

30 January 2023

Committee	Overview and Scrutiny
Date	Tuesday, 7 February 2023
Time of Meeting	4:30 pm
Venue	Tewkesbury Borough Council Offices, Severn Room

ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND

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 (during office hours staff should proceed to their usual assembly point; outside of office hours proceed to the visitors' car park). 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.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Pursuant to the adoption by the Council on 24 January 2023 of the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct, effective from 1 February 2023, as set out in Minute No. CL.72, Members are invited to declare any interest they may have in the business set out on the Agenda to which the approved Code applies.



	Item	Page(s)
4.	MINUTES To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2023.	1 - 14
5.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN 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.	15 - 19
6.	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2022/23 To consider the forthcoming work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	20 - 23
7.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE RURAL COMMUNITY COUNCIL PRESENTATION To receive a presentation from Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) to understand how it fulfils the requirements of the service level agreement.	
8.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (3 February 2023).	
9.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (18 January 2023).	24 - 25
10.	COMMUNITY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PLAN To consider the progress made against the Community Services Improvement Plan.	26 - 30
11.	SEPARATE BUSINESS The Chair will move the adoption of the following resolution: That under Section 100(A)(4) Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.	
12.	SEPARATE MINUTES To approve the separate Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2023.	31 - 33

13. TRADE WASTE PROJECT UPDATE

34 - 39

(Exempt –Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 –Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

To receive an update on the trade waste project.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING**TUESDAY, 7 MARCH 2023****COUNCILLORS CONSTITUTING COMMITTEE**

Councillors: K Berliner (Vice-Chair), G J Bocking, C L J Carter, K J Cromwell, P A Godwin, H C McLain, P D McLain, C E Mills, H S Munro, J W Murphy (Chair), J K Smith, C Softley, S Thomson, M J Williams and P N Workman

Substitution Arrangements

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

Recording of Meetings

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, 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 Chair 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, 17 January 2023 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Vice Chair in the chair

Councillor K Berliner

and Councillors:

K Berliner, G J Bocking, C L J Carter, K J Cromwell, P A Godwin, P D McLain, C E Mills, H S Munro, J K Smith, C Softley, S Thomson, M J Williams and P N Workman

OS.65 ANNOUNCEMENTS

65.1 In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair took the chair for the meeting.

65.2 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.

OS.66 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

66.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H C McLain and J W Murphy (Chair). There were no substitutes for the meeting.

OS.67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

67.1 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.

67.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
P D McLain	Agenda Item 5 – Fit for the Future 2 Outcomes – Presentation.	A member of his family has a senior role in the NHS in the region.	Would speak and vote.

67.3 No further declarations were made on this occasion.

OS.68 MINUTES

68.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2022, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

OS.69 FIT FOR THE FUTURE 2 OUTCOMES - PRESENTATION

- 69.1 Attention was drawn to the Fit for the Future 2 Outcomes presentation, circulated separately. The Chair introduced the Associate Director Engagement and Experience and the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director from NHS Gloucestershire and the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director indicated that the purpose of today's presentation was to inform Members of the outcomes of the engagement activity in relation to Fit for the Future 2.
- 69.2 Members were advised that the key objective was around using the Cheltenham and Gloucester hospital sites as effectively and efficiently as possible by separating planned and emergency care to maximise the opportunity for planned operations without the risk of cancellation due to emergency activity. Five services were being considered as part of the consultation: at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital this was Diabetes and Endocrinology (in-patient), Respiratory (in-patient and high care) and Non-Interventional Cardiology (in-patient); at Cheltenham General Hospital this was Benign Gynaecology (day case) and stroke (in-patient). The Associate Director Engagement and Experience explained that comprehensive engagement had taken place with the residents of Gloucestershire with over 50 engagement events, group meetings and online sessions. Over 3,000 engagement booklets had been distributed and made available in places such as libraries and GP surgeries. There had also been live streaming on Facebook Live – this had been used successfully during the pandemic to connect with new audiences and attract a different demographic and was something which would continue to be used going forward. Over 1,800 face to face conversations had taken place with members of the public and staff through focus groups or when out and about on the NHS Information Bus which had been located in Spring Gardens Car Park and Morrison's in Tewkesbury. More than 200 surveys had been completed which showed people's dedication due to their comprehensive nature – people had been asked to answer the questions which were relevant to them as it was recognised that not everyone would have an interest in all five services. There had also been a lot of communication with partners and presentations had been given to the Primary Care Networks (PCNs), Integrated Locality Partnerships (ILPs) and Clinical Programme Groups (CPGs) as well as the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC).
- 69.3 In terms of what had been learnt from the engagement, the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director explained that staff responses had been separated from the public although he stressed they were not treated differently in their views. There was overall support of more than 90% for four out of five services with the results for Stoke slightly lower at 84% which was primarily due to concerns about vascular surgery and a misunderstanding about how the service would be configured. As well as this qualitative feedback, it was equally important to know what people had to say and several themes had been identified in the feedback from public and patients around supporting the centre of excellence approach; travel and transport; car parking; ward environment – Stroke patients would benefit from a better environment in Cheltenham General Hospital as it was built for rehabilitation with larger rooms etc.; innovation ; and clinical considerations. Similar themes had been identified from staff feedback in terms of benefits of the centre of excellence approach; clinical considerations; travel and transport; car parking for patients; health inequalities; interdependencies with other clinical services – focus on the person as a whole; and improved integration with primary and community services. It was noted that frailty had also been included as part of the engagement to seek views of the population regarding that pathway and the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director explained that no changes were being proposed to where the service was based but there may be opportunities to enhance service integration. The feedback had highlighted a real desire to achieve as much as possible outside of hospital in recognition that it was not always the best place for people to be.

