

12 October 2015

Committee	Overview and Scrutiny
Date	Tuesday, 20 October 2015
Time of Meeting	4:30 pm
Venue	Committee Room 1

ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND



**for Sara J Freckleton
Borough Solicitor**

Agenda

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

When the continuous alarm sounds you must evacuate the building by the nearest available fire exit. Members and visitors should proceed to the visitors' car park at the front of the building and await further instructions (staff should proceed to their usual assembly point). Please do not re-enter the building unless instructed to do so.

In the event of a fire any person with a disability should be assisted in leaving the building.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

To receive apologies for absence and advise of any substitutions.



	Item	Page(s)
3.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	Pursuant to the adoption by the Council on 26 June 2012 of the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct, effective from 1 July 2012, as set out in Minute No. CL.34, Members are invited to declare any interest they may have in the business set out on the Agenda to which the approved Code applies.	
4.	MINUTES	1 - 9
	To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2015.	
5.	CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN	10 - 13
	To determine whether there are any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can give to work contained within the Plan.	
6.	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16	14 - 15
	To consider the forthcoming work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	
7.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE	
	To receive feedback from the last meeting of the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	
8.	UPDATE ON UNIVERSAL CREDIT	
	To receive an update on Universal Credit.	
9.	REVIEW OF UBICO	16 - 22
	To receive a six month update following the transfer of Waste Services to Ubico.	
10.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE FAMILIES FIRST UPDATE	23 - 27
	To consider the progress made in delivering the Families First Programme.	
11.	FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP MONITORING REPORT	28 - 40
	To consider progress against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan.	
12.	REVIEW OF COMPLAINTS	41 - 49
	To consider the complaints received by Tewkesbury Borough Council and the Local Government Ombudsman and to determine whether any further action is required.	

13. UPDATE ON DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS REVIEW

To receive an update on the progress of the Disabled Facilities Grants Review from the Chairman of the Working Group.

14. TIMING OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To discuss the timing of future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING**TUESDAY, 1 DECEMBER 2015****COUNCILLORS CONSTITUTING COMMITTEE**

Councillors: P W Awford (Chairman), Mrs G F Blackwell (Vice-Chairman), 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, M G Sztymiak, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

Substitution Arrangements

The Council has a substitution procedure and any substitutions will be announced at the beginning of the meeting.

Recording of Meetings

Please be aware that the proceedings of this meeting may be recorded and this may include recording of persons seated in the public gallery or speaking at the meeting. Please notify the Democratic Services Officer if you have any objections to this practice and the Chairman will take reasonable steps to ensure that any request not to be recorded is complied with.

Any recording must take place in such a way as to ensure that the view of Councillors, Officers, the public and press is not obstructed. The use of flash photography and/or additional lighting will not be allowed unless this has been discussed and agreed in advance of the meeting.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the
Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 8 September 2015
commencing at 4:30 pm**

Present:

Chairman

Councillor P W Awford

and Councillors:

G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, R D East, 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

OS.29 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 29.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 29.2 The Chairman welcomed Inspector Dave Goga, from Gloucestershire Police Service to the meeting and advised that he was in attendance for Agenda Item 8, Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership. 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. Bearing in mind the attendance of the Police, the Chairman announced his intention to vary the order of the Agenda so that Item 8, Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership, was taken at Item 6 after the consideration of the Executive Committee Forward Plan. This would enable the Police representative to leave the meeting in a timely fashion.

OS.30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 30.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs G F Blackwell (Vice-Chairman) and D T Foyle. Councillor K J Cromwell had indicated that he would be late. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 31.1 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.
- 31.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

OS.32 MINUTES

- 32.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2015, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

OS.33 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

33.1 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.

33.2 A Member questioned what the Executive Committee would be considering in terms of the lease of facilities at Cold Pool Lane. In response, he was advised that the Council was due to take over the facilities. There was a longstanding action to lease the facilities from Bloor Homes and this needed to be agreed by the Executive Committee in order to commence the tender process.

33.3 In respect of the 'Review of the Safeguarding Children Policy', the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager indicated that, due to potential changes at a County level, there may be a need to change the date that this was considered by the Executive Committee. She would know more in due course. In addition, she indicated that she had recently organised some Safeguarding Training which was provided by an external trainer. She had been disappointed with the level of interest shown by Members through the attendance numbers. She hoped in future Members would be more willing to engage.

33.4 Accordingly, it was

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

OS.34 SCRUTINY OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

34.1 The Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager introduced a presentation which set out details about the Borough's Community Safety Partnership. The key points were provided as follows:

- Current Model – This was not working very well and had not done for some time. It had been agreed by the previous Chairman that things needed to change to ensure the Partnership was more effective and the current Chairman had indicated that she was happy to continue this work and explore the changes. Currently the Neighbourhood Watch organisations received information but there was no particular involvement with the Community Safety Partnership. There was an Anti-Social Behaviour meeting every six weeks at which operational issues were discussed and shared by a number of agencies that were in attendance; this was a particularly successful meeting that worked really well and was a model that Officers would like to replicate if possible.
- Proposed Structure – The same groups would be involved (Neighbourhood Watch Coordinators; Neighbourhood Coordination Group Chairs; Anti-Social Behaviour Meeting; Statutory Members; and Registered Providers) but they would all link into the Community Safety Partnership rather than only to each other. The Community Safety Partnership would work in partnership with all agencies for projects to be delivered on the ground to address emerging issues of anti-social behaviour in an effort to increase public perception.

- Involving Communities – Help to relaunch Neighbourhood Coordination Groups; encourage attendance and community leadership; better advertising; and use available money to tackle issues in communities. Local area contact through Community Development Officers. Address emerging issues through Anti-Social Behaviour Meetings; there was money available to tackle issues in communities. Use the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinators; the eyes and ears ‘on the ground’.
- Funding – Bid submitted to Police Crime Commissioner which targeted six priorities (Accessibility and Accountability; Older but not Overlooked; Young People becoming Adults; Safe Days and Nights for All; Safe and Social Driving; and Safer Cyber), currently had £20,000 to spend on four of those priorities (Older but Not Overlooked; Young People becoming Adults; Safe Days and Nights for All; and Safer Cyber).
- What’s Next – Arrange workshop to share the structure and receive feedback from partners; understand the new policing model and impact; and decide launch date.

34.2 In making his presentation, Inspector Goga explained that he had been in Tewkesbury since May 2014. A new Police operating model had been in place since July with most Officers now working in a pattern of two early shifts; two late shifts and two night shifts. This ensured everyone was doing their fair share of working during peak demand times. Over 100 shift patterns had been in place prior to the reorganisation. For Tewkesbury there had been a big impact in two ways, firstly there were more Officers available to meet demand and, secondly, Tewkesbury was quite unique as it touched every other local policing area in the County. Prior to July, Cheltenham and Gloucester had its own incident response teams but now they were all working out of Bamfurlong which was within the Tewkesbury Local Policing Area. Part of Tewkesbury Local Policing Area was in the middle of Cheltenham/Gloucester and the reconfigured response teams would go from Bamfurlong to those areas. Tewkesbury had its own response team to respond to incidents in the north and central areas of the Local Policing Area. This new approach had created capacity for Tewkesbury which meant Officers could start being proactive in dealing with community priorities at a local level. He felt that the reorganisation had been successful with all of the Community Sergeants having given a positive response and indicating that they were happy to have additional capacity to deal with concerns. Street Safe had been reintroduced for Friday and Saturday evenings and the Pubwatch Scheme had been reinvigorated with local licensees; both of which had been very positive. Since July, the numbers of crimes and incidents had begun to drop which it was felt was due to more Officers being on duty at the right time. In Tewkesbury particularly, mobile working had had a big impact on Officers time as they could deal with incidents out in the patch rather than having to go back to the Police Station to fill in forms etc. He hoped the current momentum would continue and he felt that improving the Community Safety Partnership would have a very positive impact in the future.

34.3 During the discussion which ensued, a Member indicated that he had thought the Neighbourhood Watch had been disbanded. In response, the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager advised that this was not the case. Some Coordinators had left and the Neighbourhood Watch organisation was in the process of being reorganised; it was now up and running across most areas. It was hoped that joining it more with the Community Safety Partnership would help reinforce the work it did. In respect of ‘Rural Watch’ a Member advised that, as a Coordinator, he used to receive texts and calls to update him on crimes in the area; however, he had now had no contact for five/six months and he questioned why this was. Inspector Goga indicated that there was an Officer who was an integral part of Rural Watch; he understood that this year she had had a strategic

role supporting the Themeis Operation but Rural Watch should still be running. He undertook to try and establish where the missing link was in the chain as this was a scheme that was really important in the rural areas. In terms of Neighbourhood Watch Coordinators, he agreed that there had been difficulties in recruitment but they were extremely important and this was a priority for the Police.

