

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 7 February 2017 commencing at 4:30 pm**

**Present:**

Vice Chair in the chair

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, Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

**also present:**

Councillor R E Garnham

**OS.70 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 70.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 70.2 The Chair welcomed Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, to the meeting and indicated that he would be providing an update at Agenda Item 7.

**OS.71 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

- 71.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P W Awford (Chair) and M G Sztymiak. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

**OS.72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 72.1 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.
- 72.2 There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

**OS.73 MINUTES**

- 73.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**OS.74 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

- 74.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages

No. 12-15. 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.

74.2 A Member questioned what changes were envisaged in respect of the report on the Joint Core Strategy allocation of affordable housing item, due to be considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 15 March 2017. The Chief Executive indicated that a written response would be provided following the meeting. With regard to the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy which was being taken to the Executive Committee on 26 April 2017, a Member raised concern at the derogatory portrayal of Tewkesbury and its facilities, particularly within the High Street, by the BBC during a recent interview. The Chief Executive confirmed that he was aware of the interview and Officers had been surprised at its tone. He explained that the Communications team met regularly with local media and this was something which would be discussed as part of that process. In response to a Member query, assurance was provided that the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy would be brought to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, prior to consideration by the Executive Committee.

74.3 It was

**RESOLVED** That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

#### **OS.75 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

75.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016/17, circulated at Pages No. 16-19, which Members were asked to consider.

75.2 The Head of Corporate Services drew attention to the pending items, set out at Page No. 19 of the report, and advised that a report would be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 21 March 2017 to establish a Working Group to undertake the review of the Borough News and to approve Terms of Reference for the review. It was subsequently

**RESOLVED** That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016/17 be **NOTED**.

#### **OS.76 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE**

76.1 Members received an update from Councillor Rob Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Panel held on 3 February 2017.

76.2 Councillor Garnham advised that the main focus of the meeting was the setting of the Police precept, however, it had begun with the confirmation that the Chief Constable, Suzette Davenport, was retiring after four years with the force. The Police and Crime Commissioner would therefore be starting the process for recruiting a new Chief Constable; it was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner's manifesto stated that Gloucestershire would have its own Chief Constable so sharing with another area would not be possible.

76.3 Councillor Garnham advised that a comprehensive report had been provided by the Chief Executive giving information on crime statistics, collaboration and complaints. It was of particular note that, in November 2016, Avon and Somerset Constabulary had contacted Gloucestershire Constabulary to state that it would not be proceeding with any further service transformation collaboration on the basis that the current programme was not sufficiently broad enough to achieve the financial savings it required. Collaboration would still continue on major crime investigations, specialist operations and the firearms training centre. With regard to emergency services collaboration, and the potential for Police and Crime

Commissioners to take over the running of the Fire Service, the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner had attended a meeting with the County Council where he had been informed that there was nothing to discuss as the County Council was happy with the current arrangements. The Police and Crime Commissioner had highlighted that the government had written to all Police and Crime Commissioners stating that they must lead this agenda – not the Fire Service or County Councils – and, therefore, this issue would be revisited. In the government’s view, simply stating that the status quo was the preferred choice was not sufficient justification. Members were informed that the Police and Crime Commissioner’s office had shared its delivery plans for 2017; these were the oversight plans that would be adhered to in order to deliver the Commissioner’s six strategic priorities. It was stressed that more detailed plans were discussed with each of the six leads who would be making presentations to the Police and Crime Panel in due course.

