



## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

**TUESDAY 22ND AUGUST 2017**  
**AT 6.00 P.M.**

**PARKSIDE SUITE - PARKSIDE**

**MEMBERS:** Councillors L. C. R. Mallett (Chairman), S. A. Webb (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, C. J. Bloore, S. R. Colella, M. Glass, C.A. Hotham, R. J. Laight, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas and M. Thompson

### **AGENDA**

1. Apologies for Absence and Named Substitutes
2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Arrangements

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on: (Pages 1 - 14)

24<sup>th</sup> April 2017  
26<sup>th</sup> June 2017

4. Local Government Act 1972

During consideration of item No 5 it may be necessary to

**"RESOLVED:** that under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the

Act, as amended, the relevant paragraph of that part, in each case, being as set out below, and that it is in the public interest to do so:-

- | <u>Item No</u> | <u>Paragraph(s)</u>   |
|----------------|---|
| 5              | 3 (Information relating to financial or business affairs)   |
| 5.             | Burcot Lane Site Redevelopment - Presentation   |
| 6.             | Update in respect of Council's Economic Priorities - Presentation   |
| 7.             | Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group - Final Report (Pages 15 - 32)   |
| 8.             | Hospital Car Parking Charges (Pages 33 - 36)  |
| 9.             | Finance and Budget Working Group - Update   |
| 10.            | Measures Dashboard Working Group - Update   |
| 11.            | Task Group Updates  |
|                | CCTV Short Sharp Review (Cllr Steve Colella, Chairman)<br>Social Media Task Group (Cllr Rod Laight, Chairman)   |
| 12.            | WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Pages 37 - 44)  |
|                | The minutes of the most recent meeting of the HOSC are attached for information.  |
| 13.            | Cabinet Work Programme (Pages 45 - 52)  |
| 14.            | Overview and Scrutiny Board Work Programme (Pages 53 - 58)  |
| 15.            | To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting. |

K. DICKS  
Chief Executive

Parkside  
Market Street  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B61 8DA  
14th August 2017



## **INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC**

### **Access to Information**

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

- You can attend all Council, Cabinet and Committee/Board meetings, except for any part of the meeting when the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- You can inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- You can inspect minutes of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards for up to six years following a meeting.
- You can have access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to six years from the date of the meeting. These are listed at the end of each report.
- An electronic register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc. is available on our website.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public will be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards.
- You have access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned, as detailed in the Council’s Constitution, Scheme of Delegation.

You can access the following documents:

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- The Council’s Constitution

at [www.bromsgrove.gov.uk](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk)



## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

**24<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors L. C. R. Mallett (Chairman), S. A. Webb (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. R. Colella (until Minute Item No. 117/16), C.A. Hotham, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas (from Minute Item No. 115/16) and M. Thompson

Officers: Ms. J. Pickering and Ms. J. Bayley

111/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor R. J. Laight.

The Board was advised that there was the possibility that absent Members had provided their apologies in advance to a member of staff who was unable to attend the meeting due to unforeseen circumstances. Members agreed that any such apologies should be noted and approved at the following meeting of the Board.

112/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING ARRANGEMENTS**

There were no declarations of interest nor of any whipping arrangements.

113/16 **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD HELD ON 27TH MARCH 2017**

The minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on Monday 27th March 2017 were submitted.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be approved as a correct record.

114/16 **TASK GROUP UPDATES**

The Board received updates in respect of ongoing Task Groups and Short Sharp Reviews.

a) **Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group**

The Chairman of the Task Group, Councillor S. R. Colella, reported that the group had undertaken detailed scrutiny of the staff survey

at various meetings. A number of lessons had been learned about joint scrutiny working and these needed to be taken into account for the future. However, during the course of the review it had become apparent that the situation in respect of the staff survey was changing and some of the group's terms of reference were out of date. The group's findings would be recorded in an interim report and this would be presented for Members' consideration at the following meeting of the Board.

b) Social Media Task Group

In the absence of the Chairman of the Task Group Councillor M. Thompson explained that there had been no meetings of the group since March.

c) CCTV Short Sharp Review

The Chairman of the group, Councillor S. R. Colella, explained that no meetings had been held since the last meeting of the Board. As agreed during the previous meeting Officers had consulted with non-executive Members to find out whether any would be willing to participate in the review. Councillors C. J. Spencer and S. A. Webb explained that they would be interested in becoming Members of the group.

**RESOLVED** that Councillors C. J. Spencer and S. A. Webb be appointed to serve on the CCTV Short Sharp Review.

115/16

**JOINT SCRUTINY WORK WITH REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

The Board considered a proposal that had been received from Redditch Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee to undertake joint performance scrutiny where appropriate.