- 34.4 Referring to the Crime Performance Indicators, the Chairman indicated that the 12 month rolling programme had confirmed an increase in crime of 8%; he questioned why this was the case when Inspector Goga had noted a 10% reduction in crime. In response, Inspector Goga explained that the Tewkesbury Local Policing Area had seen a spike in crime last year but since mid-July this had fallen rapidly and was now resting at a lower rate. A Member questioned whether those figures included crimes investigated by the Military and, in response; the Inspector explained that this was something that he was investigating. Currently the crime statistics received from the Military were quite sparse and he had asked his Sergeants in Churchdown to improve links in that area as the Police statistics should include the Military.
- 34.5 In terms of the funding for the Police Crime Commissioner's priorities, a Member questioned how much could be used on anti-social behaviour. In response, the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager explained that the bid had been for addressing emerging issues around the four priorities identified (Older but Not Overlooked; Young People becoming Adults; Safe Days and Nights for All; and Safer Cyber). When people looked at percentages of incidents, anti-social behaviour looked quite high but, in actual figures, the incidents were extremely low compared to other Districts. Inspector Goga offered reassurance that community priorities were in place and the Anti-Social Behaviour Group was a really well organised Group that had a real understanding of anti-social behaviour issues in the area. He was sure the funding available would go to the right places. The Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager advised that funding was allocated in order of priority and Officers would look for Groups to come up with bids for the projects they were running which would include information on objectives, outcomes and how the project was creating sustainability. In terms of anti-social behaviour, the Chief Executive expressed the view that partnership was absolutely essential and he felt that having the Police based at the Council Offices really helped to enforce that link.
- 34.6 One Member indicated that the Police used to attend Parish Council meetings in his area which he had always found very useful. This had ceased in recent times and he questioned why this was. Inspector Goga explained that the reorganisation of the Local Policing Areas meant that there were Officers identified for each area and this was something he would look into. He indicated that his Officers would not always be able to attend Parish Council meetings but there needed to be a link established so that they knew when they were and then could accept or decline invitations as appropriate.
- 34.7 Members thanked Inspector Goga for his time and it was

RESOLVED That the presentation provided on the Community Safety Partnership and new policing review be **NOTED**.

OS.35 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

35.1 Attention was draw to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 2015/16, circulated at Pages No.18-19, which Members were asked to consider.

35.2 The Corporate Services Group Manager took the opportunity to remind Members of the training which was being facilitated by South West Councils the following Monday and he indicated that he hoped as many Members of the Committee would be able to attend as possible.

35.3 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 2015/16 be **NOTED**.

OS.36 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE

36.1 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 8 September 2015.

36.2 Councillor Garnham advised that the Police and Crime Commissioner had indicated that he would be happy to come and talk to the Committee rather than just providing written answers to the questions posed by the Committee at its last meeting. However, Councillor Garnham had felt that written responses were important and as such he had pushed for them. They had now been circulated by Democratic Services. In terms of the meeting on 8 September, he advised that the main agenda items had focussed around a presentation from the Chief Constable on the Constabulary's "New Operating Model". There had also been a presentation regarding various schemes that were aimed at meeting the Commissioner's Safe and Social Driving objective. Although the "Finance Update" had appeared as Agenda Item 8 this had been a verbal report only as the Commissioner had stated that the papers were still confidential until the Constabulary had met later that week. Therefore no finance data was actually tabled. It had been highlighted that the minutes of the meeting on 16 July had included a recommendation from the Police and Crime Panel to the Police and Crime Commissioner that he redraft his Annual Report to include "relevant statistics" and reissue the report. The statistics that had been requested were around the levels of crime in the County. The Commissioner had stated that he was not prepared to include this data and therefore the Annual Report would remain unchanged.

36.3 The meeting had received a short report from the Chief Executive and it was clear that the Constabulary was still awaiting various reports from the Inspector of Constabularies on Effectiveness and Legitimacy, Custody Centre Operations and the Constabulary's approach to Domestic Violence, Child Exploitation and Safeguarding. In terms of the new operating model, the Chief Constable, and Superintendent Richard Cooper, had given a very informative presentation. The slides were available on the County Council's Police and Crime Panel website and he urged Members to read them -

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/documents/b11117/New%20Operating%20Model%20presentation%20Tuesday%2001-Sep-2015%2010.00%20Police%20and%20Crime%20Panel.pdf?T=9>

Reassurances had been provided over the importance the Constabulary attached to maintaining neighbourhood policing and the number of Officers devoted to this task had increased from 84 to 95. The main focus of neighbourhood policing would be "tackling harm and vulnerability". Local Policing Officers would be assigned to one of three core roles: Incident Resolution (IR - previously known as "Response");

Local Investigation; and Neighbourhood Policing. It was stressed that flexibility was inherent in those roles as Officers may perform all three roles depending on local and County priorities. Incident Response Officers for Gloucester and Cheltenham would be based in Bamfurlong, whilst for rural areas including the Forest of Dean, the Cotswolds, Stroud and Tewkesbury, Incident Response would remain local to those areas. Whilst named local Neighbourhood Policing Officers would remain it was expected that there would be a reduction in their attendance at formal meetings and events.

- 36.4 Members had also received an update on mobile frontline policing. The presentation had included a brief update on this, along with a list of “what success will look like” factors. These included Officers remaining on patrol and not having to return to base for more briefings, completion of forms whilst out on patrol, using GPS, mapping and cameras and spending more time with victims and investigating crimes and patrolling. The topic of safe and social driving was one of the Commissioner’s main aims and priorities and the Panel received an excellent presentation from Louise White, the Commissioner’s Safe and Social Driving Coordinator. The presentation could be found on the County Council’s website <http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/documents/b11118/Safe%20and%20Social%20Driving%20presentation%20Tuesday%2001-Sep-2015%2010.00%20Police%20and%20Crime%20Panel.pdf?T=9> and Councillor Garnham urged Members to take a look. Of particular note were the three schemes aimed to help young people improve their driving skills: Drive IQ Gloucestershire; IAM Courses; and the Pathfinder Programme, all of which he felt were excellent.
- 36.5 The Police and Crime Commissioner had given a brief verbal update explaining that no financial information could be tabled as papers were still confidential at this stage and would need to be debated internally by the Constabulary at a meeting later that week. The Commissioner had highlighted that the forthcoming crime service review at the end of the year would lead to more budget cuts and financial challenges; perhaps as much as between £15m to £20m. Changes were also being made to the Policing Funding Formula and these changes were subject to ongoing consultation. The Panel restated its wish to support the Commissioner and, at a forthcoming work planning meeting, discussions would be held over what documentation/data was needed for the Panel to achieve that aim. The next meeting of the Panel would be 5 November and a work planning session with the Constabulary would be held on 22 September 2015. Councillor Garnham invited any questions from Members before 5 November and he could then ask them at the Panel meeting.
- 36.6 The Chief Executive explained that, in terms of local management of the police units in Tewkesbury Borough, he felt Inspector Goga was working well in partnership with Borough Council Officers and other partner organisations in the area. The Chief Executive shared concerns about neighbourhood policing and the risks had been pointed out. The Police and the Police Constable had put forward a management system which they felt would work and he was sure the Police and Crime Panel would monitor this carefully, as would Borough Council Officers locally. Inspector Goga had indicated that he was committed to working hard with partners locally to ensure the system worked and the Borough Council would do its best to try and get the best local outcomes for its Parishes. A Member commented that the Chief Executive had previously undertaken to provide Members with a contact telephone number for the Local Policing Team and, in response, the Chief Executive indicated that Inspector Goga had only just returned from leave but he would speak to him and get something to circulate to Members.

36.7 Accordingly, it was

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

OS.37 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT - QUARTER 1 2015/16

- 37.1 The report of the Corporate Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 20-73, attached performance management information for quarter 1 of 2015/16. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was asked to review and scrutinise performance information and, where appropriate, identify any issues to refer to the Executive Committee for clarification or further action to be taken.
- 37.2 The performance management report comprised the Council Plan Performance Tracker, the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) set, the Revenue Budget Summary Statement, the Capital Monitoring Statement and the Reserves Position Summary. The majority of information within the Performance Tracker, attached at Appendix 1, reflected the progress of Council Plan actions as at the time of writing the report. Paragraph 2.3 of the report highlighted a number of achievements since the last update. Members were informed that business transformation savings of £171,000 had been included within the 2015/16 budget and a total of 2016m² office space had been made available for rental. In terms of service reviews, the Customer Service review was now complete; the review of Development and Environmental Health had commenced and, following the success of the Revenues and Benefits review, the team had successfully been shortlisted for the prestigious Institute of Revenues Rating and Valuation (IRRV) award. Ongoing partnership work was taking place with Cotswold Tourism, which was now a standalone company, which was excellent news for the Borough. Development of projects such as the Heritage Walks and Interpretation was taking place with the Tewkesbury Town Centre Partnership and this was working well. The governance arrangements to support the £1.4million LEADER project were being formalised and a Tewkesbury Borough Local Action Group had been formed. The client monitoring framework for the Ubico contract had been implemented and a monitoring report was due to be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee. In terms of the Volunteer Litter Pickers Scheme, an additional 26 people had now joined which took the total to 180. The Repair and Renew Grant Scheme had closed at the end of June and a total of £572,000 had been awarded to residents with flood affected properties. A new Community Funding Officer had been appointed and she would be able to signpost communities to funding sources other than the Borough Council. In addition, the new leisure centre remained on target for completion by July 2016 and a new Tewkesbury Parkrun had been established which attracted over 100 weekly runners and 30 volunteers.
- 37.3 The Corporate Services Group Manager advised that the complex nature of the actions being delivered meant that some may not progress as smoothly or quickly as envisaged and those were set out in the table at Paragraph 2.3. Particular attention was drawn to the fact that a partner to rent the vacant top floor of the Council Offices building had not been confirmed; this meant that the target of £75,000 income in 2015/16 was unlikely to be achieved. The Internal Audit report on the handling and learning from complaints had not got the sense that the Council was learning from complaints received; with this in mind it was intended that a fundamental review of the complaints framework would be undertaken. In terms of the business grant scheme, no grants had been awarded in quarter 1 as the Scheme had been put on hold for a number of reasons and would now be reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as part of its review of the Economic and Tourism Strategy. In terms of Key Performance Indicators, the Corporate Services Group Manager explained that it was early days for the data reported currently and a clearer picture would emerge at the end of quarter 2. However, Key Indicators of

