



**COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4th DECEMBER 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 20 th June 2018	3
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes of Meeting held on 11 th September 2018	10
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel Minutes of Meeting held on 14 th September 2018	15
(iv)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel Minutes of Meeting held on 16 th November 2018	23
(2)	Executive Forward Plan - December 2018 Update	29

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 Shire Hall, Gloucester at 1.30 pm on Wednesday 20 June 2018.

PRESENT

Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr Stephen Hirst
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Bruce Hogan
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr Joe Harris
Cllr David Norman MBE	Cllr Sajid Patel
Cllr Paul McCloskey	

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Phil Awford and Martin Whiteside.

Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Dave Norman, welcomed two new members to the committee. Cllr Klara Sudbury, (representing Gloucestershire County Council), replaced Cllr Colin Hay and Cllr Sajid Patel, (representing Gloucester City), replaced Cllr Dawn Melvin.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Seeking nominations for Vice-Chairman of the Committee 2018-19, Cllr Norman received nominations for Cllr Kevin Cromwell, (former Vice-Chairman), and Cllr Kate Haigh.

Cllr Kevin Cromwell was appointed Vice Chairman of the Committee 2018-19.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2018 were agreed and confirmed as an accurate record of that meeting.

The Chairman congratulated the Fastershire Project Team for winning the Superfast Broadband Award at the Connected Britain Awards held in London on 19 June 2018.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

5. GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH JOINT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

Chairman of the Economic Growth Joint Committee, Cllr Lynden Stowe, and Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, Mike Dawson, attended the meeting to update members on the items included on the Joint Committee work plan.

Cllr Stowe also provided clarification on the request from the Joint Committee for the Scrutiny Committee to consider the impact of the aspiration by the Cotswold Conservation Board to establish a "National Park" in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB).

Cllr Stowe acknowledged that, following a recent statement by the Environment Secretary, Michael Gove, the option to consider the merits of obtaining National Park status would be no longer restricted to the Cotswold AONB but could be extended to include other areas within Gloucestershire. This was reinforced by the suggestion that other areas in Gloucestershire might be interested in achieving National Park status.

Members noted that, since the introduction of National Parks and AONB's almost 70 years ago and the campaign to create more accessible places of beauty in the UK, it had been deemed an appropriate time for the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to review the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949.

The review, (led by Julian Glover), would be supported by an experienced advisory group. The review will draw on existing evidence, plus information submitted by interested groups and other individuals. The review team to undertake visits to locations in a range of designated landscapes.

DEFRA to provide the secretariat for the cross-party review, the outcomes of which will be presented in a series of recommendations to the government. A more detailed timetable of the proposed study was anticipated.

The review to examine and make recommendations on: -

- a) The existing statutory purposes of National Parks and ANOB's and how effective these purposes are being met;
- b) The alignment of the purposes with the goals set out in the government's 25 Year Plan for the Environment;
- c) The case for extension or creation of new designated areas;
- d) How to improve individual and collective governance of National Parks and AONB's and how that governance interacts with other national assets;
- e) The financing of National Parks and AONB's;

- f) How to enhance the environment and biodiversity in existing designations;
- g) How to build on existing plans for National Parks and connect more people with the national environment;
- h) The review to consider how well National parks and AONB's support local communities

Expanding on the work already underway, the review to take advice from Natural England on the process for designating National Parks and AONB's and extending boundary areas.

Cllr Stowe referred to the aspiration by the Cotswold Conservation Board to achieve National Park status for the Cotswold AONB and suggested that this might be a worthwhile opportunity for the Scrutiny Committee to consider the financial benefits of the proposal. He also suggested that it might be useful for the committee to consider some of the 'dis-benefits' of the aspiration, including potential changes to local governance and decision making arrangements. Cllr Stowe also made reference to consideration of the impact of the proposal on the Minerals Local Plan for Gloucestershire and consideration of how the plan might be progressed under the control of a national body.

The committee engaged in a full and detailed discussion about the merits of the proposal, including the feasibility of the request by the Joint Committee for the Scrutiny Committee to undertake a task group review.

One member questioned the impact of the proposal on stimulating economic growth, whilst several other members expressed concerns about the possible restrictions on local planning authority decisions. Another member questioned where the request to undertake a scrutiny task group review had originated from and suggested that the work might be better allocated to the district authorities.

Cllr Stowe noted the concerns, including the impact of achieving National Park status on the Mineral Local Plan, house prices and district boundaries. Whilst Cllr Stowe agreed that many of the issues associated with the aspiration to seek National Park status linked directly to the work of the district councils, he nevertheless maintained that the scrutiny committee, with its combined county and district membership, would be best placed to undertake the review. He added that, this would not preclude the district councils from undertaking their own reviews at the same time. Expressing some misgivings about this perception, officers stressed how important it was to avoid a duplication of work.

Cllr Stowe concluded by stating that the scrutiny committee, comprising county and district membership and with input from GFirst LEP, was the most suitable vehicle to undertake the proposed review, and in doing so, demonstrate partnership working at it's most effective. He also stated how critical it was to gather evidence on such an important issue in an attempt to determine whether the outcome would be a positive or negative one for Gloucestershire.

Taking a vote on the views of the committee, it was agreed, (by a slight majority), that the committee seek approval from the Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to establish a scrutiny task group to consider the impact of obtaining National Park Status for the Cotswold AONB. It was later suggested that the scope of the review be broadened to include other areas within Gloucestershire with an interest in obtaining National Park status.

A second proposal, that the Joint Committee, (with input from the Scrutiny Committee and district authorities), set up a task group, was rejected, as was the suggestion that a Cabinet Panel under the leadership of the relevant cabinet portfolio holder be formed.

