

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 11 February 2020 commencing at 4:30 pm**

**Present:**

Chair  
Vice Chair

Councillor K J Cromwell  
Councillor J W Murphy

**and Councillors:**

G J Bocking, P A Godwin, P D McLain, J K Smith, R J G Smith, P D Surman, M J Williams, P N Workman, S Thomson and D J Harwood (Substitute for S A T Stevens)

**also present:**

Councillor R A Bird

**OS.76 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 76.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 76.2 The Chair welcomed the Growth Hub Manager to the meeting and indicated that she was in attendance for Agenda Item 7 – Growth Hub Presentation. It was noted that the Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion was also present for that item.

**OS.77 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

- 77.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C L J Carter, H C McLain, H S Munro and S A T Stevens. Councillor D J Harwood would be acting as a substitute for the meeting.

**OS.78 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 78.1 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.

78.2 The following declarations were made:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application No./Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b>
K J Cromwell	Item 12 – Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2020/21 Financial Contribution.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the room for consideration of this item.

78.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

## **OS.79 MINUTES**

79.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **OS.80 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

80.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 8-9. 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.

80.2 It was noted that the Agenda for the meetings on 4 March and 8 April 2020 were very light; this had been raised at the previous Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. The Chief Executive provided assurance that the Corporate Management Team was aware of this and was considering how to populate the Agenda for those two meetings and beyond; the Agenda for the Executive Committee meeting the previous week had been particularly lengthy so it was a question of how to achieve the correct balance. He recognised that it was important for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be aware of what was coming forward in order to determine what scrutiny may be required.

80.3 It was  
**RESOLVED** That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

## **OS.81 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20**

81.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20, circulated at Pages No. 10-15, which Members were asked to consider.

81.2 The Head of Corporate Services explained that the Workforce Development Strategy Review which was on the Agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 10 March 2020 would now be brought to the meeting in June to allow final outturn figures for the set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) contained within the strategy to be provided. It was also noted that it was intended to establish an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group to look at the Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Terms of Reference would be brought to the Committee in April.

81.3 It was

**RESOLVED**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20 be **NOTED** subject to the following amendments:

- Workforce Development Strategy Review – to be moved from March 2020 to June 2020; and
- Council Tax Reduction Scheme Working Group – to be added to the Agenda for the meeting on 14 April 2020.

**OS.82 GROWTH HUB PRESENTATION**

82.1 The Chair indicated that the GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had attended the previous Overview and Scrutiny Committee to give a presentation on its work of which Growth Hubs were a key element. The Growth Hub Manager would now give a more specific presentation in relation to the Tewkesbury Growth Hub.

82.2 The following key points were made during the presentation:

- Tewkesbury Growth Hub: Flagship delivery – First Growth Hub in the world delivered in a local authority setting, opened in 2018; key aims of the Growth Hub network: to help businesses to start-up, grow, boost performance and exploit their full potential, provide support for businesses to accelerate growth and create opportunities for businesses to meet, network and promote their services to each other; the award winning Tewkesbury Growth Hub was doing just that and was a flagship for the county and Growth Hub network; praised for innovative approach to supporting high growth potential businesses; successfully delivering the unique selling point of linking hub support with Council services.
- First year success – Achieved high delivery rate; within the eight months – exceeded annual target for hub visitors, supported over 100 start-up businesses, delivered over 4,000 business support interactions, delivered 160 intensive business growth plans and delivered 55 business events in the hub; punched above its weight in comparison to other larger hubs.
- Businesses supported – 40:60 ratio of start-ups to existing businesses; borough coverage and diverse range of sectors including manufacturing, food/drink, tourism and retail; supported businesses to invest in borough – positive growth rates, employment and business rates; connector of businesses and supply chain development e.g. gin and tea collaboration; working with library growth Hubs – creative sector business group; integrated delivery with other agencies within the building including Job Centre Plus e.g. helping tenants with staffing/employment needs, upskilling and confidence workshops, job fair, self-employed.
- Hub events/Meeting space – Free workshops and one-to-ones led by business experts who give their time free of charge; demand-led e.g. social media, marketing, leadership, HR, sales, funding, green business, video, social enterprise; meeting spaces – local business hub hire and Committee Rooms for training, events and team meetings; co-working – drop in, free workspace, builds local business community.
- Hub Incubator Offices – Support businesses to start and grow; one year lease and growth support from hub and partners; first year - IT company, graphic design and domiciliary care company.
- Hub tenant testimonials – Members were provided with a selection of testimonials from previous and current tenants.