- 76.4 Councillor Garnham reiterated that the Police and Crime Panel meeting in February was required to scrutinise the Police and Crime Commissioner’s proposed budget which it was able to accept without comment; make comments upon; or, ask the Police and Crime Commissioner to reconsider. It was noted that the government had imposed tight constraints this year and Police and Crime Commissioners had been told that the direct resource funding, including precept, would be protected at flat cash levels assuming that precept income was increased to the maximum, within the referendum limit. In effect, this meant that the Police precept proposed had to be 1.99%; the Chief Constable supported this proposal which was unanimously approved by the Police and Crime Panel. Members were advised that this effectively meant a grant reduction of 1.4% because of additional grant reallocations by the Home Office. During the period 2018/19 to 2020/21, the Police and Crime Commissioner would still have to make savings of £6.4M and it was noted that the required revenue budget for the Commissioner’s office was £106.5M. The Police and Crime Commissioner had stated that he still aimed to maintain or increase the number of Police Officers; to double the size of the Special Constabulary; and to have a “re-imagining” of neighbourhood policing, including rural policing. He indicated that there were currently 1,060 Police Officers, which was expected to rise to 1,095 by the end of March 2019, and 124 Special Constables, which it was intended would increase to 300 by 2019. It was noted that the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel was due to be held on 14 March 2017.
- 76.5 A Member questioned whether additional funding had been allocated for the extra Police Officers and confirmation was provided that would be the case; overall there would be 35 new Officers above the current level. Another Member asked whether there had been any indication as to where the £6.4M savings would be made, particularly given the plans to increase staff levels. Councillor Garnham advised that there would be cuts, the majority of which were likely to be in relation to back office processes, vehicles etc. It was noted that there were reserves of £20M and a £5M “rainy day” fund. The Police and Crime Panel recognised that savings had to be made but it would be difficult, as was the case across the country.
- 76.6 A Member queried whether the Police and Crime Panel would play a role in the recruitment of the new Chief Constable and was advised that the Panel would be required to confirm the appointment. In response to a query regarding rural policing, Members were advised that there had been an acknowledgement that neighbouring policing was not working as well as it should be and it was accepted that changes were needed; unfortunately there were no longer enough resources for Police Officers to attend meetings and report crime statistics as they had done in the past, and, although this information was available elsewhere, this did not negate the need for a police presence in rural areas. A Member sought clarification as to whether Rural Watch was still in operation as he had not received any updates for 18 months or more. Two other Members of the Committee

confirmed that they did receive emails and telephone calls and Councillor Garnham undertook to remind the Police and Crime Commissioner of Rural Watch when considering neighbourhood policing.

76.7 A Member indicated that he had previously raised a query regarding the replacement of the military Police Officer. Councillor Garnham had taken this up on his behalf and he was pleased to report that the Police had subsequently contacted the military and the old military building was now being used as a base for Police Officers - effectively operating a local policing point within the Borough.

76.8 The Chair 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.77 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

77.1 Members received an update from Councillor Mrs J E Day, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on matters discussed at its last meeting held on 10 January 2017.

77.2 Members were advised that one of the agenda items had related to mental health in Gloucestershire and the Committee had been pleased to welcome representatives from the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust, the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG), the Council and the Police to the meeting to engage with Members on this important issue. It was clear that there had been a real culture change in the way in which mental health services were commissioned and provided. The structure had changed from one of containment and sanctuary, to one of hope and recovery; from a legacy of exclusion to one of aspiration and action to ensure inclusion. The understanding of mental health illnesses had greatly improved, with significant investment in learning from experience and developing knowledge; a good example of this was the establishment of the Severn and Wye Recovery College which empowered people to become 'students of their own recovery'. It was noted that the Mental Health Acute Response Service was co-located with the Police at Waterwells and worked closely with the Ambulance Service. Police Officers had benefitted from their proximity to health professionals in terms of advice and accessing health records and care plans to inform decisions when people were in crisis. The Committee had also heard about the pilot schemes that were in place to better support children and young people, in particular the Stroud Schools project. There had been, and continued to be, a lot of activity to remove the stigma that had been associated with mental health; the Committee fully supported this work and, in support of this principle, some Members had chosen to share their own experiences.