- 69.4 With regard to the next steps, Members were advised that the report was being reviewed by partners including the Integrated Care System Board Executive, Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, National Health Service Executive and Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and was being taken into consideration along with the Clinical Senate Review report to test whether the proposals were clinically appropriate. Subject to the partners being satisfied, it was intended to move to implementation with a decision-making business case in March 2023. It was noted that four out of five services had already re-located (Diabetes and Endocrinology, Respiratory, Stoke and Benign Gynaecology) on a temporary basis but it was necessary to formalise the arrangement in order to make this permanent.
- 69.5 A Member asked whether the care system would be supporting the changes and raised concern as to whether there were enough staff to be able to implement the changes. In response, the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director clarified that it was about the relocation of services and it was not expected that additional activity would be generated as a result. Staffing across the health and social care sector was a challenge and the benefits of centralisation and moving services from two sites to one included more resilient rotas and better management of current resources. Although there was no requirement for additional staff, it was hoped that retention and recruitment would improve. The Member was aware that six patients at Stroud Hospital who were ready to go home last week had been forced to stay as there were no carers available to support them. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director recognised that this was a problem and, whilst these proposals were not part of the solution, they were impacted by it. Another Member went on to challenge the idea that the changes were somehow optimising health services within the county. Cheltenham General Hospital had been operating as a Minor Injury Unit and, in his view, running a single 24/7 Accident and Emergency site out of Gloucestershire Royal Hospital for the population of the county was ridiculous. He raised concern that the relocation of teams would mean that, even during the daytime, there would be no specialists available to deal with emergency cases coming to Cheltenham General Hospital. He questioned whether relocation of four out of five services was ever a temporary measure as the fact the Fit for the Future 2 consultation reinforced this seemed a “fait accompli” and he queried whether the consultation had properly followed the gunning principles. With regard to delayed discharge, the Member went on to reference the Care Quality Commission’s State of Care report and concerns regarding morale, recruitment and retention. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director indicated that he was not in a position to comment on the Care Quality Commission report but this had been discussed at Gloucestershire HOSC in November. He reiterated that it was the in-patient element only so there were still respiratory, diabetes and cardiac patients on the Cheltenham site. There would be more investment in things such as transport between the sites, out of hours etc. to ensure the Cheltenham site had the support it needed. The NHS Gloucestershire Hospitals Foundation Trust had been on record in terms of its support for the Accident and Emergency Department at Cheltenham and it had reverted to its pre-pandemic state in July 2021 opening between the hours of 8am and 8pm. With regard to issues around recruitment and retention, the stress for staff was significant – he worked for the NHS but did not feel the same pressure experienced by colleagues, friends and family on the frontline. It was important to do whatever possible to support their jobs and delayed discharge was of no benefit to anyone. In terms of the gunning principles, the Associate Director Engagement and Experience advised these were not rules, but very good guidelines by which to carry out any public consultation about probable service changes which required consideration to be given to including people at the start of the ideas process and ensuring people had enough time etc. All public sector organisations were required to have regard to the principles and she confirmed that feedback from the engagement had been consciously considered which was the reason for such an extensive output report. It was possible to be challenged on the

gunning principles but she confirmed there had been no challenge in relation to this particular piece of work. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director indicated that, if Members were concerned about the process, they could write to the NHS to express those concerns and how things could be done differently. He provided assurance that, if there was a need to reconsider plans around public improvement then they would do so and it was noted that the business case would not be brought forward until the time for consultation had passed.

69.6

A Member questioned if the proposal to build a completely new hospital had been raised during the consultation as he felt a more radical solution of that nature was needed to address the issues – he had recently seen on the news that the NHS had been built to cope with 55 million people but there were now over 70 million so the reality was it could no longer cope. Morale was at an all-time low and he felt that trying to adapt buildings which were not adaptable was not the answer. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director noted this had been touched on at the previous Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting in July and he recognised that a single hospital had been suggested around five years ago but had not been properly addressed; however, he believed that had now changed and was something which was now being considered more closely. Notwithstanding this, his personal opinion was that, even if the right site could be found, it was a £600m project so funding would be a significant issue. The Associate Director Engagement and Experience advised that, in the 20 years she had been doing her job, she did not think there was a single consultation where the idea of a new hospital had not been raised. The Member was quite right in that some of the infrastructure was old but fantastic remedial work was being carried out at both sites and the reality was that a new hospital was not something which could be afforded currently. She pointed out that the problems would not go away even if a new hospital was agreed as there would be considerable debate about where it was located and its proximity to Cheltenham and Gloucester. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director reminded Members that, during the pandemic it had been beneficial to have two hospital sites – a green site and a red site – as this had meant it had been possible to maintain some level of elective treatment which was not an option for single sites; whilst he recognised this was not a reason not to do something, it was a factor worthy of consideration. The Member raised concern that, in reality, both sites had been red – it was not possible to control who went into hospital and, if they had COVID, infection rates inevitably increased. Staff, including surgeons, were currently being pushed between the two different sites and it was getting to the point that staff were being lost because they could no longer cope; his opinion was that this could not continue and he questioned how a service could be built to be ‘fit for the future’ if the solution was to plaster over old wounds. Another Member agreed that the health service was not built for the current population; the population within Gloucestershire was growing at a considerable rate and he asked how much space was available for departments to grow. If there was a shortage of space, he felt it was important to bring this into the political arena so pressure could be exerted to raise more interest in the county. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director agreed that work would be needed in order to address population growth and there was a gap between where things were and where they should be; however, there were a number of things which could be done to maximise space with small differences adding up, for example, using procedure trolleys or chairs to maximise throughput and moving services to the new day care unit at Cheltenham General Hospital to free up the equivalent of more than 43 beds space at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital which could now be used as assessment rooms. The Member indicated that he was impressed with the online service that was starting to roll out and expressed the view that online consultation had to be an option for a lot of people which would help to free up resources.

69.7 A Member sought clarification as to the implementation process and the services which were not yet in place and asked what the business case was designed to achieve. The Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director advised that the Stroke unit at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital had been moved to Cheltenham General Hospital during the early part of the pandemic, around June 2021, and the Diabetes and Endocrinology (in-patient only) had moved in September 2021. Respiratory could only be run from one location so the in-patient service had been centralised at Gloucestershire Royal in June/July 2021. Benign Gynaecology had moved off the Gloucestershire Royal site during the pandemic with elective cases taking place in Cheltenham. As had been referenced earlier in the meeting, there was a process to follow in accordance with the gunning principles; whilst it was possible to make temporary changes, it was necessary to draw up a business case to make these permanent and services would have to move back to their original sites if changes were not appropriate. The only service which had not already moved was non-interventional Cardiology. Subject to approval, the four services in situ would become permanent in April 2023 with Cardiology moving around August/September 2023. The Member asked if any material changes would be made as a result of the consultation and the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director advised that the consultation did ask for different ways of doing things but no alternative suggestions had been put forward in this instance. Phase 1 of the consultation had proposed more significant change around planned general surgery but Phase 2 was more bounded in terms of the services so there were very few alternatives, for instance, the Hyper Acute Stroke Unit needed to be located on the same site as the Stroke Unit – from June 2020 to February 2022 the Hyper Acute Stroke Unit had been at Gloucestershire Royal and the Acute Stroke Unit had been at Cheltenham General which had not worked as staff had been required to move back and forth between the two sites. The commissioners who ran the Stroke Unit had said themselves that, had the pandemic not happened, they would not have wanted the Unit to be located in Cheltenham; however, better outcomes were being achieved having done that with statistical data improving from D to B which could not have been forecast. A Member noted the early improvements in relation to Strokes and asked if there were any other indications of improvement. In response, the Fit for the Future 2 Programme Director advised that there were reduced cancellation rates for Benign Gynaecology day cases and the length of stay for Diabetes and Endocrinology patients had reduced by just under a day. There was so much going on in healthcare that, to be able to say categorically that an outcome had been caused by one single factor would be unfair – it would be necessary to look at change over a much longer period to be clear what had actually caused it. The Member asked whether any efficiencies had been identified in terms of staffing and was informed that the programme was not about saving money but there would be some financial savings as a result, for instance, having services over two sites required two sets of stock which could be combined if services were operating from a single location. The NHS needed as many staff as it could get so no savings would be made from reducing staffing numbers; rather, it was about using existing resources in a more effective way.