interest at this stage included KPI 5 – number of overall crime incidents – the 12 month rolling total confirmed an increase of 8.44% overall but it was anticipated that as the new operating model was embedded this would reduce; KPI 11 – average number of sick days – the outturn of 1.23 days was a significant improvement on the previous year and it was currently anticipated that the target would be met; KPI 15 and 16 – Average time to process benefit applications – processing times were at their best ever level and showed continued improvement from 2014/15, this confirmed that the improvement programme was really working and was becoming embedded into the service; and KPI 26 – Number of reported enviro-crimes – looked like they could be on the same level as reported in 2014/15.

- 37.4 During the discussion which ensued, the Chairman offered the Committee's congratulations to the Revenues and Benefits Teams who had been shortlisted for an award. It was felt that this was an excellent achievement and a great recognition of the improvement work undertaken. In terms of the answering of telephone calls, a Member expressed the view that, whilst some departments were excellent at picking up calls for each other, others were not so good and this was frustrating for Members and the public. In response, the Corporate Services Manager explained that Customer Services now fell within his remit and he would be considering this issue. Everything that the Council did was about good customer service and if he was aware that service was slipping he would ensure good customer service was championed throughout the teams in the Council. It was his intention that standards for voicemail would be introduced so that people knew when staff would be available if they were not answering their telephone at a certain time. In respect of tourist attractions, a Member indicated that an initiative was underway in Down Hatherley Churchyard to restore the Gwinnett family tomb which dated from the 18th Century. He felt that this could be a really good tourist attraction for the Borough and he wondered whether it was something that the Borough Council would contribute to. In response, the Economic and Community Development Manager explained that he would discuss this with the Member outside of the meeting. He felt sure there would be funding streams that could be accessed to help with the project. In response to a query regarding the LEADER funding, the Economic and Community Development Manager explained that the funding was for rural growth so could not be used in all areas of the Borough. It was about generating growth and creating new jobs in rural areas i.e. farm diversification by the creation of a farm shop which would create employment and encourage local producers. If there were any particular projects that Members were aware of they should advise the Programme Manager, Neil Batt, who would meet with the relevant people. Neil worked for both Tewkesbury Borough Council and the Forest of Dean District Council and he was meeting with people now so he was ready when the money came in from Defra.
- 37.5 In terms of the Council's financial position as at the end of June, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager referred to Page No. 24 – Table one, which showed the overall position. There was a surplus of £109,849 for this quarter which was mainly as a result of income from the Planning, Garden Waste and One Legal Services. It was hoped that this could be carried forward into the second quarter. Paragraph 4.3, and Appendix 3, showed the position for each Group Manager with notes against any significant variances. He explained that, although the Group Managers position appeared to be significantly underspent, the budget report also recognised the need to achieve savings from the base budget in terms of salaries and procurement savings. Those savings targets were currently held on the corporate budget codes on the ledger. No savings were recognised against those plans as they accumulated through the year within service groupings. The potential impact of appeals on business rates also needed to be taken into account. A spike in applications had been seen in March as a result of changes in Government Policy on backdating appeals. The impact of appeals was uncertain as it remained with the Valuation Office to process them; although an estimated impact of successful

appeals had been allowed for. The first quarter position for business rates retention was in line with expected levels of income following the Virgin Media reassessments in 2014/15. A full year deficit of £110,000 was currently predicted. Paragraph 5, and Appendix 4, showed the capital position as at the end of quarter 1. This currently showed an overspend against the profiled budget of £182,672. Community grants were underspent due to slippages in approved schemes, however, monitoring by the Working Group highlighted that all schemes were continuing and budgets were expected to be spent. In addition, the overspend on housing and business grants was due to the fact that the grants had been awarded for flood relief but the Council had not yet recovered the money from central Government; this was due to be received in quarter 2. Paragraph 3.1, and Appendix 5, showed a summary of the current usage of available reserves. At present the reserves were beginning to be utilised and only showed the actual payments made. The information contained within the Appendix did not take account of reserves which had been committed but not yet paid. As at the end of the first quarter, £485,853 had been expended against the opening reserves of £10,567,814. Details of significant movements were contained within the notes on the Appendix.

37.6 During the brief discussion which ensued, a Member questioned what the planning obligation reserve was. In response, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager advised that Section 106 money was funding which was received from developers. As a development progressed there were trigger points at which time funds were released and they were then held in the planning obligation reserve awaiting expenditure. In addition, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that the details of a Section 106 Agreement was negotiated with the developer based on the needs of a community and the mitigation of a development. Each negotiation was different, as were the triggers for funding. A Member queried whether it was correct that there had been £5million of Section 106 monies for development in Longford. In response, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager indicated that he was unsure but would check and respond to the Member accordingly.

37.7 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the performance management information for quarter 1 of 2015/16 be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 6:00 pm

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

OCTOBER 2015 TO FEBRUARY 2016 (No Meeting in December)

REGULAR ITEM:

- **Forward Plan – to note the forthcoming items.**

Addition to 14 October 2015

- Gloucestershire Business Rates Pool.

Deletion from 14 October 2015

- Six Monthly Ubico Update – Monitoring Report to be Reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Committee Date: 25 November 2015

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit Take-Up Strategy.	To review the strategic approach to encourage the take-up of benefits and consider the impact of financial inclusion.	Richard Horton, Revenues and Benefits Group Manager.	No.
Climate Change Strategy.		Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Waste Management Strategy.	To consider the Waste Management Strategy.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Review of Safeguarding Children Policy	To approve the Safeguarding Children Policy.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager	No.
Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).	To recommend to Council the adoption of the five year MTFS which describes the financial environment the Council is operating in and the pressures it will face in delivering its services and a balanced budget over the period.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	Yes deferred from October meeting.

10

Agenda Item 5

Committee Date: 25 November 2015			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Asset Strategy.	To recommend to Council the adoption of an updated and comprehensive Asset Strategy covering the next 4 years and the Council's entire asset portfolio.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	Yes deferred from October meeting to allow time to consult with the Transform Working Group.
Volunteering Policy – Phase 2.	The second phase of the Volunteering Policy will set out how the Council will support employees who wish to do volunteer work within the community or for charitable institutions.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	Yes – from October Executive Committee.

Committee Date: 12 January 2016

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Budget 2015/16.	To recommend a budget for 2015/16 to Council.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.
Performance Management Report – Quarter Two 2015/16.	To receive and respond to the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee’s review of the quarter one performance management information.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Cemetery Provision in Tewkesbury.	To review the options for the provision of cemetery facilities within Tewkesbury.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.
Customer Services Strategy.	To approve a Strategy that will set out how the Council will provide a high quality customer service so we serve our customers in an open, inclusive and efficient manner.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	Yes deferred from October meeting to allow for the completion of the review of Customer Services.
Waste Review & Vehicle Procurement.	To consider the Waste Review & Vehicle Procurement and make a recommendation to Council.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.

