

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 9 April 2019 commencing at 4:30 pm**

## **Present:**

Chair  
Vice Chair

Councillor P W Awford  
Councillor R E Allen

## **and Councillors:**

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

## **also present:**

Councillor G F Blackwell

## **OS.98 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 98.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 98.2 The Chair welcomed the Lead Member for Organisational Development to the meeting who was present as an observer.

## **OS.99 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

- 99.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P E Stokes and P D Surman. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

## **OS.100 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 100.1 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.
- 100.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

## **OS.101 MINUTES**

- 101.1 A Member drew attention to Minute No. OS.92.8 in relation to the Ubico overspend which had been reported as part of the Performance Management Report and questioned which Committee would be taking this forward given that it had also been discussed by the Executive and Audit and Governance Committees. In response, the Head of Community Services provided assurance that Officers were liaising with senior management at Ubico to ensure that these problems did not continue and, going forward, consideration was being given as to how to involve Members with Ubico issues across the board, potentially through establishing an overarching Working Group following the Borough Council elections in May. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that he had met with the Managing Director of Ubico that morning and would be receiving information

regarding the overspend by the end of the week which would be shared with Members of both the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were subsequently approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **OS.102 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

102.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 16-22. 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.

102.2 It was

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

## **OS.103 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20**

103.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 23-36, which attached, at Appendix 1, the draft Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20. Members were asked to approve the Work Programme.

103.2 The Head of Corporate Services advised that the Work Programme detailed at Appendix 1 contained the core work activities of the Committee and was a combination of standing agenda items such as performance management information, complaints, policy and strategy updates, and new areas of review that had emerged and been built into the programme, for instance, Healings Mill and Trade Waste. It was noted that the workshop in relation to the Single Use Plastic Policy had been removed from the pending items as a full report would now be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June. Members were also advised that the Workforce Development Strategy, which had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its last meeting, had been approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 3 April 2019 and a report would be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis in order to monitor delivery.

103.3 With regard to the Single Use Plastic Policy, a Member indicated that he had understood it might be necessary to establish a Member Working Group in order to look at how this could be developed once any 'quick wins' had been delivered. The Head of Finance and Assessment Management confirmed that there would be an opportunity for Members to discuss this further when the report was brought to the Committee in June; however, Officers were not experts in this field and it was felt there was a lack of material for a workshop to discuss wider actions around the elimination of single use plastic in the building and supply chain. Notwithstanding this, Officers were more than happy to look into any particular suggestions Members had for progressing the project. The Member felt it was important to eliminate single use plastic from all Council-owned buildings, including the Leisure Centre, and the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that Places for People, who managed the Leisure Centre, had an extensive policy which could be included in the Council's report.

103.4 A Member indicated that the Committee had asked for a report on Planning Committee overturns which was currently listed under 'pending items' and he asked when that would come forward. The Head of Development Services confirmed that a populated version of the template would be included on the Agenda for the July meeting. It was subsequently

**RESOLVED** That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20 be **APPROVED**.

**OS.104 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE**

- 104.1 The Chair advised that the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel had been unable to attend the last meeting of the Panel and there was no update on that basis, although the Minutes of the meeting were available on the Gloucestershire County Council website.

**OS.105 GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

- 105.1 The Chair indicated that, whilst he was the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee, it was chaired by one of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members and he invited that Member to give a brief update.

- 105.2 With regard to the review of scrutiny, the Chair of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee advised that the Council had recently agreed that the heavy workload of the existing Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee and the complexity of the governance arrangements around a joint Environment with Economic Growth Committee meant that it was probably better to retain separate committees. With regard to the fact that adult social care was not given adequate attention, the proposed separation of Health and Adult Social Care would provide an opportunity for proper scrutiny of both areas. In addition, it was noted that there would be two joint meetings per year specifically to consider issues around integration. This separation meant that there would be one additional Committee, the Adult Social Care and Communities Committee. District Councils would continue to be represented on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee would be retained in its current format.

- 105.3 It was

**RESOLVED** That the update from the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Overview and Scrutiny Committee be **NOTED**.

