

OFFICIAL



Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

2pm on Monday 7 June. 2021

Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Alfred Gelder Street, Hull

Present: Councillors Chaytor (Chair), Conner, Dearing, Dad, Fareham, Fudge, Hatcher, Healand, Herrera-Richmond, Matthews, Pritchard, Randall (Mrs) C.E., Ross, and Wilson.

In attendance:

J. Newman (Chair of the Hull and East Yorkshire LEP) Minute 3
A. Codd (Assistant Director Economic Development & Regeneration) Minute 4
A. Holgate (Governance Group Manager) Minutes 5,8 & 9
M. Garlick (Customer Feedback Team Leader) Minute 5
M. Leighton (Head of Transformation Support) Minute 6
P. Chadwick (Property & Assets) Minute 7

Apologies:

No apologies were received for this meeting.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

1	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
No declarations of interest were received in respect of the items that follow below.		
2	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 29 MARCH 2021	
The Governance Group Manager submitted the minutes of the meeting of Monday, 29 March, 2021 for approval.		
Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 March, 2021, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chair.	N/A	Scrutiny Officer (FH)
3	ATTENDANCE OF THE CHAIR OF THE HULL AND EAST YORKSHIRE LEP	
<p>J. Newman (Chair of the Hull and East Yorkshire LEP) attended the meeting to enable the Committee to discuss the newly formed LEP and how it and the Council could work together to support the City.</p> <p>The Chair advised Mr Newman of what the Committee wished to discuss with him, including the remit of the new LEP; what the LEP was, and what it was intended to do; and, the allocation of funding, with a view to Hull receiving a fair share.</p> <p>Mr Newman detailed his professional background, and went on to advise the Committee that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. The new LEP would have a smaller Board, which would be less business focussed and more community based, to include the NHS, education and the Voluntary Community Sector.ii. New sub-boards would be created, and boards would include investment, employment & skills; an infrastructure, including transport, digital, housing and flooding board; an innovation and transformation board; an audit, finance and governance board; and, the boards would ensure transparency, and the majority would be independent of the main Board.iii. Terms of Reference were being developed and would need appraisal by Hull City Council; and, progression was slower than had		

OFFICIAL

been envisaged due to financial constraints.

The Committee discussed:

- i. How some of the boards would work together without overlapping and how they would offer value for money.
- ii. The number of boards in comparison to those of the previous LEP; that the previous LEP had had a maximum of 20 boards but with 4 authorities and the new LEP would have 10 boards and 2 Leaders; and, the number of boards would be about the same, with the addition of the Skills and Innovation board.
- iii. Whether there was the need to lobby for the better use of the apprenticeship levy.
- iv. How the reviewed Industrial Strategy would be used by the LEP.
- v. Whether there was a role for the LEP to branch out into research and development and link with medium sized businesses; and, that conversations had been held with Hull University, and it was acknowledged that a lot of funding had gone into big businesses but that the supply chain was important.
- vi. The importance of the new LEP boards attending the Scrutiny Commissions for questions and discussion.
- vii. How the success of the LEP would be measured.
- viii. How the LEP would work with the Freeport.
- ix. Potential tax benefits, such as Business Rates retention and customs benefits.
- x. What the new LEP could do for Hull that previous LEPs had not; that the new LEP would concentrate solely on the East Riding and Hull, not the South Bank; the focus would be on improving the region; there would be improved connectivity with Yorkshire and the North; and, it would be easier to unite two sets of politicians than four.
- xi. That Hull needed to see its economy promoted; the need to stabilise and increase employment and prevent quality jobs leaving the City for the East Riding; and, that the LEP recognised the need to keep jobs within the City, and a package to retain workers was being created.
- xii. The need to promote Hull to Transport for the North to improve the City's transport infrastructure, including electrification of rail for the benefit of both passenger and industrial freight lines; the priority to promote Hull as a port so that Hull was used for import and export for the whole region; that conversations had been held with MPs regarding a direct rail timetable to York and electrification; and, that it had yet to be decided who the representative from the LEP would be, but the importance of transport to the City meant that a transport expert was being sought.