77.3 Councillor Day went on to advise that the Committee had been pleased to receive the End of Life Strategy and agreed with its aim to make sure that the highest quality end of life care services were available to all who needed it. It had been particularly good to hear that time had been taken to speak with families about their end of life experiences, both good and bad, and that this feedback had influenced the development of the strategy. In its consideration of the GCCG performance report, the Committee had noted that the concerns remained in relation to the 62 day cancer target and Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT), and the GCCG continued to work through the associated action plans to address these issues. The concerns regarding ambulance response times would be looked at in greater detail at the Committee's meeting in March. Members had been disappointed that there seemed to be no improvement in

performance against the non-emergency patient transport service delivered by Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd. There had been a frank exchange of views with the GCCG and, although it had been made clear that it was applying all clauses in the contract, Members felt that the GCCG should be looking at stronger measures.

77.4 During the scrutiny of the adult social care and public health budget, it had been noted that Gloucestershire County Council would receive a further £2.5M for the adult social care grant for 2017/18; this was a one-off amount and was ring-fenced, aimed at starting the transition to the increase in the Better Care fund from 2018/19. Members had discussed how this funding might best be utilised and it had been suggested that it could cover some of the cost reductions in adult mental health services as well as services for people with learning disabilities. With regard to learning disabilities, Members had been made aware of the positive work that had been carried out in terms of helping individuals into employment and increasing independence. Queries had been raised in respect of the reduction in the number of assessments being carried out and it was noted that the cost reductions in the budget related to a change in approach brought about by the Building Better Lives Programme rather than a reduction in staffing levels for social worker teams.

77.5 The Chair indicated that the update would be circulated to Members following the meeting and it was

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

**OS.78 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COUNCIL'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH, COMMUNITY AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

78.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 20-23, asked Members to consider the effectiveness of the Council's continued involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, subject to the Committee being satisfied that value for money was being achieved, Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2017/18 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

78.2 In response to Member queries, clarification was provided that it was an annual contribution and, if the Council did not make the payment it would not be represented on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It was subsequently

**RESOLVED** That Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2017/18 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**OS.79 ENVIRO-CRIMES UPDATE**

79.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Interim Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 24-30, which gave an update on the progress that had been made in respect of tackling enviro-crimes and the position regarding the recruitment of an Environmental Warden to work across the borough, in

partnership with Town and Parish Councils, to reduce enviro-crime. Members were asked to consider the report.

- 79.2 The Interim Head of Community Services advised that, in July 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered a report detailing the Council's approach to addressing the increased level of enviro-crime across the Borough. It was noted that responsibility for enviro-crime sat with the Council's Environmental Health team and Ubico cleared fly-tips on the Council's behalf. Since the last report there had been notable activity and progress in dealing with enviro-crimes and some of the recent achievements were set out at Page No. 26, Paragraph 2.1 of the report. Particular attention was drawn to the successful prosecution of a householder whose waste had been fly-tipped by a contractor who was not a registered waste carrier. In addition, One Legal was considering several investigation files in connection with separate fly-tipping offences. Fly-tipping warning signs had been erected within Sandhurst, where this had been a particular problem, and a joint project was also being carried out with the Police in that area. Members were informed that an application had been made to use two of the community safety partnership cameras to gather evidence to tackle fly-tipping in Sandhurst and Coriander Drive, Churchdown where a multi-agency project involving the Council, Severn Vale and the Police had also been initiated. Officers were working with an anti-fraud specialist at Cheltenham Borough Council on techniques for gathering evidence from information that was found within fly-tips and how to trace it back to the perpetrator. The Interim Head of Community Services also pointed out that there was a multi-agency review across the county in respect of the approach to abandoned vehicles.
- 79.3 In order to build on this success, further options were being explored and these were referenced at Page No. 27, Paragraph 3.1, of the report. This included: further joint working with the Police; visits to other local authorities which had successfully reduced serious fly-tipping incidents to share knowledge; additional training for officers in the Environmental Health team in terms of serving fixed penalty notices and carrying out investigations; pooling resources across the Gloucestershire authorities to tackle fly-tipping; the potential adoption of provisions to introduce a Fixed Penalty Policy; and increased use of fixed penalty notices. Members were informed that this was very much a work in progress; the new Head of Community Services would be taking up his role at the end of February and he would be looking to build on recent activity and develop a project plan which could be brought back to the Committee in future.
- 79.4 A Member questioned what progress had been made with One Legal in terms of its consideration of fly-tipping files with a view to taking further action. The Interim Head of Community Services indicated that it was his understanding that this was nearing completion. Another Member sought clarification as to what would be covered in the enviro-crime training plan which was being introduced for Officers in 2017/18 and, whilst assurance was provided that all Environmental Health Officers were qualified for their roles, Members were informed that some lacked experience of enforcement situations and did not always have the necessary skills to diffuse confrontation; it was this more specialist training which would be included within the plan. With regard to the reduction in fly-tipping in Sandhurst, a Member queried whether the problem had simply moved to another area. The Interim Head of Community Services confirmed that this was the most likely scenario. Publicity arising from prosecutions and having visible officers in the field tended to be the best deterrents and generally led to a reduction in fly-tipping in one particular area. The Member noted that officers planned to visit other local authorities and she questioned which ones had successfully reduced fly-tipping. Members were informed that the Forest of Dean District Council had done a lot of work in the terms of reducing fly-tipping and it was hoped that intelligence could be shared to bring the main offenders to task. In response to a query as to whether cameras were being used for fly-tipping, Members were advised that community safety