Members were advised that Redditch Members had established a Performance Scrutiny Working Group, which had a similar remit to Bromsgrove District Council's Measures Dashboard Working Group, in June 2016. At the latest meeting of the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members had agreed that the Performance Scrutiny Working Group should continue with its work in 2017/18. Redditch Members had become aware that there were similarities between the work of the Performance Scrutiny Working Group and the Measures Dashboard Working Group and had felt that it might be useful to hold informal meetings to enable Members to share ideas and best practice. The Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee had also proposed that joint scrutiny meetings could be held, involving Members of both working groups, where the same issues were identified as suitable for further scrutiny.

Councillor S. A. Webb, the Chairman of the Measures Dashboard Working Group, explained that the group had discussed this proposal at

their latest meeting. Members had had some concerns that due to delays accessing the dashboard on their iPads the group was at a different stage in terms of scrutinising the performance of Council services to Redditch Members. For this reason Members concurred that it would be premature to hold joint scrutiny meetings in 2017/18. However, there was recognition that informal meetings, every 6 months, could add value as it would provide an opportunity for Members from the 2 Councils to share ideas.

**RESOLVED** that in 2017/18 informal meetings should be arranged every 6 months between Redditch Borough Council's Performance Scrutiny Working Group and Bromsgrove District Council's Measures Dashboard Working Group to share ideas and understanding of best practice in performance scrutiny.

116/16

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17 AND REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

Members considered a draft copy of the Overview and Scrutiny Board's Annual Report 2016/17. During consideration of the document the following points were raised:

- A similar format had been used for the content of the annual report as had been adopted in previous years.
- The final version of the annual report would be presented by the Chairman of the Board at a meeting of Council in the new municipal year.
- A copy of the Chairman's foreword was circulated for Members' consideration during the meeting and it was agreed that this should be added to the final version of the report prior to publication.
- There was general agreement that reference to the staff survey in the Chairman's foreword should reflect the concerns that had led to the launch of the joint scrutiny review.
- A number of typographical errors were identified in the membership gallery and it was noted Councillor Spencer's profile had been missed accidentally and needed to be added.
- Members suggested that it would be helpful if the report could clarify that the annual report covered the municipal year 2016/17 and the months included within this period.
- The Board agreed that the information provided in respect of the staff survey review should be amended to recognise that the exercise had been launched after the second survey results had been reviewed by Members due to concerns about the level of progress that had been achieved since the first survey had been conducted.

The Board also considered the role of the Finance and Budget and Measures Dashboard Working Groups during the year. There was general consensus that these groups had made a constructive contribution to the scrutiny process and should be retained in 2017/18. Due to the workload of these groups the possibility of reducing the

number of Board meetings had been discussed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman with Officers. However, Members agreed that until the work programme planning process was improved for the Cabinet the number of meetings should remain the same to provide the Board with opportunities to pre-scrutinise relevant items of business.

Finally Members concluded this item by discussing the timing of meetings of the Board. Some Members suggested that it would be preferable to reschedule meetings of the Board so that these did not take place on Monday evenings, as this often conflicted with Parish Council meetings. However, the Chairman noted that the calendar for 2017/18 had already been developed and it would be difficult to reschedule meetings of the Board at this stage. Under these circumstances Members agreed that the day when meetings of the Board were held should be reviewed for subsequent years.

**RESOLVED** that

- (1) The Finance and Budget Working Group and Measures Dashboard Working Group should continue to form part of the Council's scrutiny process in 2017/18; and
- (2) Subject to the amendments detailed in the preamble above, the content of the Overview and Scrutiny Board's Annual Report 2016/17 be approved.

117/16

**CABINET WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the content of the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme for the period 1<sup>st</sup> May to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2017. The Board noted that the majority of items were scheduled for consideration at a meeting of the Cabinet due to take place on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2017. As this would be on the eve of the general election questions were raised as to whether this meeting would still go ahead and Officers were asked to consult with the Leader in respect of this matter.

The Board's recommendation in relation to the Work Programme, which had been proposed at the previous meeting, had been approved by Cabinet. Senior Officers were also aware of the concerns raised by Members in respect of the amount of notice provided for items on the Work Programme. The subject would be raised again at forthcoming meetings of the Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Members were advised that it was possible some of the items due to be considered in June would need to be rescheduled. In particular, Officers suggested that the *Burcot Lane Site Future Development* item might need to be considered on a different date potentially necessitating an extra meeting of the Board to enable pre-scrutiny of the report.

The inclusion of a number of shared service business cases on the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme was noted by the Board. Members suggested that given the potential relevance of these items to future



# Agenda Item 3

Overview and Scrutiny Board  
24th April 2017

service delivery these reports might be suitable for pre-scrutiny. As such the suggestion was made that consideration should be given to postponing these items until July 2017, though it was noted that the business case for Legal and Democratic Services might need to remain on the agenda for the June meeting of Cabinet due to recent changes in personnel.

