



**COTSWOLD**  
**DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **QUARTERLY DIGEST** **(DECEMBER 2015)**

## INDEX

Item	Subject	Page No.
<b>(1)</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	
(i)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2015	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 5 <sup>th</sup> November 2015	10
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 15 <sup>th</sup> September 2015	18
(iv)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Report of Meeting held on 3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2015	26
(v)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 9 <sup>th</sup> September 2015	29
(vi)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes/Report of Meeting held on 16th November 2015 (to follow/to be circulated at the meeting (if available))	-
<b>(2)</b>	<b>Executive Forward Plan - December 2015 Update</b>	34

**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)

## **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Tuesday 1 September 2015 at the Members' Room - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

**PRESENT:**

Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Barry Kirby
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Andrew Chard	Martin Smith
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)

**Substitutes:**

**Officers in attendance:** Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Richard Cooper, Suzette Davenport, Stewart Edgar, PCC Martin Surl, Paul Trott and Louise White

**Apologies:** Cllr Gerald Dee, Cllr Helena McCloskey, Cllr Bernie O'Neill, Cllr Mark Rees and Cllr Bill Whelan

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

These were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

One member commented that in the minutes of the previous meeting, a request had been made to include relevant statistics within the annual report and he questioned whether this would be done. The Commissioner explained that he would not be amending the annual report. The Chairman informed members that the use of statistics in future reports would be discussed at the upcoming work planning meeting.

### **20. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT**

20.1 Paul Trott introduced the report which provided information required by the Panel such as the number of complaints against the Commissioner. No complaints had been received since the previous report.

20.2 Members noted that there had been a number of HMIC inspections. Once the reports were received they would be circulated to members. Members discussed the difficulties of the Constabulary receiving a number of inspections over a short period of time. The Commissioner indicated that there was now a good relationship with the HMIC and in the most part the reports were helpful. A lot of preparation took place before inspections and this had to be managed. In response to a question it was explained that the reports should not present any surprises but it was good to offer challenge and a fresh look at things.

## **21. NEW OPERATING MODEL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING**

21.1 Suzette Davenport and Richard Cooper gave a presentation on the new operating model explaining the programme objectives and strategic objectives. This was built up of the values and principles the Constabulary delivered everyday. The public was at the heart of everything they did and the structure was designed to deliver a more cohesive service with less barriers. The new model allowed for the Constabulary to police the county as one.

21.2 The programme's vision included ensuring strong relationships with communities and collaborating with partners. A key part of this was ensuring that processes were efficient and effective, providing the public with services that matter to them, no more and no less.

21.3 Members were shown the measures by which the effectiveness of the new model would be monitored. The Panel recognised that these measures contained a combination of easier data measure and more difficult to assess qualitative measures. The Panel were informed that the Commissioner and the Chief Constable met regularly and discussed the measures and that these were effective in helping him to hold the force to account. Members suggested that these measures be shared with themselves and form part of the performance monitoring.

21.4 One member queried the measure relating to reducing the percentage of incidents which needed a police officer to attend in person. He suggested that this was one measure that the force were able to control by deciding not to attend a certain type of incident. He asked how that decision to prioritise attendance at incidents might be made. In response it was explained that there would not be a rule to refuse to attend certain types of incidents. Each call would be assessed based on vulnerability and the suitability of a certain type of response.

21.5 Members discussed the importance of ensuring the public understood how these decisions were made. One member queried the appearance of the police at parish council meetings indicating that this was now becoming less frequent. It was explained that it was important to understand what the benefits of neighbourhood policing was and what some of the features were. The attending of parish council meetings was one feature of how officers could engage with the public and disseminate information, but there might be other methods of getting information out. With reducing resources, it was important to explore the best and most efficient ways of doing this and that might not be through a parish council meeting.

21.6 One member asked whether the current model still suggested that there would be a fall in the number of police officers by March 2016. In response it was explained that without the detailed budget information from central government no decisions could be made for certain. With likely reductions in budgets it was inevitable that staff numbers would fall.

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

21.7 Local policing officers would be assigned to one of three core roles: Incident Resolution (previously just response), Local Investigation and Neighbourhood Policing. The flexibility was then 'built-in' so that officers could perform all three roles from time to time depending on local and county priorities. It was noted that there were 438 police officers (FTE) and 124 PCSOs (FTE) working in local policing. In the core role of Neighbourhood Policing there would be 94 officers compared to 85 prior to the changes.

21.8 It was explained that the move to the new model was essential in order to meet the financial demands for the future and that the changes would lower the risk to core services should there be further decreases in budget in future. Neighbourhood policing was not ending, it was becoming more focused on tackling harm and vulnerability.

21.9 In response to questions on the deployment of officers in urban and rural areas, it was explained that the Incident Resolution Team was now based at Bamfurlong to serve the urban areas with the rural area retaining their own incident resolution officers. Officers and staff could be called to any area of the county if needed based on demand. Local communities would maintain a named nominated officer but with less emphasis on attending formal events/ meetings.

21.10 One member asked how the shift patterns ensured that the model of three different types of officer allowed for the flexibility required and how they could be sure it was working. In response it was explained that it was important that officers understood their role within the organisation as a whole and that shift patterns could be monitored to understand how officers were being allocated.

21.11 There was some discussion around whether small rural villages would still see a police presence. It was noted that some members of the public wanted to see police visibility in these areas. It was explained that it was important that police officers were allocated with a purpose and not just being allocated to an area. If a police presence was required then the model allowed for that to be there, but this should be intelligence led. Members asked how this message could be put out to the public so that expectations could be managed. It was explained that press releases and media interviews had been part of the communications strategy on this. The Commissioner outlined that in January he would be holding a webcast where he would question officers on the success of the changes.

21.12 Members requested that the slides be circulated.

**ACTION**                      **Stephen Bace**

## **22. UPDATE ON MOBILE FRONTLINE POLICING**

22.1 As part of the presentation on the new operating model, Suzette Davenport and Richard Cooper provided an update on the implementation of mobile working. This would be successfully implemented when officers were able to be deployed to, and then deal with, incidents without the need to return to a police building in order to complete paperwork.

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

22.2 As of August 2015, the project was within budget and was broadly on timetable but with some snags and bugs that needed to be fixed with regards to software. User feedback had been on balance very positive. On a red-amber-green rating, the only red light was associated with the E-crime and ViST (DASH) which was still being tested and was not yet live. As at the end of August, there was to have been 600 devices issued and approximately 230 users trained.

22.3 One member asked what would happen if there was a system failure. In response it was explained that it depended on the problem; there were back ups in place and the ability to restore servers and software quickly, but ultimately if needed hard copy backups and paper and pen would be used. Reassurances were given as to the security of the devices which made mobile working possible and contingency plans were in place.

22.4 One member asked whether the devices were on a public network. It was explained that they were with EE as that provided better coverage over the county. Airwave was used for the radios but over time this would change as the emergency services and others transitioned to the next generation of Emergency Mobile Communications, currently planned for 2018.

