose is an Executive decision that:

- has significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions of the County Council without reference to a financial threshold.
- domestic decisions (affecting the internal workings of the Council) which have a financial impact on the Council of £1.4m or more.

The Forward Plan enables the public to see what Key Decisions are due, who will be taking them and when, and what consultation will occur.

This can also be found under "F" via the alphabetical search on the front page of the county council's website via the following link:

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk>

The Forward Plan is presented to all scrutiny committees on each agenda. The onus is on individual Members to look at the Forward Plan using the links provided above and obtain further information from the officer(s) shown for any decisions which may be of interest to them. The Member may then raise for consideration by the Committee any relevant, proposed decision that he/she wishes the Committee to review.

### **Consultations**

N/A

### **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

### **Risk management**

There are no significant risk management or other implications

### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
-------	------	-------------------------

N/A

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

## Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on 9 March 2012

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## Work Plan 2011/12

(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:

Claire Evans 07917 836 698, Office of the Chief Executive,

claire.evans@lancashire.gov.uk

### Executive Summary

The plan at Appendix 'A' summarises the work to be undertaken by the Committee during 2011/12. The statement will be updated and presented to each meeting of the Committee for information.

### Recommendation

The Committee is asked to note the report.

### Background and Advice

A statement of the current status of work being undertaken by the Committee is presented to each meeting for information.

### Consultations

N/A

### Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

### Risk management

There are not significant risk management implications.

**Financial, Legal, Equality and Diversity, Human Rights, Crime and Disorder, Personnel, Property Asset Management, Procurement, Traffic Management, CIA (policies and strategies only):**

N/A

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**  
**List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A	N/A	N/A
Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate		
N/A		



## Scrutiny Committee Workplan 2011 / 2012

Date of Meeting	Agenda setting	Chair's Briefing	Topic	Witness	Purpose/Key issues
10 Feb		8 Feb	Utilities Companies	United Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streetworks</li> <li>• Reinstatements</li> </ul>
9 Mar		7 Mar	Supporting People Programme	Sarah McCarthy	
13 April			Safeguarding and Looked After Children Update	CC Susie Charles Louise Taylor	
11 May		9 May	Highways Agency?		Local Coordination, communication and consultation issues

			<b>United Utilities Electricity North West (ENW)</b>		Street-lighting (ENW); flooding issues, bathing water quality
			<b>Report of the "Arts Development Funding" Task Group</b>	Cllr Kevin Ellard	
<b>8 June</b>			<b>Economic Development</b>	Martin Kelly/Michael Welsh	Committee to scrutinise progress in outcomes from the EDF and achievements from a reoriented LCDL in support of it
			<b>Apprenticeship Programme in Lancashire</b>	Martin Kelly	
			<b>Tourism?</b>		
<b>6 July</b>			<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	Safer Lancashire Board	
<b>14 Sep</b>			<b>Flooding Lower Alt with Crossens</b>	Environment Agency	EA to respond to recommendations in task group report, in particular effectiveness of new public consultation arrangements

<b>12 Oct</b>					
<b>9 Nov</b>					
<b>7 Dec</b>					
<b>18 Jan 2013</b>			<b>Youth Employment and Employability Strategy</b>	Bob Stott/Marti n Kelly	
<b>8 Feb</b>					
<b>15 March</b>					
<b>19 April</b>					

**Possible future issues:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>	<b>Notes</b>
20mph zones – Update on Cab member decision Feb 2010 when plans more developed / or implemented	Note for information	Short note, giving timings for various actions
Utilities Companies: Street Lighting and road Reinstatements Environment Directorate Commissioning		United Utilities and Electricity North West <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeking advice and guidance from Env. Dir.</li> </ul> Ref: UU and ENW at Scrutiny Committee on 4 February: <a href="http://mgintranet/mgAi.aspx?ID=2059">http://mgintranet/mgAi.aspx?ID=2059</a>
Supporting People Programme; Partnership working	Note for information	
VCFS – Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector	Note for information	Update on previous Communities report. Particular interest in formal commissioning arrangements & monitoring
Working with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector in Services for Young People		Discussion with Cabinet Member for Young People with chairs & deputies of Scrutiny
Positive Life Style Choices (include Lancashire Alcohol Network)	Note for Information	
Traffic Regulation Orders	<b>Report to Committee?</b>	Interest expressed by the Chair Issues around cost of introducing TROs and levels of enforcement. Lancs Constabulary as witness?
Budget Scrutiny	<b>Reports to Committee</b>	Quarterly budget monitoring report (as supplied to Cabinet) – George Graham January 2012 – scrutiny of budget proposals, same process as previous year. Focus on impact of new budget changes/cuts

		NB 09/03/2012 as third one.
Corporate Strategy 2010-13 <b>REFRESH</b>		Lynne Johnstone

### LINKS TO KEY DOCUMENTS/SITES

Lancashire County Council [Corporate Strategy](#)

Lancashire Partnership's Sustainable Community Strategy [Ambition Lancashire](#)

Local Area Agreement [LAA](#)

Lancashire Children's Trust [Childrens Trust](#)

Children and Young Peoples' Plan [CYPP](#)

Joint Lancashire Transport Plan 2011-2021 [JLTP](#) Final sign off by Cabinet due March 2011

Safer Lancashire and Community Safety Agreement [CSA](#)

### TOPICS ALREADY CONSIDERED

**July 2010** – Impact Gvt Spending Reductions on Lancashire County Council

Youth Employment and Employability **TG report**

**Sept 2010** – Subsidised Bus Services and Concessionary Travel

Highways Winter Maintenance

**Oct 2010** – Impact of Gvt's £6.2bn Savings requirement on the county council

Private Children's Homes – task group established

Grit Bins

Lancashire Museums Service **TG report**

**Nov 2010** - After Care for children who have been looked after by the county council

Road Safety for Children and Young People **TG** – Executive Response

Highways Winter Maintenance Service **TG** – Executive Response and Draft Plan

**Dec 2010** – Role of LCC in local economic development: Economic Development Framework Strategy and LCDL

**Jan 2011** – Scrutiny of Budget Proposals 2011/12-2013/14

Street-lighting – role and performance of county council

**Feb 2011** – United Utilities – Roadworks and TMA; water management infrastructure;

Electricity North West - streetlighting

**Mar 2011** - Crime and Disorder Scrutiny – evidence base for setting priorities; domestic violence/anti-social behaviour

**April 2011** – Lancashire County Council Cultural Offer

- Cultural and Sport Strategy
- Cultural Services Restructure
- Museums Service **TG** – Executive Response
- Lancashire Records Office – Review and Action Plan

**May 2011** – Corporate Communications Service

**June 2011** – Arts Council Funding

Flood Risk Management

**September 2011** – Winter Maintenance

"Who Cares?" – Cross Boundary Children task group report

**October 2011** – Lancashire County Council's Cultural Offer

CYP Early Intervention and Prevention

**November 2011** – Leaving Care Services

**December 2011** – Budget monitor

"Who Cares?" task group report – Interim Executive Response

Local Economic Development – role and performance of county council

**January 2012** – Budget Scrutiny

Youth Employment and Employability Strategy

Flooding of Lower Alt task group report

## **TASK GROUPS**

Road Safety for Children and Young People – Completed

Youth Employment and Employability – Completed  
Extending Use and Access to the Lancashire Museums Service  
Cross Boundary Looked After Children, "Who Cares?" – (full Exec Response due March 2011)

