

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the  
Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 21 March 2017  
commencing at 4:30 pm**

## **Present:**

Chair  
Vice Chair

Councillor P W Awford  
Councillor Mrs G F Blackwell

## **and Councillors:**

K J Cromwell, Mrs J E Day, R D East, D T Foyle, Mrs J Greening (Substitute for G J Bocking),  
Mrs R M Hatton, Mrs H C McLain, T A Spencer, Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak,  
H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

## **also present:**

Councillors R E Allen, M Dean and R E Garnham

### **OS.82 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 82.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 82.2 The Chair welcomed Richard Bradley, Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, to the meeting and indicated that he would be giving a presentation at Agenda Item 11. He also welcomed the new Heads of Community Services and Development Services, Peter Tonge and Annette Roberts, to the meeting. It was noted that Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, would be providing an update at Agenda Item 7. Councillors R E Allen and M Dean were present as observers.

### **OS.83 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

- 83.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G J Bocking. Councillor Mrs J Greening would be acting as a substitute for the meeting.

### **OS.84 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 84.1 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.
- 84.2 The following declaration was made:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application No./Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b>
P W Awford	Agenda Item 13 – Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report.	Tewkesbury Borough Council representative on the Lower Severn Internal Drainage Board.  Member of Severn Wye Regional Flood Defence Committee.  Member of Wessex Regional Flood Defence Committee.  Life Member of the National Flood Forum.	Would speak and vote.

84.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

#### **OS.85 MINUTES**

85.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

#### **OS.86 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

86.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 11-17. 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.

86.2 The Chair noted that the Forward Plan was more populated than it had been in recent months. The Chief Executive indicated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recent comments had been noted and, whilst it was not always possible to plan which items of business would come forward, he accepted that the Committee needed to see the Forward Plan to be able pick up on any areas which may require additional support etc. The Democratic Services team worked with Officers to ensure that the plan was populated regularly and he thanked the Chair for noting the progress that had been made.

86.3 It was

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

#### **OS.87 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

- 87.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016/17, circulated at Pages No. 18-20, which Members were asked to consider.
- 87.2 In response to a query regarding the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review, Members were advised that this was an item for consideration later on the Agenda. It was noted that the Working Group report would be brought to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 2 May 2017. It was subsequently

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

## **OS.88 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE**

- 88.1 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 14 March 2017.
- 88.2 Councillor Garnham advised that the newly appointed Temporary Chief Constable, Rod Hansen, was present at the meeting. Mr Hansen had been appointed by the Police and Crime Commissioner for up to one year in order to provide continuity. This was important given the government's direction regarding the future of the Fire Service and whether or not it would form part of the remit of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Comments had been made in relation to the nature of the appointment and the fact that the Police and Crime Panel had not been given any opportunity to endorse Mr Hansen in his role. It was suggested that the role of the Police and Crime Panel in the appointment of the previous Chief Constable had not gone well and that lessons could have been learnt from that experience. The appointment was robustly defended by the Police and Crime Commissioner who informed the Panel that the Chair had been notified of the decision the day before any public announcement had been made, nevertheless, Members felt that the Police and Crime Panel could have been more involved.
- 88.3 There were no crime statistics to present as the national website had not been updated since his previous report in February. In respect of emergency services collaboration, the Police and Crime Commissioner's office had made a grant bid to the national Police Transformation Fund and received £100,000 to enable further work to be undertaken. External consultants would be appointed to review the business case and Andrew North had been appointed as an assurance adviser. The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed once again that he was open to all possibilities and would only make a decision once the business case had been delivered. The Panel had also been advised that the sale of the land that was previously the Constabulary HQ at Lansdown Road in Cheltenham had now been completed and CALA Homes would be taking possession of the site. It was hoped that there would be an additional town centre police presence at Cheltenham Borough Council offices shortly.
- 88.4 Members were informed that, in December 2016, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) had released its latest leadership and legitimacy reports for all 43 forces in England and Wales. The effectiveness report for Gloucestershire Constabulary had only been released at the start of March 2017. In terms of the leadership report, the overall view was that there were no causes for concern and only two areas for improvement, however, improvements were needed in respect of both legitimacy and effectiveness. It was important to put this into context and there had been a detailed presentation and discussion in relation to the reports which had also included some very good comments about the work of the Constabulary. National comparisons of levels of crime at the time of the inspection, and for the current year to date, as well as the direction of the force and delivery i.e. crimes per 1,000 citizens, were also provided. When these figures

