



**COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

QUARTERLY DIGEST

(1ST MARCH 2016)

INDEX

Item	Subject	Page No.
(1)	Meeting Minutes/Reports	
(i)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 5 th February 2016	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 12 th January 2016	9
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Report to the GCC Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (covering meetings of 16 th November 2015 and 9 th December 2015)	15
(2)	Executive Forward Plan - February 2016 Update	17

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 Friday 5 February 2016 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

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

Substitutes: Cllr Jane Horne (In place of Bruce Hogan)

Officers in attendance: Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Suzette Davenport, Stewart Edgar, Martin Surl and Paul Trott, Ian Maxted, Dave Bennett

Apologies: Cllr Andrew Chard and Cllr Bill Whelan

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

These were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

One member asked for clarification in relation to point 28.3 and asked whether there had been any progress in relation to the recommendations from the HMIC and HM Inspector of Prisons inspection of the Constabulary's new custody centre relating to an immediate review of the provision of local authority accommodation. In response it was explained that this was a challenging area and that work was underway to ensure this was brought to the attention of all partners.

2. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

2.1 Paul Trott, introduced the report drawing attention to the details around Freedom of Information requests and Complaints. It was clarified that a response had been made in relation to the cost of interpreters. It was explained that the police had a duty to ensure that the individual understood the caution and that detailed legal facts could be communicated to them.

2.2 One member requested that the Panel be provided with comparative figures around the number of complaints received by other Commissioner's Offices.

ACTION Paul Trott

2.3 In response to a question, details were provided around the complaint that had been upheld by the IPCC. The Commissioner's Office had been in contact with the individual who had raised the complaint.

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

2.4 There was some discussion around the valuation of the Land at Eastern Avenue, it was confirmed that an independent valuation had been undertaken.

2.5 One member asked for a further breakdown of the areas where Freedom of Information requests had been made.

ACTION Paul Trott

2.6 In response to questions, the Commissioner explained that phase one had been completed with regards to Wilton (Holland) House and that the site was open but not finished with phase 2 having been delayed which would allow for disabled access to the building and resurfacing of the car park.

2.7 The Panel requested a verbal update at the next meeting on how the Commissioner's Office would be working to meet any statutory requirements in the lead up to the PCC election.

ACTION Paul Trott

3. SAFER CYBER

3.1 Iain Maxted provided members with an update on the priority explaining that since the priority had been introduced, expertise had been brought in with regards to dedicated staff but also from expanding the network of cyber volunteers.

3.2 A Constabulary wide training programme was being rolled out which would embed cyber related knowledge throughout.

3.3 Gloucestershire was one of the leading constabularies in the country with regards to cyber crime. The Constabulary was steering the national agenda and sharing learning with other forces.

3.4 In response to questions it was explained that there was a review that would be undertaken to consider the first point of contact for a member of the public reporting a cyber crime.

3.5 Members discussed the important role played by Special Constables who had a wide range of transferable skills

3.6 One member expressed his concerns around the use of social media and the technical skills used by criminals who could deceive members of the public through cyber crime. He wanted reassurance that the work being carried out with regards to this priority was targeted in the right areas and able to have an impact both locally and nationally. In response it was explained that this was exactly where the priority was targeted and that Gloucestershire was leading the way in being able to respond to cyber crime.

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

4. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN HIGHLIGHT REPORT

4.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report explaining that it provided members with a large amount of information to demonstrate the work that was being undertaken to deliver the police and crime plan. He directed members' attention to the value of the Special Constables through the range of work they got involved in, as well as the detail provided on the 'Aston Project Task Force'.

4.2 One member spoke positively about the 'Aston Project Taskforce' and asked whether this type of work could be replicated in other areas and whether there was the resource to do so. In response it was explained that there were opportunities for collaborative working.

4.3 There was some discussion around the Special Constables being based in Hucclecote, with one member querying why this site had been chosen. In response it was explained that the site has not been used effectively in the recent past and that a trial had taken place to see if the Special Constables could help to make the site viable and meet the expectations of the public.

4.4 In response to questions on the new operating model, it was explained that the Commissioner had held a webcast on 26 January with the Chief Constable which could be viewed on the Stroud District Council website. Local policing was still a priority but officers would be moved around based on the operational judgement of the Chief Constable.

4.5 It was explained that previous issues with 101 calls had been due to software issues which had now been resolved.

4.6 One member asked for clarification on the 55 young people detailed on page 33 of the agenda papers who did not engage with the Youth Support Team. Further details would be provided.

