



**COTSWOLD**  
**DISTRICT COUNCIL**

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**1 SEPTEMBER 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM (13)**

**QUARTERLY DIGEST**

## INDEX

Item	Subject
<b>(1)</b>	<b>Joint Scrutiny Etc. Meetings/Oral Updates as appropriate</b>
(i)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee – Minutes of meetings held on 26 February and 2 July 2020 (attached).
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of meetings held on 14 July 2020 (attached).
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 17 July 2020 (attached).
<b>(2)</b>	<b>Forward Plan – Update</b>

### Notes:

- (i) The items contained within this Quarterly Digest are not for formal debate by the Committee, and do not appear as stand-alone agenda items.
- (ii) Members are invited to identify any issue(s) arising out of the information provided within this Digest for future debate and/or action by the Committee.
- (iii) If Members have any questions on the detail of any of the information provided within this Digest, they should address such questions to the accountable Member and/or Officer concerned, for a reply outside the formal Meeting.

(END)

# GLoucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 26 February 2020 at the Civic Suite - North Warehouse - Gloucester City Council.

## PRESENT:

Cllr Brian Robinson	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Nicky Packer
Cllr Kevin Cromwell (Chair)	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Ben Evans	Cllr Sajid Patel
Cllr Kate Haigh (Vice-Chair)	Cllr John Murphy

Officers in attendance: David Owen, Claire Edwards and Angela Presdee

## 1. WELCOME

- 1.1 Chair of the Committee, Cllr Kevin Cromwell, opened the meeting by thanking Gloucester City Council for hosting the Committee.
- 1.2 It was explained that the purpose of the meeting was to focus on issues relating specifically to the economic agenda for Gloucester City and for members to consider proposals on how engagement between the Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee, the Joint Scrutiny Committee and the District Authorities might be improved.
- 1.3 The Chair informed members that this was the final local meeting and in March the Committee would be considering an outcome report which would address all local meetings and issues raised.

## 2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Stephen Davies, Gina Blomefield (Cotswold District Council) and Jim Dewey (Stroud District Council).

Cllr Patrick Coleman was present as a substitute for Cllr Gina Blomefield.

Apologies were also received from Colin Chick and Simon Excell.

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

## 4. GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

Local Presentation

*The presentation for this section can be found at Annex A*

## **Introduction**

- 4.1 The Chair invited Cllr Paul James, former Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and the Economy for Gloucester City Council, to open the first section of the meeting, a presentation from Gloucester on key issues and concerns affecting the economic growth and development of the City.
- 4.2 The Committee heard that the regeneration of the City has been the best part of a 20 year project, dating back to the first major scheme as the opening of the Oxstalls Campus in 2002 to form part of the University of Gloucestershire.
- 4.3 The majority of the regeneration was focused around Gloucester Docks and Quays area, and the Council were conscious efforts needed to be redirected to the City Centre going forward.
- 4.4 Members heard from Slides 4 to 6 about the economic challenges the City had, and how the Council saw its role in addressing those.

## **Presentation 1**

- 4.5 David Evans, City Growth and Delivery Manager, gave an overview of the main economic challenges facing the City.
- 4.6 The Committee heard a snapshot view of Gloucester's economy (*slides 8 and 9*). They were advised that unlike the national picture, Gloucester had a mixture of large, traditional employers which were double that the South West average and new SME's in emerging industries. This mixture means Gloucester is highly exposed to the changing nature of productivity and the decline in traditional sectors.
- 4.7 There was a higher than average proportion of the population who were economically active, however, qualification rates were low across the board meaning the local population may not be able to take full advantage of growth in new industries requiring technical skills.
- 4.8 The City have produced an Economic Growth Strategy 2018-21 which analysed what was happening in the City now and then how in the future to stimulate growth development, increase skills and improve the place that is Gloucester through investment.
- 4.9 Slides 10-16 gave an overview of the three key areas of focus; Business, People and Place, with a cross cutting objective of 'Impact', ensuring all growth benefits Gloucester's residents.

## **Presentation 2**

- 4.10 Ian Edwards, Head of Place, presented on the current initiatives.
- 4.11 It was stressed the need to work in partnership with all local authorities in Gloucestershire and the GFirst LEP, to tackle economic growth challenges together and develop regeneration together.
- 4.12 Slides 20 to 23 showed the Committee several of the regeneration projects in Gloucester over the last two decades.
- 4.13 Members were informed that the next stage of regeneration would focus on the City Centre and beyond. They were facing a huge challenge with the changing role of retail which was bringing a change of balance in the City. Gloucester needed a to provide a new experience which encouraged visitors to spend more time there.
- 4.14 The Council was taking a leading role in the redevelopment of the City Centre through its recent acquisition of three shopping centres. It was their view that by having control of the assets, they would be able to control the development and make sure it was the best for Gloucester as a whole.
- 4.15 Finally, members noted that the next phase of regeneration would include projects such as; the Fleece Hotel, Old Prison site, Kimberly Philpot Warehouse, the Railway Station and Bakers Quay.

#### Committee Member questions

- 4.16 Several members commended the work done by Gloucester City and noted that Gloucester had transformed through a number of projects and developments.
- 4.17 A member asked whether the City saw improvements in rail connectivity as a positive for Gloucester. In response, it was made clear that any improvement to Gloucester's transport would be welcomed, but the City's own agenda focused more on improving the physical environment of the rail station and its link to the centre. It was vital that alongside the connectivity improvements, Gloucester's offer to visitors and business commuters arriving in the City saw the same improvement journey.
- 4.18 In relation to the issue of a skills gap in the City, a member sought clarity on whether the educational opportunities for the required skills were being provided. It was advised that there was definitely a part for schools, Higher and Further Education providers in recognising and responding to the changing business needs of not just the City, but county-wide and even nationally.
- 4.19 It was highlighted as well in relation to the demographic challenge in Gloucestershire, many older workers who may be trained in more traditional

sectors, were finding they do not possess the skills needed for modern day jobs.

- 4.20 Following this point, a member stressed that there was a need to provide training and apprenticeship opportunities for all levels of skills, and not to focus entirely on the technical end of the job market.
- 4.21 A suggestion was made that Gloucester's past job markets lent itself to taking the lead on engineering and technical base skills, which would match the growing demand in these areas, for example, the consideration of retrofitting existing houses to be carbon neutral.
- 4.22 It was pointed out that Gloucestershire was ideally situated to have access to two significant powerhouses – the Western Gateway and Midlands Engine and it was questioned what the City was doing to take advantage of these opportunities.
- 4.23 It was advised that the best approach here would be a county-wide and it would not be beneficial for the City to try and 'go it alone' in approaching these powerhouse discussions. This whole county exposure was happening through the County Council and LEP discussions.
- 4.44 A member highlighted that these messages were really important for the public to be made aware of and the benefits that membership to such bodies can yield for the county.
- 4.45 There was a discussion about the perceived rivalry between Gloucester and Cheltenham and why, when their offer was so different, they were sometimes not seen as complimentary to each other. It was advised that the relationship between the City and the Town was better and it was acknowledged that it was better for both areas to be strong and stable. A member suggested the areas needed to be better at promoting each others activities.
- 4.46 The LEP highlighted that the Cyber Central project was an example of something that shouldn't just be seen as a benefit for Cheltenham but as a wider benefit the whole county, especially Gloucester.

