



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5th SEPTEMBER 2017

AGENDA ITEM (14)

QUARTERLY DIGEST

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 23 rd February 2017	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 15 th March 2017	10
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 21 st June 2017	14
(iv)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 7 th March 2017	22
(v)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 6 th June 2017	28
(vi)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 11 th July 2017	32
(vii)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 14 th March 2017	37
(vii)	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 14 th July 2017	44
(2)	Executive Forward Plan - September 2017 Update	52

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 at the Growth Hub, Oxstalls Campus, Longlevens, Gloucester on Thursday 23 February 2017.

Present:

Cllr Joe Harris (Chair)	Cllr Shaun Parsons
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Bruce Hogan
Cllr Paul McMahon	Cllr Roger Wilson
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Kevin Cromwell
Cllr Simon Pickering	

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Tim Harman, (Gloucestershire County Council), Cllr Barry Kirby, (Gloucestershire County Council), Cllr Stephen Hirst, (Cotswold District Council), Cllr Dawn Melvin (Gloucester City Council), Cllr Phil Awford, (Tewkesbury Borough Council), and Cllr Martin Whiteside, (Stroud District Council).

The following members substituted at the meeting; Cllr Roger Wilson, (representing Cllr Harman); Cllr Paul McMahon, (representing Cllr Kirby); Cllr Kate Haigh, (representing Cllr Melvin); Cllr Kevin Cromwell, (representing Cllr Awford).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2016 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record of that meeting.

4. VISION 2050

Jenny Evans, Lead Officer for the Vision 2050 Project, presented an overview of the background and scope of the project, including a summary of current activities and an update on the progress of the Draft Gloucestershire 2050 Vision Document.

Commissioned by Leadership Gloucestershire, GFirst LEP and consultants JBP, the project had involved a number of consultation and engagement activities, including:

- a) A group of ten 'expert' advisors representing economic development; local businesses; social housing; education and skills; design and creativity; environment; communities;

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

- b) Students aged 15 to 18 from secondary schools throughout Gloucestershire;
- c) An 'Economic Experience' group established to consider the needs of an ageing population;
- d) A range of business organisations and business leaders, including representatives from the food and farming sector.

Conceived from discussions highlighting a need to produce a long-term economic development plan for Gloucestershire, a (G2050) Project Steering Group had been established to look at proposals and initiatives to consider where Gloucestershire would like to be positioned in 30 years time and to assess the impact and opportunities that might arise from anticipated major changes during this time. (Please refer to the attached briefing note and slide hand-outs for details of the presentation).

Outlining some of the outcomes of the consultations, the presenting officer referred to some of Gloucestershire's assets as; i) the county's diverse and robust business sector; ii) countryside and landscape; iii) culture and heritage; iv) education; v) safe environment; vi) agricultural status. Included within the list of challenges identified by the consultations were; i) the demands of an ageing population; ii) the lack of young people; iii) areas of significant deprivation; iv) skills gap – including 'hard to fill' jobs; v) housing shortages and vi) shortage of economic development land.

Seeking the committee's views on projects that might be suitable to deliver the aspirations of the 2050 Vision, the presenting officer noted members comments and agreed to feed back to the steering group when submitting the draft document for approval.

Key messages from the discussion included; concerns about the democratic structure for Gloucestershire; the impact and influences of an 'ever-changing world'; the relevancy of issues today in comparison with issues prevalent in 30 years time; advances made by the transport system and the demands created from the need to address the repercussions of an ageing society.

Particular focus was placed on the perceived inadequacies of the current two-tier governance system for Gloucestershire and the idiosyncrasies of the local authority decision making process.

Questioning the role and function of Leadership Gloucestershire as the vehicle for steering the Vision 2050 Project, members upheld reservations expressed at previous meetings about the relationship between the scrutiny committee and the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee.

The outcome of the discussion was a clear consensus to establish improved lines of communication between the two committees and to seek greater awareness of the work of Leadership Gloucestershire. It was suggested both of these aspirations form part of a committee review discussion at the next meeting and to feature significantly in the reporting process of the new committee appointed in May.

The Vision 2050 update was noted. Lead officer, Jennie Evans welcomed the committee's input, and looked forward to engaging with the new committee on how

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

the Vision might be achieved. The committee's comments to be included in an updated version of the G2050 Vision Document, and circulated for public consultation later in the year.

5. CURRENT ISSUES

a) Growth Deal Funding

The Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure updated members on an announcement made by the Government earlier that day, confirming the award of £29.13m funding to the GFirst LEP in the latest round of Growth Deal funding. It was noted that the funding was considerably higher than anticipated in this, the most competitive round of funding to date.

The Commissioning Director confirmed that, in considering the bid, the government had reviewed the county's portfolio, and had chosen to award funding allocations that would enable the Gfirst LEP to deliver the top three prioritised projects included within the submission.

These included;

Longford Housing Project: £4.53 million
Cyber Park Project: £22 million
Forest of Dean Campus Project: £2.6 million

The total allocation at the end of the third round of the Growth Deal submission had now reached £106.6 million.

Expressing disappointment that some of the projects had not received the sought after funding, the Commissioning Director informed members that such projects would remain on the list of funding priorities, and were still considered worthy of funding as future opportunities.

Members welcomed the announcement and requested an overview of the top 10 projects receiving funding.

b) Fastershire Broadband

The Commissioning Director gave an update on the progress of the Fastershire Broadband project.

6. WORK PLAN

Committee members noted items for discussion at future meetings and agreed to review the committee work plan at the next meeting.

Members to review some of the items considered by the committee over the past few years before drawing up a work plan for discussion at the first meeting of the new committee on 21 June 2017.

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

7. FUTURE MEETINGS

15 March 2017 – following on from the Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting
21 June 2017 - following on from the Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting
6 September 2017 - following on from the Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting
19 October 2017 - stand alone scrutiny committee meeting
29 November 2017 - following on from the Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting

All meetings to commence at 1.30 pm

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 3.50 pm

Gloucestershire 2050 Vision Project Progress Update

Project Overview

The Gloucestershire 2050 Vision Project ('G2050') was conceived following a number of developments and discussions that identified the need for an ambitious, innovative, coherent and cohesive long term development plan for Gloucestershire. This is in recognition that whilst excellent progress is already being made in addressing short to medium term economic and social issues, without a longer term view of what Gloucestershire could – and should – become, the existing nature of interventions is largely reactive to current drivers (including local and national political drivers) and both too fragmented and small scale to engender step change.

Although 2050 could be considered an arbitrary date and the impact of progress that far ahead in key areas such as technology is difficult to predict, focussing on a date that is approximately 30 years in the future facilitates the long term investment and progressive planning necessary for truly game changing projects. Significantly greater funding can also be leveraged with a 30yr payback period, enabling the development of transformational projects.

The purpose of the G2050 Vision Project is therefore to step outside of the status quo and current development plans, frameworks and initiatives to consider where Gloucestershire wants to be in 30 years time and to take an unfettered, high level view of the opportunities for major change projects that will help get the County to that place. When it is launched in June, the G2050 Project will provide an ambitious vision for Gloucestershire that will stimulate appropriate development and challenge and inform decision makers at both local and national level.

Project Consultation

The G2050 Vision Project has involved a number of consultation and engagement activities to date:

- A group of ten 'expert' advisers representing key sectors – economic development, businesses, social housing, education and skills, design and creativity, the environment, communities - was established and invited to take part in an initial visioning exercise to arrive at some concepts encompassing the aims, values and determining factors for the strategic vision, as well as to identify some potential projects
- Feedback from the first meeting of the Expert Advisory Group were shared with Leadership Gloucestershire in September, with further discussion facilitated by the Strategic Ambitions workshop led by David Marlow
- Retaining and attracting young people to Gloucestershire has been identified as a central issue. All secondary schools in Gloucestershire were therefore invited to send representatives from their Years 10 -13 (15-18yr olds) to a youth led event held at The Crypt School in November. The success of the event has confirmed the importance of the continued involvement of young people in the G2050 Vision project as it is further developed

- To ensure that the consultation process reflected the predicted demographic profile of Gloucestershire in 2050, an Economic Experience group to consider the needs of an ageing population was also established and consulted
- As the success of Gloucestershire's economy is critical to the overall well being of the County, a range of business organisations and business leaders and representatives of the food and farming sector were invited to contribute their views and ideas
- Presentations/briefings have been or are being given to GFirst LEP sector groups, Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee, Gloucestershire County Council Executive team, and the Leading Places project co-ordinator

Current status

Feedback from the consultation process has been collated and an initial draft of the findings has been shared with the Expert Advisory Group and G2050 Project Steering Group. This includes a summary of Gloucestershire's assets, the challenges the County faces specifically and the wider challenges that are likely to impact nationally and internationally such as climate change. The draft includes the values and aims that have been consistently put forward as important features underpinning the G2050 Vision, such as inclusivity, distinctiveness and cohesion (see Annex 1 for summary of these), and the overarching Vision Statement for Gloucestershire that has been arrived at as a result. The current draft of the Vision Statement is as follows:

"The 2050 Vision for Gloucestershire is of a County that is ambitious for all of its people, an advocate for its environment, and is distinctive, inclusive, connected and vibrant."

A 'long list' of projects identified through the consultation process has also been collated and discussed, and those most likely to generate significant positive impact on the County have been put forward as a potential shortlist for inclusion in the final report.

Next steps

Re-drafting of the G2050 Vision document is currently underway and the revised version will be discussed by the Expert Advisory and Steering Groups in March/April to agree the final report. Conceptual drawings will shortly be commissioned to provide a visual representation of the shortlisted projects and how they fit together to deliver for the future ambitions of the whole County to augment the report. The final G2050 Vision portfolio will be launched publicly in late May/early June. Further detailed scoping work on the projects included will then commence.

Annex 1

Gloucestershire's Assets

- Diverse and robust business sector
- Countryside and landscape
- Culture and heritage
- A safe place
- Good education
- Diverse agriculture

Gloucestershire's Challenges

- Aging population and loss of young people
- Relative productivity
- Areas of significant deprivation
- Skills gap – 'hard to fill' jobs
- Housing shortage
- Shortage of economic development land

Wider/Global Disruptive Factors

- Technological change
- Climate change
- Increased longevity
- Falling birth rate
- Globalisation

Values

- Inclusive
- Distinctive – a USP
- Sustainable
- Connected
- Vibrant
- Creative
- .. and a unified vision

Emerging Projects – still at discussion stage

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held at Shire Hall, Gloucester on Wednesday 15 March 2017

Present:

Cllr Dawn Melvin
Cllr Joe Harris
Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr Tony Hicks
Cllr Shaun Parsons

Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Phil Awford

1. APOLOGIES

Cllr Dawn Melvin (Vice Chair) acted as Chairman at this meeting. Apologies were received from Cllrs Tim Harman and Barry Kirby from Gloucestershire County Council; Cllr Bruce Hogan from the Forest of Dean District Council and Cllr Martin Whiteside from Stroud District Council.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held at the Growth Hub on 23 February 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record of that meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest.