## **23. SAFE AND SOCIAL DRIVING**

23.1 Louise White gave a presentation focussing on young drivers in Gloucestershire and the initiatives under the priority of Safe and Social Driving. Members noted that the number of people killed and seriously injured on the roads of Gloucestershire was decreasing. Vast improvements had been made in reducing car driver and passenger casualties; however young people were most at risk with 1 in 5 crashing in the first 6 months of passing their test. In 2014 a quarter of all car occupant casualties were aged 17-24.

23.2 A local research study had been commissioned to ask 17-24 year olds how they behaved when in a car, why they acted as they did and what did they think should be done to reduce accidents. The results of the study helped to develop and deliver key projects for 2014-15.

23.3 Members were provided with details of Drive iQ which was the first major venture for the team and was an online modular programme for pre and novice drivers. It was award winning and 1000 schools in the UK had signed up to it with 50% implementing it in curriculum time. At the end of the course students were certificated. Schools and colleges could embed it into their curriculum in a number of ways including the requirement of the certificate in order to obtain an on-site parking permit being one such way.

23.4 The Panel were informed about a one day road safety 'extravaganza', with the planning and preparation delivered by a multi agency project team. It involved presentations from the host, the Police and Crime Commissioner and a family member or victim of a road traffic casualty. The event provided an

opportunity to learn from the services about the harsh realities of accidents but also about what could be done to prevent this from happening.

23.5 An evaluation of the event was commissioned from a private research company that indicated that there was clear evidence that afterwards young people were less likely to admit to poor behaviour and that their attitudes to dangerous driving had also changed for the better. The next event was due to take place on 20 October at Gloucestershire College in Forest of Dean and the second at the Royal Agricultural University in November.

23.6 Members received details of another initiative which was an anti drink and drug drive workshop delivered by the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service, Gloucestershire Constabulary, and Road Safety team. 15-29 year olds were most at risk of being a casualty in a drink/drug incident in Gloucestershire.

23.7 The programme of work was delivered through a letter to schools from the Commissioner's Office with bookings then coordinated and confirmed. The delivery team then hosted the presentations.

23.8 Details were provided of the Pathfinder Programme. This was a 5 day intensive road safety and driving course based on the Under 17 Car Club methodology. Members were also informed of the Skill for Life course which was IAM's flagship produce to train drivers to the IAM Advanced driving test.

23.9 The 'byPASStheEdaNGER' workshop was about empowering passengers to 'stand up' to unsafe drivers. 74% of young car passengers were killed or seriously injured by a young driver. In addition, the commissioned research found that passengers felt that they did not have a voice.

23.10 The Panel were informed of a number of upcoming workshops; one to support the new passenger campaign would be launched in the Autumn throughout the County and a 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive' roadshow coming in 2016 based around powerful personal testimony.

23.11 One member noted that much of the work was aimed at schools and post 16 and he questioned whether work was being carried out to engage with those young people not at school post 16. He suggested that some of the work could be targeted at a younger age group. It was explained that there were initiatives aimed at younger age groups such as the passenger campaign and through a number of voluntary and youth groups other than schools.

23.12 It was noted that 40% of schools had not replied to the initial email to receive workshops and support, members asked how these schools would be targeted. In response, it was detailed that further follow up work would be carried out with those schools who had not been in contact.

23.13 Members thanked the officers for the presentation and the good work being carried out in this area. They asked that the slides of the presentation be circulated.

**ACTION Stephen Bace**

## **24. FINANCE UPDATE**

24.1 Martin Surl provided members with an update on the financial situation and considerations in the development of the 2015/16 budget. Once the draft budget was approved at his Finance Panel it would be shared with members.

24.2 The key consideration going forward was the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and what changes would be made to the amount of funding from central government in the future. Previously the Constabulary had delivered savings in the region of £18m and this had been acknowledged by HMIC. Indications were that there would need to be further year on year savings with early projections by the Commissioners Office of anywhere between £16m and £18m.

24.3 Investment had been made in the new operating model, ICT and through the estates strategy to ensure that the Constabulary was in as strong a position as it could be going forward. This included the purchase of the new Custody Suite and Prism House and the removal of liabilities associated with Bearlands. Landsdown Road in Cheltenham would be decommissioned and the Commissioner confirmed that the station on Hester's Way would be retained. Wilton House would be kept as the community police station for Cheltenham. In response to a question on whether the Commissioner would look to utilise space with Cheltenham Borough Council in Delta House, it was explained that this was an option the Commissioner was likely to explore once available.

24.4 More information on the finances going forward would be available following the CSR in December and when it was expected that there would also be a change to the funding formula from government which would have implications on policing nationally.

24.5 Further financial information would be provided to members in the coming weeks following the meeting of the Commissioner's Finance Panel. In addition members asked that the outturn report on the Commissioner's website be circulated to members.

**ACTION**                      **Martin Surl/ Stephen Bace**

24.6 One member, noting the outturn report on the Commissioner's website asked whether the Commissioner still planned to allocate the same percentage of funds from the budget to the Commissioner's fund. It was explained that this allocation of funding was regularly reviewed in discussion with the Chief Constable.

## **25. NEXT MEETING**

25.1 Members were informed that Graham Robinson had stood down as an independent member of the Police and Crime Panel. Graham had been a member of the panel since its formation and the Chairman thanked him for all his hard work. The Panel wished him all the best for the future.



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

25.2 Members were informed that the work planning session had been moved to 2 October. This meeting was an opportunity for the Panel to discuss the format and content of reports being received from the Commissioner's office. The reports for the formal Panel meeting in November would then reflect those discussions.

**CHAIRMAN**

Meeting concluded at 12.35 pm

## **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

**MINUTES** of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Thursday 5 November 2015 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

**PRESENT:**

Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Helena McCloskey
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Andrew Chard	Cllr Mark Rees
Cllr Gerald Dee	Martin Smith
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Bill Whelan
Cllr Barry Kirby	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)

Substitutes: Cllr Jane Horne (In place of Cllr Bernie O'Neill)

Officers in attendance: Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Philip Sullivan, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies:

### **26. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

26.1 The Chairman noted the sad passing of Graham Robinson who had been an independent member on the Police and Crime Panel. Graham had been well liked and highly respected by both members and officers and was an integral part of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel. Graham had been key in helping to establish the Panel and in ensuring that there was a strong and knowledgeable independent voice.

26.2 The Panel was in the process of recruiting for a new independent member. The advert would go out on 6 November.

26.3 The Chairman informed the Panel that at the last meeting of full Council it was resolved that police and crime panel members be invited to publically oppose the closure of Stroud and Gloucester Magistrates Courts. Cllr Barry Kirby who had proposed the motion explained to the panel his concerns around 'access to justice'. Some members commented that it was important to ensure that the public could access the courts and that any new arrangements had to be fit for purpose. The Commissioner outlined that he had opposed the closure in his response to the consultation.

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

These were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

## **28. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT**

28.1 Paul Trott, Chief Executive of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office, explained that the report was aimed at providing more detail of the activity within the office. The report contained details of inspections, government consultation on blue light collaboration, and the Police and Crime Commissioners election.

28.2 Members noted the HMIC and HM Inspector of Prisons inspection of the Constabulary's new custody centre and the recommendation for the Commissioner to work with 'counterparts in the local authority and instigate an immediate review of the provision of local authority accommodation under section 38 (6) PACE 1984 for children and young people'. One member asked for reassurance that this was being handled as a high priority and was informed that this was something the Commissioner's Office were discussing with the County Council and that a shared protocol concerning the provision of such accommodation was being developed.