were analysed and compared with the family of most similar forces this did not appear to reflect the HMIC findings; Gloucestershire was doing far better than some of the forces graded by the HMIC as performing better. The analysis had included the level of risk to the work of the Constabulary; Gloucestershire had been found to have very low risk. It could be that more focus was needed in the areas which were examined by HMIC, and assurance was provided that the Constabulary was learning from the reports; however, it was recognised that those areas may not be the main priority for the public, the Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner of Gloucestershire. Update reports would be provided to the Police and Crime Panel on the areas of concern that had been highlighted.

- 88.5 Councillor Garnham advised that the author of the Community Safety Review, John Bensted, had attended the meeting to provide a brief update on his work. The review was now entering the implementation phase and assurance had been given that the new structure still allowed local Community Safety Partnerships to continue their work. It was noted that the next Police and Crime Panel meeting was due to be held on 14 July 2017.
- 88.6 In response to a query regarding the emergency services collaboration and the external consultants that had been appointed to review the business case, Councillor Garnham advised that Gloucestershire County Council, and the government, each had a view, however, the Police and Crime Commissioner had been given a mandate to make the final decision. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that there was a process to go through; the Police and Crime Commissioner had to make his case and there would then be a 12 week consultation process. A final decision would be made by the government and that would lead to a number of options around the total governance of the Fire Service which was another issue in itself. He stressed that, if the facts did not stack up then the Police and Crime Commissioner would not proceed; however, Councillor Garnham reiterated that simply stating that the status quo was preferable was not an option.
- 88.7 A Member queried when the review of Community Safety Partnerships was due to be completed as the Tewkesbury Borough Community Safety Partnership was on hold and nobody seemed to know what was happening. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner explained that the review had commenced in the summer of 2016 and had concluded at the end of the year. There was still a lot of work to do in terms of implementation which was more of a challenge than the actual review given the significant changes proposed. John Bensted was working with partners to achieve the best outcomes for all rather than simply imposing the new system upon them; this was a very important message.
- 88.8 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**.

- 89.1 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 7 March 2017.
- 89.2 In light of the closure of Cleeve Link – one of the Council's home care providers – the Committee had received an update from the Cabinet Member for Older People, the Adult Social Care Commissioning Director and Deputy Commissioning Director. The Committee appreciated the goodwill and commitment of Cleeve Link staff in continuing to deliver care to their customers following the closure, particularly as many of them had not received payment for some weeks. Over the weekend following the closure, the County Council had supported these staff by providing free petrol/diesel (via the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service) and food and had subsequently organised a payroll run to ensure that people were paid. Members had been pleased to note that Officers were working with other providers to ensure that these vulnerable people continued to receive care in the long term.
- 89.3 Councillor Day went on to advise that the Committee had been pleased to welcome the Chief Executive and Chair of the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to the meeting. The Chief Executive had apologised that she was not able to present the findings of the financial governance review at the meeting as originally planned. Whilst the Committee was frustrated with the delay, Members had acknowledged that this was not of the Trust's making. There had been a robust and detailed discussion of the Trust's current financial position and the recovery plan and it was noted that the Trust planned to return to a breakeven position by the end of March 2019. The Committee was, of course, concerned as to the potential impact of the Trust's financial situation on services.
- 89.4 The Committee had received an update on the Ambulance Response Programme from the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust Director of Operations. Members had been informed that the additional time available under the Ambulance Response Programme to triage calls had meant better identification of which calls required an eight minute response, and the despatch of the clinically appropriate vehicle rather than the nearest. The South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust had been consulting staff on changes to the rota and they would be implemented in April 2017; this would ensure that the right number of staff were on at the right time and in the right place, to better manage peak demands. Alongside this there would be a re-profiling of vehicles in Gloucestershire. This would mean 16 more double-crewed ambulances and a reduction in the number of rapid response vehicles.
- 89.5 In terms of the non-emergency patient transport service, it had been disappointing to note that a significant number of aborted journeys resulted from patients cancelling their hospital appointment but not their transport, or making their own way to the hospital without cancelling their transport. A text reminder service was being introduced that month which it was hoped would reduce these wasted journeys.
- 89.6 The Chair thanked the Chief Executive and his team for the prompt circulation of an email explaining the situation regarding Cleeve Link. The Chief Executive indicated that Gloucestershire County Council's emergency planning team had done a fantastic job and had worked very hard, particularly over the first weekend, to ensure that care to vulnerable people was maintained under very difficult circumstances.
- 89.7 The Chair thanked the Council's representative for her update and indicated that it would be circulated to Members following the meeting. It was