4. CURRENT ISSUES

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

Scrutiny members were invited to comment on the issues considered at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting held earlier that day.

Please refer to the following link to view the agenda and supporting documents for the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting. Hard copies of the agenda for both meetings will be available at the meeting.

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=725&MId=8454&Ver=4>

b) Gloucestershire County Council

Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure for Gloucestershire County Council gave a verbal update on issues likely to require decisions by the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee.

5. TASK GROUP UPDATE

In response to a motion at the Gloucestershire County Council meeting in November 2014, a 'Pub is the Hub' workshop was held at Shire Hall on 6 March 2017. The workshop was attended by District and Parish Councillors from the Cotswold, Stroud and Forest of Dean Districts with an interest in promoting the extended and wider use of licensed premises within their areas to meet the needs of the local community. Pub is the Hub received a positive response to the offer of providing financial assistance and advice. It was suggested Community Engagement Officers from the relevant authorities be invited to participate in future activities.

6. WORK PLAN

At the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee meeting on 23 February 2017, members expressed concerns about the engagement between the Economic Growth Joint Committee, (executive body), and the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee.

Comments were also made about the role of district members in communicating the work of the committee to the districts and in advising the committee of key issues within their areas.

At the committee meeting on 15 March 2017, the following proposals were suggested for the new committee to consider at the first meeting of the committee on 21 June 2017, (post the county council elections on 4 May 2017): -

- i. Review the attached terms of reference and, (subject to the agreement of the new committee), make a recommendation to the Constitution Committee/Full Council to amend the wording of the terms of reference from 'review the decisions of the Gloucester Economic Growth Committee' to 'review the work of the Gloucester Economic Growth Committee'. A course of action to be agreed at the first meeting of the new committee. .
- ii. Reflect on the current arrangements/cycle of meetings. One member proposed a change to the current arrangement of holding scrutiny committee meetings on the same day as the joint committee. It was noted that this arrangement was set to run until 2018. Any changes would be subject to the agreement of the incoming committee and could only be implemented from 2019.
- iii. Promote awareness of the role and purpose of 'Leadership Gloucestershire'. Following the committee meeting on 23 February 2017, a new arrangement

was put in place to publish information for Gloucestershire County Council members, (terms of reference; membership; responsibilities; working arrangements; priorities and links to meeting papers), via the council's weekly 'Members Matter' publication. The committee welcomed the proposal that the information be shared with committee representatives and the Democratic Services Teams from each district, (Democratic Services to share the information with district councillors via local authority newsletters);

- iv. Propose that the Chairman of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee attend the meetings of the Economic Joint Committee to report the views of the committee, based on the information reported to OSMC and GCC meetings. The proposal has since received the approval of the County Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Full Council.
- v. That the update report presented to the County Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Council meetings be circulated to committee (district) members and the Democratic Services Teams at each district;
- vi. That the new committee consider and reinforce the role of district members as 'Ambassadors' to local authorities;
- vii. That two 'stand alone committee meetings' held each year to be held at one of the 6 district council offices, (arranged on a rotational basis), with an invitation to the councillors from that authority to attend the meeting and ask questions on a 'localised' related issue. Lead officers to adapt the committee work plan to include 'localised issues' relevant to the agenda for the district where the meeting is being held.
- viii. Alternatively, invitations could be sent to the members of an individual authority, inviting them to consider a specific item at the meeting. District authorities to be invited to host a scrutiny committee meeting on a rotational basis/provide a written report on district aspirations and priorities/make a 30 minute presentation to the committee. The meeting to be held at the district council offices of the individual authority.
- ix. The committee to avoid the duplication of issues. Where possible, officers to cross reference presentations by inviting the members of other scrutiny committees to meetings where a specific (common interest) issue will be considered.

Items suggested as items for consideration at future meetings, (to be considered as part of a training and review meeting at the induction meeting on 21 June 2017), include : -

- a) National Policy Development – to include a) Government Industrial Strategy (Green paper) b) Housing (White paper) and c) Defra 25 year Environment Framework;

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

- b) Education, Employment and Skills – (Possible presentation from Pete Carr: Lead Commissioner of Skills and Employment at the 6 September 2017 meeting);
- c) Infrastructure and Development
- d) Vision 2050 (Possible 'Leading Gloucestershire' presentation from Mike Dawson (Chief Executive of TBC) and Stephen Marston (Vice Chancellor of the University of Gloucestershire) at the 29 November 2017 meeting.

7. FUTURE MEETINGS

21 June 2017
6 September 2017
19 October 2017
29 November 2017

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 3.06 pm

GLoucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee, held at Shire Hall, Gloucester on Wednesday 21 June 2017.

Present:

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr David Norman MBE (Chairman)
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Jack Williams
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Kevin Stephens
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Jim Dewey

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Bruce Hogan, (Forest of Dean District Council), Martin Whiteside, (Stroud District Council), and Dawn Melvin (Gloucester City Council).

Cllr Jim Dewey deputised for Cllr Whiteside and Cllr Kevin Stephens deputised for Cllr Melvin.

2. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

Newly appointed Chairman, Cllr Dave Norman, welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a short overview of his aspirations for the committee to work towards.

3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Cllr Kevin Cromwell, (Gloucestershire County Council), and Cllr Dawn Melvin (Gloucester City Council), received nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman of the Committee. On being put to a vote, Cllr Cromwell was appointed Vice Chairman.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Gillian Parkinson, Head of Legal Services at Gloucestershire County Council, advised the committee on the governance arrangements for the committee, including member's declaration of interests.

Members were reminded that some of the issues considered by the committee could impact on matters affecting district and borough councils and to be mindful of making declarations of interest that allowed them to be open-minded when making decisions at local authorities. The information was noted.

It was suggested officers from Gloucestershire County Council contact local authorities to obtain copies of member's declaration of interest forms as an annual arrangement and this was agreed. **Action by – Jo Moore**

5. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2017 were agreed and signed as an accurate record of that meeting.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members considered the committee terms of reference as agreed by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) on 25 June 2014 and endorsed by the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee in October 2014, where the committee had;

RESOLVED to:

- 1) *Review the decisions of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee, and*
- 2) *Review the overall impact and delivery outcomes of the Gloucestershire Strategic Economic Plan, and make recommendations to the Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Community Interest Company, (GFirst) and Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee on issues and improvements.*

Further to consideration of recommendations put forward by the former committee, and with the agreement of members at this meeting, it was suggested the committee review its terms of reference and submit a report to the GCC Constitution Committee, based on the following proposals:

- a) The committee to consider amending statement a) of the terms of reference, and the requirement 'to review the decisions of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee'.
- b) The statement to be amended to give the committee a wider scope by 'reviewing the economic plans and policies of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee',

It was also proposed that:

- c) A request be put to the members of the Joint Committee that the Chairman, (or Vice Chairman), of the scrutiny committee be invited to comment on the views and work of the committee at joint committee meetings. A request to be made at the joint committee meeting on 6 September 2017.
- d) The minutes of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee meetings to be circulated with the agenda of the Joint Committee.

Members reflected on the current reporting arrangements for the committee, whereby officers from GFirst LEP and GCC present reports at both the Joint Committee meeting, (on the morning of the Scrutiny Committee), and at the Scrutiny Committee later the same day.

Expressing concern about the possible duplication of information, and the timing of reports, some members sought to review the current arrangement, whilst others agreed that the arrangement worked well and was flexible enough not to hinder the work of the scrutiny committee.

After a full and detailed discussion, the committee resolved to continue to consider information presented to the joint committee, (under the current arrangement of the scrutiny committee meeting being held on the same day as the joint committee), supplemented by a report to the GCC Constitution Committee, outlining the scrutiny committee's proposals on how the committee might add more value when scrutinising Economic Growth and Development in Gloucestershire.

The committee welcomed the proposal that the Chairman of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee be invited to present the minutes of the scrutiny committee meetings at future joint committee meetings.

Actions by – Jo Moore

7. ECONOMIC VISION AND AMBITIONS

a) Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership (GFirst LEP)

David Owen, Chief Executive of the Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership, (GFirst LEP), presented information on: -

- i. The role of the GFirst LEP
- ii. Economic Growth Framework for Gloucestershire
- iii. Gloucestershire Growth Deal
- iv. Gloucestershire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP)

Prior to the meeting, the committee had been advised to consider background information published on the council website at the links below: -

Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire
http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=168

Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire (Business Case)
http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=169

Building on Success – Gloucestershire Growth Deal 3
http://www.gfirstlep.com/doc_get.aspx?DocID=380

The Chief Executive confirmed that the GFirst LEP was one of 38 Local Enterprise Partnerships responsible for commissioning positive economic growth and development in the UK. Clarifying the links with Gloucestershire County Council, (as the 'accountable body'), the Chief Executive advised that the release of capital monies from Central Government via the Gloucestershire Growth Deal was

overseen by the County Council based on decisions made by the GFirst LEP Board.

Circulating copies of the GFirst LEP Annual Report 2017, the Chief Executive gave an update on the Government's Growth Deal Programme and provided details of the award of £29.13m awarded in the latest round of Growth Deal Project funding.

The Chief Executive confirmed that, in considering the recent bid, the government had reviewed the county portfolio, and had chosen to award funding allocations intended to enable the LEP deliver the top three priority projects for Gloucestershire.

The successful bids included;

- Longford Housing Project, Gloucester - £4.53 million
- Cyber Business Park Project, Cheltenham - £22 million
- Forest of Dean Campus Project, Cinderford - £2.6 million

It was noted that the total allocation at the end of the third round of the Growth Deal submission had reached £106.6 million.

Responding to concerns that some of the projects included in the submission had not received the sought after funding, the Chief Executive informed members that the unsuccessful bids would remain on the list of funding priorities as worthy investment opportunities.

Responding to questions, the Chief Executive acknowledged the significance of challenges to the economic viability of Gloucestershire brought about an ageing population. He advised that this was a particular concern for the county, with every age band in Gloucestershire currently above the national average.