#### GFirst LEP Presentation

- 4.47 Next, the Chair invited David Owen, Chief Executive of GFirst LEP, to give an update of the LEP's engagement with Gloucester's economic growth projects.
- 4.48 The Committee heard that overall, the LEP was into year four of their five year investment programme of which Gloucester City have received £35m worth of growth funding for projects including:
- £6.4m for the new transport hub;

- £5m for the Growth Hub which is located within the University of Gloucestershire Oxstalls Campus and has been noted as one of the two most successful growth hubs in the country;
  - £3.75m for improvements to the Railway Station; and
  - £4.13m for regeneration of the Blackfriars and Quayside sites.
- 4.49 The LEP also allocate funding from the Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Fund of which Gloucester received support for projects such as the Park View and the next phase of the Quays developments.
- 4.50 In addition, the City would benefit from the LEP's role in promoting Gloucestershire for inward investment opportunities both nationally and internationally.
- 4.51 The Committee were reminded that one of the biggest challenges that the county faces was its demographic. The LEP suggested that this could be a major opportunity for Gloucester in that it could act as a catalyst for the demographic challenge in Gloucestershire, due to its younger population.
- 4.52 It was considered how the City saw its centre changing over the coming years. It was suggested it would become less reliant on retail (due to the declining use of high street shops) and have more of a focus on a mix of office, housing and retail space. Simply having the units occupied would increase footfall in itself.
- 4.53 Members were informed that there was currently a high vacancy rate in units in the centre which needed to be addressed. With the Council owning more of these units, it would have better control over the development, being able to make sure it has the best benefit for the City, rather than trying to influence third party owners.
- 4.54 It was suggested that one thing pushing people away from the city centre was parking; availability and charging. Members were informed that the parking charges were competitive with other areas and they were also an important source of revenue for the Council. It was also emphasised that considering the climate emergency, big investments in car parking would not be the best option.

Member questions (including from observing Gloucester City members)

- 4.55 A member questioned what the anticipated investment return was for The UK Digital Retail Innovation Centre (DRIC) (the first of a kind hub for helping retailers adapt in an age where customers are abandoning High Streets) and what its future was anticipated to be.
- 4.56 The Committee heard that it was a capital investment of £400,000 to refurbish the 1st floor of the Eastgate Shopping Centre and as the Council now owned the shopping centre, the investment capital was within that

ownership. There will be ongoing discussions now on agreeing the best use of that space and whether the DRIC model will still be pursued.

- 4.57 Several members recognised Gloucester's unique offer of culture in relation to activity and performance in Kings Square, the The Music Works charity, the Barton Street and Kings theatres and performances at the Guildhall.
- 4.58 It was acknowledged that in its widest sense, culture could be a real driver for change. Members heard that the Culture Trust commissioned a report to look at the availability and use of culture facilities in the City. The evidence back was that rather than creating more spaces, efforts should focus on developing the existing venues for culture and enhancing its audience. It was clear there was an appetite for culture in the City but there was a perception among many that Gloucester did not have much going on.
- 4.59 A member enquired as to the balance between council, public and private sector financial resource in the City's development. It was advised that there was a real mix of the three. The Council had recently invested quite considerably in the fabric of the City such as the three shopping centres purchased.
- 4.60 For projects such as Kings Quarter, the balance fell far more towards the private sector and Peel have invested a lot over the past ten years. It was acknowledged that where there was public expenditure, the Council considered the monies as an investment rather than capital – be that a return economically, environmentally, socially or financially.
- 4.61 A member noted that as well as providing skills for young people, there needed to be support available to enable them to build resilience against issues and fear they may face. An example was given of the increasing fear among younger people around knife crime.
- 4.62 It was advised that community engagement with young people was being improved through youth groups such as GL4 Group but the Committee agreed this was a county-wide issue that needed county-wide support. It encompassed many different avenues of support from education and skills accessibility to effectively addressing anti-social behaviour.
- 4.63 To address the demographic challenge, a member highlighted that Worcestershire had created a Careers Hub to help young people and parents be aware of opportunities available locally.
- 4.64 It was acknowledged that it was just as important to retain Gloucestershire's young people as to attract new. If the offer of living, working and studying in the County was approved, it would make it a more attractive place for young people to move into. It was stressed however that this would need to be followed up with the infrastructure to support such an offer e.g. affordable housing, transport links etc.



*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

- 4.65 It was pointed out that sometimes Gloucestershire can feel like it is very separate between districts due to the variety of experiences across the county.

#### Work Plan

- 4.66 The Chair advised the Committee that at their next meeting in March they would be drawing together a summary of all six district meetings to shape an outcome report.
- 4.67 A summary report will be provided to members with the agenda pack.
- 4.68 The meeting was closed with the Chair thanking Gloucester City for hosting the Committee and of their informative presentation and question and answer session.

#### **CHAIR**

Meeting concluded at 15:40.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Creating Investment and Economic Opportunities in Gloucester

Presentation to the  
Gloucestershire Economic  
Growth Scrutiny Committee by  
Gloucester City Council

# Contents

## 1. Introduction

*Cllr Paul James*

## 2. Overview of Gloucester's economy

*David Evans, City Growth & Delivery Manager*

## 3. Evidencing Change

*Ian Edwards, Head of Place*

# Introduction

Cllr Paul James

# Overview

Gloucester been through nearly two decades of change and improvement  
£1 billion of investment in regeneration –  
St Oswalds Park, The Docks, South West Bypass, Gloucester Quays, Greyfriars, Railway Triangle, Blackfriars  
Not enough regeneration in the core historic city centre – This is now our focus, with the Council directly intervening

City is the engine of the County economy but faces economic challenges –  
unemployment relatively low but the highest in the county, several areas of deprivation, over-reliance on public sector jobs, changing role of city centre

# The Role of the City Council

The City Council has played a central role in regeneration and economic development by:

- Promoting the City to visitors and investors
- Providing a robust planning framework to generate investor confidence
- Investing in sites and infrastructure to achieve regeneration as well as creating a financial return for the Council
- Securing external funding to leverage in private investment
- Using our procurement process to achieve social value

# The Challenge Continues...

Transformation is ongoing, but many challenges remain:

- The success of the Quays and Docks has to be drawn in the City Centre and beyond.
- The economic benefits of growth and investment have to spread to all in the community
- We need to recognise and respond to the challenges of climate change
- The emergence and growth of new business sectors coupled to the decline of others.
- Gloucester's growth cannot be accommodated within the city's boundaries



# State of the Local Economy

David Evans,  
City Growth and Delivery  
Manager

# The State of the Economy in Gloucester: Quick Snapshot

A mixture of large, traditional employers, and SME's in emerging sectors

Continuous business growth, but still lagging behind the average

An economically active population lacking the skills required by modern businesses

# The State of the Economy in Gloucester: Quick Snapshot

House prices increasing but issues persist with perception and development viability

Affordability issues around grade A office space alongside declining standard of City Centre offices

Issues of deprivation broadly spread across City wards, with intensity of issues differing e.g. income equality

# Gloucester Economic Growth Strategy 2019-2021

*Generating economic growth in Gloucester to create opportunities for our residents and businesses*

## **Business**

*Promote investment and business growth in Gloucester by strengthening support for start ups, existing firms and inward investors*

## **People**

*Address the skills gap, and ensure that local people have the skills and abilities they need to access the jobs available.*

## **Place**

*To create a location that attracts and sustains business investment*

**Ensure that opportunities for Gloucester's residents are created from regeneration and investment**

# Key Challenges - People

- High levels of deprivation and economic exclusion within local areas
- An aging workforce
- Ensuring wealth created in the city is retained locally by reducing the proportion of the skilled workforce that commutes into Gloucester
- Ensuring all members of the community benefit from the wealth generated from Gloucester's regeneration programme.