**RESOLVED** That the feedback from the last meeting of the Gloucestershire

Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee be **NOTED**.**OS.90 PERFORMANCE REPORT - QUARTER 3 2016/17**

- 90.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 21-60, attached performance management information for the third quarter of 2016/17. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was asked to review and scrutinise the performance information and, where appropriate, identify any issues to refer to the Executive Committee for clarification or further action to be taken.
- 90.2 Members were advised that this was the third quarterly monitoring report for 2016/17 and progress against delivering the objectives and actions for each of the Council Plan priorities was reported through the Performance Tracker, attached at Appendix 1 to the report. Key actions which had advanced since quarter two were highlighted at Paragraph 2.3 of the report and included: approval of the refurbishment of the reception area and top floor; the successful launch of the Council's website, which continued to enjoy attention nationally; and the adoption of a new Housing and Homelessness Strategy for 2016-20. Due to the complex nature of the actions being delivered, there were inevitably some which were not progressing as smoothly or quickly as envisaged and these were detailed at Paragraph 2.4 of the report. In terms of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), Members were informed that the status of each indicator was set out at Paragraph 3.2 of the report. Of the 17 indicators with targets, 13 indicators were performing better than the previous year with only two performing worse than the previous year. Areas of interest included: KPIs 14, 15 and 16 which related to the processing of planning applications and showed a significant improvement in performance compared with 2015/16; KPI 20 relating to the number of reported enviro-crimes where there had been a significant drop in the reports of abandoned vehicles and fly-tipping incidents; and KPI 30 which showed that the amount of waste being recycled or composted had improved compared to the previous year and the level of contamination had also dropped.
- 90.3 A Member raised concern that the report seemed to be quite negative and gave the impression that a significant number of actions were not being achieved within their timescales. He questioned how this could be addressed. The Chief Executive indicated that the covering report aimed to extract the actions where performance was not as anticipated; some of these were things within the Council's control and others were due to outside organisations which impacted upon the Council. The report did not highlight the majority of actions which were performing positively. In an organisation like Tewkesbury Borough Council, with a huge agenda to address, there would inevitably be some negatives to address and it was these areas which were drawn to the Committee's attention. He welcomed comments and questions from Members on any specific actions and issues.
- 90.4 During the debate which ensued, the following queries and comments were made in relation to the Performance Tracker:

**Priority: Finance and Resources**

P30 – Objective 3 – Action c) Undertake a review of the discretionary trade waste service to ensure it is operating on a viable commercial level – A Member raised concern that there was no timeline for the review.

The Head of Community Services clarified that there were two reviews - one had been commissioned by Ubico and one was being undertaken by the Council. It had been felt that it would be sensible to wait until Ubico had appointed consultants to start its work; now that had been done, a scope would be put together for the Council's review and it was anticipated that this would move forward quickly.

**Priority: Economic Development**

P34 – Objective 3 – Action a) Produce a vision for the J9 area – A Member sought an update as to how this was progressing.

The Chief Executive advised that the removal of the Ministry of Defence site at Ashchurch was not the Council's decision and it had been necessary to develop a way forward through the Joint Core Strategy. This had been discussed with Members of the J9 Area Member Reference Panel and a consultant had been engaged to help produce and deliver the vision. A successful bid for £234,000 of funding had been made to the Homes and Communities Agency, with the potential for more following further discussions. A meeting of the J9 Member Reference Panel would be taking place very shortly to consider an action plan to take this forward. He stressed that this was a major piece of work and there would be no simple solution.

**Key Performance Indicators for Priority: Housing**

P46 – KPI 15 – Percentage of 'minor' applications determined within 8 weeks or alternative period agreed with the applicant – A Member felt that Officers spent a lot of time on the finer details of planning applications and yet they were often still refused which she found difficult to understand.

The Head of Development Services advised that, whilst she could not comment on any particular application without knowing the details of the scheme, it was important to recognise that planning was a very complex matter and there were different issues to take into consideration, even with small householder applications. Officers worked hard to achieve the right solutions for as many parties as possible. If Members had queries about specific applications she would be more than happy to look at those on an individual basis.