ACTION **Richard Bradley**

4.7 In response to a question on the future plans for the late night levy, it was explained that this was a decision for the Borough Council.

4.8 There was some discussion around the use of the Neighbourhood Engagement Vehicle.

5. PROPOSED GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE PRECEPT 2015/16

5.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced the report which proposed that:

Funding for the proposed £106,527,066 revenue budget will require a police related Band D Council Tax element of £210.31. This represented an increase of 1.24% in the police related Band D Council Tax or £2.58 for the year.

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

5.2 The Commissioner explained that it had been a difficult budget to formulate having been told for the past 12 months to prepare for further sizeable cuts in the grant that would be received from the Home Office. This could have been anything between 25% to 40%, with speculation that police officer level in Gloucestershire could have dipped below 1,000 for the first time. The Autumn Statement had been a surprise when it had outlined that there would be 'no cuts in the police'. It was clarified that this related to the Home Office settlement and that this figure would then be distributed to the country's police forces through a complicated formula.

5.3 The overall reduction in the Core Grant and Ex DCLG is 0.6% compared to a 5.1% reduction in 2015/16. The Commissioner outlined how a proposed increase of 1.2% reflected the need for continued stability against a backdrop of uncertainty. It was explained that there had been investment in ICT which had increased the mobile policing capacity of the force and helped to free up officers to be on the frontline. The Commissioner also outlined around £10m in savings that had been achieved in police buildings and infrastructure.

5.4 Members were informed that HMIC had concluded that Gloucestershire was 'outstanding' for planning, 'good' at keeping the public safe and had a workforce model that was 'sustainable and affordable'.

5.5 It was clarified that a 1.2% increase in the police precept would raise £560,000 which the Commissioner explained would ensure that the plan could be financed and enable the Chief Constable to meet her operational responsibilities. The plan was for an additional 40 officers and an additional 200 Special Constables to be recruited over the next four years. The freeze in recruitment would be over as a result of the budget put before the panel. He stated that this was a thoughtful budget based on the continuation of a strategy for long term planning and that he believed he could not justify putting up council tax by 2%.

5.6 The Commissioner explained that he would 'release' £8m from Police reserves which had been earmarked to cushion the effects of the proposed cuts and would now be put to other uses including upgrading police intelligence systems, estate development and invest to save projects.

5.7 The Chief Constable outlined her recommendations as detailed with the papers. She outlined the increased pressures and demands on the Constabulary and the reduction in police officers over the previous years. The Chief Constable had presented a case for a 2% increase to the Commissioner and explained that additional funding would help provide sustainability over the longer term. Members discussed whether an increase in the precept above what the Commissioner was proposing would lead to more police officers. It was explained that it would not make a difference to staff levels in the coming year.

5.8 Members discussed the assumptions from Central Government around police precepts across the country being put up by 1.99% and that this had been factored into their allocation of funding. In response it was explained that the

allocations were based on the national average increase and that given the increase in the tax base Gloucestershire Constabulary was in a favourable position.

5.9 Some members spoke strongly in support of the suggestions that the precept should be increased to the maximum available amount of 1.99%. They felt that this would better meet the need outlined by the Chief Constable. Some members suggested that given the previous freeze in council tax and precept that the public were now in a position to pay the additional amount in order to receive the service they wanted. In response to a query it was clarified that the difference in funding between the proposed precept and the 1.99% equated to around £350,000.

5.10 One member queried the term within the paper that £8m had been 'released' from reserves. He suggested that the funds had been moved from one earmarked reserve to other parts of the reserves so that the total amount for reserves remained at £22m. In response it was explained that this was correct, but that these reserves would be spent on the specific areas detailed in the report and that once they were that would bring the overall level of reserves down to £14m.

5.11 In response to questions it was clarified that the settlement from the Home Office was a four year settlement.

5.12 Some members commented that they were supportive of the proposed precept. They noted that any increase on the precept would not mean additional officers and that the 1.2% proposed would finance the plan and enable recruitment to begin again.

5.13 One member asked why the Commissioner continued to keep the Police Station in Coleford open when there were more cost effective alternatives. The Commissioner explained that he had spoken to individuals in the Forest of Dean who wanted the station to remain open and that it had been a manifesto commitment.

5.14 The Commissioner explained that it was a question of judgement and opinion as to what the precept should be and that he had made the decision based on what he felt was best for the Constabulary and the people of Gloucestershire. He explained that in previous years the precept had been frozen and in previous years it had been raised.

