



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4th SEPTEMBER 2018

AGENDA ITEM (13)

QUARTERLY DIGEST

INDEX

Item	Subject	Page No.
(1)	Joint Scrutiny Etc. Meetings/Oral Updates as appropriate	
(i)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 22 nd February 2018	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 14 th March 2018	10
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes of Meeting held on 6 th March 2018	14
(iv)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes of Meeting held on 8 th May 2018	19
(v)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes of Meeting held on 10 th July 2018	24
(vi)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel Minutes of Meeting held on 16 th March 2018	30
(vii)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel Minutes of Meeting held on 13 th July 2018	35
(2)	Executive Forward Plan - September 2018 Update	43

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 Cotswold District Council Offices on Thursday 22 February 2018.

Present:

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr David Norman MBE
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Dawn Melvin
Cllr Colin Hay	

1. WELCOME

Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Dave Norman, opened the meeting by thanking Cotswold District Council for hosting the meeting.

Explaining that the purpose of the meeting was to focus on issues relating specifically to the economic agenda of the Cotswold District and for members to consider proposals on how engagement between the Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee, the Joint Scrutiny Committee and the District Authorities might be improved, the Chairman informed members that, from the discussion, an outcome report would be produced, incorporating the responses to any questions considered at the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Martin Whiteside, (Stroud District Council), Bruce Hogan, (Forest of Dean District Council), Stephen Davies (Gloucestershire County Council), and Matt Babbage (Gloucestershire County Council).

There were no substitutions at the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

4. MINUTES

The actions from the meeting held on 29 November 2017 were noted.

Detailed minutes of the meeting to be considered at the committee meeting on 14 March 2018

5. COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Inviting local committee members, Cllrs Stephen Hirst and Joe Harris, to set out their aspirations for the discussion, the Chairman invited members and officers from

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

Cotswold District Council to give an overview, (from an economic growth perspective), of issues affecting the local economy and growth ambitions of the Cotswold District.

The Chairman introduced Cllr Christopher Hancock, Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Partnerships, Nigel Adams, Head of Paid Service and James Brain, Forward Planning Manager for the District Council to present information on behalf of Cotswold District Council.

The Chairman also introduced David Owen - Chief Executive of the Gloucestershire First LEP; Pete Carr - Lead Commissioner: Skills and Employment; Nigel Riglar - Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure at Gloucestershire County Council and Angela Presdee - Lead Officer for Economic Growth and Development at Gloucestershire County Council.

Cllr Norman informed members that there would be an opportunity for local members to ask questions on the work of the Gloucestershire First LEP and Gloucestershire Growth Deal at the meeting.

Cabinet Member, Cllr Christopher Hancock, opened the presentation by informing members that the Cotswold District was not unique in the economic challenges it faced. Explaining the process for adoption of the Cotswold Business Development Plan, the cabinet member stated that the aim of the business plan was to protect and enhance the local environment, whilst striving to support the economic growth of the local area.

Nigel Adams, Head of Paid Service, reiterated the importance of the Business Development Plan in meeting the council's key priorities of i) providing high quality services; ii) championing specific issues and iii) protecting the local environment. The business plan would also ensure sustainability in the future.

James Brain, Forward Plan Manager outlined some of the specific challenges to the Cotswold economy. These included; lack of productivity, housing need, the impact of an ageing population, and the need to invest in the local infrastructure.

Setting out the corporate objectives and tasks from which to support the business plan and local strategies, the Forward Plan Manager reinforced the need to support the local economy from joint working with the LEP and other agencies and communities within the district to remove any barriers to the creation of new employment opportunities; supporting sustainable tourism; investigating new means of increasing the number of international visitors to the Cotswolds; and improving the wider economic growth of the county from improved strategic decision making and better utilisation of public sector resources and infrastructure development.

The Forward Plan Manager explained that the basis of the Business Development Plan aimed to address the needs of local businesses; provide support to competitive town centres, and help create and develop a more prosperous rural economy.

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

Outlining some of the headline facts that characterised the local economy, the Forward Plan Manager informed members there had been strong job growth within the district since 2010, with the local economy supporting approximately 52,000 jobs, equating to a total economic value of between £1.69 billion and £1.86 billion. A high proportion of the jobs are leisure and recreational based; construction; real estate, engineering, secondary education, computer programming and consultancy. Retail and visitor economy based industries continue to reflect some of the most important industries within the District

A significant concern impacting on the local area was the net loss of B Class employment land since 2011. Concerns surrounding this issue have resulted in the district council seeking to allocate new employment land, while continuing to promote and safeguard existing business locations.

Other key issues affecting the local economy included; the limitations imposed by some of the transport links to the area, (with particular emphasis on the A417 Missing Link Highway), poor broadband and mobile phone coverage in rural areas; the below average earnings; the outward migration of young people; the impact of house prices within the area; and the potential impact of bidding for National Park status on the district's planning and development proposals.

Noting the significantly higher representation of smaller enterprises located within the district, (89% of businesses represent micro businesses and 9% of businesses employ up to 49 employees), it was pleasing to acknowledge that the district continued to maintain a strong and growing business base, even throughout a period of recession.

Members were advised that, approximately 55 enterprises within the Cotswold District employed between 50 and 249 employees, with only 10 enterprises employing over 250 employees. Education and skills remained a priority, with increased emphasis placed on raising awareness of the value of apprenticeships.

Another consideration highlighted during the discussion was the number of people commuting to and from the district for employment purposes, with 15,709 people commuting from other districts, balanced against 13,820 people travelling out of the district to work in other districts.

Summarising some of the key strengths and weaknesses represented by the area, members acknowledged the strength and potential of the 'Cotswold' brand, a brand that continues to be of significant value to the district. Other strengths included, the architectural and environmental heritage of the area and the number of research, education and training institutes. In terms of weakness, however, this needed to be balanced against the problem of attracting and retaining younger people, including graduates and apprenticeships, to work and live in the area.

Another notable weakness highlighted during the discussion was the low rental value of commercial properties in the district, currently considered too low a value to attract interest from property developers to invest in providing speculative developments.

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

Potential opportunities identified during the discussion included; interest from key employers to expand existing sites; opportunities to grow significant micro enterprises; the growth in scientific, professional and technology industries; and anticipated opportunities from Gloucestershire 2050 initiatives and Brexit.

Acknowledging the perception that the district had a strong business confidence, such a perception was not necessarily shared by the whole of the district. Whilst Brexit was seen as providing some opportunities, it was also seen as creating potential threats to the local economy. Another potential threat was the loss of employment land to create residential and retail development.

The Forward Plan Manager gave a detailed account of the Local Business Plan, including the local plan policies designed to help the plan progress. He also outlined some of the draft economic proposals and initiatives put forward as options to help grow the economy, including the 'Cotswold is open for business' campaign and initiatives introduced to promote the better strategic management of assets, including use of land.

In conclusion, the Forward Plan Manager put forward a number of 'asks' the local authority wanted the GFirst LEP to consider as potential initiatives for the future. These included: -

- i. Endorsement of, and support in implementing the Cotswold Business Implementation Plan;
- ii. Endorsement of the Royal Agricultural University Growth Bid;
- iii. A Physical Growth Hub Presence;
- iv. Brokerage for Apprenticeships;
- v. Key Stakeholder Engagement;
- vi. Cotswold Parking Study Update/Implementation;
- vii. Business Support – Signposting
- viii. Business Support – Assistance to address loss of business premises

The Forward Plan Manager also outlined a number of challenges and perceptions the local authority had put forward as potential barriers to growth. These included: -

- i. The perception that the LEP struggled to understand the council's economic priorities and needs;
- ii. If this perception was considered a reality, the local authority questioned why the disconnect existed, and what could the Council, (and other Councils), do to better articulate its needs and ultimately access funding to deliver economic growth;
- iii. The Cotswold Business Implementation Plan and strategic priorities were described as robust and evidenced based – the local authority requested that the council and partners be allowed to embrace and own the required actions;
- iv. It was suggested that; fundamental to everything was the relationship between GFirst LEP, businesses and local communities. Collaboration between each of the factions was vital to the economic growth of the district.

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

Following a series of in-depth questions and observations from scrutiny members, local members were invited to ask questions of the GFirst LEP. The majority of questions were submitted prior to the meeting, supplemented by a number of other questions asked at the meeting.

Detailed responses to the following questions will be provided after the meeting.

- 1) Small and Micro businesses in rural areas have a number of unique challenges. Small towns, such as Fairford, may try to retain buildings and areas as business premises in order to provide both vitality to those towns and employment opportunities to local residents, but current planning measures are failing to protect them. The result is a steady transformation of business premises/areas into residential use. This prevents a micro enterprise that, assuming adequate communications, may be looking to grow out of its SOHO background into a larger business unless it moves to a larger centre, such as Cirencester.

What measures are GFirst LEP taking/planning to support the indigenous growth of micro businesses across the Cotswolds, e.g. by providing support to multi-occupancy/shared business space that can be used to assist such fledgling businesses in their growth?