P46 – KPI 15 – Percentage of 'minor' applications determined within 8 weeks or

The Head of Development Services indicated that she was keen to look at performance and build upon the improvements that had already

alternative period agreed with the applicant - A Member questioned whether it would be appropriate for an update to be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the second phase of the Planning Systems Review.

been made. She hoped to do this sooner rather than later and would add the update to the Committee's Work Programme in the coming months. In response to a query regarding staffing, she advised that the department was almost at full capacity; some appointments had been made but the people were not yet in post. A Member questioned how performance had improved during quarter three without the new staff being in post and she explained that this had been down to a number of improvement projects and the use of temporary staff. The Deputy Chief Executive indicated that he was keen to improve efficiency within the Planning service. There had been a lot of discussions about whether the department had enough staff, however, it was important to also look at the approximate number of planning applications per Officer and the efficiency of processing applications in order to establish whether productivity was being hampered and what could be done to address this.

### **Key Performance Indicators for Priority: Corporate**

P54 – KPI 20 – Number of reported enviro-crimes – A Member noted that there had been a significant reduction in the number of reported fly-tipping incidents; however, he understood from Officers that it was not always possible to get hold of a camera and he sought clarification as to whether the necessary equipment was available.

The Head of Community Services undertook to find out how many cameras were available and report back to Members following the meeting. He advised that 89 fly-tipping incidents had been reported in the last quarter, which was a reduction; some would have been individual bags being put out early as opposed to huge fly-tips. He had signed off two fly-tipping prosecutions in the last week and was about to rejuvenate the conversation with Parish Councils in relation to the employment of an Environmental Warden. His team was looking at hotspots for dog fouling and the Public Protection Orders which would allow fixed penalty notices to be issued in those areas. He undertook to look into the availability of cameras - he confirmed that they were all deployed but he did not know their exact locations - and indicated that he would report back to Members outside of the meeting.

P58 – KPI 29 – Average number of sick days per full time equivalent – A Member

The Head of Corporate Services advised that there was often an increase in short term absences during quarter 3 which covered the



noted from the report that there was an increasing trend in short term sickness and sought assurance that this was being monitored.

winter period when colds and other viruses were more prevalent. He confirmed that this was something which was being monitored and he pointed out that a review of the Absence Management Policy was one of the pending items in the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme. The Internal Audit team had also been tasked with looking at absence management and ensuring that the policy was applied consistently. A new Human Resources system was currently being considered which would be more focused on self-service; at present absence management was very much a manual exercise and the new system would help to manage the process more effectively.

- 90.5 Having considered the information provided and views expressed, it was  
**RESOLVED** That the performance management information for quarter 3 of 2016/17 be **NOTED**.

#### **OS.91 REVIEW OF BOROUGH NEWS**

- 91.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 61-64, advised Members of the need to review the Tewkesbury Borough News. Members were asked to establish an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group to undertake the review and to approve the proposed Terms of Reference for the Working Group as set out at Appendix 1.
- 91.2 The Communications and Policy Manager advised that a Member workshop had been held in October 2016 to gain feedback on corporate communications. One specific area discussed was the Tewkesbury Borough News which had generated a lot of discussion around cost, quality, regularity of production and format. Given that it was a high profile communication tool for the Council, it was felt that it may be beneficial for an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group to be established in order to carry out the review. The Working Group would be asked to investigate three options: to retain Tewkesbury Borough News in its current format and circulation; to retain Tewkesbury Borough News but consider an alternative format and/or circulation e.g. digital options/issue twice-yearly/reduced circulation; or, to stop producing Tewkesbury Borough News. The proposed Terms of Reference for the Working Group were attached at Appendix 1 to the report. It was suggested that the Working Group comprise five Members, plus the Lead Member for Customer Focus, and that the review be conducted over three meetings during May and June 2017.
- 91.3 A Member questioned whether it would be possible to publicise the fly-tipping prosecutions, which had been referenced by the Head of Community Services earlier in the meeting, in the Tewkesbury Borough News. The Communications and Policy Manager advised that the spring edition of the Tewkesbury Borough News was just being finalised; she undertook to find out more about the two cases and include them in the summer edition, if appropriate. She pointed out that a previous prosecution had been publicised in this way as well as having press releases issued. A Member suggested that it would be helpful to have a list of prosecutions to distribute to Parish Councils for inclusion in their Parish magazines and newsletters. The Head of Community Services provided assurance that any successful prosecutions would be widely publicised and the relevant information disseminated to partners.

