



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5th MARCH 2019

AGENDA ITEM (15)

QUARTERLY DIGEST

INDEX

Item	Subject	Page No.
(1)	Joint Scrutiny Etc. Meetings/Oral Updates as appropriate	
(i)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee – No Minutes available.	
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes of Meeting held on 13 th November 2018	1
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel Minutes of Meeting held on 4 th February 2019	10
(2)	Executive Forward Plan – March 2019 Update	19

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)

HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 13 November 2018 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

Present:

Cllr Stephen Andrews	Cllr Steve Lydon
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Helen Molyneux
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Pam Tracey MBE
Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Martin Horwood	Cllr Eva Ward

Substitutes: Cllr Ron Allen (in place of Cllr Janet Day)

Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)

Mary Hutton – Accountable Officer
Becky Parish – Associate Director Patient and Public Engagement
Dr Hein Le Roux, Deputy Clinical Chair and Clinical Commissioning Lead

Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT)

Deborah Lee – Chief Executive
Peter Lachecki – Chair
Simon Lanceley – Director of Strategy and Transformation

Gloucestershire County Council

Mark Branton – Deputy Director: Adult Social Care
Sarah Scott – Director of Public Health
Cllr Roger Wilson – Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Commissioning
Cllr Tim Harman – Cabinet Member Public Health and Communities
Sarah Jasper - Acting Head of Safeguarding Adults

Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust/2Gether NHS Foundation Trust

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

Apologies: Cllr Janet Day

52. 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 and as the council appointed Governor to the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust.

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

53. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 11 September 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

54. GLOUCESTERSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

54.1 The Acting Head of Adult Safeguarding presented the main areas of activity undertaken by the GSAB in the period 2017 to 2018. Using case studies she also drew member's attention to safeguarding adults reviews undertaken during this time period. These cases illustrated the impact of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) on the individual and their longer term effect.

54.2 The committee was pleased to note that the GSAB was already working closely with the Gloucestershire Children's Safeguarding Board (GSCB) as it was clear that there is learning across the lifecycle.

54.3 It was agreed that Housing had a significant role in safeguarding matters; housing officers have powers that safeguarding officers do not, eg. the right to enter their property, and were well placed to spot concerns and report them. The committee noted that housing providers were active members of the GSAB.

54.4 The committee was concerned with regard to those people placed out of area, both by this council and by other local authorities placing people in Gloucestershire. People placed out of area were more vulnerable to abuse as they were at distance from family and friends and a case study described in the Annual Report deftly demonstrated this. A particular concern related to people placed in Gloucestershire by other local authorities. An important factor was that the placing authority should (continue to) ensure that placements were suitable and that the individual was safe. However the committee heard that this does not always happen and this council has no powers to enforce this duty. It is also of concern that providers did not always inform this council when a person from out of the area was placed with them, despite there being a clear expectation from GCC Commissioning. There was ongoing work in this area to address this.

Committee members agreed that this area would benefit from better regulation and agreed that it would write to the Secretary of State for Health and Care with its concerns.

ACTION Andrea Clarke

54.5 In response to a question it was explained that the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) which was now located in Shire Hall, currently focused on children. The longer term ambition expressed by the Assistant Chief Constable was to make this an all age group. Members indicated that they would like to visit the MASH.

ACTION Andrea Clarke

54.6 It was explained that if a member of the public reported a concern it was difficult to let them know what action had been taken as the consent of the individual concerned was required.

54.7 Members questioned what was being done to identify young adults who were at risk and what support was available. In response it was explained that this would be a specific focus for the GSAB this year. It was stated that recent research talked of children "walking off the cliff edge at the age of 18" in terms of services available to them; it was important to understand how these gaps could be filled. In response it was explained that this would be a specific focus for the GSAB this year. It was stated that recent research talked of children walking off the cliff edge at the age of 18; it was important to understand how these gaps could be filled and what we could do to help people overcome what they faced in childhood; this was about a trauma informed approach (Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)).

55. QUARTER 2 PUBLIC HEALTH PERFORMANCE REPORT

55.1 The Director of Public Health (DPH) presented the report. The committee had shared concerns with regard to drug and alcohol performance against target at previous committees. The DPH indicated that she had included additional information on this matter in her report to committee later on the agenda to inform on the wider context. The committee remained concerned and would need to discuss at its next work planning meeting whether this matter would be better addressed through a workshop.