5.15 Following the discussion on the proposed 2016/17 budget and precept, the Panel were asked decide whether they:

- Supported the precept without qualification or comment;
- Supported the precept and make recommendations, or
- Veto the proposed precept

5.16 It was moved, and seconded, that the proposed precept be vetoed and that the Panel ask the Commissioner to revise the precept to an increase of 1.9%. To veto the precept a two third majority of the Panel (11) was required. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

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

5.17 It was subsequently moved that the proposed precept be supported with the recommendation that there be additional clarity on the savings requirement going forward, including the ongoing use of reserves. On being put to the vote it was therefore:

RESOLVED that:

- a) The Police and Crime Panel supported the police precept for 2016/17 as proposed by the Police and Crime Commissioner
- b) The Panel recommended that the Commissioner provide additional clarity on the four year Medium Term Financial Strategy period, including how the projected savings requirements for the three years 2017/18 to 2019/20, will be met and to provide additional clarity on the ongoing use of reserves.

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 12 January 2016 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Stephen Lydon
Cllr Flo Clucas	Cllr Paul McMahon
Cllr Doina Cornell	Cllr Helen Molyneux
Cllr Iain Dobie (Chairman)	Cllr Jim Parsons
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Brian Robinson
Cllr Jan Lugg	Cllr Roger Wilson (Vice-Chairman)

Substitutes: Cllr Bernard Fisher (In place of Cllr Joe Harris)

Apologies: Cllr Klara Sudbury

Others in attendance:

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer

Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement

Maria Metherall – Senior Commissioning Manager for Urgent Care

2gether NHS Foundation Trust

Ruth FitzJohn - Chair

Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

Gloucestershire County Council

Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health

Mark Branton - Assistant Director Adult Social Care Commissioning

Care UK

Sue Brooks

James Ward

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Claire Feehily – Chair

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS NHS Trust)

Susan Field - Director of Nursing

Rob Graves – Non Executive Director and Deputy Chair

1. 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.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the meeting on 3 November 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

With regard to minute number 48.2 Cllr Wilson requested further information as to whether the Primary Care Centres located at Cheltenham General Hospital and Gloucestershire Royal Hospital had had to close/not open.

ACTION: GCCG

3. NHS111

- 3.1 Two representatives of CareUK (provider of the NHS111 service in Gloucestershire) and the Senior Commissioning Manager for Urgent Care at Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) attended the committee to engage with members on this matter. They gave a detailed presentation (for information the slides were available on the council's website and included within the minute book) which demonstrated the actions that have been taken to address performance issues. Committee members had also received information from Healthwatch Gloucestershire (HWG) on feedback it had received relating to the NHS111 service.
- 3.2 The data was showing that there has been some improvement and that CareUK was performing above the England average against some targets. It was interesting to note that the recent flooding has impacted on performance as this had caused communication outages for some providers and therefore calls had been automatically transferred to other NHS111 providers.
- 3.3 In response to questions CareUK explained the process by which calls to NHS111 were handled. It was also explained that CareUK has invested a lot of time into ensuring the appropriateness of referrals to the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) and that this work continued on a daily basis. On a monthly basis CareUK also undertook an audit of calls received.
- 3.4 It became clear through the discussion that CareUK was struggling with the same workforce issues as other (NHS) providers, in that there was a national shortage of the clinicians needed to support the service. Although CareUK had been able to recruit to some clinical posts it was still managing a number of vacancies. A recruitment plan was in place but it was important to place this within the context of a national shortage of clinicians.
- 3.5 Members were clear that the NHS111 service has an important role as an efficient and effective gateway to health services but that this could not be achieved without access to sufficient clinical resources (workforce) or the confidence of the general public. The committee was scheduled to consider workforce challenges across the NHS in Gloucestershire at its meeting on 17 May 2016. Some members were of the view that the general public held a negative view of the NHS111 service. It was important to consider how this perception could be improved. The GCCG acknowledged this point and informed the committee that the ongoing Choose Well campaign was focused on informing people of the options available to them with regard to health care, and encouraged the use of the NHS111 service.
- 3.6 There was a concern that as CareUK was not a public sector organisation that making a profit was a particular factor. In response CareUK assured the committee that profit was not a factor; the salary range for their workforce was similar to SWAST – it was simply that there were not enough clinicians.
- 3.7 In response to questions the committee was informed that CareUK undertook staff surveys which indicated that the majority of staff enjoyed their job, finding it rewarding and satisfying. Also, action plans were developed in response to the surveys.