12

Committee Date: 17 February 2016			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Treasury Management Strategy (Annual).	To consider the Treasury Management Policy.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Work Programme 2015/16

Regular Agenda Items –

- Consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme
- Consideration of the Executive Committee Forward Plan

Task Description	Lead Officer
1 December 2015	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update – to discuss any issues arising from the last meeting (3 November 2015). 	O&S Member Rep
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police and Crime Panel Update – to discuss any issues arising from the last meeting (5 November 2015). 	O&S Member Rep
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management – Quarter 2 2015/16 – To review and scrutinise the performance management information and, where appropriate, to require response or action from the Executive Committee. 	Graeme Simpson
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing, Renewal and Homeless Strategy Review Monitoring Report (<i>annually</i>). 	Val Garside
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review Action Plan Monitoring Report (<i>six monthly</i>). 	Graeme Simpson
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Waste and Recycling Action Plan 2015/16 	Val Garside
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Review of Economic Development and Tourism Strategy 	Chair of Working Group
19 January 2016	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report (<i>quarterly</i>). 	Val Garside
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enviro-Crimes Review Monitoring Report (<i>six monthly</i>). 	Val Garside
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Wellbeing Strategy Monitoring Report (<i>six monthly</i>). 	Julie Wood
23 February 2016	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens' Advice Bureau Presentation – to ensure that the work carried out within the Borough provides value for money (<i>annually</i>). 	Julie Wood
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management – Quarter 3 2015/16 – To review and scrutinise the performance management information and, where appropriate, to require response or action from the Executive Committee. 	Graeme Simpson
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Effectiveness of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. 	Graeme Simpson
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the Gloucestershire Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee in order to authorise payment of the Council's contribution to the running costs for the forthcoming year. 	Graeme Simpson

Task Description	Lead Officer
12 April 2016	
• Revenues and Benefits Improvement Project <i>(12 month update)</i> .	Richard Horton
• Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership <i>(six monthly)</i> .	Val Garside
• Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016/17.	Graeme Simpson
• Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2015/16.	Graeme Simpson
• Gloucestershire Families First Update <i>(six monthly)</i> .	Val Garside
• Review of Ubico <i>(12 month update)</i> .	Val Garside
• Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report <i>(quarterly)</i> .	Val Garside
• Complaints Report <i>(six monthly)</i> .	Graeme Simpson

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	20 October 2015
Subject:	Review of Ubico
Report of:	Val Garside, Environment and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor J R Mason
Number of Appendices:	None

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>Tewkesbury Borough Council Waste Services transferred to the local authority owned company Ubico Ltd as an equal partner as of 1 April, 2015. This report provides a six monthly update on the transfer of the service.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>To CONSIDER the six monthly update regarding the transfer of Waste Services to Ubico.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in June, 2015 it was agreed that the transfer of the waste service be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a six monthly basis.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>None for this report</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>None for this report</p>
<p>Risk Management Implications:</p> <p>None for this report</p>
<p>Performance Management Follow-up:</p> <p>Regular Performance meetings are included within the contract to monitoring of the contract.</p>
<p>Environmental Implications:</p> <p>None</p>

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1** The transfer of the Council's waste service to Ubico Limited took place on 1 April, 2015. The service includes waste and recycling, street cleaning, grounds maintenance and other services.
- 1.2** Ubico is a local authority owned company and has been set up as a separate legal entity wholly owned and controlled by the Shareholders. Shareholders include Cotswold District Council, West Oxfordshire District Council, Forest of Dean District Council, Cheltenham Borough Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council. The transfer involved all staff being transferred under TUPE rules and regulations.
- 1.3** The current vehicle lease with CP Davidson was also novated to Ubico Limited, which means that in all there was no change to service delivery to residents; the only change was the management of the team.
- 1.4** Although Ubico provide a range of services to a number of local authorities, the Tewkesbury waste team is still managed on a day to day basis by Nick Firkins as the Direct Services Manager. Nick now reports to Beth Broughton - Senior Operations Manager, who in turn reports to Rob Bell – Managing Director.
- 1.5** The waste service being delivered by Ubico Ltd, again with no change, means that residual waste is collected every fortnight, alongside the garden waste collections, with recycling being collected every alternate week. Food waste is collected weekly.
- 1.6** At a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2015 it was agreed that a review of the transfer of the waste service be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a half yearly basis.

2.0 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

2.1 Included in the contract are various performance monitoring procedures:

Frequency	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Annually
Title	Customer Service Liaison Meeting	Performance Monitoring Review	Performance Monitoring Group	Environmental Services Partnership Board (ESPB)	Annual Report
Attendees	Ubico Operations Manager	Ubico Operations Manager	Ubico Operations Manager	Ubico Managing Director/Senior Operations Manager	ESPB attendees from all shareholders
	Customer Service Manager	Council Representative	Council Representative	Council Representatives	
	Others - optional	Others - optional	Others - optional	Lead Member	
Terms of Reference	Information exchange can be by telephone	Review previous month performance plan for coming month	Review previous quarter performance. Analyse and interpret trends. Plan for coming quarter.	Review previous quarter performance. Consider trends, strategies Planning, Service updates	Review Annual Report
		Operational review Health & Safety	Operational review Health & Safety	Operational review Health & Safety	

2.2 The weekly Customer Service Liaison Meetings are running well, a number of teething problems that were identified in the first couple of months have been resolved during these meetings. Issues included amendments to the Achieve System (Report it on line) and management of complaints. Communication and areas of responsibility between TBC and Ubico were a major issue in the first couple of months this has now been resolved, so much so that the weekly meetings are now fortnightly.

2.3 Monthly Performance review meetings are conducted by the Joint Waste Team on behalf of the Council. Again a number of teething issues were identified and are being worked through to resolve.

2.4 Whilst the service remains unchanged, there have been communication difficulties for Parish Councils; whilst the Council would prefer Parish Councils to go either through Customer Services or via the Council's website through the "report it on line" option, it is appreciated that some Parish Councils would prefer direct contact. This does present issues, in that if Parish Councils have direct contact with Ubico and are requesting services, the Council will have no control over expenditure.

2.5 The first Environmental Services Partnership Board meeting took place on 27 August 2015. As this was the first meeting, decisions were made on which reports should be presented at subsequent meetings. However the following performance management reports were provided:

2.5.1 Health & Safety – Corporate

Health & safety - Corporate					
Ref	Indicator title	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Q1
HS 1	Number of reported RIDDOR incidents within period - TBC contract	0	0	0	0
HS 2	Number of reported lost time incidents within period - TBC contract	0	0	0	0
HS 3	Number of reported non lost time incidents within period - TBC contract	0	0	0	0
HS 4	Number of reported near misses within period - TBC contract	0	0	0	0
HS 5	Number of crew inspections within period - TBC contract	20	20	20	60
HS 6	Number of reported vehicle related accidents within period - TBC contract	3	0	4	7

2.5.1.1 There have been no significant health and safety incidents during quarter 1. There have been no RIDDOR reportable incidents. Health and safety days are usually held monthly with the crews and include a focus on daily defect reporting ensuring employees are carrying out vehicle and equipment checks before leaving the depot each day.

2.5.1.2 No health and safety legislative changes impacting on Ubico have occurred in quarter 1. A change in Drug Driving Legislation occurred in March 2015 which now allows the Police to undertake roadside testing. This new legislation has been communicated to all staff to ensure that they are aware of the risks of the use of over-the-counter prescription, and illegal, drugs on their ability to work safely.

2.5.1.3 Ubico attends the Local Authority Waste Safety and Health Forum which meets as a national group in the winter and summer and a regional group in April and October. The aim of the group is to work with the HSE and Environmental Services Association (ESA), Waste Industry Safety and Health Group (WISH) and Local Government Association (LGA) in influencing legislation and guidance affecting the waste industry and sharing of best practice.

2.5.2 Residual household waste per household (kg/year) (Previous National Indicator N191)

Month		
	2014/15	2015/16
April	35	39
May	38	37
June	36	37
July	37	
August	33	
September	37	
October	37	
November	33	
December	33	
January	40	
February	33	
March	36	

2.5.3 Household waste reused, recycled and composted (%) = 52.44% (Previously NI 192)

Month		
	2014/15	2015/16
April	54.47%	51.26%
May	53.83%	51.84%
June	54.47%	52.44%
July	52.04%	
August	53.49%	
September	52.89%	
October	51.32%	
November	48.99%	
December	47.43%	
January	45.37%	
February	43.11%	
March	47.92%	

2.5.3.1 The Joint Waste Committee, of which Councillors J R Mason and R J E Vines are Members, is aware that the Committee is currently looking at ideas on how to improve recycling rates as the majority of districts have suffered a downturn in collection rates

2.5.4 Human Resources

Human Resources - Corporate - 2014/15					
Ref	Indicator title	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Q1
HR 1	Business Support average days lost per FTE	2.86	1.51	3.51	2.63
HR 2	Operations average days lost per FTE - TBC	1.37	1.01	0.97	1.12
HR 3	% of staff turnover - TBC contract	0.00%	0.00%	3.15%	3.09%

3.0 FUTURE WORK

As a result of the legislative changes in respect of collecting recycling materials, the Council is currently reviewing collection methods; the current vehicle lease expires in 2017. Ubico, in partnership with the Joint Waste Team, is assisting the Council with this major project.