**OS.106 GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT WASTE COMMITTEE - SIX MONTH UPDATE REPORT**

- 106.1 The report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 37-74, gave an update on progress against the Joint Waste Action Plan 2018/19 as adopted by the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee. Members were asked to consider the report.

- 106.2 The Head of Community Services drew attention to the additional Appendix, circulated separately, which provided a Tewkesbury Borough Council specific project plan and he apologised for this being omitted from the original report. He pointed out that Page No. 39, Paragraph 4.0 of the report discussed the future of the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee and the Joint Waste Team and he was now able to speak openly about the fact that Cheltenham Borough Council had given notice of its intention to withdraw from the Committee in December 2019. This left a number of options for Tewkesbury Borough Council including remaining in the partnership with fewer partners, dissolving the partnership or continuing in a less formal partnership arrangement without a formal Committee. An options appraisal was currently being carried out, the outcomes of which would be

presented to the Council in due course. It was noted that the future of the Joint Waste Team was also part of the consideration with one possibility being that staff would be employed by the individual organisations. The Head of Community Services advised that himself and the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment had made representations to the Joint Waste Committee expressing their preference for a Gloucestershire-wide strategy which they felt was more beneficial than working individually.

- 106.3 The remainder of the report gave an update on the Joint Waste Team and the elements that were specific to the Borough Council and particular reference was made to Page No. 72 which outlined the Javelin Park Energy from Waste project and the street cleansing review. In terms of Javelin Park, a successful solution had been reached through negotiation which would mean that 30% of Tewkesbury Borough residual waste would be delivered directly to Javelin Park – Gloucestershire County Council had commissioned a waste transfer station within Tewkesbury Borough at Wingmoor Farm where the remaining 70% waste would be tipped. This would avoid vehicles having to travel from the north of the borough all the way to Javelin Park which would take a considerable amount of time and subsequently put pressure on the Council's waste services. This had been a significant piece of work and it had taken a long time for the Council, Joint Waste Team and Ubico to secure a beneficial deal.
- 106.4 A Member raised concern at the late circulation of the appendix as it gave very little time for the Committee to scrutinise the information. He was immediately struck by the absence of any 'red' projects and raised concern that this was not a true reflection. He drew attention to Page No. 56 of the report which included a street cleaning operational review which had been given a target date of March 2019 and pointed out that this was included on the appendix with a new date of October 2019 but had been given a 'green' status. In his opinion, the original delivery date of March 2019 had been missed and therefore it should be red or amber – this was just one example and he questioned how many more had not been picked up. The Head of Community Services took the point regarding the late circulation of the appendix and undertook to ensure that it was provided to Members in good time in future. With regard to the comments on the street cleaning review, he clarified that, although work had commenced during 2018/19, Javelin Park had taken considerable Officer resource which had meant that it could not be completed and had to be added to the new 2019/20 work plan which Members had before them. The Member indicated that he had no problem with the fact the project had moved, rather that it had not been correctly flagged as having slipped. This point was taken on board by Officers and it was accepted that the action plan needed to clearly show when particular projects had not been delivered within the original timeframes.
- 106.5 A Member indicated that he was very concerned about the future of the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee; in his view the Committee was a positive thing and he hoped its future would be considered carefully. The Head of Community Services assured Members there was an absolute will to continue to work in partnership across the county, but it was a question of how that happened and what the mechanism for governance would be. In response to a question as to whether the business plan would be obsolete if the Committee was dissolved, confirmation was provided that the work contained within the plan still had to be delivered no matter what, although clearly there would be some changes. In response to a query regarding the roles of the Joint Waste Team, Members were advised that the Environment and Waste Policy Officer was responsible for dealing with the issues which came up on a daily basis; the Contracts Manager was Line Manager for the Environment and Waste Policy Officer and also looked after the Forest of Dean District Council. It was intended for the team to work on larger projects across the county, for instance, there was a will to align waste services in Tewkesbury Borough, Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City to ensure that residents who were living on opposite sides of the road, but fell within different local