118/16

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the contents of the Board's work programme and in so doing noted that a number of items which had been scheduled for consideration in April had been postponed. This included an update report in respect of the Council's economic priorities, which had been rescheduled for consideration at the June meeting of the Board to provide time for additional detail to be gathered. The latest biannual update on the planning backlog data, for the period up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017, had also been postponed and it was anticipated that this would now be received in June 2017.

The Chairman concluded the meeting by thanking every Member of the Board for their hard work as well as the 2 Democratic Services Officers and the Executive Director for Finance and Corporate Resources for their support during the year. Members also extended their thanks to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board.

The meeting closed at 6.40 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

26TH JUNE 2017, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors L. C. R. Mallett (Chairman), S. A. Webb (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. R. Colella, M. Glass, C.A. Hotham, R. J. Laight, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas and M. Thompson

Observers: Councillor C. B. Taylor

Officers: Ms. J. Pickering, Ms. A. Scarce and Ms. J. Bayley

10/17 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

The Board was advised that Councillors C. Allen-Jones and M. Thompson had advised in advance of the meeting that they would be arriving late due to other commitments.

The Chairman informed the Board that Councillor J. M. L. A. Griffiths had stood down from the Board due to the change in Committee places following the by-election in June 2017. There remained a vacancy on the Board which would be filled in due course.

11/17 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING ARRANGEMENTS**

There were no declarations of interest nor of any whipping arrangements.

12/17 **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD HELD ON 24TH APRIL 2017**

Members noted that the minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 13th June, and not 24th April 2017 as recorded in the agenda, had been submitted. There was general consensus that the minutes from the April meeting of the Board should therefore be considered at the next meeting.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on 13th June 2017 be approved as a correct record.

13/17 **SCRUTINY TOPIC PROPOSAL - PARKING ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

The Board considered a proposal that had been received for there to be a scrutiny review of parking enforcement in the district. The subject had originally been raised in a Notice of Motion at a Council meeting held on

# Agenda Item 3

Overview and Scrutiny Board  
26th June 2017

26<sup>th</sup> April 2017. During the Council meeting Members had concluded that the Board should be asked to consider whether this would be a suitable topic for further scrutiny.

The following points were discussed whilst Members were debating this proposal:

- The costs involved in undertaking parking enforcement work and the extent to which income from fines covered these costs. Officers advised that this income did not always cover the costs of preventative work.
- The extent to which parking problems were greater in parts of the district outside Bromsgrove. Members noted that parking problems were especially acute in some of the other towns in the district and within the vicinity of local schools.
- The number of Parking Enforcement Officers in the district and the extent to which this was sufficient to meet local needs.
- The areas in which the Parking Enforcement Officers were deployed and the frequency with which they visited different areas within the district.
- The time taken by Parking Enforcement Officers to respond to reports about parking violations.
- The extent to which Parking Enforcement Officers focused on patrolling hot spots.
- The potential for a Task Group to investigate the safeguarding implications of parking around schools and whether this should more appropriately be addressed by ward Councillors.
- The extent to which drivers were flouting existing Parking Enforcement Regulations and the action that could be taken to address this.
- The impact of the introduction of new double yellow lines on parking problems in surrounding areas.
- The extent to which parking problems were taken into account by the County Highways Department when considering planning applications for new housing developments.
- The objectives of the Parking Enforcement Service.
- The challenges created by the urban design of many of the streets within the district in respect of parking.
- The problems residents reported with cars parking on pavements.
- The role of the Police in terms of parking enforcement.

The Board noted that there were a number of scrutiny reviews ongoing and that there would be limited capacity to facilitate another review until some of these had been completed. However, Members concurred that it would be helpful to receive further information on the subject in relation to many of the points and concerns that had been raised by Members during the course of the meeting. For these reasons Members concluded that relevant Officers should be invited to attend a future meeting of the Board to discuss the subject of planning enforcement at

which stage a decision would be taken as to whether the matter should be investigated further.

**RESOLVED** that Officers be invited to attend a future meeting of the Board to discuss Parking Enforcement arrangements in the district and to respond to some of the concerns raised by Members during the course of the meeting.

14/17

## **FINANCE AND BUDGET WORKING GROUP - UPDATE**

The Chairman of the Finance and Budget Working Group, Councillor L. C. R. Mallett, explained that the group's terms of reference had been attached to enable Members to reflect on the group's role at the start of the municipal year. There were only 4 Members on the group and this number was not considered to be ideal when considering budgetary matters from a strategic perspective. The Board therefore welcomed Councillor Laight's offer to join the group.

15/17

## **MEASURES DASHBOARD WORKING GROUP - UPDATE**

The Chairman of the Measures Dashboard Working Group, Councillor S. A. Webb, explained that the group had been holding regular meetings during which Members had scrutinised the measures associated with each of the strategic purposes in turn. In some cases the group had highlighted where the detail provided for the measures was out of date. In other cases Members had suggested that the style in which the measures were being presented could be changed.