- RESOLVED**
1. That an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group be established to review the Tewkesbury Borough News comprising the following Members:  
Councillors Mrs G F Blackwell, D T Foyle, Mrs S E Hillier-Richardson, Mrs H C McLain and Mrs P E Stokes plus the Lead Member for Customer Focus.
  2. That the Terms of Reference for the Working Group be **APPROVED** as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

**OS.92 PRESENTATION FROM THE OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER**

92.1 The Chair introduced Richard Bradley, Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, and indicated that he would be giving a presentation on the role, responsibility and action plan of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

92.2 The following key points were made during the presentation:

- The Police and Crime Commissioner – Martin Surl – elected November 2012, re-elected May 2016, Independent. Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner – Chris Brierley – appointed October 2016 to support the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Main Responsibilities – Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011: secure an efficient and effective police force for the area; appoint the Chief Constable, hold to account for running the force and dismiss them if necessary; set the police and crime objectives for the area through a Police and Crime Plan; set the force budget and determine the precept; contribute to the national and international policing capabilities set out by the Home Secretary; bring together community safety and criminal justice partners to make sure local priorities are joined up.
- The Role – Cutting crime; improving outcomes for local people; working in partnership with local leaders for community safety, youth, justice, health and safeguarding/civil contingencies; award grants for community safety objectives; pool funding with local partners.
- Future Responsibilities for the Police and Crime Commissioner – Fire and Rescue; Criminal Justice (courts, youth justice, victim and witnesses, offender management, oversight of Crown Prosecution Service).
- Police and Crime Plan – ‘Less crime, more peace and good order’; accessibility and accountability; older but not overlooked; young people becoming adults; safe days and nights for all; safe and social driving; safer cyber.
- Police and Crime Plan 2017-21 Approach – e.g. Neighbourhood Policing, Community Safety Review, Restorative Gloucestershire, Rural Policing, Home Secretary Directives, information sharing, strength-based working.
- Funding – Priority Leads - £1.5M over four years; Community Fund - £1.1M annual fund, more than 350 projects being funded within Gloucestershire, each one must meet one or more of the six priorities, look for projects that are sustainable and had match funding; Ministry of Justice funding - £750,000 annual fund for victims and restorative justice; Speed Enforcement Camera System (SPECs) fund; High Sheriff’s fund.
- Accessibility and Accountability – e.g. Restorative Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire Constabulary, Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service, Gloucestershire Constabulary 101.

- Older But Not Overlooked – e.g. Barnwood Trust, Gloucestershire Age UK, Cheltenham Polish Tenants and Residents Association, Small Sparks Grants, World Jungle, You're Welcome Keep Safe Scheme, Gloucestershire Deaf Association.
- Young People Becoming Adults – e.g. Gay-Glos, The Door Youth Project, Prince's Trust, Young Gloucestershire.
- Safer Days and Nights – e.g. University of Gloucestershire, Student Community Patrol, Hello Gloucester, Street Pastors, Cheltenham Safe, Hollie Gazzard Trust.
- Safe and Social Driving – e.g. Gloucestershire Rural Community Council, Road Safety Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire Group Advanced Motorists, Pathfinder, Special Constabulary.
- Safer Cyber – e.g. Everyman Theatre, Gloucestershire Business Show, Think U Know, Circles South West.
- Victim Capacity – e.g. Safe at Home, Stroud Beresford Group, Hope House Sexual Assault Referral Centre, Gloucestershire Rape and Sexual Abuse Centre, Victim Support.

92.3 A Member questioned whether there were any groups for organised crime and drugs. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner advised that a joint policing panel on organised crime had been set-up in 2016 and each of the local authorities in the county had been invited to send a representative to the first group; it was noted that the Head of Community Services was the Tewkesbury Borough Council representative. The main focus was on crimes associated with the dangerous drug network, for instance, "cuckooing", which involved a drug dealer befriending a vulnerable individual who lived alone; like a cuckoo, the dealer moved in, took over the property and turned it into a drugs den. It was noted that there had been at least two incidents in the county which had resulted in homicide. The community safety structure had an important role to play in this regard as it presented a real opportunity for the Police to work with partners, Officers and Councillors who represented the areas where these crimes were being committed and who could share intelligence in order to be more effective. In response to a query regarding reporting, the Head of Community Services indicated that the sensitive nature of the information shared at the organised crime panel meetings made it difficult to do this in the public domain; however, he undertook to provide something which would give Members assurance that it was being adequately addressed.