- 2) On a similar theme, what is the role of GFirst LEP in attracting investors/companies to take up the employment land allocations in the Local Plan?
- 3) Is there any specific role that GFirst LEP could play, or any support they could offer, in helping to maintain the viability of our town centres (particularly in the market towns)?
- 4) The Council recognises that the Local Plan and its objectives need actions and interventions to ensure that the Local Plan is implemented successfully, and has submitted this to the Inspector to demonstrate its commitment to doing things differently.
- 5) How can GFirst help with definition of the interventions, securing maximum value, skills opportunities together with marketing and delivery?
- 6) Can GFirst provide good examples of business cases bringing sites to the market; and what funds are available to support development of this?
- 7) How can we establish better links, and enable a closer working relationship with, the LEP – How have other councils achieved this?
- 8) How do we secure a presence in The Growth Hub, and what might that look like?
- 9) How can we ensure/enable full high speed broadband and mobile phone coverage across the District and, perhaps more importantly, ensure that advances in technology are applied in the future?

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

10) How can we best seek to support the apparent momentum in securing a solution to the A417 'Missing Link'?

An outcome report of the key messages from the meeting, including the responses to the questions raised during the discussion will be considered under the work plan item at the committee meeting on 14 March 2018.

6. WORK PLAN

Copies of the updated committee work plan were circulated with the agenda.

The following updates were noted prior to the meeting: -

Committee Meeting - 14 March 2018

At the scrutiny committee meeting on 29 November 2017, members requested a briefing on 'what issues/aspects of the impact of Brexit the committee/GCC might need to consider in preparation for leaving the EU. Nigel (Riglar) and David (Owen) suggested a paper on 'key lines of enquiry' be considered at the 14 March 2018 meeting. Members were advised no proper analysis could be done ahead of the March 2019 deal.

Subsequent to this, at a Gloucestershire Leader's Group Meeting on 1 December 2017, Cotswold County Councillor, Cllr Paul Hodgkinson mentioned that *'Cornwall Council had set up work streams to look at specific aspects of Brexit and noted that a recent presentation to the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee had indicated that Gloucestershire could lose significant sums currently available through the European Social Fund. Cllr Hodgkinson suggested the Council should be doing more to analyse the potential impact of Brexit with regular updates provided to members'*. At the same meeting, Cllr Mark Hawthorne referred to a study the LGA was due to launch in February 2018 and highlighted the difficulties in considering the impact of Brexit on Gloucestershire prior to March 2019. After further discussion, *it was agreed the Joint Economic Growth Committee, on which the six district councils and GFirst LEP are represented, was the appropriate place for the matter to be raised.*

Based on this information, it was agreed the matter would be considered at the next Joint Committee meeting on 14 March 2018 and a position statement considered later the same day under the LEP/Joint Committee update item at the scrutiny committee meeting. A course of action to be agreed under the committee work plan item.

Vision 2050 Update

At the November committee meeting, members requested an update on Vision 2050.

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

Following invitations to the Vision 2050 Launch at Cheltenham Race Course on 1 February 2018, it was agreed an update would be provided at the scrutiny committee meeting on 14 March 2018.

Committee Meeting - 31 October 2018 - Cheltenham Borough Council Issues and Priorities. (This meeting will be held at the Cheltenham Borough Council Offices).

7. FUTURE MEETINGS

14 March 2018
20 June 2018
5 September 2018
31 October 2018 (Cheltenham Borough Council)
21 November 2018

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 4.15 pm

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 14 March 2018 at Shire Hall in Gloucester.

Present:

Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr Joe Harris
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Jim Dewey	

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from the Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Dave Norman, Cllr Phil Awford, (Gloucestershire County Council), Cllr Dawn Melvin, (Gloucester City), Cllr Bruce Hogan, (Forest of Dean District Council), and Cllr Martin Whiteside (Stroud District Council). Cllr Jim Dewey substituted for Cllr Whiteside, (representing Stroud District Council).

Cllr Kevin Cromwell (Vice Chairman) presided at the meeting in Cllr Dave Norman's absence.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 29 November 2017 and 22 February 2018 were confirmed and agreed as an accurate record of the meetings held on these dates.

Responding to concerns about an email from the Chairman of the Committee following the meeting at the Cotswold District Council offices on 22 February 2018, it was agreed that the email, plus a review of the arrangements for holding district based committee meetings, would be considered when the Chairman was available to respond to the concerns.

It was suggested that the committee; i) consider the issues raised at the meetings held at Tewkesbury Council and Cotswold District Council and, ii) review the arrangements for holding 'district held' meetings, at the committee meeting on 5 September 2018, and this was agreed. This will be prior to the committee meeting scheduled to take place at Cheltenham Borough Council on 31 October 2018.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

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

4. GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH JOINT COMMITTEE

Member's attention was drawn to the reports presented at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee earlier that day. Please refer to the following link to view the reports: -

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=725&MId=8749&Ver=4>

Specific areas of interest identified by the scrutiny committee included; the update from Highways England on plans to investigate route options for improving the A417 Missing Link; the potential impacts of the anticipated removal of tolls from the Severn River Crossings, and the scheduling of planned works on the M5 Corridor.

The committee noted the request by the Joint Committee for Highways England to work closely with local authorities and partners in Gloucestershire on strategic issues.

At the committee meeting on 29 November 2017, members made specific reference to concerns about the impact of Brexit on the economic growth for Gloucestershire, and the award of European Funding. Further to this, at a Group Leader's meeting on 1 December 2017, it was suggested that the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee lead on this aspect of work, with input from the Scrutiny Committee. It was noted that an update had been presented to the joint committee at the committee meeting earlier that day. The scrutiny committee requested regular updates at future meetings.

5. VISION 2050

Members recalled the launch of the 'Vision 2050 Big Conversation' at Cheltenham Racecourse on Thursday 1 February 2018.

The Vision 2050 Big Conversation is a six-month programme of public engagement activity introduced to develop and collect alternative ideas from residents and organisations to consider the long-term vision for Gloucestershire over the next 30 years.

Funded by Leadership Gloucestershire, it was explained that the aim of the programme was to bring together Gloucestershire's councils, emergency services, health services and business communities to move the vision forward. Those organisations involved had commissioned the University of Gloucestershire as the independent facilitator for the Big Conversation, assisted by Dialogue by Design, (an employee-owned research and engagement company), employed to work with public services, charities and communities across the UK.

It was reported that Dr Matthew Andrews from the University of Gloucestershire had been invited to the meeting to give an update on the work in developing a Vision for Gloucestershire to 2050. Unfortunately, Dr Andrews had been unable to attend the meeting but had subsequently agreed to attend the committee meeting on 5

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

September 2018 to provide members with an overview of the outcomes and issues raised during the 'Big Conservation Public Engagement' exercise.

Expressing concerns about potential gaps in the collection of evidence and a desire to seek alternative views other than those presented by the University, it was agreed that the concerns, plus information on the University's engagement plan and intentions beyond the Big Conservation consultation, be shared before consideration of the outcomes by the committee in September 2018.

Members noted that a steering group comprising representatives from Gloucestershire County Council and the Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership had been established to make collaborative decisions and support the direction of travel.

Responding to the request that alternative views and stakeholders be considered, including the proposal that the committee be allowed to consider evidence from which to make informed decisions, officers explained that it was the views of local authorities and communities across Gloucestershire, and not the committee that the Big Conversation sought to gain views and ideas.

Debating whether the committee should consider evidence from the evidence gathering process or the process itself in developing a long term vision for Gloucestershire, it was suggested that the committee consider the current engagement plan and make proposals on the process post the Big Conversation as part of its scrutiny evaluation of the Vision 2050 Programme.

6. WORK PLAN

At the Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting held earlier that day, the Joint Committee considered the 'aspiration to achieve National Park Status for the Cotswold District AONB' by the Cotswold Conservation Board.

Chairman of the Joint Committee, Cllr Lynden Stowe, informed the committee that a briefing note had been circulated to members to advise on the background to the proposal.

Following the advice of officers, the Chairman proposed that the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee might wish to consider the potential benefits and economic impacts of achieving National Park status for the Cotswold ANOB, with a request for a report back to the Joint Committee later in the year.

The proposal was supported by the members of the Joint Committee, including the leaders of the affected councils, and has since been reinforced at the extraordinary meeting of the committee on 21 May 2018.

The request for the scrutiny committee to scrutinise the aspiration from the Cotswold Conservation Board to achieve National Park Status for the Cotswold District AONB was considered.

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

Questioning the origins of the proposal, scrutiny members requested that contact be made with those councils impacted by the proposal, seeking each authority's approval that the work be undertaken as part of a joint scrutiny exercise in collaboration with the affected authorities.

Following an in-depth discussion on the principle and context of the proposal, it was agreed that i) the briefing note circulated to the joint committee as background information be shared with scrutiny members and ii) contact be made with those authorities impacted by the proposal, seeking their endorsement of the request proposed by the Economic Growth Joint Committee.