ACTION Andrea Clarke

55.2 It was stated that the data for Cheltenham relating to disadvantaged children and the effect of this on their life chances was stark, and it was questioned how the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board (GHWB) was addressing this issue. It was explained that the GHWB was in the process of refreshing the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWBS) and this matter was being included in the GHWB discussion around priorities. The GHWB was also leading on the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) work (please see www.actionaces.org); the council was leading on a restorative practice programme; and the council also lead on the Children's Partnership Framework in Gloucestershire.

- 55.3 The DPH also explained that the public health team were working on population health dashboard and this would be shared with the committee in due course.

56. QUARTER 2 ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 56.1 The committee continued to be concerned with regard to performance against reassessments. This concern was exacerbated by the lack of detail in the comments section about what was being done to address this situation; the committee has asked for this to be improved. The committee acknowledged that this was a complex area with various recording issues adding to the complexity, but does feel that it was time that there was a positive shift in performance against these targets.

57. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 57.1 The committee agreed that having previously expressed concerns with regard to the performance of the South Western Ambulance NHS Foundation Trust (SWASFT) against category 1 calls, it was only right to congratulate the Trust for now achieving this target. However, it was acknowledged that this would become more challenging as winter pressures built.
- 57.2 Some members continued to express concern at the difference in performance against the 4 hour A and E target across the two acute hospitals. However the committee was reminded that at the overall Trust level (which was the national reporting requirement) the 90% target has been consistently met in every quarter in 2018/19. These members questioned why performance at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital (GRH) was not at the same level as at Cheltenham General Hospital. It was explained that there were particular pressures on the GRH site, particularly related to the level of activity and acuity of patients. The Chief Executive, Gloucestershire Hospitals Trust NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT), informed the committee that it was important to place this within the wider context of how does the GHNHSFT maintain resilience across available resources; matching resources to the demand.. She also added that excessive demand was primarily a daytime issue.
- 57.3 It was commented that it was disappointing that the committee was not receiving the most up to date data on Children and Young People Services (CYPS) delivered by the 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust (2G). It was explained that this was a timing issue. It was also explained that 2G and the GCCG were still waiting to hear whether the bid to become a trailblazer pilot to reduce waiting times has been successful.
- 57.4 It was explained that a significant factor in those areas where performance targets were not being met related to the available workforce. It was clarified that this was not about finance but about workforce shortages at the national

level. A particular concern related to the two week wait and 62 day cancer targets which have been consistently not achieving target. The committee was informed that the GHNHSFT has just appointed two urology consultants and it was expected that the impact of these appointments would soon be seen in the performance reporting.

- 57.5 In response to concerns with regard to cross border factors relating to continuing health care the committee it was agreed that the committee would receive a written briefing from the GCCG.

ACTION: Becky Parish

58. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE ICS LEAD REPORT

- 58.1 The committee was particularly interested in the structure and membership of the Integrated Locality Boards particularly with regard to whether/how they would engage with local government.

- 58.2 The committee noted the report.

59. GENERAL SURGERY

- 59.1 To try to set the context for the debate on this matter the committee's role in this process was explained. Unlike substantial/significant service change proposals the Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013 were silent on proposals for pilot schemes. The committee's role therefore was that of critical friend. If the committee agreed that the pilot was not something that it could support this would not prevent the GHNHSFT from proceeding to plan for the pilot. If the committee was so minded it could decide to write to the Secretary of State for Health and Care with its concerns, but this also would not prevent the GHNHSFT from proceeding, unless he chose to intervene. (It was important to set the wider context to this issue in that the first that the committee knew of this proposal was following a leaked internal staff memo by a GHNHSFT staff member two days after the committee's 11 September 2018 meeting. This was followed by 57 GHNHSFT consultants writing to all members of the GHNHSFT Board expressing views on the preferred model of care, and which was subsequently the basis for articles in the local media.)

- 59.2 The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, assured members that this was a pilot and that no irreversible steps would be taken during the pilot's timeline. She expected a robust debate with members of the committee today. She explained the timing for the different communications, noting that the approach for this proposal was identical for that previously taken for orthopaedics and gastroenterology and noted the timing of the Trust meeting and the HCSOC was unfortunate.