Several members believed the proposed piece of work would be better undertaken by the Joint Committee to avoid a conflict of interest by scrutiny members. Other members believed it was too early, with very little substance on which to base any evidence, to set up a task group.

With mixed views, it was agreed to arrange a meeting between the Chairman of the Committee and officers in early August to scope out a draft one page strategy for the proposed review.

The draft document to be shared with GCC lead opposition members, Cllrs Kate Haigh (Labour) and Joe Harris (Lib Dem), before seeking the views of the committee and submitting to the GCC Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for approval. If approved, a task group to be established in the Autumn.

Mike Dawson concluded by giving a detailed overview of some of the items due for consideration by the Joint Committee. He confirmed that the Joint Committee would be considering a range of issues throughout the remainder of the year, including: -

a) Establishment of a Sub National Transport Body (SNTB)

Local authorities in England have been advised to join together to form SNTB's in response to the Government's request for more 'strategic' thinking in relation to transport investment priorities. It was explained that the development of a SNTB was an important factor in helping to move Gloucestershire forward. The County Council was working alongside other local authorities in the West of England and Wiltshire to form the Western Gateway SNTB.

During the Scrutiny Committee discussion, concerns were raised about changes to local bus services and the impact on people living in rural communities.

b) Economic Intelligence

At its committee meeting held earlier that day, the Joint Committee had considered the Economic Intelligence Working Group Activity Report, where it had been reported that the Joint Committee Senior Officer Group had

formed a small working group to review economic data management practices across the County. The work included a comprehensive stocktake of core data sets and an assessment of the known information/data gaps.

c) Statutory Planning Coordinator

Joint Committee members had been introduced to John Baker, the newly appointed Strategic Planning Coordinator. Members had considered the Strategic Planning Governance Structure and had been advised that a Leaders' Board was to be formed, meeting for the first time in late July 2018.

The Committee had received an update on the work undertaken by the 'Barriers to Development Task Group' from Tewkesbury Borough Council. The Committee had been informed that a workshop had been held on 10 May 2018, attended by a number of industry representatives and representatives from each Local Planning Authority in the County. The workshop had focussed on a number of key themes, the outcomes of which had been included in a detailed action plan.

d) Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Pipeline

The Joint Committee received an update on efforts to refresh the Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Pipeline (GIIP).

e) Gloucestershire Business Rate Pool

David Stanley, Accountancy Manager at Stroud District Council had provided the Joint Committee with an update on the Business Rate Pool. He had advised the committee that the outturn position for the Business Rate Pool 2017/18 was strong, and that the cumulative amount of funding that had been generated by the pool for the Strategic Economic Development Fund since 2013/14, including the contribution of £0.789m in 2017/18, had been £1.134m.

Gloucestershire Chief Finance Officers were due to meet in July 2018 to review 2018/19 forecasts, followed by an update to the Joint Committee in September 2018.

Mike Dawson informed scrutiny members that additional items had been added to the work plan at the Joint Committee meeting, including the request for a report on the County Council Peer Review and issues impacting on local investment.

In response to the suggestion that the Joint Committee consider ways of supporting the economic vitality of market towns in Gloucestershire, it was suggested that an item be added to the scrutiny committee work plan for consideration at a future meeting and this was noted.

6. CURRENT ISSUES

Chief Executive of GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership, David Owen, gave an update on current growth issues affecting Gloucestershire. Scrutiny members were invited to comment on the reports considered at the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting held earlier that day. (Scrutiny members are invited to attend this meeting in an observer capacity).

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

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=725&MId=8750&Ver=4>

To aid discussion, scrutiny committee members are encouraged to read the reports considered at the Economic Growth Joint Committee meeting in advance of the scrutiny committee meeting.

Commissioning Director: Communities and Infrastructure at Gloucestershire County Council, Nigel Riglar, gave an update on issues that might require decisions by the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee.

The updates were noted.

7. WORK PLAN

a) Brexit

A member proposed the establishment of a task group to consider some of the specific implications relating to Brexit. It was pointed out that both the Joint Committee and the LGA, (Local Government Association), were currently involved in aspects of this work, and taking into consideration the current national position, it might not be an appropriate time for the committee to undertake a review at this time. It was agreed that the viability of setting up a task group for this purpose should be reviewed periodically.

Another proposal was to invite the Leader of the Council or a representative from the LGA to give an update at a future Joint Committee meeting on current issues and some of the potential implications of Brexit, post March 2019. Scrutiny committee members to be invited to this meeting.

b) Mobile Phone Coverage/Connectivity

A member requested a presentation from mobile phone providers and an update on mobile phone coverage/connectivity in rural areas. An all-member briefing was held on 13 July 2018, to be supplemented by a more detailed briefing in the Autumn. Cllr Bruce Hogan offered to circulate a motion considered by the Forest of Dean District Council (FODDC) relating to this issue.

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

c) Cotswold Water Park

A member requested a presentation from the Cotswold Water Park Trust. The committee agreed that the item be added to the work plan for future consideration.

d) Demise of City Centres

A Gloucester City member expressed concern about the demise of city centres and the impact of largescale retail business moving to out of town locations. Chief Executive of the GFirst LEP, David Owen, offered to arrange a presentation from lead members of the GFirst LEP Board and this was agreed. A similar suggestion, (made on behalf of the Joint Committee), was for the Scrutiny Committee to consider the sustainability and economic growth of market towns in Gloucestershire to form part of the committees' visits to local authorities.