Subject to the agreement of the affected authorities, it was later suggested that the Cotswold Conservation Board be invited to a future scrutiny committee meeting to explain the reasoning for their proposal.

Expressing several concerns, including the timing of the request, the majority of members refused to commit to the proposed review, pending clarification of the request from the Joint Committee.

After the meeting, the Chairman of the Joint Committee was asked to produce a one page strategy to advise the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee of the request for a scrutiny review of the aspiration by the Cotswold Conservation Board to seek "National Park Status" for the Cotswold District AONB. A scoping document was presented to the management committee on 23 March 2018. The matter was also discussed at the full council meeting on 16 May 2018, where it was suggested the Chairman of the Joint Committee and the Scrutiny Committee meet with officers to consider a way forward.

The matter to be considered under the work plan item at the next meeting.

Cllr Colin Hay reinforced the need to consider ways of promoting Gloucestershire. Cllr Hay believed the Joint Committee was the accountable body for ensuring the matter was given the emphasis it required and requested that the issue be revisited in the Autumn.

7. FUTURE MEETINGS

20 June 2018
5 September 2018
31 October 2018 (Cheltenham Borough Council)
21 November 2018

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 14.55

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 6 March 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Stephen Andrews	Cllr Steve Harvey
Cllr Doina Cornell	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin (Chairman)
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Eva Ward
Cllr Joe Harris	

Apologies: Cllr Stephen Hirst and 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 – Clinical Chair
Maria Metherall – Head of Urgent Care

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki - Chair
Simon Lanceley – Director of Director of Strategy and Transformation
Professor Mark Pietroni - Speciality Director for Unscheduled Care GHFT
Sharon Nicholson – Director Winter Flow

Gloucestershire County Council

Margaret Willcox – Director of Adult Social Services
Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health
Cllr Roger Wilson – Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Commissioning
Cllr Tim Harman – Cabinet Member Public Health and Communities
Dave McConalogue – Consultant in Public Health

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Alan Thomas – Chair

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust/2gether NHS Foundation Trust

Katie Norton – Chief Executive
Nikki Richardson - Vice-Chair at 2gether
Sue Mead - Vice-Chair for GCS

South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

Steph Bonser- Operations Manager

CareUK Ltd

Daniel Eddie – NHS111

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

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

Cllr Steve Harvey declared a personal interest as his wife is employed by NHS England.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin declared a personal interest as she is a member of the Royal College of Nursing.

11. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 9 January 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12. ESTABLISHMENT OF A SUBSIDIARY COMPANY (SUBCO) AT GLOUCESTERSHIRE HOSPITALS NHS FOUNDATION TRUST (GHNHSFT)

12.1 This matter would have been reported to the committee at its meeting in May 2018. In response to a request from some committee members, who had concerns with regard to this matter, at the discretion of the Chairman this was instead included on the agenda as a late item.

12.2 In response to a request from the Chairman of the committee the Chief Executive of GHNHSFT had submitted a detailed briefing to the committee including; the reasons for and development of the proposal to establish a SubCo, the type and number of staff affected and the staff consultation process. The proposal did not include clinical staff.

12.3 In response to questions the CEO explained that GHNHSFT had looked carefully at models used in other NHS Trusts and had proceeded with SubCo because the Board felt it was most likely to address the challenges facing the service, secure many of the benefits associated with private sector companies but most importantly would be wholly owned by the NHS Trust. In response to the suggestion that the model would create a two tier service she explained there were already examples of the current workforce being on different terms and conditions, for example, there were already three iterations of the NHS pension scheme in place and equal pay legislation required GHNHSFT to ensure that staff doing the same, or very similar jobs, were remunerated to the same level. It was also clarified that the petition (900 signatories) that had been referred to in the local media was a national, not local, petition; and that this SubCo would be fully accountable to Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) as required.

12.4 Some committee members, whilst acknowledging that there has been formal consultation with affected staff members, felt that the HCOSC should also have been consulted. However this matter relates to how GHNHSFT organises its workforce, not to a service change and therefore does not fall within the remit of the committee, nor would there be a requirement for GHNHSFT to consult the committee. It was commented that information on the committee's position with regard to this proposal had been sent to committee members on 2 January 2018.

13. WINTER PLANNING - DID IT ACHIEVE ITS OBJECTIVES?

13.1 At the November 2017 committee meeting the Gloucestershire Winter Resilience Plan was received and discussed. It was therefore important to understand whether the objectives identified in the plan had been achieved. The committee was pleased to welcome representatives from across all partners (NHS, Public Health and Social Care) to the

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

meeting to discuss this matter with committee members. The Winter Plan document and the detailed presentation received at the committee meeting described the breadth of activity and schemes involved; these were available on the council's website.

- 13.2 It was clear that despite the challenges a lot had been achieved; attributed to significantly closer partnership working, and to every member of staff working together to achieve the best for patients. Headlines from this period included:-
- Significantly improved winter ED (Emergency Department) performance – the national 4 hour standard was met in November 2017 (the first time in 4.5 years); December 2017 saw an increase in performance of 16.84%, and January 2018 a 15.01% improvement in comparison with the same time period in the previous year;
 - A 78% reduction in ambulance handover delays, with zero over one hour;
 - 59% increase in weekend discharges;
 - Reduced delayed transfers of care (DTC) with Gloucestershire being the third best in the country for January 2018;
 - The (Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust) rapid response service supported 80% (1295) more patients to remain in their own home this winter compared to last year;
 - CareUK's south west 111 service maintained a strong and consistent clinical service across the winter period; and were able to rapidly deploy a dedicated A & E revalidation line specifically to assist with system challenges within the GHNHSFT.
- 13.3 It was also reported that there had been unprecedented demand on the Ambulance Service, particularly on New Years Day; that flu preparedness across the system had worked exceedingly well; and that the GP support in the Emergency Departments had been outstanding.
- 13.4 The Clinical Chair GCCG emphasised that this had been a system wide approach. Whilst a lot of the data was focused on outcomes at the acute hospitals, the achievements were down to strong partnership working across health and social care; working as one system.
- 13.5 In response to a question it was explained that a lot of work had gone into developing resilience at the Minor Injury and Illness Units.
- 13.6 Members empathised with staff concerns that they were not able to deliver the level of care that they would wish to for patients waiting on trolleys in corridors. This was acknowledged and the care and compassion of staff was recognised. The committee was informed that work was continuing to improve the process, the number of patients waiting on trolleys was tracked, and that this number had reduced. It was accepted that the system was not yet where it needed to be but there was evidence of good progress and the system had performed better than the prior year despite additional challenges such as a severe and protracted flu season.
- 13.7 In response to a question regarding resources it was explained that this winter money had not been the problem; the main issue had been the inability to recruit to some posts. It was also explained that the system had been running very 'hot' all the time, and staff were now very tired. These were some of the reasons why the system needed to be improved.
- 13.8 The committee stressed the importance of sustainability. This was acknowledged and it was stated that significant improvements had been achieved, although the associated costs were not insignificant. These changes had enabled staff to be better able to deliver good care to patients.

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

- 13.9 Members were pleased to note that patient experience in the emergency departments had improved by 10%. The committee was informed that the patient experience was not just about the clinical care but also about the wider care, preserving patient dignity (additional screens were purchased for use if patients had had to wait on a trolley), and ensuring that patients have eaten and were hydrated.
- 13.10 The committee received a detailed update on the flu vaccination programme. Members were pleased to note the positive level of performance in schools; although improvement was still required across the wider children group. It was disappointing to note that there had been a low uptake of the vaccine among carers and it was acknowledged that work was needed to improve this position in future. The NHS England representative at the committee congratulated all providers for the improvement in staff uptake of the vaccine.
- 13.11 Members were updated on the trauma and orthopaedics pilot at GHNHSFT. The data indicated that this was having a positive effect on the patient experience and also improving job satisfaction for staff, and training for junior doctors. GHNHSFT therefore asked the committee for agreement to extend the pilot to gather more data and continue validation of this process with a formal consultation on a service change in due course. It was expected that the service change proposal would be included in the wider STP proposals for change expected later this year. Committee members agreed to the extension of the pilot on the understanding that if the wider STP proposals were delayed beyond 12 months from now the trauma and orthopaedic service change proposal consultation would proceed.

14. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 14.1 The Accountable Officer, GCCG, assured the committee that the GCCG was concerned about those areas that continue to show 'red' in the report, and were actively working to improve these areas. Of particular concern to the committee were the cancer targets and members would continue to closely monitor these targets.
- 14.2 In response to a question it was explained that with regard to Early Intervention in Psychosis (EIP) the GCCG is working with the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust to improve waiting times, and would be looking at increasing the age range in the next year.
- 14.3 Committee members requested a briefing on why there had been a drop in performance in quarter 3 for level 2 and 3 referral to treatment in the Children and Young People Service (CYPS).
- ACTION: Jane Melton**

15. QUARTER 3 PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 15.1 With regard to the percentage of children who received a 1 year check by 1 year the Director of Public Health drew member's attention to the improved performance. It was noted that a particular difficulty was reaching parents within the required time frame of one year.
- 15.2 In response to a question the committee was reminded that the recommissioned NHS Health Check programme launched on 1 April 2018.