# Key Challenges - Business

- The suitability of commercial space (office and retail) in attracting new occupiers
- The ongoing decline in manufacturing and other traditional forms of employment.
- Ensuring that local skills keep up with the changing needs of businesses
- Deliver economic growth and business investment in the face of economic transformation and uncertainty, including BREXIT

# Key Challenges - Place

- Low property values but high development costs
- The changing function of the city centre and the role of retail
- Negative perceptions of Gloucester as a place to visit and live
- A stressed and over-congested road system
- Available space for Gloucester to grow
- Climate Change

# Opportunities - People

- High proportion of young residents in Gloucester
- Potential to attract greater numbers of shoppers and visitors to the Quays/City Centre
- Potential to attract niche/specialist retail, leisure operators, and offices to City Centre.
- Potential of economic growth/regeneration for the whole community
- Oxstalls University Campus – first class HE facilities



# Opportunities - Business

- Development of emerging and growing business sectors; eg. engineering, advanced manufacturing and aerospace, Cultural, Cyber security, Digital retail, nuclear, as well as supporting existing employers in traditional sectors.
- Environmental technologies and 'greening' business
- To focus on start ups and enterprise – Gloucester as an 'edgy' place

# Opportunities - Place

- Gloucester's built environment and heritage
- Culture as a driver of growth
- Location, Communications and transport infrastructure
- The City Centre's Purple Flag status; by strengthening the evening economy and extending activity between the Quays and the City centre
- Working in partnerships with other Gloucestershire local authorities and the Gfirst LEP to promote the area.
- To drive up the quality of design in new developments

# Evidencing Change

Ian Edwards, Head of Place

# Securing Business Investment

- Gloucestershire Inward Investment programme
- Investor support in Gloucester
  - Business engagement
  - Enquiry management and property advice
  - New website under development with advice and support for inward investors

# Developing Local Employment & Skills

- Social Value policy
- Employment & Skills plans in all major new developments
  - Winneycroft
  - King's Quarter
  - Hydro Components
- Young Enterprise programme with Young Gloucestershire

# Creating Successful Places





# Creating Successful Places



**Gloucester**  
**City Council**  
*Transforming Your City*

# Creating Successful Places



Page 22





# What Next?



Thank you for listening

Any Questions?

# **GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held (virtually) on Thursday 2 July 2020.

PRESENT:

Cllr Brian Robinson	Cllr Nicky Packer
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Kevin Cromwell (Chair)	Cllr Sajid Patel
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr John Murphy
Cllr Ben Evans	Cllr Gina Blomefield
Cllr Kate Haigh (Vice-Chair)	Cllr Simon Pickering
Cllr Klara Sudbury	

Officers in attendance: Sophie Benfield, Dev Chakraborty and Colin Chick and Simon Excell.

## **1. APOLOGIES**

No apologies were received for this meeting.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

## **3. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings held on 30 October 2019, 20 November 2019 and 26 February 2020 were approved.

## **4. GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH JOINT COMMITTEE UPDATE**

4.1 The Chair invited Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Chair of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGJC), to present this item and Members noted the following points:

- Under the current governance arrangements, the GEGJC 6 year term was due to end in September 2020. The Committee agreed to extend this for a further 18 months.
- The two SEDF funding requests for the Central Gloucestershire City Region Board and Multi-Modal Transport Brief were approved, as was the proposal for the continuation of the Gloucestershire Strategic Planning Coordination Project.
- There was a discussion at the meeting about how the Scrutiny Committee could be involved with the Covid-19 Economic Recovery planning for Gloucestershire.
- It was acknowledge that we are still in uncertain times and economic recovery was a very fluid issue which GEGJC would continue to monitor.

- It was agreed that GEGJC would take a co-ordination role on the economic recovery response to ensure that all partners were working together, not replicating work but also not missing any gaps.
- It was agreed that GEGJC would meet for a second time at the end of July for a one item agenda on recovery planning.

## **Questions**

- 4.2 It was questioned what role the Central Gloucestershire City Region Board would play in the economic recovery of the county and whether it had been impacted by the pandemic. It was advised that the Board would still be a key component for Gloucestershire's Vision 2050 project but as with everything else, it would need to be revisited in light of the Covid-19 impact. How the county moved forward to 2050 would now need to include lessons learnt from the pandemic. It was requested that the Committee be kept up to date on any changes/activities of the Board.
- 4.3 A discussion followed about the Committee's role in scrutinising the work of the GEGJC and GFirst LEP in relation to the economic recovery planning. Cllr Cromwell as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee had attended the GEGJC meeting on 2 July 2020 and requested an answer to the following questions: How are you going to involve the scrutiny committee in the economic recovery process?; How will the scrutiny committee be kept informed of the work being undertaken by the Joint Committee/GFirst?; and What contribution can the scrutiny committee make to the recovery process?. It was advised that these questions would form part of the discussions at the next GEGJC meeting at the end of July 2020.
- 4.4 It was stressed by the Committee the importance of receiving up to date and timely information on the recovery planning and decisions taken, be this by the Joint Committee or the GFirst LEP. It would be impossible for scrutiny to fulfil its function if this information was not being shared effectively. It was appreciated that some of this information would be sensitive and could not be shared wider or discussed in a public forum, but that should not mean scrutiny members were unable to access it.
- 4.5 A member recognised that money would need to be spent to get the economy moving again and questioned what approach would be taken towards decision making to ensure that we were doing the right thing for Gloucestershire. In response, it was explained that the county was facing unprecedented times, and partners were working together to understand the best approach to its recovery. Whilst the answer to this remained unclear, it was important to make sure this was a joint discussion between all partners, and that all discussions and decisions were scrutinised along the way by the appropriate bodies. In addition, any decision would need to be supported by an appropriate evidence base.
- 4.6 Following this, it was questioned whether the Council had considered any additional decision making structures for recovery. It was advised that the

GEGJC had agreed to act as a steering group for the decision making and therefore it did not need to create an additional body.

- 4.7 In reference to support of local businesses, it was confirmed that over £125 million had been distributed to businesses during the pandemic and it had been done in an incredibly short amount of time. The FSB, Circle 2 Success and Growth Hub were all focusing on helping to share information and up to date government guidance across the county's businesses.

## **5. GFIRST LEP UPDATE**

- 5.1 The Chair invited Dev Chakraborty, Deputy Chief Executive of the GFirst LEP, to give a verbal update to the Committee.

### **Growth Deal**

- 5.2 It was advised that the LEP had worked hard throughout the pandemic to ensure key projects for the county remained in progress, but highlighted this had been challenging behind the scenes. Although some time had inevitably been lost, key projects such as the Railway Station, West Cheltenham Transport Scheme etc. had not suffered the full lockdown impact.

### **Inward Investment Project**

- 5.3 Members noted this was a project aimed at trying to attract foreign owned business into the county, and considering the impact of Covid-19 on the world's economy, it had come to quite a halt for the time being. Unfortunately all major national and international trade events from March onwards had been cancelled and clearly no business was looking to relocate anywhere at the moment.
- 5.4 The team had been redeployed to help with the LEP's Covid-19 response and recovery planning, which had included making outbound calls to companies throughout the county to understand the effects of the pandemic and what issues they needed help with. This information was then being fed into the LEP's own recovery planning and daily calls with Government.

### **Investment Portfolio**

- 5.5 It was advised that the LEP always tried to have a live pipeline of infrastructure projects ready for any potential government funding. A new funding pot was announced by central Government, called the 'Getting Building Fund', but the turnaround time for submitting projects was incredibly tight, just 6 working days from the fund announcement to projects being submitted.

- 5.6 The criteria to apply for this funding was quite specific for example, the projects had to be 'shovel ready', be completed by December 2021 with a key focus on recovery, job creation and green credentials.
- 5.7 After working hard with all local authority partners, education and the private sector, Gloucestershire submitted 15 projects totalling £52 million worth of work. A subsequent announcement advised that LEPs in England would share a pot of £900 million and broadly speaking as Gloucestershire represented about 1% of economic output for England, the LEP anticipated they would be allocated about £9 million.
- 5.8 The submission included familiar projects for the County such as the Kings Square Development, Tewkesbury Garden Town, and Cheltenham to Gloucester cycleway etc. Members noted the LEP would know more in the coming few weeks about which projects had been accepted but they were now currently working with partners to complete their full business case ready for submission by July 2020.

### **Questions**

- 5.9 A member sought clarity on the need for projects to be 'shovel ready', it was their understanding that in order to be at this stage, these project ideas must have been conceived before the pandemic and were therefore not actually being responsive to recovery. It was advised that as previously stated, some of the projects that had been submitted were already working away in the background, but these projects still had to meet the criterion for the funding e.g. to create jobs. However, the LEP also asked partners for any new, 'exceptional' ideas that were not already on the existing pipeline and therefore some of the 15 made the shortlist at very short notice and were responsive to the pandemic. Members were reminded that it was always the LEP's job to drive economic recovery, regardless of the economy's state.
- 5.10 It was queried whether the deadline for completion applied to all submitted projects. It was advised that completion did not necessarily mean the whole project, for example some of the larger projects submitted like Kings Square, the funding would only go towards part of it. As GCC is the partner submitting the cycle highway projects for example, the team have made sure both schemes were well progressed and if/when funding became available, it was ready to be used straight away and combined with existing funding.
- 5.11 A member requested for the project pipeline to be shared with the Committee. It was noted that the pipeline was not currently publicly available due to some promoters marking their projects confidential, and to avoid building expectations until the funding allocation was clear. It was agreed that the Chair would discuss offline with the LEP about sharing confidential information with the Committee as it was stressed Members were allowed to have access to this and it would help to improve their scrutiny function.