92.4 A Member queried whether there were enough resources to carry out all of the current work which had been highlighted as well as the potential increase associated with the new areas being allocated. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that the answer was probably no; he reiterated that a business case needed to be produced in respect of the Fire and Rescue Service and, if the outcome was a positive one, additional administrative resource would be needed.

92.5 With regard to community safety, the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner showed a slide which set out the 'Safer Gloucestershire' model being worked to. Local delivery was through a place-based multi-agency forum including community safety, health and wellbeing and social inclusion. He explained that, under the current arrangements, representatives were attending different meetings where they often talked about the same individual and the new structure would merge these without losing the statutory element. He also advised that the Community Safety Partnership was responsible for calling for, and managing, domestic homicide reviews, of which there had been two in Tewkesbury Borough. Home Office guidance stated that

these reviews should be completed within six months and, whilst the ones in Tewkesbury Borough had been timely, others within the county were taking a long time which was not effective or appropriate. Nobody was currently holding this process to account and Safer Gloucestershire would now have that oversight. In terms of timescales, he advised that a meeting was being held in May to find out what partners wanted Safer Gloucestershire to do. The Chief Executive indicated that the review of the Tewkesbury Borough Community Partnership was not dependent upon this wider review and, now that the Head of Community Services was in post, work would commence to set-up the new local structure.

- 92.6 A Member raised concern that he had attended an event at his local village hall where the Police had been invited to speak but only a handful of people had turned up and he questioned what could be done to encourage people to engage with the Police. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner indicated that the communications team looked at different ways to connect with communities and used social media, such as Twitter and Facebook, as well as more traditional routes like newspapers and radio. The Police had lost over 300 officers in the last four years through austerity measures and therefore it was not possible for them to attend every Parish Council meeting so it was important to make these connections in different ways which was a real challenge. A Member indicated that, without regular meetings, he found it difficult to know what work was being targeted by the Police and how the community could help to move that forwards. The Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner agreed and felt that information sharing was key; having the right people in the room to talk about individuals allowed a more complete picture to be built and the various partners could respond collectively.
- 92.7 A Member indicated that his area was a hotspot for fly-tipping. 'Stop and search' events had previously been successful in terms of the information this had uncovered e.g. vehicles without waste carrier licences, vehicles using red diesel etc. and he queried whether there were plans to hold more of these in the future. The Head of Community Services agreed that stop and search events could be really effective as they sent out a clear message about behaviour that would not be tolerated. He had a great deal of experience of such interventions and intended to hold two or three each year. He had not yet had an opportunity to speak to his Police colleagues but he provided assurance that he would do so at the appropriate time.
- 92.8 Another Member went on to query why the Police and Crime Commissioner had withdrawn his support for the Road Safety Partnership. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner advised that drivers caught speeding may be offered the opportunity to pay to go on a speed awareness course, as an alternative to a fine and penalty points, based on the theory that it was better to educate than enforce. It had become clear that some of the money collected from the scheme was used for administration rather than for education and therefore the Police and Crime Commissioner had made the decision to take a step back until this matter was resolved; legislation would make clear what the money could be used for.
- 92.9 The Chair thanked the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for his informative presentation and indicated that hard copies of the Police and Crime Plan would be available for Members following the meeting. It was