Key considerations highlighted by the discussion included, concerns about housing development and a shortage of employment land in Gloucestershire. Responding to the areas identified by the previous committee as priority considerations, members spoke in support of the need to create more employment and skills in Gloucestershire and to make the county an attractive location in which to work, live and visit.

b) Employment and Skills Update

The committee considered a report from Pete Carr: Lead Commissioner: Skills and Employment, on the role and work of the Gloucestershire Employment and Skills Board and the progress to date of European Social Fund (ESF) Skills and Employability Projects for Gloucestershire. The committee noted the report and welcomed the suggestion that the Lead Commissioner present a more detailed update at a future meeting.

The Lead Commissioner has since confirmed he would be inviting representatives from 2 of the ESF (European Social Fund) Funded Projects to present to the

Scrutiny Committee at the committee meeting on 29 November 2017, followed by an opportunity for members to ask questions on each of the projects.

The Lead Commissioner to update members on the progress of the Gloucestershire Employment and Skills Board at the meeting.

Actions by – Pete Carr (Lead Commissioner: Skills and Employment)

c) Gloucestershire Joint Economic Growth Joint Committee

Nigel Riglar, Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure, (GCC), gave an update on current issues, including a review of the economic growth agenda for Gloucestershire.

Members considered a report presented to the Economic Growth Joint Committee earlier that day, including information on the Growth Policy for Gloucestershire; an update on the mechanisms for delivering growth in the county, and the potential for local growth opportunities.

Included within the update was an overview of the government policies that have, or could have, a bearing on Gloucestershire's growth ambitions, plus a summary of key developments that have impacted on the progress of economic growth, both at a national and local level. These included; the formal triggering of the Brexit process; the recent development of the government's industrial strategy, (the government green paper published earlier in the year), and the government's approach to devolution, (this issue is currently on hold).

Expanding on the discussion held at the Joint Committee meeting earlier that day, the Commissioning Director confirmed that the committee had identified the following issues as key areas to consider when producing the joint committee agenda: housing development; the need to coordinate the various plans and policies in existence; and the need to establish a common evidence base from which to record information data. The scrutiny committee acknowledged the areas that had been identified and hoped that the role of the scrutiny committee would assist in adding value to the aspirations for economic growth within Gloucestershire.

The issues suggested as issues to add to the committee work plan included; i) seeking clarification on the geographical context of the 'South West of England', (in terms of Gloucestershire's 'economic and characteristic' compatibility within the region); ii) the progress of improvements to the rail network infrastructure for Gloucestershire; iii) Fastershire, in terms of 'what happens next', post 2019; iv) the case for creating a Growth Hub in Cheltenham; and v) skills and education.

The report was noted.

8. WORK PLAN

Members reviewed the work of the previous committee, (2016-17), including proposals suggested as possible items to consider at future meetings.

It was noted that, at the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee meeting on 23 February 2017, the committee had expressed concerns about the lines of engagement between the scrutiny committee and the Economic Growth Joint Committee.

Comments had also been made about the role of district/borough members in communicating the work of the scrutiny committee to the respective local authorities and in advising the scrutiny committee of local aspirations and priorities.

At the committee meeting on 15 March 2017, the following considerations were suggested as proposals for the incoming committee to consider at this, the initial meeting of the committee, post the County Council election on 4 May 2017.

Details of the responses below provide an overview of the outcomes of the proposals:-

- 1) Review the committee terms of reference and, (subject to the agreement of the new committee), consider making a recommendation to the Constitution Committee to amend the wording of the terms of reference.

Committee response: A form of words to be considered at the scrutiny committee meeting on 6 September 2017, followed by submission of a short report to the GCC Constitution Committee meeting on 9 October 2017, seeking to revise the terms of reference.

- 2) Review the current arrangement of holding joint committee and scrutiny committee meetings on the same day. (It was noted that the arrangement was set to run until 2018). Any changes would be subject to the support of the incoming committee and only implemented from 2019.

Committee response: The committee agreed to continue with the current arrangement, pending a review at the end of the 2017/18 cycle of meetings in March 2017.

- 3) Promote awareness of the role and purpose of 'Leadership Gloucestershire'. Acknowledging the merits of the proposal, it was suggested an arrangement be introduced to publish information relating to the terms of reference; membership; responsibilities; working arrangements; priorities and links to meeting papers for Leadership Gloucestershire via the GCC weekly 'Members Matter' publication. (This action has been implemented).

Committee response: The committee welcomed the proposal, including the proposal that the information be shared with committee representatives and democratic services teams from the district and borough councils, (if required, the respective democratic services teams to share links to the information with district/borough councillors via local authority newsletters).

- 4) Propose that the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee attend meetings of the Economic Joint Committee. The Chairman, (or Vice Chairman), to report on the work of the scrutiny

committee and present an overview of the information presented to the GCC Overview Scrutiny Management Committee and Full Council meetings.

Committee response: The Chairman of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Dave Norman, to put the proposal to the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting on 6 September 2017. With the agreement of the joint committee, a standing item to be included on the agenda of all future meetings and the minutes of the scrutiny committee meetings circulated with the agenda.

- 5) The scrutiny committee report presented to the GCC Overview Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) and Full Council meetings be circulated to committee representatives and democratic services teams at district/borough councils, (this proposal received the support of the GCC Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Full Council prior to the County election in May 2017).

Committee response: The committee supported the proposal.

- 6) That the new committee seek to cultivate the role of district/borough members as 'Ambassadors' to their local authorities.

Committee response: The committee supported the proposal.

- 7) That the two 'stand alone committee meetings' held each year be held at one of the 6 district council offices, (arranged on a rotational basis), with an invitation to councillors from that authority to attend the meeting and present questions on a 'localised' related issue. Lead officers to be invited to attend the meeting to consider issues and priorities relevant to the economic agenda for the district/borough where the meeting is being held.

Committee response: The committee supported the proposal.

The Chairman sought nominations for where the committee meeting on 19 October 2017 might be held and it was agreed Cotswold District Council would host the meeting. A one page strategy to be completed by Cotswold District Council in advance of the meeting. Since the meeting, a local member has requested that a local priority area be put forward as a discussion item at the meeting involve an update on Mobile Phone Coverage in Rural Areas.

- 8) To avoid the possible duplication of presentations on related issues, lead officers to cross reference presentations at scrutiny committee meetings by inviting members from other committees, (namely the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee), to attend meetings where a specific/related issue will be considered.

Committee response: The committee supported the proposal

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

- 9) Items suggested as possible items for consideration at future meetings, (proposed by the former committee (2016/17), included: -
- i. National Policy Development (including industrial strategy)
 - ii. Education, Employment and Skills (including Growth Deal Projects)
 - iii. Infrastructure and Density
 - iv. Promoting Gloucestershire

Committee response: The committee endorsed the suggestions (above), and agreed to add to the following additional items to form the committee work plan 2017/18:

- v. Housing (incorporating a review of potential changes to the Joint Core Strategy)
- vi. Vision 2050 (to incorporate issues relating to Promoting Gloucestershire as a desirable location to live, work and visit).
- vii. Transportation Links

9. FUTURE MEETINGS

Meeting dates (2017)

6 September 2017
19 October 2017* (Cotswold District Council to host the meeting)
29 November 2017

Meeting dates (2018)

22 February 2018* (meeting to be held at District/Borough Council)
14 March 2018
20 June 2018
5 September 2018
31 October 2018* (meeting to be held at District/Borough Council)
21 November 2018

All meetings commence at 1.30 pm

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 3.50 pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 7 March 2017 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

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

Substitutes: Cllr Alan Preest (In place of Cllr Phil Awford)

Apologies: Cllr Doina Cornell, Cllr Steve Harvey and Cllr Helen Molyneux

Also in attendance

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Felicity Taylor Drewe – Associate Director of Commissioning
Gill Bridgland – Commissioning Implementation Manager

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki – Chair

South Western Ambulance NHS Foundation Trust

Neil le Chevalier – Director of Operations

Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd

Ed Potter – Managing Director
Paul Willetts - Head of Patient Transport Services South
Philip Hennessey – Communications and Engagement Manager
Alex Sanderson – Locality Manager, Gloucestershire

2gether NHS Foundation Trust

Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust

Ingrid Barker – Chair
Glyn Howells – Director of Finance and Deputy Chief Executive
Rod Brown – Head of Planning, Compliance and Partnerships

Gloucestershire County Council

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

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

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Alan Thomas – Acting Chair

Barbara Piranty – Chief Executive

76. 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.

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

77. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

77.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 15 December 2016, and Tuesday 10 January 2017 were agreed as correct records of those meetings and signed by the Chairman.

77.2 Cleeve Link Update

77.2.1 In light of the closure, last week, of Cleeve Link, one of the council's home care providers, the Chairman asked the Commissioning Director Adult Social Care to update the meeting on the current position.

77.2.2 The Director informed the committee that thanks to the goodwill, and commitment, of the Cleeve Link staff, there was a continuation of care to customers following the closure. This was particularly impressive given that many of these staff members had not received payment for some weeks. Over the weekend the council had supported these staff by providing free petrol/diesel (via the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service) and food; and had subsequently arranged for advances to those people who have not been paid.

77.2.3 Members were pleased to note that officers were working, with other providers, to ensure that these vulnerable people continued to receive their care in the long term; and that the council was also supporting self-funders through this process.

77.2.4 There were questions as to whether the council should have been aware of this position earlier and also why did the council not know. The committee was assured that due diligence had been undertaken at the time of the contract being awarded to Cleeve Link. The original owner had sold the business to Primus Medical last year, and following a restructure Primus then decided to sell this part of the business this year. It was sold to a third party on 16 February 2017. The council had been informed that this sale would go alongside a capital injection, but this ultimately did not happen. The committee was reminded that it was the CQC's decision as to the registration of a business; and it was the responsibility of the owner to inform the CQC of their decision to enter into voluntary liquidation.

77.2.5 The committee agreed that, whilst this was an unfortunate situation, it was good to see that all partners across the health and social care landscape in Gloucestershire had come together to ensure that these vulnerable people were safe and supported. The committee would revisit this issue in the new council.

78. GLOUCESTERSHIRE HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST FINANCIAL POSITION - UPDATE

78.1 The committee was pleased to welcome the Chief Executive and Chair of GHNHSFT to the meeting. The Chief Executive apologised that she was not able to present the findings of

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

the financial governance review at this meeting as originally planned. Whilst the committee was frustrated with the delay, members acknowledged that the cause was not of the Trust's making. The report would not now be able to be received by the committee until the new council.

- 78.2 The committee engaged in a robust and detailed discussion of the Trust's current financial position and the recovery plan. The Trust planned to return to a breakeven financial position at the end of March 2019. The committee was, of course, concerned as to the potential impact of the Trust's financial situation on services. The committee was reminded that in the NHS the funding followed the patient and therefore there was no incentive for the Trust to stop providing services. However that was not to say that the Trust would not be looking for opportunities to do things differently/better; and the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) reminded the committee that the direction of travel described in the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) (self-care, prevention) would affect some services, but emphasised that this was about ensuring the best level of care for the people of Gloucestershire, within the current funding climate.
- 78.3 The committee commented that a significant factor in achieving the recovery plan was the engagement and willingness of staff to buy in to this process. It was felt that previously there had been some challenges with regard to the working culture at the Trust, and that this would need to be addressed. The Chair of the Trust informed the committee that there needed to be a culture of openness, and that this needed to start at the top of the organisation. He felt that the level of challenge at Board meetings between the Trust's Non-Executive Directors and the Directors demonstrated that the culture change was already in progress.
- 78.4 In response to a question it was clarified that the 'must do' actions identified in the CQC Inspection Report (June 2015) have all been delivered, bar two which were ongoing. A follow up inspection by the CQC has recently been undertaken and the report was expected to be published in April/May 2017. This activity was separate to the actions in the recovery plan. This was also the case for any service changes that might come through the STP; these would be distinct from the recovery plan.
- 79. SOUTH WESTERN AMBULANCE NHS FOUNDATION TRUST - UPDATE ON THE AMBULANCE RESPONSE PROGRAMME**
- 79.1 The committee was pleased to welcome the SWASFT Director of Operations to the meeting. The Director gave a presentation updating the committee on the Ambulance Response Programme (ARP), staff rota changes and the re-profiling of vehicles in Gloucestershire (for information the presentation slides were uploaded to the council website and included in the minute book).
- 79.2 The committee was informed that the additional time available under the ARP to triage calls has meant better identification of which calls required an 8 minute response, and the despatch of the clinically appropriate vehicle rather than the nearest. Sheffield University has undertaken a review of the ARP and the final report was in the process of being prepared. It was important to note that if the ARP report was to recommend a permanent change to the target framework, and this was approved by the Secretary of State for Health, this would require Parliamentary approval.
- 79.3 The committee was informed that SWASFT has been consulting staff on changes to the working rota. The consultation in the North Division (which included Gloucestershire) was complete and the changes would be implemented in April 2017. The changes were to ensure that there were the right number of staff on at the right time and in the right place, to

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

better manage peak demands. Alongside this there was a re-profiling of vehicles in Gloucestershire. This would mean that there would be 16 more double crewed ambulances (DCAs) in Gloucestershire with a reduction in the number of rapid response vehicles. This re-profiling has been undertaken to better meet demand. SWASFT continued to work with the GCCG on demand management.

- 79.4 Committee members agreed that the role of the Community First Responder (CFR) was an important factor in the delivery of emergency response times, and it was important to ensure that they remained engaged with service. Members were pleased to note that, in Devon, SWASFT was piloting using CFRs to respond to calls relating to falls. If the evaluation of this pilot was positive members would wish to know if SWASFT would be implementing this across the region. Members were also interested to note that SWASFT continued to work with the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS) to identify other areas where the GFRS could support SWASFT.
- 79.5 In response to a question it was explained that SWASFT did collect data on how many times CFRs responded to calls. It was agreed that this information would be shared with committee members.
ACTION: Neil le Chevalier
- 79.6 It was explained that the increase in the number of double crewed ambulances (DCA), particularly in the rural areas, meant that patients would be taken to hospital more quickly as they would negate the need to wait for another vehicle, as happens when a rapid response vehicle (RRV) was the initial call out vehicle.
- 79.7 In response to questions it was explained that at present SWASFT was performing well in Gloucestershire on category 1 calls. However SWASFT was not performing well with regard to transporting low acuity patients (eg. GP referrals) to hospital.
- 79.8 Members questioned whether the situation with the transfer of calls from NHS111 had improved. The Director explained that SWASFT maintained a close working relationship with CareUK and had seen a reduction in the number of 999 calls transferred.
- 79.10 The Director informed the committee that the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group would be taking over from Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) as Lead Commissioner for SWASFT from 1 April 2017. The Director of Operations expressed his thanks to the GCCG, in particular Felicity Taylor-Drewe, Associate Director of Commissioning, and the senior team at the CCG.
- 79.11 Going forward, members agreed that it would be important that the committee continued to monitor performance against targets to ascertain whether the rota changes and the re-profiling of vehicles were delivering the expected outcomes.
- 80. NON EMERGENCY PATIENT TRANSPORT SERVICE - UPDATE**
- 80.1 The committee was joined by the Managing Director, Head of Patient Transport Services South, Locality Manager Gloucestershire, and Communications and Engagement Manager from Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd (ATSL) the provider of the Non Emergency Transport Service.
- 80.2 Committee members were aware that performance against targets continued to present a mixed picture. However this position was reflected across the country which suggested that some of the problems were systemic rather than local or specific to any particular provider.

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

It was important to note that nationally providers were leaving this market; and that the service was funded on a very tight margin.

80.3 The committee was reminded that ATSL have been subject to an unannounced inspection by the CQC. The Managing Director informed members that ATSL welcomed the inspection and were pleased with the outcome. An action plan was in place to take forward the recommendations from the inspection.

80.4 The briefing provided to committee members identified the significant challenges to the service. Members were disappointed to note that a significant number of aborted journeys resulted from patients cancelling their hospital appointment but not their transport, or making their own way to the hospital but again not cancelling their transport. The committee was informed that a text reminder service was being introduced this month and it was hoped that this would help to reduce these wasted journeys. It was agreed that better communication with patients was needed to ensure that they understood the importance of cancelling their transport if it was not required. ATSL also intended to hold a workshop with the GHNHSFT and this would include the impact of aborted journeys on the system. Members hoped that this activity would have a positive impact; but did feel that it would be more productive if the system was more joined up.

80.5 Members remained concerned with regard to the performance data; and also discussed how the hospital discharge process could impact on this service.

80.6 The committee would continue to monitor progress.

81. HEALTHWATCH GLOUCESTERSHIRE Q3 2016-17 PATIENT FEEDBACK

81.1 The committee noted the report.

81.2 The committee was aware that that as of 1 April 2017 a new organisation would be providing the Healthwatch service in Gloucestershire. The Chairman thanked the current provider for the work undertaken over the last 4 years to support the people of Gloucestershire, and for the informative reports to this committee.

82. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SERVICES REPORT

The committee noted the report.

83. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

83.1 The committee applauded the ambition for Gloucestershire to become the most physically active county in the country; and members gave their support to the Gloucestershire Moves project.

83.2 Cllr Roger Wilson declared a personal interest as a county council appointed member of the Cotswold AONB Conservation Board. He informed the committee that the AONB has been trying to become involved with 'health walks' but as yet has not had any success. The Director of Public Health agreed that she would feed this back to the appropriate body.

84. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

84.1 The Accountable Officer informed the committee that the GCCG was in the process of writing the STP Engagement Outcome Report; the GCCG had received good feedback from members of the public.

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

- 84.2 A member referred to a survey of NHS Commissioners with regard to STPs which indicated that 52% of STP areas were planning to downgrade A & E provision; the detail of Gloucestershire's STP was still not clear. The member asked the Accountable Officer to comment. The Accountable Officer informed the committee that she was not aware of this survey, and could not comment on this data as she did not know its provenance. She assured the committee that any significant service changes would be formally consulted on as they were identified.
- 84.3 In response to a question with regard to the tender for the provision of community connectors (VCAs and Social Prescribing) the Accountable Officer informed the committee that specification was close to completion and would be going out to tender soon.
- 84.4 The Chairman congratulated the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust on achieving Leader status under the government's 'Disability Confident' employer scheme.
- 84.5 The Chairman also congratulated the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust on being rated as one of the top two mental health trusts in the country, based on service users ratings in the National Community Mental Health Patient Survey (Adults) 2016.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.52 pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 6 June 2017 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Doina Cornell	Cllr Steve Harvey
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin (Chairman)
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Rachel Smith
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Robert Vines

Substitutes: Cllr Stephen Andrews (In place of Cllr Jim Parsons)

Apologies: Cllr Helen Molyneux, Cllr Jim Parsons and Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Dr Hein le Roux – Deputy Clinical Chair
Caroline Smith - Senior Manager Engagement and Inclusion

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

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

Gloucestershire County Council

Margaret Willcox – Director of Adult Social Services
Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health
Mark Branton – Deputy Director Adult Social Care
Cllr Roger Wilson – Cabinet Member Vulnerable Adults and Commissioning
Cllr Tim Harman – Public Health and Communities

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Chris Graves – Chair

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust

Katie Norton – Chief Executive

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Stephen Hirst declared a personal interest as a Trustee of Tetbury Hospital.

Cllr Stephen Andrews declared a personal interest as a Community First Responder with the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7 March 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

The committee chose not to elect a Vice Chairperson at this juncture, but that it would reconsider this option at a later date in the committee's meeting calendar.

4. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE: TRANSFORMING CARE, TRANSFORMING COMMUNITIES (SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PLAN (STP))

- 4.1 As this was the first meeting of the committee in the new council it was important to give members an understanding of the landscape of health and adult social care in Gloucestershire. The STP, which sets out the direction of travel for health and social care in the county, was therefore best placed to inform members on the context and direction of travel for health and care services in the county. The Gloucestershire STP Lead gave a detailed presentation and the presentation slides were uploaded to the council's website for information.
- 4.2 The presentation described the challenges facing services, which included the projected, significant, increase in the number of people over 65 living with long term conditions, and the projected increase (20%) in the 75 to 84 age group by 2021. Gloucestershire has both an urban and rural landscape and the STP recognised that one size did not fit all, that it was important to fully understand the needs of the local community, and were therefore taking a *place based* approach to health care.
- 4.3 The presentation highlighted the significant amount of work in progress to deliver the STP and the many positive health outcomes already being achieved. The detail of the work was being driven forward by a series of system enablers (e.g. workforce development, primary care and estates strategies) with leadership from across the wider health and local authority partnership. The committee was informed that there has been a strong improvement in partnership working across health and social care in Gloucestershire.
- 4.4 Some members were frustrated by what they felt was a lack of necessary detail in the STP to help members of the public understand what this meant for them. The committee was assured that as soon as any proposal for change was ready to go out for consultation the committee, as a statutory consultee, would be consulted.
- 4.5 There was also a concern that the models of care going forward could impact on the number of beds available in the county. It was explained that the focus continued to be on providing more care in a community setting, which reflected the changing nature of healthcare. Patient safety and levels of need were also key considerations. Changes in bed numbers were not a main focus of the STP.
- 4.6 In response to a question it was explained that commissioners had invested more money into Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) and expected that more would be invested in 2018. It was commented that commissioners had invested in mental health at a higher level than the national funding received from the Department of Health.
- 4.7 The meeting was informed, by a committee member, that she had been informed that there had been occasions when the Vale Hospital Minor Injuries and Illness Unit (MIIU) in Dursley had been temporarily closed and that people had instead been directed to Stroud General Hospital. She hoped that should any proposals come forward relating to MIIUs that these temporary closures were not used as evidence that the Vale MIIU was not used. The committee requested more information on these temporary closures.

ACTION: Candace Plouffe

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

- 4.8 Committee members were aware that workforce development was a specific system enabler within the STP but were very concerned with regard to the resilience of primary care given the known workforce challenges. The STP Lead, GCCG, assured the committee that STP partners were working hard on this issue.

5. ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 5.1 The Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) explained that the number of people with a learning disability in employment was at its highest; however the way this indicator was now measured did not reflect this position. A full explanation was in the report.

- 5.2 The committee was pleased to note the increase in the number of people receiving direct payments, but did ask for some clarity with regard to the process, as there was a concern that some people were having their direct payments withdrawn. The DASS explained that the council had established a dedicated team to encourage people to receive direct payments and facilitate the process. In evaluating this process it had been identified that some people were not using direct payments effectively and that receiving a service in a different way might be the better option for some individuals.

- 5.3 The Director of Public Health (DPH) highlighted that the number of adults receiving 'alcohol brief interventions' indicator was underperforming. The service had previously been achieving target and it was felt that this dip related to the change in provider at the beginning of this year. The DPH expected performance to improve during the first two quarters of 2017/18. The DPH also informed members that the council would be changing how it commissioned NHS Health Checks next year such that those people at most risk would be targeted.

- 5.4 With regard to drug and alcohol support, there was concern as to access to this service in the Cotswolds; and how young people were supported. The DPH agreed to provide information on these matters outside the meeting.

ACTION: Sarah Scott

6. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 6.1 The Accountable Officer, GCCG, informed the committee there was a new CCG Improvement and Assessment Framework in place. There were six clinical priority areas within this framework and the GCCG's current assessment was that Cancer, Learning Disabilities and Mental Health need improvement, and Dementia, Diabetes and Maternity were performing well.

- 6.2 The committee welcomed the commitment to the work relating to dementia. The Deputy Clinical Chair, GCCG, informed the committee that historically there had been a lot of stigma attached to dementia and that a lot of work has been undertaken on a national level to address this issue. It was important to note that a lot could be done to improve the quality of, if not the length, of life of a dementia sufferer. The committee was pleased to note that Gloucester City Council had agreed to become a dementia friendly city, and that organisations such as the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service have been trained in dementia awareness.

- 6.3 The committee noted that the GCCG and GCC would be tendering for a contract for a community connector service which built on the learning from the village agents service and social prescribing.

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

7. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

The committee noted the report.

8. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH ANNUAL REPORT

The committee was pleased to receive this report which outlined how the public grant was spent and information on the health and wellbeing of the residents of Gloucestershire. The report also uses case studies which were particularly helpful in demonstrating how effective interventions have been, in effect, the difference they have made to individual lives. The case study relating to a referral to Slimming World for a diabetes sufferer showed the real change that could be effected by enabling and supporting an individual to take control of their condition (where appropriate); the individual was now free of diabetes.

**9. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP
CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT**

9.1 The committee congratulated Consultant Nurse Ian Ingledew for being awarded Oncology Nurse of the Year at the British Journal of Nursing (BJN) awards recently.

9.2 The committee was pleased to note that the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) had not been affected by the recent cyber security attack. Members were informed that GHNHSFT has reviewed all processes following the attack, and has heightened the focus in this area. It was also important that as some systems were shared that all partners were robust in this area.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.15 pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 11 July 2017 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Doina Cornell	Cllr Steve Harvey
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Eva Ward

Substitutes: Cllr Stephen Andrews (In place of Cllr Jim Parsons)
Cllr Suzanne Williams (In place of Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE)

Apologies: Cllr Helen Molyneux

Others in attendance

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)
Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Dr Andy Seymour – Deputy Clinical Chair

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)
Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Dr Sally Pearson – Director of Clinical Strategy

Gloucestershire County Council
Margaret Willcox – Director of Adult Social Services
Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health
Cllr Kathy Williams – Cabinet Member Adult Social Care
Cllr Roger Wilson – Cabinet Member Vulnerable Adults and Commissioning
Cllr Tim Harman – Public Health and Communities

Healthwatch Gloucestershire
Chris Graves – Chair

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust
Katie Norton – Chief Executive
Ingrid Barker – Chair

2Gether NHS Foundation Trust
Ruth FitzJohn – Chair
Shaun Clee – Chief Executive
Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Stephen Hirst declared a personal interest as a Trustee of Tetbury Hospital.

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

Cllr Stephen Andrews declared a personal interest as a Community First Responder with the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust.

11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 6 JUNE 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 6 June 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

It was agreed that the committee would consider how to structure an item looking at a joined up approach at the point of delivery at its next work planning meeting.

12. STP ENGAGEMENT REPORT

12.1 The Associate Director, Engagement and Experience, presented the outcomes of the 12 week engagement exercise on the STP (November 2016 to February 2017), this included both quantitative and qualitative information. (For information - the presentation slides are available on the council website.)

12.2 The Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) had wanted to test whether there was still support for the objectives of the Joining Up Your Care objectives. The message back from the general public included approval of a focus on prevention and self-care, difficulties in navigating a complex system, importance of treating the whole person, and better use of technology. It was noted that for the first time a significant amount of feedback related to the physical environment.

12.3 The STP Lead informed the committee that service change proposals were now being worked through the NHS England (NHSE) Assurance process. It was emphasised that any proposal coming through the STP would be driven by clinicians, and would receive robust challenge through the South West Clinical Senate. (Post meeting note: Clinical Senates came about through the Health and Social Care Act 2012 and were established to be a source of independent, strategic advice and guidance to commissioners and other stakeholders to assist them to make the best decisions about healthcare for the populations they represent.) Once through the NHSE Assurance process significant/substantial variation service change proposals would be received by this committee as a statutory consultee.

12.4 Some members felt that the number of responses (638 completed surveys) was relatively small, and suggested that this related to the lack of detail in the STP. It was acknowledged that it was expected that there would be a significant increase in responses once the proposals for change were put out to consultation. It was hoped that the consultation process would begin later this year. It was further acknowledged that in a rural county it was always a challenge to ensure that a wide range of stakeholders were engaged, but the GCCG were of the view that the engagement activity did cut across all parts of the county, was not just focused on Cheltenham and Gloucester, and were developing a 'consultation road map'.

12.5 Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that any consultation/engagement was meaningful to the general public. Some members informed the committee that many of their constituents had felt that the engagement on the Minor Injuries and Illness Units (MIUs) had been a 'fait accompli', and that it was important that going forward people did feel that they had a voice.

12.6 In response to a question it was explained that the GCCG did regularly engage with Patient Participation Groups (PPGs), and had an active PPG network.

- 12.7 Committee members questioned the potential impact of urgent care centres (UCCs) on MIUs. It was explained that the proposal relating to UCCs was still being worked through and that the GCCG and Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust remained committed to the MIUs in the interim. The STP Lead added that the model of care for the UCCs was being developed to maximise clinical effectiveness and improve synergy with the Out of Hours Service, to provide the best outcomes for patients.
- 12.8 The STP Lead reiterated that the focus was on ensuring that people have the right solution in the right place, with access to the best clinical advice.
- 12.9 The Chairman stated that when the consultation proposals were known it would be important for members to encourage members of the public to engage with the consultation process.
- 13. CLEEVE LINK - THE LESSONS LEARNT**
- 13.1 The committee engaged in a detailed debate on this matter with the Director of Adult Social Services (DASS). Members agreed that the way in which members of staff and Cleeve Link carers had responded to this situation was to be commended, particularly the carers who had gone into work despite no longer being employed by the organisation.
- 13.2 The report described in detail the lessons learnt; despite this detail there remained a shared view and concern that signs had been missed. In response to questions members were assured that the Commercial Services team did have the necessary level of expertise in procurement and contract management, that the Finance Teams also had the necessary skill base and that if the situation required it additional expertise would be brought in.
- 13.3 In response to a question it was explained that the funding attached to contracts was sufficient to enable providers to pay the living wage; and that the contract specified that the council would wish to check that staff were being paid the living wage.
- 13.4 Members agreed that the best way in which to get underneath the CQC registration issues would be to discuss these with the CQC at the planned CQC workshop. The committee suggested that an LGA peer into this area of work review may be beneficial. However the committee was informed that a peer review was planned for 2018 and this suggestion would be taken forward when deciding the area to be covered by the peer review.
- 13.5 There was deep concern that the council was not aware of how unmanageable staff rotas were until the collapse of the company. This was a significant learning point for the council, and how to take this aspect forward in future contracts was important. However, it was explained that, due to the volume of complaints received, the council had been working closely with Cleeve Link and had managed to significantly improve this position when the company went into liquidation.
- 13.6 It was questioned how much this situation had cost the council? In response it was explained that it had been cost neutral as the council had not had to pay Cleeve Link. It was also questioned whether it would be more practicable to bring domiciliary care back in-house. It was explained that the council has not had an in-house service (apart from reablement) for many years, and that the national model was predominantly that of external provision. The volume of the domiciliary care market was such that it was important to have a mixed economy of provision; and that there was no national evidence to say that in-house provision was better or safer.

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

- 13.7 New performance boards have been established to facilitate greater understanding and challenge on performance in this area, and a senior officer was overseeing this work. The committee will be holding a performance workshop in the Autumn (once the new datasets were in place for adult social care) and would follow through on this matter at that time. The committee has already indicated that it wished to receive a full report on progress against the learning points identified later this year.
- 13.8 It was emphasised that given that the council had been working closely with Cleeve Link and had managed to improve the position at the company that they would choose to go into liquidation without consulting the council. It was felt that this was related to the new owner/major shareholder.
- 13.9 It was commented the new owner's website was clear that they were financiers and their purpose was to be profitable. It was further commented that it would be preferable if part of the takeover process required that companies had to explain the new model of care that they would be bringing forward. It was questioned whether it would be helpful to write to the Secretary of State for Health on this matter. It was agreed that in the first instance advice would be sought from the Commercial Services Team.
ACTION: Andrea Clarke
- 13.10 The committee agreed that it would follow up on this matter at a future meeting.

14. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

- 14.1 The committee noted that the CQC (follow up) Inspection of Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) had taken place and the committee would consider this inspection report in its CQC workshop. The CQC Inspection report had stated that there was no designated room for mental health practitioners to conduct mental health assessments within the emergency department at Cheltenham General Hospital (CGH), and it was questioned as to how the GHNHSFT intended to respond to this issue. The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, informed the committee that the proportion of people who presented and needed this support was limited but that this did not mean that they should not receive care in a safe place. The GHNHSFT was currently bidding for capital funding to develop a secure area at CGH. In the meantime the GHNHSFT was looking at how it could better use the area in the emergency department.
- 14.2 It was questioned whether an Urgent Care Centre at CGH would be located at CGH. The STP Lead explained that the service proposal was still in development, had not been out to consultation and therefore she could not comment.
- 14.3 Members remained concerned with regard to the situation with the Minor Injury and Illness Units in the Stroud area. A briefing on this matter had been shared with committee members, and a significant issue was workforce resilience. It was important that the committee continued to monitor this issue, particularly as the proposals relating to urgent care centres were unknown at present. It will also need to consider the workforce stream of the STP to test out the principles supporting the work. Members requested that information on occasions when the MIUs had had to close be included in the committee's agenda packs for September 2017. Members also requested information on the salary structure, and whether there was a differential between Gloucestershire and Bristol, and whether this reflected the national position.
ACTION: Katie Norton

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

14.4 In response to a question the Chief Executive, Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust, informed the committee that when planning the remedial works at Tewkesbury Community Hospital due consideration had been given to ensuring that the impact on patients and the wider system would be minimal. There has been positive feedback, so far, from both staff and patients.

14.5 The STP Lead assured the committee that the GCCG did work closely with neighbouring CCGs to ensure that they were aware of service change proposals coming through, and what the impact could be on Gloucestershire residents.

15. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

15.1 The Director of Public Health presented the report, which focused on mental health issues, to the committee. However, she did inform members that this report had in fact been received by the committee the previous year and had been submitted in error. The correct report would be shared with the committee.

ACTION: Sarah Scott/Andrea Clarke

15.2 The DPH informed the committee that the recently published Public Health Outcomes showed that Gloucestershire was no longer an outlier with regard to death by suicide.

15.3 The committee was informed that the Prevention Concordat for Better Mental Health, which has been developed by Public Health England would be published soon. This would be received by the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board.

15.4 It was commented that despite the funding made available through the NHS England Five Year Forward View for Mental Health this was struggling to make its way through the system.

15.5 It was agreed that it would be helpful for the committee to receive the evaluation report on the evidence based preventative intervention work which aimed to reduce the incidence of eating disorders in young women who were at risk which had been trialled in four Gloucestershire schools.

ACTION: Sarah Scott

16. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

16.1 The Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) gave a detailed presentation of the report.

16.2 A member drew the committee's attention to an article in the local press that day regarding the CQC ratings for 4 care homes in Gloucestershire. Having been in meetings since 8am the DASS was unable to comment on the detail of the article and would follow up on this matter on her return to her office. She did, however, assure members that officers did monitor the care of GCC placements in care homes.

ACTION: Margaret Willcox/Tina Reid

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.38 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Tuesday 14 March 2017 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Helena McCloskey
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Karen McKeown
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Chris Nelson
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Martin Smith
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Bruce Hogan	Cllr Roger Wilson (Chairman)

Substitutes:

In attendance: Stephen Bace, John Bensted, Richard Bradley, Chris Brierley, Stewart Edgar, Ruth Greenwood, Rod Hansen, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Adrian Connor, Cllr Barry Kirby, Cllr Keith Pearson and Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations made.

7. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

In response to actions from the previous meeting, follow ups were required. A glossary to the Police and Crime Plan would be circulated as well as a response from the Police and Crime Commissioner on hate crime.

ACTION **Richard Bradley**

8. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

8.1 The Chairman thanked the Chief Constable Suzette Davenport for her work for the Constabulary and for Gloucestershire over the past four years.

8.2 It was explained that a meeting had been hosted by Grant Thornton and facilitated by Frontline Consulting to discuss the development of an Association of Police and Crime Panels. Some proposals were being drawn up with the main aim to help increase the profile of Panels and provide a national voice.

8.3 Adrian Connor, Independent Member, had decided to resign from the Panel due to work pressures. A recruitment exercise would be carried out once the new Panel was established at the July meeting.

9. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

9.1 Paul Trott presented the report which contained statistics around complaints and a link to crime statistics. The panel noted that the Police.UK website had not been updated since the last panel meeting. Members were aware of the publication of the HMIC Peel inspection reports which would be discussed in the next item.

Chief Constable

9.2 In January it was announced that Chief Constable Davenport would be retiring in April. Members were informed that the Police and Crime Commissioner had taken the decision to hold the post vacant for the time being and had asked DCC Rod Hansen to fulfil the role as Temporary Chief Constable. The Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office stated that this was legislated for in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act (2011) S.41 (subsections (1) and (11)).

9.3 As the decision had been taken to not appoint a Chief Constable at this time, the Panel was informed that there was no legal requirement for the Panel to hold a confirmation hearing. The Panel had sought advice from other panels and from the Home Office who advised that the Panel should use its wider scrutiny role to understand the thinking behind keeping the post vacant for potentially a twelve month period.

9.4 Members were informed that the drive from Government was to review Fire and Rescue Service governance and that this had played a part in influencing this decision. The Commissioner had wanted to ensure all governance options were open to him once the results of the business case and consultation on future Emergency Services Collaboration was known. He felt that appointing a new Chief Constable at this time may limit those options.

9.5 It was explained that a number of forces, when advertising for Chief Constable, had found it difficult to attract candidates. It was suggested that in some ways it was just as important to get the appointment of the Deputy right due to the operational nature of the role compared to the strategic role of the Chief.

9.6 In response to a question, it was explained that the operational distinction between policing and 'fire' should be maintained. In terms of the options open to Commissioners relating to 'fire' governance, he could sit on the Fire and Rescue Authority or take on that role entirely. It could involve 'back office' functions being brought more closely together and, while the services would remain two legal entities, there could be one Chief Officer.

9.7 Consultants had been employed to look at whether there was merit in pursuing this further. Once they had reported, the Commissioner would be in a position to make further decisions.

9.8 There was some discussion around the stability of the Constabulary with members noting that ACC Richard Berry had left the organisation, the Chief Constable was retiring, and now the Deputy would be 'acting up'. The Commissioner stated that he felt that Rod Hansen was the right person to hold the position over the short term.

9.9 Some members questioned the security of the Deputy's position and what would happen at the conclusion of his temporary role. It was explained that the replacement Deputy would be on secondment from another Force. After Rod had 'acted up' he would return to post. Rod Hansen explained that he had worked for the Constabulary for three and a half year and was content with the length of the temporary arrangement.

9.10 The Panel noted the requirement for each Police Force to have a Chief Constable. The Chairman asked whether the Force was content with the arrangements and process being followed. The Commissioner explained that he had discussed it with the Chief Constable and asked her advice and she fully endorsed the position. He stated that he would ask the Chief Constable to provide the Panel with her view in writing.

ACTION **Martin Surl/ Chief Constable**

9.11 The Commissioner explained that other areas had held vacancies and put in place temporary appointments. It was clarified that Sussex had held the vacancy of Chief Constable for a period of four months and that the Police and Crime Panel had endorsed the approach. This holding of the vacancy was pending an interview process.

9.12 One member stated that when the Police and Crime Commissioner had been elected he had overseen a period of change in the Constabulary, and that once noting that the senior positions of the Force were on a temporary basis, he had moved quickly to rectify this. The member questioned why he was now allowing the Constabulary to once again have a temporary 'top team'.

9.13 Some members commented that by holding a confirmatory hearing, it could have allowed Rod Hansen to have received an endorsement of the Panel. One member explained that he would have preferred a recruitment campaign to have been held and that he felt that process might well have led to the appointment of Rod Hansen.

9.14 One member raised his concerns about any changes to Fire and Rescue Service governance given that the Fire and Rescue Service was known as a high performing efficient and cost effective service that worked as part of the County

Council across a number of areas such as adult social care. Referring to the HMIC inspection, he noted that the Force had been rated as requiring improvement in a number of areas.

9.15 In response to questions about the amount of money being spent on consultants to consider whether there was a business case to take on governance of 'Fire', it was explained that the transformation fund was being used so this was Home Office money. The Commissioner compared this to the spending undertaken by the County Council on consultants to carry out their own work regarding the future of the Service.

9.16 One member emphasised the importance of communicating to the public the detail of what was going on.

9.17 One member asked how the Commissioner would ensure diversity was reflected in the senior appointments in the Constabulary. The Commissioner explained that he had been proud to appoint Suzette Davenport as Gloucestershire's first female Chief Constable, but that she had got the position because she had been the best candidate. He stated that he would once again appoint the best candidates. He felt that the Force was well represented, although he acknowledged his past concerns around BME representation within the Force. He would provide the member with detail on the diversity of the Force.

ACTION **Martin Surl**

9.18 It was clarified that the legislation around collaboration of blue light services had a focus on the Fire and Rescue Service, but that there would be an increase in collaboration across the board, including the ambulance service.

Estates

9.18 The 'new Holland House, formerly known as Wilton House, was now the base for PCSOs, neighbourhood and local investigation officers.

Commissioner's Fund

9.19 It was confirmed that an update on the Commissioner's Fund would come to the next meeting in July.

ACTION **Richard Bradley**

Road Safety Partnership

9.20 The Chairman asked for an update on changes to the Road Safety Partnership. Paul Trott explained that the governance arrangements and financial arrangements for the partnership had not been resolved. The Commissioner's Office had concerns that the money raised by the fees being charged for motorists for speed awareness courses was being spent on other road safety related

activities by the County Council. It was stated that the legal advice from the Commissioner's Office was they were not legally able to do this.

9.21 Funding would be withdrawn from the Commissioner's Office unless the County Council were able to ensure the legality of the activity. The Commissioner stated that he would review the commissioning of the courses within the next twelve months regardless of the current situation. The Commissioner explained that this communication with the County Council had been misrepresented in the public as a reckless act. He reassured the Panel that there was no political motivation with regards to this. He said he was pleased that the County Council had put forward money to meet any shortfall.

9.22 Some members of the Panel highlighted how good the courses were and stated that they would like to see them continue. Members noted that new legislation was being drawn up which allowed greater flexibility around the use of funds obtained through courses of that nature.

9.23 There was some discussion around the £390,000 allocated within the County Council budget which had been taken out of reserves to ensure the continuation of the GCC road safety employees should the Commissioner's funding be withdrawn. The Chairman suggested that should the Commissioner continue to fund the service, the additional County Council funding could be returned to reserves.

9.24 The Panel understood the legal advice provided to the Commissioner and that members were not in a position to advise on this. The Panel's main concern was to ensure the safety of the people of Gloucestershire and asked the Commissioner to note the comments made regarding the high quality of the courses being offered.

10. HMIC PEEL INSPECTION UPDATE

10.1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary had released its latest Leadership and Legitimacy reports in December 2016. Regarding Legitimacy report, Gloucestershire was rated as 'requiring improvement, a down grading from last years 'good'. It was explained that it was difficult to make like for like comparisons as the judgement criteria had changed. The Commissioner stated that it would be unfair and inaccurate to say that the force had 'got worse'.

10.2 On 2 March, the Inspectorate published its reports relating to Effectiveness. It assessed how well the Constabulary keeps people in Gloucestershire safe from harm and what it is doing to keep crime down. The report stated that the Constabulary 'requires improvement'. The Constabulary had challenged the findings, requesting that consideration be given to the re-grading in light of the year on year reductions in crime in Gloucestershire.

10.3 The Panel welcomed the ForceSight statistics they were provided with, which was the same data available to inspectors. This demonstrated that the Constabulary was performing well against comparative neighbours and that crime

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

in the County had fallen. With this in mind the Panel were sympathetic to the comments raised by the Chief Constable on the inspection. Members were also reassured by the comments of DCC Rod Hansen that work was being undertaken in response to the areas of vulnerability identified.

10.4 The Commissioner explained that the inspection had not taken account of the work carried out due to the funding provided by the Commissioner's Fund.

10.5 The Deputy Chief Constable stated that the Force was transparent and it was reflective, looking to embrace the areas where they were rated weak in order to improve. While he felt that inspection helped to make the Force stronger, he emphasised that crime had reduced in Gloucestershire as well as satisfaction levels. He said the Force would take time to reflect on the administrative points raised in the reports and that work was already underway including the recruitment of Senior Analysts.

10.6 Some members stated that anecdotally they had not picked up any concerns from the public in the service being provided by the Constabulary.

10.7 One member requested information on how many areas were graded as part of the Inspections. This would be provided.

ACTION Ruth Greenwood

10.8 In response to a concern expressed around anti-social behaviour, the Commissioner explained that he had been pleased to see a reduction in this area, but noted the role of partners and the impact that this had on a large number of areas. In relation to Modern Day Slavery, he felt that this was contained within his plan and that the Constabulary were 'coming up to speed on that'.

10.9 A response would be provided to HMIC with a revisit in September.

10.10 The Panel felt that the comments in the report did not reflect the Constabulary. The Commissioner would take into account areas that had been raised by the report. The Deputy Chief Constable provided reassurance to members about the work being undertaken in response to the report. An update would be provided in due course from the Deputy Chief Constable around progress in relation to vulnerable areas and his vision for the Force.

ACTION Rod Hansen/ Stephen Bace

11. COMMUNITY SAFETY REVIEW - UPDATE

11.1 Richard Bradley provided some context to the Community Safety Review. This examined the current approach to community safety in Gloucestershire. John Bensted who had been the independent consultant for the review updated the Panel on progress. The review report had been received by the Panel in September

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

and now the early phases of implementation were underway. The aim was to ensure that there was a structure in place so that community safety partnerships could continue to evolve.

11.2 John Bensted explained that it had been the first review of community safety for twenty years and that there had been a huge amounts of changes in that time. There had been a drift in community safety and a fragmentation.

11.3 It was important to recognise that districts retained responsibility for community safety, but it would be helpful to have an overarching body that could allow for the development of county strategies for issues such as anti-social behaviour and drugs. Some members challenged the progress being made by urging caution about adding additional bureaucratic layer.. It was clarified that any changes were about rationalising and merging meetings and refocussing on outcomes.

11.4 The six community safety partnerships also had responsibility for domestic homicide reviews. But there was no overarching County approach so that lessons learned could be passed across districts.

11.5 A workshop was being developed around Community Safety to work with the partnerships and thematic leads to create best model that would work for the County.

11.6 The Chairman asked for John Bensted to come back to Panel in 6 months to update.

ACTION **John Bensted**

11.7 The Panel noted that one district was happy with their arrangements; the other five would like a better more streamlined system.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.25 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 14 July 2017 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Helena McCloskey
Ray Brassington	Cllr Karen McKeown
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr Rob Garnham	Martin Smith
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Bruce Hogan	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive

Substitutes:

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

Apologies: Cllr Chris Nelson

12. ELECTION OF CHAIR

Following a vote, Cllr Will Windsor Clive was appointed as Chairman of the Panel.

He thanked the previous Chairman Cllr Roger Wilson for his work with the Panel.

13. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Cllr Colin Hay was appointed as Vice Chairman of the Panel.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Rob Garnham informed the Panel that he was an associate of the College of Policing.

15. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

At 10.10 – to state that *almost* all the Panel felt that the comments in the report did not reflect the constabulary. The emphasis was that not all the Panel felt that way.

The Commissioner requested that the comments at minutes 9.21 and 9.23 about the withdrawal of funding from the road safety partnership be removed as this was incorrect. The Members agreed to the amendment.

One member questioned at 9.7 the reference to consultants to look at Fire and Rescue Service Governance. She asked when a report would be expected and consultation undertaken. In response it was stated that the report was expected for August.

16. ROLE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

- 16.1 Members were provided with an overview of the key powers and responsibilities of the Panel. It was suggested that a work planning session be arranged which would allow members to consider how they wished to carry out their role.
- 16.2 Members understood that the Panel was required to be politically balanced across the Force area and for that reason top-up members had been added. This had led to 16 councillors and 2 independent non-elected members. There was a vacancy for one of the non-elected member position and so a recruitment process would begin involving Lead Members.
- 16.3 The Panel were informed that they were there to provide a check and balance to the Commissioner and to both review and scrutinise his actions and decisions. The Panel was also under a duty to support the Commissioner and act as a critical friend.
- 16.4 Members recognised that they had a power of veto on the precept and the appointment of the Chief Constable. This required 2/3 of the membership (12) to vote to veto and it was suggested that this was a last resort position when all other methods had failed. Legislation dictated processes and timescales around these powers of veto, for the precept if the Panel vetoed the Commissioner's proposal then he would only need to come back higher or lower as per the Panel's recommendation and the Panel would have no further veto to use.
- 16.5 The Panel had responsibility for complaints against the Commissioner. The Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office had been delegated to handle the complaints and find resolution. If resolution could not be found then the Police and Crime Panel could consider the complaint through a sub-committee. Any criminal complaints would be referred directly to the IPCC.
- 16.6 Members noted the attached terms of reference and the Commissioner's plan and budget for their background reading.
- 16.7 One member emphasised the importance of the Panel being able to make recommendations on the Commissioner's Annual Report .

17. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

- 17.1 Paul Trott, Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office, introduced the report which provided an update on the actions and decisions taken by the Commissioner.

- 17.2 He emphasised the volume of FOI requests including commenting on one particular request that had created a large amount of workload for the office. He explained that many people would write to the Commissioner as he was a public figure and so he looked constructively to engage with the public when they contacted him. While there was an acknowledgement of the increased workload, the Chairman stated that this was legislated and if the public required information then it had to be released.
- 17.3 The report included crime data figures which included links to more detailed information relating to district areas from www.police.co.uk. In comparison with the 42 forces in England and Wales (1 being good) in terms of delivery, Gloucestershire Constabulary was ranked 11th in relation to delivery (crime rates) and 17th in relation to direction (crime going up or down).
- 17.4 As detailed in previous reports, the provisions within the Policing and Crime Act included collaboration between emergency services. The Commissioner's Office had circulated phase one report from consultants to leads from Gloucestershire County Council, Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service and Gloucestershire Constabulary. Work was ongoing and a full report was anticipated in late summer. Members noted that a task group had previously been set up to better understand these developments but had been decommissioned. It was suggested that it might be a good opportunity to reconvene the group to look over the reports. This could be considered during work planning. Members would be provided with a copy of the consultants' report.
- ACTION** **Ruth Greenwood/ Stephen Bace**
- 17.5 One member asked what data sat behind the breakdown within the report at table 3.1. It was explained that British Crime Survey comparator data was used as this set of crimes was considered by the Home Office to have the greatest impact on communities. The chart showed the volume of crime per rate of 1000 population.
- 17.6 One member stated that the decision log provided at the link within the report was hard to find for members of the public. She suggested that a full list of decisions should be included within the report. She explained that the website was not being kept up to date.
- ACTION** **Paul Trott**
- 17.7 One member commented that the table of complaints received by the OPCC showed that as many police misconduct type complaints had been received as antisocial behaviour matters and that this had not been picked up within the text.
- 17.8 The Panel noted the appointment of a Contact and Complaints Officer who could be contacted via the Commissioner's Office.

17.9 There was some discussion around the recent PEEL inspections. Members noted that the latest inspection on safeguarding would be discussed during the next item. One member asked for an up to date report on what had been done to ensure improvement. The Commissioner outlined that there was an action plan which was monitored by his Governance Board. This could be provided to members.

ACTION Martin Surl/ Paul Trott

17.10 The Panel noted that the old Stroud Magistrates Court house was now with the Commissioner and was being redeveloped. The Commissioner stated that early plans centred on combining the police station and courthouse.

17.11 The Panel passed on their congratulations to Detective Sergeant Nigel Hatten who had been awarded a QPM in the Queen's Birthday Honours List.

18. HMIC NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION INSPECTION- GLOUCESTERSHIRE

18.1 Martin Surl explained that this was a challenging item and that the various reports received by both the Constabulary and the County Council on how we treat our children in Gloucestershire was humbling. He felt that by reading both reports side by side you get a picture of where we are in this County.

18.2 He emphasised that his role as Commissioner was to hold the Chief Constable to account. Having received the report he had met with the inspector and then the Chief Constable. He noted the significant shortcomings identified and explained that he was grateful that these had been brought to his attention. In terms of context he explained that the service had previously lost 30% of their detectives but that the Force remained very committed to the care of young people. He stated that this was a highly motivated work force with support structures in place, but that it was still failing.

18.3 Of most concern were the case studies of individuals who had been failed by the Constabulary. When the Constabulary had reviewed its own work they had come to a different view to the inspectorate so the question was why had they felt that they were doing an adequate job?

18.4 Some changes to staffing structure and training had been made to ensure improvement. Other forces were inspected on this and all had similar comments. Regular meetings were being held with the Chief Constable and

an action plan was developed and monitored through the PCC's Governance Board. The Commissioner was confident that this would be resolved. The Commissioner had requested that all case files were reviewed including the ones that had been raised by HMIC.