8. FUTURE MEETINGS

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

14 February 2019
20 March 2019
5 June 2019
4 September 2019
30 October 2019
20 November 2019

CHAIRPERSON

Meeting concluded at 3.50pm

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 11 September 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

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

Apologies: Cllr Helen Molyneux and Cllr Pam Tracey MBE

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
Maria Metherall – Senior Commissioning Manager Urgent and Emergency Care

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki – Chair
Simon Lanceley – Director of Strategy and Transformation
Dr Ian Shaw – Consultant Gastroenterologist

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
Zoe Clifford – Public Health Consultant

Healthwatch Gloucestershire

Bob Lloyd Smith

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust/2Gether NHS Foundation Trust

Paul Roberts – Chief Executive
Ingrid Barker - Chair
Jane Melton - Director of Engagement and Integration

41. 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.

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

42. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting on Tuesday 10 July 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment: -
Cllr Iain Dobie had sent his apologies.

43. THE IMPACT OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD 2013-2018

43.1 Cllr Roger Wilson, Chairman of the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board and Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health (DPH), gave a presentation informing the committee on the responsibilities of the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB), work undertaken so far, and plans for the future. The DPH highlighted that the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWBS) was currently being refreshed and would be completed by April 2019. The committee thanked Zoe Clifford, Public Health Consultant, for the clear and informative report.

43.2 The presentation referred to guidance from the Centre for Public Scrutiny on HWBs which reflected the HWB role in local democracy. Some members stated that as the HWB membership did not include any opposition members this did not seem, to them, to be democratic. Cllr Wilson explained that the council had only a limited number of spaces on the HWB, and that the Leader of the council had elected to place the Cabinet Members responsible for health and wellbeing matters on the HWB.

43.3 Comments were also made with regard to the LGA prevention peer review that took place earlier this year with some members feeling that the committee should have had greater involvement in this process and the actions to address the recommendations from the LGA peer review. However the Director of Public Health reminded the committee that she had provided regular updates in her reports to committee and that elected members were included in the 106 interviews that were undertaken as part of the review. In response to a question the DPH acknowledged that the Peer review had highlighted that the HWB did need to strengthen its communication/working with communities and that Appendix 4 of the report received by the committee indicated how this matter would be taken forward. She also reminded the committee that the prevention peer review was, in the main, very positive about Gloucestershire.

43.4 It was commented that the report was very public health focussed; and that one of the statutory responsibilities of the HWB was to line up the needs of the local population. It was explained that the Joint Commissioning Partnership Board and Executive meet every month and this work fed into the work of the HWB. The HWB also received an annual report on integrated commissioning. There was a line of sight demonstrating that the HWB does influence commissioning.

43.5 In response to a question it was explained that there was district representation on the HWB, although this was currently under review.

43.6 The committee was clear that it wished to continue to scrutinise the work of the HWB, particularly the JHWBS; this was welcomed by Cllr Wilson. This would be discussed at the committee's work planning meeting this month, and could also be discussed through the review of scrutiny which was due to start in the autumn.

44. GLOUCESTERSHIRE URGENT AND EMERGENCY CARE SUSTAINABILITY PLAN 2018/19 (WINTER PLAN)

- 44.1 The committee received a detailed presentation from Maria Metherall, Senior Commissioning Manager Urgent and Emergency Care at the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG). (For information the presentation slides were included in the meeting agenda pack.)
- 44.2 It was noted that NHS England has instructed Clinical Commissioning Groups to now refer to sustainability rather than winter plans; this reflected the significant level of demand across the year rather than just over the winter period. The sustainability plan built on the Winter Resilience Plan 2017/18 and picked up the learning opportunities discussed at the committee's meeting on 6 March 2018. The committee was informed that NHS England have approved the GCCG sustainability plan and that it had been stamped as 'best in class'.
- 44.3 The committee agreed that this was a robust plan, and members hoped that it would be successful but recognised the challenges faced by the NHS in Gloucestershire, particularly regarding the pressures on A & E.
- 44.4 In response to a question it was clarified that the GP support in the Emergency Department (ED) at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital (GRH) was a pilot programme. This would be reviewed and evaluated in order to identify whether this scheme should be taken forward across both EDs at Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT). Members were informed that there was an onsite GP at Cheltenham General Hospital (CGH) for the Out of Hours Service.
- 44.5 A member commented that the A & E data was showing that the ED at GRH had missed the target for the last four months. He stated that he felt that there was a fundamental structural problem with A & E in Gloucestershire. The Clinical Chair, GCCG, acknowledged that there were differences between the two EDs but was clear that the current position was a significant improvement from where the system was some years ago. The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, stated that it was important that we collectively recognised that the urgent care system has changed significantly over the last five years.
- 44.6 In response to a question the committee was informed that the business case for the service change proposals relating to urgent care was still being worked through. A significant challenge related to the workforce. However it was important to note that Gloucestershire was bucking the national trend with regard to the recruitment and retention of GPs.
- 44.7 As part of the sustainability plan the committee was informed of a proposal relating to the pilot reconfiguration of gastroenterology. This proposal aims to bring all gastroenterology inpatient activity into a single ward at CGH to optimise care quality and outcomes. Simon Lanceley, Director of Strategy and Transformation, GHNHSFT, and Dr Ian Shaw, Consultant Gastroenterologist presented the detail of the proposals, including the key performance metrics that would be baselined and tracked to ensure that the expected outcomes were achieved. The committee agreed that it could support this pilot given the expected benefits for both patients and staff. It was also commented that this proposal, and the stroke rehabilitation proposal received at the previous meeting, demonstrated that centres of excellence were the way forward, and it was hoped that there would be other opportunities to do this. It was also commented that no one was arguing for everything to be locally based, but that it was important to understand the pressures, eg. access to

transport; it would be important to ensure that health inequalities did not 'creep in'. The committee would be briefed on the evaluation of the pilot next year and the planned course of action should the pilot have proved successful.

45. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 45.1 The main discussion focused on the type of performance data that the committee needed to do its job well. It was suggested that the committee could benefit from looking at how EDs performed over time, and outcome data by postcode. The committee was reminded that the government directed NHS bodies on which data needed to be reported. Members were also informed that there were many complexities and confounding factors involved in trying to report by postcode or at ward level.
- 45.2 The committee was reminded of the planned NHS performance workshop at which these questions could be better explored, including ambulance trust data, particularly as it was important to manage expectations on both sides.
- 45.3 The committee was informed that each year the government identified a chosen outcome and that last year this had been asthma. The committee asked to receive this report.
ACTION: Deborah Lee
- 45.4 The committee was concerned to see that the Mental Health Children and Young People Services (CYPS) referral to treatment indicators (level 2 and 3) had dropped significantly from 2017/18 outturn position of 78% receiving treatment within 8 weeks and 86% within 10 weeks. The committee was informed that this was due to an increasing demand for specialist treatment in the second half of 2017/18. The service have looked for a number of efficiencies and would be providing a report with completed actions and expected demand and capacity gap going forward. The committee asked to receive this report when available.
ACTION: Jane Melton

46. QUARTER 1 PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 46.1 In response to a question relating to the rate of STI referrals it was explained that the manner in which the data was reported made it difficult to identify the trend. The committee was informed that the increase in Gloucestershire was not at the same rate as nationally. Members agreed that it was good to see that more people were coming forward to be checked.
- 46.2 Committee members remained concerned with performance against drug and alcohol targets. The Director of Public Health (DPH) agreed to provide a more detailed briefing on this issue in a future DPH report to committee.
ACTION: Sarah Scott
- 46.3 A member questioned whether there was any evidence that the number of people with mental health problems presenting at the criminal courts was increasing. The 2gether NHS Foundation Trust informed the committee that they have a good working relationship with the criminal justice system, and this was a question that they would work through with this member outside of the committee meeting.

47. QUARTER 1 ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 47.1 The committee remained concerned about performance against the percentage of service users who have had a full reassessment of their needs in the last 12 months. The Director of Adult Social Services informed members that this was the most challenging area of

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

work. Work continued to address this situation but it was important to be aware that the demand from the front door, particularly from Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, was the immediate priority. It was suggested that it might be helpful to have a workshop on this matter to support members' understanding of the issues involved. This would be discussed at the forthcoming work planning meeting.

48. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE ICS LEAD REPORT

48.1 The committee was interested in the three pilot locality boards (now called networks) and members questioned whether they would be able to see the terms of reference and who sits on the boards.

ACTION: Mary Hutton

48.2 In response to a question the committee was informed that there was a lot of progress on mental health and that more information would be shared in future reports.

ACTION: Mary Hutton

49. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

The committee noted the report.

50. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The committee noted the report.

51. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

The committee noted the report.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12:50

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Friday 14 September 2018 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

William Alexander	Cllr Joe Harris
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr Jonny Brownstein	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive (Chairman)
Cllr Rob Garnham	

Substitutes: Cllr Stephen Cooke (In place of Louis Savage)
Cllr Jane Horne (In place of Cllr Bruce Hogan)
Cllr Steve Lydon (In place of Mattie Ross)
Cllr Clayton Williams (In place of Cllr Keith Pearson)
Cllr Lesley Williams MBE (In place of Cllr Steve Robinson)

In attendance: Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Ruth Greenwood, Nigel Hatten, Amanda Segelov, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Cllr Julian Beale, Cllr Gerald Dee, Martin Smith and Cllr Brian Tipper

22. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Signed as a correct record.

23. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No additional declarations were made.

24. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT

24.1 Paul Trott, presented the report for the Panel.

24.2 One member asked a question relating to the Badger Cull and the announcement of an extension. The member asked what consultation would have been undertaken between Natural England and the Police when extending the cull and what resources were allocated to it. In response, it was explained that consultation was undertaken between Natural England and Police and that it was an operational matter which didn't come under the remit of the Commissioner. In recent years it had been a fairly low scale operation with the risk of conflict diminishing. It was noted that Stroud was a new area to this. The resources required were paid by Defra to the Constabulary, this was not about resources being allocated from another

part of the budget. In the past the Police had advised Defra of when major commitments were. The approach from the Constabulary was business as usual.

- 24.3 Members noted the topics raised between the Commissioner and Chief Constable including the RHPG funding letter to Home Secretary.
- 24.4 One member commented on the excellent ISVA Service.
- 24.5 There was some discussion around safe and social driving and the initiative to take more notice of dash cam footage. It was asked what opportunities had been explored to involve the general public with this. It was explained that the strategic priority was to go digital. Currently the Constabulary would find it challenging to receive a large volume of data providing video evidence. The Constabulary was aspiring to have a system that could handle these submissions, with the timeframe suggested as the next 12 months. One member raised a concern about the danger of a two tier system developing which meant that those with dash cams or technology could potentially be taken more seriously when reporting an incident. In response it was explained that this was something the office was mindful of and needed to be prevented. In many incidences the use of technology through dash cams or body cams was a deterrent.
- 24.6 One member commented about the good work of the Neighbourhood Engagement Vehicle. The Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner had met people over the summer period using the vehicle.
- 24.7 In response to a question, the Commissioner emphasised the importance of rural policing. The decision taken on all terrain vehicles (quad bikes) had been to allow officers to get to the harder to reach locations. A tractor was being used at county shows to draw people in and promote the green pledge and compassionate approach to animals. This only cost the Constabulary the price of fuel but nothing in addition to that.
- 24.8 Members noted that 38% of FOIs were categorised as 'other'. They requested additional information to show a breakdown of what was represented in that group.
- ACTON** **Ruth Greenwood**
- 24.9 Members recognised that some decisions were not published, with it being noted that they were not of significant interest to the public. Legislation dictated what information could be made public, although the test was vague and just stated that the Commissioner must publish decisions of significant public interest. Some decisions were operationally sensitive and so they would not be published. The particular decision noted at 'D30' was a security issue around a police matter. It was suggested that in future reports the grounds for removing the detail was noted.