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

- 3.8 It was noted that should an outcome of the call to NHS111 be a referral to an A & E department an email was sent to the hospital. However members were aware that this email was not always directed to the correct email address within the hospital. CareUK assured members that they were addressing this issue with the Acute Hospitals.
- 3.9 The committee was aware that the target for the number of calls transferred to SWAST was 10% but requested the actual number(s). The committee also asked for information on the KPIs in this contract including information on penalties.
ACTION: CareUK/GCCG
- 3.10 Whilst recognising that progress has been made in some areas concerns remain and the committee would continue to closely monitor performance through its regular performance monitoring.

4. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (GCCG) PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 4.1 The Accountable Officer, GCCG, presented the report, which demonstrated that there was a lot of good performance against targets. However, there remained concerns with performance against some targets including cancer wait times, for those people at risk of a stroke who experience a TIA (Transient Ischaemic Attack), and the 4 hour A & E target at both Acute Hospitals.
- 4.2 Recruitment of clinical staff was a significant factor with regard to cancer targets. The NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) guidelines relating to urology (suspect cancer) were also having a significant impact. The committee was informed that the GCCG was co-ordinating a working group which was working with local providers to understand the impact of the NICE referral guidance. Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) and GCCG were also actively engaged in working with the IMAS (NHS Interim Management and Support) Intensive Support Team to aid improvements in performance.
- 4.3 The committee was informed that the GCCG would be a 'Beacon CCG' having become one of the first CCGs to commit to the 'Sign Up to Safety' campaign (more information was available at this link www.england.nhs.uk/signuptosafety). The GCCG indicated that it would be happy to inform the committee on this issue in more depth at a future meeting if required.
- 4.4 Given the committee's previous concerns and discussion (November 2014) regarding the correspondence delays relating to cardiology members were concerned to note that this was still being reported. The committee was assured that this matter was under control and all actions identified, following the committee's meeting in November 2014, have been taken forward. The GCCG continued to monitor this activity.
- 4.5 Members concerns relating to the Non Emergency Patient Transport Service (NEPTS) were acknowledged. The GCCG informed the committee that there was still a lot of work to do to raise the performance level. The committee was reminded that it would be taking an in-depth look at NEPTS at its July 2017 meeting. It was also suggested that the committee might wish to consider the wider issues involved in transport.
- 4.6 In response to a question the GCCG explained that it did not have commissioning responsibility for renal dialysis, this was the responsibility of NHS England (NHSE). The commissioning responsibility for some specialised services was due to be transferred from NHSE to CCGs from 1 April 2016 but at present it was not clear as to whether renal

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

services were included. (Post meeting note – renal services will not be transferred to CCG Commissioning from April 2016).

- 4.7 The committee remained concerned with regard to the stroke pathway. The GCCG informed the committee that they were actively looking at the design of this pathway; but again recruitment was a factor.
- 4.8 Members wanted to understand whether the learning from last year's major internal incident had been implemented as requested by the committee. It was good to hear that although there had been significant pressure on the system at the start of the previous week, with some parts of the system being at red and black levels, the escalation process, and the improved joint working, had brought the system back into equilibrium by Friday. The committee also received a presentation which demonstrated the improvements made to the escalation process. These slides were available on the council website.
- 4.9 Concern was expressed with regard to the impact of diverts from Gloucestershire Royal Hospital (GRH) to Cheltenham General Hospital (CGH), in particular was there sufficient staffing at CGH to manage these additional patients, and the impact on the 4 hour A & E target. It was felt that the escalation process presentation, although informative, had not clarified this aspect. It was agreed that a briefing on diverts would be sent to committee members.
ACTION: GCCG
- 4.10 It was agreed that it would be helpful to understand the impact of the junior doctors strike (today), including had the contingency plans been sufficiently robust, and were there any particular learning points.
ACTION: GHNHSFT
- 5. QTR2 ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT**
- 5.1 This report demonstrated that there was a mixed picture of performance. Members noted that in line with the intention to support more people to live independently that the number of people (over 65) being admitted to residential care was reducing. The good work with regard to supporting people with learning disabilities into employment continued, and this approach was now being extended to include people with a mental health problem. Performance against target for the reassessment of care needs continued to be a concern, and officers were looking at whether the model in use was appropriate.
- 5.2 There was a concern with regard to the reported level of satisfaction with social services. However it was explained that Carers Gloucestershire were now contracted to deliver a number of services and it was thought that this 'disconnect' meant that people did not realise that their service was funded by the council, hence the reported level. This was being looked at.
- 5.3 It was questioned as to whether the identified strategic risks should be shared risks with the GCCG. The committee was informed that this was a complex picture and was being managed through the Better Care Forum and could be picked up by the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 5.4 Members remained concerned with performance against drug and alcohol targets. However the committee was aware that this service was in the process of being re-commissioned. Committee members had also taken a detailed look at this matter in its recent workshop; and had indicated that they were satisfied that the Director of Public Health was managing this position appropriately.