- 5.12 The Committee noted that central Government had created a task force to help revive the highstreets, and Gloucestershire was the only LEP in the country to have a representative on it. In addition, the LEP were currently considering a 'Think Gloucestershire' campaign which would seek to encourage people to buy locally, have staycations and support local procurement.
- 5.13 Finally, there was a discussion about the Covid-19 financial support for business. A member highlighted that the recent grants from Government had not been enough for some businesses, whilst others were thriving and still receiving the grant money. It was stressed that this did not seem a very fair system.
- 5.14 In response, members heard that the business grants were based on purely rateable value and this reflected the speed needed to turn around such schemes during the pandemic. Unfortunately due to the unprecedented situation, it was inevitable that some businesses would benefit more than others. Members noted however that some businesses like supermarkets, for example, were donating their grants to charity. The second wave of business grants was more discretionary and had much more rigid guidelines in place. The LEP were waiting to hear from the Chancellor what action would be taken next to support businesses.
- 5.15 It was also questioned whether the recent 'bounce back' loan announcement from Government had considered that some businesses may cease operations before repayments on their loan were completed. It was advised that the LEP were currently awaiting further details on the details but suggested the banks were preparing to not receive 100% repayments on these loans.

## **6. COVID-19 RESPONSE - PLANNING FOR GLOUCESTERSHIRE'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY**

- 6.1 The Chair acknowledged that this item had already been covered in some depth during the previous items. Cllr Molyneux confirmed they had nothing further to add, the Chair therefore invited Dev Chakraborty and Colin Chick to comment.
- 6.2 Members noted that all local authorities in the county (7) were producing their own recovery plans, plus the LEP who were producing an economic sector based recovery plan.
- 6.3 As mentioned previously, one of the LEP's key roles during the pandemic was sharing business intelligence for the county via Leadership Gloucestershire. This had included a sector analysis report and economic modelling broken down by district.

- 6.4 The Committee heard that officers saw the role of GCC as one of leadership, coordination and analysis, and then using that analysis and evidence to check and make sure recovery was moving in the right direction, highlight any issues and fill gaps where necessary.
- 6.5 It would be vital that major schemes remained on track to strengthen the economy for the future, for example Junction 9 and 10 and the Cyber Park. In addition, localised work would need to be considered such as a bigger emphasis on skills training (especially reskilling into different sectors).
- 6.6 It was noted that research had shown the hardest hit age group economically would be 17-24 year olds who might still be in education and have little to no work experience. The job market was therefore likely to be significantly harder for this age group, regardless if they had a certain level of qualification or not.
- 6.7 It was stressed however that recovery needed to be a slow burn fuse, we did not know the size of the problem at the moment, and a lot of the potential economic issues were still being 'covered' by the government financial schemes.
- 6.8 The Committee noted that it would be best to go for a sector based approach to recovery, by raising the platform to a high enough level for all businesses in that sector to 'springboard' off across the county, rather than picking and supporting individual companies.
- 6.9 The Chair also invited Simon Excell, Lead Commissioner for Strategic Infrastructure, to add any comments. The Committee were reminded that in early March, the Government gave the go ahead for three major schemes (A417, Junction 10 and Junction 9), and then two weeks later the pandemic hit which obviously brought huge complications and delays.
- 6.10 It was advised however, that schemes GCC had control and funding for, the Council were doing everything they could, with the resource and capacity available, to ensure these schemes progressed.
- 6.11 A member requested that the reports mentioned by the LEP were shared with the Committee.

**ACTION: DEV CHAKRABORTY**

## **7. WORK PLAN**

The Committee discussed the following points in relation to its ongoing work plan:

- The Local Transport Plan scrutiny meeting has been rescheduled as an additional meeting date for Economic Growth members on 23 September 2020;



- For 16 September 2020 meeting, members requested an update on: Broadband/Mobile Connectivity and the Business Rates Pool;
- As Chair of the Taxi Licensing Task Group, Cllr Haigh confirmed that the group potentially had one meeting left before a final report would be ready to submit to the Committee. It was agreed this report would either be brought to the September Committee date, or discussed via email by members, with a summary of views being recorded by DSU.
- Members noted there was a suggested item on reviewing the changes to the Joint Core Strategy for housing. Whilst acknowledging that GCC was not responsible for housing (this was a district responsibility), it was stressed that this was a Joint scrutiny Committee and had district member representation from around the county, which made it a suitable place to discuss a joint approach to housing, which was sustainable and met the needs of the county's residents. Members agreed to keep an item on the future list to look at housing availability, incorporating any appropriate discussion on the Joint Core Strategy.
- In relation to housing, it was also noted that there was an increasing interest in modular development and with the current Government strategy of trying to build the country out of economic crisis; this would be a really important area to look at. It was suggested the Committee could do an 'enquiry-like' meeting on this topic and speak to national experts to scrutinise the information available on modular builds. It was agreed this item would remain on the future list and the Chair would look into how to take it forward. Members were reminded to email DSU if they had any suggestions.
- A member acknowledged that the pandemic's impact on business and employment in the county would only become clear once the furloughing schemes had come to an end. It was request for this to be added to the future work plan.
- It was agreed that the LEP would update the Committee on their Industrial Strategy when it was timely to do so.
- The two future items relating to transport were removed as it was agreed this would be adequately covered during the Committee's ongoing involvement in the review of the Council's Local Transport Plan.
- It was highlighted that as research showed young people were likely to be the most effected economically post-Covid, the Committee requested a future item on skills and work force development post-Covid (with a particular focus on young people).
- A future item was added to review the strategy for the future of the high street across the County.
- It was agreed that DSU would have an offline discussion with the LEP to check whether the performance report deadlines had been affected by the pandemic and understand what would be timely to schedule for their September update.
- Finally, the Chair highlighted the two information items on this agenda for the Committee to review.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

**CHAIR**

Meeting concluded at 12:20.

# HEALTH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 14 July 2020 at the Virtual Meeting - Web ex meeting.

**PRESENT:**

Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Helen Molyneux
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Dilys Neill
Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Paul Hodgkinson (Vice-Chair)	Cllr Brian Robinson (Chair)
Cllr Martin Horwood	Cllr Jill Smith
Cllr Steve Lydon	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE

Substitutes: Cllr Iain Dobie (In place of Cllr Suzanne Williams)

In attendance:

## **NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)/ One Gloucestershire Integrated Care System (ICS)**

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer and ICS Lead  
Ellen Rule - Director of Transformation and Service Redesign  
Becky Parish

## **Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust**

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive  
Peter Lachecki – Chair  
Simon Lanceley- Director of Transformation

## **Gloucestershire Health and Care NHS Foundation Trust**

Ingrid Barker – Chair  
Angela Potter, Director of Strategy and Partnerships  
Paul Roberts

## **Gloucestershire County Council**

Sarah Scott Director Public Health  
Margaret Willcox – Director Adult Social Care  
Cllr Tim Harman, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities  
Cllr Carole Allaway Martin, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Commissioning

Apologies: Cllr Brian Oosthuysen and Cllr Robert Vines

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

See above.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No additional declarations were made.