16. QUARTER 3 ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 16.1 The committee has been concerned with regard to adult social care reassessments for some time. The Director of Adult Social Services had commissioned the performance team to undertake a detailed analysis and they have worked with every team. It was identified

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

that restrictions within the ERIC system had resulted in each locality developing their own way of recording data which has then impacted on the overall performance picture. Members were informed that work was already underway for a replacement for ERIC and this information would be included in the specification. The committee was also informed that the adult social care service has also looked at how Children's Services have responded to the Ofsted inspection and taken learning from this process.

17. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE STP LEAD REPORT

17.1 The STP Lead gave a detailed presentation of the report. Some members felt that the STP process was confusing and it was agreed that a workshop on the STP process would be arranged.

ACTION: Becky Parish

17.2 The STP Lead also assured members that she was committed to keeping the committee up to date on all issues coming through this process.

18. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH ANNUAL REPORT

The committee welcomed this report and agreed that it would take a detailed look at this report at its meeting on 8 May 2018.

19. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

19.1 The Director of Adult Social Services drew attention to the Blue Badge consultation and encouraged people to respond. It was questioned whether there were any plans to move away from using the wheelchair symbol on the badges. It was explained that the community was divided about this aspect, and it was an internationally recognised symbol. The Director indicated that if members so wished she could include this in the council consultation response, but could not see this changing.

19.2 It was commented that Highways could sometimes be a barrier to implementing/supporting disability schemes and that it would be important to ensure that they are appropriately briefed.

19.3 It was also commented that 'invisible' disability was a key factor, and that it was important to ensure that people understood that this was not just about wheelchair users.

20. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The committee noted the report.

21. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

21.1 The Accountable Officer, GCCG, informed the committee that the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) was one of the most improved Trusts in the country with regard to Sepsis management.

21.2 In response to a question it was explained that the work to develop the Citizens Jury for the Community Hospitals in the Forest of Dean proposal was progressing and that it was expected that more information would be available at the 8 May 2018 meeting.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 1.30 pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 8 May 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Stephen Andrews	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Eva Ward
Cllr Carole Allaway Martin	

Substitutes: Cllr Ron Allen (In place of Cllr Janet Day)
Cllr Colin Hay (In place of Cllr Joe Harris)

Officers in attendance: Sarah Scott and Margaret Willcox OBE

Apologies: Cllr Doina Cornell, Cllr Janet Day, Cllr Terry Hale, Cllr Steve Harvey and Cllr Helen Molyneux

Also in attendance

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)
Mark Wilkingshaw – Accountable Officer and Director of Commissioning
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Dr Andy Seymour – Clinical Chair
Gill Bridgland - Commissioning Implementation Manager

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)
Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki - Chair

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

Healthwatch Gloucestershire
Bob Lloyd Smith

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust/2Gether NHS Foundation Trust
Paul Roberts – Chief Executive
Ingrid Barker - Chair
Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd
Ed Potter – Managing Director
Paul Willetts – National Head of Service Development

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

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin declared a personal interest as she is a member of the Royal College of Nursing.

23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8 March 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

24. NON EMERGENCY PATIENT TRANSPORT SERVICE

- 24.1 The committee was pleased to welcome the Managing Director and National Head of Service Development from Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd, and the Lead Commissioner from NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) to the committee to debate this issue with committee members. The committee received a detailed presentation from Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd and the GCCG. (For information - the presentation slides were uploaded to the council website and included in the minute book.)
- 24.2 The committee had last met with Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd in March 2017. Performance data at that time was showing a mixed picture; there has been some improvement in the overall picture, but concerns remain particularly relating to KPI4 and KPI5. Other challenges included the increasing number of bariatric patients. The committee heard that it was the volatility of the demand, not necessarily the volume that created challenge.
- 24.3 It was disappointing to note that there was still no national guidance relating to non-emergency transport or a national government lead; although Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd did lobby MPs on a general basis, and, of course, also engaged with them on an individual case basis as part of their constituency work.
- 24.4 Frustration was expressed by Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd that although the discharge process has improved such that transport was considered earlier in the process, this was still not the norm, and there was still a high number of on the day requests. The Chief Executive of Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) informed the committee that GHNHSFT had as much to contribute to a well performing system as Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd, and that booking on the day was not the best way. It was also stated that all partner organisations needed to get much better at planning; this was an expensive resource that should be used more efficiently.
- 24.5 The committee was informed that Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd was working with the local authority to ascertain if there was any capacity in the local authority fleet during 'quiet' periods. Members were also informed that following a successful implementation of dedicated routes for renal dialysis patients requiring frequent journeys in other areas this would go live in Gloucestershire on 1 May 2018.
- 24.6 Members were informed that an extension to this contract has been negotiated until 31 May 2019 to avoid a winter start date for a new contract. In response to a question it was explained that the re-commissioning process would be conducted in an open and transparent manner, as previously, and that there would be opportunities for the public and

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

the committee to engage with the procurement process. It was also explained that all the KPIs were being reviewed as part of the re-commissioning process.

- 24.7 It was questioned where the boundary between this service and that provided by the Voluntary and Community Sector lay? It was clarified that the responsibility of NHS Commissioners was to commission a service for non-emergency medical (not including primary care), not social, need.
- 24.8 The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, informed the committee that feedback received by GHNHSFT on the non-emergency transport service was always shared with the GCCG. It was noted that that the majority of feedback related to waiting time, in particular following an outpatient attendance or admission. She re-iterated that this was as much about partners planning better for discharge, but emphasised that there would always be occasions where a patient would have to be discharged on the day.
- 24.9 Members were aware of anecdotal information with regard to patients being transported home very late in the day and asked whether this did happen. In response it was explained that if Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd received bookings in the evening they would have to respond to them. However, they would check with the clinicians at the hospital as to the appropriateness of the pick up time and would reschedule if requested.
- 24.10 It was commented that it was important to continue to inform and educate the public on the eligibility criteria for this service, and to be prepared to challenge when there was evidence of misuse of the service.
- 24.11 It was agreed that in order to facilitate a better understanding of this service committee members would visit an Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd control centre.

25. THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

- 25.1 The committee had received this report at the committee meeting on 8 March 2018 but had not had time to give the report its full consideration. The Director of Public Health (DPH) therefore gave a detailed presentation on the key messages identified in the report (for information - the presentation slides were uploaded to the council website and included in the minute book).
- 25.2 The committee welcomed this report. Members liked the clean, clear approach to the report, which meant that the information was understandable, and direct.
- 25.3 Members agreed that this report presented a challenging picture of need and health inequality in the county, and agreed with the Director of Public Health that understanding the underlying issues could help to interrupt the cycle of adversity.
- 25.4 Committee members indicated that an important factor for children and families was access to early help/early years, and were interested in the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) work being led by the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board. Members were also pleased to note the restorative practice work taking in place in schools to try and reduce the number of fixed term and permanent exclusions.
- 25.5 It was commented, by one member, that the children centre changes had not helped, and that it was a struggle to keep them running properly. They also informed the committee that schools in their area struggled to get support from families. They mentioned the changes to the youth services, and that what was needed was team of detached youth workers. They also hoped that this report would be shared with the district councils in the county.

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

25.6 Members were very concerned that many young children were not 'school ready'. The DPH explained that this was not always about the parents, but could be related to developmental factors, and also explained the role of Public Health visitors in this process.

26. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE STP LEAD REPORT

26.1 The Deputy Accountable Officer and Director of Commissioning, GCCG, gave a detailed presentation of the report.

26.2 It was questioned what was meant by 'achieve very low numbers' with regard to patients placed out of area for acute psychiatric care. There was agreement that it was good to try and have low numbers out of county, but knowing exactly what the aim was would be helpful and give a better understanding of the objective.

ACTION: Jane Melton

26.3 In response to a question regarding social prescribing it was explained that the GCCG have a series of measures for measuring the impact. It was also explained that social prescribing allowed a response to a person's wider health and wellbeing needs; and that the GCCG was seen as leading the way nationally. It was clarified that all GP practices in the county were involved in this approach.

26.4 It was questioned whether people in the county would be denied services if they were obese, or smoked. It was explained that there was no blanket policy in place in Gloucestershire, but that clinical guidelines for procedures would need to be followed.

27. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

27.1 The committee welcomed the news that the CQC has improved its overall rating of Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust to 'Good' following its inspection in January and February 2018.

27.2 The committee was particularly concerned with the financial position at Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT). Members were disappointed to note that the last reported forecast for the year (February 2018) was a £27.8m deficit against a planned deficit for the year of £14.6m, and was now at £30m, and questioned whether this was related to the problems with the TrakCare system.