28.3 Members understood that section 136 of the Mental Health Act enabled a police officer to remove from a public place someone who they believe to be suffering from a mental disorder and in need of immediate care and control, to a place of safety. One member noted that the Peel inspection stated 74 incidents (section 136) where individuals were held in police cells as opposed to being placed in the Maxwell suite which was for this purpose. The Commissioner explained that section 136 was used as a last resort, although this was not infrequent, and that sometimes police cells were the appropriate place for individuals. The accommodation in the police estate was very good and he said the member was welcome to visit. In response to further questions, the Commissioner explained that there was a good relationship with the Together Trust and that decisions were made in the best interest of the individual.

28.4 In response to a question regarding the inspection detailing that there was no 'dip sampling' in relation to custody reports, the Commissioner explained that this had been rectified.

28.5 Members discussed the reference in the report to the government consultation on blue light collaboration and potential benefits in aligning both the command and governance of these services nationally. In response to a question it was explained that there was no appetite for this in Gloucestershire and that the Commissioner's Office and Constabulary worked well with the fire and rescue service. There were benefits to continued closer working for example through training opportunities. It was explained that while there was a good relationship with the fire and rescue service, the relationship with the ambulance service was not as strong.

28.6 The Panel noted that the Commissioner's response to the consultation raised the possibility of the Commissioner becoming a permanent member of the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee. It was explained that there was an increasing amount of joint working and that this was

one possible direction of travel. The response had been made to a national consultation prior to any legislation and that until that legislation was in place there was no action to take with regards to this.

28.7 One member commented that it would be useful for the Panel to receive further detail on the decisions contained within the log on the website. It was explained that what was published on the website was what was statutory required. The Panel asked that consideration be given to what information could be provided to the Panel on decisions.

**ACTION Paul Trott**

28.8 The Commissioner's Office had received a total of 46 Freedom of Information requests since 1 January 2015. 175 complaints had been received during 2015 of which all but 3 had received substantive replies. No complaints had been received regarding the Commissioner since the previous report. The Panel felt that it would be useful to have an annual report which went into a little more detail on this.

**ACTION Paul Trott/ Stephen Bace**

28.9 During discussion it was emphasised that the Commissioner was the decision maker, but when making decisions he consulted with his team and considered detailed reports. The Chairman noted that Annual Governance Statement outlined that Strategic performance monitoring is reported to the Performance Operations Meeting, with reports containing a broad set of quantitative and qualitative data. Members requested that these papers be provided to the Panel on a regular basis.

**ACTION Richard Bradley**

28.10 Members noted the preparations and arrangements being made in advance of the Police and Crime Commissioner elections in May 2016. One member queried whether it was necessary for the Commissioner's Office to be carrying out this preparation work. In response it was explained that it was important that the Office be seen to be independent from an individual and ready for any potential change.

## **29. DEVOLUTION UPDATE**

29.1 Richard Bradley, Deputy Chief Executive of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office, introduced the report explaining that the 'devolution agenda' for Gloucestershire was very much underway and that the detailed bid had been submitted and that the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) would submit Gloucestershire's final bid to Rt Hon. Greg Clark MP, Secretary of State for CLG with a small delegation from Gloucestershire attending a challenge session with him on 11 November 2015. The final announcement would be made on 25 November 2015.

29.2 The Panel were informed of the community safety aspect of the bid which looked to deliver joined up public protection and safeguarding practice to improve outcomes for some of our most vulnerable people and was being led by Richard Bradley. It was explained that only Gloucestershire had a community safety

aspect to the bid and that a whole system approach was being taken in order to deliver change.

29.3 The Police and Crime Commissioner role would not change under the current terms of the bid which included a combined authority model

29.4 If the bid was successful there would be around an 18 -24 month period of development where it would be important to bring the right people in partnership together. In response to a question it was explained that this could involve police and crime panel members.

29.5 Members discussed the difficulties in getting the message out to the public about devolution with it being suggested that it just wasn't on people's radar. Members asked whether the police could help in terms of getting that message out. The Commissioner outlined that there was a lot of joint working within the police and crime plan with priority leads across the public sector. This example of joint working promoted the ethos of the devolution deal and demonstrated how better collaboration could deliver outcomes for people.

29.6 Further discussion centred on the importance of good communication to parish and town councils to ensure they were aware of the proposed changes brought about by devolution and how these changes would benefit the people of Gloucestershire.

29.7 One member asked whether the Commissioner would look to move his office closer geographically to partner agencies and was informed that the current position ensured a strong independent voice while also allowing for close working.

29.8 There was some discussion about how a combined authority would work. One member suggested that the Commissioner was the only representative who could make a decision without potentially needing to take it back to an organisation. It was suggested that for a combined authority to work every representative would need the authority to make decisions with unnecessary delay.

29.9 In response to a question the Commissioner explained that he did not see any threat to devolution through police forces being brought together regionally.

### **30. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN HIGHLIGHT REPORT**

30.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report which aimed to provide all stakeholders with an update that monitored progress in respect of each of the priorities. Members welcomed the level of information provided and the work that had been carried out in response to the work planning meeting.

30.2 One member asked whether the theatre company delivering a message on the hidden risks associated with domestic abuse as detailed on page 20 of the agenda pack was a one off event or would continue. It was explained that

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

this would continue in the future and that there were a variety of tools and information available on the new Police and Crime Commissioner website.

30.3 There was a brief discussion on the intention of encouraging people to engage with the Police and Commissioner's office online, with the example of 101 reporting being online.

30.4 The Panel noted comments made nationally regarding the future of neighbourhood policing. In response the Commissioner explained that neighbourhood policing was still a focus in Gloucestershire with new recruits still doing their 200 hours of foot patrol and the Neighbourhood Engagement Vehicle visiting communities.

30.5 One member commented that the report contained some information which appeared to be retrospective and that it was not easy to see outcomes. In response it was explained that the report was intended for the Commissioner so that he could be provided with detail around activity. With regards to the Commissioner's Fund there were 200 projects which could not all be detailed every quarter. The Panel were welcome to identify any of the projects they wished to do a deep dive of and the list of projects were available on the website. The Panel agreed to cover this at the next work planning meeting.

**ACTION Stephen Bace**

30.6 In response to questions around how the Commissioner satisfied himself with regards to outcomes from the projects, the Commissioner provided detail of the arrangements in place.

- There was a funding panel in place initially which looked at the bids for funding and evaluated them against criteria that included relevance to the plan, value for money and sustainability.
- Audit had reviewed this process to ensure that it was fit for purpose.
- In making a decision about who received funding, the Commissioner would consult with the team headed up by Richard Bradley.
- Where multiple small bids were received in an area looking to carry about similar projects, the Commissioner would ask them to join together to submit a bid to reduce duplication.
- Quarterly meetings were held with priority leads and there was a governance board where the police leads would meet to discuss activity.
- The Commissioner was always looking to challenge in relation to outcomes and what progress had been made.