**RESOLVED** That the presentation from the Deputy Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner be **NOTED**.

**OS.93 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM STRATEGY REVIEW UPDATE**

- 93.1 The Chair indicated that the Head of Development Services would be providing an update on the progress of the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review.
- 93.2 Members would be aware that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had previously established a Working Group in order to assist with the development of a new Economic Development and Tourism Strategy. Economic development and tourism was one of four key themes in the Council Plan. The Council had successfully applied for funding which had enabled a consultant to be appointed to carry out an employment land review, economic assessment and land survey to inform the strategy. This work had been completed and presented to all Members at a seminar in October 2016. Since that time, the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review Working Group had been designing the strategy and building on the recommendations in the consultant's report. The Working Group would be meeting on 30 March 2017 to approve the draft strategy, along with a year one action plan, which would be presented for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 2 May 2017. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be asked to endorse the strategy and action plan and to recommend them to the Executive Committee for adoption at its meeting on 7 June 2017.
- 93.3 A Member indicated that he had expressed concern on several occasions that the review had been ongoing for some time and yet there was no evidence of any outcomes. He felt that the Committee needed some reassurance about the work that was underway in order for Members be able to give the local communities which they represented some insight into what was planned. The Head of Development Services provided assurance that there was a very clear work programme which Members would see when the strategy came forward at the next meeting. The Economic and Community Development Manager advised that there was currently a great deal of work underway, particularly in respect of Tewkesbury Town centre, and not all of it related directly to the strategy. If Members had any specific queries, or if businesses needed any advice or support, the team would be more than happy to help. The Chief Executive explained that Tewkesbury Borough was the greatest growth area in Gloucestershire and this would be reflected in the strategy which intended to address the wider, strategic issues as well as the more routine, day-to-day aspects of economic development.
- 93.4 A Member raised a specific concern about the loss of traders from Tewkesbury Town market. The Economic and Community Development Manager advised that Officers regularly communicated with Cotswold Markets - who ran the market in Spring Gardens, as well as the farmers' market and annual food and drink festival - and, whilst there had been some concerns, he had been informed that there had been an improvement by the end of 2016. The development of the Spring Gardens site would provide an opportunity to promote the market and bring in more customers. Another Member expressed concern about the High Street market taking trade away from the shops in the High Street and the problems which this caused for people living in the town as a result of overflow traffic. He was informed that only one comment had been received from a concerned trader, however, there were mixed views about the market. A meeting was due to be arranged with County Highways to discuss the impact on the roads and whether it supported the local economy in the way it could do.
- 93.5 Having considered the information provided, it was

**RESOLVED** That the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review

update be **NOTED**.

## **OS.94 FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP MONITORING REPORT**

- 94.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 65-79, which provided an update on the progress of the Flood Risk Management Group action plan and reviewed the Terms of Reference for that group. Members were asked to consider the progress that had been made and to recommend to the Executive Committee that the revised Terms of Reference and action plan be adopted; that a review of the Terms of Reference be carried out within the first 12 months of the term of the new Council; and that progress against the action plan continue to be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis.
- 94.2 The Head of Community Services explained that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee currently received an annual update on the work of the Flood Risk Management Group and the progress made against its work plan. It was noted that the action plan was a living document to which funding or partnership opportunities were added as and when they arose. It included the routine maintenance carried out on watercourses on land owned by the Council. The work plan at Appendix 1 reflected the report that had been presented at the Flood Risk Management Group meeting on 13 March 2017. At that meeting, the Working Group had also considered the Terms of Reference and thought them still to be relevant and necessary, however, it was felt that it would be more appropriate to undertake a review as to whether there was an ongoing role for the group in line with the term of the Council as opposed to on an annual basis. If this was agreed, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would continue to monitor progress against the action plan on an annual basis. The proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference were set out in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 94.3 With regard to the maintenance of Tewkesbury Borough Council-owned watercourses, a Member questioned why the charges had doubled when comparing the work completed in 2016/17 against that proposed for 2017/18. The Flood Risk Management Engineer explained that two contractors had been procured to carry out the maintenance work over the next three years. This would involve flail cutting of the banks twice yearly in June/July and October/January and de-silting where necessary on a three year programme; this was doubling the amount of work being undertaken and would mean that banks were cut more regularly. In addition, the 2016/17 costs did not account for reactionary work e.g. trees falling into watercourses. Efficiencies had been made in terms of the total budget so it would actually cost less overall. In terms of the grant applications, set out at Pages No. 76-77, a Member noted that the Brockworth scheme had been delayed due to landowner objections and she questioned whether this had been resolved. The Flood Risk Management Engineer advised that the matter had not yet been concluded but progress was being made and there was light at the end of the tunnel.
- 94.4 It was
- RESOLVED**
1. That the progress made against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan be **NOTED**.
  2. That it be **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**COMMITTEE** that:

- a) the revised Terms of Reference and Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan be adopted;
- b) a review of the Terms of Reference take place within the first 12 months of the term of the new Council; and
- c) progress against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan continue to be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis.

The meeting closed at 6:25 pm