

To: Members of the Council

Date: 16 February 2012

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

**Please contact:** Steve Pearce

**Contact Number:** 0151 934 2046

**Fax No:** 0151 934 2034

**e-mail:**

steve.pearce@sefton.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

**COUNCIL - THURSDAY 16TH FEBRUARY, 2012**

I refer to the agenda for the above meeting and now enclose the following report(s) which were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

<b>Agenda No.</b>	<b>Item</b>
6.	<b>Questions Raised by Members of the Council</b> (Pages 259 - 262) Schedule of questions submitted to Cabinet Members and the responses.
7.	<b>Transformation Programme 2011 - 2014</b> (Pages 263 - 266) Revised Cabinet Recommendation and Service Description for Option E3.6

Yours sincerely,

M. CARNEY

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

## COUNCIL – 16 FEBRUARY 2012

### ITEM 6 - QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

**(1) Question from Councillor Jones to the Cabinet Member - Environmental - (Councillor Shaw)**

“It has been reported in a recent publication that a Rogue bin crew has been operating in Ainsdale ward. This is causing concern and upset to the residents within my ward. Can you confirm if such a crew has been operating.”

**Response:**

“With something approaching 10,000,000 refuse collections a year by the Council’s own refuse collection staff and by its contractor Palm (in relation to recyclables), the Council occasionally gets things wrong, and for that I apologise.

The main point is that we should try to put things right as speedily as possible.

In relation to any recent case of Ainsdale residents having concerns about the refuse collection service, the one I am aware of involves a refuse vehicle regularly “laying over” for a break in an inappropriate location. One of Cllr Jones’ ward colleagues has dealt with the problem and I understand that he is very happy with the way that the department has handled the matter.

If Cllr Jones knows of any other residents who are concerned or upset in any way about any aspect of the refuse collection service, then my advice would be as follows (as to any councillor):

- (i) The residents should be asked to contact the Sefton Plus call centre on 0845 140 0845, or
- (ii) The Councillor, on their behalf, should contact Sefton Plus or management within Sefton’s cleansing service, or
- (iii) In the event that the councillor is unhappy with the response in (ii), or feels that there is a “systemic” problem, then I would ask them to contact me as Cabinet Member responsible.”

# Agenda Item 6

**(2) Question from Councillor Papworth to the Cabinet Member - Transportation - (Councillor Fairclough)**

“How much net income has been generated so far, since inception from charging for car parking at Crosby Civic Hall? What was the cost of installing the “pay-and-display” machines?; and how does the figure compare with the market research which was no doubt undertaken before the scheme began?”

**Response:**

Crosby Civic Hall Car Park and Hougoumont Avenue Car Parks in Waterloo have been treated as one scheme for the introduction of parking charges. I can confirm the following net income from the car parks (net of VAT and enforcement / cash collection costs)

From Monday 28th November 2011 to Sunday 12th February 2012 ( 11 weeks)

Hougoumont Avenue	£9,337.73
Civic Hall	£1,419.09
Total	£10,756.82

The cost of installing the pay and display machines and associated signing was £28,000 and was funded from the Capital Programme.

The original projection for the income from the two car parks was £47,000. Based on income to date the full year income should be just over £50,000.

**(3) Question from Councillor Brodie-Browne to the Cabinet Member - Children, Schools and Families - (Councillor Moncur)**

“Many Southport residents have become alarmed by reports that Birkdale High School has been put into ‘special measures’ following an Ofsted inspection. Can the Cabinet Member report on any meetings he or the Council’s senior staff have had with the Chair of Governors or Headteacher?”

**Response:**

“As members will be aware Birkdale High School converted to an academy in August 2011. As part of the process the Local Authority were instructed by the Secretary of State to cease maintaining the school.

Birkdale was inspected by Ofsted on 12/13 December 2011 and as a result of that inspection was placed in special measures (the lowest category in which some 9% of secondary schools nationally sit). Whilst the Local Authority have no statutory role in respect of academies it

# Agenda Item 6

was felt that we had a moral obligation to the pupils in the school and immediately the Council became aware of the inspection result senior Officers contacted the Chair of Governors to offer support if it was needed and this was followed up in writing, on behalf of the Cabinet Member, on 15 December. This support was offered on the basis of our recent track record with St Wilfrid's, where the team assembled by the Local Authority moved the school out of special measures in the space of four terms (virtually unheard of). The Chair of Governors declined to take up the offer at that time.

Statutory responsibility for intervention in failing academies rests with the Secretary of State and senior Officers contacted the DfE on 18 January to enquire as to their plans and to offer support from the Local Authority, based on our recent track record, if it was needed. The local Authority was contacted by the Department for Education (DfE) on 8 February explaining that they had received a copy of Birkdale's action plans which were being evaluated, and would be meeting with the academy within the next couple of weeks but stating that the Head Teacher was unaware of Sefton's offer of support. The Strategic Director immediately wrote to the Chair of Governors to reiterate that support from the Local Authority was available if required. The Chair of Governors responded to say the original offer had been discussed with the Head Teacher and they had decided to enlist support from another local authority (which we understand to be Liverpool).

The DfE have been asked to keep Sefton up to date with progress."