- 59.3 The Director of Strategy and Transformation at the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (GHNHSFT) gave a detailed presentation on this proposal highlighting the benefits that were expected to be achieved, and the

metrics that would be used in the evaluation of this pilot. Two consultant surgeons from GHNHSFT also explained to the committee what an average day in general surgery looked and felt like. (The presentation slides were uploaded to the council website and included in the minute book.)

- 59.4 In the discussion that followed, it was stated by members that this was just another step in the downgrading of Cheltenham General Hospital (CGH); that this meant that access to emergency surgery was not safe and quoted an anonymous consultant who had spoken on local radio that this proposal was not safe for patients.
- 59.5 Some members felt that the fact that this number of consultants (57) had written this letter and that to them this signified a high degree of concern; and also suggested that there was a culture of fear at the GHNHSFT whereby consultants were afraid to raise their concerns publicly. In response it was commented that as they had signed the letter this did not seem to indicate that they were afraid to raise their voice.
- 59.6 The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, drew members attention to the wording of the letter which in fact set out support for the proposed direction of travel and did not raise concerns for safety. She stated that it was clear that there was clinical consensus on the proposals related to emergency surgery, and that this was confirmed by the consultant letter; where there was some dissonance related to the proposed model for the elective pathway. She stated that whilst the views of the 57 consultants were important and added value to the discussion it was necessary to place them in context and understand that they represented a minority of the overall number of consultants at the GHNHSFT (400). She also reminded the committee that similar letters had been received with regard to the trauma and orthopaedic pilot but that this has been a success and none of the articulated fears had ultimately been realised.
- 59.7 The Chief Executive further stated that she wanted to be clear that this proposal was in no way linked to the provision of A & E at Cheltenham General Hospital; of the 130 attendances per day at CGH A&E only around 5 related to general surgery in Gloucestershire. Furthermore, she did not recognise the view that there would be a deterioration in access to general surgery, access and quality would in all likelihood be improved by this change.
- 59.8 In response to criticism that the GHNHSFT had not brought this matter to committee earlier it was explained that the GHNSFT were required to take any proposals through its clinical governance process and senior leadership team. The senior leadership team had signed off the proposal in principle on 13 September 2018 (two days after the committee meeting). This information was then shared with staff via an internal email. The email had been shared outside of the Trust by a member of staff which placed the GHNHSFT in the position of having to share information publicly earlier than it would have wished to given that much of the planning and preparation was still in

process. The GHNHSFT would have shared this proposal with the committee in due course as it had with the trauma and orthopaedic and Gastroenterology pilot proposals.

- 59.9 In response to a question it was explained that whilst the service was safe now, the long term sustainability of the service was at risk and there was evidence that the current service was falling behind others and local patients were not receiving care in line with national standards. This proposal was also part of wider considerations linked to the system's vision for the development of centres of excellence (CoE). One of the aims associated with the CoE proposals was the potential to bring back to Gloucestershire several areas of service where significant numbers of patients currently travel out of county for more specialist care. CoE were also expected to improve the training experience for clinicians and improve recruitment and retention in medical, nursing and other specialist areas of workforce.
- 59.10 Cllr Flo Clucas, Cabinet Member Healthy Lifestyles Cheltenham Borough Council, had asked to speak to the committee on this matter. At the discretion of the Chair this was allowed. Cllr Clucas reiterated other members concerns regarding the letter from the consultants, access to general surgery in an emergency situation, and that there was a culture of fear at the Trust. She also stated that she felt that all options should have been presented to this committee for consideration; she felt that the committee should have another meeting to discuss this matter.
- 59.11 The Chief Executive, GHNHSFT, the Director of Strategy and Transformation and the Chair of GHNHSFT, and the two consultants present informed the committee that they did not recognise this description of the Trust. It was reiterated that this was not an anonymous letter; the consultants had felt able to sign their names to it. All signatories to the letter had received a response from the Chief Executive, and this had been discussed openly at a GHNHSFT Board meeting. It was also stated that the letter indicated support for the proposed CoE model, including the centralisation of emergency care and dedicated elective centres.
- 59.12 Other members were of the view that this was an excellent proposal; that it was good to have specialist teams in place; and that sometimes pilots were the only way to identify the way forward. It would be important to be clear as to what the process would follow the completion of the pilot.
- 59.13 The Deputy Accountable Officer, GCCG, explained that the GCCG supported the pilot, that the report was clear on the work that has already been done to identify how this pilot would be measured, and that the GCCG and GHNHSFT were committed to a full evaluation.
- ACTION** **Andrea Clarke**
- 59.14 It was agreed that the committee would write to the GHNHSFT and GCCG Boards outlining its concerns. The committee would also hold an additional meeting to discuss this proposal to gain a better understanding of the detail