69.8 The Chair thanks the representatives from NHS Gloucestershire for their informative presentation and it was

RESOLVED That the outcomes arising from the Fit for the Future 2 engagement be **NOTED**.

OS.70 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

70.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 20-24. Members were asked to determine whether there were any questions for relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could give to the work contained within the plan.

70.2 The Head of Corporate Services advised that great effort had been put in by Officers to ensure the Forward Plan was populated, as requested by Members. He stressed that, due to the nature of Council business, it was a fluid plan so additional items would come forward and dates may change. He drew attention to Page No. 20 of the report and indicated that the 'Health in All Policies' Policy had been considered by Management Team and needed some further work around how it could be practically implemented so that would not be going to the meeting on 1 February 2023 as set out in the Forward Plan. In terms of the meeting on 1 March 2023, it had been felt prudent to defer both the Council Plan 2020-24 Refresh and the High Level Service Plan Summaries until after the Borough Elections in May.

70.3 It was

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

OS.71 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2022/23 AND ACTION LIST

71.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme, circulated at Pages No. 25-30, and the action list setting out the actions arising from meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee between October 2019 and October 2022, circulated at Pages No. 31-52. Members were asked to consider the Work Programme and the action list.

71.2 The Head of Corporate Services advised that the Work Programme covered the next three meetings which would take Members to the end of the current municipal year. He confirmed that the Review of the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy would be coming to the next meeting on 7 February having been deferred from today's meeting. There were a number of pending items and work was being done at an Officer level to bring those forward into the Work Programme. With regard to the pending items, a Member asked if a date had been agreed with the Police and Crime Commissioner to present to the Committee and the Head of Community Services advised he would take this up with the Commissioner who he was due to meet the following day. Another Member asked what the current situation was in relation to the Parking Strategy and the Head of Corporate Services advised that the Head of Finance and Asset Management had emailed Members of the Working Group to establish whether there was any appetite to reconsider car parking charges - that had appeared not to be the case so he hoped this would come forward sooner rather than later. He undertook to speak to the Head of Finance and Asset Management following the meeting and update Members accordingly.

71.3 In terms of the action list, the Corporate Services Manager advised that 13 of the 54 actions remained outstanding with 11 of those relating to meetings which had taken place in July 2022 or earlier. Members had previously asked for an audit trail of when outstanding actions would come back to Committee and there was now a requirement for Officers to include a target date. The following issues were raised during the discussion:

Meeting Date: 22 October 2019

P31 – Agenda Item – Warm and Well Scheme Update. A Member noted it was proposed that an item on the Warm and Well Scheme was due to be included on the Agenda for a Town and Parish Council seminar by April 2023 and asked if Parish Councils could be made aware of the grants available to open up as warm spaces. The Community and Economic Development Manager clarified that the Warm and Well Scheme was different to the Warm Space Scheme; in terms of the latter, there were two grants available – one which could be used towards the cost of opening up community venues as warm spaces and another which could be used to put on activities and provide food. Funding had been capped at £500 as it had initially been unclear how many venues would come forward but there were funds available so this was being reviewed. There were currently 28 warm spaces across the borough so the scheme was being well-used.

Meeting Date: 12 July 2022

P42 – Confidential Item – Trade Waste Project Update. A Member noted that the project plan was to be circulated by email by January 2023 and she asked if this was on schedule and whether the plan would be brought back to the February Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting in order for Members to discuss it. In response, the Head of Community Services confirmed that the plan was ready to be emailed to Members. It had been discussed in a number of other places, such as the Depot Services Working Group, and the Trade Waste Project was an item on the Agenda for today's meeting but he could see no reason why the project plan could not be brought to the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

71.4 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2022/23 and the action list be **NOTED**.

OS.72 ACTIVE GLOUCESTERSHIRE 'WE CAN MOVE' PROJECT PRESENTATION

72.1 Attention was drawn to the Active Gloucestershire 'We Can Move' presentation, circulated separately. The Community and Economic Development Manager advised that the Council had agreed to provide funding support to Active Gloucestershire's 'We Can Move' project for five years from 2021/22 to 2025/26 and he introduced the Chief Executive from Active Gloucestershire who would be giving a short presentation and answering questions.

72.2

The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire explained that the case for sport and physical activity was very clear and had been proven to change lives, not only from a medical perspective, but it did require behavioural change and therefore was inherently complex and challenging. The positive impact which physical activity could have on mental health meant that it was very important for deprived and new communities - this was particularly relevant to Tewkesbury Borough given the significant population growth in the area. The 'We Can Move' programme had come about as a result of his predecessor joining Active Gloucestershire and the realisation that the approach being taken, based on helping the already active get more active through direct delivery of programmes, was not working. The potential for grassroots participation in sports had not been realised following the 2012 Olympics and this had sparked a period of change during which Active Gloucestershire had worked with Sports England, NHS Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire County Council and district authorities to redefine its role and support the county's approach to sport and physical activity. The Integrated Care Board and Health and Wellbeing Partnership Board, along with Active Gloucestershire, supported 'We Can Move' with training, resources and learning to assist voluntary and professional organisations. 'We Can Move' became the movement to inspire, connect and enable individuals, communities and organisations across Gloucestershire to help the least active to move more. The key values were to be brave – the best way to see if something worked was to give it a go; be curious and listen hard – gather learning, insight and data and look to understand the experiences of those with perspectives furthest from your own; stand shoulder to shoulder – ask for help when you need it, offer it when it would be useful and be prepared to grow ideas together; find the energy – focus on strengths, emphasise the positive and gently challenge the negative; and, build relationships of trust – invest in others as much as in getting things done. He went on to give examples of initiatives where 'We Can Move' had made a significant contribution, the first of which was a countywide yoga programme for schools which had targeted those who were not interested in school sports – typically there was a drop-off in school sports participation in girls aged 14. Active Gloucestershire had worked with Gloucestershire Healthy Living and Learning to develop a yoga programme with an expert yoga teacher which was provided to teachers to deliver in schools. An unintended consequence was that teachers had really enjoyed it and had started to practice yoga themselves. They had found that the eight week programme was not enough so this had been extended to 26 weeks. The second example was the Fall-proof campaign which was about behavioural change aimed to reduce the prevalence of falls in older adults – 29 groups had used the campaign resources in Tewkesbury Borough with over 500 packs being distributed and partnership working had taken place with GPs at The Mythe Medical Practice. This had started to generate more demand for strength and balance classes as people became more aware of the project. Evaluation and monitoring was really important and an evaluation framework had been developed for that purpose – this formed part of the national Sports England evaluations. In terms of what this meant for Tewkesbury Borough, there were a number of different programmes for children and young people with a pilot around creating an active school programme. Cheltenham Borough had 'Move More' which covered part of Tewkesbury Borough and would be expanded to the remainder of the borough going forward. There was access to funding with £200,000 obtained over the last two years and a further £40,000 recently being secured and £5,000 specifically for providing resilience advice to organisations. If any community organisations were struggling financially and had a line of sight to physical activity, he encouraged them to come forward so Active Gloucestershire could help to make their case. Significant investment of £740,000 had been secured for school facilities for sport or physical activity and he would like to see some of the money spent in Tewkesbury Borough so he urged Members to come forward with suggestions.