- Hub USP – Council services – Hub is unique in its support as unparalleled access to Council services; offering a one-stop shop approach for regulatory, planning and environmental health advice; positive change to our service delivery model for businesses, putting them at the heart of what we do; business champions – simplifying support services with a single point of contact (planning, building control, environmental health etc); business advice surgery sessions e.g. planning – 37 sessions delivered to date; positive feedback from businesses.
- Business surgeries – positive feedback – Members were given feedback from some of the businesses that had benefitted from the surgeries.
- Case study – Members were taken through a case study on a local delicatessen that had been supported by the Growth Hub.
- Best location for business – Tewkesbury Hub held as an example of best practice by government and other local authorities; visits from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; visits from other councils interested in replicating in their areas; linking Growth Hub, economic development and Council services into a seamless business support service; all combined with the fact that Tewkesbury Borough was the fastest growing district outside of London.

82.3 A Member queried whether figures were available to demonstrate how many new jobs had been generated through new and existing businesses locating to the area and the Growth Hub Manager confirmed that, if it was anticipated that jobs would be created then this would be monitored over the year so she would be happy to provide that information following the meeting. The Member went on to question how the Tewkesbury Growth Hub was advertised and promoted and whether there were plans for expansion. In response, the Growth Hub Manager advised that the Borough News was used for promotion and always generated a spike in enquiries, in addition, there was a social media channel dedicated to the hub and marketing campaigns were run in conjunction with the wider hub network. She explained that using themes to appeal to the right markets and generate new interest was crucial. In terms of expansion, a bid had been made to the GFirst LEP for funding which would double the space to give greater flexibility and entice more people in. The Member questioned whether there was any potential to generate income from Growth Hub events and confirmation was provided that consideration would be given to this going forward, for instance, if the expansion went ahead, it was proposed to introduce a membership model with charges for working in the hub, as had been done in other hubs across the country. The Chief Executive reminded Members that the Growth Hub was run in partnership with the GFirst LEP – the LEP had provided the capital for the Council to provide the hub and to support the upgrade of the Committee Suite which was used as a venue for events for businesses. Tewkesbury Borough Council provided staff for the Growth Hub, which was effectively based on the Council's own economic development unit, therefore, it had been more a question of refocusing how the service would work as opposed to additional resources. The three incubator units provided a small rental income which offset some of the costs to the Council and it was noted that these had been incredibly successful; nevertheless, it was important to remember that this was a partnership between the Council and the LEP.

82.4 A Member sought clarification as to who the business champions were and was advised that they were internal officers who worked within different departments of the Council and represented their services, for instance, a senior planning officer and a business rates officer. The Member also asked whether the short courses were run internally or externally and the Growth Hub Manager confirmed they were all led by businesses who donated their time; in response to a query as to why they did this, Members were advised that a lot wanted to give something back to the

community but it also gave them a platform to interact with other businesses, although she stressed that the courses were all impartial. The Member noted that the Tewkesbury Growth Hub had been described in the presentation as being the first Growth Hub in the world to be delivered in a local authority setting which he found very impressive. The Chief Executive confirmed that it was certainly the only one in the UK and he was not aware of any others on a global scale. He clarified that there were three tiers of Growth Hub – tier one hubs were the headquarters in Oxstalls and Cirencester; Tewkesbury Growth Hub was the only tier two hub; and tier three hubs were basic information points within libraries.