of the proposal particularly the benefits for both staff and patients, what the implementation planning timeline looks like, including the decision points, and the frequency of updates to the committee.

59.15 The Chief Executive GHNHSFT indicated that she would support the committee's proposed work on this matter; she would prefer to be in a position where the majority of members were supportive of the proposal. However her paramount concern was addressing the safety and sustainability of emergency general surgery. She was clear that the GHNHSFT would continue with its planning for this pilot; she was also clear that this was a pilot and should it become clear that it was not generating the expected outcomes this was reversible. It was reiterated that the proposal was addressing significant issues within the service and had been developed through a panel of external experts, chaired by the national lead for general surgery. She stated that she fully accepted the need for HCOSC support should the Trust propose a permanent change.

60. INTERVENTIONAL AND COMMUNITY RADIOLOGY

- 60.1 This item related to the need to implement a temporary service change. It was important to note that changes could be made temporarily under regulation 23(2) of the s.244 Regulations (National Health Service Act 2006) because of a risk to safety or welfare of patients or staff and that in these circumstances it might not be possible to undertake any public involvement or consultation with the Local Authority.
- 60.2 The Director of Strategy and Transformation, GHNHSFT, and the Chief Operating Officer, Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCSNHST) gave a detailed presentation of the reasons for the service change which were attributable to severe shortages in staffing which were jeopardising the GHNHSFT's ability to provide acute radiology services safely. It was noted that this was the first time that the NHS in Gloucestershire has had to take this type of action.
- 60.3 Members were concerned regarding the impact on those people who would usually visit the community hospitals most affected by this change. They asserted that it would be important that there was clear communication on what services were available and when, otherwise there was the potential for the acute hospitals to be adversely affected by an increased footfall.
- 60.4 In response to members concerns regarding the reduction in hours it was explained that this was the minimum level of commitment. This service operated on a six week rota and with the goodwill of staff it might be possible to provide an additional day in Tewkesbury and the North Cotswolds. It was also explained that most of the referrals to the service were routine referrals from GPs and not related to emergency care.
- 60.5 The reasons for the service change related to the workforce; this was a national issue, and had recently been reported in the national media but the

position in Gloucestershire was even more challenged with a 24% vacancy rate in radiographers. The committee would be regularly informed on progress but it was recognised that in the current circumstances GCSNHST and GHNHSFT were not able to specify when this service would be fully restored as it relied on the Trust's ability to recruit new and retain existing staff.

61. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

61.1 The committee noted the report.

62. DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES REPORT

62.1 The committee noted the report.

63. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

63.1 A member raised anecdotal information which related to the issue of a specific thyroid medication being withdrawn, and asked for an explanation as to why this had been undertaken. She questioned whether the GCCG review panel was overriding a government ruling relating to prescription entitlement.

63.2 The Deputy Accountable Officer, GCCG, informed the committee that the GCCG was not overriding national guidance but rather was responding to it. The evidence related to this drug (in that it delivered better outcomes than alternatives) was limited. Individual cases should be reviewed by a consultant endocrinologist; and there were some exceptions. In Gloucestershire a Review Panel, which included clinicians and lay representation, had reviewed cases and letters regarding the review and the Review Panel's decision. Due to data protection requirements, it was then for the GP to communicate the information to the patient.

63.4 The Deputy Accountable Officer informed members that the GCCG had a duty to regularly review financial resources. The Deputy Clinical Chair, GCCG, explained that the evidence was not there to support routinely prescribing this medication. He also informed the committee that this approach was supported by the British Thyroid Society.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 2.12 pm

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

MINUTES of a meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on Monday 4 February 2019 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

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

Substitutes:

Officers in attendance: Jo Arnold, Mark Astle, Stephen Bace, Richard Bradley, Chris Brierley, Ruth Greenwood, Rod Hansen, Peter Skelton, PCC Martin Surl and Paul Trott

Apologies: Martin Smith

1. APOLOGIES

The apologies for the meeting were noted.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No additional declarations were made.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record.

4. SAFE AND SOCIAL DRIVING

4.1 Mark Astle (Fire and Rescue Service) and Jo Arnold (co-ordinator Safe and Social Driving) gave a presentation on this priority within the Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioner introduced the item emphasising the word 'safe' within the priority name. He explained that the Chief Fire Officer led on the item, and that Mark Astle had led on this in the absence of a Chief. In regards to the Road Safety Partnership, he explained that he had

never withdrawn money from that partnership. The presentation outlined the current position for Gloucestershire compared to national statistics and the focus on prevention through education.

- 4.2 Members understood that in 2016, 27 people had lost their lives. In 2017 20 people had lost their lives. The majority of fatalities had happened in the later months of the years, this was due to changing weather conditions, darkened nights and behaviours. It was behaviour which could be changed. It was explained that most fatalities had occurred in the Cotswolds. Male fatalities were higher than female fatalities in all modes of transport other than car passenger.
- 4.3 With regards to education, the focus was on 16-24 year olds. This was because although there had overall been a decrease in the number of fatalities between those ages, there had been an increase already in the current year compared to the previous year. It was important to continue to deliver messages that would change driver behaviour. The Fire Service was now delivering education prevention packages to year 12 and 13 students across the county. By Spring 2019, 8 firefighters would achieve accreditation to ensure the continued delivery of this. Members heard details of the 'What if?' Road Show, which would be delivered to 3700 students throughout February and March.
- 4.4 In September 2018, a 'Leave your mobile phone alone' campaign was run for a week. The lack of knowledge and understanding from the public was evident of how prevalent the problem was. Speed camera vans had been placed in strategic locations. Drink/ Drug Drive campaign in December was carried out through social media, police operational support and educational support. The target audience was 17-25 year old male drivers. Members received details of how the campaigns were co-ordinated showing the partnership work with the Fire and Rescue Service.
- 4.5 As part of the 'Choose Zero' campaign 1142 students had received education throughout December. This had been very effective and would continue moving forward. Campaigns for the future, included seat belts and speeding on top of the continued mobile phone and drink and drug driving campaigns.
- 4.6 In the future there would be a review of the current action plan taking into account the data the team had received. These messages would be included in the Safe and Well visits that the Fire Service carried out. Options included the use of virtual reality headsets to give people a real insight into what it would feel like to be involved in an incident. One aspiration was to develop a safe and social driving app.
- 4.7 The Commissioner thanked the Fire Service and the Constabulary for the partnership work being carried out. He outlined the new technology being

used by the Police to help support this work and noted that the Chief Constable would welcome an increase in precept which would help fund further work in regards to Safe and Social Driving. The National Drivers Offending retrain scheme had been very effective, with the cost to the public reduced and more locations for people to go for those courses. 1% of the Policing budget was top sliced as part of the Commissioner's Fund and this funded a great deal of work. The Police did not receive any money from enforcing fines, the only funds allowed to be generated were those that directly paid for the enforcement and retraining.

- 4.8 One member asked about any targeted work around the effects of prescribed drugs of drivers. In response it was explained that this was about implementing these messages into Safe and Well Visits. Another member asked whether work was being carried out with pharmacies to help provide that information to people of the effects of medication on driving. In addition the member emphasised the importance of educating at an even younger age about safety on the road referencing children as young as seven playing games on the road. The member referenced the work of Police Cubs and the work in educating around speeding.
- 4.9 With regards to the Cotswolds having the highest amount of fatalities, one member referred to the A429 task group and asked whether there needed to be more visible campaigns such as signage on the road referencing the number of fatalities on a road. In response the Commissioner stated that 'Highways' was a county council responsibility but that he had provided a degree of funding for signage.
- 4.10 One member asked whether the Constabulary were asking young people on how they wanted to be engaged? It was explained that this work was very much led by young people and that the team were most interested in what they had to say. Members received details of collaboration across emergency services through the south west collaboration board and about the learning from what had worked in other areas. Members understood the role of the Skillzone centre in terms of helping to engage with young people.
- 4.11 Accident figures for November and December emphasised that this was the most dangerous time of the year and it was important to get that message out. It was explained that a lot of campaigning was carried out at that time of year.
- 4.12 One member explained that he thought that dash cams were useful in terms of providing evidence of where people were acting inappropriately on the road. This was something that was being taken forward in the future.
- 4.13 One member raised the lack of statistics to help support members in getting highways improvement work started. He asked if any work was being done to share those statistics. The Commissioner shared the member's frustration that sometimes it was about pre-emptive work being taken in areas where an accident had not happened yet. In response to a question it was explained

that insurance companies would not hand over data for data protection reasons.

- 4.14 One member asked whether the Police took action against incidents such as cars with only one headlight which in rural lanes caused problems. It was explained that there was money in the proposed budget to increase policing of roads. The Commissioner emphasised the partnership working needed to deliver some of these outcomes.
- 4.15 One member emphasised that this was a small percentage of incidents in regards to the overall population of Gloucestershire. He reiterated the importance of education with regards to the attitude of young people in a wider sense than just safety on the roads.
- 4.16 One member stated that she believed the drink drive limit was out dated and not fit for purpose and that it should be at zero. There was further discussion around areas of concern from members including trials on widening cycle lanes, as well as types of education and providing support for elderly drivers.

5. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

- 5.1 Paul Trott introduced the report which provided details on the actions of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office.
- 5.2 One member asked a question regarding the underspend on the police salaries budget. In response it was explained that the actual underspend for the year would be minimal; it had been anticipated that once the precept had been raised in 2018/19 it would take time to recruit officers so the additional income had been used cover short term projects. The Chief Constable explained that it took 22 months to replace a police officer, and that they were seeing a different profile of candidate coming into the Force. The Constabulary was on target to recruit 90 officers this year.
- 5.3 Members noted the Tri-Force update within the report. It was explained that there had been a difference of views around fire arms officers, with Avon and Somerset and Wiltshire unable to come to an agreement around this. The Commissioner stated that the County had a strong fire arms response team. The Chief Constable explained that there had been vacancies in fire arms capability in the past because there was a very high pass mark with regards to training and the role was very demanding. The capacity of the training centre was also a consideration. There was planned replacement for all the vacancies and those should be filled by the middle of 2019. One member asked for an update on the Tri-Force to a future panel meeting.
ACTION Democratic Services
- 5.4 In response to details within the report on the Criminal Justice System, members were informed that the government had recognised the failures in the changes they had put in place around privatising part of the probation

service. The contracts would be terminated early at the end of 2020 and there would be a change of approach. The Commissioner's Office was working closely with the Ministry of Justice on this. The Commissioner explained that his office had opposed the initial changes. One member stated that this was an area that the Panel should be interested in and expressed concern about the underfunding of the courts. He suggested that an item be put on the agenda for the next meeting to better understand the context behind the changes to the Criminal Justice system and its impact.

ACTION Democratic Services/ Martin Surl

6. PROPOSED GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE PRECEPT 2018/19

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

Funding for the proposed £119.912m 2019/20 revenue budget would require a police related Band D Council Tax element of £250.49. This represented an increase of 10.6% in the police related Band D Council Tax or £24 for the year.

- 6.2 The Panel had received a briefing in January to ensure that members had the background to the budget and an understanding of the options available. The Commissioner set out the proposal outlining the work being carried out by the OPCC and the work on consulting with the public. He outlined the financial pressures nationally and that, aside from a small increase in the previous year, the police locally had not seen any increase in funding since 2010. The balance between local funding and national funding was now at about 50:50 with Gloucestershire receiving one of the smallest grants from national government. He explained how the Constabulary had managed despite the financial pressures and the consequences of cuts. The Constabulary reserves had been used appropriately and not for the day to day running of the force. HMIC had commended the Constabulary on the way the reductions in funding had been managed.
- 6.3 It was the Commissioner's assessment that the Constabulary remained strong, but he felt that the Constabulary was now facing a pivotal point, and that the strain was beginning to show. He felt that if the cuts were not reversed the Force would be weakened and not able to deliver the service the public expected. This was a planned approach to take any flexibility provided by central government with regards to funding. The Commissioner had lobbied MPs to support additional investment from government.
- 6.4 The Commissioner explained that he had asked the Chief Constable to demonstrate how he would look to use any additional funding and how he had used the increase in funding he had received the previous year. The Chief Constable and his officers had provided this detail. For the proposals outlined by the Constabulary there would be a lead in time to see the

benefits, in particular around the recruitment of officers. Members noted the detail in a letter from the Chief Constable on how the additional funding would be provided. This included funding alongside the priorities within the Police and Crime Plan. The Commissioner emphasised the funding for the multi-agency safeguarding hub noting its importance in providing a better service for young people.

- 6.5 Referring to the previous presentation on Safe and Social Driving, the Commissioner outlined additional funding proposed in this area for roads policing and collision investigation. In addition there was additional money proposed to support adults at risk and Safer Cyber, in particular the digital forensics unit.
- 6.6 The Commissioner explained that performance in Gloucestershire around 999 calls was good but calls were increasing rapidly. In addition 101 calls were also increasing rapidly.
- 6.7 The Commissioner summarised that it was a measured and fair budget with intelligent proposals from the Constabulary as to how additional funding would be used.
- 6.8 In support of the increase, a member explained that there was an opportunity to help relieve pressures on policing. It was recognised that once that funding was in the base budget it would be there year after year. If the option of not asking for an increase was taken then that weakened the argument back to central government around additional funding. One member outlined the shift towards local funding and raised concerns around council tax as a non-progressive form of taxation. Concern was expressed around reductions in funding potentially leading to year on year increases in crime.
- 6.9 In response to a question, the Commissioner explained there was no additional funding in the budget going to a review of fire service governance as that review was complete and a decision would be made in the coming weeks. He reminded members that he had received a grant from government to carry out much of that work.
- 6.10 One member noted the recruitment of police officers noting that with the current numbers in training that would bring the Constabulary up to the planned establishment. He referred to the letter from the Chief Constable noting the aspirations within the letter based on the additional funding spread across the priorities. It was stated that there was no explanation around how the increase would affect the establishment and how that would be spread across the areas. In response it was explained that there would be an additional 50 police officers and 30 police staff. PCSOs would remain at the same level. There had been a planned increase in recruitment and the numbers should be up by the end of the financial year.
- 6.11 One member recognised that the budget could be balanced by a 2.5% increase and that with the core funding being one of the lowest, by

increasing the precept it was putting the cost of policing on the public and the most vulnerable would be the hardest hit. He asked why the Commissioner wasn't doing more to put pressure on central government. The Commissioner stated that this was not something he could change. There was a funding formula in place and commissioners had been lobbying to have that changed. It was understood that this would be considered as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review. The Commissioner stated that he had raised it on multiple occasions and was meeting with the Home Secretary. If the full amount wasn't asked for, the Commissioner felt that the Constabulary would be weakened. It was not enough to just balance the budget, investment was needed.

- 6.12 It was explained that the National Police Chiefs' Council had made a full submission to Government on the issue of police funding. There would be a planned communication approach to ensure communities understood about the reasons for the increase in precept.
- 6.13 One member asked for a 'strapline' of what the public would get for the increase in the precept. The Commissioner explained that in meeting members of the public he felt that they understood the pressures on the police. He explained that the police would only see an increase in funding of the council tax element of spending which was around 50% of the budget and that from government they were receiving nothing. The member requested something from the Commissioner's Office's communication team to help communicate that message.
- 6.14 In response to a question on the precept in future years, the Commissioner explained that he did not want to see an increase of this nature next year.
- 6.15 One member explained that a number of the public would just be concerned with whether the Chief Constable had enough officers to do the job. The Chief Constable felt that the investment was needed in order to save the County further issues and the need for greater investment in the future. In addition, the member asked that there be more scrutiny of the Commissioner's Fund to ensure the public understood how that money was used and whether it had good outcomes. The Commissioner stated that he welcomed the challenge.
- 6.16 The Chairman noted the previous year's Commissioner's Fund carry forward from the reserves. The Chief Finance Officer projected the carry-forward would reduce from around £700,000 to £500,000 in the following year. The commitment on projects was over a three year period and so the reserves would continue to come down.
- 6.17 One member commented that it was for the Commissioner to justify the increase in the precept and for the Chief Constable to show how that money could be spent. He noted a growth in the office of the Commissioner and asked whether that money could have been used in a different way. In response it was explained that this related to additional work within the office