- 72.3 A Member indicated that he was a school governor in Innsworth and Sportily was the main organisation he was aware of in terms of delivering sports and physical activity initiatives. He questioned what 'We Can Move' had delivered in the Tewkesbury Borough area and whether they worked with Sportily. In response, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire advised that they tried to work with as many partners as possible. 'We Can Move' worked on the basis of a universal, proportionate approach whereby the money went to where it was needed most; however, Active Gloucestershire would like to do more work in Tewkesbury Borough and he would be happy to speak to the Member outside of the meeting. The Member asked whether Active Gloucestershire got involved with the provision of infrastructure for other organisations to deliver what was needed in the area and the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire confirmed that was exactly the type of thing it did by working in a strength-based way with the community in order to achieve sustainable outputs.
- 72.4 A Member thanked the Chief Executive of Active Gloucestershire for his presentation and enthusiasm and she questioned how much funding had gone to Tewkesbury Borough. In response, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire advised that applications for £20,000 funding to organisations had been approved for Tewkesbury Borough which he recognised was not enough; however, he stressed that, once the money was spent, they could ask for more so people should not feel they could not ask for the full amount. The national grant programme had been opened up and Active Gloucestershire provided support with applications – traditional clubs had been discouraged in the past but since the pandemic they were no longer self-sustaining. A lot of the work done by Active Gloucestershire was about making connections within the system so if Members could help with that in any way it would be appreciated. The Member asked how many communities had benefited from the single payment and if there was a specific reason why the £11,000 had not been granted. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire advised that one of the two organisations had not been funded due to a request for further information. In that case, all funding had to be signed off by Sports England. The average amount of funding received by an organisation was £2,500 – during the pandemic this was £1,500 which indicated that need was greater now. The Member asked whether unsuccessful organisations were signposted elsewhere and the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire confirmed that, depending on the circumstances, a different funding route would be suggested.
- 72.5 A Member asked whether there was interaction with planning authorities about how to improve design as a lot of inequalities were as a result of where people lived and proximity to facilities etc. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire indicated that they did not have as much contact as he would like. In his opinion, there was value in being brave and trying new things, for example, closing roads around schools so children had to walk. A Member indicated that this was being trialled in three schools within Gloucestershire. In response to a query as to how Tewkesbury Borough Council and its Members could work better with Active Gloucestershire, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire indicated that he would like to talk to Members more often, not necessarily via the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and he suggested it may be beneficial to hold a less formal session for Members to meet other partners and see how they contributed. Another Member felt it would be helpful for Members to receive more communications from the Community team about the 'We Can Move' project given that the Council was contributing financially. The Community and Economic Development Manager advised that campaigns were shared on social media and via Member Updates but he accepted these were not as frequent as they could be and he undertook to share more information following the meeting.

72.6 In response to a query regarding the line of reporting, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire confirmed it was an independent charity and its strategy had been approved by Gloucestershire County Council – ‘We Can Move’ reported to the Health and Wellbeing Board which was part of the Integrated Care Partnership. A Member indicated that she ran a youth club in the most deprived part of the borough and she asked if Active Gloucestershire did any work with youth clubs and if training was provided for staff to deliver programmes. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire confirmed that they did work with youth clubs but their role was more about enabling organisations to do things as opposed to delivering it for them. A Member noted the earlier comment about the difficulties with ensuring that girls at school stayed active and she asked how Active Gloucestershire engaged with hard to reach groups such as people who were unable to afford yoga classes etc. She indicated that when she had lived in Leeds, a campaign had been targeted at deprived areas which focused on encouraging people to be more active in their daily lives, for instance, getting off the bus a stop early. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire agreed there was great work being done in other areas, such as Leeds, and University College London was developing strategies in line with that theory which could be adapted for different parts of the country. He recognised there had not been enough focus on young people and ensuring physical activity and sport was systematically embedded but this was in the action plan for the current year. A Member noted that The Mythe GP Surgery had been specifically referenced in the presentation and she asked if other GP surgeries were engaging. In response, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire explained that having a primary healthcare provider who understood the benefits of sport and physical activity made a big difference - The Mythe GP Surgery was a real champion and there were a few others dotted across the county but they were still in the minority and he was keen to see more on board. In response to a query as to whether Active Gloucestershire was in touch with the Council’s Community Funding Officer, the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire confirmed that they were. Another Member noted that there had been a lot of references to elderly and young people but no mention of those in the middle who would be the next in line to experience health problems and he asked how Active Gloucestershire targeted the working age population. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire advised that it was harder to obtain funding for that group as they were not seen as a significant risk. There was an active businesses programme which targeted people in work and covered things such as sustainable transport – an active businesses group had been implemented pre-pandemic targeting the area between Cheltenham and Gloucester which aimed to reduce car travel. Active Gloucestershire also supported a number of organisations such as Health and Hustle.

72.7 A Member asked whether Active Gloucestershire helped to make connections in communities, for instance, providing assistance with advertising. The Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire explained that they ran online advice clinics each month where his colleagues would be able to answer this in more detail. The Member asked if Active Gloucestershire would be willing to attend Parish Council meetings and the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire indicated this may be possible as a pilot but there were only 20 people in the team so he needed to be mindful of resources. He was aware that a lot of Parishes in Tewkesbury Borough had Community Infrastructure Levy money to spend so that was potentially an area where Active Gloucestershire could work with them. In terms of funding, a Member queried if there was someone who represented Tewkesbury Borough to ensure it received its fair share and was informed there was a relationship manager for each of the six district authorities in Gloucestershire. The Member asked if there was any sports which people were encouraged not to do, for instance, which could cause injury or damage later in life, and the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire advised that Sports England stated that the benefits of participation in sport or physical activity at any age outweighed the risks.

72.8 The Chair thanked the Chief Executive for Active Gloucestershire for his enthusiastic and enlightening presentation and it was

RESOLVED That the progress of the Active Gloucestershire 'We Can Move' project be **NOTED**.