Members were reminded that at the April 2017 meeting of the Board a decision had been taken to participate in informal meetings with Members of Redditch Borough Council's Performance Scrutiny Working Group. An invitation had subsequently been sent to the Chairman of the Redditch group to attend one of the Measures Dashboard Working Group's meetings later in the year.

The Board noted that at a recent meeting of the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee it had been reported that the internal auditors had commented on the reliability of the dashboard. Officers noted that the level of assurance for the dashboard would continue to be addressed by Internal Audit and Officers could take into account the findings of the Measures Dashboard Working Group as part of this process.

16/17

## **TASK GROUP UPDATES**

The Board received verbal updates in respect of the following scrutiny reviews:

- a) CCTV Short Sharp Review

The Chairman of the CCTV Short Sharp Review, Councillor S. R. Colella, advised that the group had held a meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2017. The Head of Community Services and the CCTV and Telecare Manager had attended this meeting to discuss the service with Members. Various issues had been addressed during this meeting including the history of the service, funding arrangements, the performance of the service and the extent to which Members could influence the locations in which CCTV cameras were installed.

A number of further meeting dates had been agreed and the group would report back to the Board later in the year.

b) Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group

The Chairman of the Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group, Councillor Colella, explained that a meeting of the group was due to take place on 27<sup>th</sup> June. During this meeting Members would consider a draft report which outlined the group's findings. In particular the group had found that many of the issues arising from the staff survey had already or were in the process of being addressed by the Programme Board. As such the Chairman suggested that it would be appropriate to draw the review to a conclusion. A number of draft recommendations had been identified and these focused on taking constructive action that would have a positive impact in the future. The group's report would be presented for Members' consideration at the following meeting of the Board.

c) Social Media Task Group

The Chairman of the Social Media Task Group, Councillor R. J. Laight, informed Members that a meeting of the group had taken place the previous week. During this meeting the feedback received from Members in completed surveys had been considered and this had revealed that a number were not confident about using social media and required training. The Council's Communications Manager had been invited to attend a future meeting to discuss the group's findings and potential uses of social media. The group was aiming to complete their review by October 2017.

17/17

**WORCESTERSHIRE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - UPDATE**

Councillor S. A. Webb, the Council's representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC), explained that there had not yet been a meeting of the Committee. The first meeting of the Committee in 2017/18 would take place in July.

18/17

**CABINET WORK PROGRAMME**

Members were advised that there had been no further editions of the Cabinet Leader's Work Programme published since the last meeting of the Board.

A number of items had been selected for pre-decision scrutiny during the previous meeting including; Burcot Lane Site Redevelopment, Industrial Units Outline Business Case and the update report in respect of the Council's economic priorities. However, none of these items were scheduled for the consideration of Cabinet until September 2017 and this meeting would take place before the meeting of the Board that month creating difficulties in terms of scheduling the items for pre-scrutiny. As there were other items due to be considered at the Board's September meeting Members concurred that this should not be rescheduled. Instead there was general agreement that the meeting of the Board that had been due to take place on 31<sup>st</sup> July should be postponed to provide Members with an opportunity to pre-scrutinise the relevant items. The proposed date for this meeting would be Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> August, subject to the availability of relevant Officers. Members were advised that the meeting of the Measures Dashboard Working Group that had been scheduled to take place that evening could be postponed to start once the meeting of the Board had finished.

19/17

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME**

Members considered the Board's work programme and noted that the items scheduled for consideration at the 31<sup>st</sup> July meeting would now be considered in August, as agreed earlier in the meeting.

20/17

## **PLANNING BACKLOG DATA**

The Board received a report detailing the determination times for major planning applications in the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and in so doing noted the following:

- Improvements continued to be made in the processing of major applications by the Council.
- Highways issues presented a challenge in respect of the planning process and this had been discussed at recent Council meetings.
- The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services and Strategic Housing advised that he would shortly be attending a meeting with the Leader of Worcestershire County Council, together with the relevant Cabinet member for Highways at the County Council and the Leader and Deputy Leader of Bromsgrove District Council, to discuss these highways issues further.
- The time taken by the Council to process minor planning applications was not due to be scrutinised at a national level and there were no plans to add data for these applications to the update report.

21/17

## **PLANNING POLICY REVIEW BUSINESS CASE - PRESENTATION**

The Board considered the draft Planning Policy Review Business Case and received a presentation from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Strategic Housing Services about the proposed structure for the team. Following prior agreement of the Chairman, the Head of Planning and Regeneration called in to the meeting and participated in the presentation and debate on this item through telephone communication.