authority areas, were receiving the same level of service, and the Joint Waste Team worked closely with both authorities on cross-boundary issues. The Contracts Manager explained that, when the Joint Waste Team was established, the Officers working for each individual authority had been put into the team – the Officer from Tewkesbury Borough Council continued to be the resource for Tewkesbury Borough. The Joint Waste Committee comprised two members from each of the partner authorities and was responsible for delivering the work plan. She stressed that this was no different from each authority having its own action plan but the work was shared in order to make the best use of resources. She and the Environment and Waste Policy Officer were also responsible for contract procurement and management on behalf of Tewkesbury Borough Council and they regularly fed back any issues to the management team in order to work together to make improvements. She confirmed that she had sight of the other authorities' contracts which allowed comparison and sharing of best practice; however, there were differences as everyone worked on different systems. The main point was that the same people would be responsible for delivering the service for each of the local authorities regardless of whether they were in a team.

- 106.6 A Member raised concern that there was currently no consistency between the waste services offered by Tewkesbury Borough, Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils; Tewkesbury Borough Council's waste collection service was very good and he was concerned that this would be compromised should there be a move to align services and also questioned whether the budget was adequate for the forthcoming year. The Head of Community Services reassured Members that there would be no drop in services as the plan was to look at those elements the authorities were already doing similarly and to add consistency to those services with benefits such as fleet procurement etc. Whilst Tewkesbury Borough Council prided itself on its recycling and would not want to see any reduction in levels, Stroud District Council was virtually the best performing authority in the country in relation to recycling so if any lessons could be learnt to further improve the service this would be welcomed. In terms of finances, he reminded Members that the Joint Waste Team's finances were separate from Ubico and the team had not contributed to the Ubico overspend. The Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that the Ubico budget was £3.87M which was an increase of £200,000 and he explained that a 5.5% contingency had been incorporated to cover justified costs, for example, agency staff, and should ensure there was no impact on the Council's bottom line.

- 106.7 It was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was due to receive an update from the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee in October and the Head of Community Services indicated that he was happy to continue to report back to the Committee; if Tewkesbury Borough Council was not involved in the Joint Waste Partnership, the report would be more concise and specific to the Borough Council and any other areas that might impact upon it. Having considered the information provided and views expressed, it was

**RESOLVED** That the progress made in relation to the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan 2018/19 be **NOTED**.

## **OS.107 HOUSING STRATEGY MONITORING REPORT**

- 107.1 The report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 75-104, provided a summary of the key activities during 2018/19 and the changes in activity for year three of the Housing Strategy. Members were asked to consider the progress made to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Action Plan.
- 107.2 The Housing Manager advised that the Executive Committee had approved the Housing Strategy Action Plan for 2019/20 at its meeting in January 2019; this was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and included updated targets. Members were

reminded that the strategy contained four key priorities to meet the housing needs of the borough: increasing the supply of housing; prevent homelessness; meet the housing needs of specific groups; and improving the health and wellbeing of local people. In terms of increasing the supply of housing, Members were informed that two modular housing projects had commenced on former garage sites with a planning application received for the site in Staverton and an application due to be submitted for the site in Winchcombe later in the year. With regard to homelessness and prevention, the government had recently introduced a number of funding opportunities. Tewkesbury Borough Council had led a partnership bid for the Ministry of Communities, Housing and Local Government private sector access funding along with the other Gloucestershire authorities and West Oxfordshire District Council and had been awarded £363,408 which it was hoped would assist 180 households in one year. There had been a raft of other opportunities through partnership working and it was noted that Gloucestershire County Council had been awarded £553,289 of Rapid Rehousing funding to operate two 'Somewhere Safe to Stay' centres which would be located in Gloucester and Cheltenham and would link in with the countywide homeless single person pathways. With regard to Universal Credit, the demand on discretionary housing payments had increased significantly and new claims during homelessness were resulting in higher costs to the authority whilst in emergency accommodation. In relation to improving the health and wellbeing of local people, it was noted that new regulations had come into force in October 2018 altering the definition of Houses In Multiple Occupation (HMO) which required mandatory licensing. This had resulted in 11 new applications which were currently being processed and, as part of these activities, an unlicensed HMO in very poor condition had been identified in Tewkesbury resulting in seven prohibition notices on individual units and an improvement notice on the entire building; Housing Services had rehomed the affected households and the landlord had been prosecuted for being unlicensed. In summary, the Head of Community Services indicated that it had been a really big year and the Homelessness Reduction Act had been very resource intensive so the achievements in the strategy were extremely positive and the team had worked very hard.