Councillor Brodie-Browne gave advance notice of the following **supplementary question** to the Cabinet Member:

"What have we put in place for the schools that have not opted out, to support them through the new Ofsted inspection regime?"

## **Response:**

"The new Ofsted inspection framework came into effect on 2 January 2012 (Birkdale High School was inspected under the old framework). In order to prepare schools for the new framework, a series of training events have been held for school leaders and governors. Schools performance is monitored by the Local Authority and school specific targeted support is provided for schools as required. Support for all maintained schools is provided in the run up to an inspection, during the inspection and as part of any follow-up action required.

As colleagues may be aware, the new Ofsted Chief Inspector took up post in January and has already indicated that he will revise the inspection framework. Officers will ensure that maintained schools are kept up to date with any changes, with specific support available for individual schools."

# Agenda Item 6

## (4) Question from Councillor Shaw to the Cabinet Member - Older People and Health - (Councillor Porter)

“In relation to the recent award (on the basis of a combination of quality and price) by the Council of new Domiciliary Personal Care Services contracts for a 5 to 7 year period from 1 April 2012, I wish to ask the Cabinet Member the following questions:

1. Which companies are currently contracted, until 31 March 2012, to provide the service and what geographical areas do they cover?
2. What prices were quoted in each of the 6 new geographical areas by:
  - (a) the successful tenderer for that area, and
  - (b) any existing providers (identified in 1 above) who may have bid in that area?”

### Response:

“The Procurement process was a Part EI open process tender (Mt3 (European Procurement) via the North West Procurement Hub “the Chest” which is open to all local, national and international organisations in line with European legislation.

The evaluation of bids was carried out by Commissioning staff and Social Work Managers who are involved in service delivery and scoring was moderated by the Corporate Procurement Team.

The scoring was assessed on the basis of 60% for Quality and 40% for Cost in order to be able to deliver an innovative, responsible and sustainable service to service users. The process of getting to contract with successful bidders is in the concluding stages and commercial negotiations on the final contracts going forward are underway. For this reason, it would be inappropriate to release commercial information at this stage save to say that the Council, in carrying out this exercise, has produced a better service delivery model at a more economical rate which will allow flexibility for managers going forward.”

## COUNCIL – 16 FEBRUARY 2012

Council is requested to consider the following revised recommendation from the Cabinet relating to Policy Option E3.6 - Sports and Recreation - Review of the lifeguard cover at all swimming pools. A copy of the revised service description for the option is attached.

### CABINET - 16 FEBRUARY 2012

The Cabinet considered the minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 2 February 2012 and a discussion took place on Minute No. 94 (8) relating to the Transformation Programme 2011-2014 and in particular the recommendation in respect of the proposed action to be taken on policy option E3.6 – Sports and Recreation – Review of the life guard cover at all swimming pools. In response to the views raised during consultation and the continuous risk assessment process on this option, it was proposed that the proposed action to be taken on the option of providing “a limited reduction of life guard cover during the low cost periods identified in the report” be deleted and substituted by “life guard cover be provided at all public swimming sessions, as at present and the shortfall in budget savings to be achieved, be met by a increase of 3% above inflation in the charges for swimming sessions.

### RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 2 February 2012 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the amendment of Minute 94 (8) to enable the recommended action to be taken on option E3.6 to read as follows:

Ref	Service Area	Proposal	Recommendation to Council
E3.6	Sports and Recreation	Review of the life guard cover at all swimming pools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• life guard cover be provided at all public swimming sessions, as at present and the shortfall in budget savings to be achieved, be met by a increase of 3% above inflation in the charges for swimming sessions.</li> <li>• Officers be authorised to prepare for implementation immediately, (subject to the duty to consult with employees and trade unions) including the issue of relevant statutory notifications, if necessary, subject to the final decision of Council.</li> </ul>





## **Savings option Reference E3.6 - Proposed Amendment**

### **Original Service Description: Lifeguard Savings**

### **Proposed Amendment: Adaptation of working arrangements for Lifeguards**

The Public Consultation undertaken on the original proposal to remove lifeguard cover at certain times of operation identified that 94% of respondents were against the removal of lifeguards during general public swimming times. The ongoing risk assessment identifies this a high factor in need of mitigation.

If the Council are minded to maintain the lifeguard cover during general public swimming times it would reduce the savings proposal by approximately £27,000. To recover this loss it is proposed that there is an increase to the fees and charges for swimming by 3% above inflation, allowing for the full saving to be achieved and lifeguard cover during general public swimming times to be continued. This alternative option together with the other adjustments to lifeguard working arrangements contained in the original proposal will achieve the full saving of £70,000. This restructure of the saving proposal will mean that:-

- All general public swimming sessions will continue to have lifeguard cover.
- There will be an increase in fees and charges for general public swimming and swimming related activity.
- No lifeguard cover for clubs sessions.
- Clubs are delivering swimming development and use highly trained coaches. All members are highly competent swimmers. Coaches would be trained to be able to affect a pool rescue.
- Reduced cover during school swimming lessons.
- Swimming teachers are present during the lessons and can be trained up to provide rescue cover.
- Reduced cover in Splash World.
- By altering the way lifeguards operate and their working hours it is possible to reduce the number.

This page is intentionally left blank