## **3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2020 were agreed as a correct record subject to the amendment of a typo at 7.1 where it should read: 'enabling active communities'

## **4. PUBLIC REPRESENTATION**

4.1 The Committee welcomed Dr David Willingham who was a Cheltenham Borough Councillor to make his representation as detailed below:

*I am making this public representation to HOSC in respect of my continued concern about the reported Covid-19 death rate in the "Alstone and St Mark's" Middle-layer Super Output Area (MSOA) which has the formal designation of "Cheltenham 007".*

*Online mapping published by the Office of National Statistics, suggests that as of 31<sup>st</sup> May 2020, there have been thirty-two (32) Covid-19 related deaths in this MSOA. My further analysis of dataset from which this mapping visualisation was derived, shows that this is the highest number of Covid-19 deaths for any MSOA in not just Gloucestershire, but the whole Southwest region, and equal fourth highest number of Covid-19 deaths in the whole of England and Wales. My analysis also shows that in April 2020, Covid-19 was the leading cause of deaths (59%) in this MSOA.*

*Dialogue with the Director of Public Health for Gloucestershire County Council has suggested that "This MSOA has 9 care homes with 264 beds. This is much higher than the MSOA average of 3 care home with 80 beds. When cross-referenced with our local registration data there is a high match between areas with a high number of care homes and deaths we are aware of in care homes."*

*The communities that I represent, the bereaved families of the deceased, and families with relatives in care homes deserve both answers and reassurance.*

*I am therefore making this public representation to request the HOSC investigate what factors led to the high death rate in the Alstone and St Mark's MSOA, and if, as suggested, the majority of deaths were in care homes, what the causal factors that lead to this tragically high death-rate were.*

*If there were systemic failures at any level, whether national, regional or local, then it is imperative that these are quickly identified so that remediation can occur. This feeds into the second part of my request which is to ensure that in the event of resurgence of Covid-19 as lockdown measures are*

*eased, the community that I represent, can be confident that there is sufficient understanding and preparedness that there will not be a repeat of the conditions that led to the high localised mortality rate.*

*My focus as a Borough Councillor is predominantly on the ward I serve and represent, as it has suffered the worst impact of this virus. However, I recognise that it is clearly in the best interests of the county if other MSOAs in Gloucestershire with statistically significant elevated Covid-19 mortality rates also have similar investigations performed.*

*I trust that HOSC will agree that it is in the public interest for this to be investigated in as open and transparent way possible, so that the communities that I represent can understand what happened, and also get a reassurance that the understanding gained from this investigation is being used to inform the current response and will be used to inform any future response as part of any Local Outbreak Control Plan response if one needs to be implemented anywhere in Gloucestershire.*

- 4.2 The Chair thanked him for raising those points with the committee. He stated that he was sure members shared his concern about the high level of Covid-19 related deaths in his ward. The Committee would want to understand the challenges and learning points from Covid-19 later in the year from a strategic viewpoint and members would take on board the concerns raised when shaping the item as part of work planning.
- 4.3 Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health, thanked Dr Willingham for raising his questions and she provided some information regarding the way in which the MSOAs information was collated, emphasising that these areas were larger than traditional wards. She recognised that these areas often had variations in infection rates and there were certain factors which could make people more vulnerable to severe illnesses than others. A range of information continued to be monitored on a daily basis to help provide a better picture of incidents of Covid-19 and the impacts on communities. Where care homes were suspected of suffering from an outbreak, contact was made by Public Health England, risk assessment taken and advice and support given. GCC and the CCG Integrated Brokerage Team were in daily contact with care homes offering support. Members noted that there was a Local Outbreak Management Plan. Some deaths were attributed to Covid-19 as a secondary cause, and it was important to fully understand the data. The deaths referred to had been in relation to two of the nine care homes in the area. Care homes were particularly at risk as they house a group of people who were known to be vulnerable to the Covid-19 infection. Each care home had been offered guidance and training on the use of infection prevention and control techniques and the correct use of PPE. There had not been an issue with the supply of PPE in the County. The Public Health team would be discussing with Public Health England colleagues to better understand what had happened in this particular circumstance.

13.4 Margaret Willcox, Director of Adult Social Care, provided detail on the active work carried out with the Gloucestershire Care Providers Association around free webinars and additional support. Every care home had received an uplift in funding since April with Cabinet agreement to continue this through to September as required. A detailed report had been provided to Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee and this would be circulated to Members.

4.5 The Committee noted that all members had received a letter from REACH who wished to raise significant concerns about Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust's intention to request a 3 month extension in respect of temporary emergency measures already in place. Members would keep this information in mind when considering item 5 on the agenda.

Robert Arnold outlined the concerns which were articulated in the letter including the statistic that 20% of elective surgical patients who got Covid-19 died within 30 days according to the British Medical Journal. He suggested that these concerns applied locally. The safety concerns he outlined included the continuation of major elective surgery at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital against national advice; the transfer of arterial vascular surgery from Cheltenham General to Gloucestershire Royal; the potential mixing of elective and emergency surgical patients; and the removal of emergency theatre at Cheltenham General. REACH suggested that all elective surgery be transferred to Cheltenham General, that there be a robust consent policy for surgical patients, and the reopening of emergency theatre at Cheltenham General.

4.6 Deborah Lee stated that the Trust would respond fully in writing to the REACH letter. The focus of the emergency service changes was on ensuring the safety of services in light of the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic and to promote public confidence in services so that patients who needed access to healthcare, felt able to attend hospital. She went on to say that the changes had been developed by clinicians who had the safety and wellbeing of their patients at the forefront of their minds. She noted REACH's concerns about the risk of transmission of the virus between emergency and elective patients and confirmed that there had not been a single episode of in hospital transmission of COVID-19 since the changes had been made. It was explained that 'blue patients' were those patients confirmed to have COVID-19 and they were never cared for in an area with those awaiting elective surgery. Elective patients were only admitted after having a negative swab result at which point they would be labelled as 'green patients'. Those of uncertain status, or confirmed positive, were managed in separate areas and wards, until a negative result was confirmed

The Chair thanked REACH for bringing the matter to members' attention and stated that this would help inform members' discussion of the main items on the agenda.

## **5. COVID-19 TEMPORARY SERVICE CHANGES**

- 5.1 The Committee received a report to update members regarding the Covid-19 incident response and proposals for the temporary substantial variation and development of Health Services in Gloucestershire that were required to meet the ongoing operational requirements. The Committee was asked for further support for changes with details provided in line with the locally agreed Memorandum of Understanding. Ellen Rule introduced the report.
- 5.2 This related to two service changes, the temporary reconfiguration of Emergency General Surgery to Gloucestershire Royal Hospital from Cheltenham General Hospital (temporary change enacted on 1 April 2020 and the temporary closure of The Vale, Dilke & Tewkesbury Minor Injury Units (enacted on 22 March 2020). Members had been notified of the initial temporary changes by email at the time.
- 5.3 The Committee understood the two-phase incident response where it was necessary to radically reprioritise and reshape services. Phase 1 had been about moving at pace to ensure services were safe, with short term actions taken so that Covid-19 patients were handled safely. Now the Trust was in phase 2 where Covid-19 was still in circulation but the rate of infection had changed and the degree to which the Country was 'locked-down' had changed. It was noted that throughout this a number of factors have arisen that have and continue to significantly affect productivity of health and care services; these include the need for increased levels of infection prevention and control in all services, the challenge presented in caring for those safely in the shielded and vulnerable categories and continuing higher levels of staff sickness. In addition the Trust was modelling scenarios with regards to potential winter pressures and a potential second peak to ensure services were in a safe place to respond.
- 5.4 The changes proposed would be up for review in September 2020 with HOSC meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> September.
- 5.5 The Committee recognised that there was some overlap between the emergency service changes enacted in response to Covid-19 and the Fit for the Future proposals due to be brought to public consultation later in the year. This presented a complex message to the public and stakeholders.
- 5.6 An extensive public engagement had been carried out in relation for Fit for the Future in late 2019 and it was proposed that the programme would be re-established in the autumn. There would be clarity around the changes that had been enacted as part of the temporary incident response and ensuring that no presumption existed regarding the medium to long-term proposals.
- 5.7 Winter planning proposals had not been completed and that would come to Committee in September.