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

6. HEALTHWATCH GLOUCESTERSHIRE PATIENT AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK QTR2

The committee noted this report.

7. HEALTHWATCH GLOUCESTERSHIRE DISCHARGE PROCESS TASK GROUP REPORT

- 7.1 The Chair of Healthwatch Gloucestershire (HWG) presented this report to the committee. She took this opportunity to thank everyone involved in this task group. This report looked at the impact of the discharge on the patient and their family/carer.
- 7.2 The committee agreed that this was an informative and comprehensive piece of work. Members were pleased to note the positive responses by the commissioners and providers to the recommendations in the report. It was clear from these responses that a lot of activity to improve the discharge experience had already been identified and actioned.
- 7.3 The committee was informed that HWG would review action against the recommendations in 3 months. The committee would be interested to note the outcome of the review.
- 7.4 The Chairman informed the committee that it was important to note that in terms of delayed transfers of care (DTC) Gloucestershire's performance was better than the England average and the best in the South West region.

8. HEALTHWATCH GLOUCESTERSHIRE PATIENT TRANSPORT TASK GROUP REPORT

- 8.1 The Chair of HWG was mindful that the committee would be taking a detailed look at this issue later in the year and so gave a short presentation of the task group report.
- 8.2 The committee thanked HWG for its work on this matter, and agreed that the findings and recommendations identified in this report would be used to inform the debate in July 2016.

9. DIRECTOR PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The committee thanked the Director of Public Health for her report in particular the information relating to the Public Health budget position.

10. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SERVICES REPORT

- 10.1 The committee requested more information on the location of the community hubs.
ACTION: Mark Branton
- 10.2 Members remain concerned with progress against reablement targets and noted the work being undertaken to address this matter. It was questioned whether any research had been undertaken looking at models of reablement in other countries in the European Union (EU), eg. France. Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS) indicated that they would be interested to understand and potentially learn from the experience of other countries. Cllr Clucas informed the committee that she would be happy to undertake some initial research on this matter.

11. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP (GCCG) CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

- 11.1 The committee welcomed the news that the joint bid to secure funding to promote good mental health in schools had been successful. This initiative was part of the Future in Mind

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

programme of work. The committee was also informed that the School Nurse service, commissioned by Public Health, did include mental health.

- 11.2 In response to a question relating to cross border issues it was explained that there was a lot of activity underway to address this matter. It was anticipated that this would be resolved by the end of March 2016.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.37 pm

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Report to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

25 January 2016

This report relates to items considered at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee meetings held on Monday 16 November 2015 and Wednesday 9 December 2015. Members may recall that, at an earlier meeting, the committee agreed to combine several specific issues into combined topics, to form the following work plan items: -

- a) Employment skills/devolution
- b) Promoting Gloucestershire/supporting businesses
- c) Next generation communication technology (including Broadband and Mobile Phone issues)

In addition to four scheduled meetings per year, (to coincide with Joint Committee meetings), the committee decided to schedule an additional two scrutiny meetings per year for the committee to consider specific topics and areas of interest. The first 'specific topic' meeting was held on Monday 16 November 2015, with employment skills as the main item. The aim of the meeting was to assist members better understand some of the detail relating to the implementation and likely impacts of the Berkeley Green, STEM and Cyber Skills investments, and to consider how growth deal projects might help in addressing gaps in educational skills. Presentations were received from South Gloucestershire College (Berkeley Green Project), Gloscol (STEM Project) and the University of Gloucestershire (Cyber Skills Centre Project).

At the committee meeting on 9 December 2015, members considered a series of reports presented to the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee earlier that day, including updates on the work of the Gfirst LEP, Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Plan and Growth Fund Pipeline Project.

