

H L HEALTH BOARD CIC

Investigation of a Statute for those who are born in Parts beyond Sea (1350) to support health, safety, and psychological wellbeing across the Commonwealth realm, with particular attention to children, adults, the elderly, and members of the Windrush generation.

2026 /2027

Prepared for: Parliament and Local Authorities (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland where applicable)

Prepared by: Lancelot Webb the Leader of H L HEALTH BOARD CIC independent scrutiny plan.

HL Health Board CIC: Registered number 16043352

Contents

- **Foreword**
- **1. Executive Summary**
- **2. Terms of Reference**
- **3. Governance and Assurance**
- **4. Methodology and Evidence Standards**
- **5. Workplan and Milestones**
- **6. Stakeholder Engagement Plan**
- **7. Deliverables**
- **8. Budget and Value for Money**
- **9. Risk Register**
- **10. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning**
- **Annex A: Call for Evidence template**
- **Annex B: Consent and safeguarding scripts**
- **Annex C: Interview guides**
- **Annex D: Data Protection and DPIA checklist**

1. Foreword

This Scrutiny Plan establishes a rigorous, trauma-informed investigation into the historical and contemporary implications of the 1350 statute A Statute for Those Who Are Born in Parts Beyond Sea. The work responds to enduring disparities in health, safety, psychological wellbeing, and institutional trust affecting the Windrush generation and their descendants across the Commonwealth realm.

As Chairman of H L Health Board CIC, I affirm that this scrutiny is not historical curiosity, but a public health, safeguarding, and legislative duty—supporting Parliament and local authorities to improve outcomes for children, adults, and the elderly.

Lancelot Webb



Programme Leader
H L Health Board CIC

1. Executive Summary

This report presents findings and recommendations arising from a review of the historic statute of 1350 concerning individuals born outside the realm to English parents, and its continuing influence on modern local authority governance and administrative decision-making.

This programme will deliver an evidence-led scrutiny of the 1350 statute commonly referred to as 'A Statute for those who are born in Parts beyond Sea' (De natis ultra mare), with outputs designed to be directly usable by Parliament and Local Authorities.

Primary aims

- Clarify the statute's historical purpose and its status in the modern statute book.
- Identify patterns of contemporary citation, misunderstanding or misuse that affect public administration.
- Produce practical guidance, templates and training for parliamentary casework and local authority services.
- Reduce harms linked to misinformation (exploitation, harassment, community tension) through proportionate responses.

2. Terms of Reference

1.1 Background

The 1350 statute (De natis ultra mare) is a historic enactment that is sometimes referenced in modern discourse. Parliamentary offices and local authorities may encounter references to the statute in correspondence, petitions, complaints, FOI requests, or community campaigns. This programme provides structured scrutiny and practical tools.

1.2 Objectives

1. Produce an accurate, accessible account of what the statute is and is not, and how it is presented on the UK statute book.
2. Map contemporary usage and the operational impacts on public bodies (process burden, safeguarding, cohesion, legal risk).
3. Co-design proportionate guidance and standard responses for Parliament and Local Authorities.
4. Provide training resources and evaluation to support sustained implementation.

1.3 Scrutiny Questions

- What problem did the statute address in 1350, and what did it practically change at the time?
- What is its status in the modern statute book and how should it be described accurately today?
- How is it being cited now (frequency, contexts, typical claims) and where do claims diverge from current law/practice?
- What risks arise (financial exploitation, harassment, safeguarding, misinformation amplification, community tensions)?
- What response pathways and guidance do Parliamentary offices and Local Authorities need?

1.4 Out of Scope

- Providing individual legal advice to members of the public.
- Taking a position on political viewpoints; the programme is non-partisan and evidence-led.
- Operational decisions that remain with statutory bodies (police, safeguarding boards, local authorities).

3. Governance and Assurance

| Role | Responsibility |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project Director | Overall accountability |
| Legal Historian | Accuracy & interpretation |
| Local Authority Advisor | Practical relevance |
| Equality Specialist | Compliance review |
| Independent Reviewer | Quality assurance |

Monthly progress reporting and audit compliance ensured.

4. Methodology

Phase 1 – Documentary & Archival Review (Months 1–3)

- Transcription and modern legal translation
- Cross-comparison with:
 - Magna Carta clauses
 - Statute of Westminster
 - Early nationality doctrines

Output: Annotated statute report

Phase 2 – Legal Lineage Mapping (Months 4–5)

- Track legal inheritance into:
 - British Nationality Acts
 - Local government administrative powers
- Identify where principles persist implicitly

Output: Legislative genealogy map

Phase 3 – Local Authority Scrutiny (Months 6–8)

- Interviews with:
 - Local authority solicitors
 - Registration officers
 - Housing eligibility leads
- Case study review (anonymised)

Output: Operational impact assessment

Phase 4 – Equality & Human Rights Analysis (Months 9–10)

- Review compatibility with:
 - Equality Act principles
 - Public Sector Equality Duty
- Identify historic bias embedded in law

Output: Equality implications paper

Phase 5 – Reporting & Recommendations (Months 11–12)

- Final scrutiny report
- Local authority guidance note
- Parliamentary briefing pack

5. Workplan and Milestones (12-month)

Summary timeline

| Phase | Months | Key activities | Outputs |
|----------------------|--------|--|---|
| Mobilisation | 1–2 | Governance set-up; recruit members; safeguarding/DPIA; build training; comms plan. | Approved ToR; training pack; evidence standards |
| Desk review + launch | 3–5 | Desk review; stakeholder mapping; open call for evidence. | Interim briefing note; call for evidence live |
| Fieldwork | 6–8 | Interviews; LA roundtables; evidence sessions; survey; case studies. | Evidence logs; draft findings |
| Synthesis | 9–10 | Analysis; red-team review; counsel review; draft toolkits. | Draft report and toolkits |
| Publish + implement | 11–12 | Accessibility; publication; launch events; training delivery; evaluation. | Final report; Parliament pack; LA toolkit; MEL report |

6. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Parliament and Local Authorities)

1.1 Parliament

- Briefings for parliamentary staff and casework teams (virtual + optional in-person).
- Select Committee-style evidence session (recorded and transcribed).
- Templates: standard reply language, escalation guidance, signposting.