30.7 One member noted the increased seasonable demand on 101 calls and the increase in abandoned call rate. There would be ongoing work to look to

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

improve the 101 service. Members noted that 101 had been cause for concern before and queried the reason for the current underperformance. In response it was explained that there had been some technical issues with the ICT system which had led to some calls being lost. The public would be notified of the issues and it was expected to be resolved shortly.

30.8 In relation to 101 calls members requested that they receive the regular statistics on calls against targets.

**ACTION Richard Bradley**

30.9 One member asked how the Commissioner's six priorities were contributing to less crime and more peace and good order. In response the Commissioner outlined that crime in Gloucestershire was statistically at a similar level to previous years while crime nationally and in the south west had risen.

30.10 Some members commented on the special constables and wished to place on record their thanks for the excellent work that they did and how professional a body they were.

30.11 In response to a question it was explained that the budget consultation would be promoted on the website and through social media. In addition, the Commissioner had given a radio interview and issued a press release. The Neighbourhood Engagement Vehicle was also out in communities.

## **31. FINANCE MONITORING**

31.1 Dave Bennett, Chief Finance Officer, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, introduced the finance monitoring report which the Commissioner received to hold the Constabulary to account. The report included revenue expenditure, reserves, capital expenditure and the treasury management report.

31.2 The Panel asked for the definition of a major incident, noting that there was a proportion of the budget allocated to this. It was explained that this was a mixture of expected events such as the Cheltenham Festival or Royal Air Tattoo, which had associated funding, and unexpected events where it was important to have funds available.

31.3 In response to a question around the difference between the Commissioner Fund budget allocation detailed within the budget and that cited within the highlight report at the previous agenda item, it was explained that the highlight report contained the total budget across the four year period. The Panel were assured that the Commissioner Fund spending would come in on budget.

31.4 Members asked for clarification on changes to the budget since the receipt of the budget by the Panel in February. One example was an increase of £345,000 which was explained to be in relation to funding from reserves which had been previously earmarked for projects.

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

31.5 There was a specific question in relation to the apparent changes in police staff and officer budgets. It was explained that in the past year there had been a loss of around 70 police officers. It was forecasted that each year around 60 officers would leave for reasons such as retirement so the increased number accounted for a drop in the budget. The Constabulary was also looking ahead to the Comprehensive Spending Review and potential reductions in funding of between 25%-45%. With this in mind there was a pause on recruitment. It was explained that the Constabulary could not make an officer redundant and so this affected the planning for reducing officer numbers. The Constabulary had to look to downsize in an intelligent way.

31.6 One member noted that the Peel inspection report of the Constabulary detailed that 10% of savings were from collaboration and commented that this seemed low. In response the Commissioner outlined that a great deal of collaboration had taken place in the past and cited the tri service centre as an example. Collaboration would only be entered into if it was for the benefit of the people of Gloucestershire.

31.7 In response to further questions in relation to police officer budget it was explained that when submitting the budget in February the police officer budget included additional budget areas such as the Major Incidents allocation in order to simplify the figures for the public. The budget monitoring data separated out these figures and the overall budget total was the same, just presented in a different way.

31.8 The Panel asked questions in relation to the Revenue Support Reserve. It was explained that with the likely high level of reductions in funding in future years there needed to be provision to support the savings that would have been made.

## **32. OLDER BUT NOT OVERLOOKED**

32.1 Phil Sullivan, Priority Lead, provided members with an update and outlined that there were many excellent projects across the county. He explained that where the Commissioner provided endorsement of a project through funding, then that project was then able to multiply those funds by gaining support from other organisations with the National Lottery being one example.

32.2 The Panel was informed that the biggest area of difficulty was in addressing fear of crime as opposed to criminal activity. Many of the projects were aimed at helping people feel connected and feeling confident and safe. It was important to get the truth out that Gloucestershire was a relatively safe place to live.

32.3 The example of 'Treasure Seekers' was given that looked to provide support to both older and younger people.

32.4 The 'older but not overlooked' priority was just a heading and the projects looked to cover a number of demographics and in some cases crossed into other priority areas. The open day at Police HQ was given as an example of police



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

engagement with communities and reducing fear and intimidation and allowing the police to be approachable.

32.5 The projects were often aimed at areas where there was the greatest need and looked to provide services for the most vulnerable in communities.

32.6 In response to a question it was explained that a lot of work was carried out with village agents. Police Community Support Officers were also key to engagement with communities, as were neighbourhood watch in some areas.

32.7 There was some discussion about rural isolation, with the example given of the number of domestic abuse cases. One member commented about the opportunity to engage with parish and town councils and expressed concern about inconsistency of police presence and engagement at these meetings. In response the Commissioner outlined that with reducing resources officers were not always able to attend these meetings, but that they would still engage by other means. The Commissioner would speak with the member about his specific area of concern.

32.8 One member asked about the role of the media in effecting people's perception of crime. It was important to look to get out positive messages about Gloucestershire being a safe place to live, but negative stories about crime were always likely to get media attention.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Meeting concluded at 12.50 pm

## HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 15 September 2015 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

**Present:**

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Paul McMahon
Cllr Doina Cornell	Cllr Helen Molyneux
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Jim Parsons
Cllr Iain Dobie (Chairman)	Cllr Brian Robinson
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Roger Wilson (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Jan Lugg	

**Substitutes:** Cllr Brian Oosthuysen (In place of Cllr Stephen Lydon)

**Apologies:** Cllr Flo Clucas

**Others in attendance**

**Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)**

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer

Caroline Smith - Senior Manager Engagement & Inclusion

**Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)**

Dr Sally Pearson – Director of Clinical Strategy

**Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS NHS Trust)**

Ingrid Barker – Chair

Paul Jennings – Chief Executive

Duncan Jordan – Chief Operating Officer

**Healthwatch Gloucestershire**

Claire Feehily - Chair

Barbara Piranty – Chief Executive

**Gloucestershire County Council**

Margaret Willcox – Commissioning Director Adults

Sarah Scott – Interim Director of Public Health

Jennifer Taylor – Lead Commissioner Public Health Commissioned Services

**2gether NHS Foundation Trust**

Ruth FitzJohn – Chair

Shaun Clee – Chief Executive

Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

**36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Roger Wilson declared a personal interest as a Governor of the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust; and as a Trustee of the Gloucestershire Rural Community Council which hosts Healthwatch Gloucestershire.

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

Cllr Brian Oosthuysen declared a personal interest as the council's appointed Governor on the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Council of Governors.

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

Minutes – The minutes of the meeting on 14 July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The committee was updated on the action from the July meeting and informed that the presentation slides from the Big Health Day were available should members wish to see them.

### **38. THE FUTURE OF COMMUNITY HOSPITALS**

38.1 Duncan Jordan, Chief Operating Officer Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS), presented this item to the committee. He emphasised that before any redesign of community services in the county could take place it was important to understand what was currently in place, and in particular ensure that there was clarity with regard to the needs of the local population, in order to be able to understand how best to support communities.

38.2 The GCCG has established a Transforming Community Hospitals Group (this has been meeting for a year) to take this matter forward. The Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) was clear that there was not a one size fits all solution to the localities across Gloucestershire.