- 4.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**
- 4.1 None
- 5.0 CONSULTATION**
- 5.1 None
- 6.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES**
- 6.1 None
- 7.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES**
- 7.1 None
- 8.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)**
- 8.1 None
- 9.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)**
- 9.1 None
- 10.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)**
- 10.1 None
- 11.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS**
- 11.1 None

Background Papers: Future Management of Councils Operational Services –Council 30
September, 2014 (Restricted Documents)

Contact Officer: Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
01684 272259 val.garside@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: None

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	20 October 2015
Subject:	Gloucestershire Families First Update
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor R E Allen
Number of Appendices:	None

Executive Summary:

Families First Plus, formerly Families First, is the local name for the national Troubled Families programme. It was initially a three year programme aimed at turning around the lives of the estimated 120,000 troubled families in the country. The government has announced an expansion of the programme reaching out to a further 400,000 families over a five year period from April 2015. The programme is overseen by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) which has an agreement from the County Council that an estimated 900 families can be worked with in Gloucestershire; 10% of this total i.e. 90 families, are within Tewkesbury Borough.

Recommendation:

To CONSIDER the progress made in delivering the Families First programme.

Reasons for Recommendation:

'Progress the Families First Programme to deliver a multi-agency response to the issues faced by families in challenging circumstances' is an action within the Council Plan under the priority theme 'Provide customer focused community support'.

An update of the programme was first presented at Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 8 October 2013. It was resolved at that meeting that six monthly updates on progression of the programme should be brought back to the Committee.

Resource Implications:

None directly resulting from this report.

Legal Implications:

None directly resulting from this report.

Risk Management Implications:

If the Council does not attain its target then there is a reputational risk.

Performance Management Follow-up:

Delivery of the programme is monitored by Overview and Scrutiny Committee every six months.

A high level overview is also included in the Council Plan Performance Tracker which is reported on a quarterly basis.

Environmental Implications:

None.

1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 Families First is the local name for the national Troubled Families programme. It was initially a three year programme aimed at turning around the lives of the estimated 120,000 troubled families in the country. The government has announced an expansion of the programme reaching out to a further 400,000 families over a five year period from April 2015. The programme is overseen by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) which has an agreement from the County Council that an estimated 900 families can be worked with in Gloucestershire; 10% of this total i.e. 90 families, are within Tewkesbury Borough.

2.0 THE PROGRAMME

2.1 'Troubled Families' were originally, in the first phase of the programme, defined by DCLG as those families which are high need and are of high cost to the public purse. They meet 3 main criteria :

- An adult on out of work benefit.
- Children not attending school.
- Family members involved in crime and anti-social behaviour.

In addition, there was an option to use local discretion to include families who are experiencing other issues that are high cost to public services, for example mental health issues, drug and alcohol misuse and domestic abuse.

2.2 The overall aims of the Gloucestershire Families First programme are to:

- Get children back into education.
- Reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Put adults on a path back to work.
- Scale down the amount of public service spending required to assist these families. This will include better coordination of support and a reduction in the number of agencies working with the family.

Through this work there is an expectation that the programme will:

- Change the way services are delivered to families – re-designing them for the longer term.
- Work to address entrenched issues within the family unit.
- Look to create a lasting difference in communities.
- To enable families to be more resilient, independent and self-supporting.
- Work collaboratively with local communities to develop community solutions giving people a stronger sense of belonging, ownership and control over their lives.

3.0 TEWKESBURY BOROUGH - THE DELIVERY MODEL

3.1 The Families First programme in Tewkesbury Borough is overseen by the Locality Partnership Group which acts as the delivery group for the programme. The Families First team is line managed by Emma Trigwell (GCC Families First Plus Team Manager). The team is based here in the Families First Plus office and they also spend time in other locations such as Children's Centres.

4.0 DELIVERY OF THE PROGRAMME

4.1 The programme is proving to be a great success with the target to engage with 90 families by March 2015 being achieved a year early. Detailed figures for the third year of the programme by district were not available at the time of writing this report but overall figures for Gloucestershire payment-by results claims for over 900 'turned around families' have been made to DCLG.

4.2 From April 2015 Gloucestershire has a target to work with 3,000 families, but there is currently no breakdown of district targets as the outcomes framework is still being developed, it is hoped this will have been produced by Autumn 2015

5.0 NEXT STEPS

5.1 As noted above, due to the success of the programme in Gloucestershire the county was chosen as an 'early adopter' for the next phase of the programme which started nationally in April 2015. In response to this Families First Plus has been embedded within our local network of support for vulnerable families, children and young people as part of our Early Help offer in localities.

5.2 Families First Plus will build on the existing multi-agency partnerships in Tewkesbury Borough in order to improve the way we work together to provide early help and support to families, children and young people. The Tewkesbury Families First team will provide a focus for:

- Building community capacity –working with partners to support families to help themselves and identify community resources to meet need early. This will build on the Tewkesbury Public Service Centre approach which has been key to bringing together the range of local partners.
- Building capacity in universal services - acting as an enabler and supporting links across services and teams. This will ensure that effective advice and guidance is available to support and enhance the positive early help work that takes place in the range of local settings including schools, health services, children centres, youth support, housing, VCS etc. The role of community social workers and CAF coordinators will continue as part of the team in order to provide advice and support to practitioners, including a focus on safely managing risk.
- Targeted support – providing a coordinated response to need where a specific intervention is required. This will involve providing a whole-family approach across the continuum of need. Building on existing good practice these workers will work with local partners in order to ensure a coordinated multi-agency response to complex family issues including mental health, substance misuse and domestic violence.

Revised Criteria:

The referral criteria have changed from those detailed in 2.1. There are now six criteria as follows:

- Parent and children involved in crime or anti-social behaviour.
- Children who have not been attending school regularly.
- Children who need help.
- Adults out of work or at risk of financial exclusion and young people at risk of 'worklessness'.
- Families affected by domestic violence and abuse.
- Parents and children with a range of health issues.

Families First Plus will depend on an effective local partnership that works together to offer support families as a whole; building on their strengths and fostering resilience. It is proposed that the Tewkesbury Borough Locality Partnership Group will provide local governance for the pilot, meeting regularly to ensure a robust joined up approach, sharing resources and reducing duplication.

6.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 None

7.0 CONSULTATION

7.1 None

8.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

8.1 The delivery of the programme is an action within the Council Plan.

9.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

9.1 DCLG Troubled Families programme (launched 2011)

10.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

10.1 None directly

11.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

11.1 The programme has significant social impact and in some cases, community safety issues may arise. A key aim of the programme is to create a lasting difference in communities.

12.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

12.1 There is a value for money element to the programme as any financial outturn claimed as a result of turning families around can be recycled back into the programme.

13.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

13.1 <http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/114462/About-Families-First>

Tewkesbury Borough Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes 8 October 2013 – first presentation on the progress of the programme.

Tewkesbury Borough Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes 8 April 2014 – six monthly update.

Tewkesbury Borough Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee Minutes 2 December 2014 – six monthly update.

Background papers: None

Contact Officer: Adrian Goode, Community Development Officer
01684 272268 Adrian.Goode@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: None

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	20 October 2015
Subject:	Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor J R Mason
Number of Appendices:	1

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>This report contains an update on progress of the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Members are asked to CONSIDER progress against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 25 March 2015, it was agreed that the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan progress be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>Included in the report; met from existing allocated resources (the Council employs a Flood Risk Management Engineer).</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>The Council has powers under Section 14A of the Land Drainage Act 1991 to undertake flood risk management work where it considers that the work is desirable having regard to the local flood risk management strategy for its area and where the purpose of the work is to manage a flood risk in the Council's area from an ordinary watercourse. The works that the Council is permitted to do under this section is wide-ranging and includes the construction or maintenance of existing works (which include buildings, structures, watercourses, drainage works and machinery).</p> <p>Where the works are to be carried out on land not owned by the Council, agreements should be put in place to cover consent of the owner for the works to be carried out and responsibilities for maintenance.</p> <p>The Council's contract rules will need to be followed when appointing contractors.</p>

Where there are joint projects, such as with the Environment Agency, the Council should enter into agreements which set out each party's obligations and responsibilities in relation to these projects, including ongoing maintenance of the works.

Gloucestershire County Council has made funding available to the district councils to give grants to residents affected by flooding.

Risk Management Implications:

Care must be exercised to ensure that no ongoing liability is attached to the Council for work on watercourses for which the Council has no direct responsibility through making a financial contribution or carrying out of works on a one-off basis. This will be achieved as part of the project management process.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The recommendation is that performance will be monitored through regular reports to the Flood Risk Management Group and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Environmental Implications:

Any work involving natural watercourses or the cutting back of trees or hedges will be carried out at the time of year that has least impact on wildlife and habitat (e.g. bird nesting season). Where necessary the appropriate licences will be applied for.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 25 March 2015, it was agreed that the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan progress be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis.

2.0 FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP ACTION PLAN

2.1 The Action Plan at Appendix 1 is based on land drainage projects monitored by the Flood Risk Management Group. The Action Plan is 'living' document to which funding or partnership opportunities can be added as and when they arise.

2.2 Tewkesbury Borough Council owns various parcels of land across the Borough and some of these have watercourses either running through them or adjacent to them. This means that Tewkesbury Borough Council is a 'riparian owner' with responsibilities to maintain these watercourses in good condition. In 2010 Tewkesbury Borough Council agreed to increase the land drainage revenue budget in order to allow for routine maintenance work to be carried out.