cameras were currently being used around Sandhurst and Coriander Drive. There were very strict regulations on the use of cameras for covert surveillance and care needed to be taken to accord with the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. Cameras had been purchased by the Environmental Health department for the purpose of combatting enviro-crime and, whilst they were not currently being used, it was intended to bring them into operation; however, given the amount of time and resources associated with reviewing the footage, it was important that they were utilised to the best effect. With regard to the table of estimated officer investigation costs for April to December 2016, a Member sought further information in respect of abandoned vehicle removal, storage and disposal. The Interim Head of Community Services indicated that he did not have the detailed information to hand but he would be happy to provide a response following the meeting.

- 79.5 With regard to the Environmental Warden, a Member questioned when this post was likely to come forward. The Interim Head of Community Services explained that the Executive Committee had considered a report in respect of the potential recruitment of an Environmental Warden at its meeting in November 2016; it was intended that the post would be funded by participating Town and Parish Councils. A meeting had been held in December, which was attended by representatives from several Town and Parish Councils, and a number of questions had been generated which Officers were still working through, for example, whether a vehicle would be provided, whether certain powers had been adopted by the Council etc. The Human Resources team had evaluated the job description and was in the process of determining a pay grade for the position. It was to be borne in mind that the Environmental Health Manager, who had been spearheading the development of this post, had left the authority in December and it had been picked up via the seconded Environmental Health Manager, Yvonne Hope; Members would be given a firm date once all of the issues had been worked through. A Member noted that 11 Town and Parish Councils had expressed an interest in funding the post and he questioned whether they had committed this money within their precepts. The Interim Head of Community Services confirmed that the amount each Town and Parish Council contributed would depend on how much time they wanted the Environmental Warden to spend in their area; this had been factored into their precepts. Another Member queried whether additional Town and Parish Councils would be able to contribute towards the position at a later date and Members were advised that they would need to wait until an appropriate point in the contract – which was expected to run for between one and three years – in order to prevent disruption to the service being provided to the Town and Parish Councils that had signed up originally. If the role was successful, there may be potential to recruit an additional Warden. Clarification was provided that it would not be feasible for another Town or Parish Council to join at this point in time.
- 79.6 Whilst they welcomed the progress that had been made, several Members were of the view that it would be more beneficial if the information within the report was presented as an action plan, with targets and timescales for delivery together with outputs. It was felt that the happy and sad faces used in the performance management report would allow Members to see more easily what was being achieved. The Interim Head of Community Services undertook to ensure that the next report was amended accordingly. The Chief Executive reiterated that the new Head of Service would not be in post until the end of the month and it would be unrealistic to expect that significant progress would be made by the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; he suggested that three months would be a more reasonable timescale and Members agreed that the next report would therefore be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 2 May 2017.
- 79.7 It was subsequently