The committee also received an update from Cllr Barry Kirby, Chairman of the Community Pubs Scrutiny Task Group Review. In presenting the task group's interim report, Cllr Kirby informed members that, at the full council meeting on 26 November 2014, members had supported a motion for the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee to explore ways in which the council might support local pubs and restaurants, including a proposal for the creation of pub hubs in various communities throughout Gloucestershire.

Further to discussions with the not for profit organisation, 'Pub is the Hub', and a visit by Cllr Barry Kirby to the Pub is the Hub launch in Devon on 3 November 2015, the organisation met with the task group on Friday 20 November 2015, to give an overview on how the organisation might assist with the review, including offering to undertake strategic mapping of Gloucestershire to identify priority areas.

The 'Pub is the Hub' organisation has undertaken work with several other local authorities over the past 15 years, focussing on supporting and encouraging local pubs to diversify and better serve local communities. The organisation also provides workshops and assistance to local communities to apply for funding, including seeking grants from the Community Services Fund, (providing the named projects are seen to be providing needed services). In terms of funding, Pub is the Hub offered to contribute £3.5k towards completion of a strategic mapping analysis of Gloucestershire. (This was later increased to £5750).

After an in-depth discussion, the committee agreed to formalise the offer made by Pub is the Hub to bear the cost of analysis work of 'all rural services and pubs in Gloucestershire' to the value of up to £5750. Alerting members to the fact that the work would be undertaken at the request of, and on behalf of, Gloucestershire County Council, it was suggested lead officers, (overseen by Strategic Needs Analysis Manager, Neil Dixon), should meet with Pub is the Hub to discuss the proposed arrangements, and to consider what work the council might be able to assist with. It is anticipated a meeting will take place in early February 2016.

Currently maintaining a watching brief on the status of mobile phone coverage in Gloucestershire, it was suggested that at one of its 'additional' committee meetings, (originally scheduled for 3 February 2016), the committee would invite leading Mobile Network Operators to give an update on current issues. During the discussion, it was agreed that the committee would send a letter to the Minister of State for Culture and Digital Economy, expressing its concerns about the Government's roll out and delivery of the Mobile Infrastructure Project (MIP). Furthermore, it was suggested Gloucestershire County Councillors be invited to provide evidence about mobile phone coverage within their divisions, and to make enquiries with town and parish council's about relevant issues within their wards that might assist in developing an evidence base for the committee to refer to at the meeting. The meeting originally scheduled for 3 February 2016 to be rescheduled in April 2016.

The committee received an update on the progress of the recommendations from the Apprenticeship Task Group. Further updates to be provided.

In considering items to add to the committee work plan, a member requested that the committee give a steer on how it wanted to consider promoting Gloucestershire as a more desirable destination to live, work and play. It was suggested the item be considered at the committee meeting on 16 March 2016.

Cllr Paul Hodgkinson
Chairman of Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee
25 January 2016

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - FEBRUARY 2016 UPDATE

Item for Decision and (if applicable) reason(s) the matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Local Plan Reg 19 consultation	Yes	No	Cabinet	March 2016	Deputy Leader of the Council and Forward Planning	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Local Plan Programme Senior Officers Internal Consultation	
Digitisation of Planning History files	No	No	Cabinet	April 2016	Planning and Housing	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Wotswold Local Plan: Pre-submission Draft	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	May 2016	Deputy Leader of the Council and Forward Planning	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Local Plan Programme Senior Officers Internal Consultation	Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation : Development Strategy and Site Allocations January 2015 Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation : Policies November 2015

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - FEBRUARY 2016 UPDATE

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
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
Draft Housing Strategy 2016-2020	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2016	Planning and Housing	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Member Senior Officers	Draft Housing Plan
To be advised				October 2016				
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

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - FEBRUARY 2016 UPDATE

Form for Decision (if applicable) Reason(s) the matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
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
There is no scheduled December Meeting								
to be advised				January 2017				

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - FEBRUARY 2016 UPDATE

Form for Decision (if applicable) Reason(s) the matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
General Fund revenue budget/Medium term Financial Strategy 2017/18 including Capital Programme, Treasury management strategy and additional indicators	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2017	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers Treasury Management Advisers Local Businesses Residents Town/Parish Councils	Likely Local Government Finance Settlement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process
Performance Report (quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2017	All	-	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Waste Committee - Annual Business Plan and Budget	No	No	Cabinet	March 2017	Health, Environment and Communities	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Current Budget and Plan

(END)