38.3 Mr Jordan explained to the committee that it was easy to become fixated on an asset but it was more important to ensure that services reflected the current medical approach and fitted with the desire to continue to integrate health and social care services in the county. He was clear that the current review of community services, led by GCCG and GCS, was looking at the whole county. The initial engagement and consultation might be with the Forest of Dean community but the ultimate ambition was to ensure that the county had effective and robust community services across the county. Mr Jordan assured the committee that neither GCCG nor GCS had any preconceived proposals ahead of the planned engagement with the Forest of Dean community. The engagement was about understanding the needs of the community and gathering their views on services.

38.4 The committee was assured that the learning points from the changes made at Cirencester Hospital had informed this work. The committee received a clear commitment from the GCCG and GCS that the committee would be kept up to date with the progress of this work.

38.5 In response to questions members were assured that the cross border factors, both with Wales and Herefordshire, were included in this work, and that meetings with these stakeholders were already in place.

38.6 Members understood the need to look at the structure of community hospitals and services across the country. They were clear that it was very important to ensure that communication with stakeholders and the media were clear and consistent. Within the current climate of challenges relating to both budget and available resources many people could feel that this was about cutting services. It was also important to remember that people were very attached to their local community hospital.

38.7 Cllr Paul McMahon asked to be included in the Stakeholder Group; and recommended that Parish Councils should also be included given their valuable role in the local community.  
ACTION: Caroline Smith

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

- 38.8 The committee was reminded that Cheltenham and Gloucester City did not have community hospitals so understanding how these populations accessed community services was an important factor; particularly how they would access rehabilitation services. Accessing services would be a key issue across the county and members were clear that travel issues must be factored into this work.
- 38.9 Mary Hutton, Accountable Officer GCCG, informed the committee that the GCCG was currently working on the rehabilitation model for the whole of Gloucestershire; looking at care pathways and beds, eg. stroke pathways. She also assured the committee that the GCCG was mapping out plans for Cheltenham and Gloucester City and that there were currently ambulatory care units at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital (GRH) and Cheltenham General Hospital (CGH).
- 38.10 The committee was informed that the current timeline indicated that the GCCG and GCS would be able to return to the committee in second quarter of 2016 with an interim position statement on the development of proposals. The committee asked to be informed on the business case for the rehabilitation work.  
ACTION: Caroline Smith
- 38.11 In response to a question the committee was informed that GCS worked closely with GPs, and that a Service Level Agreement (SLA) was in place with GPs to cover wards at the Community Hospitals.
- 38.12 Members continued to be concerned as to how the engagement exercise could reach all groups across the Forest of Dean; this was a huge challenge. Caroline Smith (Senior Manager Engagement & Inclusion, GCCG) assured the committee the GCCG was utilising every opportunity, including social media to engage and inform people. She explained that the Communication and Engagement Plan was still being developed, and was in effect a 'living document' that would be updated on a regular basis. She also assured members that two Forest of Dean District Council Cabinet members were on the Forest of Dean Locality Reference Group; and that as many groups as possible would be involved. It was further explained that the overall needs assessment for this work would be informed by the Locality Reference Group.
- 38.13 The committee was interested to note that social prescribing was identified as having an important role in supporting individual care journeys. The committee agreed to consider including an item on social prescribing on a future agenda.  
ACTION: Chairman/Andrea Clarke
- 38.14 The committee was informed that (ultimately) each locality would have a plan specific to the needs of that community.
- 38.15 The committee was clear that community hospitals and services were a vital and valuable part of the provision of health and social care in the county. Members of the committee were clear that they must be regularly informed of the progress of this work; and that the GCCG and GCS must work to ensure that the communication with the public was clear and consistent.
- 39. SUICIDE PREVENTION STRATEGY**
- 39.1 Jennifer Taylor, Lead Commissioner (Public Health Commissioned Services), gave a full presentation of this strategy. Suicide and self-harm were issues that committee members

- were deeply concerned about. The committee had requested to receive this strategy to understand the work and action plan in place to support this area of work.
- 39.2 The committee was pleased to note that there was a clear endorsement of this strategy by the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board and that there was good governance through the Gloucestershire Suicide Prevention Partnership Forum (GSPPF).
- 39.3 In response to a question Ms Taylor informed the committee that it was important to be cautious around the data. The Coroner would conclude whether or not a death was suicide, and the Coroner did not always conclude this; and the data was always at least 9 months behind. Ms Taylor explained that going forward it would be important to develop a more proactive approach to data capture. It was also important to remember that not all people who kill themselves have previously been diagnosed with a mental health illness. It was important to identify ways to encourage people to ask for help.
- 39.4 Training was a key aspect. It was known that a significant number of people who have previously not regularly visit their GP do so in the seven days prior to their death. Supporting GPs in their understanding of this issue and potential ways in which to identify people at risk is crucial. A factor here though is that the training programme is two days and it is difficult for GPs and other professionals to take this amount of time out of their schedule. Work was in place to try to compact this course into a shorter time period.
- 39.5 Members questioned what support was given to schools and parents and businesses. It was explained that schools were signed up to Gloucestershire Healthy Living and Learning (GHLL) (<http://www.ghll.org.uk/>) and that GHLL were part of the GSPPF. There were a range of activities to support schools, although it was acknowledged that more needed to be done. The committee was reminded that self-harm did not always lead to suicide. It was acknowledged that parents could be a valuable asset and it would be important to find more ways to support them.
- 39.6 With regard to businesses it was known that being in employment reduced the risk of suicide. Job CentrePlus was on the GSPPF; and it was intended that stronger links with the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) would be developed.
- 39.7 Shaun Clee, Chief Executive 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust (2G) informed the committee that the number of young people under the age of 11 presenting with mental health issues was of concern. He further informed the committee that mental health was a Prime Ministerial priority, and that a new national mental health strategy was required to be in place by December this year and would be an all age strategy.
- 39.8 It was explained that where preventative work relating to employment was available it was good. The 2G tackling stigma group has visited more than 40 employers locally and would do more. The Interim Director of Public Health (DPH) informed members that additional investment had been put into the school nurse service to support developing emotional resilience at an early age, and in addition commissioning was ongoing with regard to early help for children and families.
- 38.9 The committee was reminded that the Gloucestershire Mental Health Crisis Concordat was well supported by organisations in the county. It was agreed that there were opportunities for the district councils to support this through their role in the planning process. It was also explained that Stroud District Council were trying to support the Credit Union which could have a positive impact.