- 5.8 Simon Lanceley Director of Strategy, provided members with a run through of the pro-forma for Emergency General Surgery emergency service change. He explained that as a result of centralisation of emergency surgery services, five of the extreme risks have been reduced. He highlighted the patient benefits and case study outlined within the pro-forma and emphasised how these actions removed the rota challenges.
- 5.9 In response to a member question, it was explained that carrying out a pilot during a pandemic was not the right thing to do. This was about temporary service change with any future permanent changes coming through the Fit for the Future programme. It was suggested that confidence could be taken from the fact that some of the areas of change to make things safe were changes that the Trust had been thinking about making for a while. Deborah Lee reiterated that the main driver for temporary change was handling the impact of the pandemic, but that there was still the opportunity to learn throughout. It was emphasised that in September the Committee would be able to clearly see the difference between the temporary service changes and the medium to long term changes that would be consulted on.
- 5.10 Members discussed the scepticism that was out there in the general public, where there were suggestions that temporary service changes would go on to be made permanent. In addition some members expressed concern that media reports suggested that Gloucestershire Royal were struggling as the only A & E in the County. Officers emphasised that Cheltenham A & E would be reinstated following the temporary period and it was explained that this statement had been made a number of times and would continue to be repeated. Members understood that any permanent changes would need to be consulted on and this was planned as part of the Fit for the Future programme. In relation to A & E performance it was explained that there an been some initial issues related to power cuts and road closures, but that those teething issues had been dealt with and things had settled down considerably. The performance was strong with the example given of no 12 hour trolley breaches and the fact that patients were not transferred from Cheltenham to Gloucester in the middle of the night as had been suggested.
- 5.11 In response to queries on the Flu Jab it was explained that planning was underway and that there would be new challenges. It was suggested that the measures around social distancing and hand washing might have a positive impact on the incidences of Flu.
- 5.12 One member expressed concern about plans to launch the Fit for the Future consultation during a pandemic.
- 5.13 One member asked the questions raised by the REACH presentation relating to why elective surgery had not been moved to Cheltenham General, why the emergency theatre at Cheltenham General had been closed and would a Type 1 A & E be restored at Cheltenham General following the end of the temporary service changes.



- 5.14 In response it was stated that the Type 1 A & E would be restored at Cheltenham General at the cessation of the temporary period. In relation to concerns on transmission of Covid-19 in hospitals, it was explained that once the bed base had changed due to social distancing and the temporary measures had been put in place, this had stopped. The General Surgery change had been due to long standing workforce issues. Changes made on 9 June had been to address the risk of virus transmission and that was from when the cross-infection figures had been taken. For Cheltenham there was still out of hour's theatre available if a patient that required surgery was not well enough for transfer to Gloucestershire Royal.
- 5.15 Members were informed that the changes relating to Vascular surgery were in relation to transmission risk and the need to create three separate entry pathways and this could not be done in isolation. The focus was on ensuring the whole emergency service model was safe.
- 5.16 In response to a question it was emphasised that those patients at Gloucestershire Royal were not exposed to greater risk. The changes enabled Covid-19 patients to be treated in isolation. With regards to concerns about the risk to elective surgical patients of contracting Covid-19, it was stated that 46 patients (predominantly emergency patients) had contracted Covid-19 in the early phase of the pandemic while in the Trust's care which was less than 0.2% of patients. 11 of these had died. This was a sad situation and reflected the fact that many of these patients were in a vulnerable group. This was a position reflected across the Country and the Trust had responded and learned from this and their approach was now part of a national pilot. She restated that since the temporary changes were enacted there had been no cases of in-hospital transmission.
- 5.17 Angela Potter introduced the second pro-forma within the papers which was in relation to Minor Injury Units. There had been no incidents or complaints as a result of the temporary changes. The Trust were looking to move four units to an 8am to 8pm opening, but would not be in a position to open the other three units within the three month time period. The risks were outlined within the document.
- 5.18 Members commented that they would be interested to see the analysis, once completed, around why the number of people visiting units had significantly reduced during this period.
- 5.19 The Committee noted the pro-forma's and the plans for the continuation of the temporary changes without further comment. The minutes of the meeting would reflect the concerns raised and the variety of views. Members welcomed a further update in September as the Trust moved towards consultation of medium and long term changes as part of Fit for the Future. The Trust were able to extend the temporary service changes for a further three months.

## **6. FIT FOR THE FUTURE UPDATE**

- 6.1 Members noted the timeline outlined within the previous item for Fit for the Future and confirmed that they would receive the pre-consultation business case proposals at the meeting on 15 September 2020.
- 6.2 It was explained that the Trust was working on the detail during July before meeting NHS England improvement in August and then in September launching the consultation with public boards and HOSC. In November there would be a Citizens Jury and then implementation would be planned for the new year (subject to consideration of outcome of consultation and any Citizens' Jury recommendations). While it was recognised that the short term challenges around Covid-19 needed to be considered, it was still felt that long term planning and consultation on those plans were needed. Throughout the process there would be opportunity for reflection and consideration of current challenges and how that might change long term plans.
- 6.3 One member asked how the consultation would be publicised and carried out. It was explained that members would receive a detailed consultation plan, but it was acknowledged that traditional methods were unlikely to be relied upon in the current circumstances. The consultation would include online discussion forums, short surveys, polls and conversations with training being carried out on the systems and processes to support this. Members understood that the CCG had been working closely with Gloucestershire County Council with the recent allocation of grants and funding through the Digital Innovation Fund.

## **7. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT**

- 7.1 Mary Hutton presented the performance report explaining that there was some updated information. This included a recent rise in Emergency Department activity but still below pre-covid levels as well as a 4.9% reduction in category 1 ambulance calls. There was also a focus on discharge.
- 7.2 In relation to cancer referrals, these had been well below the previous year's levels for May and June but for July was back up to 100%.
- 7.3 In response to a question on ambulance response times in rural areas, it was explained that there had been new investment to provide more vehicles on the ground in 2020 as well as an investment in first responders. This was not an area the CCG was taking lightly.
- 7.4 There was some discussion around pathology services particular in Cirencester and members was reminded that phlebotomy services across the county were being delivered through GP surgeries in their own practices

which should allow them to be more responsive. There would be no changes to the timeline and process for obtaining results.

- 7.5 In response to questions on waiting time at Gloucestershire Royal compared to Cheltenham, it was stated that Gloucestershire Royal Hospital performance during the pandemic was very strong and comparable to the previous year. One member expressed concern and stated that the poor performance in Gloucester was striking.

## **8. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE ICS LEAD REPORT**

8.1 The Committee noted the report.

- 8.2 It was explained that a survey had been issued for those that had been volunteering during the Covid-19 pandemic asking for their experiences and asking if they would like to volunteer again. One member emphasised the importance of utilising the experience in this area.

## **9. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT**

9.1 The Committee noted the report.

- 9.2 One member noted the actions that had been taken to support care homes and asked whether there were any national systemic failures in this areas that had been identified and fed back to Government. In response it was explained tat issues had been identified of staff moving between care home and the need for PPE training and that all that learning was being fed back into the national work. It was also explained that a number of care homes had staff that did not have good use of the English language and that they had been unable to interpret guidance. One member called on the need for greater regulation of care homes.

9.3 Members were asked to fill in the survey within the papers on Covid-19 and pass the link on more widely.

- 9.4 One member asked a question about the previous mention that locally the Public Health team did not have access to the patient details of local cases of Covid-19 to enable outbreak management. This was confirmed as correct by the Director of Public Health. Instead, she worked closely with the South West Public Health England Team who did have access to this data to manage outbreaks. There was also a question on spare capacity at local testing sites. With regards to testing, there was spare capacity due to the relatively low numbers of Covid-19 in the County. This spare capacity was available should there be a second peak, but the Public Health team was also in discussions with regards to how this resource could be best utilised.

**CHAIRMAN**

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Meeting concluded at Time Not Specified



## GLoucestershire POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

**MINUTES of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 17 July 2020 commencing at 10.00 am.**

**PRESENT  
MEMBERSHIP:**

William Alexander	Cllr Karen McKeown
Cllr Ray Brassington	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Jonny Brownsteen	Cllr Steve Robinson (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Philip Burford	Mattie Ross
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Martin Smith
Cllr David Gray	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Colin Hay (Chairman)	

**Substitutes:** Cllr Dr Andrew Miller (In place of Cllr David Norman MBE)

**Apologies:** Cllr David Norman MBE

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON**

Cllr Colin Hay was elected Chairperson for the year 2020/2021.