OS.73 DEPOT SERVICES WORKING GROUP UPDATE

73.1 The report of the Waste Contracts Manager, circulated at Pages No. 53-66, provided Members with an update on the progress of the Depot Services Working Group. Members were asked to consider the report.

73.2 The Waste Contracts Manager advised that the Depot Services Working Group had met on three occasions during 2022/23 and a further meeting was planned on 1 March in accordance with its Terms of Reference. The main considerations had been the Ubico overspend, which was largely due to the increased cost of diesel, and the impact of the pay award going forward; improvement in grass cutting standards with 82% of inspections meeting the required target compared to 48% in the previous year; waste fleet procurement; and, ongoing discussions with Gloucestershire County Council around the grass which Tewkesbury Borough Council cut on its behalf – discussions had reached an impasse but were now moving forward again.

73.3 A Member of the Depot Services Working Group raised concern regarding the discussion that had taken place at the Working Group in relation to land maintained on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council. He felt there had been a lack of understanding amongst Officers regarding the implications of changing the current arrangements – something which had been discussed at length by the former Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group, which had been subsumed into the Grounds Maintenance Working Group and subsequently the Depot Services Working Group. The Waste Contracts Manager explained that, since the Depot Services Working Group had requested that further negotiations take place at a senior officer level, Gloucestershire County Council had been more accommodating and work was being undertaken with Ubico to put together a proposal based on increased capital spend, as such, it was now considered that it may be possible to carry out two cuts per year using cut and collect methods which he hoped would be a good outcome for everyone. The Member explained that certain areas would need to be cut more than twice per year, for instance, the Wheatpieces roundabout which was the gateway to Tewkesbury. In his view it should not be all about money and he felt this needed to be looked into more fully. The Head of Community Services recognised these concerns and clarified that the discussions with the County Council were in relation to having the correct equipment and it would be Tewkesbury Borough Council's decision to continue to cut certain areas more frequently than twice per year but, for the majority of areas, two cuts would be reasonable. The Member raised concern that it was not as straightforward as it seemed, for instance, would the areas be weeded, and he indicated that wildflower planting was something the Grounds Maintenance Working Group had also been keen to explore, and was included in the pending items of the Depot Services Working Group Work Programme, so he asked if consideration would be given to that. The Head of Community Services took this point on board and advised that the initial conversation with Gloucestershire County Council had been financial and the County Council had blankly refused the proposal to pay for eight cuts per year; however, following the Depot Services Working Group meeting in October, further discussions had taken place at senior level about the possibility of using capital funding to obtain the right equipment to allow cuts to take place twice per year, possibly using the 'cut and collect' method. It would take a period of time before natural growth looked aesthetically pleasing but that approach would cost Tewkesbury Borough Council less and benefit all parties; clearly that approach

would not be taken at the entrances to Tewkesbury. A Member noted from Page No. 65 of the report that the recommendation arising from the Grounds Maintenance Working Group was that no further work on wildflower planting should be considered until the project at the Grange Field was complete and its impact evaluated. She pointed out that the project was now complete and the wildflowers looked amazing with a lot of positive comments received so she asked when it would be evaluated and where that would be reported. In response, the Head of Community Services undertook to speak to the Community and Economic Development Manager following the meeting. He felt it was important to remember that the Grange Field project had cost a lot of money and had been paid for by European funding so whilst this was something that could be done across the borough it would be expensive. Notwithstanding this, the evaluation would be important in considering how to move forward with wildflower planting in certain parts of the borough.

73.4 A Member drew attention to Page No. 55, Paragraph 2.11 of the report, and indicated that she had been surprised to read that Gloucestershire County Council only cut twice per year. She received a lot of complaints from residents in relation to grass cutting and, whilst she felt that Tewkesbury Borough Council's grass cutting standards had really improved, the areas maintained by Gloucestershire County Council were a mess – those areas could be adjacent to Tewkesbury Borough Council land which caused a problem. She was unsure what the solution was but she personally did not feel that two cuts per year was enough. In response, the Head of Community Services stressed that it was not suggested to take that approach across the borough but it would work well in more rural areas. A trial had previously been run in a small area in Winchcombe which had been successful and achieved the desired outcome. Another Member noted that the Depot Services Working Group annual report was due to be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in April and he asked whether it would be appropriate to consider that under separate business so Members could have a full and frank discussion about that matter. The Head of Community Services undertook to check whether the financial details were in the public domain and, if that was not the case, the report could be considered under separate business.

73.5 A Member congratulated Ubico and Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers, particularly Customer Services, for the service provided during the recent snow; he had received a lot of compliments from members of the public who had been able to leave side waste out for collection – this was echoed by another Member who mentioned that the Communications team had done a brilliant job of keeping residents informed. The Member went on to note that the Ubico overspend was still quite high so he asked if there were other factors besides the cost of diesel and he questioned if there was potential to cut any costs. In response, the Waste Contracts Manager explained that the only other significant expense had been the increase in depot costs which was due to a historic undercharge which had been rectified by Cheltenham Borough Council. An additional cost of £20-25,000 was expected as a result of the pay award and that would feature in forthcoming financial reports. Unfortunately, he was not aware of any potential savings at this time. With regard to fleet procurement, the Member noted that Page No. 55, Paragraph 2.10 of the report mentioned the possibility of using Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil (HVO) as a fuel source – he asked whether it was intended to use food waste for this and he assumed the vehicles would have to be dual fuel. In response, the Head of Community Services advised that there were financial and ecological questions to be balanced; dual fuel vehicles were an option being considered as it would be possible to switch between diesel and HVO as and when the prices varied but a guarantee was needed from the new vehicle supplier that they would still be under warranty on that basis. The Member explained that he worked for a company which used dual fuel on its entire vehicle fleet which ran on fuel generated from food waste and he asked if there were plans to be able to run the Ubico fleet in that way. The

Head of Community Services indicated that nothing had been looked at in terms of food waste but it was likely that HVO and electric would be form part of the procurement strategy which was being discussed by the Executive Committee in March. Another Member pointed out that most diesel vehicles would run on HVO so he suggested it might be possible to trial this on some of the existing vehicles which were approaching end of life.

73.6 It was

RESOLVED That the Depot Services Working Group update be **NOTED**.

OS.74 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

74.1 Attention was drawn to the report from the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, circulated at Pages No. 67-69, which gave an update on matters considered at the meeting held on 6 December 2022.

74.2 The Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee advised that the main issues discussed were dentistry and mental health. In terms of dentistry, there was currently a shortage of NHS dentists with 29.2% of the population being able to access services in Gloucestershire – a lot of younger people could not find an NHS dentist therefore the focus was on preventative care e.g. giving out toothpaste and advice. Local commissioners had been instructed by NHS England to look at this and it was hoped the situation would improve over the next two years. With regard to mental health, there had been an increase in referrals, particularly into the crisis team, child and adolescent services and those dealing with eating disorders and autism. Specialist mental health practitioners were being employed so that the correct services could be provided at GP level.