2.3 The Flood Risk Management Group last met on 28 September 2015. The Action Plan at Appendix 1 represents the report that was presented at that meeting. This report included a final analysis of the Government's Repair and Renew Grant Scheme, which has now closed, shown at section (iv), and the new format for reporting on major schemes in delivery, shown in section (v). The next meeting of the Group is scheduled for 16 December 2015.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 None

4.0 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Funding opportunities are applied for and realised with the agreement of local communities, partners such as Gloucestershire County Council and the Environment Agency, and the Flood Risk Management Group.

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

- 5.1 The Council Plan 2012-16 contains the following priority within the section “Improve recycling and care for the environment”;
5. Continued work with partners to provide flood resilience measures;
- a) Work with partners to deliver flood alleviation projects funded by Gloucestershire County Council
 - b) Advise and signpost local communities when applying for external funding for flood resilience measures.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

- 6.1 National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-strategy-for-england>).

Gloucestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (available from <http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/LFRMS>).

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

- 7.1 Tewkesbury Borough Council employs a Flood Risk Management Engineer. Part of the post holder’s responsibilities is to identify flood risk management funding opportunities and submit bids, as well as to monitor progress on the Action Plan.

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

- 8.1 Flood risk management reduces the likelihood that local residents and businesses will have flood water entering their properties and the consequential impact that such an event would have on the health, welfare and finances of those affected.

9.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

- 9.1 None

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

- 10.1 Flood Risk Management Group Terms of Reference and Action Plan - Annual Review (Meeting of Executive Committee, 25 March 2015)

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: David Steels, Environmental Health Manager,
01684 272172 david.steels@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1: Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan

Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan

i) “Live” capital projects

Table 1: Live Capital Projects

Location	Scheme / Works Description	Funding Source	Funding Allocated	Progress	Target Completion Date
Tirley	Flood attenuation measures	Gloucestershire County Council	£135,000	Separate detailed update to be given at meeting on progress and discussions with Parish Council.	Winter 2015
Chaceley 31	Diversion of drainage channel & reopening outfalls	Gloucestershire County Council	£45,000	Ongoing work at Tirley is taking priority. Therefore preferred option to create a new twin outlet (which will ease pressure on the existing EA outlet at Chaceley Stock) has been reprogramed	Spring 2016

ii) Tewkesbury Borough Council Programme of Watercourse Maintenance

Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC) owns various parcels of land across the Borough and some of these have watercourses either running through them or adjacent to them. This means that Tewkesbury Borough Council is a 'riparian owner' with responsibilities to maintain these watercourses in good condition.

In early 2010 TBC agreed to increase the land drainage revenue budget; in order to allow for routine maintenance work to be carried out.

Table 2: Completed Tewkesbury Borough Council owned watercourse maintenance works 2015 – 2016

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	Bramble Chase	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (adjacent Gabions)	50	£170.00
2	Hayfield Way	Bishops Cleeve	Unblock outfall and ditch	sum	£1,019.75
3	Oldacre Drive	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	250	£162.50
4	Oldacre Drive (By pass ditch)	Bishops Cleeve	De silt	50	£1,000.00
5	Oldacre Dr/Millham Rd	Bishops Cleeve	Fallen Trees (Blocking watercourse)	sum	£550.00
6	Tobyfield Close	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	20	£126.00
7	Coopers View	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	406	£407.00
8	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Rope Swing removal blockages cleared	Sum	£140.00
9	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	500	£2,500.00
10	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Fallen Trees	Sum	£1,450.00
11	Chargrove Lane	Shurdington	Blockage & vegetation removal (Nature Reserve)	180	£1,000.00
12	Carrant Brook, Mitton	Tewkesbury	Split tree on watercourse	sum	£73.02
13	Lankett Lane	Tewkesbury	De silt & flail cutting of bank (A lot of fly tipped material)	180	£1,800.00
14	Lower Lode Lane	Tewkesbury	Fallen tree removals (from river Avon)	sum	£1,740.00
15	Lower Lode La/Bloody Meadow	Tewkesbury	Fallen tree removals (Blocking watercourse)	sum	£550.00
16	Mill Avon	Tewkesbury	Vegetation and tree clearance (Access difficult - by Glos Road)	sum	£7,020.00
17	The Vineyards	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	446	£289.90

18	Honeybourne Meadow	Woodmancote	Blockage removal + tree clearance	sum	£700.00
	-	-			£20,698.17

Table 3: Tewkesbury Borough Council owned watercourse maintenance works proposed 2015/16

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	Kings Gate	Ashchurch Rural	Flail cutting of banks	181	£271.50
2	Bramble Chase	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	330	£214.50
3	Finlay Way	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	420	£273.00
4	Hayfield Way	Bishops Cleeve	De silt & flail cutting of bank	512	£2,560.00
5	Stoke Road	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	55	£82.50
6	The Grange	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	275	£1,375.00
7	Voxwell Lane	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	100	£350.00
8	Ermin Park	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	200	£1,000.00
9	Green Way Road	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks and de silt (Balancing pond)	50	£250.00
10	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Collapsed banks assesment work up scheme to repair	sum	£3,635.00
11	Grenville Close	Churchdown	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	600	£3,000.00
12	Parkside Close	Churchdown	De silt & flail cutting of bank	66	£330.00
13	Pineholt	Hucclecote	Clearnce Around Pond Area	Sum	£500.00
14	Pineholt	Hucclecote	Assessment and works to secure slipping banks	sum	£3,500.00
15	Rookery Road	Innsworth	Flail cutting of banks	8	£50.00
16	Fircoft Road	Longford	Flail cutting of banks	115	£345.00
17	Tip Road	Stoke Orchard	Flail cutting of banks and de silt	100	£1,500.00
18	Bloody Meadow	Tewkesbury	De silt & flail cutting of bank	440	£2,200.00

19	Carrant Brook	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	500	£325.00
20	Cricket ground	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	265	£265.00
21	Lincoln Green Lane	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	550	£357.50
22	Rails Meadow	Tewkesbury	De Silt	395	£3,950.00
23	Beauchamp Road	Walton Cardiff	Clearance of reeds	sum	£500.00
24	Crown Road	Walton Cardiff	Clearance of reeds	sum	£500.00
25	Honeybourne Meadow	Woodmancote	De silt concrete channel	sum	£1,000.00
26	Various Sites	Various	Footbridges over watercourses inspection and repairs	sum	£1,000.00
					£29,334.00

All works are subject to current quoted costs. Flail cutting and vegetation clearance will be carried out October 2015 – March 2016.

Table 4 – Insurance claim

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	9 The Highgrove (Structural Engineers - Employed to work out budget costs and alternative schemes)	Bishops Cleeve	Banks collapsing rear of garden adjoining The Grange Watercourse	N/A	£4,300.00

Table 5 – Nature Reserve Lease, Priors Park, Tewkesbury

A 30 year lease was sign on 23 June 2015 by the Tewkesbury Nature Reserve. The table below indicates the locations of land drainage items that are now managed by them as part of their lease agreement.

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	Barton Court	Tewkesbury	Clearance Works	170	N/A
2	Cam Brook	Tewkesbury	Clearance Works	180	N/A
3	Swilgate River	Tewkesbury	Clearance Works	1480	N/A
4	Reed Beds and Ponds	Tewkesbury	Clearance Works	sum	N/A

iii) Update on Grant Applications (including Flood Defence Grant in Aid)

Table 6: Update on Grant Applications (including Flood Defence Grant in Aid); Existing Schemes

Location	Scheme / Works Description	Funding Source	Funding Allocated	Progress	Target Completion Date
Bishop's Cleeve, Woodmancote and Southam	Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) identified a range of measures including diversion, storage and property protection	FDGiA	Estimated at ~ £1M	This is a GCC scheme as Lead Local Flood Authority Initial package of works being developed in association with Parish Council. These options will then be worked up, with detailed design to follow.	2020
Churchdown 36	Surface water flood alleviation, via re profiling the existing ground levels	FDGiA	£124,000	This is a GCC scheme as Lead Local Flood Authority Investigative/design work and negotiation with land owners is in progress but yet to be finalised	tbc
Kenulf Road, Winchcombe	Individual Property Level Protection	FDGiA	£40,000	Installation of recommended measures is complete. We have been providing support to a resident who questioned the level of works at their property. One other resident may need support of a query regarding some supplementary snagging work but as yet this has not been confirmed by them.	Completed June 2015

iv) Capital Improvement to Properties in Tewkesbury Borough (Repair and Renew Grant)

Table 7

(GCF = Gloucestershire Community Foundation)