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

- 38.10 It was suggested that social media could be a driver for support for young people as opposed to the usual view that it was a negative force in this regard. Young people used their mobile phones a lot and it would be helpful if something could be developed in this regard. Mr Clee informed the committee that this was a good point and that he was working with colleagues to understand how social media could be utilised as a positive force. He also informed members that 2G was working with UCAS and running mental health stigma awareness days.
- 38.11 Ms Taylor clarified that the training offered by Public Health was free of charge and was offered to anyone who was likely to come into contact with this at risk group. She informed the committee that Parking Control Officers who had undertaken this course had found it to be helpful.
- 38.12 Ms Taylor, in response to a question, explained that protocols were in development to enable more timely data to be collected and shared with partners to increase intelligence in this area. A better understanding of attempted suicides would also help. She explained that this issue needed a collective responsibility across partners. It was acknowledged that a particular issue with regard to this work was being able to identify whether it was making a difference.
- 38.13 The committee was concerned as to how the current lack of clarity around future public health funding would impact on this work.
- 38.14 The committee supported this strategy and associated action plan and agreed that it would wish to receive an update on progress against the action plan in twelve months.  
ACTION: Jennifer Taylor/Andrea Clarke

#### **40. QTR 1 ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT 2015/16**

- 40.1 Margaret Willcox, Director Adult Social Services, presented this report. She highlighted the increase in the number of safeguarding referrals, that performance against direct payments, reassessments (of needs within the last twelve months), drug and alcohol and health checks targets continued to be of concern. In response to members concerns and questions the Director explained the activity that was in place to address these areas. The committee was also reminded that a workshop on Adult Social Care and Public Health performance was scheduled for 16 November 2015 and members would also be able to follow up on these matters at that time. A workshop on Drug and Alcohol performance was also in place for 1 October 2015.
- 40.2 Members were also concerned to see that the reablement service was not performing as expected. The committee was informed that a significant factor was the sickness absence rates experienced by GCS in relation to reablement staff. GCS were addressing this matter; and the committee agreed that it would need to continue to monitor this performance closely.
- 40.3 The Interim Director of Public Health informed the committee that targets related to smoking were being exceeded but that this was now becoming more challenging in part this could be attributed to the use of e-cigarettes. More also needed to be done with regard to chlamydia testing. It was noted that only one third of local authorities nationally were meeting this target. It was questioned what could be done here as the test itself was straightforward.
- 40.4 Members emphasised their concerns re health checks and that there seemed to be a lack of clarity around who would be invited to receive one, and would this be those people who needed one most. It was acknowledged that there was a full explanation of the activity

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

commissioned in this area in the Director of Adult Services Report which was later on the agenda.

40.5 It was noted that the data issues between the council and 2G have now been resolved and that it was now clearer how these services were performing against the mental health targets. Members were pleased to hear this but given that there were also some anomalies with some other targets asked that these be made clearer in the comments section.  
ACTION: Simon Hawkins/Mark Branton

40.6 In response to a question regarding the use of residential care homes the committee was informed that it was well evidenced that people should not go into long term care too early as it was not good for their overall health and wellbeing. Some recent work with the Order of St John Trust (OSJ) had shown that one person had been in residential care for 29 years and another for 27. The Director indicated that at the time this placement was made no doubt it was felt to be the best option; however these people could probably have lived much more independent and active lives for a large proportion of that time. The overwhelming view from the community was that people wanted to remain independent as long as possible.

#### **41. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (GCCG) PERFORMANCE REPORT**

41.1 The GCCG Accountable Officer gave a full presentation of this report. She informed the committee that the cost of new drugs was a particular issue for the GCCG, as was the impact of new NICE guidelines relating to cancer targets. She drew members attention to the clinical programme groups and indicated that she was happy for the committee to look at these groups should it so wish. She was encouraged to see the progress against the stroke targets, and the GCCG and partners continued to work on the winter plan. She informed members that August had been very busy and that the peaks and troughs in Gloucestershire were particularly challenging.

41.2 The GCCG continued to encourage and direct people to the right services at the right time. More work was being undertaken on case reviews to try and understand the wider picture.

41.3 There was steady improvement against the mental health targets and a significant amount of money had been invested in these services this year. She reminded members that the GCCG had focused particularly on dementia diagnosis last year and this was reflected in the improved performance demonstrated in this report.

41.4 Given the concerns about access to mental health services for children and young people the Chairman asked that targets relating to children and young people's mental health services be included in future reports.  
ACTION: Alex Holland

41.5 In response to a question the Accountable Officer acknowledged that QIPP targets continued to be a concern. Each year it became more difficult to deliver the required efficiency savings. It was clarified that the Trusts were each set targets. The committee was informed that nationally 75% of health trusts were running at a loss but it was felt that in Gloucestershire the providers were holding on to their position and there was no financial deficit at present in Gloucestershire.

41.6 Members reiterated their previous concerns regarding stroke services and highlighted the comments made in the recent CQC inspection report of the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. The Accountable Officer informed the committee of the response to the CQC's points and the ongoing work in relation to improving the stroke pathway. Members

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

were also reminded that, at their request, following their recent visit to the stroke pathway at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital the stroke consultant had been invited to the January 2016 committee to discuss this matter with members.

- 41.7 Committee members were also concerned with regard South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) response times. It was agreed that these questions would be held over to the 3 November 2015 meeting when the committee would be undertaking a spotlight on this performance and SWAST officers would be in attendance.
- 41.8 The difficulties relating to being able to recruit sufficient district nurses was explained in particular that this reflected the national position. The GCCG has a workforce group which was actively addressing these issues. It was questioned whether nursing was an issue that the committee should look at at a future meeting.

## **42. HEALTHWATCH GLOUCESTERSHIRE PATIENT AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK QTR 1**

- 42.1 The report was presented by the Chair of Healthwatch Gloucestershire. The report demonstrated the feedback received from the general public during the first quarter of this year. The committee was reminded that the detail of the report was shared with provider organisations. HWG had worked closely with the CQC in readiness for the inspections of both GHNHSFT and GCS.
- 42.2 The committee was informed that HWG was on the GCCG Primary Care Commissioning Committee which oversees the co-commissioning undertaken by the GCCG. HWG had also just completed two task and finish groups looking at Non-Emergency Patient Transport and the discharge process. These would be submitted to this committee in due course.
- 42.3 The committee thanked HWG for their input to the committee's work and in particular for their engagement with the parish councils.

## **43. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SERVICES REPORT**

- 43.1 The Director of Adult Services gave a full presentation of this report which included a full briefing on the Care Act. The report referred to the recent judgement on Ordinary Residence which the Director felt would make this issue even more challenging than it already was. The committee requested a briefing on this matter.  
ACTION: Margaret Willcox
- 43.2 Alongside the information in the report detailing how adult social care was now managed in the county the committee was informed that 4 of the locality Integrated Social Care Managers have been appointed out of the six required; and that the county wide manager has also been appointed.

## **44. GCCG CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT**

- 44.1 The Accountable Officer presented this report. Members were pleased to note the awards that have been won by the NHS providers in the county. In particular the awards won by the Hospitals Trust at the Gloucestershire Apprenticeships Awards 2015 where their Lifelong Learning Team took the award for the Employer of the Year, and one of their apprentices won two awards including the Apprentice of the Year.
- 44.2 The committee was interested in the Accountable Officer's view of the Devolution bid by Gloucestershire. Mrs Hutton indicated that the GCCG was happy to be involved in this work and that there remained a lot of process to go through (if the bid was successful). The bid had highlighted a number of areas where partners wanted to work together more including



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

community safety and self-care and prevention. It was also important to continue to drive forward the continued integration of health and social care provision in the county.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Meeting concluded at 1.05 pm

## Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee

November 2015

### **1. Care Quality Commission (CQC) Inspection Report – Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust**

This report was presented to the committee by Amanda Eddington, CQC Inspection Manager (Hospitals Directorate) South West Hospitals team. The presentation slides are available on the council's website and detail the inspection process and the outcomes from the inspection.