74.3 The Committee had also been provided with performance reports and it was noted that weekly reviews were being carried out to check on progress in relation to ambulance call answering times, handover delays, category 2 response times and bed occupancy – all issues which had been in the national media recently. A report from the Gloucestershire Integrated Care Board had referenced pooling of capital budgets to enable investments in specialist Housing Occupational Therapists, nursing to work on better outcomes for the homeless, two hospital step-down flats to aid movement of patients from hospital, fall prevention work and a Housing Frailty Officer. The Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust report had highlighted that £12.1m funding had been secured to transform the tower block at Gloucestershire Royal Hospital.

74.4 A Member was aware that work was being done with universities such as the University of Worcestershire to bring new doctors to the area and he asked if there were any similar plans regarding dentists. The Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee confirmed that efforts were being made to get retain dentists from local dentist schools within the area but a lot wanted salaried roles as opposed to partnerships. As with doctors, dentists tended to go to cities once they were qualified, unless they had areas of specialism.

74.5 It was

RESOLVED That the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee update be **NOTED**.

OS.75 SEPARATE BUSINESS

75.1 The Chair proposed and it was

RESOLVED That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

OS.76 TRADE WASTE PROJECT UPDATE

(Exempt – Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

76.1 Members considered an update on the progress made in relation to the trade waste project and agreed that a further report be brought to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 7 February 2023.

The meeting closed at 7:10 pm

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN 2022/23

REGULAR ITEM:

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

Additions to 1 February 2023

- Military Covenant.

Committee Date: 1 March 2023

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Waste Services Fleet Procurement.	To approve the procurement of the waste services vehicle fleet.	Head of Community Services.	No.
Council Plan Performance Tracker and COVID-19 Recovery Tracker – Quarter Three 2022/23.	To receive and respond to the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's review of the quarter three performance management and recovery information.	Head of Corporate Services.	The information is being considered by O&S Committee on 7 March so a briefing note will be circulated to Executive Committee Members instead.
Council Plan 2020/24 Refresh (Annual).	To consider the Council Plan and make a recommendation to Council.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
High Level Service Plan Summaries (Annual).	To consider the key activities of each service grouping during 2023/24.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Volunteering Policy.	To approve the Volunteering Policy.	HR and OD Manager.	No.
Financial Update - Quarter Three 2022/23.	To consider the quarterly budget position.	Head of Finance and Asset Management.	Yes – moved from 1 February 2023.
Economic Development and Tourism Strategy.	To approve the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy.	Community and Economic Development Manager.	Yes - moved from 1 February 2023.

15

Agenda Item 5

Committee Date: 1 March 2023			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Woodmancote Neighbourhood Development Plan.	To approve for Referendum.	Head of Development Services.	No.
Council's Response to National Planning Policy Framework and Levelling Up Bill.	To agree the response to consultation.	Head of Development Services.	No.
Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Policy.	To adopt the amended Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Policy following vehicle criteria amendment.	Licensing Operations and Development Team Leader.	No.

Committee Date: 29 March 2023 - CANCELLED			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required

2022/23 Items

Committee Date: June 2023			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Planned Maintenance Programme.	To approve the Planned Maintenance Programme.	Asset Manager.	No.
Use of Mobile Surveillance Equipment for Fly-Tipping Investigations.	To consider the results of the six month trial to inform a final recommendation to the Executive Committee on the way forward.	Head of Community Services.	No.
Data Protection Policy.	To approve the Data Protection Policy following consideration by Audit & Governance Committee in March 2023.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes – deferred from January 2023.
Risk Management Strategy.	To approve the Risk Management Strategy following consideration by Audit & Governance Committee in March 2023.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes – deferred from January 2023.

17

PENDING ITEMS

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Date Item Added to Pending
CIL Review of Charging Schedule(s) with the new 'draft' Charging Schedule submitted for approval to go out to formal public consultation.	To consider and make a recommendation to Council.	Head of Development Services.	January 2022. JSP partners to undertake the review at the same time.
Spring Gardens Regeneration Phase 1a report.	To agree the recommendation of the preferred option for the regeneration of Spring Gardens.	Head of Finance and Asset Management.	4 September 2019.
Capital Funding for Additional Waste Vehicle.	To receive a report following exploration of the mechanism for requesting additional capital funding for an additional waste vehicle, and for adding the provision of a new waste collection depot to the Infrastructure List to enable Community Infrastructure Levy funding to be used.	Head of Community Services.	Request by Overview and Scrutiny Committee April 2022.
Council Tax, Business Rates and Housing Benefits Overpayments Debt Recovery Policy	To approve the Council Tax, Business Rates and Housing Benefits Overpayments Debt Recovery Policy.	Head of Corporate Services.	21 June 2022
Licensing Services Review and Restructure.	To approve the new licensing service structure and associated use of funds.	Head of Community Services.	Removed from 5 October 2002 and added to pending on 7 September 2022.
Equalities and Diversity Policy.	To approve the Equalities and Diversity Policy.	Head of Corporate Services.	Removed from 5 October 2022 and added to pending on 21 September 2022.

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Date Item Added to Pending
Car Parking Strategy.	To approve the Car Parking Strategy.	Head of Development Services.	Added to pending on 11 October. Deferred from 16 November until consideration by the O&S Committee and the Car Parking Working Group.
ICT Strategy.	To approve the ICT Strategy.	ICT Operations Manager.	Removed from January 2023 to go into January 2024.
First Floor Refurbishment Project.	To approve the project.	Asset Manager.	Removed from January 2023 until further information is known.
To approve the 'Health in All Policies' policy.	To approve a policy to better consider the Council's approach to health and wellbeing in the community.	Head of Community Services.	Removed from 1 February 2023 until the policy has been considered by Management Team.
Asset Management Strategy.	To approve the Asset Management Strategy.	Head of Finance and Asset Management.	Yes – from 1 February 2023.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2022/23

REGULAR ITEMS:

- **Executive Committee Forward Plan**
- **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2022/23 (to include the Action List Update on a quarterly basis – June, September, January and March meetings each year).**

<p><u>Additions to 7 February 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidential Item – Trade Waste Project Update – as agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 January 2023. <p><u>Deletions from 7 February 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Economic Development and Tourism Strategy – Moved to 11 July 2023.
--

Committee Date: 7 March 2023			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Council Plan Performance Tracker– Quarter Three 2022/23	To review and scrutinise the performance management and recovery information and, where appropriate, to require response or action from the Executive Committee.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Housing and Homelessness Strategy	To monitor delivery of the actions in relation to the Housing and Homelessness Strategy.	Head of Community Services	No.