1.2 Local Authorities

- Regional roundtables (legal, democratic services, community safety, comms, safeguarding).
- Toolkit co-design workshop with pilot authorities.
- Micro-training module for frontline staff (20–30 minutes).

7. Deliverables

1. Annotated 1350 Statute analysis
2. Legal lineage mapping document
3. Local authority operational impact report
4. Equality and fairness assessment
5. Policy recommendations for reform or clarification

8. Budget and Value for Money

Budget Breakdown

Staffing Costs (£154,200)

| Role | Cost |
|------------------------------------|---------|
| Project Director (0.4 FTE) | £38,000 |
| Legal Historian | £42,500 |
| Local Authority Policy Analyst | £31,200 |
| Equality & Human Rights Consultant | £22,500 |
| Research Assistant | £20,000 |

Research & Operations (£53,600)

| Item | Cost |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Archival access & licensing | £8,500 |
| Transcription & translation | £7,800 |
| Legal databases | £6,200 |
| Stakeholder workshops (3) | £12,000 |
| Travel & subsistence | £9,100 |
| Data handling & compliance | £10,000 |

Reporting & Dissemination (£24,000)

| Item | Cost |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Final report production | £8,000 |
| Local authority guidance | £6,000 |
| Parliamentary briefing pack | £5,000 |
| Public access summary | £5,000 |

Contingency (6%) (£16,000)

Total Project Cost: £247,800

Value for Money

- Prevents misapplication of inherited legal assumptions
- Improves local authority decision consistency
- Supports equality compliance
- Enhances legislative transparency

Cost per local authority (if national rollout): < £1,000 per authority

9. Risk Register (with mitigations)

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigation | Owner | Status |
|--|------------|--------|--|-------------------------|--------|
| Misinformation amplification | Medium | High | Neutral framing; paraphrase harmful claims; publish 'information not advice'; counsel review. | Comms Lead / Legal Lead | Open |
| Safeguarding incidents involving members | Low-Med | High | Mandatory safeguarding training; escalation pathway; incident log; avoid high-risk engagement. | Safeguarding Lead | Open |
| Data protection breach | Low | High | DPIA; minimisation; secure storage; access control; redaction before publication. | Data/Impact Lead | Open |
| Stakeholder non-participation | Medium | Medium | Early outreach; flexible scheduling; offer anonymised participation; use LA networks. | Programme Director | Open |
| Reputational risk / perceived bias | Medium | High | Independent Chair; transparent method; publish limitations; red-team neutrality audit. | Chair / Board | Open |

10. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)

1.1 Outcomes and indicators

| Outcome | Indicators | Data sources |
|---|--|---|
| Improved accuracy and confidence in public body responses | Staff report higher confidence; fewer escalations caused by unclear handling | Pre/post surveys; qualitative feedback |
| Reduced administrative burden for repeat claims | Time-to-triage reduced; fewer repeat contacts with identical claims | Pilot LA metrics; casework sampling |
| Safer handling of vulnerable or exploited individuals | Appropriate referrals; safeguarding escalations handled appropriately | Safeguarding log; referral pathway tracking |

1.2 Learning loops

- Monthly learning huddles with cohort leads.
- After-action reviews after each evidence session.
- Quarterly board learning memo capturing changes made and why.

Annex A: Call for Evidence

A1. Submission questions

5. Where did you encounter references to the 1350 statute (context and date)?
6. What claim was being made and what outcome was sought?
7. What impact did this have on you/your organisation (time, cost, safety, wellbeing)?
8. What evidence can you provide (documents, screenshots, links)?
9. May we quote you (anonymised) and may we contact you for follow-up?

A2. Data handling statement

We will use your submission for research and scrutiny purposes. We will minimise personal data, store submissions securely, and publish only anonymised summaries unless you give explicit permission otherwise.

Annex B: Consent and safeguarding scripts

B1. Consent script (interviews)

Thank you for speaking with us. We will take notes and may record if you agree. You can pause or stop at any time. We will anonymise your comments in published outputs unless you explicitly request attribution. Do you consent to proceed?

B2. Safeguarding escalation

If you think someone is at immediate risk of harm, call emergency services. For non-emergency safeguarding concerns, follow your organisation's safeguarding lead process. Members must not investigate beyond their remit; escalate and step back.

Annex C: Interview guides

C1. Parliamentary staff (casework) - prompt questions

- How often do you see references to the 1350 statute in casework?
- What types of outcomes are typically requested?
- Where does handling become time-consuming or risky?
- What guidance/templates would be most useful?
- What red lines should guidance avoid (e.g., appearing to give legal advice)?

C2. Local Authority leads - prompt questions

- Which services receive these contacts (democratic services, legal, community safety, comms, safeguarding)?
- What are the typical escalation routes and pain points?
- Have you observed links to harassment, scams, or community tensions?
- What template responses and triage flow would help?
- How should we design micro-training for frontline staff?

Annex D: Data Protection and DPIA checklist

- Purpose and lawful basis documented.
- Data minimisation plan and retention schedule.
- Security controls (access, encryption, storage).
- Consent/notice wording approved.
- Special category data handling and redaction process.
- Publication risk review completed.