<u>Repair and Renew Grant</u>				<u>GCF grant</u>		
	No. grants	Measures taken	Amount	No. grants	Amount	Commentary
Apperley	2	flood barriers, pumps, generator	£9,973.55	1	£500.00	
Ashleworth	3	flood barriers, doors, flood survey, floor repair	£10,355.60			Possible bund at White End proposed by local residents, but Glos has no money to apply for in 2015-16
Chaceley	14	flood walls, flood barriers, flood doors, raising floors, pumps, repair bund	£92,250.90	3	£4,804.00	All allocated to flood protection, including place of safety improved, and outfall reconfiguration scheme in preparation
Coombe Hill	6	associated work and bund construction	£24,859.73			Bund constructed
Deerhurst and Deerhurst Walton	10	Flood scheme with gates and pump in place round central village	£49,567.97	5	£5,000.00	Earth and blue clay flood bund constructed to protect 9 homes
Forthampton	2	waterproof walls, flood barriers, flood doors, floors, pumps	£10,000.00	1	£1,000.00	
Haw Bridge Tirley	16	flood walls, flood barriers, flood doors, pumps, air brick covers, floor levels	£73,561.02	1	£1,500.00	Minimally affected by Tirley attenuation scheme?
Longford	9	flood walls, land drains, barriers and pumping	£34,572.11	1	£414.00	
Maisemore	6	flood fencing, flood walls and barriers, flood doors, raise floors, repoint with water resistant mortar	£39,774.79			Highways road scheme applied for in 2015
Minsterworth	3	flood walls, electricity sockets raised	£10,859.04	3	£9,000.00	Place of safety improved
Norton	1	flood wall, gate and barriers	£5,000.00			

Oxenton	1	flood barriers	£5,000.00			
Sandhurst	1	raise electrics, stone floor laid	£5,000.00			
Sandhurst Lane	9	flood barriers, raised floors, equipment and sockets, flood doors, pumps and generators,	£44,760.67	2	£1,282.00	Sandhurst and Longford Flood Action Group: egress main concern
Tewkesbury Town	23	Flood walls, gabions, flood barriers and doors, air bricks and covers, pumps, waterproofing walls, and raise floors	£87,436.28	2	£1,000.00	Maintenance event
The Leigh	3	flood walls, barriers, sumps and pumps, generator	£12,096.40	1	£1,000.00	(outside existing bund)
Tirley	9	flood walls, bund, permanent and temporary barriers, flood doors, pumps, non-return valves, waterproof walls, air bricks & cover	£44,771.12	1	£1,000.00	Tirley works under construction: outfall and attenuation
Twigworth	3	airbricks and covers, door guards, barriers pump and generator	£12,736.00			
			£572,575.18		£26,500.00	

v) Update on Progress at Tirley

Table 8

NAME OF SCHEME	TIRLEY - Outfall		Completed												
SCHEME REFERENCE WITHIN NEW FINANCIALS			TIR/OUT/001												
SUB GRANT AMOUNT (£)	£55,000.00														
FINANCE REPORT															
Order number	Date	Contractor	Description of works	Estimate cost (£)	Invoice number	Actual cost ex VAT (£)	Actual cost inc VAT (£)	Payee	Expenditure code	Uncommitted balance (£)	Actual balance (£)	Date sent for payment	Invoice raised to GCC to reclaim (date and £)		
CS 22739	04/12/14	Willems	Outfall excavation	£4,975.00	2151	£3,200.00	£3,840.00	contractor	DRAI/4100	£51,800.00	£51,800.00				
CS 22739	17/04/15	Willems	Temp. secure outfall	£500.00		£471.77	£566.12	contractor	DRAI/4100	£51,328.23	£51,328.23				
CS 22909	08/06/15	Wilkinson	Heras fencing	£500.00	13524	£345.60	£414.72	contractor	GCCF/4100	£50,982.63	£50,982.63				
CS22935	20/05/15	Wilkinson	Materials for outfall	£10,000.00	13488	£10,000.00	£12,000.00	contractor	GCCF/4100	£40,982.63	£40,982.63	25/05/2015			
CS22941	03/06/15	Wilkinson	site clearance	£800.00	13589	£750.00	£900.00	contractor	GCCF/4100	£40,232.63	£40,232.63	24/07/2015			
CS23281	22/07/15	Wilkinson	Outfall re-instatement work	£23,500.00	13588	£23,500.00	£28,200.00	contractor	EARM8170ER16	£16,732.63	£16,732.63	10/08/2015	10/08/2015	£28,421.77	
CS23283	24/07/15	Wilkinson	Safety railings & stairs	£14,000.00		£13,720.00	£16,464.00		GCCF/4100	£3,012.63	£3,012.63				
							£0.00			£3,012.63	£3,012.63				

Table 9

NAME OF SCHEME	TIRLEY - Grove Cottage														
SCHEME REFERENCE WITHIN NEW FINANCIALS			TIR/GRV/001												
SUB GRANT AMOUNT (£)	£3,000.00														
FINANCE REPORT															
Order number	Date	Contractor	Description of works	Estimate cost (£)	Invoice number	Actual cost ex VAT (£)	Actual cost inc VAT (£)	Payee	Expenditure code	Uncommitted balance (£)	Actual balance (£)	Date sent for payment	Invoice raised to GCC to reclaim (£ and date)		
			Ditch reinstatement	£3,000.00					EARM8170ER16	£0.00	£3,000.00				
										£0.00	£3,000.00				

Table 10

NAME OF SCHEME	TIRLEY - Ham Rd crossing		Completed											
SCHEME REFERENCE WITHIN NEW FINANCIALS			TIR/HAM/001											
SUB GRANT AMOUNT (£)			£12,000.00											
FINANCE REPORT														
Order number	Date	Contractor	Description of works	Estimate cost (£)	Invoice number	Actual cost ex VAT (£)	Actual cost inc VAT (£)	Payee	Expenditure code	Uncommitted balance (£)	Actual balance (£)	Date sent for payment	Invoice raised to GCC to reclaim (date and £)	
22945	12/06/15	GCC	Section 50 Licence	£360.00	1800361344	£360.00	£360.00	GCC	GCCF/4100	£11,640.00	£11,640.00			
CS23282	24/07/15	Wilkinson	Supply/install 900mm culvert	£10,000.00	13637	£9,900.00	£11,880.00	contractor	EARM8170ER16	£1,740.00	£1,740.00	10/08/2015	09/09/2015	£10,260.00
										£1,740.00	£1,740.00			

Table 11

NAME OF SCHEME	TIRLEY - Natural Flood Management (NFM)													
SCHEME REFERENCE WITHIN NEW FINANCIALS			TIR/NFM/001											
SUB GRANT AMOUNT (£)			£80,000.00											
FINANCE REPORT														
Order number	Date	Contractor	Description of works	Estimate cost (£)	Invoice number	Actual cost ex VAT (£)	Actual cost inc VAT (£)	Payee	Expenditure code	Uncommitted balance (£)	Actual balance (£)	Date sent for payment	Invoice raised to GCC to reclaim (£ and date)	
			Procurement of clay	£20,000.00					GCCF/4100	£60,000.00	£80,000.00			
			Construction of flood storage	£40,000.00					GCCF/4100	£20,000.00	£80,000.00			
			In ditch barriers	£20,000.00					GCCF/4100	£0.00	£80,000.00			
										£0.00	£80,000.00			

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	20 October 2015
Subject:	Review of Complaints
Report of:	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Mike Dawson, Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor M Dean
Number of Appendices:	2

Executive Summary:

Tewkesbury Borough Council has a formal, published complaints procedure. This requires a report to be presented to Overview and Scrutiny every six months, with an update on complaints recorded and managed through corporate feedback management procedures. This report provides an update on the six months from January 2015 to June 2015.

Recommendation:

Members are asked to CONSIDER the information provided and to determine whether any further action is required.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- To ensure that Tewkesbury Borough Council's complaints procedure is followed.
- To ensure that improvements in the quality and performance of the Council and its services can be shown to be informed through learning from complaints.
- To demonstrate that the findings of the Local Government Ombudsman are used to improve Council services.

Resource Implications:

The outcome arising from complaints handling including the findings of the Local Government Ombudsman may impact upon the resources of the authority.

Legal Implications:

The Local Government Ombudsman has power to investigate complaints of maladministration against the Council (subject to certain exceptions) and may make recommendations as to how such complaints may be resolved. Where considered appropriate the ombudsman has the power to issue a formal report on any particular case for consideration by the Council. Although not legally bound to accept any recommendations from the ombudsman it is important that the Council takes careful note of them and learns from any recommendations that he makes.

Risk Management Implications:

If complaints are not handled in accordance with the corporate complaints procedure and the Council does not learn from the complaints received then there is a potential reputational risk to the Council.

Performance Management Follow-up:

Customer complaints, including those made to the Ombudsman are considered every six months.

Environmental Implications:

None directly.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 The Council has a formal complaints procedure which is published on its website. Complaints may also be handled more informally, where the customer prefers this. Complaints are made to our Customer Services team or directly to the service area concerned. Complaints may go on to be reported to the Local Government Ombudsman if the complainant is not satisfied with action taken by the Council or with the complaint outcome.

1.2 Details of complaints included in this report are:

- Formal complaints logged and managed through the corporate complaints procedure.
- Other complaints received through the Council website.
- Complaints to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO).

2.0 COMPLAINTS RECEIVED JANUARY TO JUNE 2015**2.1 Formal complaints**

2.1.1 14 formal complaints were recorded in the first six months of 2015.