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
a) That the Chair of the LEP be thanked for his attendance at the meeting, and his attendance to update at future meetings will be welcomed.	a) N/A	a) Fiona Harbord / Alex Codd



OFFICIAL

4	CIVIL SERVICE RELOCATION OPPORTUNITIES
<p>A. Codd (Assistant Director Economic Development & Regeneration) attended the meeting to provide a copy of the finalised proposition from the Council to Civil Service departments looking to relocate from London and the South East of England.</p> <p>The Assistant Director advised the Committee of the content of the relocation prospectus.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the content of the prospectus but raised concerns around the format of the document and recommended that the key information regarding the location of potential office space be moved to the beginning of the prospectus as this would be the information that would be of most interest to the civil service departments; the information related to quality of life, although relevant, should follow; and; that the transport links such as those to Leeds needed to be emphasised.</p> <p>The Committee discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. What progress had been made in promoting Hull as a relocation site; the prospect of relocation to Hull in the next timeframe; that this would depend on devolution; that contacts would be made over the Summer; there had been much movement; and, much good work had taken place with the Department for Work and Pensions.ii. How it could be ensured that Hull reached the next stage and was successful; whether there was a budget to promote Hull, and who would carry out that promotion; whether the East Riding would speak up for the City; that a briefing inviting people in could be held; and, whether the High Sherriff of Hull and the Steward of Hull could be used for promotion.iii. The timeline for relocation; concerns that relocation to Myton Street would be difficult if it coincided with the A63/Castle Street Works; concerns that the Myton Street area was both publicly and privately owned; and, that conversations were taking place with the private sector about bringing Myton Street forward.iv. Which government departments the authority was in discussion with; that conversations with the DWP were seen as a way in to other departments; and, that the LEP was new but once established may offer future support.v. When progress would be reported back to the Committee; that there would not be anything to report back on until Autumn 2021; that it was difficult to give an end point as it would depend on issues nationally and other towns and cities pushing forward; and, it was important that Hull did not miss out.vi. That the prospectus should include what the region as well as Hull had to offer, including the East Riding leisure offer; that the prospectus could be used to advertise the City to companies and other relocating organisations to maximise the promotion of the City; that there was no single umbrella group within the government that was responsible for the transfer to other regions; and, the final version of the prospectus needed to be promoted to senior civil servants, MPs and members of the House of Lords as soon as possible.	

OFFICIAL

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
<p>a) That the prospectus be amended so that the key projects and maps, which are the most relevant information to government departments, are the first seen.</p> <p>b) That once the prospectus has been amended officers take every opportunity to promote it to government offices, Members of Parliament and members of the House of Lords.</p> <p>c) That an update to the Civil Service Opportunities Prospectus will be brought to the September 2021 meeting of this Committee.</p>	<p>a) It was felt that the prospectus needed to be "punchier" from the start.</p> <p>b) To ensure that all relevant people of influence are aware of the positive information that makes Hull suitable for the relocation of government departments and promote Hull accordingly.</p> <p>c) To provide any updated information and present the amended prospectus,</p>	<p>a) Alex Codd</p> <p>b) Alex Codd</p> <p>c) Alex Codd</p>

5	CUSTOMER FEEDBACK DATA REPORTING
<p>A. Holgate (Governance Group Manager) and M. Garlick (Customer Feedback Team Leader) presented a briefing providing an overview of the performance data available regarding feedback received into the Council.</p> <p>The Governance Group Manager informed the Committee that, following the briefing to a previous meeting, this briefing was to demonstrate the levels of recording customer feedback, with a view to persistent issues being reported to the appropriate Scrutiny Commission by exception. Service areas would be requested to feed in to Commission meetings and report on what was being done to address issues.</p> <p>The Committee discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. That, as most of the complaints related to waste disposal and housing, the majority of the work would fall within the remit of the People and Communities OSC; and, that an update was also needed to the Chair of the Appeals Committee. ii. Where there were gaps in the information; that this data was seen as a starting point; and, that the Customer Feedback Team were currently working on identifying gaps. iii. Whether it might be more useful for complaints to be expressed as a percentage of the Area and Ward population; work would take place to see if that was possible; and, it should also be explored as to whether the age of complainants could be recorded to see 	

OFFICIAL

- where there were gaps in reporting.
- iv. That Members Support was working on an electronic system to manage Councillor caseloads, including complaints; and, that many complaints for Councillors came via MPs.

The Governance Manager advised the Committee that it was intended that Scrutiny Officers would work with service areas to perform a deep dive and bring the relevant information back to Scrutiny Commissions; and, that complaints and actions to mitigate them would become a regular feature on work programmes.