Committee Date: 4 April 2023			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Use of Mobile Surveillance Equipment for Fly-tipping Investigations	To consider the results of the six month trial to inform a final recommendation to the Executive Committee on the way forward.	Head of Community Services	No – moved from pending items.
Customer Care Strategy	To consider the progress made against the actions within the Customer Care Strategy during 2022/23 and to endorse the action plan for 2023/24.	Corporate Services Manager	No.
Communications Strategy 2020-24	To consider the progress made against the actions within the Communications Strategy during 2022/23 and to endorse the action plan for 2023/24.	Corporate Services Manager	No.
Depot Services Working Group Annual Report	To receive the annual report on the work of the Depot Services Working Group and to consider whether there is a continuing role for the Group and if any changes to the Terms of Reference are required.	Head of Community Services.	No
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2023/24	To consider and approve the forthcoming Committee work programme.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.

Committee Date: 4 April 2023			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report 2022/23	To approve the annual report as required by the Council's Constitution to ensure that the activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are promoted, both internally and publicly, to reinforce transparency and accountability in the democratic process.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel Update	To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (24 March 2023).	N/A	No.
Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee Update	To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (30 March 2023).	N/A	No.

PENDING ITEMS			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Date Item Added to Pending
Scrutiny of Relationship between the Council and Community Policing	Follow-up from the update on local policing arrangements – as agreed at the O&S meeting on 7 June 2022. Mutually convenient time to be agreed with the Police once the new Chief Inspector has had time to settle into the post.	Head of Community Services	7 June 2022
Community Safety/Aston Project Presentation	To evaluate whether it is delivering against its Terms of Reference – agreed at the O&S meeting on 7 June 2022	Head of Community Services	7 June 2022
Parking Strategy	To endorse the findings of the Parking Strategy Review and approve the draft strategy for public consultation / To consider the consultation responses and to recommend to the Executive Committee that the strategy be approved.	Head of Finance and Asset Management	Delayed from 7 June 2022 due to Officer resources (added to pending October 2022).
Police and Crime Commissioner Presentation	To receive a presentation from the Police and Crime Commissioner.	Head of Community Services	22 November 2022

Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee – 18 January 2023 - Summary Report

Supporting Small Businesses and Assistance for Start-Ups

The report was taken as read but David Owen, Director of Economy and Employment, presented a brief summary:

- 1-year and 3-year business survival rate is higher in Gloucestershire than in the rest of England and the South West, though business birth rate is slightly worse than the South West Average.
- Unemployment still very low (2.3%) and both the Growth Hub and SAGE programme are credited with Gloucestershire's good performance here.

Discussion centred around these key areas:

- Whilst a 60% business success rate may suggest a lot of businesses are failing by 3-years, the 60% does not include figures for other outcomes such as businesses that are sold.
- More start-ups are being supported by the SAGE programme as they have moved from one-to-one to many-to-one interventions.
- Officers are still awaiting final discussions about funding through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) which is in the control of the districts. Central Government core funding for 2023/24 will have a 50% reduction.
- Recruitment was highlighted as a key area of concern.
- Each Growth Hub has a speciality with the new Hub being opened in Cheltenham specialising in cyber. There's also specialism in the county for agri-tech start-ups but, generally, they have a broad approach wanting to support businesses across all sectors.

Addressing the Labour Shortage

The report was presented by Pete Carr, Head of Employment and Skills, and he focused on:

- Plans to work with employers to help make new roles as attractive as possible for candidates, including increasing salaries. Also supporting colleges and training providers to ensure they are giving training that develops employees that the labour market needs.
- Health and social care and cyber identified as sectors being specifically targeted because of their significant shortfalls.
- They are also keen to make the most of encouraging migration to help with labour shortfalls.

Discussion centred around these key areas:

- Automation and how that can help fill gaps in the workforce as well as increasing productivity.
- Improving refugee and migrant employment uptake from businesses by better publicising success stories and potentially looking into employment agencies.
- Members were also interested to explore whether Gloucestershire County Council leads by example in terms of creating work environments that are attractive to the economically inactive and that support current employees.

- Significant concern was raised over the rise in housing costs and the lack of housing development to combat this. Without sufficient and affordable housing, people won't be able to move to Gloucestershire even if there are career opportunities.

GCC Economic Dashboard

Katherine Martin, Data Analysis Manager, gave this presentation (available at [EconomicDashboardJanuary2023final.pdf \(gloucestershire.gov.uk\)](#)). It is quite a visual presentation focusing on unemployment and economical inactivity in the labour market.

Discussion centred around these key areas:

- How best to encourage people out of early retirement. There is anecdotal evidence of this happening as the cost-of-living crisis affects people's retirement funds but returning to work is currently dis-incentivised by the tax code.
- There are also strains due to many more people looking after family members post-Covid and so not being able to work. Flexible working was explored as a way to help in some cases.

ACTIONS

- Pete Carr to explore the process for employers to bring migrants over to the UK to work and whether there is anything they can do to support that.
- Committee Terms of Reference to be discussed at the meeting on 25 May 2023.
- 'Reflection on the LEP's delivery against the Strategic Economic Plan and proposals for the future delivery of the refreshed Local Industrial Strategy' discussion item scheduled to be split into two items:
 - 'Reflection on the LEP's delivery against the Strategic Economic Plan' – 25 May 2023
 - 'Proposals for the future delivery of the refreshed Local Industrial Strategy' 30 November 2023
- Glassdoor.com website to be circulated to Members.
- Update on rail transport within Gloucestershire, including potential for rail expansion, to be added to the Agenda for 20 July 2023.

Councillor Kevin Cromwell

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	7 February 2023
Subject:	Community Services Improvement Plan
Report of:	Head of Community Services
Head of Service/Director:	Head of Community Services
Lead Member:	Lead Members for Clean and Green Environment, Community and Housing
Number of Appendices:	1

Executive Summary:

A full service review of Community Services was undertaken in 2018 which identified a number of areas for improvement. This report provides a progress report on the action plan that was developed following the service review. The actions related to the various teams that sit within Community Services and this report provides an update on some of the key actions. Updates on all actions can be found within the appendix to this report. Officers consider that no further reports on this item are necessary.

Recommendation:

To CONSIDER the progress made in relation to the Community Services Improvement Plan and to AGREE that no further reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee are required.

Financial Implications:

None arising directly from this report.

Legal Implications:

None arising directly from this report.

Environmental and Sustainability Implications:

None arising directly from this report.

Resource Implications (including impact on equalities):

None arising directly from this report.

Safeguarding Implications:

None arising directly from this report.