- 18.5 The Commissioner explained the importance of all partners and organisations in Gloucestershire working together to make improvements. He outlined the need to 'understand what good looks like' and stated that he would be putting together a summit for those with concerns to come together as a County to decide how to best support vulnerable children.
- 18.6 Members expressed their concerns about the report noting that it stated there had been limited strategic oversight and a lack of supervision. One member asked what the Commissioner had done to ensure strategic oversight in the future. In response the Commissioner explained that this was a part of the action plan. He explained that the impact of austerity was being felt, with over 300 leaving the service and a reduced budget. He reassured members that training would improve and everything would be looked at comprehensively but that the 'frontline was thin'.
- 18.7 One member expressed concerns that the issues within the Constabulary were systematic and cultural with risk and demands not being fully recognised. The member recognised that resources were stretched but felt that the Constabulary was being let down by its leadership. He emphasised that the Commissioner's role was to ensure an effective Police Service and that was not currently happening. He asked how the Commissioner was holding the Chief Constable to account on the points raised in the report. In response, the Commissioner stated that he had been provided with assurances around increased training, but that any opportunity for increased funding and additional officers would make a huge difference. The Commissioner reminded the Panel that the Leadership team within the Constabulary had recently changed with a new Chief Constable, Deputy Chief Constable and new superintendents.
- 18.8 Some members commented positively on the work that was being undertaken to resolve the issues, in particular the arrangement of a summit meeting.
- 18.9 There was further discussion on the difference in view given by the internal assessment and the HMIC assessment. Members were concerned that officers could not have been clear about the required outcomes to believe that they were performing adequately. The Commissioner explained that the world of policing was continually changing and there were many resource intensive areas of work such as modern slavery.

- 18.10 One member spoke about the effect of austerity over a number of years and included community policing as part of that. He felt that impacts would continue to be seen due to reductions in funding in previous years.
- 18.11 In response to a question it was explained that sickness levels had risen since 2014 and that the number of assaults on officers had gone up. It was important that officers had the psychological supervision and counselling that they needed to help support them.
- 18.12 One member suggested that the Commissioner ask HMIC as to whether they had directly targeted Gloucestershire for inspection because they already had concerns. She outlined concerns that she had raised previously around the Community Safety Review. She suggested that the Commissioner refresh his Police and Crime Plan in order to refocus priorities on protecting vulnerable children in light of the recommendations made. The Commissioner explained that the priorities allowed for more detailed plans to sit below them and that he did not feel there needed to be a change. There were plans in place which sat under the priorities with a real focus on vulnerable children.
- 18.13 The Commissioner confirmed that recommendations which had been stated as needing immediate attention had been addressed in the first week and the other recommendations within 3 months.
- 18.14 One member asked the Commissioner where he would go in order to understand what 'good looked like'. In response he stated that for the Constabulary they would look at other areas that were performing well in this area with Hampshire suggested. In wider terms there would need to be a piece of work to identify experts in the field and to understand the role and position of partners.
- 18.15 There was some discussion around concerns the Commissioner had expressed about the sharing of data. One member commented on 'Total Place' which had been about the importance of sharing information across the public sector. It was explained that the first meeting of Safer Gloucestershire had launched and that one of the purposes was to ensure all partners shared data more easily. An update would be provided at the next meeting.

ACTION **Richard Bradley**

- 18.16: The Panel noted that HMIC would be back in September to provide a report on progress since the previous inspection.

19. COMMISSIONER'S FUND

- 19.1 Richard Bradley delivered a presentation on the Commissioner's Fund. He stated that the Commissioner had the ability to award grants to partners, agencies and projects. Since the Commissioner's Fund had been established in 2012 over 350 community based projects had been funded.

- 19.2 The Commissioner's Fund was made up of a number of funding streams including 1% from the Constabulary budget along with money from the Ministry of Justice and elsewhere.
- 19.3 166 applications had been made since the previous September which compared to 65 applications that had been made in 2013. Some had been extensions on those that had been funded over the last four years. Members noted that the total value of all applications would be £3.4m so not all could be funded. 78 projects had been funded. It was suggested that reductions in funding nationally had led to more organisations and projects seeking support from the Commissioner's Fund.
- 19.4 Members were shown the breakdown of the bids from each district and the ones that had been awarded. There was a strong scrutiny process in examining the bids and determining the value of the work and contribution to deliver the police and crime plan.
- 19.5 In response to an earlier question it was explained that 45% of the awards went to activity to support young people as this was about trying to prevent young people from getting involved in the criminal justice system.
- 19.6 The Panel noted that this was the fifth year of the fund and asked to receive a report outlining the outcomes from the fund over that time period.
ACTION Richard Bradley.
- 19.7 One member commented that it was important to ensure that smaller charities and community based projects had an opportunity to successfully bid for funds. In response it was recognised that it was important to provide those groups with a chance and that there was year on year benefits to funding this activity.
- 19.8 One member praised the projects going in local areas and the work of the PCSO. The Panel understood that work was being put in place to deliver the new neighbourhood policing offer.

20. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PRIORITIES HIGHLIGHT REPORT

- 20.1 Richard Bradley introduced the highlights report which monitored progress in respect of each of the priorities within the police and crime plan. The report demonstrated activity within each area for members to consider and question.
- 20.2 One member stated that she was favourable of the mounted police trial, but wanted a breakdown of costs to be provided. The Commissioner explained that the horse box had been provided by Avon and Somerset for the year of the trial and now purchased for £60,000. There had been over 7,000 interactions with the public and over 1100 meaningful interactions. Members

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

understood that there were now four horses and the Commissioner stated that some people were vocal in their objections; the majority of the public were overwhelmingly supportive. Details of the costs would be provided to members.

ACTION Martin Surl/ Paul Trott

- 20.3 One member had reservations about the trial but would await the outcome of the trial. It was important to understand how the mounted police helped to keep people safe and help the vulnerable.
- 20.4 Some members spoke positively about the control room and the response from 101. The Commissioner explained that there were still challenges in this area with a 20% increase in calls (and complexity of calls) since the introduction of the new system with no increase in staff. He raised concerns about the lack of integration between the fire control centre and police control centre and suggested that he should have discussions with the Chief Constable and Chief Fire Officer as to how a better service could be provided to the public.
- 20.5 One member questioned whether drones could be used to allow searches across difficult terrain. The Commissioner stated that Devon and Cornwall were launching this and that there would be potential for this in the future.
- 20.6 In response to a question on the progress of confirming the position of Chief Constable, the Commissioner stated that his position had not changed and that he would consider this once there was a direction for governance of the Fire and Rescue service going forward. He did not believe that the current arrangements were damaging the Constabulary.
- 20.7 One member asked whether funding was being withdrawn from Neighbourhood Watches with parishes being asked to fund them. In response it was explained that this was under significant review but no funding had been withdrawn. The member would discuss this with officers after the meeting.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12:30

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - SEPTEMBER 2017 UPDATE

Cabinet Member Arrangements

Councillor	Portfolio Area	Areas of Responsibility
Mark F Annett (Leader)	Resources	Financial Strategy and Management; Revenues and Benefits; Grants; Policy Framework, including Corporate Plan; Co-Ordination of Executive Functions; Democratic Services; Press and Communications
NJW Parsons (Deputy Leader)	Forward Planning	Strategic Forward Planning; Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); Neighbourhood Plans; Property/Asset Management
Sue Coakley	Environment	Waste and Recycling; Drainage and Flood Resilience; Public Protection; Food Safety; Building Control; Cemeteries; Abandoned Vehicles; Stow Fair
C Hancock	Enterprise and Partnerships	Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and County-Wide Partnerships; Promoting Enterprise and Tourism, including Visitor Information Centres; 2020 Partnership and Shared Services; Efficiency Agenda; Car Parking and Enforcement
SG Hirst	Housing, Health and Leisure	Housing Strategy and Allocations, Homelessness and Partnerships; Private Sector Housing; Crime and Disorder and Community Safety; Public Health and Well-Being; Supporting People/Safeguarding; Leisure, Museums and Arts; Licensing; Public Conveniences; Street Naming and Numbering
MGE MacKenzie-Charrington	Planning and Licensing Services and Cirencester Car Parking Project	Development Management; Heritage and Design; Conservation and Landscape; Cirencester Car Parking Project Lead; Licensing; Street Naming and Numbering

Item for Decision	Key Decision	Likely to be Considered in Private	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Housing Benefit Overpayment Write-Off in Excess of £5,000	No	No	Cabinet	September 2017	Leader	Jon Dearing	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Flexible Homeless Support Grant	Yes	No	Cabinet	September 2017	Housing, Health and Leisure	Jon Dearing	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	HB Circular re withdrawal of Temporary Accommodation Management Fee
Community Projects Fund - Request for Additional Financial Allocation	No	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2017	Leader	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Performance Report (Quarter 1)	No	No	Cabinet	September 2017	All	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
'Park and Stride' Project	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2017	Planning and Licensing Services and Cirencester Car Parking Project Board	Claire Locke Christine Cushway	Landowner Senior Officers Parking Demand Project Board	Parking demand project data and Parking studies available on the Council's Website

53

Item for Decision	Key Decision	Likely to be Considered in Private	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Enforced Sale of Residential Property	Yes	Yes	Cabinet	September 2017	Leader	Frank Wilson	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Revenues Write-Off in Excess of £5,000	No	No	Cabinet	October 2017	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Corinium Museum - Accreditation Standard - Collection Policy	No	No	Cabinet	October 2017	Housing, Health and Leisure	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	-
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2020/21 - Draft for Consultation	No	No	Cabinet	November 2017	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	LG Finance Settlement Budget 2018/19 Council Aim and Priorities Corporate Strategy and Plan
Community-Led Housing Fund	No	No	Cabinet	November 2017	Housing, Health and Leisure	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Internal consultation	None
Performance Report (Quarter 2)	No	No	Cabinet	November 2017	All	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Existing Plan/Strategy Service and Financial Performance Data

55

Item for Decision	Key Decision	Likely to be Considered in Private	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
There is no scheduled December Meeting								
Development of The Waterloo Car Park, Cirencester for Decker Car Parking - Business Case	Yes	Yes	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	January 2018	Deputy Leader/ Forward Planning; Enterprise & Partnerships; Planning and Licensing Services & Cirencester Car Parking Project	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Cabinet and Council decisions - February 2017
Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19 to 2021/22 and Budget 2018/19	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2018	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

Item for Decision	Key Decision	Likely to be Considered in Private	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Land at Kemble	Yes	Yes	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2018	Deputy Leader	Bhavna Patel	Cabinet Members Ward Members Senior Officers Parish Council	
Performance Report (Quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2018	All	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
No item(s) yet identified				April 2018				
No item(s) yet identified				May 2018				
Performance Report (Year End)	No	No	Cabinet	June 2018	All	Diana Shelton	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
No item(s) yet identified				July 2018				

56