- 107.3 A Member drew attention to Page No. 91 of the report which stated that Tewkesbury Borough Council's rough sleeper figure for 2018 was one and he questioned what was being done in relation to that single person. In response, the Head of Community Services explained that this was calculated based on the number of people observed 'bedded-down' between 2300 and 0400 hours; in reality, between 30 and 40 people were homeless and rough sleeping within the borough at some point during the course of a year. With regard to the one person referenced in the figures, it was noted that this individual had mental health problems and had been spending time in both Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Boroughs – the individual had now gone into supported accommodation. Another Member drew attention to Page No. 94 and the actions to procure cost effective temporary accommodation within Tewkesbury Borough for accepted households with poor tenancy histories who were difficult to rehouse, including properties suitable for households with mobility needs, and to stop the use of private bed and breakfast accommodation except in emergencies, and questioned whether the homeless shelters would help to improve the situation. In response, the Housing Manager explained that, unfortunately, it was not the people who continued to be vulnerable under the Homelessness Reduction Act who would use the shelters. Bromford Housing would be providing 12 properties within its stock which would be suitable for use by homeless people; however, it would not consider more chaotic households, therefore this would not eliminate bed and breakfast use altogether. It was noted that the Council was looking at purchasing a property for use as a HMO or similar but it was important to find the right property in the right place at the right cost. In response to a query regarding how to ensure this was retained as temporary accommodation, as opposed to having someone move in and stay in the property, the Head of Community Services explained that Stonham Housing currently managed five

properties on behalf of the Council; however, this would not continue beyond April 2020, therefore, they would either need to be managed in-house or the Council would need to enter into a partnership arrangement with another housing authority to take over their management. His preference would be for the Council to have total control over the properties but this would be dependent on the outcome of the business case which was currently being worked up. A Member questioned whether the action to eliminate use of bed and breakfast accommodation was realistic and was informed this was a government target and it was hoped that, with the assistance of Bromford Housing, this could be limited to emergency use rather than 'business as usual'.

- 107.4 Members congratulated Officers on the amount of funding which had been secured and felt that more should be done to promote this. It was subsequently

**RESOLVED** That the progress made to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Housing Strategy Action Plan be **NOTED**.

#### **OS.108 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REVIEW ACTION PLAN**

- 108.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 105-138, gave an update on progress against the Development Services Action Plan that had been approved by Council in April 2018. Members were asked to consider the report.

- 108.2 Members were reminded that, whilst planning and development management were significant elements, the action plan covered all of the service areas within the remit of the Head of Development Services. It was a strategic document and was a tool to help manage service improvements. With regard to development management, the Head of Development Services indicated that the Key Performance Indicators had previously been presented to the Committee and would be reported back as part of the performance management report; Planning Performance Agreements had been implemented for two planning applications with discussions ongoing in relation to a number of potential others; and re-validation checklists had been published to improve the opportunity for customers to self-serve. In terms of planning policy, the focus had been on responding to the issues and options stage of the review of the Joint Core Strategy and the preferred options stage of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan and they would continue to be a focus for the foreseeable future. Work had also commenced on the development of the Statement of Community Involvement which was hugely important. With respect to economic development, the integration of the Growth Hub as a service within the Council was progressing and surgeries and briefing sessions had allowed better communication between services. Community development was critically important in terms of the place approach and a Member workshop had been held to clarify and define its role.

- 108.3 A Member noted that concerns had previously been expressed about planning application recommendations being contrary to pre-application advice and she questioned what had been done to address that. The Head of Development Services explained that this could happen for a number of reasons, not least changes in planning policy – this was significant in terms of the Joint Core Strategy and the five year housing land supply. Officers always tried to be open and transparent with developers and householders and positive conversations at the pre-application stage would not be over-ruled by a Senior Officer without good reason. Regular meetings with the teams and the Officers responsible for signing-off decision notices had helped with this. A Member drew attention to Page No. 123, Action B.13 ii) which related to creating and publicising Section 106 templates and standard clauses and indicated that the target date had changed from July 2018 to March 2020. He raised concern that people were not aware that Section 106 money was available and made particular reference to a football club in Churchdown which needed new pitches and a cricket club in Down Hatherley that

required a changing room, both of which may benefit from such funding. The Head of Development Services advised that the Executive Committee had approved a new process for administering Section 106 spending in July 2018 and, under that process, where the money was not to be provided to the Parish for provision of community facilities, it would be advertised on the Council's website and bids invited. In many cases, the Council had already received notification of community groups looking for funding. The bids were considered by a Panel which comprised the Lead Members for Community, Finance and Asset Management and Health and Wellbeing as well as herself and Officers from One Legal and Community Services. The Member questioned whether Ward Members could be informed when Section 106 money was available within their Wards and the Head of Development Services undertook to provide updates before the money was allocated. Another Member queried what the process was for payment of Section 106 monies as he was aware of a delay in one particular Parish and the Head of Development Services advised that she would look into this outside of the meeting. The Chair asked for the Executive Committee report and Minutes to be circulated to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to help Members understand exactly what had been approved.

- 108.4 A Member drew attention to Page No. 137, Action H.1 – Discuss tourism role with Members and partners - and indicated that this was quite concerning. The Head of Development Services reassured Members that tourism was very important to the authority and, whilst there was uncertainty in relation to funding and the models of governance in tourism services nationally, it was more about establishing what opportunities there were for additional funding and ensuring that the Council was best placed to maximise those opportunities. It was noted that Officers worked with various destination management organisations, such as Cotswold Tourism, in order to promote Tewkesbury Borough as a tourist destination. A Member made reference to the recent archaeological findings at a site in Innsworth and indicated that, should they prove to be historically important, he would be keen to ensure this was promoted as a tourist attraction. The Head of Development Services confirmed that once the archaeological findings had been unearthed and recorded, consideration could be given as to how they could best be promoted. Another Member questioned how the Growth Hub would be assessed in terms of value for money and was informed that it had its own targets in relation to footfall and number of businesses assisted. The Member felt it would be beneficial to include these in the report going forward.
- 108.5 A brief discussion ensued in relation to the successful garden village bid at Ashchurch and the need to deliver high quality development. The Head of Development Services indicated that the garden village would bring huge opportunities but also significant challenges and it would be important to ensure that the right resources were available to deliver an appropriate scheme for Tewkesbury. The Joint Core Strategy and Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan set out the policies to give the Council 'teeth' to ensure that development within the borough was of a high standard, and this would be particularly relevant in terms of the garden village. Whilst Officers were aware of issues with sub-standard housebuilders, she was confident that appropriate safeguards were in place in terms of planning policy and building control.
- 108.6 A Member noted that a lot of the actions within the plan had been ticked, suggesting that vast improvements had been made within the department, and he queried how the Committee could be assured that was the case. The Head of Development Services explained that a lot of the actions related to structural and procedural changes which had been delivered; notwithstanding this, she provided assurance that nobody was resting on their laurels and Officers were always looking for opportunities to make further improvements. In response to a query as to whether she felt that the changes had made a difference, she indicated that she could see a positive impact in the day-to-day running of the service, but it was ultimately for users of the services to judge whether they had seen an improvement. The Deputy



Chief Executive expressed the view that the Head of Development Services and her team had worked very hard to implement changes and, in his view, this was starting to pay dividends.

108.7 It was

**RESOLVED** That the progress made against the Development Services Review Action Plan be **NOTED**.

## **OS.109 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

109.1 The report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 139-145, provided an update on the Community Safety Partnership. Members were asked to consider the report.