Impact on the Customer:

None arising directly from this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In 2018, a review of Community Services was undertaken and an improvement plan produced. It was agreed by the Executive Committee that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would receive an update on the implementation of the identified improvements.
- 1.2 The majority of the improvements have been implemented; one has been delayed and some superseded by events or other Council priorities.
- 1.3 Much of the routine work of the team was put on hold for almost two years as a result of the global pandemic. Environmental Health was at the forefront in dealing with combatting the pandemic by providing advice to businesses and communities.
- 1.4 This report highlights some of the key actions and improvements that have been made and the document at Appendix 1 shows progress against all actions.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

- 2.1 One of the improvements within this service area was to undertake a trial of a new way of working by moving the staff into geographical teams where they would work in a more generic manner, dealing with all of the various elements of environmental health work within that geographic area. This way of working was trialled for a period of six months and the feedback from Officers was negative. The main reason for this was because Officers felt comfortable dealing with areas of work within their professional discipline, for example, food safety or environmental protection, but they lacked the in-depth knowledge of the other disciplines outside of their specialist areas. For this reason, and following consultation with the team and with HR, the team has moved back to the method of working previously used i.e. Officers working across the whole borough within their specialism.
- 2.2 A further improvement in this area was to recruit to vacant posts within the structure. This action was implemented and the team is now fully staffed.

3.0 HOUSING

- 3.1 New legislation was introduced in 2018 which required the Housing team to change the way it worked. The Homelessness Reduction Act 2018 required Council Housing departments to undertake a much more preventative approach to those threatened with homelessness and the improvement plan identified that the level of resource required to work in this way would need to be increased. New officers were employed and the team has implemented the new legislation which is now embedded into the way that they work.
- 3.2 The improvement plan also highlighted the need to work better with the private sector. This remains challenging and a pilot carried out in 2019 to offer incentives to landlords to take those on benefits or lower incomes proved to have limited benefit. The team still work closely with private landlords where the opportunity arises.

4.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY

- 4.1 The Council's Community Safety Partnership (CSP) has been suspended in Tewkesbury Borough and one of the actions was to reintroduce the CSP. This was done prior to the pandemic; however, the partnership is yet to deliver a meaningful Community Safety plan. This remains the only outstanding action from the improvement plan.

4.2 The Council previously did not have any resource to tackle anti-social behaviour (ASB) and the improvement plan introduced the development of a Community Safety team. There is now a team of two Officers in place who deal with ASB supported by a Community Safety Coordinator. The Council is about to enter into a trial partnership with Gloucestershire Police in order to improve the way it deals with persistent and high level ASB.

5.0 LICENSING

5.1 A full review of the Licensing service has been carried out and this service is subject to its own improvement plan, which is reported regularly at the Transform Working Group, Programme Board and to the Licensing Committee. Therefore, the actions in the improvement plan have been superseded.

6.0 CONSULTATION

6.1 HR were consulted on any staffing changes that arose from the improvement plan.

7.0 ASSOCIATED RISKS

7.1 None

8.0 MONITORING

8.1 No further monitoring of this action plan is proposed.

9.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL PLAN PRIORITIES/COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

9.1 Corporate Enforcement Policy and Environmental Health Enforcement Policy.

Background Papers: Executive Committee report - Community Services Review - 11 July 2018.

Contact Officer: Head of Community Services
01684 272259 peter.tonge@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 - Community Services Improvement Plan – Action Plan

Appendix 1 – Community Services Improvement Plan – Action Plan

Ref:	Summary of Improvement	Council value / priority	Update	Implemented
	Environmental health			
EH-1	Implement the new structure.	Customer focussed services Economic development Housing	The new structure was trialled for six months and the feedback from Officers was that the level of training to work in various environmental health disciplines was too great and was negatively impacting on the service. Therefore, a decision was taken to revert to the old structure.	✓
EH-2	To deliver on the Council's enviro-crime action plan.	Customer focussed services	The enviro-crime action plan has been fully implemented and updates have been provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Numerous enforcement actions have been undertaken and are publicised regularly.	✓
EH-3	To ensure that hazards in properties in the private rented sector are minimised.	Housing / Homelessness.	A dedicated Officer is now in place to deal with hazards in private sector housing. Whilst this Officer is employed on a temporary basis, they have trained permanent Officers who are now competent to deliver this work.	✓
EH-4	To ensure that all of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) in the Borough are licensed and inspected in line with current legislation.	Housing / Homelessness.	All HMOs that the Council is aware of in the area are now either licenced or in the process of being licensed.	✓
EH-5	To ensure that the team are taking appropriate and risk-based enforcement action in all types of business premises targeting rogue traders where needed.	Economic development (Better Business for All).	Enforcement action is taken in line with the Council's Environmental Health Enforcement Strategy.	✓
EH-6	To ensure that Environmental Health comments on planning applications are made in a timely fashion.	Customer focussed services Economic development Housing	This remains challenging; however, commenting on planning applications has been brought back in-house.	✓
EH 20	Ensure that a baseline of performance is established and promote continuous improvement against a suite of KPI's.	Customer focussed services Streamlined Service Delivery	KPIs are reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as part of the performance tracker.	✓
	Housing			
H-1	To deal appropriately with the new requirements of the Homelessness Reduction Act in preventing homelessness and limiting the negative impact on the community of homelessness.	Housing / Homelessness.	Additional Officers employed and the Act has been implemented within the Council.	✓
H-2	To work better with the private rental sector including private landlords to deliver a sustainable supply of temporary and emergency accommodation.	Housing / Homelessness.	A pilot working with private sector landlords was undertaken in 2019 the reports of which were reported back this the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Officers continue to work with private sector landlords as and when the opportunity arises.	✓
	Community Safety and Enforcement			
CS-1	Implement a new structure for dealing with community safety issues.	A place where a good quality of life is open to all.	The new structure has been implemented and is working well to tackle ASB.	✓
CS-2	To reintroduce an effective Community Safety Partnership (CSP) which will develop a Community Safety strategy to meet the needs of the borough in tackling low level crime and ASB and engender a feeling of safety within the borough.	A place where a good quality of life is open to all.	CSP in place with Terms of Reference etc. A Community Safety Plan is yet to be developed.	April 2023
CS-3	To provide better support to the Community and Place Development Officers in their role relating to community safety and crime and disorder reduction.	A place where a good quality of life is open to all.	The Community and Place Development Officers report cases of ASB to the team and they are effectively dealt with.	✓

Appendix 1 – Community Services Improvement Plan – Action Plan

Ref:	Summary of Improvement	Council value / priority	Update	Implemented
	Licensing			
L-1	To provide a level and quality of service in accordance with 'Public Sector Internal Audit Standards' that contributes to an effective and efficient licensing service.	Customer Focus Streamlined Service Delivery	Superseded and now forms part of the licensing service improvement plan.	✓
L-2	To ensure that the licensing objectives are regulated in premises and at events within the borough.	A place where a good quality of life is open to all.	Superseded and now forms part of the licensing service improvement plan.	✓

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted