

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 21 July 2015 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chairman
Vice Chairman

Councillor P W Awford
Councillor Mrs G F Blackwell

and Councillors:

G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, Mrs J E Day, R D East, D T Foyle, Mrs R M Hatton, Mrs H C McLain, T A Spencer, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

also present:

Councillors R E Garnham and J R Mason

OS.15 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 15.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 15.2 The Chairman welcomed Rachel Capon from the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Team to the meeting and indicated that she would be giving a presentation at Agenda Item 9. Councillor J R Mason was also in attendance for that item as the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment. In addition, Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, would be providing an update on the last meeting of the Panel at Agenda Item 7.

OS.16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 16.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman and M G Sztymiak. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 17.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.
- 17.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

OS.18 MINUTES

- 18.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2015, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

OS.19 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

- 19.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 14-17. Members were asked to determine whether there were any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could give to the work contained within the Plan.
- 19.2 A Member understood that the Executive Committee had received a report on the disposal of surplus assets at the meeting on 15 July 2015 and it had been resolved that Officers investigate the potential for disposing of a number of assets including all remaining retained garage sites managed by Severn Vale Housing Society. He raised concern that at least one of the large garage sites in Prior's Park was not managed by Severn Vale Housing Society. The Chief Executive undertook to ensure that a response was provided following the meeting and the Chairman asked that this be circulated to the whole Committee.
- 19.3 It was
RESOLVED That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.20 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

- 20.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16, circulated at Pages No. 18-19, which Members were asked to consider.
- 20.2 The Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager indicated that an Overview and Scrutiny Committee workshop had been held on 8 July 2015 in order to review the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy and how it would link to the commitment to achieve the gold standard challenge award for homelessness prevention. Following the workshop it had been decided that more work needed to be done around the gold standard and a report would be brought back to the Committee at a later date, if appropriate. The review of the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy would be discussed in more detail under Agenda Item 10.
- 20.3 The Corporate Services Group Manager explained that, at the Scrutiny Training which had been provided as part of the Members' Induction Programme, he had indicated that some more formal training would be provided around the role of the Committee. A proposal had come forward from South West Councils which he would be discussing with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman with a view to providing the training in mid-September. He also took the opportunity to update Members on the recent Corporate Services restructure and he was pleased to report that Clare Evans, Communications Team Leader, had been appointed as the new Policy and Communications Manager. Clare would have direct responsibility for scrutiny and would be attending future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 20.4 Having considered the information provided, it was
RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16 be **NOTED**.

OS.21 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE

- 21.1 Members received an update from Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Panel held on 16 July 2015.
- 21.2 Councillor Garnham advised that the main Agenda items had been the appointment of the Chairman of the Panel; the annual report from the Police and Crime Commissioner; a refreshed version of the Police and Crime Plan; the Chief Executive's report; and a presentation on "Accessibility and Accountability", one of the main policing priorities. The Chief Constable and the Chief Executive had given their apologies for the meeting.
- 21.3 As it was the first meeting of the new municipal year, Councillor Roger Wilson had been elected as Chairman and Councillor Barry Kirby appointed as Vice-Chairman. The new Chairman had stated that he wanted to work more closely with the Police and Crime Commissioner and, in the spirit of working in a more co-operative manner, he hoped to have regular meetings with him. The Police and Crime Commissioner, Martin Surl, had presented his annual report for the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015. There had been a general debate about the report and the good work around child sexual exploitation; forensic services and how the service had stayed in-house rather than merging with other forces, but had still managed to make savings of £300,000; and the new custody facility at Compass House which had opened a week ahead of schedule and was one of the leading custody suites in the country. Following on from an item in the Minutes, and in the debate around the annual report, it had been noted by several Panel Members that there was no quantitative analysis of crime figures. Given that the mission statement of the Police and Crime Commissioner was to have "less crime, more peace and good order" Members had questioned whether the public could be reassured that crime was actually being reduced. The Police and Crime Commissioner had explained that he was reluctant to put figures into the report if they had no meaning for the public and any figures which were included would need a commentary. The Panel had formally voted to move a recommendation that the report should be redrafted to include figures showing the levels of crime throughout the previous year.
- 21.4 Whilst there had been a refresh of the Police and Crime Plan, only minor changes had been made. There was an update from the Police and Crime Commissioner that, in the coming year, he would be "conducting independent reviews of various Police functions and, maintain oversight of the financial position and any resultant impact from changes to government funding". He had added that he would also "maintain oversight of the implementation phase of the new Police operating model, and the development of the Safety Cyber priority and Centre of Excellence". There had been further discussions around mental health; stop and search; and poverty and its possible influences on crime. The Deputy Chief Executive had given a brief presentation, in the absence of the Chief Executive, which had covered use of the neighbourhood engagement vehicle; freedom of information request; complaints; and the recent Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC) inspections. The inspections had focused on domestic violence and the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults. The reports on the inspections would not be available until the autumn. The Panel had discussed the burden on inspections and the Assistant Chief Constable, Sally Crook, had highlighted how much time and resource had to be devoted to the numerous HMIC inspections that took place.

- 21.5 The Assistant Chief Constable had given a brief presentation on how the Constabulary was meeting the priority on “accessibility and accountability”. She highlighted that the Chief Constable would give a presentation on the force’s new Operating Model at the next meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, which would add weight to the priority, and the Council’s representative undertook to provide an update to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 8 September. On being asked about police visibility, the Assistant Chief Constable stated that, under the new model of working there would be an increase in the numbers of neighbourhood police. In addition, all new recruits would undertake 400 hours of foot patrol. The Constabulary’s overall aim was to be responsive to need rather than being “a force which simply responds”. He confirmed that the next meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel would be on 1 September 2015.
- 21.6 With regard to crime figures used to compile the annual report, a Member questioned whether account was taken of crimes investigated by the military as he was aware of a number of crimes in Innsworth which had occurred within the estate covered by the military. The Council’s representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel undertook to ask that question as it was possible that not all crimes were being captured. A Member welcomed the commitment to increase the number of neighbourhood police and stressed the importance of community cohesion in terms of the prevention of certain crimes. Another Member went on to raise concern that he was a representative of Rural Watch, however, he had not received any alerts for some time. Other Members indicated that they had continued to receive the alerts and the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager explained that there had been amendments to the Neighbourhood Watch co-ordination work which had resulted in several changes of personnel. She undertook to find out the latest situation and to circulate a Member Update on the new arrangements. In addition, the Chief Executive explained that he had met with the Chief Constable to discuss the new Police Operating Model and he had been advised that there would be a small increase in the number of staff at Tewkesbury. The new Model would focus on a ‘response’ policy with a view to resolving crimes as they actually happened. He had requested a two page briefing note setting out the basic changes which would be circulated to Members when available. If appropriate, the Police could also be invited to give a presentation at a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 21.7 A Member noted that the new Police Operating Model would include Police Officers going back to wearing white shirts and he raised concern as to the costs associated with that change. The Council’s representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel felt that there was likely to be quite a considerable cost and he undertook to find out how much that would be. Another Member questioned what would happen with the land in Bishop’s Cleeve, that had been purchased for a custody suite which was now not being built. In response, the Council’s representative advised that a decision had been taken to have a divisional headquarters with a new custody suite rather than a separate custody suite in Bishop’s Cleeve. The land was still owned by the Constabulary, which did have an estate strategy, but he would try to establish whether there were any immediate plans in place.
- 21.8 The Chairman thanked the Council’s representative for his presentation and indicated that the update would be circulated to Members via email following the meeting. It was

RESOLVED That the feedback from the last meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel be **NOTED**.

OS.22 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

- 22.1 Members received an update from Councillor Janet Day, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Panel held on 14 July 2015.
- 22.2 Councillor Day indicated that the Care Quality Commission Inspection Report of Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust had been presented to the Committee. The report had provided details of the inspection process and the outcomes from the inspection which covered Cheltenham General Hospital, Gloucestershire Royal Hospital and Stroud Maternity Hospital. The overall rating for the Trust was "requires improvement", however, it was at the higher end of that scale and none of the services were considered to be in any danger of slipping into "inadequate" and it did not mean that the hospitals were unsafe in any way. The Trust would be submitting its action plan in response to the inspection report and progress would be monitored by the Committee.
- 22.3 The Committee had also considered the Gloucestershire Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2014/15. The Board was now on the same statutory footing as the Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children Board following the enactment of the Care Act in May 2015. Members had been pleased to note the establishment of the Fire Safety Development Group in late 2014 in response to six fire deaths. The Group aimed to reduce the risk of harm to adults who had care and support needs, living in their own homes or in residential care.
- 22.4 The Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group Performance Report showed an improvement in dementia diagnosis and the finance and efficiency rating had moved from amber to green. Members had continued to raise concern regarding cancer waiting times and more details would be provided at the next meeting in terms of what was being done to improve that position. An action plan had been developed to address the immediate concerns regarding the District Nursing function within the Integrated Care Teams across Gloucestershire and to improve resilience. One key factor was the national shortage of senior grade nurses. Members also raised concern regarding the performance of the NHS 111 service against targets and the Committee agreed that it would be helpful to invite the providers, Care UK, to a future meeting.
- 22.5 In terms of the Adult Social Care and Public Health Performance Report, direct payments and reassessments continued to miss targets and Members had been concerned that the uptake of health checks had not improved. Drug and alcohol targets were also a concern and would be discussed at the next planning meeting. The Committee had welcomed the Healthwatch Gloucestershire patient and public feedback report and it was suggested that elected Members could play a role in promoting Healthwatch within their divisions. The Committee had also been pleased to note the Cirencester Hospital Development Plan and had requested clear and consistent communication on what was happening at the hospital to ensure that people did not misinterpret the planned changes. Members had congratulated Officers on the Medical Journal award which had been received in recognition of the work of the Disability Quality Assurance Team and its partners. They had also been pleased to note the development of the App to assist people with disabilities in finding employment. The full Minutes of the meeting would be available on the Gloucestershire County Council website.

- 22.6 The Chairman thanked the Council's representative for her presentation and indicated that the update would be circulated to Members via email following the meeting. It was

RESOLVED That the feedback from the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee be **NOTED**.

OS.23 JOINT WASTE TEAM PRESENTATION

- 23.1 The Chairman introduced Rachel Capon, the Contracts Team Leader for the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Team, and indicated that she would be giving a presentation on the work of the Joint Waste Team and Joint Waste Committee. Julie Davies was also in attendance; she had previously been employed as the Council's Environment and Waste Policy Officer before her transfer to Ubico in April 2015.

- 23.2 Members were advised that the strategic objectives of the Joint Waste Team were to provide a good service; to be safe and cost effective; and to minimise waste for collection and disposal. Tewkesbury Borough Council had joined the Joint Waste Committee in December 2014, however, each local authority still had a duty to provide waste and street cleansing services and Tewkesbury Borough Council remained the point of contact for residents. The Committee was a body with delegated powers to make decisions concerning recycling, waste collection and street cleansing for the four District Councils (Cheltenham Borough Council, Cotswold District Council, Forest of Dean District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council) and to deliver waste treatment and disposal for the County. It was to be borne in mind that there were some decisions which would automatically be brought back for Tewkesbury Borough Council to make, for instance, the Joint Waste Committee could make recommendations regarding service change but the decision would have to be made by Tewkesbury Borough Council. Each authority was represented on the Committee by two elected Members and the Tewkesbury Borough Council representatives were Councillor R J E Vines, Leader of the Council, and Councillor J R Mason, Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment. The Committee directed the Joint Waste Team which was comprised of 11 Officers and led by Steve Read who was Head of Service, and also Managing Director of Somerset Waste Partnership. Contractors sat beneath the Joint Waste Team and were responsible for actually delivering the services. The Team worked with the Committee and Senior Management Group, of which the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager was a member, to produce an annual business plan and action plan which it then helped to deliver.

- 23.3 All seven local authorities within Gloucestershire were signed up to the Gloucestershire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy and a diagram was displayed to show the waste and recycling service design for each authority across the County. It was quite complicated as authorities did not use the same contractors, for example, Amey was the contractor for Gloucester City Council whereas Biffa was used by the Forest of Dean District Council; whilst Ubico delivered services for Tewkesbury Borough Council, Cheltenham Borough Council and Cotswold District Council, and would deliver Stroud District Council's service from July 2016; Stroud District Council was not currently involved with the Joint Waste Committee.

- 23.4 The business plan focused on broadening, integration and diversion. It was an annual rolling plan which was signed off by the Joint Waste Committee at the beginning of each calendar year and it focused on outcomes rather than being specific to each organisation. The notes of the Joint Waste Committee meetings were available on the Gloucestershire County Council website and it was noted that the business plan was part of the notes of the February meeting which included a two page action plan. With regard to “broadening”, the Team had provided assistance with Gloucester City Council’s service review and had also been helping with the service change at Stroud District Council which would have new contractors from July 2016. In terms of engagement with customers, a project was in operation to increase the volume of food waste diverted from landfill. Approximately 40% of residents across Gloucestershire used the food waste service and this had been falling year on year. WRAP had worked with a number of local authorities to test whether some simple interventions could yield substantial increases in the capture of food waste for recycling. The most effective of those had involved stickers discouraging people from putting food waste into the residual bin. It was intended to use the stickers in combination with a bin hangar which would provide more information about the new treatment plant and the fact that energy was now generated from food waste, as well as information on how to order a food waste caddy. The project was being funded by Gloucestershire County Council and would be rolled out across Gloucestershire during the week commencing 7 September 2015, with the exception of Gloucester City, in order to avoid the Rugby World Cup, and Stroud District where food waste was not currently recycled. Other areas had seen uplift of up to 30% where similar schemes had been implemented and it was hoped that similarly positive results would be achieved within Gloucestershire. A Member queried whether the provision of recycling banks could be included as part of the planning permission for developments of a certain size. The Chief Executive explained that there was a question mark over how cost effective recycling banks could be, given that the waste recycling market fluctuated, and he did not wish to raise public expectations. Consideration was being given to different ways of storing waste on larger developments, rather than using bins, which could significantly reduce the cost of collection; this was particularly important given the major strategic housing sites coming forward in the Borough and it was something which the Joint Waste Team would be looking at on behalf of the Council.
- 23.5 A school and community education programme had been running for several years, however, this no longer fitted with the curriculum and the uptake had significantly reduced in the last year with only one school signing up in Tewkesbury. The resource for delivering the programme was no longer available and a review would take place from September as to what would be the best way to use the available funding for education. A Member indicated that poster competitions had worked well in his experience and the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager advised that herself and the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment had recently judged a competition at Shurdington Primary School.
- 23.6 With regards to procurement, the Forest of Dean District Council’s contract would come to an end in 2018 and consideration was being given to different service designs. The consultation was due to finish at the end of September with a report being taken to the Joint Waste Committee in October. In addition there was a project around materials recycling and sales for Cheltenham Borough Council which would go live on 1 October. Members were informed that legislative changes introduced in January would have an impact on the way recycled materials were collected and could lead to separate collections of paper, metal, plastic and glass. Robust evidence would be needed to demonstrate that this could be accommodated as Tewkesbury Borough Council currently carried out comingled collections. Compliance reviews had been carried out for Tewkesbury

Borough, and other local authorities, and the results had shown that the recycle was high quality, with the exception of glass. A Member queried whether an additional bin would be required if a decision was taken to collect glass separately and she was advised that, if a decision was taken to make that change, it would be a box which would sit inside the wheeled bin as opposed to a completely separate bin.

- 23.7 A Member understood that there had previously been plans to install recycling bins in various parts of the Borough and for Parishes to take a share of the profits which were generated, however, that had not happened as far as he was aware. Clarification was provided that this related to a textile recycling scheme which had been seen as a sustainable way to recycle whilst also providing an incentive. Unfortunately, the textile market had diminished and the amount which could be obtained per tonne had dropped considerably rendering the scheme unviable. A Member questioned what was happening to the material which was not being recycled and was informed that a lot of people took unwanted textiles to charity shops, as well as places offering “cash for clothes”, and recycling banks were available across the Borough. The Member indicated that he was also concerned about other materials which could be recycled but were being thrown away as household waste, for instance, if people could not fit them into their blue bins. The Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment indicated that the collection crews were usually very accommodating and would be willing to take additional materials which did not fit into the bins and the Council provided blue bags for that purpose. It was recognised that it may be beneficial to send out a press release outlining the locations of the recycling banks and centres across the Borough.
- 23.8 A Member raised concern regarding grounds maintenance, particularly in relation to grass cutting and the general appearance of the A38. The Contracts Team Leader for the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Team indicated that similar issues were experienced by the Forest of Dean District Council as County Highways no longer carried out weeding in gullies which meant that mechanical sweeping was ineffective. The Forest of Dean District Council had also stopped grass cutting unless it was impacting upon visibility for vehicles pulling out of junctions. The Chairman indicated that, as a Gloucestershire County Councillor, he had previously used some of his dedicated budget to ensure that grass cutting was undertaken in particular areas.
- 23.9 The Chairman thanked the Contracts Team Leader for the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Team for her informative presentation and, it was

RESOLVED That the presentation on the work of the Joint Waste Team and Joint Waste Committee be **NOTED**.

OS.24 REVIEW OF DISCRETIONARY HOUSING PAYMENT POLICY

- 24.1 The report of the Revenues and Benefits Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 20-31, asked Members to endorse the findings of the review of the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy and to recommend to the Executive Committee that the revised Policy be adopted.
- 24.2 At its meeting on 16 June 2015, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed to carry out a review of the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy and a workshop had subsequently been held on 8 July 2015 to conduct the review. The current policy for awarding discretionary housing payments needed to be reviewed in light of a number of changes, the main one being the impact of welfare reform and the Chancellor’s budget of 8 July 2015. It was anticipated that there would be benefit cuts in the region of £12M and, in order to meet that challenge, the Government had committed a further £800M towards discretionary housing payments over the next 4-5 years. Other factors contributing to the review included the work which had been carried out on financial inclusion and the completion of the

transformation project within Revenues and Benefits. The proposed changes would assist moving clients into cheaper alternative accommodation and reduce the need to make further applications for discretionary housing payments. If the changes were accepted then it would greatly assist both the Benefits Team and the Housing Team in the administration of the discretionary housing payments and would help to reduce expenditure. In addition, there would be further reductions in welfare benefit awards following the Chancellor's announcement in the budget speech and it was important that the Council was in a position to react and assist housing benefit recipients who could be facing further reductions in benefit when they were experiencing difficult or challenging circumstances. Members were advised that there would be resource implications; the Council received a grant of £86,795 from central Government so that it could make awards of discretionary housing payments and that amount would potentially increase.

- 24.3 Discretionary housing payments were made to those tenants who were on low incomes and they must be eligible for housing benefit in order to qualify. Currently, the discretionary housing payment was being used to help tenants to keep their homes where their housing benefit did not meet their full rent. Welfare budgets were being reduced and there was a need to encourage some tenants into cheaper alternative accommodation which would reduce the regular monthly discretionary housing payments and make people less reliant on those payments. The impact of the benefit cap would be significant with the amount awarded being reduced from a maximum of £26,000 per year per claimant to £23,000 per year per claimant for residents of London and £20,000 per year per claimant for residents outside of London. In order to assist the claimant, it was proposed that the Council be able to pay towards the rent deposit when moving into a new home and to assist with any reasonable removal costs. When considering the application, it was necessary to take into account whether the property was affordable for the tenant; whether the tenant had a valid reason to move; and whether the deposit or removal cost was reasonable. The Council currently had five housing benefit claimants whose benefits were being capped and it was likely that those numbers would increase. It was important that the Council was in a position to offer assistance where there was a need and the housing benefit recipient was in temporary accommodation; an individual or family was fleeing domestic violence; for those with kinship care responsibilities; or an individual or family who could not move immediately for reasons of health, education or child protection. Finally, there was a need to update the introduction of the Discretionary Housing Policy to set out that local authorities may also make payment awards towards other housing costs in order to better reflect the proposed changes to the policy. It was also necessary to set out that the level of discretionary housing payment awarded must not exceed the eligible rent, taking into consideration the claimant's overall financial and personal circumstances, in order to bring the Policy in line with the regulations. All applications for discretionary housing payments were made in writing, and with supporting evidence, and consideration was given to background information about levels of income and expenditure. Follow-up reviews and managerial checks were also carried out and the budget was subject to checking by the Council's auditors.

- 24.4 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the findings of the review of the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy be endorsed and that it be **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** that the revised policy be **ADOPTED**.

OS.25 FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP MONITORING REPORT

- 25.1 The report of the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 32-41, provided an update on the progress of the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan. Members were asked to consider the progress which had been made.
- 25.2 Members were advised that, following the flooding in 2007, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had undertaken a review of the arrangements for the land drainage budget and its effectiveness in providing value for money. The review report had been adopted by the Executive Committee in February 2010 and one of the recommendations included in the action plan was to establish a joint Member/Officer Flood Risk Management Group with its main role being to monitor the delivery of the Council's Flood Response Action Plan (FRAP) which set out the various land drainage projects that had been identified following the flooding. Although the FRAP was nearing completion, it was considered that the Flood Risk Management Group continued to have an important role to play in identifying resource requirements for flood risk management projects and liaising with partners to secure further funding as well as overseeing the development of a programme of watercourse maintenance and reviewing the Council's response to flooding events and supporting development of flood risk management policies.
- 25.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee reviewed the Terms of Reference and action plan for the Group on an annual basis and received quarterly monitoring reports on progress against the plan. The action plan, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, was a living document to which funding and partnership opportunities could be added as and when they arose. The Environmental Health Manager explained that an additional table, Table 4, had been added to the action plan following comments made at the last meeting of the Flood Risk Management Group in relation to the programme of watercourse maintenance in order to separate significant works of repair and improvement. He was pleased to report that work at Tirley, the final scheme in the FRAP, was now well underway and the Repair and Renew Grant scheme had been very successful with over £0.5M improvements made to properties in the Borough. Officers were currently working with the Environment Agency on a follow-up project.
- 25.4 A local Member for Tirley indicated that a significant amount of work had already been carried out in the area and the final piece was around attenuation and rural sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS). A Member went on to raise concern that flooding was exacerbated by properties being built below ground level and she queried whether the Group entered into discussion with Planning Officers. The Environmental Health Manager confirmed that the Development Manager had given a presentation at a recent meeting of the Flood Risk Management Group. He provided assurance that flood risk management was a key consideration in assessing planning applications which was managed by the Planning Team as part of the consultation process. Whilst he was not consulted on every application, the Flood Risk Management Engineer was consulted on all applications in areas at risk of flooding. A Member pointed out that the properties which appeared to be built below road level may have used permeable paving which had a similar appearance to block paving but allowed water to pass through into a soakaway tank beneath. The Chief Executive indicated that flooding was always high on the agenda for Tewkesbury Borough and he felt that it would be beneficial to arrange a seminar for all Members to set out the main issues.
- 25.5 It was

RESOLVED That the progress against the Flood Risk Management Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.26 HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY MONITORING REPORT

- 26.1 The report of the Development Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 42-66, set out the progress which had been made against the actions contained within the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-16 during the first two years. Members were asked to consider the report.
- 26.2 The Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-16 had been approved by the Executive Committee in September 2013 following an Overview and Scrutiny Committee review. The Strategy focused on three key themes: to support, encourage and enable healthy active lifestyles; to facilitate opportunities for children and young people; and to provide an infrastructure which made it easier to be healthy. The Strategy action plan was attached at Appendix 1 to the report, with progress against each action set out in the right hand column. In terms of key achievements, the Community and Economic Development Manager advised that major progress had been made on the new leisure centre over the last 12 months. Work had started on the site and the build was currently on time and on budget with a planned completion date of July 2016. 'Places for People' had been appointed through the tender process to manage the facility over the next 15 years.
- 26.3 He went on to explain that social prescribing was a new national initiative whereby referrals were made by GPs for non-medical providers of activity, advice, support and information provided by local groups and organisations. Within Tewkesbury Borough there were three pilot social prescribing schemes, one for each of the three cluster areas that covered the Borough GP practices. The Gloucester City Scheme, which covered Brockworth, Churchdown and Highnam surgeries, and the Tewkesbury Town Scheme, which covered the two Tewkesbury Town GP practices, both employed a Social Prescribing Hub Co-ordinator who took referrals directly from the GP and worked with patients on a one to one basis. They were able to spend time with patients to really understand their situation, needs and interests in order to make appropriate recommendations to local services, groups and activities. The Cheltenham scheme, which covered the GP practices in Bishop's Cleeve and Winchcombe, worked differently in that the GPs made direct referrals to one of six agreed local organisations. The type of support varied depending on the individual but could include healthy living, including weight management and exercise; building networks and making friends in the community; caring for someone in the home or elsewhere; housing related issues; or mental health and wellbeing. The Council provided a supporting role in terms of providing information for the three areas and helping to develop the schemes, as well as involvement in the strategic direction for social prescribing.
- 26.4 One further success was the introduction of women's running clubs across the Borough. The Women's Running Network had originally started as a national campaign to encourage women who were not confident in running to take-up exercise. There were now running groups in Tewkesbury, Winchcombe, Bishop's Cleeve, Churchdown and Brockworth. Women were encouraged to attend over a 10 week period with a group leader and there were approximately 330 active runners per week. Tewkesbury Borough Council had provided support through training, promotion and sourcing venues. From that relationship, the Council had been able to highlight potential running leaders from within the groups, and get them trained and qualified to form new groups in other parts of the Borough. The group leaders also had input as competitors and marshals for the Tewkesbury half-marathon, which had over a thousand runners each year. In addition, the internationally renowned Parkrun had commenced on 4 July 2015 on the Vineyards in Tewkesbury with funding assistance from the Council and support from the Sports Development team. Finally, along with Run England, the Council had helped to establish a junior athletics club at Tewkesbury School by assisting

with the set up and funding of coaches and equipment.

- 26.5 A Member sought an update on the new GP surgery in Tewkesbury and the Chief Executive confirmed that the project was on track but he would circulate a Member Update with more information in the near future. The Chairman indicated that good progress had been made in respect of the actions in the Strategy and it was

RESOLVED That the progress made in relation to the implementation of the actions in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-16 be **NOTED**.

OS.27 ENVIRO-CRIMES REVIEW MONITORING REPORT

- 27.1 The report of the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 67-72, provided an update on the progress against the recommendations arising from the Overview and Scrutiny Review of Enviro-Crimes. Members were asked to consider the report.

- 27.2 Members were advised that an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group had been established to review the Council's approach to tackling environmental crimes such as dog fouling and fly-tipping. The Working Group had been very productive and its report had been adopted by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 16 July 2014. The report contained a series of recommendations, progress against which was set out at Appendix 1 to the report. The Environmental Health Manager indicated that the majority of actions were complete or ongoing. Members were advised that Recommendation 11, 'Organise a training session tailored to the Police, explaining how they can help in tackling dog fouling' and Recommendation 14, 'Carry out educational campaigns at local schools to make them aware of the dangers of dog fouling; explore partnership working with other agencies', had both been delayed due to the reorganisation of the Environmental Health section. As that was now complete, Officers would be in a better position to ensure that those recommendations were implemented.

- 27.3 With regard to Recommendation 3, 'Provide portable signs warning residents and visitors that fly-tipping will not be tolerated, and enforcement action will be taken', a Member noted that 20 signs had been purchased which could be used, however, there was no follow-up information to indicate where and when the signs would be used. The Environmental Health Manager advised that the recommendation related to plastic laminate signs which had been purchased and could be taken from site to site to use during different operations in order to target 'hotspots'. In addition, some hard-hitting signs had been produced in-house to target dog-fouling which had been used successfully by Members. A Member confirmed that the luminous signs with the evil eyes had been used to good effect in Brockworth where dog fouling on the playing fields had reduced.

- 27.4 The Chief Executive explained that there had been a lengthy discussion in relation to enviro-crimes at the Executive Committee meeting on 15 July. Members had not been fully aware of the work which was being done within the Environmental Health service in terms of responding to fly-tipping etc. Whilst the Working Group had been made fully aware of the details around enviro-crimes, he recognised that it would be beneficial for all Members to receive an update about the work which was ongoing.

- 27.5 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the progress against the recommendations arising from the Enviro-Crimes Review be **NOTED**.

OS.28 REVIEW OF DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS

28.1 The report of the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 73-77, advised Members of the need to review the Council's approach to dealing with Disabled Facilities Grants. Members were asked to establish an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group to conduct the review and to approve the proposed Terms of Reference for the Working Group as set out at Appendix 1.

28.2 Members were informed that Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) helped towards the cost of essential adaptations to homes to enable applicants to live more independently. DFGs were administered by the Council's Environmental Health section. Due to changes in the way they were financed, the cost of adaptations, the number of different agencies involved and the increasingly ageing population, it was felt that it was an appropriate time to undertake a review of the Council's approach to dealing with DFGs. It was recommended that a small Working Group be established to conduct the review with the membership drawn from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and including the Portfolio Holder for Clean and Green Environment which covered Environmental Health.

28.3 It was subsequently

RESOLVED

1. That an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group be established to review the Council's approach to dealing with Disabled Facilities Grants comprising the following Members:
Councillors Mrs G F Blackwell, K J Cromwell, T A Spencer and Mrs P E Stokes plus the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment.
2. That the Terms of Reference for the Working Group, as set out at Appendix 1, be **APPROVED**.

The meeting closed at 6:35 pm