82.5 Another Member questioned what progress was being made in attracting larger companies across the borough in terms of mentoring; whether accommodation packages were offered to attract new companies to the borough; what feedback was received from existing partners and users; and what links had been put in place with other organisations within the Public Services Centre such as the Police. The Growth Hub Manager advised that all authorities within the county were partners with the LEP in terms of the inward investment programme which aimed to attract businesses to the area. With regard to accommodating businesses, she explained there was a land allocation coming forward and they were always looking to allocate more land, for instance, through the Garden Town where there may be an opportunity for an area for advanced manufacturing businesses; the Growth Hub was looking to promote key sectors which had been identified as advanced manufacturing, renewables, agri-tech and cyber. Working with existing companies was also important to allow businesses to expand and the Growth Hub provided assistance with identifying premises etc. With respect to mentors, they were extremely valuable and the team was always looking for new volunteers and was keen to sign up as many large and medium sized businesses as possible. In terms of feedback, the Growth Hub Manager recognised the importance of returning to businesses to establish their wants and needs - that was a question which was regularly asked at the majority of sessions and would be a particular focus now that the Tewkesbury Growth Hub had been open for a year. She explained that the team tried to offer things which businesses would need, for instance there had recently been a sold out event on sustainability, as well as on the demand from businesses which they heard on a daily basis. The Chief Executive explained that the Growth Hub team had worked very hard to help larger business re-locate to the borough and they had been extremely positive about the support they had received. Notwithstanding this, there was more work to do, particularly in terms of building businesses to ensure that the smaller ones could develop and he felt it would be very interesting to see what happened over the next 12 month period.

82.6 A Member queried whether the Growth Hub was looking to make any links with the Tewkesbury District Twinning Association which had a relationship with Miesbach in Germany and the Growth Hub Manager provided assurance that the team worked closely with the Deputy Chief Executive of the GFirst LEP who was the lead on the inward investment programme and was keen to liaise with the Twinning Association in relation to the advanced manufacturing campaign. The Chief Executive explained that this had been discussed with representatives from Miesbach during the last trade visit and was an area of potential; however, one difficulty was that smaller businesses tended to be locally focused due to their nature and larger businesses believed they already had the links they needed to be able to do business without the support of the Growth Hub. Notwithstanding this, he felt that maintaining links was worthwhile, particularly as Miesbach had very similar agricultural businesses to Tewkesbury Borough and there was a particular movement in Germany around sustainability and quality of food production which could be beneficial.

82.7 The Chair thanked the Growth Hub Manager for her presentation and congratulated the team on their hard work and dedication which had ensured the Tewkesbury Growth Hub was a huge success. In terms of going forward, he asked how the success of the Growth Hub would be measured. The Chief Executive explained that Tewkesbury Borough Council was in a contract with the LEP and was required to provide statistics in order to make national comparisons. In addition, the Council monitored economic growth more widely and he suggested that the Committee could receive an annual report on the general economy of the borough. He advised that the Council had been nominated for an award for promoting growth and a lot of statistics had been produced as part of that submission which were extremely positive about the performance of the Council. As such, the Committee may also wish to monitor the general performance of businesses in the borough. The Chair welcomed these suggestions and felt they could all be incorporated into an annual report to the Committee. The Head of Corporate Services reminded Members that the Corporate Risk Register was considered on a quarterly basis by the Audit and Governance Committee and this included an item on effectiveness of the Growth Hub. The Internal Audit team would be conducting an audit on the Growth Hub shortly to ensure it was delivering the partnership agreements with the LEP and to agree a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

82.8 The Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion wished to commend the Growth Hub Manager for her drive, leadership and enthusiasm in taking the Growth Hub from a mere concept to something that was being treated as the gold standard to which others should aspire. The breadth of work that went on in the Growth Hub was extraordinary and one of the most valuable aspects was that businesses could be referred to other businesses in order for them to support one another; networking was another important aspect. In terms of statistics and monitoring performance, he felt that the biggest indicator of success could be seen in business rates for the borough.

82.9 It was subsequently

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Growth Hub Presentation be **NOTED**.
2. That an annual report on economic growth be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to include performance of the Growth Hub and businesses within the borough.

**OS.83 GROUNDS MAINTENANCE WORKING GROUP REPORT**

83.1 The report of the Grounds Maintenance Working Group, circulated at Pages No. 16-24, outlined progress made by the Working Group which had met on four occasions between September 2019 and January 2020. Members were asked to consider the report and to recommend to the Executive Committee that the recommendations set out at Paragraph 3 of the report, including that future monitoring of grounds maintenance be undertaken by the Depot Services Working Group, be approved.