The Committee agreed to this work, but that the Portfolio Holders should be included in the process, and that an update should be brought to the Committee before any reporting to OSCs took place.

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
<p>a) That an update to the progress of the customer feedback data be delivered to the September 2021 meeting of this Committee, with a view to data being taken to appropriate Scrutiny Commissions in October 2021.</p> <p>b) That before the customer feedback data issues are taken to the Overview and Scrutiny Commissions the complaints issues identified should first be referred to the appropriate Portfolio Holders and Managers to be commented on.</p> <p>c) That an update on the complaints be provided to the Chair of the Appeals Committee.</p> <p>d) That, if possible, complaints as a percentage of residents be included in reporting.</p>	<p>a) To enable the Committee to consider the data before it is referred to appropriate Scrutiny Commissions for consideration.</p> <p>b) To inform the Portfolio Holders and Managers and enable them to comment on the identified issues prior to Scrutiny consideration.</p> <p>c) To inform the Appeals Committee of issues on a City and Service area basis.</p> <p>d) To enable members to identify the service areas and Areas within the City with the greatest issues.</p>	<p>a) Alex Holgate / Michelle Garlick</p> <p>b) Alex Holgate / Michelle Garlick</p> <p>c) Alex Holgate / Michelle Garlick</p> <p>d) Alex Holgate / Michelle Garlick</p>

OFFICIAL

M. Leighton (Head of Transformation Support) attended the Committee to deliver a presentation providing additional information requested related to the Brexit Transition and updating on the position to date.

The Head of Transformation Support summarised the presentation.

The Committee members discussed:

- i. Whether tenants had been communicated with in regards to EUSS; that communication had been via letter, and tenants had been told of 300300 and the web-site; and, that contact should have been made through Tenancy and Tenancy Support Officers.
- ii. How many people for whom English was a second language had not responded to attempts to engage; that attempts had been made to identify EU speaking children when applying for school; and letters were sent home with pupils; that young people did not always give parents letters from school; and, because of this letters were also being sent direct to the family address
- iii. Concerns about the imminent deadline; that a massive number of EU residents could be in private accommodation, and as such would not be reached through the Tenancy team; and, that these pressures meant that officers needed to use any legal avenue to reach affected residents and workers.
- iv. Concerns about data protection and whether, under GDPR, it was legal to access data through schools; whether similar data could be shared between Council departments; and, that this data sharing had gone through the data protection process, and only anonymised addresses were used
- v. Whether churches and community groups linked with EU residents had been contacted; and, that church leaders and support groups had been approached and asked to cascade the information.
- vi. That many Hull residents worked in East Riding factories, and contact should be made with those.
- vii. Where possible, future presentations should be less national and more Hull focussed.

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
a) That an update be brought to the next meeting of this Committee, following the 30 June deadline for the EUSS.	a) To ensure members are fully informed of the progress of the EUSS information scheme, and of the progress of any other aspect of Brexit.	a) Andy Burton / Mark Leighton
b) That as a number of Hull residents work in East Riding based factories, consideration be given as to how ER factories can be linked with in order to engage with their employees.	b) To use every means possible to contact the target population.	b) Andy Burton / Mark Leighton
c) That a copy of the leaflet and letter sent out in regard	c) So that members are aware of what	c) Mark Leighton /

OFFICIAL

to EUSS will be circulated to members of this Committee and to the Chair of the People and Communities OSC.	information is being circulated.	Fiona Harbord
---	----------------------------------	---------------

7	URGENT ITEM - ICE ARENA ESSENTIAL BUILDING MAINTENANCE WORKS	
<p>P. Chadwick (Property & Assets) attended the Committee to present a report seeking to award a NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract to JP Developers Limited for essential building maintenance of the Ice Arena, for a value of £254,095.49.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the reasons why the report was being included on the agenda as an urgent item.</p> <p>Concerns were raised at the number of major projects which overspent on their original budgets, such as Ennerdale and the Beverley Road works, and that the contract and tender process needed to be considered to prevent future underestimation.</p> <p>The officer was asked what, with reference to point 6.5 of the report, were the factors that resulted in an almost 40% increase in costs. It was explained that the initial intent was to refurbish the Arena and keep it running for 5 to 10 years until the new Arena was developed at Albion Square; inflation of the cost of copper and the purchase of plant that could be transferred to the new Arena had resulted in increased costs; but, that savings would be made by the relocation of the plant to the new Arena.</p> <p>The Committee commented that this information should have been included in the report, and queried how it could be guaranteed that the equipment currently being purchased would not be obsolete in 5 years and what percentage of contingencies were built into contracts.</p> <p>The officer advised that no contingencies were built in due to Council policies.</p>		
Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
<p>a) The Commission supports the recommendation at section 2 of the report.</p> <p>b) In addition, following concerns being raised that the original estimate of the cost of the project had increased to a level where a second key decision was</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) Members were concerned at the number of reports being brought forward requesting approval for additional</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) Nick Howbridge / Garry Taylor / Neil Daynes / David</p>