**2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON**

Cllr Steve Robinson was elected Vice Chairperson for the year 2020/2021.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 3 February 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

**5. COVID-19: LESSONS LEARNED AND POLICING THE 'NEW NORMAL'**

5.1 Martin Surl, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), informed the Panel that this had been a challenging time for both the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) and the Constabulary. He had ensured that the Chief Constable had had the space needed to get on with operational matters, and had also dug into finance reserves to ensure that there were no concerns with regard to funding: £1m was released to support Covid-19 activity.

5.2 Staff welfare during this time had been a key issue and the PCC commended the way in which the Chief Constable had supported officer's health and wellbeing.

5.3 The Chief Constable stated that from the outset of the Covid-19 pandemic he had wanted the Police approach to be one of education, engaging with the public, with enforcement as a last resort. A bespoke command structure had been put in place early in the pandemic, Assistant Chief Constable Craig Holden as Gold lead, which included identifying future threats and issues, and monitoring the impact on resources.

- 5.4 It was explained that one of the biggest challenges in the early stages had been the amount of information coming through and the rapid turnaround needed to achieve the requirements of the latest guidance from national government.
- 5.5 Initially 40/50 officers had displayed symptoms of Covid-19 and 200 members of staff had self isolated, but as the time progressed this number reduced significantly. Thousands of hours had been put in by the special constables; many had been furloughed by their employer and so were able to give more time to the Police. The service moved to 12 hour shifts so that there was no overlap between teams in order to reduce the potential for infection. The majority of the enforcement activity undertaken related to people travelling into the county.
- 5.6 There was a drop in reported crime relating to burglary and shoplifting. However there has been a small increase in the number of domestic abuse (DA) incidents in the county. Early in the pandemic the Police had engaged with perpetrators and victims of DA, keeping a close eye on activities and making it clear that they remained vigilant.
- 5.7 The PCC and Chief Constable stated that they were proud of the response from Gloucestershire residents and partners. It was felt that the county was in a positive place as it emerged from the pandemic.
- 5.8 In response to a question the PCC acknowledged that the 101 system was struggling. The complexity of calls being received was in excess of what was originally envisaged when the system was established; in its current state it was not sustainable. A significant number of calls received by the Police should have been directed to other agencies. This was under review; any changes would be directed by the Chief Constable as this was an operational matter. This also linked to the need for new ICT systems to replace those currently in use; this would be at a significant cost.
- 5.9 In response to questions it was explained that the level of county lines crime had reduced during lockdown. As we emerged from lockdown it would be important to closely monitor this activity. It was also clarified that the MASH (Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub) had continued to operate virtually throughout the lockdown. An increase in calls relating to DA had been received, but this had not lead to an increase in numbers of cases, but these were being tracked. It was also expected that once schools fully reopened that there would be a surge in the number of referrals to children's services.
- 5.10 It was clarified that the additional funding utilised by Gloucestershire Police had come from the PCC. It was also explained that the government had clarified that it would reimburse the cost of the PPE (personal protective equipment) used during the lockdown by Gloucestershire Police.
- 5.11 Concern was expressed that the Police activity to move people exhibiting anti-social behaviour (ASB) from Gloucester City Centre was displacing this activity to other areas of the city. The PCC explained that the city centre was a defined safe area. The support put in place had been predicated on a problem solving approach not displacing crime. It was also explained that this area of the city had a public space protection order but that enforcement would not be the immediate response to ASB. The PCC explained the work of Operation Solace, and also that to best support some of the people who were exhibiting ASB all agencies needed to step up to the mark and help. The PCC also informed the Panel that he had commissioned a piece of work to gain a greater understanding of the circumstances of these people. He has also been in contact with the local member on this matter.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

- 5.12 The Chief Constable explained that the Constabulary was due to return to a more geographical based policing model on 7 September 2020. This would comprise of 3 Superintendents for 3 geographic areas across the county. This would enable better visible leadership and a more straightforward point of contact for people (eg. MPs, councillors, managers of care homes). These officers would be working together ahead of 7 September 2020 to discuss how they could best deliver an effective, cohesive approach.
- 5.13 Concerns relating to anti social behaviour at a particular location during lockdown were raised. It was agreed that given the potential for individuals to be identified this matter would be discussed offline.

## **6. OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT**

- 6.1 Richard Bradley, CEO OPCC, gave a detailed presentation of the report.
- 6.2 The Panel engaged in a discussion with regard to the PCC's aspirations for a new court complex in Gloucestershire. The PCC acknowledged that his remit did not cover this issue but given the impact of the justice system across society he thought it important to try and ensure that Gloucestershire had a fully accessible court complex. The PCC informed the Panel that a particular frustration was the lack of response from Gloucestershire MPs.
- 6.3 The Panel agreed that the courts in Gloucestershire were in a sorry state of repair, were not accessible for people with disabilities, essentially not fit for purpose. There was no agreement from the Panel on the PCC's preferred location for a new court complex, given that it was not a central site and public transport options were limited. The PCC stated that he did not mind where the court complex was located, but thought that the Quedgeley site with its proximity to the cell complex was the better option. The most expensive part of a court was the cell complex, therefore this proposal had the potential to save millions of pounds. It was also close to the Park and Ride facility.
- 6.4 Although outside its remit, and mindful that the Panel could not lobby on behalf of the PCC, it was agreed that Gloucestershire did need an up to date and accessible court complex; it would not be helpful for the people of Gloucestershire if they had to have their cases heard at courts outside the county. It was therefore agreed that a letter be sent to Gloucestershire MPs to ask for their support in maintaining a Gloucestershire based court system.  
**ACTION: Andrea Clarke**
- 6.5 The Panel asked that its thanks be passed on to all Police staff and volunteers for their commitment and dedication to keeping the residents of Gloucestershire safe during the pandemic.
- 6.6 The Panel agreed to support the Black Lives Matter Statement agreed by Leadership Gloucestershire as described in the report.
- 6.7 Members also thanked officers for providing the additional information on domestic abuse and Special Constables (these were available on the council's website).

## **7. OPCC DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT**

7. The Panel agreed that this was a good report, and an improvement on the previous year. Panel Members were particularly impressed with the parking buddies in use at some Gloucestershire schools and requested details on how to acquire these for schools in their divisions/wards.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

**ACTION: Andrea Clarke**

7.2 In response to a question it was explained the Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR) were now managed by Safer Gloucestershire, Chaired by the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner. Previously they could take up to 4 years to complete but now that they were in the purview of Safer Gloucestershire this had been reduced to 12 months where possible. It was noted that there were 4 currently being undertaken. The Deputy PCC informed the Panel that he would be instigating a review of completed DHRs to identify whether the learning points had been picked up across partner organisations.

**8. OPCC APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

8.1 The PCC reminded the Panel of the background to the appointment of Mr Bradley to the post. Supporting documentation was included in the agenda pack. Mr Bradley discussed his work experience and background, and the changes/achievements he had put in place since his interim appointment as CEO in 2019.

8.2 The Panel agreed that having worked with Mr Bradley for some years, both as Deputy CEO and Interim CEO, that it could support this appointment; that Mr Bradley had the professional competence to exercise the role as set out in the role profile, and that he has the personal independence to exercise the role, as set out in the role profile.

**9. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Panel agreed that it was not necessary to go into exempt session to discuss the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Meeting concluded at 12.25 pm





**COTSWOLD  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN  
INCORPORATING NOTICE OF DECISIONS PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE  
SESSION AND NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A KEY DECISION**

**The Forward Plan**

By virtue of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, local authorities are required to publish a notice setting out the key executive decisions that will be taken at least 28 clear days before such decisions are to be taken. The Regulations also require notice to be given of any matter where it is proposed that the public will be excluded during consideration of the matter.

This Forward Plan incorporates both of these requirements. In the interests of transparency, it also aims to include details of those items to be debated by the Cabinet that relate to either policy/budget formulation, matters which will be subject to a recommendation to the Council, and other matters due to be considered by the Cabinet. This programme covers a period of four months, and will be updated on a monthly basis. The timings of items may be subject to change.