83.2 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee indicated that he had also chaired the Working Group and he thanked Members and Officers for their participation in what he considered to be a very productive Working Group in terms of outcomes. The Head of Community Services echoed these sentiments with regard to it being an effective piece of scrutiny which had really allowed monitoring of how grounds maintenance had been undertaken in the borough. He was pleased to report that, of the 94 areas monitored over the summer, 68 had been maintained to grade A or B standard with only 26 areas classed as C or D. The Working Group had considered a range of aspects of grounds maintenance and made a number of recommendations which were set out at Paragraph 3 of the report. It was noted that there were two particular pieces of work which had not been completed due to time

constraints – exploring potential for introducing a hire contract for equipment; and working with partners, including Parish Councils and housing associations, to look for opportunities to optimise efficiencies – both of which were significant undertakings. As such, it was felt that there was a continuing role for Members to play in terms of monitoring grounds maintenance but it was recommended that this be subsumed into the work of the Depot Services Working Group which had a wider remit to look at the Ubico contract generally.

83.3 A Member pointed out that Page No. 19, Paragraph 2.8 - which stated that Members received an update on the pilot that had been undertaken at Brook Close in Winchcombe where a small discreet piece of highways land had only been cut twice during the growing season and had been closely monitored - did not make sense without reading Page No. 20, Paragraph 3.1.4 which provided a greater explanation of maintenance of land on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council and the trial that had been undertaken to reduce the number of cuts. In addition, he was unclear about Page No. 21, Paragraph 3.1.5 which stated that areas of land that were rated as category D should be “eliminated”. The Head of Community Services apologised that these sections had been confusing and, with regard to the latter, clarified that this meant that the quality of cuts should be raised from category D to category C or higher. The Member also indicated that Page No. 21, Paragraph 3.1.6 in relation to the potential for a hire contact for equipment/sharing across Ubico partners did not specifically state that this would be a comparison between hire and purchase.

83.4 A Member noted the recommendation that the future monitoring of grounds maintenance be undertaken via the Depot Services Working Group and he queried whether any Members of the Grounds Maintenance Working Group also sat on the Depot Services Working Group, and how the wider membership would be kept informed of its work. In response, the Chair confirmed there were three Members who sat on both Groups and the Depot Services Working Group was required to report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a biannual basis. He stressed that the Committee received quarterly performance reports and, should any further issues be identified in respect of grounds maintenance, they could be picked up and dealt with accordingly at that time.

83.5 It was

**RESOLVED** That the progress made by the Grounds Maintenance Working Group be **NOTED** and that it be **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** that the recommendations set out in Paragraph 3 of the report, including that future monitoring of grounds maintenance be undertaken by the Depot Services Working Group, be **APPROVED**.

## **OS.84 REVISED SAFEGUARDING POLICY**

84.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 25-36, which asked Members to consider the revised Safeguarding Policy and to recommend to the Executive Committee that it be adopted.

84.2 The Head of Community Services explained that the Council had a Safeguarding Policy which detailed issues regarding children and vulnerable adults and how to respond, report and work with other local authorities. The original policy had been adopted in November 2016 and required periodical review to ensure it was fit for purpose. There had been a few significant changes to the policy including the incorporation of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and there had been changes at county level which did not affect Tewkesbury Borough Council directly but needed to be acknowledged due to the changes to working together guidance – there had a been a big change in the way safeguarding, especially safeguarding

children, was delivered countywide in that the statutory responsibility was now with Gloucestershire County Council, NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group and Gloucestershire Constabulary as opposed to the County Council being the sole accountable body. One further change which did impact Tewkesbury Borough Council was in relation to the annual audit; previously, district and borough councils were required to complete a Section 11 audit to demonstrate compliance with safeguarding duties; however, this was not the best way to reflect the activities undertaken by those authorities. As such, in future, each agency would provide an annual safeguarding report and the relevant Officer may be invited to an assurance panel to answer questions.