OFFICIAL

necessary, the Committee agreed that the contract and tender process be referred to the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission for consideration as to why the cost of a number of projects have been under estimated and how the process can be made more financially accurate.	funding for projects for which budgets had previously been agreed and allocated, and wished to investigate issues which could contribute to under-estimating the cost of contracts.	Bell
--	---	------

8	NOTICE OF KEY DECISIONS REPORT
----------	---------------------------------------

The Governance Group Manager presented an item to support consideration by the Committee of the new entries in the Forward Plan.

The Committee discussed the Notice of Key Decision entries and agreed to their allocation for pre-decision scrutiny.

Recommendations:	Reasons for Recommendations:	Officer Assigned
a) Item 1 - Adoption of Old Town Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan - That this item is not subject to scrutiny as it will be fully considered by the Planning Committee.	a) No pre-decision scrutiny necessary.	a) Phil Hampel
b) Item 2 - Every Child Connected – devices and connectivity - That this item is considered by the Early Support and Lifelong Learning Overview and Scrutiny Commission.	b) For pre-decision scrutiny.	b) Maria Kohler
c) Item 3 - Hull Carbon Neutral Strategy 2030 – Corporate Buildings LED Lighting Replacement Framework - That this item is considered by the Infrastructure and Energy Overview and Scrutiny Commission.	c) For pre-decision scrutiny.	c) Fiona Harbord
d) Item 4 - Humber Freeport - That this item is considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.	d) For pre-decision scrutiny.	d) Fiona Harbord / Alex Codd

OFFICIAL

<p>e) Item 5 - Procurement of Litter Enforcement Services - That this item is considered by the People and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Commission.</p> <p>f) Item 6 - Public open space – maintenance arrangements - That this item is considered by the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission and is also referred to the Planning Committee for consideration.</p> <p>g) Item 7 - SEND contracts - That this item is considered by the Early Support and Lifelong Learning Overview and Scrutiny Commissions.</p> <p>h) Item 7 - That, with reference to Lot 3 of the SEND contracts, whether an advocacy service contract was in place for children who are not SEND or Looked After.</p>	<p>e) For pre-decision scrutiny.</p> <p>f) For pre-decision scrutiny and as this was a planning protocol it was felt that the Planning Committee should also have input.</p> <p>g) For pre-decision scrutiny.</p> <p>h) This contract focussed on SEND and LAC, but it was felt that other young people would also benefit from such a service.</p>	<p>e) Maria Kohler</p> <p>f) Fiona Harbord/Paul Rawcliffe</p> <p>g) Maria Kohler</p> <p>h) Russ Waterman / Maria Kohler</p>
---	---	---

<p>9</p>	<p>OSMC RESOLUTION LIST</p>	
<p>The Governance Group Manager presented an item to inform the Committee of items coming up on future agenda and on progress against agreed actions.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the future Work Programme and resolution list and made recommendations based on the outstanding actions on the list.</p>		
<p>Recommendations:</p>	<p>Reasons for Recommendations:</p>	<p>Officer Assigned</p>

OFFICIAL

<p>a) That those actions that have been resolved are removed from the Resolution List.</p> <p>b) That NPS be pressed for a date when the NPS Humber Covid-19 Business Impact and Recovery Plan will be presented to this Committee.</p> <p>c) That the meeting between members and officers in relation to the issues around Ring Roads be organised to occur within one month.</p>	<p>a) Members agreed that the outstanding actions had been resolved, including those resolved as a result of the items on the agenda of this meeting.</p> <p>b) It was felt that the Recovery Plan should have been progressed and be ready for presentation to the Committee in a more timely manner.</p> <p>c) Members raised concerns at the length of time since the request for a meeting had first been made.</p>	<p>a) Fiona Harbord</p> <p>b) Nick Howbridge</p> <p>c) Antony Spouse</p>
---	---	--