During consideration of this item the following points were discussed:

- The Planning Policy team dealt with strategic planning documentation and planning policies.
- The proposals in the business case would help both Councils to achieve budgetary savings.
- Under the proposals the assistance provided by the team in relation to conservation issues would be enhanced helping the Council to better meet local demand.
- The proposal would be for Bromsgrove District Council to host the service due to the higher number of listed buildings and conservation areas in the district compared to the Borough of Redditch.
- The structure would enable Officers to represent both Councils in relation Planning Policy issues where the local authorities had differing views.
- The benefits of the shared service would be the enhanced opportunities to share resources and expertise. The service would also be more flexible than existing structures.
- The shared service proposals followed the implementation of the shared Development Control Service across the 2 Councils.
- The introduction of a shared Planning Policy team would not impact on the Planning Officers who presented planning applications at meetings of the Planning Committee.
- The proposals in the business case had been reviewed by the HR team to ensure compliance with legal requirements and Council policies.
- The Council needed to ensure that all roles in the new structure and the financial implications for both Councils were properly assessed.
- The Board suggested that there was a need in all business cases to provided junior staff with an opportunity to achieve career progression.
- The Board also discussed the value of a review of pay grades and the uniformity of job roles within shared services as a whole in future.

**RESOLVED** that the Planning Policy Review Business Case be noted.

(During consideration of this item Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore



# Agenda Item 3

Overview and Scrutiny Board  
26th June 2017

agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that information would be revealed relating to labour relations matters. However, there is nothing exempt in this record of proceedings).

The meeting closed at 7.25 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

22<sup>nd</sup> August 2017

#### STAFF SURVEY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Geoff Denaro
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service for Overview and Scrutiny	Claire Felton – Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services
Wards Affected	N/A
Ward Councillor Consulted	No
Non-Key Decision	

#### 1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

To consider the findings and recommendations from the Scrutiny investigation undertaken by the Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

##### 2.1 Members are requested to:

- (a) consider and approve the report and the recommendations attached at Appendix 1; and
- (b) submit the report and recommendations to the Cabinet for approval.

#### 3. KEY ISSUES

For the first time, Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils have worked together to carry out a joint scrutiny task group. The Staff Survey was an area which Bromsgrove Members had considered on a number of occasions in previous years, with it first considering it back in 2013. Following receipt of the results of the second survey at its meeting in 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016 Members agreed, that as little progress appeared to have been made on a number of areas of concern, it was something which needed further investigation and would be suitable for joint scrutiny as the majority of staff were part of a shared service.

A topic proposal and a brief joint scrutiny protocol were considered by the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board at its 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016 meeting. Following the agreement of the Board the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Cllr Colella attended the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting putting forward its proposals. The Redditch Committee supported the proposal and the joint Scrutiny Task Group was formed. As it was the first time joint working had been carried out both Overview and Scrutiny functions agreed that the membership would be taken from the main committees on this occasion.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

22<sup>nd</sup> August 2017

---

### **Financial Implications**

- 3.1 There are no direct financial implications other than officer time and general resources.

### **Legal Implications**

- 3.2 There are no direct legal applications arising from this report.

### **Service/Operation Implications**

- 3.3 Overview and scrutiny is a key part of the Council's democratic decision making process and enables non-executive Members of the Council to put forward recommendations for policy development, policy review and service improvement.

### **Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

- 3.4 N/A

## **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 4.1 N/A

## **5. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group Report

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

See attached report for details.

## **7. KEY**

None

## **AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Amanda Scarce & Jess Bayley – Democratic Services Officers

E Mail: [a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) / [jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

Tel: 01527 881443

## **STAFF SURVEY JOINT SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT**

**JUNE/JULY 2017**

**Membership:**        **Bromsgrove District Council –**  
Councillor Steve Colella (Chairman)  
Councillor Caroline Spencer  
Councillor Shirley Webb

**Redditch Borough Council –**  
Councillor Jane Potter (Vice Chairman)  
Councillor Tom Baker-Price  
Councillor Jenny Wheeler

### **1. Executive Summary**

The purpose of this report is to confirm the findings of the Staff Survey Task Group to date and to redefine the scope in view of the suggested recommendations.

The Group must now change its focus and needs to move on from its assessment of the 2016 Staff Survey and the Performance Board's work programme. The Task Group has made every effort to drill down to get to the bottom of why there was a perceived low response to completing the survey but feels that this has now become outdated and overtaken by new Performance Board work streams.

The Task Group needs to now concentrate its work on ensuring that the next survey is fit for purpose, well defined, focused and that the outputs are robust in order that clear corporate and performance indicators can be developed. This in turn will ensure that the two authorities are performing efficiently and effectively to the highest levels of service. To support this outcome it must support initiatives that will ensure staff are supported, motivated and focused and that their wellbeing is a major contribution to making both Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Councils amongst the best performing authorities in the country.

The recommendations made by this Task Group are focused on ensuring that the preparation for the next survey (scheduled for autumn 2017) is designed and delivered based on the areas of improvement established from the work of this group.

It is proposed that a Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff be appointed to attend staff briefings with the Chief Executive Officer to show that Members are there to support staff and want to hear their views as well as ensuring that 'lessons learnt' from previous surveys are not ignored.