The overall rating for the Trust is Requires Improvement. It is important to note that the ratings across all services provided by the Trust range from Inadequate (Urgent and Emergency Services 'Safe' category) to Outstanding (Community Inpatients 'Caring' category). In total over 60% of the ratings are 'Good'. It is also important to note that the CQC recognised that this is a new organisation (only just over 2 years old) and that it is working hard to 'catch up'.

The committee heard from the Chair of the Trust that the Trust recognised itself in this report; and had itself identified many of the issues in the report to the Inspection Team at its initial presentation to the CQC. The Trust is required to submit a detailed action plan to the CQC by 6 November 2015. This action plan will be overseen in its delivery by the Trust Development Agency, the CQC and the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG). The committee will also monitor progress against this plan as part of its regular performance monitoring.

The committee recognises the importance for the people of Gloucestershire to be aware of how their health and social services are rated by the CQC. However, it is also important to be clear that the CQC recognised that this is a very caring organisation with staff who treat people with kindness, dignity and respect and who are consistently exceptional at the community hospitals, and in places it was hard to imagine how it could have been better; and committee members hope that staff morale is not adversely affected by the overall Requires Improvement rating.

### **2. Out of Hours Service – 6 month review**

The committee welcomed the Head of Operations (Urgent Care), South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST), to the meeting to inform members on progress since SWAST commenced delivery of the Out of Hours Service on 1 April 2015.

Committee members engaged in a robust debate with SWAST officers on this matter. It was clear that this has been a challenging period for the service, particularly regarding the staffing of the Primary Care Centres (PCCs). There have been occasions during this time period where PCCs have had to close/not open. The target for the service is that people should not have to travel more than 30 minutes and analysis has shown that these closures resulted in 15 people having an extended journey. The meeting was informed that ensuring that the PCCs in the main urban areas of Gloucester and Cheltenham were fully staffed was a priority. In response members were clear that those people living in the rural areas should not be treated any differently to those living in the urban areas. SWAST acknowledged this point and assured members that closing/not opening a PCC was something that they wished to avoid and only did in extreme circumstances. SWAST assured the committee that it was working hard to address the staffing issues.

The service is not meeting the National Quality Requirements (NQR) and given the committee's concerns regarding the delivery of this service it was agreed that the committee would receive a further update in 6 months.

### **3. South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust – Spotlight on performance**

OSMC is already aware of the ongoing concerns regarding the SWAST response times in the rural areas of Gloucestershire. SWAST acknowledged that Gloucestershire is a particular challenge especially relating to workforce issues. The Trust is working hard to address these issues and to find innovative ways of working.

It was good to hear that SWAST is in discussion with the council's Chief Fire Officer to identify options for joint working in Gloucestershire. The Trust is also funding the training of 30 Emergency Care Assistants to become Paramedics (this is a University course). This cohort is due to qualify in 2016 and will be followed by another 30. The committee was informed that 50% of these 30 new Paramedics will be based in Gloucestershire. Community First Responders and defibrillators play a key role in the rural areas and the committee was pleased to welcome the SWAST Gloucestershire Community Responder Officer who updated members on the on the current position in Gloucestershire in this regard.

The Trust was also selected by the Department of Health to pilot a new way for ambulance services to respond to 999 calls – Dispatch on Disposition. This pilot has proved successful and is now being extended to other ambulance services. SWAST is also the best performing English ambulance trust for 999 calls resolved over the telephone and for the percentage of patients cared for through alternative healthcare pathways avoiding unnecessary admissions to hospital emergency departments (52.7% against the national average of 37.3%).

Committee members are of course concerned about the poor response times in the rural areas, but it is also important to acknowledge that SWAST is, overall, performing well against its targets. Going forward it will be important to see whether the increase in the number of paramedics next year and the work with Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service makes a real difference on the ground.

### **4. Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group Chair/Accountable Officer Report**

The committee sought assurance that the lessons from the major internal incidents over the Christmas and New Year period had been used to inform the winter planning for this year. Members were assured that this was so and that partnership working has improved. The committee was however informed that demand over the last month had been higher than ever experienced and that the GCCG and providers were trying to understand what was driving this increase in demand.

### **5. Director of Public Health Report**

The committee congratulated Sarah Scott on her appointment to this post and looked forward to receiving her Annual Report in due course.

### **6. Director of Adult Services Report**

The committee agreed that it would be helpful to have another Members Seminar on the Care Act. Officers agreed to set this up but did remind members that for previous seminars on this matter numbers attending had been small. I therefore ask OSMC members to do what they can to ensure that their groups are informed about this event.

Committee members were particularly concerned to understand the proposals to remodel the existing Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Service. This is part of the review of the Crisis Care Concordat Action Plan. The committee will be scheduling Mental Health into its

work plan. The committee was also quite rightly reminded by the Chair of the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust that there is 'no health without mental health' and that this should be borne in mind across all our work.

**7. Healthwatch Gloucestershire Podiatry Task Group Report**

The committee was pleased to receive this report and looks forward to receiving two further task group reports (Discharge process and Patient Transport) from Healthwatch Gloucestershire in the New Year.

**Cllr Iain Dobie  
Chairman**

## **GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held at Shire Hall, Gloucester on Wednesday 9 September 2015.

**PRESENT:**

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson (Chairman)
Cllr Flo Clucas	Cllr Richard Leppington
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Nigel Moor
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Shaun Parsons
Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Tom Williams
Cllr Roger Wilson	

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Nigel Moor (Gloucestershire County Council) and Barry Kirby (Gloucestershire County Council).

Cllr Roger Wilson substituted at the meeting for Cllr Moor.

**2. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record of that meeting.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

**4. BROADBAND UK PRESENTATION**

Lionel Spencer from Broadband UK gave a presentation on the Mobile Infrastructure Project (MIP) undertaken by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Full details of the presentation can be viewed at the following link:

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=731&MId=8078&Ver=4>

Members were informed that this publically funded project aimed to consider how best to provide mobile phone coverage in areas currently receiving no coverage.

Key points identified during the presentation included:

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

- The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (Broadband delivery UK) would meet the capital cost of the project;
- Arqiva was the appointed organisation contracted to deliver the project;
- The four main mobile operators in the UK had signed up to provide a service from all MIP sites for the next 20 years, and would meet the operating costs for the service.

Expressing concerns about the impact of limited mobile coverage in parts of Gloucestershire, members requested information on the (i) 13 'not spot' areas identified as having no effective mobile phone coverage, and (ii) the mobile phone media campaign undertaken by Shropshire Council when addressing similar issues in another rural area of Britain.

During the discussion, it was suggested officers involve county councillors in developing an evidence base from which to demonstrate members concerns about poor mobile phone coverage in Gloucestershire, including seeking information on the decommissioning of mobile phone masts within their divisions. It was also suggested Town and Parish Councils be included in the review process, aided by the use of a simple questionnaire. Later in the meeting, a member suggested it might be useful for the committee to consider data on the number of visitors to areas with limited mobile phone coverage as another a means of strengthening the evidence base.