27.3 The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, informed the committee that the significant risk identified as part of the recovery plan had come to fruition, and that this did relate in part to the deployment of the Trusts electronic patient record, TrakCare. She reported that the GHNHSFT had received tremendous financial support from the GCCG through its contract process, and had hoped for the same level of support from other commissioners but this had not happened resulting in a significant income loss for the Trust (£10m). The Chief Executive noted that in respect of other aspects of the financial recovery plan, the Trust had performed exceptionally well achieving one of the highest levels of cost improvement in the sector, whilst dramatically improving operational performance and outcomes for patients.

27.4 However, it was important to stress that, in respect of the Trust's ability to reduce its cost base without impacting on the quality of services provided to patients, it has achieved better than, not just the sector average, but was one of the strongest of the eleven Trusts that were in financial special measures. The Chief Executive wanted to stress that this was testament to the Trust's staff. She further explained that GHNHSFT was evidentially delivering lower cost services than the national index, and due to the cost efficiency of the

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

Trust it was delivering this scale of cost reduction without impacting on the quality of care to patients. She reminded the committee that it has seen on many occasions in the last year evidence of where standards of care have improved, eg. sepsis, trauma and orthopaedic, patient experience, improvement against the A & E 4 hour targets.

- 27.5 In response to a question as to whether the Trust's financial position would result in cuts to services the Chief Executive reminded the committee that the Trust's position had always been that the quality of care to patients would not decline as the Trust sought to balance its books. She reiterated that the Trust has no intention to cut services, as had been explained at previous committee meetings if the Trust cut services this would result in a loss of income from their commissioners so would do very little to improve the financial position. It was explained that the question of whether there would be cuts to services was for the commissioners to answer. She stated that whilst there were no plans to cut services, the status quo was not sustainable and the nature and location of some services may change in the future. However, she stressed an absolute commitment to ensure full and proper engagement and consultation with the public, through the HCSOC, where any such changes were considered material.
- 27.6 The Deputy Accountable Officer, GCCG, stated that the focus was on ensuring that there was a really strong offer of services from GHNHSFT. He explained that there would be a need for services to be more efficient in the future, but there would not be service cuts. He informed members that everyone in the NHS was working towards the national requirement for services to be as productive and efficient as possible, and as the committee was aware through previous updates this did mean a need for change and development.
- 27.7 Following the recent announcement by NHS England regarding issues relating to the Breast Cancer Screening process members questioned whether it was known how many people in Gloucestershire had been affected? The Director of Public Health informed the committee that NHS England was still working through the figures, and she would include an update on this matter in her report to the 10 July 2018 meeting of the committee.

ACTION: Sarah Scott

28. **DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT**
The committee noted the report.

29. **DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT**
The committee noted the report.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 1.05 pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 10 July 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Stephen Andrews	Cllr Martin Horwood
Cllr Janet Day	Cllr Steve Lydon
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Eva Ward
Cllr Stephen Hirst	

Substitutes: Cllr Alan Preest (In place of Cllr Pam Tracey MBE)

Apologies: Cllr Helen Molyneux, Cllr Pam Tracey

Also in attendance

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Dr Andy Seymour – Clinical Chair
Debbie Gray – Clinical Lead Therapist

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki – Chair
Simon Lanceley – Director of Strategy and Transformation
Dr Kate Hellier – Consultant Physician in Stroke and General & Old Age Medicine

Gloucestershire County Council

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

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Alan Thomas – Chair

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust/2Gether NHS Foundation Trust

Paul Roberts – Chief Executive
Ingrid Barker - Chair
Professor Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration
Candace Plouffe – Chief Operating Officer

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

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

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin declared a personal interest as she is a member of the Royal College of Nursing.

Cllr Martin Horwood declared a personal interest as a family member works for the NHS.

31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8 May 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

32. HOW WILL BEING AN INTEGRATED CARE SYSTEMS (ICS) BENEFIT GLOUCESTERSHIRE?

- 32.1 The Accountable Officer, Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG), informed the committee that in June 2018 it had been confirmed that Gloucestershire would become one of only 14 ICS in the country. The county was also given a huge vote of confidence and praised by the NHS England Chief Executive, Simon Stevens, for providing strong leadership, effective partnership working and its ambitious plans to join up support and services for the benefit of communities. It was explained that becoming an ICS was, in effect, a continuation of the work already in place and planned in Gloucestershire. It was emphasised that this was not a merger of organisations.
- 32.2 The committee agreed that it was good to see the close cooperation and greater integration between organisations. In response to questions it was explained that the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board (GHWB) was a very active part of the system, and that as per the committee's work plan members of the committee would be scrutinising the work of the GHWB at the committee meeting on 11 September 2018.
- 32.3 Members also expressed concern with regard to the pressures on the workforce. It was explained that a workforce strategy was in place.
- 32.4 It was questioned whether this would lead to further integration and was this about achieving savings. The Accountable Officer informed the committee that the ICS would have to manage within the resources available. The aim was to provide quality care at the right time in the right place. An important part of this was about identifying and promoting self-care.
- 32.5 Members also questioned whether there would be an impact on the number of beds available in the county. In response it was explained that it was important to understand that things needed to be done in a more joined up way, and supporting people to be independent (if that was what they wanted). Within this context it was important to understand that the most important bed was the person's own bed; creating bed equivalents in the home; developing care around the individual.
- 32.6 It was acknowledged that there would be financial challenges, in particular ensuring that one budget was not depleted at the expense of another, but that together we could do this better. It would be important to ensure that the Gloucestershire tax payer achieved the best value for their Gloucestershire Pound.
- 32.7 The potential impact on the people who lived on the county's boundaries was questioned. The committee was assured that the GCCG had good working relationships with the CCGs on the border.

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

32.8 The committee agreed that it would be helpful for there to be a seminar for county and district members. This was agreed and will be held in the Autumn.

33. STROKE REHABILITATION - UPDATE

33.1 The committee was pleased to welcome Candace Plouffe, Chief Operating Officer (COO) Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS), Debbie Gray, Clinical Lead Therapist, Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG), and Dr Kate Hellier, Consultant Physician in Stroke and General & Old Age Medicine at Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT), to present and discuss the clinical case for change for bed based stroke rehabilitation. (For information the presentation slides were uploaded to the council's website and included in the minute book.)

33.2 It was acknowledged that the committee had been concerned about performance against stroke targets for some time, and in a previous council some committee members had visited the stroke pathway at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital. Members agreed that it was therefore good to receive this proposal.

33.4 Members agreed that the clinical evidence supporting this change was strong and that creating a centre of excellence for stroke patients in Gloucestershire would be the best way forward for patients. Members acknowledged that:-

- it would deliver benefits to patients' health and reduce social care needs
- It would be staffed in line with the national guidance from the Royal College of Physicians and the Stroke Association
- Stroke patients and their families, and the Stroke Association were very involved in the engagement activity
- The options appraisal that was undertaken had identified the Vale Community Hospital in Dursley as the preferred location
- Important factors were that the Vale has single rooms, as opposed to a ward setting, rehabilitation space and the location itself, which with the gardens and light traffic lent themselves to a 24/7 rehabilitation regime
- The bed modelling undertaken by GCS had demonstrated that there would be no reduction in beds overall though the distribution of beds would change
- The other services delivered at the Vale Hospital would continue as normal
- It was expected that this change would make the hospital sustainable in the long term.

33.5 Having said this the committee did have significant concerns with regard to the accessibility of the site; were public transport options sufficient to enable patients to receive visitors? (not everyone has access to private transport). It was commented that many of these patients visitors were likely to be frail themselves.

33.6 It was questioned that given that the greater population density was in the urban areas the Vale Hospital seemed an odd choice. The Chief Executive, Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT), informed the committee that the GHNHSFT had looked carefully at whether this service could be delivered at one of their sites, which were considered more accessible. The Trust, including the Clinical lead for Stroke Services had serious concerns about the suitability of the environment of an acute hospital site which did not lend itself to a rehabilitation ethos and that non-emergency services, on acute hospital sites, were at risk of being adversely impacted by winter pressures when there were peaks in patients with more urgent medical needs who often displaced non-urgent patients. Such a scenario would result in the interruption of stroke rehabilitation services at

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

times of peak operational pressure. The GHNHSFT was overwhelmingly of the view that this service should be delivered outside of an acute hospital setting.

- 33.7 In response to a comment the Accountable Officer emphasised that it was important not to confuse general rehab beds with the specialised stroke rehab service.
- 33.8 The Accountable Officer reinforced that this was about investing in the service, and would make massive improvements; this was not a substantial variation. She assured the committee that she valued the opinion of the committee and would take its concerns to the GCCG governing body. She explained that GCS did want to proceed with the recruitment of staff in August 2018 so that the new service could be bedded in as quickly as possible.
- 33.9 In response to concerns regarding visiting it was explained that the Vale Hospital operated open visiting hours. GCS was also ensuring that patients and their families/carers could take advantage of technology such as Skype and FaceTime. It was stated that within this context it was also important to bear in mind that patients' rehab would be designed to be 24/7.
- 33.10 Dr Hellier informed members that the patients she supported and talked to everyday were clear that they wanted to be treated where they could get the best service, and that this was not possible in an acute setting. She was clear that the current environment at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital did not offer the support that stroke patients needed. She was very clear that this was a wonderful opportunity for patients. She reminded the committee that for other serious neurological conditions patients would have to travel to Bristol, where they would receive the best care and no patient or family had ever raised concerns with her about that. She emphasised that as a stroke expert she strongly believed this was the right thing for patients and it was important to get on with it as soon as possible to avoid delaying the benefits it would bring.
- 33.11 There was concern as to how patients with dementia would cope with being moved; change could be very distressing for them. However it was explained that as the Vale Hospital had single rooms; this would enable family members/carers to stay with the patient overnight as necessary.
- 33.12 The committee did not wish to prevent this proposal moving forward as quickly as possible and agreed that on completion of the engagement period that the proposal was considered at the GCS and GCCG Governing Boards so that recruitment could be progressed as soon as possible. It was also agreed that the committee would be updated at a future meeting on what was being done to address transport issues.

34. QUARTER 4 ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 34.1 The Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) informed the meeting that overall performance was good. However performance against the reassessment targets remained a concern, although it was stated that the data was beginning to show some improvement but that this would take some time to show in the performance scorecard.
- 34.2 The committee noted that performance relating to carers and self-directed support was also not where it needed to be. The committee was informed that a report was going to Cabinet (18 July 2018) with regard to the procurement of a new carers contract. Within this context consideration had been given to how to make this funding more available. Carers have been asked, and officers have also looked at approaches in place at other councils. It was suggested that it might be better to make this a larger sum and over a three year period. The DASS agreed to consider this point.

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

- 34.3 In response to questions relating to safeguarding adults it was agreed that a briefing on Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) would be provided.
- 34.4 Some members stated that it was disappointing that not all the data in this report was the most current, and it was important that scrutiny be in receipt of the most up to date data. It was also stated that the structure of this report did not make it easy to understand the overall performance picture.

35. QUARTER 4 PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 35.1 The Director of Public Health (DPH) informed the committee there continued to be a positive trend against performance targets in the Healthy Lifestyle Service. Performance relating to NHS Health Checks fell in quarter 3, although it was still above the regional and national average (based on the latest available data).
- 35.2 In response to questions it was stated that although drug and alcohol performance remained on target there was a downward trend. It was explained that this was due to the transition to the new contract. The DPH informed the committee that experience had shown that this was to be expected during the transition process, although it was of course a concern, and the council was working with the new provider to see what could be done to support these people.
- 35.3 Some committee members felt that it would be helpful to receive a wider range of public health indicators, eg. immunisation data. It was agreed that this was something that the committee could discuss at a future work planning meeting.
- 35.4 Members again commented that it was not helpful that the data for some targets was not the most up to date, and that the structure of the scorecard did not make for easy reading.

36. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 36.1 With regard to A & E performance the Accountable Officer (AO), GCCG, informed the committee that there had been significant use of the Emergency Departments in the last month by people with minor conditions. This level of demand was unmanageable in the long term. The AO informed members that this was disappointing given that the GCCG has extended the primary care offer, including greater capacity in appointments, including at the weekend.
- 36.2 Given previous concerns members were pleased to note that the investment in Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) was making a difference with the service now achieving well.
- 36.3 A member commented that it would be more informative for the committee to receive the A & E data broken down between sites rather than the performance for the Trust as a whole as this would demonstrate if one site was performing better than the other. This request was agreed.
- 36.4 Performance against cancer targets continue to remain of concern, particularly the two week wait. The GCCG were continuing to work to redress this position.

37. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE STP LEAD REPORT

The committee noted the report.

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

38. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

The committee noted the report.

39. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

39.1 In response to questions the Director of Public Health (DPH) clarified that the work related to period poverty was a budget amendment at the meeting of full council in February 2018; it was not a council motion. It had been agreed that this work would be taken forward by the DPH and her team. She informed the committee that there was a lot of work already in place and the aim was to work with these people not establish another route. It was agreed that members would contact the DPH with information on any activity that was already in place in their communities.

39.2 It was commented that there was more to do at the planning level with regard to how to design housing estates. The committee was informed that Jon McGinty, Managing Director Gloucester City Council, and Commissioning Director Gloucestershire County Council, was the district lead on planning issues and was liaising on this aspect. The DPH also informed the committee that she had responded to the consultation for the Joint Core Strategy.

40. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

A member requested informing dating back to the service change relating to urgent care in 2013, in particular with regard to health outcomes. This change related to overnight (8pm to 8am) at Cheltenham General Hospital and affected those people who were transported by ambulance; ambulances now went directly to Gloucestershire Royal Hospital during these hours. Officers were of the view that it would not be possible to produce meaningful data, but did agree to see what was available.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 1.14 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 16 March 2018 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

William Alexander	Chris Nelson
Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr Gerald Dee	Martin Smith
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Jane Horne	Cllr Clive Walford
Cllr Helena McCloskey	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
Cllr Karen McKeown	

Substitutes:

Officers in attendance: Richard Bradley, Chris Brierley, Joanne Moore, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Cllr Rob Garnham

5. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Loraine Patrick, (substituted by Cllr Ray Theodoulou); Cllr Collette Finnegan, (substituted by Cllr Clive Walford); Cllr Ray Brassington, (substituted by Cllr Joe Harris); Cllr Bruce Hogan, (substituted by Cllr Jane Horne); and Cllr Rob Garnham.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

7. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2018 were confirmed and agreed as a correct record of that meeting.

8. RESTORATIVE GLOUCESTERSHIRE

8.1 Becky Beard, Restorative Gloucestershire Manager, gave a detailed presentation on the Restorative Gloucestershire Partnership.

8.2 Members received a short introduction from the Police and Crime Commissioner, who explained that Restorative Gloucestershire started out as a small project in 2010 based on victim and offender conferencing in HMP Gloucester.

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

- 8.3 Funded by Restorative Solutions, the partnership expanded to the Cheltenham and Cotswold areas with one part time project manager and one full time co-ordinator. In 2013, following a review of community resolutions, it was agreed the Constabulary would cease community resolutions (CR) and re-train all front line officers to deliver restorative interventions, a decision based on the effectiveness of reducing re-offending and improving victim satisfaction via this route. At this time, the Police and Crime Commissioner took over the funding for Restorative Gloucestershire and support for the service.
- 8.4 The work undertaken by Restorative Gloucestershire consists of a number of work streams; these can be divided into two main areas. The first element involves recruiting, training and supporting partner agencies to deliver restorative interventions. The majority of this activity is managed by the hub manager and police sergeant. This involves mostly low level cases, working with the police and partner agencies on cases such as shoplifting and theft. The second element involves the referral system for complex and sensitive cases. This involves working with partner agencies on complex community and family issues, as well as post-sentence cases such as burglary, GBH and murder. The work requires close management and high levels of training for facilitators, as well as signposting to support agencies. This work is managed by the volunteer manager and involves recruiting, training and managing the facilitators and their case loads. At the time of the presentation, there were around 30 volunteer facilitators plus 100 volunteers across the partnership.
- 8.5 During the presentation, panel members were informed Gloucestershire Restorative was a group of statutory, non-statutory and voluntary sector partners working together with the aim of offering people coming into contact with the criminal justice system the opportunity to participate in restorative intervention.
- 8.6 Restorative Gloucestershire is funded by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and is governed and held accountable by the Restorative Gloucestershire Partnership.
- 8.7 Progress during the past 12 months has seen a substantial expansion of the Partnership. Outlining some of the developments constituting this expansion, it was confirmed that the number of staff and facilitators working with the Partnership had increased significantly during the past year, allowing more interventions to be delivered and increasing the amount of training provided to organisations.
- 8.8 Restorative Gloucestershire was also working with the County Council, focussing on implementing the use of restorative practice within Children and Young People's services.

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

- 8.9 Drawing on the pride of receiving awards for the work undertaken by the Partnership, Becky outlined some of the specific achievements achieved during the past year, informing the Panel that 84% of offenders taken from a sample of 4000 people over 4 years had not reoffended after 2013. The ability to provide people entering the criminal justice system with the opportunity to make a change in their lives or not having to go through the court or legal process remained the highest category of achievement.
- 8.10 The Panel welcomed the update and commended the work being undertaken within schools and in collaboration with victim support services. It was noted that the council was currently engaging with a number of schools as part of a review of the high rate of permanent exclusions in Gloucestershire. One panel member suggested that the Police Crime Panel needed to accentuate this issue and proposed that a letter be written to the Home Office to express concerns about the costs of exclusion and the impact on the County. The suggestion was noted.

9. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT

- 9.1 Paul Trott, Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office, introduced the report and gave an update on the activities of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office.
- 9.2 Key messages highlighted by the report included:
- a) A summary of the decisions recorded by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC) for the period January to February 2018.
 - b) Information relating to the process for recruiting a number of new posts to the OPCC, including the post of Chief Finance Officer.
 - c) Recognition at the recent iESE Public Sector Transformation Awards, where Gloucestershire OPCC received a bronze award for community engagement and the Commissioner's Fund received a gold award and named Police Service of the Year.
- 9.3 An in-depth discussion was held on the crime rates in rural areas in Gloucestershire, with Cllr Joe Harris commending the OPCC for the encouraging reduction of crime within the Cotswold District, recently reduced by 6 %.
- 9.4 Cllr Ray Theodoulou expressed a slightly different viewpoint, highlighting concerns about limited resources and the recent spate of crimes in the Lechlade area. Cllr Theodoulou, nevertheless, commended the outcomes of a recent meeting with local police to try to better understand some of the issues.
- 9.5 A request was made for more up-to-date figures to reflect a more accurate picture of crime rates in rural areas and to highlight trends associated with

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

crimes by offenders from out of county and the impact on crime rates in Gloucestershire. **Action by - Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner**

The report was noted.

10. PCP HIGHLIGHT REPORT

- 10.1 Richard Bradley, Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, gave an update on the Police and Crime Plan for the period November 2017 to January 2018. Richard outlined the 6 priority areas for delivery of the plan and explained that the priorities would continue to be developed over the period 2017-2021.
- 10.2 Concerns were raised about whether the objectives relating to child protection needed refreshing. With additional officers assigned to meeting this objective and subject to regular monitoring, the Panel was assured the activities relating to this priority were being taken very seriously. Work between the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office and the County Council continued.
- 10.3 Praising the work of the neighbourhood policing team, one member suggested that the Panel invite a representative from the team to attend future Police and Crime Panel meetings. The Panel agreed that improved communications and first hand knowledge of some of the issues being experienced in local communities could add value to the meetings. This would be considered as part of future working planning.
- 10.4 Expressing a specific interest in the activities of the Mounted Police Section, members praised the work of the Community Harm Reduction Team and requested regular updates on the initiative at future Police and Crime Panel meetings. One member raised concerns about the need for improved driver awareness in respect of riders on horseback and horses on highways. The concerns were noted.
- 10.5 The Panel considered some of the planned activities aimed at ensuring safer cyber in Gloucestershire. Planned activities for the next quarter included; the deployment of an integrated harm reduction communications plan; the introduction of a phased approach for the deployment of a centralised content management system for partner agencies and staff engaged in content delivery; development of a staff security awareness training programme for the County Council; the rebranding and restructuring of the Gloucestershire Safer Cyber Forum to provide training and advice through adult education services; the finalising of plans for the 2018 Gloucester Business Show, (with a focus on establishing improved business risk awareness and reducing cyber crime), and; continuation of upskilling the control room staff to ensure the best possible service is provided in relation to digital harm reduction and cybercrime.

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

- 10.6 The Panel welcomed the initiatives and requested regular updates at future meetings. It was agreed this particular area of concern needed to be taken very seriously.

The report was noted.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.15 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 13 July 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

William Alexander	Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Jonny Brownsteen	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Mattie Ross
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
Cllr Joe Harris	

Substitutes: Cllr Stephen Cooke (In place of Louis Savage)
Cllr Jane Horne (In place of Cllr Bruce Hogan)
Cllr Lesley Williams MBE (In place of Cllr Steve Robinson)

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

Apologies: Cllr Julian Beale and Martin Smith

11. ELECTION OF CHAIR

11.1 Following a vote Cllr Will Windsor Clive was elected as Chair

11.2 Concerns were raised about the position of Chair and the participation of some Panel member in a recent debate at full Council. It was emphasised that it was important that the position be apolitical and that there was fair and constructive scrutiny of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

12. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Cllr Colin Hay was elected as Vice Chair.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations were made.

14. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following:

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

The Police and Crime Commissioner asked that the minutes reflect that the Chair had needed to leave the meeting early and that Cllr Colin Hay chaired the meeting in his absence. This was agreed.

A number of actions were attributed to the Commissioner's Office and it had been raised in advance of the meeting that these actions were for the Panel to consider as part of their work plan going forward. One action regarding the writing of a letter was not for the Commissioner's Office to do. It was agreed that these actions would be removed.

15. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL: TERMS OF REFERENCE

15.1 The Panel noted the terms of reference and panel arrangement. New members had been invited for a session in advance of the meeting to go through them in detail. This offer was open to any member who wished for additional training or to gain a greater understanding.

15.2 One member raised his concerns regarding the gap between meetings between March and July. Members recognised that this was due to the elections and the need for appointments to be made to the Panel and top up members to be recommended. Legislation dictated that the Panel had to be politically balanced across Gloucestershire and this caused a delay. It was agreed that officers would look at the number and regularity of meetings.

ACTION **Stephen Bace**

15.3 Members discussed whether independent members should have substitutes. One member felt that this opportunity should be made available. One independent member on the panel felt that this was not appropriate. The Panel also discussed consideration of independent members being eligible to be appointed Chair. One independent member stated that he did not believe this was a necessary change for the rules of procedure. Officers would look at the practicalities around this and get back to the Panel.

ACTION **Stephen Bace**

16. POLICE FUNDING

16.1 At the request of a member, the Police and Crime Panel considered an item on the Commissioner's draft response to the letter sent from the County Council to the Police and Crime Commissioner's office as agreed by full Council on 16 May. The debate around the motion and the questions asked by the County Council can be found in the minutes at:

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=20346>

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

The response from the Commissioner's office included a number of references to previous Police and Crime Panel meetings and the Chief Executive of his office outlined that the intention was to seek the view of the Panel and see if they wished to add anything to the letter.

- 16.2 The Chair commented that he did not believe it was the role of the Panel to consider a draft letter which was in response to the Leader of the County Council. There was some discussion around whether, during the debate on the motion, the amendment put should have included the suggestion of the debate going through the Police and Crime Panel in the first instance.
- 16.3 Some members commented that the debate in the Chamber had been 'outrageous' and 'offensive' and it was important that the Commissioner had a public arena in which to respond.
- 16.4 Some members commented that the original motion for full Council to debate was around police funding and the concerns around this.
- 16.5 One member commented that the points within the letter had been debated by the Panel numerous times and that the Panel was the right place for those debates as it had a statutory scrutiny role. It was important to take the politics out of the situation.
- 16.6 The Police and Crime Commissioner thanked Cllr David Brown who had brought the original motion on police funding to full Council, he explained police funding which was a significant concern of his. It was important with rising demand through cyber crime, child sexual exploitation and domestic violence that the Police were properly resourced. He expressed disappointment with how the debate had then moved forward at full Council and he had asked his office to circulate a transcript of that meeting to Panel members.
- 16.7 In response to points raised about the Commissioner at the full Council meeting, he stated that he was not a proxy for another political party and that he was an independent who had funded his campaign himself. He wanted to make clear that he was not untrustworthy or dishonest as had been claimed and that he felt that the Office were doing a good job and that progress was being made. He explained that the £17m cited for estates within the letter was incorrect as it related to the previous four years.
- 16.8 The Commissioner asked the Chair clarification regarding a question in the letter from the County Council on lobbying for City status. He asked what that meant? In response the Chair of the Panel advised him to seek that clarification from the Leader of Council.
- 16.9 Some members stated that they were pleased that they had sight of the letter and that the Commissioner had been given the opportunity to address a number of the comments made at the Council meeting. Members reiterated their concerns around the political nature of the discussion and the

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

role of Police and Crime Panel members, including the Chairman, in relation to the debate at full Council.

- 16.10 The Panel stated that they were happy for the Commissioner's Office to send the response unchanged. Members agreed to end the item and move forward as a panel in an independent and apolitical manner.

17. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

- 17.1 Paul Trott, Chief Executive of the Commissioner's Office, introduced the report which included details of Freedom of Information requests and complaints.
- 17.2 Members were informed that a Child Friendly Gloucestershire proposal had been circulated to strategic leaders across the county about how we can collectively move forward and develop a better county for our children, The aspiration was to create a child friendly county where what young people said are their hopes for Gloucestershire is placed at the heart of decision making and service delivery. The model being proposed was based on the Child Friendly Leeds approach which brought the together public, voluntary and private sectors under one vision which had been identified by young people. The Panel was informed that the office had received positive responses from agencies and individuals and that there would be an update to the Panel at future meetings. Some Members expressed their support for this work and the Panel looked forward to receiving further details. One member requested that this be in the form of its own item.
- 17.3 In response to a question on the occupation of Bearlands police station, it was explained that this had been refurbished by the County Council and the Constabulary occupied the bottom floor of the building.
- 17.4 The Police and Crime Commissioner explained that there was increased demand around 101 calls.
- 17.5 One member congratulated the Commissioner on crime being down in Cotswold by 12%. He asked for an update on Cirencester Police Station and was informed that the Office had entered into an arrangement with Cotswold District Council. The Commissioner had met with the Cabinet Member Cllr Nigel Moor to discuss possibilities around a joint police and fire station.
- 17.6 In response to a question it was explained that in relation to complaints there were no benchmarking data available.
- 17.7 Members received an update on discussions around the development of a court building in Gloucestershire. The Commissioner had been informed that the Ministry of Justice had no immediate plans to invest in new courts in the County and that the current courts were on a 5-10 year plan. The

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

Commissioner felt that the county should come together to identify a site now for options at the end of that period citing accessibility as a real issue. The Commissioner pointed out there was very limited disability access to Gloucestershire's courts and that this was unacceptable.

- 17.8 Concern was expressed about individual cases of children in custody with some confusion around whether a young person was being allowed home or not. The Commissioner stated that he would need to look into this.

ACTION PCC Martin Surl

- 17.9 One member asked about the response to an individual with mental health issues where a number of police cars had turned up. The Commissioner explained that the response would have been in relation to the particular circumstances and that where individuals needed medical intervention it was important that there was a place for them to go.

- 17.10 In response to a question it was explained that the removal of travellers was, in most cases a local authority responsibility.

- 17.11 It was explained that the income from the sale of land at Cleeve Business Park would be used to fund the acquisition and development of other land and buildings.

18. ANNUAL REPORT

- 18.1 The Panel had a responsibility to consider the Annual Report and make a report or recommendations as necessary. Members spoke positively about the format of the report and reiterated the importance of ensuring that it was circulated widely, with the example given of Parish Councils.

- 18.2 Members suggested that a list should be drawn up around where the report would be shared.

- 18.3 By way of suggestions for future Annual Reports, some members commented on the need to be more open with regards to concerns and worries of the Commissioner and particular areas of focus for improvement. It was recognised that there was a need for balance and it was important to celebrate the fact that a lot of good work was happening and that the County was one of the safest places to live in the country.

- 18.4 The Panel noted a typo within the report where it referenced 'body worn videos'.

19. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PRIORITIES HIGHLIGHT REPORT

- 19.1 Richard Bradley presented the report outlining that for each of the six priorities within the Police and Crime Plan there was a priority lead. The plan worked across Gloucestershire and heavily involved partners. Each priority lead worked in conjunction with a Police Lead. The report detailed activity across the period January to March 2018.
- 19.2 The Panel was informed that the Police and Crime Commissioner had set the Chief Constable the challenge of reinstating neighbourhood policing. The Constabulary had grasped that opportunity and received good feedback around police being back within communities. In September, an independent review of neighbourhood policing would be conducted and a report would be brought back to the Panel. There was a discussion around the re-focus on neighbourhood policing with members giving anecdotal examples of where it was working well in the County.
- 19.3 Members were informed that with the support of colleagues that work had been carried out to reduce the amount of young people going into custody and acquiring a criminal record. In 2010 1516 young people went into custody, in 2017 that figure had reduced to 650. One member referenced the role of PCSOs as the ears of the Constabulary and asked what training they had to ensure they understood the work around vulnerable children. It was confirmed that the Children First approach was embedded within the activity of the Police and Crime delivery plan. The Children First programme was aimed at preventing children from entering the Criminal Justice system and using restorative approaches as an alternative by involving their victims. To date more than 135 young people had benefited from this approach. One member commented about the difficulties for parents in understanding who to go to if they were having issues of a criminal nature with their children. Part of the increase in the budget was the reintroduction of school officers.
- 19.4 One member encouraged people to sign up to Community Alerts.
- 19.5 Some members raised their concerns about young people speeding and racing on mopeds and motorbikes. It was felt that this was an issue that was growing in some communities. The Commissioner explained that the Constabulary had doubled the size of the Traffic and Community Enforcement Team and there was a new vehicle that could provide equipment in small communities to help prevent and catch those who were speeding and committing other motoring offences.
- 19.6 One member referred to a cross party supported motion at Stroud District Council regarding activity to encourage car drivers to take account and show greater consideration to cyclists. She asked whether the training for Police officers would encourage officers to talk to drivers around the best way to open car doors to avoid cyclists and to understand from the council what routes had more cyclists on them. In response the Commissioner explained that the Constabulary was responsible for training officers which they did to the highest standards.

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

- 19.7 One member welcomed the increased emphasis on technology particularly around the use of body cams. He explained that there needed to be confidence that the retained digital material was used fairly and responsibly. The Commissioner provided reassurance that data protection law was followed. He provided details around the advancements in technology and how that assisted the Constabulary
- 19.8 One member detailed concerns around drug use in Pitville Park in Cheltenham. He asked who was responsible for responding to this. In response, it was explained that this was everyone's responsibility and that it was why a multi-agency approach was required. The member was advised to go through the Community Safety Partnership.
- 19.9 In response to a question it was explained that the fixed camera locations the side of the road were owned by the County Council and that the plan was to upgrade these to take digital photographs.. The Commissioner was not aware of when the work was taking place, but emphasised that while Police would operate an enforcement role, it was the County Council who determined which sites were maintained and the equipment used within them.

20. ASSOCIATION OF POLICE AND CRIME PANELS

The Police and Crime Panel agreed to become a part of the National Association of Police Fire and Crime Panels. This was a forum to allow for collaborative discussion of issues and to share ideas and experience as well as to provide a direct liaison to the Home Office and dialogue with other relevant bodies.

21. CONFIRMATORY HEARING - CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

- 21.1 The Police and Crime Commissioner introduced Stewart Walton as his preferred candidate for the role of Chief Finance Officer. This was a part time position which had previously been subject to a trial during which the role was met by the Chief Finance Officer for the Constabulary. The Commissioner emphasised the importance of having an individual who could provide good strategic financial advice and scrutinise the Constabulary's figures and performance. This was a part time position. Two candidates had been interviewed and given a presentation to the Commissioner.
- 21.2 Stewart Walton introduced himself to the Panel, He was an Accountant and had carried out similar roles to this. He had provided oversight and non executive roles in the past and was used to providing challenge where needed.

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

21.3 The Police and Crime Panel supported the appointment.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.45 pm

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - SEPTEMBER 2018 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 (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Performance Report (Quarter 1)	No	No	Cabinet	September 2018	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Request to convert Loan to Grant	No	Yes	Cabinet	September 2018	Leader of the Council/ Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Approval of funding for Fleet Lease initiative	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2018	Cabinet Member for Environment	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Consideration of options appraisal and decision on future waste service design	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2018	Cabinet Member for Environment	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Existing Contract

44

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Approval of funding to support the procurement and full business case for in-cab technology for waste service vehicles	No	No	Cabinet (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2018	Cabinet Member for Environment	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Land at Kemble	Yes	Yes	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	September 2018	Deputy Leader of the Council	Bhavna Patel	Cabinet Members Ward Members Senior Officers Parish Council	None
County-Wide Procurement of Strategic Housing Market Assessment	No	No	Cabinet	September 2018	Housing, Health and Leisure	Philippa Lowe	Other Gloucestershire local authorities Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Tender documents
Update on progress against the GDPR / Data Protection Action Plan	No	No	Cabinet	October 2018	Leader of the Council	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Customer Service and Access Strategy	No	No	Cabinet	October 2018	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Service Users	None

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Council Tax Support Scheme 2019/20 and local Council Tax Reliefs	No	No	Cabinet	October 2018	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Public Stakeholders Senior Officers	Consultation results.
Corinium Museum "Stone Age to Corinium" project - Selection of Main Contractor	No	Yes	Cabinet	October 2018	Housing, Health & Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Tender documents/returns
Electric Vehicle Charging Points - Options for Additional Provision	No	No	Cabinet	October 2018	Cabinet Member for Enterprise & Partnerships	Claire Locke/ Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Outcome of Procurement Exercise
Lifting of Designated Protected Area Status for Shared Ownership	No	No	Cabinet	November 2018	Housing, Health and Leisure	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Youth Activities Fund	No	No	Cabinet	November 2018	Leader of the Council		Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Existing Scheme
Corinium Museum "Stone Age to Corinium" project - Selection of Specialist Contractors	No	Yes	Cabinet	November 2018	Housing, Health and Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Tender documents/returns

46

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
There is no scheduled December Meeting								
Corporate Enforcement Policy	No	No	Cabinet	January 2018	Leader of the Council	Emma Cathcart	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Service Leads Legal Department	Enforcement Policy - March 2015
Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2022/23 and Budget 2019/20	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2019	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers Treasury Management Advisers Local Businesses Residents Town/Parish Councils	Likely Local Government Finance Settlement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process
Performance Report (Quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data

47

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
No item(s) yet identified				April 2019				
No item(s) yet identified				May 2019				
Performance Report (Quarter 4)	No	No	Cabinet	June 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Leisure Management Contract Review	Yes	No	Cabinet	July 2019	Housing, Health & Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Committee (June 2019)	Existing Contract

48

(END)