It should be noted that although a date not less than 28 clear days after the date of the notice is given in each case, it is possible that matters may be rescheduled to a date which is different from that given provided, in the cases of key decisions and matters to be considered in private, that the 28 day notice has been given. In this regard, please note that agendas and reports for Meetings of the Cabinet are made available on the Council's Web Site - [www.cotswold.gov.uk](http://www.cotswold.gov.uk) - five working days in advance of the Meeting in question. Please also note that the agendas for Meetings of the Cabinet will also incorporate a necessary further notice which is required to be given in relation to matters likely to be considered with the public excluded.

There are circumstances where a key decision can be taken, or a matter may be considered in private, even though the 28 clear days' notice has not been given. If that happens, notice of the matter and the reasons will be published on the Council's Web Site, and available from the Council Offices, Trinity Road, Cirencester, Glos. GL7 1PX.

**Key Decisions**

The Regulations define a key decision as an executive decision which is likely -

- (a) to result in the relevant local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having

regard to the relevant local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the authority.

In financial terms, the Council has decided that a key decision is any executive decision which requires a budget expenditure of £100,000 or more, or one which generates savings of £100,000 or more.

A key decision may only be made in accordance with the Cabinet Procedure Rules contained within the Council's Constitution.

### **Matters To Be Considered in Private**

The great majority of matters considered by the Council's Cabinet are considered in "open session" when the public have the right to attend.

However, some matters are considered with the public excluded. The public may only be excluded if a resolution is passed to exclude them. The grounds for exclusion are limited to situations where confidential or exempt information may be disclosed to the public if present and, in most cases involving exempt information, where in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. The definitions of these are set out in the Council's Constitution.

### **Documents and Queries**

Formal reports presented relating to any executive decision will be available on the Council's Web Site at least five working days in advance of the Meeting at which the decision is to be made (except insofar as they contain confidential and/or exempt information).

The Decision Notice for each key decision will be published as soon as reasonably practicable after it has been made. We will seek to do this within five working days of the date of the decision. The Decision Notice will be available for public inspection on the Council's Web Site, and at the Council Offices, Trinity Road, Cirencester, Glos. GL7 1PX.

If you have any questions about the Forward Plan, or if you wish to make representations about any of the matters contained within it, please contact the Council's Democratic Services Team. The Democratic Services Team can also, on request, provide copies of, or extracts from, documents listed in the Plan and any which subsequently become available (subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure).

### **Contact Details:**

Democratic Services,  
Cotswold District Council,  
Trinity Road,  
Cirencester,  
Glos.

GL7 1PX.

**E-mail:** [democratic@cotswold.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@cotswold.gov.uk)

**Telephone:** 01285 623000

**Fax:** 01285 623907

**Website:** [www.cotswold.gov.uk](http://www.cotswold.gov.uk)

### **The Council's Executive Arrangements**

The Council currently operates the Strong Leader and Cabinet form of governance.

By law, the Cabinet can comprise a Leader of the Council, together with up to nine other Members to be appointed by the Leader (one of whom has to be appointed as Deputy Leader). The Leader will be elected by the Council, for a four-year term; and the Deputy Leader appointment is also for a four-year term.

The Cabinet at Cotswold District Council currently comprises a Leader, a Deputy Leader, and seven other Cabinet Members. The structure is as set out in the table below.

Executive decisions are taken either collectively by the Cabinet or individually by Cabinet Members.

The Cabinet generally meets monthly; whereas decision-making by individual Cabinet Members occurs on an 'as and when needed' basis.

Decisions of the Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members are subject to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Portfolio Area</b>	<b>Areas of Responsibility</b>
Joe Harris	Leader	Overall COVID-19 recovery, Policy framework including the corporate plan, Coordination of executive functions, Democratic Services, Communications, Customer experience Publica, Democratic Renewal and Consultation, Civic Pride (streets signs, street cleaning and litter picking)
Mike Every (Deputy Leader)	Finance	Financial strategy and management, Revenue and benefits, Property and asset management, Car parking operations, Grants, Cotswold Water Park
Rachel Coxcoon	Climate Change and Forward Planning	Climate Change and energy planning, Sustainable transport, Strategic forward planning, Local plan, Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106, Allowable solutions
Tony Dale	Economy and Skills	Local Enterprise Partnership and county-wide partnerships, Economic Development and COVID-19 Economic Recovery, Council commercialisation, Internal council transformation, Tourism and Visitor Information Centres, Chamber of Commerce liaison, Young people
Andrew Doherty	Environment, Waste and Recycling	Waste and recycling, UBICO, Flooding, Public protection, Food safety, Building control, Cemeteries, Noise and public nuisance, Public toilets
Jenny Forde	Health and Wellbeing	COVID-19 response, Public health, wellbeing and mental health, Improving social mobility, Tackling social isolation, Crime, disorder and safety, Supporting and safeguarding people, Leisure, museums and culture, Support for community events (Stow Fair, Phoenix Festival, Fleece Fair, Moreton Show)
Lisa Spivey	Housing and Homelessness	Tackling homelessness and improving housing security, Delivery of social rented homes Support for small housing developers and community land trusts, Promotion of self-build and system-build housing, Strategic oversight of tenure and housing needs assessment Liaison with housing developers, Housing Benefit and Universal Credit.

<b>Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private</b>	<b>Key Decision (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Decision-Maker</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>
No meeting scheduled				August 2020				
The Cotswold Club  Likely disclosure of exempt information - paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person.	No	Yes	Cabinet	September 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Ward Members Senior Officers  Internal consultation	Scheme of Delegation for Land and Property and the Acquisitions and Disposals Policy
Revised Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2030/31 and Budget 2021/22	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from Cabinet)	September 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Likely Local Government Finance Settlement  Council Aims and Priorities  Medium Term Financial Strategy Update
Performance Report (Quarter 1)	No	No	Cabinet	September 2020	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny	Service and Financial Performance Data

<b>Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private</b>	<b>Key Decision (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Decision-Maker</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>
							Committee	
Environmental Services Proposed Ubico Fleet Replacement Plan 2020/21	No	No	Cabinet	September 2020	Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health	Scott Williams	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Internal consultation	Refresh of the MTFs, budget 2020/21
Covid-19 Hardship Fund 2020/21	No	No	Cabinet	September 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Mandy Fathers	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Local Plan Review - Partial Review report	No	No	Council	September 2020	Climate Change and Forward Planning	James Brain	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Land at Station Road, Kemble Housing Options Report  Likely disclosure of exempt information - paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - Information	Yes	Yes	Recommendation to Council  Cabinet	September 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members  Ward Member  Senior Officers  March 2020	Acquisitions and Disposal Policy  Cabinet Report dated 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2019 - Agenda Item 9  Cabinet report dated 14 <sup>th</sup>

<b>Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private</b>	<b>Key Decision (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Decision-Maker</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>
relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person								September 2017- Exempt Agenda Item 16  Cabinet report dated 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2017 - Agenda Item 10 - Community Led Housing Fund
Council Plan	No	No	Recommendation to Council Cabinet	September 2020	Leader of Council	Christine Gore	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	
Treasury Management Report	No	No	Council	September 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	
Commercialisation Strategy	No	No	Cabinet / Council	September 2020	Economy and Skills	Frank Wilson	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	
Housing Delivery Strategy	No	No	Cabinet / Council	September 2020	Housing and Homelessness	Claire Locke	Cabinet Member Senior Officer	
Climate Emergency Strategy	No	No	Council (recomme	September 2020	Climate Change and	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members	

<b>Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private</b>	<b>Key Decision (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Decision-Maker</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>
			ndation from Cabinet)		Forward Planning		Senior Officers	
Equalities Policy	No	No	Cabinet	October 2020	Health and Wellbeing	Claire Hughes	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	
Performance Report (Quarter 2)	No	No	Cabinet	December 2020	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Service and Financial Performance Data
Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2022/23 and Budget 2021/22	No	No	Cabinet	December 2020	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Autumn Statement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process

(END)