- 24.10 It was explained that there was a major operation beginning to demonstrate the new technology the Constabulary were using in teams to combat speeding. At the police open day the following day there would be a demonstration of a traffic collision involving the use of a mobile phone.
- 24.11 One member asked a question on the background of the Child Protection Project noted at 'D28'. This was in relation to new software jointly procured with the County Council.
- 24.12 In response to a question on how the Constabulary monitored roads where incidents regularly occurred but nobody had been badly injured, it was explained that there was a section on the Police website where that concern could be logged. In addition this was something the County Council should be looking at as they had responsibility for roads. One member replied that the website was not particularly easy to use. It was explained that a national hub was being developed which would lead to an update potentially by the end of the year. For this reason the website had not been updated in anticipation of the national model.
- 24.13 One member noted that insurance companies shared data regarding accidents with each other and asked why that information couldn't be shared with the Local Authority and Police. A response would be provided.
ACTION Paul Trott
- 24.14 One member asked if there was any update on Cirencester Police Station. It was explained that recommendations would be made in a report by December with options considered in January.

25. CHILD FRIENDLY PROPOSAL

- 25.1 Ruth Greenwood and Nigel Hatten introduced the report and the background to the proposal. It was explained that the HMIC report into vulnerable children which had been critical of the approach had also coincided with the Ofsted report into child protection in the County Council. Members understood there was a Commissioner's Forum which helped to ensure the Commissioner's Office looked at other perspectives and other issues. This forum had put it to the Commissioner that he should use his office to make a difference on this. Agencies were already getting on with a significant amount of work so this was not about duplicating or 'stepping on toes'.
- 25.2 Nigel Hatten was a former detective with specialism in safeguarding. He acknowledged that each partner working with young people had action plans or improvement plans to improve their response to safeguarding. Through many discussion with staff thought, five gaps were identified though:

- True voice of young people – agencies often go to easy to reach groups of young people. It was important to get a true voice of young people and include hard to reach groups..
- Voluntary Sector – actively working with young people, they felt that their contributions were often overlooked by some of the statutory agencies and that there this could often lead to a divide. If joined up better this would improve outcomes.
- Intelligence gathering – how do we ensure safeguarding children is everyone's responsibility? Ensure we can get intelligence from communities in a safe and effective way.
- How do we involve communities and business in safeguarding children?
- A need to map what work was being undertaken in Gloucestershire

25.3 The team attended a showcase event in Leeds to look at what they had done and what they had achieved.. Their starting place had been similar to Gloucestershire in terms of the challenges. Leeds reached out to all sectors, including businesses via their social responsibilities. Businesses had been overwhelmingly supportive of the scheme as they recognised that it heled them develop future leaders in their companies. Ruth and Nigel drew parallels with the aspirations of Gloucestershire 2050. The basis of the work in Leeds was an understanding of what children said they wanted and what their aspirations were and therefore meaningful consultation was at the heart of their approach.

25.4 There were some fundamental differences between Leeds and Gloucestershire, for example the system of local authority governance, but it was important to have these conversations about how it could be applied to Gloucestershire. There was a lot of positive work going on there and it was about gaining a commitment from agencies that we want to put young people at the heart of what we do. The aim was to understand what people feel they could contribute culminating with a launch event in 12 months. A steering group had been set up including the Chief Constable, Lord Lieutenant, Director of Children Services, the Bishop, the Police and Crime Commissioner and other to help oversee the development of this work.

25.5 Initial steps were outlined such as the development of a county wide youth engagement group. The meeting brings together officers from agencies working with young people from across Gloucestershire to share information and ideas and bring forward the views of young people to guide the work.

25.6 The Chairman congratulated the team on the work and stated that the County Council Cabinet had been supportive of the proposal.

25.7 One member suggested that one key area was around people who did engage and provide intelligence being given the feedback as to how that had been used. He asked how feedback was provided for those that raised issues currently. The member understood the sensitives and need for confidentiality but still felt that this was important. In response it was explained that the neighbourhood policing model and the emphasis on early

help and engagement with the community would help. Those neighbourhood teams would be a key part to providing appropriate feedback, it being important that young people understand why they are being consulted and that they will get feedback. With the proposal some evaluation tools could be built in. The Commissioner emphasised that this was a fundamental change for the County, looking across organisations.

- 25.8 Some members stated that this was an inspiring document and that it was positive that the benefits of this type of approach had already been shown elsewhere. The Commissioner welcomed the enthusiasm but emphasised that it was important not to rush the final product with the aim for a launch in late Spring 2019.. Members were informed that if there were groups that they identified that would welcome hearing about this then the team would be happy to meet, and that it was important to spread the word.
- 25.9 One member asked what age group would be part of that discussion and how to approach those young people who didn't have a voice. Nigel explained that the view was to cover the ages 0-25 which would ensure transition to adult services was included. Advice would be provided by professionals and the approach would be firmed up over the coming months.
- 25.10 One member raised the concern as to what the definition of a child friendly city was. A child friendly city should be for all children and the team hoped to hear what children thought a child friendly County should be. One member raised a concern that the focus was a little too narrow. Another member suggested the appointment of a youth worker to meet with young people, to talk to youth ambassadors and involve them at an early stage. In response it was explained that the starting point was for those most vulnerable but that the approach from Leeds was about focusing on every young person. Leeds had identified 12 wishes from those young people which included travelling safely and feeling welcome. The engagement group had experts in their fields, and one of the suggestions was to have some young people on that group or on a separate young person steering group to work alongside. The Commissioner explained that alongside this a lot of work was being funded by the Commissioner's Fund. .
- 25.11 One member raised the difficulty in involving schools and colleges. In addition he spoke of the importance of learning lessons of the past and challenging existing practice. The Commissioner stated that it was important that Gloucestershire recognise that there is a problem and take steps to make improvements within a number of organisations. He emphasised the importance of having the right ethos and generating momentum.
- 25.12 One member raised concerns around statutory bodies not doing their jobs correctly and that the Commissioner should not be looking at 'reinventing the wheel' or creating a 'talking shop.' He emphasised the importance of everyone getting their own house in order and having the resources to do this. The Commissioner explained that the level of funding meant that there were difficult choices to be made on what work could be carried out.

- 25.13 In response to a question around how we could identify what success looked like, members were advised to have a look at the Leeds model on their website. They had a list of 20 points where they could show some success. It would be up to the Steering Group to identify these points but a big part of this would be ensuring young people felt valued.
- 25.14 One member raised that some children themselves would be parents and emphasised the importance of including parents in this work. The Commissioner stated that young parents were a significant part of Police and Crime Plan. This would be very much part of Child Friendly. The member emphasised that as well as young mums there were male single parent families that must be taken into account. The Panel had a discussion on the importance of parenting.
- 25.15 In response to a question it was explained that there was a real issue with regards to online child pornography and that was recognised nationally that the resources to investigate all offences to a level that could lead to a prosecution were available.
- 25.16 One member commented that it was important to be open and less defensive when things went wrong so that changes could be made and issues mitigated.
- 25.17 In relation to a discussion around funding, the Commissioner explained the difficulties around the current level of funding and his intention to put council tax up by at least 4% in 2019.

26. CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- 26.1 Amanda Segelov, Criminal Justice Policy Officer, presented the briefing note providing an overview of Criminal Justice. The Commissioner chaired the Gloucestershire Criminal Justice Board. Three delivery groups had been set upon the specific aims and focus:
- Delivering Justice Group
 - Victims and Witnesses
 - Reoffending and rehabilitation
- 26.2 Members received details of the activity in these areas, understanding the importance of putting the victim first and ensuring that an overarching strategy was developed for the country to reduce reoffending. There will be a focus on transition groups (those between ages 18-21) to ensure they did not fall through the gaps as well as specific work around female offenders.
- 26.3 One member asked about those with mental health difficulties going through the court process. In response it was explained that this issue was recognised and the relevant partners were in the process a mental health

protocol to better deal with those entering the system. Hoping this would be less stressful and reduce re-appearances in court.

26.4 Richard Bradley provided an update in terms of Gloucestershire and the devolution of key elements of the Criminal Justice system by the Ministry of Justice to the Commissioner.. An important factor was the probation service. Currently high risk offenders went to the national probation service, while a private organisation dealt medium to low risk offenders. This approach had failed. The current for the latter service would be terminated at the end of 2020 and work was now being undertaken by the Ministry of Justice working with key stakeholders to determine the best way forward. It was likely that PCCs would be involved in the design of the new system, the commissioning of this service and the subsequent contract management.

26.5 The Commissioner raised the issue of access to Justice for those most vulnerable and those who have a disability.

27. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PRIORITIES HIGHLIGHT REPORT

27.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report which detailed 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.

27.2 Members were informed of the introduction of the school 'beat' officer with four in post and two more in the new year.

27.3 One member commented on the good work of the Force cadets.

27.4 Members were informed of the changes to staffing within the Force control room with a new appointment in place.

27.5 Responding to previous concerns around challenges relating to Children First, it was explained that this was due to a change of approach and culture and the way that resources had been administered but was now resolved.

27.6 One member asked where young people fitted into the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan. It was explained that it was integrated throughout the plan.

27.7 It was clarified that the all-terrain vehicles referred to earlier were on the block insurance for Constabulary vehicles.

27.8 There was a further discussion on resourcing from government for the police and the burden on the local tax payer. Understanding the Commissioner's intention to increase the precept, members discussed the impact on the

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

people of Gloucestershire. One member commented that this equated to only a small amount of money a month.

27.9 One member welcomed the Commissioner's Fund and the way it supported a number of scheme that had real outcomes.

27.10 One member asked the cost of the horses that were part of the Constabulary's 'fleet'. In response the Commissioner explained that this had been provided to the panel before. Further details could be provided but reference was made to the information that had been provided at the previous Panel meeting.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12.30 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

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

PRESENT:

William Alexander	Cllr Colin Hay
Cllr Julian Beale	Cllr Bruce Hogan
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Jonny Brownstein	Cllr Keith Pearson
Cllr Stephen Cooke	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr Gerald Dee	Cllr Mattie Ross
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Martin Smith
Cllr Rob Garnham	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive

Substitutes:

In attendance: Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Ruth Greenwood, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies:

28. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

29. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No additional ones.

30. FIRE GOVERNANCE

30.1 Martin Surl shared his outline business case for the Governance of the Fire and Rescue Service with the Panel for their comments. This document was out for consultation and the Commissioner would review it and decide whether to present it to the Home Secretary. In addition the Panel received a report from the Cabinet Member of Public Protection, Parking and Libraries at Gloucestershire County Council which provided an initial response to the Commissioner's report and identified some inaccuracies.

30.2 The Panel discussed a number of concerns relating to the business case, most notably around the timing of revisiting this proposal and how this would impact on relationships between the Commissioner's Office, the Council and other partners.