Through this recommendation it will reinforce the point that staff had a key role to play in supporting the Council to become more efficient, especially in the light of the challenging targets set in the Council's Financial Efficiency Plans.

The outcomes from the next and subsequent surveys must help support the most effective use of resources as well as being the platform from which staff morale and wellbeing become an integral part of improved performance across the authority.

The role of the Chief Executive and Performance Board will be a primary focus for change, building on the emerging corporate work streams. The enhanced and Member supported staff surveys will add value and focus to corporate actions.

During the life of this Task Group a number of important issues were identified that will also form additional recommendations from this interim report. These include the identified need to establish a well-founded and regular two-way performance management system that incorporates targets and objectives; a review of the quality of management information and the quality and purpose of the Dashboard system.

I would like to thank the Democratic Services' officers for their hard work and dedication to this task group and to officers and Executive Team for their support and help over the last year. I would like also to thank fellow Bromsgrove Councillors as well as Redditch Borough Councillors in what has been the first joint Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group across both authorities.

Cllr Steve Colella  
Chairman

## **2. Recommendations**

The Overview and Scrutiny Board/Committee is asked to recommend:

- a) That a member of the Overview and Scrutiny function be appointed to the role of Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff.
- b) The Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff and the relevant Portfolio Holder from each Council assist in the formulation of all future staff surveys and attend staff briefings.
- c) A quarterly update on the Programme Board's Action Plan be received by the Overview and Scrutiny Board/Committee.
- d) The Performance Scrutiny (RBC) and Measures Dashboard (BDC) Working Groups' terms of reference are updated to include an area covering performance management processes, performance target and objective setting across both authorities. (It is envisaged that this would be achieved through joint meetings being held on a regular basis.)

### **3. Introduction, and Background Information**

For the first time, Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils have worked together to carry out a joint scrutiny task group. The Staff Survey was an area which Bromsgrove Members had considered on a number of occasions in previous years, with it first considering it back in 2013. Following receipt of the results of the second survey at its meeting in 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016 Members agreed, that as little progress appeared to have been made on a number of areas of concern, it was something which needed further investigation and would be suitable for joint scrutiny as the majority of staff were part of a shared service.

A topic proposal and a brief joint scrutiny protocol were considered by the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board at its 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016 meeting. Following the agreement of the Board the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Cllr Colella attended the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting putting forward its proposals. The Redditch Committee supported the proposal and the joint Scrutiny Task Group was formed. As it was the first time joint working had been carried out both Overview and Scrutiny functions agreed that the membership would be taken from the main committees on this occasion. The first meeting of the Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group took place on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016.

### **4. Observations**

A number of observations have been made by the Group which they would like to note. The Group acknowledge the importance of carrying out joint scrutiny, but are concerned that in this case due to the nature of the subject being scrutinised and the timescale for setting up the Group itself (from when the subject was considered by the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board to the first meeting of the Group over 8 weeks had elapsed), together with the work that was being put in place to address the issues raised in the staff survey have not made it an easy subject to consider.

As is highlighted in the detail within various points in section 4 below, the work of the Programme Board, which was set up to address those issues, has progressed at such a pace that the Task Group Members were unable to have significant influence or input into that work, although it should be noted its concerns over a number of the actions being taken were raised with the Chief Executive and supporting officers. It has also made it clear to those officers for the need to increase the number of respondents to any future staff surveys. After much deliberation the Task Group feel that little can be gained from continuing to look at the previous results, but can make recommendations which will ensure Members involvement in any future surveys at the earliest stage, that being at the creation of the survey through to the completion and analysis stages of it.

### **5. Terms of Reference**

For ease of reference, this report will comment on different areas within the Terms of Reference (attached at Appendix 1) in order to show that the Group has considered and addressed, where possible, those areas which were initially highlighted by Members as in need of a more detailed investigation.

## Scrutiny of the Survey Results

The Task Group found it difficult to come to many firm conclusions from the outputs of the survey. The Group were informed that these outputs had been grouped to form 3 main work streams (Organisational Culture, People Management and Meeting our Customers' Needs) led by the Performance Board (which had been set up following the Staff Survey to address the outcomes of it) made up of Kevin Dicks, Sue Hanley, Deb Poole and Amanda Singleton. The Group looked at the results of the survey and also the Performance Board's work stream and discussed with officers the actions that were being taken.

The Group felt that it can make a positive contribution to future surveys taking a 'lessons learnt approach' and through the creation of a Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff role. This would be a member of the Overview and Scrutiny function, who would be seen to support staff by supporting the Chief Executive at staff briefings and being available to talk to staff who may wish to share their views. By providing a more "hands on" approach this would enable Members to see and hear at first hand the views of staff and also take part in discussions around issues which may be identified within future surveys.