109.2 Members were advised that the report gave an update on the work of Safer Gloucestershire, the countywide group, and the local Tewkesbury Borough Community Safety Partnership (CSP) which had been reconstituted. Safer Gloucestershire had identified six priority areas: locality-based crime; deprivation and vulnerability; safeguarding children; substance/alcohol misuse; domestic abuse/sexual violence; and criminal exploitation. Tewkesbury Borough CSP would support those priorities and engage in activities to promote them where possible. The CSP had now met twice and had agreed its Terms of Reference, attached at Appendix 1 to the report. It was noted that it would take a strategic approach to dealing with community safety in the borough which meant using an evidence-based approach to problem solving. The Head of Community Services reminded Members that, as the CSP had not been in place for a number of years, there was a lack of infrastructure, for example, there was currently no co-ordinated method for collating and tracking anti-social behaviour complaints. It would take time to address these issues but progress was steadily being made and work had started on the community safety strategy for the borough which would be brought back to the Committee in due course.

109.3 A Member raised concern that community safety issues were not being fed back locally as they had been under the previous CSP when representatives from the Police and other partner organisations had attended parish meetings. The Head of Community Services accepted this point but reiterated that the CSP had taken time to establish its priorities and he hoped that Members would soon start to feel more informed. He stressed that the Police had previously indicated to the Committee that they would be happy to send representatives to community meetings on request but did not have the resources to attend every meeting.

109.4 It was

**RESOLVED** That the Community Safety Partnership update be **NOTED**.

## **OS.110 CUSTOMER CARE STRATEGY ACTION PLAN**

110.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 146-156, which provided an update on the progress against the actions contained within the Customer Care Strategy Action Plan. Members were asked to consider the report.

110.2 Members were advised that the Customer Care Strategy had been endorsed by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee workshop in January 2016 and committed to supporting customers by going the extra mile through providing an efficient service, delivered by welcoming and knowledgeable professional staff. In order to achieve this, the strategy was supported by an action plan which was reported to the Committee on an annual basis. A review of the 2018/19 actions was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and it was noted that the majority had been completed.

Members were advised that the review of the effectiveness of the Advice and Information Centres (AICs) had been delayed due to other commitments; however, work had now commenced on the scoping of the project and it was proposed that an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group be established to undertake the review later in the year. In addition, a new target date of October 2019 had been set for the roll-out of Office 365 and a new revised IT Policy had recently been approved by the Executive Committee to facilitate this. It was noted that, as the Customer Care Strategy had been in place since 2016, it was proposed to develop a new strategy and action plan for approval in 2020 to reflect the changes that had been made and the new challenges going forward.

- 110.3 A Member raised concern that, with the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), it was unclear how Members should be dealing with queries they were not able to respond to directly and he felt this could mean that customers did not always get the best possible service. The Corporate Services Manager undertook to look into this following the meeting but she understood that Members should seek permission from the individual concerned if they intended to pass on any personal data e.g. contact information, to anyone who was not an Officer of the Council.

- 110.4 It was

**RESOLVED** That the progress made in relation to the actions contained within the Customer Care Strategy Action Plan 2018/19 be **NOTED**.

#### **OS.111 ANNUAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REPORT 2018/19**

- 111.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 157-187, attached, at Appendix 1, the Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2018/19. Members were asked to approve the report.
- 111.2 A Member drew attention to Page No. 164 which contained a reference to Severn Vale Housing and he questioned whether that should be updated in light of the fact that it no longer existed. In response, the Head of Corporate Services advised that the report looked back at the work that had been undertaken by the Committee during the year and it was accurate in that Severn Vale Housing had been in existence at the time the housing strategy report had been presented, as such, it was appropriate to retain this reference.
- 111.3 The Chair thanked the Officers for the report which he felt was a good reflection of the hard work of the Committee throughout the year. He extended his thanks to Members for their tenacious scrutiny over the Council term and his appreciation to Officers for their support. It was

**RESOLVED** That the Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2018/19 be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 6:35 pm