**RESOLVED**

1. That the current position be **NOTED** in respect of:
  - i) enviro-crimes, particularly fly-tipping, and the actions being taken by the Environmental Health section to tackle the issues; and,
  - ii) the recruitment of an Environmental Warden.
2. That an update report be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 2 May 2017 and that the information within the report be presented as an action plan, with targets and timescales for delivery together with outputs.

**OS.80 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

- 80.1 The report of the Interim Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 31-39, provided an update on the ongoing review of county and local community safety and anti-social behaviour activities within the borough. Members were asked to consider the report.
- 80.2 Members were advised that community safety was a statutory obligation for local authorities and the other responsible authorities – police, fire and rescue authority, probation and health – which worked together in Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to: reduce reoffending; tackle crime and disorder; tackle anti-social behaviour; tackle alcohol and substance misuse; and tackle any other behaviour which had a negative effect on the local environment. There were six separate CSPs within Gloucestershire which operated differently based on the challenges they faced, for example, urban areas had tended to develop and maintain more robust structures than rural districts where there was generally a lower incidence of crime. Whilst there were common threads in terms of the national agenda, e.g. on issues such as anti-slavery and hate crime, there was inevitable fragmentation and inconsistencies across the county which made collaboration difficult. A whole systems review of community safety across Gloucestershire had been commissioned by Leadership Gloucestershire in 2016 and a decision had been made in December 2016 regarding the need to rationalise the current complex arrangements across the county. The review had suggested three options: Option 1 represented a relatively minor change with six district-based CSPs remaining in place, but with regular forums for chairs to meet; Option 2 involved the establishment of a countywide CSP working closely with the six district-based CSPs; and, Option 3 represented transformational change with the six district-based CSPs merging to form an overarching county partnership with six district-based multi-agency forums allowing activities to be customised at a local level. The Leadership Gloucestershire partners had considered the review and determined that the transformational change in Option 3 would best meet the community safety needs of the county and facilitate effective activities within the districts.
- 80.3 Within the Council, responsibility for community safety and anti-social behaviour was seen as a cross-cutting activity involving input from a range of service areas including Environmental Health, Community and Housing as well as other service providers such as the police, Families First and housing providers. Reports of anti-social behaviour were generally low across the borough as a whole and community resilience had been built up through the Place Programme and preventative measures. One weakness was the lack of a common reporting/monitoring system for anti-social behaviour across the service areas which prevented intelligence sharing and co-ordination of intervention activities across the borough. The current delivery arrangements within the CSP in Tewkesbury Borough had not been considered in the context of the capacity changes within the local partner agencies and stakeholders. Securing attendance from the responsible agencies at the Tewkesbury Borough CSP had been problematic and there had been no



attendance from the health and probation services for several years. Those agencies no longer had structures that matched the district boundaries and they could not commit to attending six different CSPs. Notwithstanding this, the general attendance at Tewkesbury Borough CSP had grown to be extensive and included many agencies and voluntary groups; however, there had been a tendency among the non-responsible partners to assume that community safety was a Council responsibility rather than a collaborative function with shared responsibility. The Tewkesbury Borough CSP had been suspended in August 2016 pending a borough systems review of local community safety and anti-social behaviour activities. An external consultancy had been commissioned to undertake the review and would be delivering their recommendations at the end of the month. The adoption of a new county CSP was likely to address many of the challenges facing the Tewkesbury CSP and these were outlined at Page No. 36, Paragraph 4.3.4 of the report. Whilst the local detail was yet to be finalised, one potential option was that the local structure could be delivered through the Council's Place Programme arrangements which would offer local multi-agency community contact. The Council was in a good position in terms of its locality partnership and was ahead of the curve in how it co-ordinated and delivered work; although there had been some bumps in the road, the future looked brighter and the new Head of Community Services would help to ensure efforts continued to be focused in this area going forward.