## Scrutiny of the survey process and quality of the survey and the low response rate and implications

The Task Group felt that the process was widely promoted giving staff time to complete the survey, sending regular reminders and offering support where necessary. However, it was agreed that the quality and quantity of the questions was too broad and lacked the necessary range and type of responses that would allow robust analysis and give a true picture of staff views.

Whilst the Group felt that the 25% response rate was low, based on own work life experiences, Officers felt that it was a reasonable return. The Group remained unhappy with the low response rate and the implications that certain groups will have been over represented and others under represented, thus, resulting in biased results. Equally the Group thought Performance Board Work streams were therefore being put in place in response to issues raised by a minority of staff rather than the majority.

The Group therefore agreed that it was imperative that the Overview and Scrutiny function be involved in the creation of any future surveys, which would allow for a different perspective to be given. This also shows that the Group's views have been heard and officers understand that Members are keen to ensure that the staff are both listened to and understood. Officers are aware of the concerns raised around the response rate and will work with Members to increase the participation rate in future surveys.

Whilst the Group were unhappy with the low response rate and the implications from this (Members were concerned that actions were being put in place in response to issues raised by a minority of staff rather than the majority) after lengthy discussions it was agreed that their efforts would be better spent in ensuring that future surveys received a much higher return rate.



## Investigation into model surveys and consider the criteria of the previous survey and lessons learnt

It was found to be difficult to do comparisons with other Councils in respect of the survey content. Members acknowledged that it was important to have some comparative data and therefore understood the need for the most recent survey to be along the same lines as those issued in 2013.

However, with such a variety of services being provided it was difficult to ask the same questions of everyone, as these were not always relevant to some areas and therefore it was suggested that future surveys may be better placed if they were tailored to particular areas e.g. separating frontline and customer facing services from enabling services.

The questions for each of these services would be more effective if they were specific to each of those areas. There should also be an opportunity to either add a note or to say “sometimes” rather than having to give a clear “yes” or “no”.

## Consider how to increase the response rates in future

The Task Group found that because the Programme Board had already started to introduce work streams from the survey it was difficult for the Group to also pinpoint actions from it.

It was therefore agreed that it was essential for the Group to concentrate its efforts in supporting officers to ensure that the response rate to future surveys was increased, the range and quality of questions were conducive to extracting a balanced view across the service and ensuring that the questions were been tailored to meet the roles and responsibilities of each service provision.

The Programme Board Action Plan had already considered how to move this forward and individual Heads of Service had put forward suggestions on how to encourage and support staff in completing the next survey. The role of the Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff and the involvement of the Overview and Scrutiny functions will also play an important role in reassuring staff that they are listened to and actions are taken and ensure that there is an increase in both the number of surveys completed and the quality of the responses.

## Consider the merits of the questions both in terms of desired outputs and the number of questions

The resulting work streams were discussed and the Group agreed that both the Cultural Referendum and the Meeting Customer Need survey appeared to be a knee jerk reaction to some of the results in the original survey. Members were not clear as to how the two surveys linked back to the findings of the original survey and were again concerned that this reaction was to responses from a minority of staff and may not represent the general view of the staff.

As detailed in the relevant section of the topic proposal headings, Officers need to ensure that any future survey content is formulated to get the maximum information that can be used in a constructive way and that does not necessitate further surveys being sent out. The Group agreed that both the Cultural Referendum and the Meeting Customer Need survey appeared to be a knee jerk reaction to some of the results in the original survey.

## Bench mark survey with other similar organisations and marque organisation

As detailed and discussed, in several earlier sections, it is equally difficult to bench mark the survey against that of any other authority due to the individual needs of residents in different parts of the country and the different ways in which services are being provided these days. Whilst other authorities will discuss such a survey in general terms there is a reluctance to share any detail around staff responses.

## Establish reasons for the low response rates

Without speaking to members of staff as to why they had not completed the survey the Group had made the assumption that this was due to a number of issues; there was apathy amongst staff based on no visible actions being taken from previous surveys, the delay in receiving published survey results, a feeling that the survey “does not apply to them” or staff did not have time to complete the surveys.

Anecdotally the Group established that the low response rates were also caused by the length of the survey, the structure of the response options as well as having few staff low literacy and IT skills.

Members were advised that all these issues would be addressed through each Head of Service creating an Action Plan on how they would deal with the low response rates for their individual teams in the future. Again, the Group agreed that it was the responsibility of the Overview and Scrutiny functions to ensure that these are addressed for any future surveys, through support and monitoring.

## **6. Lead Member for Staff**

Following its final meeting when the recommendations and content of this report were discussed the Task Group agreed that it may be useful to include a little more detail around how they envisaged the Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff role working as it was not a type of role which had been considered before. Officers reminded Members that within the Audit, Governance and Standards function there were a number of roles to which Members were appointed as “champions” risk management been one in particular. Members envisaged that the main role of the Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff would be to attend staff briefings and assist officers with the formulation of future staff surveys. They could potentially act as a feedback mechanism in respect of the monitoring of the Performance Board Action Plan by the Overview and Scrutiny Board/Committee. The aim would be to show staff that Members whose role it was to act as a critical friend were ensuring that staff surveys were being responded to in an appropriate manner.