- 84.3 A Member questioned what training was in place for staff and Members in relation to safeguarding. The Head of Community Services advised that he was working with HR and Democratic Services on training for Members and that would be coming forward shortly; in future, Members would receive initial training on induction with periodic refresher training. He provided assurance that the majority of staff and Members needed more of an awareness in terms of what to look out for and who to report it to as opposed to in-depth training. The training was likely to be a seminar as feedback from the previous online Member training had been that it was too long and detailed. He undertook to raise the subject of training at the next District Safeguarding Network meeting which was taking place within the next couple of months and he would then be able to confirm a date for the training.
- 84.4 A Member questioned who had made the changes to the policy and why they had not been highlighted as it was difficult to see what had been amended or updated. The Head of Community Services confirmed that he had made the changes in consultation with the District Safeguarding Network and he undertook to ensure that he provided the current policy as well as the revised policy in future so that changes could be highlighted. Another Member questioned how compliance was monitored to ensure that the Council was not putting people at risk and was advised that the Corporate Management Team considered safeguarding activities on a quarterly basis and he provided assurance that action would be taken if any issues were identified; he stressed that, due to the sensitive nature of the material being handled, it was important that none of this was done within the public domain.
- 84.5 A Member drew attention to Page No. 36, Paragraph 11.1 of the revised policy which related to volunteers and he queried whether they should be required to undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as children quite often helped with activities such as litter picking. In response, the Head of Community Services explained that it was a question of assessing the risk of individuals being alone with children and vulnerable adults and having the opportunity to potentially cause harm – generally litter picking and other voluntary activities were carried out in the open, in full view of other people. He was not aware of volunteers having undergone DBS checks elsewhere but undertook to look into this further. Another Member drew attention to Paragraph 12.1 which referred to elected Members being fully trained and aware of their responsibilities and the correct procedures to follow with regard to safeguarding and he asked whether Members could volunteer for a DBS check to highlight any potential risks. The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that, the level of risk had been carefully considered in relation to Members and, whilst Members were not DBS checked, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor were required to undergo a check given their exposure to children and vulnerable adults as a result of their civic duties. Previous training had highlighted to Members that they should not put themselves in a position where they were alone with a child or vulnerable person and she was not aware that any other local authorities in Gloucestershire carried out DBS checks on their Members. A Member questioned whether volunteers received any training when they enrolled with the Council and if this included safeguarding and the Head of Community Services undertook to find out and advise Members following the meeting. A Member indicated that, in his opinion, the priority should be staff who carried out visits who

would potentially be able to identify vulnerable children and adults, for instance, those who worked in housing, environmental health etc. The Head of Community Services provided assurance that those staff received in-depth training.

84.6 In response to a query as to what lessons had been learnt from reviewing the policy, the Head of Community Services advised that the main change was introducing ACEs which was a very important element. A Member drew attention to Page No. 33, Paragraph 6.2.2 of the report which stated that nearly half of all people in England experienced at least one ACE with around 9% experiencing four or more, and that people with six ACEs died on average 20 years younger than people with no ACEs and he questioned where these statistics were from and what the sample size had been. The Chief Executive advised that the figures were from national research papers and were taken on board by Police and health partners when the ACEs project was established; this had led to a number of projects up and down the country to research and understand that people's behaviour was often as a result of things which had happened in childhood. The Member felt that the source of the statistics should have been noted in the report. The Head of Community Services suggested that it may be beneficial to invite the lead Police Officer to give a Member seminar on ACEs and the Chair indicated that, whilst he would welcome a seminar, Gloucestershire County Council often ran similar events which were open to other local authorities which would avoid duplication.

84.7 A Member drew attention to Page No. 35, Paragraph 8.1 of the report and indicated that bullet point 6 should be amended to read: "6. ~~Regularly review~~ **Safeguarding referrals are regularly reviewed**" and bullet point 7 should be amended to read: "7. ~~Review~~ **This policy and procedure, associated documentation and training plans are reviewed** to ensure that they are fit for purpose". It was subsequently

**RESOLVED**

That the revised Safeguarding Policy be **NOTED** and that it be **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** that the policy be **APPROVED**, subject to the following amendments:

- Page No. 35, Paragraph 8.1, bullet point 6 to read: "6. ~~Regularly review~~ **Safeguarding referrals are regularly reviewed**"; and
- Page No. 35, Paragraph 8.1, bullet point 7 to read: "7. ~~Review~~ **This policy and procedure, associated documentation and training plans are reviewed** to ensure that they are fit for purpose".

**OS.85 TEWKESBURY BOROUGH NEWS REVIEW**

85.1 The report of the Corporate Services Manager, circulated at Pages No. 37-47, provided an update on the progress against recommendations arising from the Tewkesbury Borough News Review. Members were asked to consider the report and to agree that no further reports be brought to the Committee on the basis that all recommendations had been implemented.

85.2 The Head of Corporate Services explained that an Overview and Scrutiny Working Group had been established at the end of 2016 to review the Tewkesbury Borough News. The Working Group report was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and included a set of recommendations which had been agreed by the Executive Committee. The review had resulted in a move from a newspaper to a magazine format and the number of editions had been reduced from three per year to two per year. As the recommendations had all been implemented, it was proposed that the review be closed and no further reports brought to the Committee.