- 30.3 The Panel noted the information within the business case relating to the resignation of the Chief Fire Officer and the allegations brought forward. There was some discussion around that topic, particularly in relation to the Commissioner's criticisms around the current governance for the Fire and Rescue Service. The Panel was reminded that this was the remit of the Audit and Governance Committee and that an Audit report had been published and that a task group had also been set up by scrutiny members looking at the culture of the Fire and Rescue Service. The Commissioner stated that he shared Members' disappointment, but that it was necessary to reopen discussions as he could not ignore what he had heard. He formally requested to see more detailed work behind the published audit document. This was a matter that he would need to raise with the Cabinet Member.
- 30.4 The Panel recognised that should the business case be accepted by the Home Secretary and the governance arrangements change, that this would also lead to a change of role for the Police and Crime Panel which would also hold the Commissioner to account in relation to Fire.
- 30.5 One member raised the question around the Chief Constable position which had originally been kept temporary until the original queries around Fire Governance had been resolved. The Commissioner clarified that the recommendation was for the Governance model. This meant that should the business case be successful then the role of the Chief Constable and Chief Fire Officer would remain distinct and the organisations would remain distinct. Within the legislation (Police and Crime Act 2017) there was explicitly no option of operational merger.
- 30.6 With regards to the timescale for revisiting the business case, members were informed that the Home Office needed to complete the legislative process 6 months before the Police and Crime Commissioners elections in May 2020 so that it was clear to the public what role they were electing to (PCC or PFCC). The consultation was running until 21 December and the business case would need to be submitted by February 2019.
- 30.7 Members raised the costs associated with changing governance and noted the Commissioner's frustration around not having the detailed financial information he sought from the County Council around the Fire and Rescue Service. The Commissioner stated that he would welcome any engagement with the County Council around finances.
- 30.8 Some members commented that in relation to the current issues around the Fire and Rescue Service, the whistleblowing procedure had worked. When considering the governance arrangements around the Commissioner's Office and Constabulary, members noted the areas for improvements identified in the HMIC inspections into child protection and suggested that it was important the Commissioner 'got his own house in order first'.
- 30.9 One member was critical of the County Council and suggested there were issues around transparency but felt that in relation to the Fire and Rescue

Service, the process had worked correctly. He stated that fifty-three councillors were in place to scrutinise the service and wanted to know how the Commissioner would improve upon that. The Commissioner explained that he felt that the Commissioner model provided more effective scrutiny and stated that in relation to the Fire and Rescue Service the members had missed the issues.

- 30.10 Some members explained that they felt that the timing was wrong from a national perspective and that the focus of Central Government was directed towards Brexit at this time.
- 30.11 In response to a question it was explained that the Commissioner's salary was set by the salary review board and that taking on responsibility for fire governance would see an additional £3,000 in salary for the position of Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner.
- 30.12 There was some discussion around the Chief Fire Officer's current position as being a Director at the County Council and the way in which the work cut across service areas.
- 30.13 One member questioned whether the Police and Crime Commissioner being part of the current committee overseeing scrutiny for Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service be explored. The Commissioner explained that this would be the Representative model as set out in the Policing and Crime Act and had been previously ruled out by the Council.
- 30.14 In response to a question the Commissioner explained that he had spoken to Fire Unions and would continue to do so as part of the consultation.
- 30.15 The Panel felt that they needed more time to consider the report in full and to make a response to the consultation. Members agreed to set up an informal briefing to discuss their response where they could also get the view of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Fire.

ACTION **Stephen Bace**

31. CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT

- 31.1 Paul Trott, Chief Executive, presented the report providing details on the actions of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office. One correction was made to the report that detailed the summary of decisions should read September to October.
- 31.2 There was some discussion around the issue of employers pension contributions. The Treasury had recalculated a formula which related to all public sector pension schemes, but particularly hit the unfunded schemes such as the Police. There would be an increase in the contributions that the

employer would have to make which equated to the Commissioner needed to find an extra £1.7m in the coming financial year. This would have a large impact on the budget and on areas of planned investment if there was no additional support through funding. It was recognised that the contribution paid by local tax payers as part of the Police Precept was become an increasing part of the overall police funding. The Panel would be meeting in January to receive details of the draft budget and the Commissioner's plans around the Police Precept. Further information would be provided at that stage.

ACTION PCC Martin Surl

- 31.3 Six new Independent Custody Visitors had been introduced and there was now a waiting list of people wishing to become volunteers. In response to questions it was explained that there was a good group of custody visitors in place and that there was a feeling that the current pool was sufficient to ensure that there was regularity of visits for all volunteers. Each volunteer carried out approximately six visits a year. A lot of work had been carried out in order to diversify the group. An example of this was the work with the university in order to bring in a variety of experience and perspectives. Members congratulated the team on the excellent work with regards to custody visits.

32. POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PRIORITIES HIGHLIGHT REPORT

- 32.1 Richard Bradley introduced the report which detailed 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.
- 32.2 Members noted increased exclusion rates in schools and the restorative practice work taking place. Gloucestershire had the highest rate of pupil exclusions in the South West. Cheltenham had the higher rate of exclusion in the County. A significant reduction in exclusions had been seen in those schools where restorative practice had been introduced. One member raised the issue around governance of schools and the effect of the introduction of academies. He suggested where a child is excluded the county council be aware and inform the police. The Commissioner explained that this did happen and Safer Gloucestershire had looked at this. Members noted they had received a briefing on Children First previously. Members commented on successful examples of how a restorative practice was working in communities and in some schools. The plan was to introduce this into more schools and move from a punitive approach which encouraged exclusion to a restorative approach which did not.
- 32.3 School based officers had been introduced by the Constabulary with four of the six already appointed. This had been a commitment by the Commissioner in relation to the increase in the Police Precept.