80.4 A Member indicated that he had sat on the Tewkesbury Borough CSP and felt that it had lacked direction and outcomes, however, the co-location of various services within the Public Services Centre had been very helpful in terms of attendance at meetings which may be more difficult with a countywide CSP. As a Councillor, he found that it could be difficult to keep abreast of the issues within the community without attending multi-agency meetings and he felt that Members did not always receive reports on the work which was being undertaken. The Deputy Chief Executive indicated that he would be happy to meet with the Member outside of the meeting to discuss his concerns in terms of the community groups he sat on and feed this into the process. The Chief Executive explained that CSPs had become starved of strategic information and direction and a countywide CSP, where all agencies worked together and provided strategic input, would help to overcome that issue. He stressed that community safety work within the borough had continued through the locality partnership and the suggestion was that the Place Programme could be used to provide the local context and feedback. He reiterated that there were enough partners at a local level to ensure that issues were picked up properly and that Members were not out of touch. Under the preferred option, an implementation plan would be developed at county level to set up the structure. It was intended to hold bi-annual meetings with wider partners and a local implementation plan would be developed which would then be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; further reports would be brought to the Committee as things moved forward. Whilst local authorities could not be forced to join the countywide CSP, they had a statutory duty and must have appropriate arrangements in place.

80.5 In response to a query regarding the anticipated budget of £5,000, the Interim Head of Community Services explained that this related to the quoted cost of the consultant to undertake the internal review which was a one-off piece of work. Another Member questioned who would receive that report when it was completed and was advised that it would go to the Deputy Chief Executive and Head of Community Services; when the outcomes had been identified they would be brought back to the Committee for comment.

80.6 Having considered the information provided, it was

**RESOLVED** That the update on the ongoing review of the county and local community safety and anti-social behaviour activities within the borough be **NOTED** and that further reports be brought back to the Committee as the County Community Safety Partnership progressed.

## **OS.81 PEER CHALLENGE ACTION PLAN**

81.1 The report of the Corporate Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 40-71, outlined the progress made in delivering the recommendations within the peer challenge action plan. Members were asked to consider the report and to agree that no further monitoring be required by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the basis that the majority of actions had been implemented, or were being monitored elsewhere.

81.2 Members were advised that the Council's peer challenge had taken place during November 2014 and the process had been an excellent learning opportunity for the authority, providing an external health check of the Council's position and how it was set up to meet its future challenges. Following the Peer Challenge, a formal report had been received, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, which summarised the findings of the team. The report included a number of recommendations for further improvement and the Council had approved an action plan to progress those recommendations on 19 February 2015. The action plan and a summary of progress in delivering the recommendations was set out at Appendix 2 to the report. Since the last report to the Committee in July 2016, the majority of actions had been delivered. Only two recommendations remained outstanding; Action 13 – review of the Constitution, and Action 15 – development of a Workforce Strategy. The latter was virtually complete and, whilst it was yet to progress, the review of the Constitution had been identified as a significant governance issue within the Council's Annual Governance Statement 2015/16 which was monitored by the Audit Committee on a quarterly basis. As such it was recommended that future monitoring by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was no longer required.

81.3 A Member indicated that he was happy that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee no longer needed to receive the monitoring report, provided that the outstanding actions were being monitored elsewhere, but he asked that the Committee be notified when these actions were complete. It was subsequently

**RESOLVED**

1. That the progress made in delivering the recommendations within the Peer Challenge Action Plan be **NOTED**.
2. That it be **AGREED** that no further monitoring be required by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on the basis that the outstanding actions were being monitored elsewhere, but the Committee should receive notification when these actions had been completed.

The meeting closed at 5:50 pm