- 85.3 A Member raised concern that he had still never received an edition of the Tewkesbury Borough News; some other Members indicated that they had not received one either but others confirmed that they did receive them regularly. The Head of Corporate Services explained that this had been raised as an issue previously and quite a lot of work had been done with the distribution company as a result. Whilst it was impossible to be 100% accurate with delivery, it had been hoped that the situation would improve and the Communications Officer would contact all Members ahead of the next issue to ask them to keep an eye out for it and report any incidents of non-delivery. A Member drew attention to Page No. 45 of the Working Group report and the last paragraph in the first column which referred to the Council having the “driest recycling rate in the county” and he questioned whether this was a typographical error. In response, the Head of Corporate Services confirmed that this was correct and was an industry term which referred to any recyclate collected in the blue bin e.g. paper and glass as opposed to food waste and compost.
- 85.4 It was
- RESOLVED** That the progress made against the recommendations arising from the Tewkesbury Borough News Review be **NOTED** and that it be **AGREED** that no further reports be brought to the Committee on the basis that all recommendations had been implemented.
- OS.86 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE**
- 86.1 Members received an update from the Council’s representative on the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) on matters discussed at the meeting on 14 January 2020.
- 86.2 The Council’s representative explained that, in relation to the Minutes of the November meeting, a presentation had been given on access to psychological therapies; this was a national programme that had started its roll out in 2008. Over one million adults had accessed this support and the NHS Long Term Plan was to increase this funding to £1.9m by 2023/24. It was concluded that a more detailed look was required to understand how these therapies were accessed and that more joined up working across the age ranges should take place. The power of technology to improve the quality of NHS services was also discussed and generally it was felt that it was not as well used as it could be – currently only 18% of repeat prescriptions were done electronically. The Clinical Commissioning Group performance report updated Members on areas of improvement and it was noted that the four hour accident and emergency target had seen reduced performance but still compared well nationally. Further work was required regarding performance relating to cancer and the 62 day target regarding GP referral, screening and consultant upgrade. Concern had been expressed but the explanation was that the focus had been on assessment targets so that 90% of patients would be reassured within two weeks that they did not have cancer.
- 86.3 Other reports received at the January meeting included fit for the future; the latest Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group performance report; the Gloucestershire Integrated Care System lead report; and the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group/Accountable Officers report. Copies of these reports were available in the Members’ Lounge. The Council’s representative went on to advise that there was currently a trial in relation to the 999 call handling service whereby less urgent calls were advised how long an ambulance would take in order for them to make a choice on whether to wait or find an alternative method of getting

to hospital. It was also noted that a review of neurology inpatient care was about to commence to establish whether better use could be made of staffing and resources.

86.4 A Member indicated that he had needed to take someone to Accident and Emergency at Gloucester Royal Hospital on Sunday morning and had checked the website to find out the waiting time which was 147 minutes with 32 people in front; however, when he had arrived there were only six people in front and the wait was due to the doctor having not arrived. He raised concern that the website was not giving the correct information. The Council's representative undertook to feed this back to the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

86.5 It was

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

#### **OS.87 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2020/21 FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION**

87.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 48-51, asked Members to consider the effectiveness of the Council's continued involvement in the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, subject to the Committee being satisfied that value for money was being achieved, Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2020/21 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

87.2 The Head of Corporate Services explained that Tewkesbury Borough Council made a contribution towards the funding of the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and was represented on that group by a Member nominated by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee who reported back on its work and the action being taken at a county level. Page No. 50, Paragraph 3 of the report set out the work that had been carried out during 2019/20.

87.3 A Member pointed out that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee did not get advance notice of what the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be looking at and he felt it would be helpful to be notified in order for Members to give comments to the Council's representative to feedback in advance of the meeting. The Council's representative confirmed that the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee had a work programme which she could circulate to Members. A Member questioned whether a breakdown was available to show what the £2,500 was used for and the Chief Executive explained that this was purely for a seat at the table; if the Council chose not to make the contribution, they would no longer be entitled to send a representative to meetings.

87.4 It was

**RESOLVED** That Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2020/21 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**OS.88 SEPARATE BUSINESS**

88.1 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.89 SEPARATE MINUTES**

89.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting on 14 January 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The meeting closed at 6:10 pm