- 32.4 The Panel understood that with pressure on police resources, it was important to focus on the really tricky areas. At the same time, Members welcomed the focus on community policing. The Commissioner emphasised the continued commitment to neighbourhood policing which was challenging to deliver in response to financial pressures. Members were informed that Gloucestershire had been rated the highest in the country for dealing with vulnerability and a lot around modern day slavery. One member provided an example of police officers now unable to attend neighbourhood policing panels in one particular area. It was important that there was continued good communication in place but there could be no guarantee that they would always be able to attend every meeting.
- 32.5 Members asked for an update on the summer recruitment of officers. The Commissioner explained that the Constabulary was on track to recruit the full commitment, but that it took two years to train officers so that they were fully operational. He estimated that it would be another 6 months before the Constabulary was staffed up to budgeted levels.
- 32.6 The Panel were informed that there was a new priority lead for Safer Cyber and a new Police lead. It was explained that previous work under the priority had focused on businesses and that it was now time to focus on communities and where possible maximise the work of the Neighbourhood Watch and community alerts system. This would cascade information and understanding of cyber crime more effectively. There was some further discussion around national issues around cyber crime with members highlighting examples of issues around harm to children and fraudulent activity.
- 32.7 Members thanked the Commissioner and his team for the report and the good work that was taking place against the plan. The Commissioner outlined that it demonstrated good relationships across organisations.

33. WHISTLEBLOWING PROCEDURE

- 33.1 Paul Trott presented the report to the Panel stating that it was a procedure that was shared with the Constabulary. The Chairman explained that he had requested the item as the Council had reviewed its own and it was important that the Panel was satisfied that the Commissioner was happy with his own procedure.
- 33.2 In response to a question as to whether the Office was aware of any whistleblowers whose identity had been revealed after following the procedure, the Panel were informed that the Commissioner's Office was not aware of any issues of that nature.
- 33.3 It was suggested that within the procedure the contact details for the Police and Crime Panel including the website address should be provided.

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

- 33.4 One member asked how whistleblowing events were reported. It was explained that since the current Chief Executive of the Office had been in post there had only been one. With regards to the Constabulary, the team would look at the figures and update the Panel.

ACTION Paul Trott

34. SAFE AND SOCIAL DRIVING

The Chairman informed members that the item had been deferred until the next meeting.

35. REPRESENTATION ON NATIONAL AND REGIONAL BODIES

- 34.1 Cllr Rob Garnham had been selected to be part of the Executive on the National Association of Police and Crime Panels. The Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Panel attended meetings. The Panel agreed that they were happy for Cllr Garnham to sit on this body. Cllr Hay has raised a concern at the meeting about the need for greater political representation on the executive of the Association.
- 34.2 It was agreed that the Panel would also be represented at South West Police and Crime Panel Chairs and Officer meetings.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 1.15 pm

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN - DECEMBER 2018 UPDATE**Cabinet Member Arrangements**

Councillor	Portfolio Area	Areas of Responsibility
NJW Parsons (Acting Leader)	Forward Planning	Policy Framework, including Corporate Plan; Co-Ordination of Executive Functions; Strategic Forward Planning; Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); Neighbourhood Plans; Property/Asset Management
AW Berry	Resources	Financial Strategy and Management; Revenues and Benefits; Grants; Democratic Services; Press and Communications
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
Homelessness Strategy	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure	Jon Dearing	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Existing Strategy
Electric Vehicle Charging Points - Options for Additional Provision	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Cabinet Member for Enterprise & Partnerships	Claire Locke/ Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Cabinet and Council decisions - February 2018 Outcome of Procurement Exercise
Youth Activities Fund	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council		Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Existing Scheme
Revised Loan Arrangement for Community Organisation	No	Yes	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council/ Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Corporate Enforcement Policy	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council	Emma Cathcart	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Service Leads Legal Department	Enforcement Policy - March 2015
Customer Service and Access Strategy	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Service Users	None

30

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
Funding allocation and approach to unsafe gravestones	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Condition survey
Update on progress against the GDPR / Data Protection Action Plan	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council	Phil Martin	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Lifting of Designated Protected Area Status for Shared Ownership	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Housing, Health and Leisure	Philippa Lowe	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Customer Service and Access Strategy	No	No	Cabinet	January 2019	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Service Users	None
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 Cttee Senior Officers Treasury Mgt Advisers Local Businesses Residents Town/Parish Councils	Likely Local Government Finance Settlement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process

Item for Decision	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Approval and adoption of revised policy and authorisation to amend - Council Tax, Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support Penalty and Prosecution Policy	No	No	Cabinet	February 2019	Leader of the Council (Cabinet Member for Resources)	Emma Cathcart	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Service Leads Legal Department	Revenues and Housing Support Services Sanction Policy
Land at Kemble Exempt information - Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person	Yes	Yes	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2019	Deputy Leader of the Council	Bhavna Patel	Cabinet Members Ward Members Senior Officers Parish Council	None
Performance Report (Quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
There is no scheduled April Meeting								

32

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 May Meeting								
Corporate Strategy 2019/23	No	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	June 2019	All	Nigel Adams	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Existing Strategy MAIDEN data User research/feedback
Performance Report (Quarter 4)	No	No	Cabinet	June 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Service and Financial Performance Data
Leisure Management Contract Review Exempt information - Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person	Yes	Yes	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	July 2019	Housing, Health & Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Existing Contract
There is no scheduled August Meeting								

33

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 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Service and Financial Performance Data
No item(s) yet identified				October 2019				
Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020/21 to 2029/30 and Budget 2020/21	No	No	Cabinet	November 2019	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Autumn Statement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process
Performance Report (Quarter 2)	No	No	Cabinet	November 2019	Cabinet	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Service and Financial Performance Data

(END)