



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

QUARTERLY DIGEST
(6TH DECEMBER 2016)

INDEX

Item	Subject	Page No.
(1)	Meeting Minutes and Oral Updates as appropriate	
(i)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 7 th September 2016	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 13 th September 2016	10
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Committee Chairman's Report re Meeting held on 15 th November 2016	16
(iv)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 9 th September 2016	18
(v)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 20 th September 2016	26
(vi)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 7 th November 2016	33

Notes:

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

(END)

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 7 September 2016.

Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr Joe Harris
(Chairman)
Cllr Tony Hicks
Cllr Tim Harman
Cllr Shaun Parsons

Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Phil Awford
Cllr Dawn Melvin
Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Martin Whiteside
Cllr Roger James

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Barry Kirby (Gloucestershire County Council) and Bruce Hogan (Forest of Dean District Council). Cllr Roger James substituted for Cllr Hogan at the meeting.

2. MINUTES

Further to the request for nominations at the previous meeting, Cllr Dawn Melvyn, (Gloucester City Council), was appointed Vice Chairman.

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2016 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record of that meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest at the meeting.

4. CURRENT ISSUES

a) Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee/GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership

Members considered a series of reports presented at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting earlier that day, including updates on the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan 2015-31; Gfirst LEP Growth Deal Activity; Skills Policy for Gloucestershire; Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Plan and Business Rates Pool.

Please refer to the following link to view the agenda and supporting documents for the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting.

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=725&MIId=8209&Ver=4>

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

David Owen, Chief Executive of the Gfirst Local Enterprise Partnership updated members on the Growth Deal 3 Submission, informing members that a total of 11 projects had been included in the bid, relating to; i) cyber security; skills development; strategic housing and employment land; housing growth; regeneration; and increased productivity.

The total amount of funding requested from the Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF) was just under £79 million. Final confirmation of the outcome of the bid was expected to be reported as part of the Chancellor's Autumn Statement in November 2016.

Responding to questions, members were advised that the Government had given assurances that future bids would not be threatened by the outcome of the EU Referendum.

b) Gloucestershire County Council

GCC Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure, Nigel Riglar, gave an update on the issues that might require a decision by the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee.

i. Cinderford Spine Road Project

The Commissioning Director reported one update, relating to the Cinderford Spine Road Project in the Forest of Dean, and informed members that construction works had commenced. Completion of the first phase of the Spine Road was anticipated in March/April 2017.

The Commissioning Director confirmed that work on the new college at the site was due to commence in Spring 2017. This would, however, be subject to discharge of all of the pre-commencement planning conditions, anticipated towards the end of 2016. The opening of the college is anticipated in September 2018.

Gloucestershire County Council was awaiting announcement of the Chancellor's Autumn Statement in November 2016, including confirmation on the outcome of the bid for funding for the college. Contingency plans would be considered should the bid be unsuccessful.

ii. Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan

Responding to questions on the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan, the Commissioning Director advised members that the Local Transport Plan 2015-2031, (adopted by the County Council in June 2016), had been issued to all district authorities, along with information on how the plan should be interpreted at the decision making stage by members and officers.

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

iii. Business Rate Pool

A member requested a presentation on the Business Rate Pool at a future meeting, while another member suggested the committee concentrate some of it's work on skills training. Members were advised that a discussion between the County Council and the LEP Board regarding skills training would be arranged in the New Year.

iv. Joint Core Strategy (JCS)

An Examination of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) had commenced in May 2015 and was ongoing. Officers had attended a specific examination in March 2016, relating to transport, highways and infrastructure issues, followed by publication of an 'interim findings inspector's report' in May 2016. Officers subsequently attended further examination sessions in July 2016, again in relation to transport, highways and infrastructure. County Council officers continued to assist with the transport implications of the JCS proposals. A further round of public consultation was expected in late 2016 and early 2017.

5. TASK GROUP UPDATE

Community Pubs Scrutiny Task Group

The committee received an update on the Community Pubs Scrutiny Task Group Review, and the following motion to full council on 26 November 2014.

Cllr Barry Kirby moved and Cllr Paul McMahon seconded that:

The Council note that local pubs and restaurants are small businesses that are essential to the economic well being of many high streets and village centres in Gloucestershire. This Council recognises that nationally the pub industry is in crisis and this is bad news for the local economy. We note that nationally CAMRA estimates that 26 pubs close each week. We further note that between 2010 and 2012 over 200 pubs were converted into convenience stores owned by large supermarket chains.

While this Council notes that Gloucester's pubs have bucked the national trend, many of the county's pubs have closed in recent years. This Council supports campaigns by CAMRA to reverse the decline in the pub trade by:

- a) *Supporting community groups who wish to register their local pubs as assets of community value.*
- b) *Requesting that the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Overview and Scrutiny Committee explore ways in which this Council can support local pubs and restaurants and consider how this Council can support the creation of pub hubs in our local communities to prevent pubs from closing in*

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

Gloucestershire. The committee will report its findings to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills, Gloucestershire's LEP and all relevant business organisations in Gloucestershire.

- c) *Requesting that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to ask that the Government help protect community pubs in England. Before community pubs are allowed to be converted to betting shops, supermarkets and pay-day loan stores or other uses, or are allowed to be demolished, the Government should ensure that full planning permission is granted and community consultation is undertaken.*

The committee considered a strategic mapping analysis of rural areas in Gloucestershire, (as produced by the 'Pub is the Hub' non-profit organisation), plus a series of recommendations from the Community Pub Task Group meeting on 5 September 2016, where John Longden, (Chief Executive of Pub is the Hub), Roger Belle, (Pub is The Hub Advisor for the West Country), and Ashley Cairns, (Director, CGA Strategy), gave a detailed presentation on the outcome of the study.

Having considered the task group's report, it was agreed to note the findings of the Pub is the Hub 'Mapping Analysis' of Gloucestershire and for lead members to;

- a) Identify possible locations to suggest as priority areas for the 'Pub is the Hub' to work with local councils and other stakeholders in targeting future rural regeneration programmes and support;
- b) Establish a realistic implementation plan and timeline from which to identify priority areas and engage with district and parish councils and other key stakeholders;
- c) Host a 'Pub is the Hub' countywide workshop for District and Parish Councils and other stakeholders to gain an understanding of what options might be available to assist rural communities in preserving and delivering local services;
- d) Consider nominating elected (district) member and officer (district) representatives to 'champion' and take the proposed schemes forward;
- e) Monitor progress with regular updates and periodical reports. The reports to be presented to the committee by the relevant district representatives.

An update report to form part of the scrutiny report to Full Council at it's meeting on 7 December 2016.

The committee confirmed that the work of the task group was now complete. Lead members to continue to work with the 'Pub is the Hub' organisation to provide support via District and Parish councils in helping local community groups consider ways of developing local pubs as assets of community value.

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

A workshop event for District and Parish Councils to be held at Shire Hall in the March 2017.

It was suggested the Rural Community Council be invited to attend the event.

6. PROMOTING GLOUCESTERSHIRE

During the course of its work over the past two years, the committee has, on several occasions, identified the need to elevate the profile of Gloucestershire as an attractive and desirable county to live and work.

To assist members broaden their understanding of the impact tourism has had on promoting Gloucestershire, the committee received presentations from Maureen McAllister, (Executive Director of Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Destination Management Organisation), and Robin Tjolle, (Chief Executive of Cotswold Tourism Partnership Destination Management Organisation), outlining the activities of the two organisations.

During the presentation, members considered the economic benefits of marketing Gloucestershire as a desirable UK tourist destination and the limited amount of funding afforded to Destination Management Organisations. Both presenters referred to the creativity that is required for the organisations to maximise and make best use of available resources.

Presentation slides are published on the GCC, (Gloucestershire County Council), website and can be viewed at the following link:

GCC, (Gloucestershire County Council), member, Cllr Colin Hay suggested a scrutiny task group be established to consider the impact of tourism in terms of creating opportunities for residents, and new and existing businesses across the county, and to investigate how tourism might benefit from a co-ordinated Gloucestershire approach.

The majority of members supported the proposal, and suggested that the scrutiny review encompass a wide range of factors, (including tourism), which might attract people and businesses to live and work in Gloucestershire.

Cllr Hay, as proposer of the review, has since produced a one page strategy for the County Council Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to consider at its meeting on 30 September 2016. (Annex A).

A second one page strategy, (Annex B), was also produced, aimed at extending the review to incorporate a broad range of other factors, (other than tourism). The proposed topics included; housing; planning; transport links; skills; employment and higher education.

The following members expressed an interest in undertaking the review: -

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

Cllr Colin Hay (GCC)
Cllr Dawn Melvin (Gloucester City Council)
Cllr Tony Hicks (GCC)
Cllr Stephen Hirst (Cotswold District Council)
Cllr Richard Leppington (Forest of Dean District Council)

At the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting on 30 September 2016, members considered the two requests for a scrutiny review, both with the intention of promoting Gloucestershire. Whilst supporting the request outlined in Appendix B, (to extend the review to include housing; planning; transport links; employment and higher education), the committee expressed concern about whether the proposal would duplicate work already underway by the Gfirst Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

The outcome of the discussion was that 'no firm agreement would be made until the members of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee had had an opportunity to discuss the proposal in more depth with the Chief Executive of the Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership, David Owen, and whether a review would duplicate or add value to the economic development of Gloucestershire.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee suggested that a meeting be held with David Owen, (Chief Executive of the Gloucestershire LEP), at the next Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee meeting, on 30 November 2016. If considered a viable option, the one page strategy outlined at Appendix B to be resubmitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for final approval with the review to commence in the next council. (Post May 2017).

7. WORK PLAN

At the committee meeting on 30 November 2016, members to consider:

- a) The outcome of the committees' request to the GCC Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for a scrutiny task group review on 'Promoting Gloucestershire'.
- b) The proposal to host a Business Rates Pool Seminar for County and District Councillors at the committee meeting on 23 February 2017.

8. FUTURE MEETINGS

23 February 2017
15 March 2017
21 June 2017
6 September 2017
19 October 2017
29 November 2017

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

The meeting ended at 4.40pm

CHAIRPERSON

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 13 September 2016 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul McMahon
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Brian Oosthuysen
Cllr Iain Dobie (Chairman)	Cllr Jim Parsons
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Brian Robinson
Cllr Steve Harvey	Cllr Chas Townley
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr Di Martin	Cllr Roger Wilson (Vice-Chairman)

Apologies: Cllr Phil Awford

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Dr Andy Seymour – Chair
Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Dr Sally Pearson – Director of Clinical Strategy
Deborah Lee – Chief Executive

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS NHS Trust)

Paul Jennings – Chief Executive
Dr Mike Roberts – Medical Director
Nicola Strother Smith – Non Executive Director

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Claire Feehily - Chair

Gloucestershire County Council

Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health
Margaret Willcox - Director Adult Social Services

2gether NHS Foundation Trust

Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

Ken Wenman – Chief Executive
Neil le Chevalier – Director of Operations
Mel Glanville – Communications Manager

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 44.1 Cllr Chas Townley declared a personal interest as the Stroud District Council representative on the General Committee of the League of Friends of Stroud Hospital and Health Centre; and as a member of the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,

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

the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust, the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust and Healthwatch Gloucestershire.

44.2 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.

44.3 Cllr Brian Oosthuysen declared a personal interest as a Governor of the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT).

45. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 12 July 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

46. REPORT TO COUNCIL IN RESPONSE TO MOTION 759: AMBULANCE RESPONSE TIMES

46.1 The Chairman informed the committee that due to pressure of business at the meeting of full council on 14 September 2016 this report had been deferred to the council meeting on 7 December 2016.

46.2 Cllr Roger Wilson, Chairman of the working group thanked officers from the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWASFT), the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG), Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS) and the council for their invaluable support to the working group. Cllr Wilson commended the report to the committee and asked for its endorsement of the recommendations.

46.3 There was some discussion relating to paramedic working conditions and the issues relating to SWASFT being able to locate residences. However no changes were made to report and the committee commended the report to council.

46.4 Whilst mindful that it was council's decision as to whether the recommendations in the report were taken forward the committee did receive assurances from the Accountable Officer, Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) and the Chief Executive, South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWASFT) that they endorsed the recommendations identified within the report.

47. SOUTH WESTERN AMBULANCE SERVICE NHS FOUNDATION TRUST (SWASFT)

47.1 The Chief Executive, SWASFT, gave a detailed presentation to the committee on the Ambulance Response Programme (ARP) and the direction of travel for the Trust. (For information the presentation slides were uploaded to the council's website and included in the minute book.)

47.2 The committee was informed that it was important to note that no Ambulance Service in the country was achieving its performance targets. The funding climate for SWASFT going forward was very challenging. The committee was informed that the ARP has the support of NHS England (NHSE) and Ministers. An improvement in response has been seen and the recoding of calls has effected a more efficient use of the vehicle fleet. The ARP was also viewed positively by SWASFT staff members. Quality assurance was undertaken on a daily basis and no serious incidents have been reported.

47.3 The committee was aware that SWASFT has stepped away from the Out of Hours Service contract in Gloucestershire and will cease delivering this service on 31 March 2017. It has

also withdrawn from the NHS111 contract in Devon; and does not intend to bid for any future Non Emergency Patient Transport Service contracts unless the funding position changed significantly. The committee was informed that the outcome of the Care Quality Commission (CQC) Inspection of the NHS111 service had reinforced to the SWASFT Board that it should not compromise when it comes to delivering services; and that the funding challenges mean that it was becoming more difficult to deliver these services alongside the service's core work (urgent and emergency care service).

- 47.4 Members were aware that the ARP was impacting on the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS) in that the number of calls it was being asked to respond to has significantly reduced. There was a level of frustration amongst firefighters that having undertaken training they were not being called on. The committee was informed that in the longer term it was anticipated that the GFRS would be involved in responding to Amber calls. It was however important to understand that the GFRS response equated to less than 1% of target; and that SWASFT reimbursed GFRS for every call-out and that these costs have to be factored in to an already challenging financial picture.
- 47.5 In response to a question it was explained that the re-profiling of vehicles in Gloucestershire would be 'live' from January 2017. The discussions with staff regarding rota changes were ongoing. SWASFT were also investing in resources in the Bristol area which should also have a positive impact on performance in Gloucestershire.
- 47.6 It was also explained that there were no significant cross border issues with Gloucestershire's neighbours other than with Wales. SWASFT monitored the number of calls where its vehicles were called on by the Welsh Ambulance Service; the number of calls responded to by SWASFT in Wales was not matched by a reciprocal number by the Welsh Ambulance Service in England. This meant that SWASFT vehicles could be 'lost' for a significant amount of time, particularly as the turnaround times in Welsh Hospitals was not good.
- 47.7 Hospital turnaround times in the Acute Hospitals in Gloucestershire could be improved, but there were significant concerns with regard to Southmead Hospital. On average SWASFT lost 100 operational hours each week in total across the SWASFT region; this was a better position than some other parts of the country.
- 47.8 In response to a question the Chief Executive informed members that once the re-profiling of SWASFT vehicles was in place, and staff rotas better aligned, he expected that members would see improvement in response times in Gloucestershire.
- 47.9 The Chair of Healthwatch Gloucestershire informed the committee that feedback received was that there was a high level of public confidence in the service; and relatively few concerns expressed. There was however a lack of understanding of response times. SWASFT were always willing to look at issues/case studies.
- 47.10 The committee agreed that the Urgent Care Strategy would have a key role in the delivery of urgent and emergency care in Gloucestershire. It was anticipated that this would be available for discussion by the committee in November 2016. (Post meeting note: this matter was scheduled to be debated at an extra meeting of the committee in December 2016.)
- 47.11 It was also agreed that going forward it would be important to ensure that the objectives of the ARP, and what this meant in terms of response times, was clearly explained to members of the public.

48. REVIEW OF MINOR INJURIES AND ILLNESS UNITS IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE

- 48.1 The Chief Executive, Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS), gave a detailed presentation on the outcome of the engagement exercise and the option to be taken forward for decision by the GCS Board at its meeting on 20 September 2016. (For information the presentation slides were uploaded to the council's website and included in the minute book.)
- 48.2 The meeting was informed that the option that would be considered for decision at the GCS Board meeting on 20 September 2016 was option 2: 'Change the opening hours of the MIUs in Stroud and Cirencester to 8am-11pm'. It was emphasised that this was not a cost cutting exercise and that this was in fact the most expensive of the options to take forward. Importantly it would make this service CQC compliant.
- 48.3 It was questioned whether the data for the Stroud MIU was accurate; as some members were aware that the NHS Choices website (which was used by NHS111 to appropriately direct calls) had been listing Stroud MIU as closed. The committee was assured that the data was correct; that the NHS Choices issue had only arisen recently ; and that GCS had looked at the data over the last three years and that this had shown a consistent picture.
- 48.4 A member informed the committee that he had been informed that there was a discrepancy between salary levels paid at Stroud Hospital compared to the other community hospitals. In response GCS explained that their nursing staff were paid in line with national terms and conditions.
- 48.5 In response to questions it was emphasised that this had been an engagement exercise not a consultation; and it had been necessary to progress this exercise over the summer period as this was an urgent situation. The CQC had published its inspection report on the GCS in September 2015 and it was important that GCS addressed the issues in this report in order that the service was fully CQC compliant when the CQC re-inspected.
- 48.6 It was commented that many people who had responded to the engagement exercise had felt disappointed that there had not been an option to retain the status quo.
- 48.7 It was suggested that this change was premature given that the work on the urgent care services review was still ongoing, and therefore the proposed locations of Urgent Centres in the county was unknown. It was agreed that it was important that the location of the MIUs and Urgent Care Centres were complementary.
- 48.8 The Accountable Officer, Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group, informed the meeting that the outcome of the Urgent Care Services review would be submitted to the committee in November 2016. (Post meeting note: this matter was scheduled to be debated at an extra meeting of the committee in December 2016.)

49. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 49.1 The Accountable Officer, GCCG, informed the committee that there was steady improvement in the diagnostic testing trajectories.
- 49.2 It was questioned why the IAPT (Improving Access to Psychological Therapies) – Referral to Treatment waiting times were so challenging. It was explained that this was because staff members required additional training to be able to deliver this service. The GCCG was

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

working with the NHS England (NHSE) Intensive Support Team, and with the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust.

- 49.3 In response to a question it was explained that the number of cancelled operations remained high due to the continued significant pressure on the system; and the GCCG were working with the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) to address this situation.
- 49.4 The committee was pleased to welcome Deborah Lee, (the new) Chief Executive GHNHSFT, to the meeting. Members were aware that NHS Improvement (NHSI) had found GHNHSFT to be in breach of its licence with regard to A and E waiting times in July 2016; and asked the Chief Executive for her perspective on this matter. The Chief Executive informed the committee that this did not feel like a crisis. Patients were regrettably waiting in excess of the national standards for A&E but she had assured herself that they were being kept safe until they were assessed and either discharged or admitted. She was able to report that whilst the position in February 2016 was that 77% of patients were being seen within the four hour standard, this figure was now at 91.9%, which was a great improvement. This was primarily down to the Trust's staff who had embraced the challenge and responded very positively – many going above and beyond to ensure patients were safe and seen in as timely a fashion as possible.
- 49.5 The Chief Executive was clear that she wanted the GHNHSFT to be in the top five Trusts nationally; and felt that the national targets were the minimum that a person could expect. She was meeting with NHSI today but was optimistic that they would recognise the good progress made. However, she re-iterated that there was still much to be done to embed and sustain the positive changes, particularly as we entered the more challenging Winter months.
- 49.6 The committee was informed that on occasions there were patients on surgical wards with medical needs, but that these patients were safe. This view was challenged by a committee member. The Chief Executive agreed that this was not an ideal situation in the long term, but asserted that there were safeguards in place to ensure that they were safe, for example, all patients were seen by a physician whilst being cared for on a surgical ward.
- 49.7 The committee also discussed the issues relating to the national workforce challenges, and the impact on the GHNHSFT, particularly on the ED workforce. It was explained that Gloucestershire was not an outlier with regard to recruitment. This related to national workforce planning issues. The increase in demand exacerbated this situation.
- 49.8 The committee asked what impact the MIU changes in opening hour proposals would have on A and E performance at the GHNHSFT. The Chief Executive informed the committee that there would be no impact.

50. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

- 50.1 The committee offered its congratulations on the award from the All Party Parliamentary Group on Cancer for the work achieved to improve early diagnosis and one-year cancer survival rates.
- 50.2 In response to a question it was explained that the proposed future model for Urgent Care Centres in the county should be available by the end of November 2016; and would be submitted to the committee for consideration and discussion. (Post meeting note: this

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

matter was scheduled to be debated at an extra meeting of the committee in December 2016.)

50.3 The committee noted the report.

51. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The committee noted the report.

52. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SERVICES REPORT

52.1 The committee were concerned with regard to the increase in the number of referrals and would monitor this situation through the quarterly performance monitoring reports.

52.2 The committee noted the report.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.33 pm

Health and Care Scrutiny Committee

November 2016

1. Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) Financial Position

In September 2016 GHNHSFT announced a significant and unexpected deterioration in its reported financial position. The committee was pleased to welcome Deborah Lee, Chief Executive GHNHSFT, and Keith Norton, a newly appointed Non-Executive Director, to the meeting to discuss this matter with members.

Ms Lee acknowledged that this position did reflect that there had been a failure of financial governance; and had the Trust, the regulators and auditors acted differently the Trust would not be in this position today. The sudden nature of the announcement had given rise to the misconception that this situation had developed 'overnight', and she wanted to be clear that this position had developed over time. The announcement had been preceded by an independent high level review, commissioned by the Trust Board, of the Trust's financial position and reporting arrangements.

This review had highlighted that there was an insufficient level of financial skills and expertise across the Trust's Non-Executive Directors (NEDs). It is important to note that an externally commissioned review of the Board's arrangements in 2015 did not raise this as an area of concern. Changes to the Trust Board have already been made; and the committee was assured that the person specification for NEDs reflected the need for financial expertise.

The Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group commissioned the services provided by the Trust and therefore there would be a continuation of services to the public. The challenge was to do things better and more efficiently.

An independent review of the circumstances that led to the financial deterioration has been jointly commissioned by the Trust and the regulator NHS Improvement. An extraordinary meeting of the committee has been set for 30 January 2017 to receive the outcome of this review.

2. Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP)

The committee was pleased to be able to discuss this plan with the commissioners and providers of health and social care services in Gloucestershire. The plan's vision is *'to improve health and wellbeing, we believe that by all working better together – in a more joined up way – and using the strengths of individuals, carers and local communities, we will transform the quality of care and support we provide to all local people'*.

There was agreement across the committee that this was an exciting plan building on and developing work already in place and planned. This plan is challenging for all partners, not least in its drive to deliver a consistent approach to services across all organisations; this alone means a significant challenge in terms of workplace culture, and a shared language. A very positive element is that prevention (Public Health) is embedded within the plan.

We are all aware that demand has increased dramatically over the last few years. We live in an online culture where people have access 24/7 to social and business media and can shop and receive goods within a 24 hour period; and there is growing expectation that access to health and social care should be the same. Managing expectations, and effectively communicating with members of the public, are key challenges.

The underlying detail on possible service changes will come forward later in 2017. At present the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) is leading on an engagement exercise to inform and engage with the public. The plan is available at www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/gloucestershire-stp. This link gives access to the full plan and a short guide. It also links to a survey and I recommend that all members respond to this survey and encourage their local communities to do so as well to ensure that the GCCG get a broad range of responses.

The committee was clear that it intends to follow the progress and implementation of this plan and will be part of any consultation on service change proposals. Urgent Care will be part of the committee's debate on the council motion relating to A and E waiting times on 15 December 2017. It is anticipated that consultation on the urgent care system model will begin in Summer 2017.

3. Adult Social Care and Public Health Performance Quarter 1

Members welcomed the continued good work to support adults with learning disabilities into employment and congratulated Forwards Employment Services (commissioned by the council) on winning the Empowerment Award at the Gloucestershire Health and Social Care Awards on 8 November 2016.

It was of concern to note that performance against reassessment targets continues to underperform, apart from those service users supported by the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust (2G). It was also of concern to hear that the demand for paid carers is outstripping supply; it was thought that this was related to some domiciliary care organisations going out of business. The committee will need to monitor this issue.

Performance against Health Checks targets continues to struggle. All GP practices in the county, apart from two, have signed up to deliver these checks, and for the two practices that have not alternative arrangements have been made for these patients. Advertising these checks and communicating with patients rests with the GP practice. A particular factor here is that no matter how the benefits of these checks are communicated we cannot make people take them up.

4. Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) Performance Report

Following a request from the committee this report now regularly includes information on mental health indicators. Mental Health will also be the main item at the committee's meeting on 10 January 2017.

As previously reported cancer targets continue to be a challenge; and whilst there is some improvement in the 6 week diagnostic target more needs to be done to bring this performance online. Recovery plans are in place.

There have been concerns with regard to Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT). 2G have benefited from support from a member of the national IAPT team, and received a visit from the NHS England Intensive Support Team. 2G have developed an improvement plan for access and recovery which has been shared with the GCCG. 2G informed the committee that it was confident that it was now on the right track.

5. Healthwatch Gloucestershire (HWG) Quarter 1 Patient and Public Feedback

The Chair of HWG informed the committee that HWG would be working with the CQC on the forthcoming inspection of GHNHSFT. It was also undertaking a follow up to its report on the Hospital Discharge process and expected to share this with the committee in the New Year.

Iain Dobie
Chairman

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 9 September 2016 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Gerald Dee	Chris Nelson
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Nigel Robbins
Cllr Helena McCloskey	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Karen McKeown	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)

Substitutes: Cllr Jane Horne (In place of Bruce Hogan)
Cllr Steve McHale (In place of Cllr Barry Kirby)

Officers in attendance: Stephen Bace, Chris Brierley, Stewart Edgar, Peter Skelton, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Cllr Julian Beale

19. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes were signed as correct record. The Chairman deferred any discussion on matters arising until the next meeting.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Rob Garnham declared that he had worked with Peter Skelton as Chair of the Police Authority.

21. DEPUTY POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER APPOINTMENT HEARING

21.1 The Panel noted that the confirmatory hearing for the appointment of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner was required by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. Members would put questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the selection process as well as to the candidate relating to professional competence and personal independence. The Panel would then go into exempt session to make its decision on whether members wished to make a recommendation on the appointment.

The Police and Crime Commissioner: Outlining the process

21.2 The Police and Crime Commissioner outlined the process that had been followed and introduced Chris Brierley as the candidate. The Commissioner explained that over the four years that he had been in the role he had been considering whether he needed a Deputy. He had observed other

commissioners who had deputies and those who had not and was familiar with both approaches and the pros and cons associated with each.

- 21.3 It was explained that when taking on the role the first time, the Commissioner had not had any intention of appointing a Deputy and so his manifesto had made this clear. For the recent election, he had made no such commitment and had wanted to keep his options open. He also noted that his private secretary had left the role after his first term.
- 21.4 Following the election, the Commissioner had felt that there might be benefit to having a Deputy and so had discussed it with his Chief Executive. He had identified that Chris Brierley was the kind of person he could work with and so he arranged a conversation with Chris on the subject of the Police and Crime Plan and asked if he was interested in the position. There had been a meeting a couple of weeks later where the role was outlined to the candidate and following that meeting a formal offer was made.
- 21.5 The Commissioner explained that he had contacted the former editor of BBC Radio Gloucestershire who had praised Chris' professionalism.
- 21.6 One member stated that the Commissioner's position was directly elected and so he could claim to have a mandate from the people of Gloucestershire whereas his deputy was unelected. In response it was explained that there was no process for the Deputy to stand for election.
- 21.7 The Commissioner was asked to outline the attributes he was looking for in a deputy. He explained that he wanted an individual who he felt he was able to work with and who brought a certain level of experience, with an understanding of police accountability. He also wanted an individual who understood the County and the differences across districts and boroughs. The individual had to be a 'people person' who could operate at a national and regional level. The Commissioner also explained that he was looking for someone with high intellect and the necessary gravitas who shared his values and could complement and add to his skills. He felt that Chris had these attributes and that he trusted him to serve the County well.
- 21.8 There was some discussion around the role of Deputy and the arrangements that would be in place if the Commissioner was incapacitated. It was explained that the Deputy would deputise at various meetings and that the Commissioner could delegate powers to his team when required. If the Commissioner was incapacitated for a lengthy period of time or was unable to continue in his role then it would be up to the Panel to appoint an individual in the interim from the Commissioner's Office; That individual could be the Deputy.
- 21.9 One member commented on instances where the Deputy would represent the Commissioner and asked how the Commissioner would ensure that he was not too far removed from the areas that his Deputy took responsibility for. In response it was explained that the Commissioner turned down more

invitations than he accepted due to the large demands on his time. He felt that a better service could be provided by having another individual who could attend on his behalf.

- 21.10 It was clarified that the position was for the remainder of the four year term of the Commissioner.
- 21.11 The Panel commented that they had not received a CV for the candidate. The Commissioner responded that he had seen a CV, but that it had not been received formally and that there was not a copy of it to send to the Panel.
- 21.12 The Commissioner was asked why he had chosen not to include his consideration of a Deputy within his manifesto and there were suggestions that this was an insult to the voting public. The example of a presidential 'running mate' was given. In response the Commissioner outlined that he had not made his decision at that time and that no one had asked him throughout the election process whether he intended to appoint a Deputy. He also stated that other candidates had not had a manifesto.
- 21.13 It was suggested by some members that in normal circumstances a high profile position would have been advertised in the public domain. It was explained that no public advert was provided because the legislation was clear and there was no requirement for it as part of the process. The Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office confirmed that the legislation had been followed. It was clarified that unlike all other posts within the OPCC, the legislation specifically provided that the position was not politically restricted and that the appointment did not have to be made on merit.
- 21.14 One member asked what provision had been made within the budget for the cost of the Deputy Commissioner position over the four year term. In response the Panel were informed that the Private Secretary position had been deleted and that this, alongside other savings, meant that there was provision within the budget. Each year the budget would be set and the Commissioner explained that his office was very efficient.

Consideration of the Candidate

- 21.15 Chris Brierley informed the Panel that he was honoured and flattered to be taking on the role. He stated that he had come to love Gloucestershire and, having worked in London and Bristol, he had returned to the County in September 2015. He had welcomed the opportunity put forward by the Commissioner and he wanted to give something back to the community.
- 21.16 He felt that he fully understood the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner and was aware of the former Police Authority. He understood the challenges facing the County and the Constabulary and wider public sector. He stated that he had been impressed with the Police and Crime

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

Commissioner role and felt that there was real scope in it. He had seen the amount of invitations the Commissioner received and the fact that some opportunities had to be turned down.

21.17 It was explained that he had seen the projects funded by the plan and the good work that had been undertaken. He reflected on the need for engagement with the public and the broad skillset required to achieve the best outcomes.

21.18 He recognised the difference between the role of the Commissioner and that of the Constabulary and the need for operational independence.

21.19 In response to a question, Chris explained that he was comfortable with being challenging to the Commissioner where there was a need to be. He explained that he shared many of the values of the Commissioner. He stated that he had demonstrated in his work in journalism that he could develop relationships and act with fairness and communicate with a broad spectrum of people.

21.20 Some members expressed their view that a Deputy role would be a good thing and that they welcomed the appointment.

22. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The panel noted that guidance from the Local Government Association with regards to the holding of confirmatory hearing recommended that the panel come to decisions on recommendations in closed session.

It was therefore resolved:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the item on the agenda in accordance with the provisions of section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (schedule 12A paragraphs 1, & 2) which were:

Information relating to any individual.

Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

This was because it was likely that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.

23. PANEL DISCUSSION

23.1 The Panel understood that for a schedule 1 appointment they could make a recommendation to the Commissioner regarding the appointment.

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

- 23.2 The Panel recognised that legislation outlining the appointment of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner did not require a formal interview process to be carried out. Members discussed that this made it difficult for them to scrutinise whether the correct process had been carried out.
- 23.3 Some members explained that while the legislation had been followed, they would have welcomed greater transparency.
- 23.4 One member suggested that a more open interview process would ensure that due consideration was given to diversity and equality. It was suggested that advice could have been sought from the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- 23.5 Some members felt that there was a weakness within the legislation with regards to the appointment of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and the role of the Panel at a confirmatory hearing.
- 23.6 The Panel resolved to note the appointment and welcome the candidate to the position while writing a letter to the Commissioner containing the following points:

The Panel notes the appointment of Chris Brierley as Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and is satisfied that the relevant legislation relating to the appointments process has been followed.

However, the Panel were concerned that a transparent and open process was not adopted when appointing to this role.

In future, for appointments of this nature, the Panel would welcome an approach more closely aligned with best practice established for other high profile appointments, including seeking advice from the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. The Panel would recommend the use of more traditional recruitment methods, involving public advertising, selection and interview, so as to ensure the appointment of the best possible candidate for the job.

The Panel felt that in not following this approach the opportunity has been lost to ensure proper diversity and equality in the process, and to establish a best practice approach to these types of appointments.

It is important to stress that these comments are in no way intended to question the capability or suitability of the candidate.

However, the Panel acknowledges the weakness within the legislation regarding this process, and would encourage the Commissioner to agree that mere adoption of the rules laid down in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 is not sufficient comfort for the people of Gloucestershire that due process has been followed.

24. CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER APPOINTMENT HEARING

- 24.1 The Panel noted that the confirmatory hearing for the appointment of the Chief Finance Officer was required by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011. Members would put questions to the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the selection process as well as to the candidate relating to professional competence and personal independence. The Panel would then go into exempt session to make its decision on whether members wished to make a recommendation on the appointment.

The Police and Crime Commissioner: Outlining the process

- 24.2 The Police and Crime Commissioner outlined the process that had been followed and introduced the candidate. He explained that Dave Bennett his Chief Finance Officer had retired and that he had been an excellent financial officer providing good advice. In considering how to move forward, the suggestion had been made to combine the post with the Chief Finance Officer position within the Constabulary and appointing Peter Skelton (the current Constabulary CFO) into the role.
- 24.3 The combining of the position would produce the same outcome and would save money with the salary being split 30% for the PCC role and 70% for the Constabulary role. Following consultation with the Chief Executive and Chief Constable it was decided that this was acceptable and could be legally achieved.
- 24.4 This approach had been carried out elsewhere as there were large similarities between the posts with both providing strategic advice and often the same advice. It would be run for a trial period of twelve months to ensure that there were no conflicts.
- 24.5 An interview process had not been carried out because Peter Skelton was effectively in post and that this would be a trial period. In response to a question, it was clarified that towards the end of the twelve months it would be discussed a Governance Board and that the Panel would be updated.

Consideration of the Candidate

- 24.6 Peter Skelton had worked for Gloucestershire Constabulary for eleven years having previously been in the private sector and had been Chief Finance Officer from 2012. He informed the Panel that he had taken advice from a number of other Chief Finance Officers before accepting the position, particularly around whether there was a conflict of interest. Their advice was that the only time that there could be an issue would be around the budget setting process. The trial would encompass that period so that the force could judge first hand whether that was an issue.
- 24.7 With regards to any conflict of interest, he explained that the guidance stated that an affective co-operative working relationship between the Chief

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

Finance Officer for the Commissioner and Constabulary was fundamental. This had always been taken seriously in Gloucestershire and this had meant that the same advice had been given in the past from both officers. The Chief Finance Officer role was an advisory one, advice would be provided but decisions were then made by the Commissioner and/or Chief Constable. During budget setting time, a number of options would be provided.

24.8 It was mentioned that the close working relationship from the two Chief Finance Officers previously had ensured that there had been a 'sounding board'. One member asked whether this same type of support would still be in place in the future. In response it was stated that there was excellent support from the existing finance team.

24.9 It was clarified that the same finance team was in place for both positions with it sitting with the Constabulary. This would not change.

25. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The panel noted that guidance from the Local Government Association with regards to the holding of confirmatory hearing recommended that the panel come to decisions on recommendations in closed session.

It was therefore resolved:

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the item on the agenda in accordance with the provisions of section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (schedule 12A paragraphs 1, & 2) which were:

Information relating to any individual.

Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

This was because it was likely that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.

26. PANEL DISCUSSION

26.1 The Panel understood that for a schedule 1 appointment they could make a recommendation to the Commissioner regarding the appointment.

26.2 Members discussed the potential conflict of interest, but noted the assurances made during the hearing and the trial basis of the appointment.

26.3 The Panel commented on the lack of a formal interview process, noting the earlier reservation regarding the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner appointment. Some members suggested that given the trial nature of the

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

position and the fact that the candidate was already an employee carrying out the role, they could understand the process followed. Other members mentioned that the Deputy position was an outward facing role while the Chief Finance Officer position was not.

- 26.4 Members commented that it was important to look to save money and achieve best value and that this was an attempt to do that.
- 26.5 The Panel resolved to note the appointment and welcome the candidate to the position. The following points would be included in the letter to the Commissioner:

The Panel note the appointment of Peter Skelton as the Chief Finance Officer of the Commissioner's Office for a trial period of 12 months.

Members were content with assurances received with regards to any potential conflicts of interest in relation to his joint role with the Constabulary.

While some members reflected on the process for this appointment and questioned whether it was as transparent as it could be, overall the Panel felt comfortable with the arrangements, given that Mr Skelton is already employed within the organisation. Furthermore, unlike the position of the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, it is not an outward facing role, and the appointment is on a trial basis.

The Panel would welcome further consultation before the end of the 12 months with regards to the success of the trial.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 11.35 am

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Tuesday 20 September 2016 at the Members' Room - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr David Brown	Cllr Chris Nelson
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)
Cllr Bruce Hogan	

Substitutes: Cllr Steve Lydon (In place of Cllr Karen McKeown)

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

Apologies: Cllr Julian Beale, Adrian Connor, Cllr Barry Kirby, Cllr Helena McCloskey, Cllr Nigel Robbins and Martin Smith

27. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes were agreed as a correct record.

There was some discussion regarding the press release that had been issued following the previous meeting detailing the Panel's recommendation in relation to the senior appointments.

For clarity the Police and Crime Commissioner outlined that he had followed the procedure within the legislation and would be responding to the Panel advising them to direct their concerns to the Police and Fire Minister.

The Chairman explained that the Panel had set out their views regarding the appointment in their letter to the Commissioner.

28. ANNUAL REPORT

28.1 Martin Surl introduced the Annual Report which had been delayed due to the PCC Elections. The Report aimed to assist the Panel in reviewing and scrutinising decisions made and actions taken by the Commissioner and his office.

28.2 One member stated that he would have expected to have seen some detail on progress against the objectives within the Police and Crime Plan, but recognised that this came to the Panel in the form of the quarterly highlight reports and updates from priority leads.

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

- 28.3 The Commissioner was asked a question about the '40 more officers and 200 special constables to be recruited in the next four years'. It was explained that the recruitment drive was going well and the Constabulary was ahead of target. The Constabulary was moving towards 1060 officers.
- 28.4 Members welcomed the format of the report stating that it was easy to read and provided a good overview of the activity that had been undertaken over the previous year. Members commented that this was a report members of the public would look at.
- 28.5 One member referred to the Hate Crime Strategy and expressed disappointment that not all districts had been invited to the launch. In response it was explained that the issue had now been resolved and that invitations had been issued.
- 28.6 Members of the Panel who had attended the Police Open day stated that it has been an excellent day and very informative.

29. COMMUNITY SAFETY REVIEW REPORT

- 29.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report from John Bensted, commissioned by Leadership Gloucestershire, which provided a review of Gloucestershire's 'Community Safety Landscape' in order to assess current strengths and areas for improvement. The review had been a part of Gloucestershire's bid to become a Combined Authority. The closing date for the Consultation was 3 October.
- 29.2 Three options were outlined within the paper: The first retained Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) in each district with the Chairs meeting every 2 months; the second option included the creation of a Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership (GCSP) working in close partnership with six district level CSPs; the third option involved the creation of an overarching Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership with local Multi-Agency Forums to implement delivery on a local level, i.e place based.
- 29.3 It was suggested that there was no coherence between partnerships, plans and strategies in Gloucestershire for Community Safety. An example was given about Domestic Homicide Reviews in that there were no current strategic oversight and ensuring that the learning is shared.
- 29.4 The Chairman asked that his thanks be passed on to John Bensted for an excellent report. He asked that following the consultation, who would drive the work forward and help facilitate the change? Richard Bradley suggested that part of his role would be to take the work forward following the consultation.
- 29.5 One member expressed a number of concerns that would be fed back into the consultation. This included a question around the independence of the

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

review, questions regarding where safeguarding sat within the structures, and a question around whether a case had really been made for the third option.

- 29.6 With regards to safeguarding it was suggested that currently there were no clear relationship with other partners and that a bigger model was needed that would show how the structure would relate to other partnerships.
- 29.7 The Panel was informed that when considering who would lead the review, enquiries had been made nationally and across the south west to identify someone with the necessary skills. In the end it was felt that John Bensted was the right individual.
- 29.8 Some members of the Panel spoke positively about the review and stated their full support for option 3. Some members also suggested that the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office should be driving the transformation in this area and potentially chairing a Gloucestershire Community Safety Partnership.
- 29.9 One member expressed a slight reservation with option 3, explaining that it was important to ensure that the Multi-Agency Forums were able to deliver locally and that there was not too big a gap between their work and the work of the strategic body.

30. UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

- 30.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report explaining that the final version of the draft would be considered by the Panel in November for final adoption. This was an opportunity for observations and comments. The plan had gone out for public consultation throughout August with 63 responses received. In general there was a lot of support for the plan and the direction being taken. Where comments were made about policing in general, these were fed back to the Chief Constable.
- 30.2 Cllr Rob Garnham referred to some of the statements made within the first few pages of the plan which he felt needed some clarification in order to ensure that they were not misinterpreted or a misrepresentation of the facts. He was concerned that the statements could be read as being critical to the Police Authority which had preceded the role of Police and Crime Commissioner.
- On page 58 there was reference to the temporary positions for the Chief Constable, Deputy, and Assistant positions. He explained that they had been made temporary in order that the incoming Commissioner would have the power to choose the individuals they wanted.
 - With regards to the lack of an ICT strategy and criticisms around the financial plan, it was explained that, again, it was felt that the best way to proceed

was to wait for the incoming Commissioner, and that at the time of the MTFs the precept increase assumptions were based on permissible levels.

- On page 59 there was a reference to the collaboration on road policing, firearms and serious crime. He suggested that a lot of this was in place prior to the Commissioner taking up the position.
 - On page 62 it stated that Coleford Police Station was under threat of closure; Cllr Garnham stated that the plan was for it to be relocated and to follow a model that had worked in Tewkesbury.
 - On page 63 a statement was made around years of inactivity at the Lansdown Road site. It was explained that each year the Police Authority had received reports from the Treasurer on the market activity and the decision was made not to sell and make a loss. The site had been changed so that residential usage was an option during that time, increasing its value.
- 30.3 In response the Commissioner explained that he held the Police Authority in high regard. He explained that in the plan he was stating facts regarding the position of the Constabulary when he had taken office.
- 30.4 In response to a question, it was explained that the figure of £3.4m saved on the investigative centre was based on figures provided by the Chief Finance Officer and shared with the panel at a previous meeting. With regards to abstractions referred to on page 10 of the report, this was taken from the HMIC report.
- 30.5 Some members commented that they were pleased to see an increase in measurable objectives within the plan and that the Panel looked forward to seeing them measured in the quarterly report. It was explained that a process was underway to capture baseline data and where relevant the data would be included.
- 30.6 One member suggested that in addition to the priorities within the report, that a priority could be established around rural communities. With a large proportion of the County living in rural communities, it was suggested that there was an enormous challenge around providing visibility and tackling the perception of crime. In response, the Commissioner stated that he was planning on sticking with his six priorities but that rural communities was one of the areas he was looking to highlight.
- 30.7 It was suggested that the plan could include a more explicit reference to the Community Safety Review.
- 30.8 There was some discussion around the expectation around a plan to challenge illegal use of mobile phones and other devices. Members

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

welcomed this approach explaining that it was becoming socially unacceptable. The Commissioner explained that this was an ambitious and challenging area to target.

30.9 In response to a question, it was explained that there was a move away from a reliance on cross force aid and now there was a focus on collaboration in a more formal way so that there was no reliance on spare capacity to cover gaps.

30.10 One member raised concerns regarding the 101 non emergency number and targets being missed. The Commissioner explained that he had raised the issue with the Constabulary and acknowledged that there had been a dip in performance in the last twelve months. He agreed to provide a full response to the Panel within the Chief Executive's report at the next meeting.

ACTION Martin Surl/ Paul Trott

30.11 One member commented that he had received a quick response to the non emergency email service and felt that the public should be encouraged to use that.

31. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

31.1 Paul Trott introduced the report outlining that one complaint had been received and had been discussed with the Chairman. The Deputy Chief Executive from Wiltshire would be investigating. The Panel would receive further details about the complaint confidentially.

ACTION Paul Trott/ Stephen Bace

31.2 It was explained that Gloucestershire was involved in a number of collaborations and cooperation with neighbouring forces covering a vast range of services. The Commissioner had met with the PCCs for Avon and Somerset and Wiltshire to agree a consistent vision for Tri-Force collaboration going forward. The core programme scope would include a single ICT service being delivered to all parties, an early agreement to a single set of terms and conditions for all officers and staff within the Constabularies and a single HR service. A single operational finance service would be included to meet the Chief Constable's obligations under the Code of Practice on Finance.

31.3 The steps relating to this programme would be subject to the delivery of satisfactory business cases and governance to ensure local service delivery of the local police and crime plans was maintained. Members understood that it was important that the collaboration worked in the best interests of Gloucestershire, while recognising that there was a duty to collaborate. It was commented that the process of drawing up these arrangements had been very demanding on the team and that the savings for Gloucestershire were potentially moderate compared to the savings for the other force areas.

- 31.4 The Chairman reminded members that a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel Chairs for Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Avon and Somerset had been arranged for 22 September and that he would report back at the next meeting on the discussions. The aim of the meetings was to ensure a joined up scrutiny process of the collaborations.

ACTION Roger Wilson/ Stephen Bace

- 31.5 The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner had received data enabling a comparison of procurement costs in Gloucestershire compared to other force areas. There did not appear to be any particular areas of concern relating to procurement costs for Gloucestershire Constabulary. In particular, members noted that with regards to face to face interpreting service Gloucestershire paid £120.00 for a period of time in comparison to the England Wales average of £340.00.

- 31.6 It was explained that the Home Office made it mandatory to procure some services nationally. Gloucestershire Constabulary was part of a four force collaboration on procurement that allowed common framework agreements to be used.

- 31.7 Members welcomed the inclusion of crime statistics in the report and the fact that it suggested lower levels of crime in comparison with other regions. It was recognised that it was harder to find statistics that measured Gloucestershire as a whole.

- 31.8 It was explained that there were no joint or shared posts with other public authorities at this time.

- 31.9 In response to a question on 'hate crime posts' it was explained that countywide approach was being developed. Currently several people had responsibility in this area.

- 31.10 In relation to the Policing and Crime Bill, it was suggested that it would be useful for the Panel to receive a briefing in the New Year explaining how the changes would impact the Office and what additional responsibilities were being taken on.

ACTION Martin Surl/ Lead Members

- 31.11 One member asked how good the force was in terms of compatibility of software and equipment with other forces regionally. In response it was explained that at the high end operation level the force was very good. With regards to IT equipment the force was improving and work was underway to better align ICT, HR and Finance systems through the Tri-Force Enabling Services Collaboration referred to above.

32. TASK GROUPS

- 32.1 The Chairman introduced the one page strategy for a task group on 'blue light collaboration'. The aim of the work was to understand the implications of potential legislative changes regarding the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner, in particular from the Policing and Crime Bill 2015-16. In addition the group aim to understand what collaboration is already underway between blue light services and the Police and potential for this to increase in the future.
- 32.2 The Commissioner and his Office had suggested some amendments to understand the financial and strategic issues around collaboration with the fire service and potentially ambulance service.
- 32.3 Members agreed to set up the task group with consideration to be given at the first meeting of the group as to any changes that would need to be made to the focus of the review.
- 32.4 The Chairman suggested that a one day evidence day be held to meet with all partners and that value would be added by taking an independent look at the issues.

33. APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT CO-OPTED MEMBER

- 33.1 The Chairman explained that a recruitment process had been undertaken for the position of non elected independent co-optee to the Panel as Martin Smith had served his four year term.
- 33.2 Interviews had been held on 7 September by the Lead Members of the Panel and the members had unanimously agreed to reappoint Martin Smith for another four year term.
- 33.3 The Panel ratified the appointment.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 3.30 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Monday 7 November 2016 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Helena McCloskey
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Chris Nelson
Adrian Connor	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Nigel Robbins
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Martin Smith
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Bruce Hogan	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)
Cllr Barry Kirby	

Substitutes:

In attendance: Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Chris Brierley, Richard Cooper, Suzette Davenport, Stewart Edgar, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Cllr Karen McKeown

34. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Panel agreed the minutes as a correct record subject to the following clarification provided by the Commissioner:

At minute 31.2 it should state that consideration was being given to the inclusion of ICT services being delivered within the collaboration. This had not been agreed.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations were made.

36. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

36.1 The Chairman informed the committee that he had agreed to continue to meet the Chairs of Avon and Somerset and Wiltshire Police and Crime Panels in relation to the collaboration being undertaken by the Commissioners and Constabularies. In addition, members had attended the Police and Crime Panel National Conference on 20 October which had been a worthwhile opportunity to network.

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

- 36.2 An informal briefing session on the budget was being arranged with the Commissioner's Office for January 2017.
- 36.3 Following the Committee meeting there would be the first meeting of the blue light services collaboration scrutiny task group.
- 36.4 The Chairman congratulated the Chief Constable on her Fellowship from the University of Gloucestershire.

37. UPDATE ON NEW OPERATING MODEL

- 37.1 Martin Surl explained that change had been necessary on a financial basis with further cuts anticipated in coming years. In addition the type of policing was changing with the example being given of cyber enabled crime which had become a greater feature of policing. The Constabulary was undergoing a rapid period of change and it had been necessary to change the operating model.
- 37.2 Work had been carried out on the examining the police estate, it had been necessary to consider whether the locations were correct and what type of demands in different locations.
- 37.3 To make the operating model work effectively with less officer numbers, it was important to ensure the ICT was fit for purpose and that mobile working was at the forefront of the plans. The revenue costs on ICT had increased by over £1m a year, but it had been effective and the organisation was now far more efficient with Gloucestershire amongst the most digitally advanced in the country.
- 37.4 The Chief Constable stated that the starting point for the new operating model was about improving service delivery when facing challenges such as saving £30m. The Constabulary had to improve how they dealt with the most vulnerable and how they handled the expansion in the breadth of policing. The complexity of crime had grown significantly.
- 37.5 The design principles were outlined for members with a focus on care, compassion and humility from officers. It was stated that the organisation was now more resilient and flexible and performing better despite having fewer officers and staff. The model was being continually review and refined in order to improve. By way of evidence, Gloucestershire had the fourth lowest crime rate per 1000 people in England and Wales and was in the top quartile for satisfaction. This emphasised the way the Constabulary was 'putting the public at the heart of everything we do'.
- 37.6 Superintendent Richard Cooper provided an appraisal of how things were going with the model. He stated that some successes could in part be attributed to the model alongside some challenges. The evidence he

provided were independent figures and they outlined that Gloucestershire has the lowest violent crime rate per 1000 population in the country.

- 37.7 He emphasised that there had been significant improvement in all areas of the service in relation to user satisfaction; however those improvements were beginning to plateau. He informed members that Gloucestershire was the second most improved constabulary in the country from June 2015.
- 37.8 In the England and Wales crime survey for March 2015 Gloucestershire had been slightly below the national average in terms of public confidence in how the Police and Council deal with crime; it was now substantially above average according to the latest data. However in terms of public perception of dealing with community priorities, this was below the national average and was an area to improve.
- 37.9 The strengths of the model were outlined to members including greater research being carried out in the control room. However this could also be perceived as a weakness because it then took longer to reach incidents. Officers now spent longer at incidents and this could be one of the reasons for the improved satisfaction rates. The Constabulary was policing the county as one, but this put greater strain on resources.
- 37.10 The Constabulary were responding to a higher proportion of incidents involved Domestic Abuse, and while the amount of crime had not risen, the amount of complex crime had increased.
- 37.11 With regards to Neighbourhood Policing a balance needed to be found between having sufficient staff available and using them simply because they were available. There would be further development of the neighbourhood policing strategy and a strengths based approach would be taken going forward.
- 37.12 Members asked how the morale of the Force was now that the new model had been in place for a while. In response it was explained that there were a range of staff that felt that they have less 'down time' and, less time to do their own pro-active work. National developments and media perception of policing also had an effect on morale, but despite that, a recent report suggested that morale had improved year on year. There were a range of things that concerned officers and staff including terms and conditions and pensions, reduction in career breaks and secondments and a change to the promotion processes.
- 37.13 One member congratulated the constabulary on the progress in relation to the operating model and the reduction in crime. While there was a lot more to do, this was a solid foundation from which to work from. The Panel formally congratulated the Constabulary and stated that a press release would be issued.

ACTION Cllr Roger Wilson/ Stephen Bace

- 37.14 One member questioned the lack of down time and asked whether it was felt that this would affect recruitment and retention in the future? In response, the Commissioner outlined that pay would affect recruitment. The Chief Constable explained that concerns around lack of officer down time related to a particular group of officers that moved from job to job as well as detectives.
- 37.15 In response to a question on satisfaction rates, it was acknowledged that the Forest of Dean had the lowest levels of satisfaction and while there had been a trend of improvement, there was still a gap. It was noted that the Forest also had one of the lowest levels of crime in the district and so this was an issue around perspective
- 37.16 Members questioned how the operating model was communicated to the public so that confidence could be improved. There was discussion around confidence arising from police being visible out on 'the beat'. The Commissioner explained that PCSO numbers had not been reduced in his term of office and his intention was to retain the same amount of officers. It was important that neighbourhood policing was in place and that the police were connected to their communities. The example was given on the use of the Neighbourhood Engagement Vehicle.
- 37.17 In response to a question, it was explained that a large amount of research had been undertaken to establish what would be the best model for policing in Gloucestershire. This had included a peer review by the College of Policing.
- 37.18 It was clarified that mobile IT allowed officers to complete work without needing to return to the office. This allowed officers to spend longer at the scene of a crime and spending time with an alleged victim rather than needing to do a return visit.
- 37.19 The Commissioner explained that his role was to look at the operating model and speak to officers. He acknowledged that some officers doubted whether this was the correct way forward but that it was not the finished model at this stage. He believed that the majority of officers thought that the model was better than what was in place before. The Chief Constable explained that officers concerns stemmed from the extra pressure created by a reduced staff.
- 37.20 One member asked whether a more honest debate was needed around neighbourhood policing as the Constabulary looked to perform with less resources. The member was concerned that the current model was not being delivered. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner explained that it was important to get the neighbourhood policing model right for modern times and that options were being drawn up.

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

37.21 One member discussed the recent increase in knife. It was important to reassure the public and the University of Gloucestershire and City Forum had been commissioned to carry out some in-depth research into possible solutions.

37.22 The Panel asked that the slides from the presentation be circulated
ACTION Stephen Bace

38. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN

38.1 Members were reminded that as previous meetings they had considered the draft plan at length. This was now an opportunity to see the final draft and to understand how it would work and be delivered.

38.2 Richard Bradley outlined the plan and how it worked. He demonstrated the governance method to ensure that leads were held to account and that the plan was being delivered.. As before there were six priorities each with a priority lead from across the public sector. Members noted the addition of Kate Langley Youth Justice manager who was now the lead for Young People becoming Adults.

38.3 A Constabulary Business Plan had been introduced which would provide a link between the overall Police and Crime Plan and the way in which the Constabulary engaged with it. An annual delivery plan was being written which would go to the next Police and Crime Panel meeting.
ACTION Richard Bradley

38.4 It was explained that meetings were held with leads and that a highlight report was produced which went to the Police and Crime Panel.

38.5 The plan was ambitious and also had one eye on national developments which could impact on the Commissioners work load around, complaints, fire and rescue service and criminal justice.

38.6 One member asked how consideration was given to changes in rural policing as a result of housing development plans. In response it was explained that the plan had to be dynamic and refreshed every year.

38.7 In response to a question the Commissioner explained that he was broadly supportive of the road safety partnership. He felt that given that Gloucestershire County Council had substantially reduced their funding of it he would have expected a parallel restructure to have taken place.

38.8 There was some discussion about the legislation going through Parliament which would enable Police and Crime Commissioner to take on governance for the Fire and Rescue Service (Policing and Crime Bill. The Commissioner stated that he had come into office to be the Police and Crime, not Fire, Commissioner. Although he'd had no plans to pursue the Fire and Rescue

Service, in light of the legislation he felt it was right to explore what was in the best interest of the public. He said that at this stage the County Council had not engaged with him on that process.

- 38.9 One member commented about the lack of reference to speed limits referring to the work of a County Council task group 8 years previous. He expressed concerns about speed limits in the Forest of Dean and asked whether this was something the Commissioner could pursue. In response the member was advised to pass this on to the road safety partnership who now had a problem solving hub.
- 38.10 Cllr Garnham, referring to concerns he expressed at the previous meeting on as he felt 'misrepresented facts within the narrative of 'My Approach', stated that in response to no change in this area he would not support the plan.
- 38.11 Aside from the concerns raised by Cllr Garnham, the Police and Crime Panel supported the plan.

39. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

- 39.1 Paul Trott introduced the report. The report included information provided on 101 call taking after the Commissioner had questioned the superintendent in charge of the control room. It was explained that more people were using the service and that this increase in demand had affected the percentage of those being answered within the time expected. These figures would continue to be monitored. Members expressed concern that the data in some cases only ran until the end of March 2015. It was explained that the data past this point had yet to be audited, but that there had been a considerable increase in calls since the summer.
- 39.2 The Commissioner explained that there would be a more detailed look at 101 calls at the governance board. Members suggested that the 101 email service needed to be promoted more and emphasised the importance of a successful 101 service as this was often the first contact the public had with the Police. There would be an update on 101 calls provided in each Chief Executive report.
- ACTION** **Paul Trott**
- 39.2 The Chief Executive report outlined that HMIC had returned to the Constabulary in October to carry out a PEEL inspection into effectiveness. Final reports from HMIC following their efficiency inspection had been published with the force rated as good overall. Inspections on, legitimacy and leadership were expected to report in December.
- 39.3 The South West Collaboration Strategic Board was due to meet on 10 November where key decision would be taken around the scope of the collaboration programme and cost. An update would be provided to the

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

Panel in January. A lot of time was being taken to go through the various options and evaluations.

- 39.4 The Panel was provided with an update on the use of the Enterprise Resource Platform which would integrate finance and HR systems. This was a major piece of software which needed to have 80,000 users to make it worthwhile and effective. Options to collaborate further afield were being explored in order to reach that level.
- 39.5 One member welcomed the level of detail in the report and stated that the figures for child arrests were excellent and that this was a huge area of success for the Constabulary.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.30 pm