and included a number of commissioning positions. There had also been the introduction of a part time post to consider complaints both of which would relieve police officers and staff of such work..

- 6.18 One member was concerned about the level of reserves noting the figures in the paper which outlined reserves in 2017 at 7% higher than the national average. The member expressed concern that central government might look at the levels of unused reserves in the future and use that as a reason to not provide funding. The Chief Finance Officer stated he would look to identify the Constabulary's reserve figures compared to national figures for 2018.

ACTION Peter Skelton

- 6.19 In response to a question it was explained that there was a continuous programme of savings. There were areas that were being looked at but no decisions had been made. 2020/21 savings were higher because it was part of a transformation strategy which included ICT investment.
- 6.20 One member outlined the fact that funding decisions made by government had led to fewer police officers and less visible policing. He stated that this was the message to the public as to why the precept was required to be raised by 10.6%.
- 6.21 One member emphasised the increasing demand from cyber-crime and suggested that big technology companies should be contributing to funding rather than the burden being placed on those that found it hardest to pay. He was interested in the Commissioner's view on the impact of technology and what he was doing to lobby on this issue. The Commissioner explained that technology was now in every part of policing. The Association of Police and Crime Commissioners met regularly and lobbied government that a proportion of funding should be coming from those companies. The Chief Constable outlined the complexities of cyber-crime and the particular skills required by the Constabulary. The Constabulary was working to adapt to respond to this.
- 6.22 One member asked whether there was any money in the budget to help support the health and wellbeing of the staff. The Chief Constable explained that work was being carried out on a strategy for this so it was felt that sufficient resources were in place..
- 6.23 Following the discussion on the proposed 2019/20 budget and precept, the Panel were asked to decide whether they:

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

It was Resolved that:

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

The proposed police precept for 2019/20 be supported with the following recommendation:

That the Panel supports the Police and Crime Commissioner in making representations to the Home Office and HM treasury seeking that a proportion of police funding is provided by the large technology companies in order to fund policing of Cyber Crime.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 1.20 pm

(2) EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN – MARCH 2019 UPDATE

Cabinet Member Arrangements

Councillor	Portfolio Area	Areas of Responsibility
AW Berry (Leader)	Resources	Financial Strategy and Management; Revenues and Benefits; Grants; Democratic Services; Press and Communications
NJW Parsons (Deputy 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
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 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Draft Publica Business Plan 2019/20	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	None
Electric Vehicle Charging Points - Options for Additional Provision	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Cabinet Member for Enterprise & Partnerships	Claire Locke/ Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	Cabinet and Council decisions - February 2018 Outcome of Procurement Exercise
Reducing the Council's Avoidable Single Use Plastic Consumption	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Cabinet Member for Environment	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Draft Terms of Reference - Review of the Leisure and Cultural Services Contract	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	None
Future Provision for Parking Enforcement	Yes	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Partnerships	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	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
Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) Policy	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Leader of the Council	Jon Dearing	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Corporate Enforcement Policy	No	No	Cabinet	March 2019	Leader of the Council	Emma Cathcart	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
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	March 2019	Leader of the Council (Cabinet Member for Resources)	Emma Cathcart	Cabinet Members Corporate Management Team Service Leads Legal Department	Revenues and Housing Support Services Sanction Policy
No scheduled Meeting				April 2019				
No scheduled Meeting				May 2019				
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
Draft Corporate Strategy 2019-23	No	No	Council (recommendation from Cabinet)	June 2019	All	Nigel Adams / Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Cttee Senior Officers	Energy Strategy Political Manifesto Service and Forward Data
No scheduled Meeting				August 2019				

2

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
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)	October 2019	Housing, Health & Leisure	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Existing Contract
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)