0 complainants appealed against the Stage 1 response.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of complaints received:

Table 1 Formal complaints resolved within target times Jan - June 2015

Service area	Total complaints	Within target	Outside target	Upheld	Complaint appeals (stage 2)
Revenues and Benefits	-	-	-	-	-
Development Services	4	2	2	-	1
Environmental Health	2	1	1	-	-
Waste & Recycling	4	3	1	-	-
Grounds maintenance	3	3	-	1	-
Property	1	1	-	-	-
Totals	14	10	4	1	1

2.1.2 See Appendix 1 for a further breakdown of the complaints and details on the complaints trend.

2.2 Complaints Received Online

- 2.2.1 Customers are able to log a complaint online through the Council's website at any time. These are not normally handled as a formal complaint as the customer is generally looking for a service failure to be rectified quickly. The complaint may be handled formally where this is requested, or appears to be warranted.

Table 2 Complaints received through the website

	Jan to June 2015	July to Dec 2014	Jan to June 2014	July to Dec 2013	Jan to June 2013
Total feedback	219	170	181	137	111
– complaints	143	99	132	98	31
– comments	69	59	35	34	21
– compliments	7	12	14	5	6

- 2.2.2 Two compliments were received for Depot Services, one for Grounds Maintenance, one for Elections, one for Revenues, one for IT and one for Housing. All comments received are passed on to service managers or partner agencies.

3.0 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN COMPLAINTS

- 3.1 The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) deals with complaints against all local government authorities in England (except Parish and Town Councils) and certain other bodies. Each year the LGO publishes an Annual Review Letter for every authority which details the number of complaints and enquiries received and the decisions made. This letter is attached to this report at Appendix 2.

- 3.2 During 2014/15, the LGO received 11 complaints relating to Tewkesbury Borough Council (13 were received in 2013/14).

Housing	2	2 – referred back for local solution
Benefits and tax	1	Awaiting decision
Environmental Services and Public Protection and Regulation	3	1 – referred back for local solution 2 – awaiting decision
Planning and Development	4	2 – closed after initial enquiries 2 – referred back for local solution
Corporate and Other Services	1	Closed after initial enquiries

- 3.3 Where the LGO has investigated a complaint the final decision is published on its website, following a three month call in period. The LGO may decide not to publish a decision, for example where it would not be in the interests of the person complaining or where there is a reason in law not to. To view those relating to Tewkesbury Borough Council please go to their website <http://www.lgo.org.uk/decisions/search> and type in the search Tewkesbury Borough Council.

4.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 None

5.0 CONSULTATION

5.1 None

6.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

6.1 Corporate Complaints Policy

7.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

7.1 Local Government Act 1974

8.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

8.1 Complaint findings and follow up actions may impact on the resources of the authority.

9.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

9.1 None

10.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

10.1 Due regard is paid to the relevant policies and schemes during the investigation and resolution of complaints. Outcomes arising from improvement actions as a result of a complaints investigation may be beneficial in these areas.

11.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

11.1 None.

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Helen Langley, Customer Services Team Leader
01684 272609 helen.langley@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendix: Appendix 1 - Complaints Breakdown
Appendix 2 - Local Government Ombudsman Annual Review Letter
2014/15.

Corporate Complaints

Table 1 – Summaries of complaint type January - June 2015

By type of complaint	Total	By remedy	Total	By parish	Total
Quality unacceptable	9	Agreed solution with customer	2	Shurdington	1
Failed to do something	1	Apology and put right	2	Tewkesbury	6
Delays receiving service	2	Explanation provided	5	Hucclecote	1
Discourteous	1	Financial compensation	0	Churchdown	2
Challenge to unacceptable decision	1	Not Listed	5	Bishops Cleeve	1
Other		Other		Not specified	3
Total	14	Total	14	Total	14

By channel	Total
Email / website	4
Letter	8
Phone	2
Total	14

Table 2 – Trend

Previous updates to this Committee on corporate complaints are listed below:

Reporting Period	Total complaints	Response within target time	Complaints upheld	Number of appeals	Appeals upheld
Jan – June 2012	42	26 (62%)	9 (21%)	5	Not reported
July – Dec 2012	18	12 (66%)	6 (33%)	2	Not reported
Jan – June 2013	18	10 (55%)	5 (28%)	3	Not reported
July – Dec 2013	23	9 (39%)	3 (13%)	5	Not reported
Jan – June 2014	28	18 (64%)	4 (14%)	3	0
July – Dec 2014	20	9 (45%)	1 (5%)	4	0
Jan – July 2015	14	10 (71%)	1 (7%)	1	0

18 June 2015

Appendix 2

By email

Mr Mike Dawson
Chief Executive
Tewkesbury Borough Council

Dear Mr Dawson

Annual Review Letter 2015

I am writing with our annual summary of statistics on the complaints made to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) about your authority for the year ended 31 March 2015. This year's statistics can be found in the table attached.

The data we have provided shows the complaints and enquiries we have recorded, along with the decisions we have made. We know that these numbers will not necessarily match the complaints data that your authority holds. For example, our numbers include people who we signpost back to the council but who may never contact you. I hope that this information, set alongside the data sets you hold about local complaints, will help you to assess your authority's performance.

We recognise that the total number of complaints will not, by itself, give a clear picture of how well those complaints are being responded to. Over the coming year we will be gathering more comprehensive information about the way complaints are being remedied so that in the future our annual letter focuses less on the total numbers and more on the outcomes of those complaints.

Supporting local scrutiny

One of the purposes of the annual letter to councils is to help ensure that learning from complaints informs scrutiny at the local level. Supporting local scrutiny is one of our key business plan objectives for this year and we will continue to work with elected members in all councils to help them understand how they can contribute to the complaints process.

We have recently worked in partnership with the Local Government Association to produce a workbook for councillors which explains how they can support local people with their complaints and identifies opportunities for using complaints data as part of their scrutiny tool kit. This can be found [here](#) and I would be grateful if you could encourage your elected members to make use of this helpful resource.

Last year we established a new Councillors Forum. This group, which meets three times a year, brings together councillors from across the political spectrum and from all types of local authorities. The aims of the Forum are to help us to better understand the needs of councillors when scrutinising local services and for members to act as champions for learning from complaints in their scrutiny roles. I value this direct engagement with elected members and believe it will further ensure LGO investigations have wider public value.

Encouraging effective local complaints handling

In November 2014, in partnership with the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman and Healthwatch England, we published *'My Expectations'* a service standards framework document describing what good outcomes for people look like if complaints are handled well. Following extensive research with users of services, front line complaints handlers and other stakeholders, we have been able to articulate more clearly what people need and want when they raise a complaint.

This framework has been adopted by the Care Quality Commission and will be used as part of their inspection regime for both health and social care. Whilst they were written with those two sectors in mind, the principles of *'My Expectations'* are of relevance to all aspects of local authority complaints. We have shared them with link officers at a series of seminars earlier this year and would encourage chief executives and councillors to review their authority's approach to complaints against this user-led vision. A copy of the report can be found [here](#).

Future developments at LGO

My recent annual letters have highlighted the significant levels of change we have experienced at LGO over the last few years. Following the recent general election I expect further change.

Most significantly, the government published a review of public sector ombudsmen in March of this year. A copy of that report can be found [here](#). That review, along with a related consultation document, has proposed that a single ombudsman scheme should be created for all public services in England mirroring the position in the other nations of the United Kingdom. We are supportive of this proposal on the basis that it would provide the public with clearer routes to redress in an increasingly complex public service landscape. We will advise that such a scheme should recognise the unique roles and accountabilities of local authorities and should maintain the expertise and understanding of local government that exists at LGO. We will continue to work with government as they bring forward further proposals and would encourage local government to take a keen and active interest in this important area of reform in support of strong local accountability.

The Government has also recently consulted on a proposal to extend the jurisdiction of the LGO to some town and parish councils. We currently await the outcome of the consultation but we are pleased that the Government has recognised that there are some aspects of local service delivery that do not currently offer the public access to an independent ombudsman. We hope that these proposals will be the start of a wider debate about how we can all work together to ensure clear access to redress in an increasingly varied and complex system of local service delivery.

Yours sincerely



Dr Jane Martin
Local Government Ombudsman
Chair, Commission for Local Administration in England

Local authority report – Tewkesbury Borough Council

For the period ending – 31/03/2015

For further information on interpretation of statistics click on this link to go to <http://www.lgo.org.uk/publications/annual-report/note-interpretation-statistics/>

Complaints and enquiries received

Local Authority	Adult Care Services	Benefits and tax	Corporate and other services	Education and children's services	Environmental services and public protection	Highways and transport	Housing	Planning and development	Total
Tewkesbury BC	0	1	1	0	3	0	2	4	11

49

Decisions made

Local Authority	Detailed investigations carried out		Advice given	Closed after initial enquiries	Incomplete/Invalid	Referred back for local resolution	Total
	Upheld	Not Upheld					
Tewkesbury BC	0	0	0	3	0	5	8