The committee requested officers invite mobile phone operators to attend a future meeting, followed by an invitation to BDUK to give an update on the Mobile Infrastructure Project (MIP). Members were advised that the project was due to end in March 2016, and that it might not be economically viable to provide mobile phone coverage in some areas of the county.

## **5. CURRENT ISSUES**

Peter Carr, (Local Enterprise Partnership), gave an overview of the reports presented at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting earlier that day, followed by an update from Nigel Riglar, Commissioning Director for Communities and Infrastructure at Gloucestershire County Council, on key issues pertinent to the Gloucestershire economy, including an update on Gloucestershire's recent devolution bid.

Members noted that a statement of intent document, *We are Gloucestershire*, (developed by countywide partners; Gloucestershire County Council, Gloucestershire District Councils, Local Enterprise Partnership, Police and Crime Commissioner and NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group), had been sent to Government Ministers confirming Gloucestershire's intent to take on greater control of its public services. On Friday 4 September 2015, a full submission of Gloucestershire's aspirations had been sent to Whitehall for consideration. A response was anticipated later in the autumn.

Detailed reports can be viewed at the following link:

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=725&MIId=8006&Ver=4>

Pete Carr from Gfirst LEP thanked Gloucestershire County Council for assisting with the processing of the first 6 projects of the Gloucestershire Growth Deal and confirmed that the current status of the projects would now be subject to the approval and funding process outlined in the Assurance Framework Document. Responding to questions, the LEP stated that, it had been clear from the outset, funding would be prioritised to those projects which would ultimately result in economic growth, and not to bids where growth might only be a possibility.

Some members expressed concern about the timescales for the implementation plan, and the monitoring and evaluation of projects. Later in the meeting, it was suggested project providers be invited to the next meeting to allow members to gain a broader understanding of the some of the investments made by the GFirst LEP.

Members recalled that, following the commitment to the Missing Link, (announced by the government in early December 2014), Highways England had developed a programme of works from which to aid and deliver the solution, involving meetings between the County Council and the Cotswold Conservation Board. Gloucestershire MP's met with Transport Minister, Andrew Jones on 8 September 2015 to identify how the pace of work could be increased. Members noted that, whilst the intention was to move as quickly as possible, it was unlikely work would commence before 2021 as the project had not been identified for funding as part of the current (Highways England) programme.

Key actions agreed during the discussion included: -

- a) The Economic Growth Team to follow up a request from Cllr Flo Clucas (Cheltenham Borough Council) regarding concerns about social enterprise issues.
- b) Pete Carr from GFirst LEP to revise the wording of the LEP Growth Deal Implementation Plan (August 2015 Update) in respect of the statement *"Highways England commits to working with GCC to investigate whether a deliverable solution to the problems on the A417 Missing Link can be found"*.
- c) Contact to be made with the appropriate Local Transport Manager regarding a request for information from Cllr Tom Williams (Stroud District Council), on the proposed timescale for the programme of works on the A419.
- d) Gloucestershire Rail Study (Amey 2015) – the Commissioning Director suggested a technical report be produced and circulated to members by email. Having studied the information, the committee to consider submitting a formal response to the Gloucestershire LTP Review Consultation at its 9 December 2015 meeting.

- e) The legal team at Gloucestershire County Council to advise on the relationship between the scrutiny and joint committees/the joint committee decision making process and the scrutiny call in process at a future meeting. It was suggested the item be included as part of a single agenda item discussion on 'Devolution and changes to the role of the Scrutiny Committee' at the February 2016 meeting.

## 6. FORWARD PLAN

In reviewing the committee work plan, the following actions were agreed: -

- a) A single agenda item meeting to be arranged in either October or November 2015 on Employment Skills. The LEP to invite the following organisations to make presentations and respond to questions: -
  - South Gloucestershire College (Berkley Green Project)
  - Gloscol (STEM Project)
  - University of Gloucestershire (Cyber Skills Centre Project)

The meeting to take the form of an exploratory session to establish how growth deal projects can address gaps in educational skills.

- b) Apprenticeship Task Group – the committee to include a standing item on the agenda of alternate meetings *'to scrutinise the work of the LEP and the council's work around skills, training and apprenticeships – with special emphasis on ensuring that the LEP's "apprenticeship clearing house project" is implemented in line with the findings of the ATG report.*
- c) In line with the above recommendation, the LEP to give an update on the Apprenticeship Clearing House Project at the committee meeting on 9 December 2015.
- d) It was suggested that a possible item for the February 2016 single agenda item meeting might be 'Devolution/Changes to the Role of the Committee'. This may be amended if a devolution update is included on the agenda at the December and March Joint Committee meetings.
- e) Suggested items for future agenda specific meetings include: -
  - Promoting Gloucestershire
  - Supporting Businesses
  - Next generation communication technology
  -

## 7. FUTURE MEETINGS

16 November 2015 (single agenda item meeting)

9 December 2015 (Joint meeting)



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

3 February 2016 (single agenda item meeting)

16 March 2016 (Joint meeting)

23 June 2016 (Joint meeting)

7 September 2016 (Joint meeting)

19 October 2016 (single agenda item meeting)

30 November 2016 (Joint meeting)

**CHAIRPERSON**

Meeting concluded at 3.45 pm

**(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - DECEMBER 2015 UPDATE**

34

<b>Item for Decision</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>
Draft Housing Strategy 2016-2020	No	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	January 2016	Planning and Housing	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Member Senior Officers	Draft Housing Plan
Visitor Information Centre Provision Grants 2016/17	No	No	Cabinet	January 2016	Enterprise and Partnerships	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Approval of Energy Re-Procurement Process/Outcomes (exempt item)	Yes	Yes	Cabinet	January 2016	Enterprise and Partnerships	Phil Martin	Cabinet Member Senior Officers	None
General Fund Revenue Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015/16 including Capital Programme, Treasury Management	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2016	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers Treasury Management Advisers Local Businesses	Likely LG Finance Settlement Council Aim and Priorities Corporate Strategy and Plan Medium Term Finance Strategy Update Consultation Responses

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Strategy and Prudential Indicators							Residents Town/Parish Councils	
Corporate Strategy and Corporate Plan 2016-2019	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2016	Deputy Leader of the Council	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Existing Plan/Strategy Service and Financial Performance Data
Performance Report (Quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2016	All	-	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Joint Waste Committee - Annual Business Plan and Budget	No	No	Cabinet	March 2016	Health, Environment and Communities	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Current Budget and Plan
To be advised				April 2016				

35

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
To be advised				May 2016				
Performance Report (Quarter 4)	No	No	Cabinet	June 2016	All	-	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	
To be advised				July 2016				
<b>There is no scheduled August Meeting</b>								
Performance Report (Quarter 1)	No	No	Cabinet	September 2016	All	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Existing Plan/Strategy Service and Financial Performance Data
To be advised				October 2016				

<b>Item for Decision</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>
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2019/20 - Draft for Consultation	No	No	Cabinet	November 2016	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	LG Finance Settlement Budget 2017/18 Council Aim and Priorities Corporate Strategy and Plan
Performance Report (Quarter 2)	No	No	Cabinet	November 2016	All	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Existing Plan/Strategy Service and Financial Performance Data
<b>There is no scheduled December Meeting</b>								

(END)