## **7. Conclusions and Future Plans**

As the Programme Board and the three supporting work streams appear to have addressed the main issues raised in the most recent staff survey, the Group believe it is now the role of the Overview and Scrutiny functions to ensure that these actions are monitored through their meetings and those responsible are held to account, in order to ensure that staff morale is improved and support is put in place where needed and that the actions do not slip.

Through the Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff role Members will support the Chief Executive in reassuring staff that management want to hear their view and are there to support them. Staff had a key role to play in supporting the Council to become efficient. Moving forward the Councils face a number of challenges and need staff to be on board in order to tackle these. There are a number of areas which the Group feel need further discussion, work or clarification to ensure that the Councils move forward.

### Staff

- Targets/Measures – clarity over what format these will take. It is acknowledged that the aim remains the same; to achieve the goals of the Councils.
- Ensure that 1-2-1s and Team meetings are taking place and that the communication and aim of a team is clear at all levels. There must be interaction within each team to ensure that the Councils' key messages are clear to everyone.
- Performance –v- Attendance. If people have a clear aim of what they need to achieve they will be more focused and positive in their outlook.

### Council

- Corporate Dashboard – Both Dashboard Working Groups and the External Auditors (at BDC's most recent Audit, Standards and Governance Committee meeting) have raised this as not being up to date or accessible, particularly to Members. This needs to be addressed and fit for purpose.
- Strategic Purposes – Members questioned whether these were still fit for purpose. It was noted that each Council had very different demographics and Members felt that this needed to be recognised within those strategic purposes. Do these need to be realigned with each Council?
- Both the Strategic Purposes and the Council Plans for each Council need to have targets and deliverables clearly set out within them, with a strategic vision being underpinned by portfolio targets.

## **8. Supporting Documentation**

Appendix 1 – Topic Proposals

Appendix 2 – Summary of Meetings

## APPENDIX 1



**Bromsgrove**  
District Council  
www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

### OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY TOPIC PROPOSAL

This form can be used for either a Task Group or a Short Sharp Review topic proposal.

Completed forms should be returned to [scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:scrutiny@bromsgrove.gov.uk) – Democratic Services, Bromsgrove District Council.

<b>Name of Proposer: Cllr Steve Colella</b>	
Tel No: 07758 739901	Email:s.coella@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Date: 21 <sup>st</sup> September 2016	

<p><b>Title of Proposed Topic</b></p> <p>(including specific subject areas to be investigate)</p>	<p>Scrutiny into the Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Council 2016 staff survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scrutiny of the survey results (Qualitative and Quantitative) and the underlying issues identified.</li> <li>• Scrutiny of the survey process and quality of survey</li> <li>• Investigations into the low response rate and implications</li> <li>• Investigation in to model surveys</li> <li>• Consider the criteria of the previous survey and lesson learned for future surveys.</li> <li>• The work of the Programme Board which is to be chaired by the Chief Executive.</li> <li>• The work to be carried out in respect of the three corporate work streams which have been established and headed up by key officers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Background to the Proposal</b></p> <p>(Including reasons why this topic should be investigated)</p>	<p>Following a presentation of the 2016 Staff survey to the Overview and Scrutiny Board (19<sup>th</sup> September 2016) concerns were raised in respect of the low response rate, the implications and possible reasons for such a disappointing outcome.</p>

# Agenda Item 7

<p>and evidence to support the need for the investigation.)</p>	<p>As this was a shared survey and the majority of services are shared with Redditch Borough Council it was suggested that it would be an ideal opportunity to carry out a piece of joint working with the RBC Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee, as the findings of the review could have implications for both Councils.</p>			
<p><b>Links to national, regional and local priorities</b></p> <p>(including the Council's strategic purposes)</p>	<p>The importance of conducting robust and regular staff surveys is to demonstrate that the organisation values the voice of its employees, at every level and is responsive to any changes that the results may highlight.</p> <p>Therefore the links are directly related to efficiency of the organisation, staff moral and effective service delivery.</p> <p>In order to achieve the Councils' strategic purposes we need to ensure that staff are motivated and operating in the appropriate culture to meet these objectives.</p>			
<p><b>Possible Key Objectives</b></p> <p>(these should be SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider how to increase the response rates in future.</li> <li>• Consider the merits of the questions both in terms of desired outputs and number of questions.</li> <li>• Establish reason for the low response rates</li> <li>• Bench mark survey with other similar organisations and marque organisations</li> <li>• To make Recommendations to the Bromsgrove Overview and Scrutiny Board and Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</li> </ul>			
<p>Anticipated Timescale for completion of the work.</p>	<p>November 2016 – February 2017</p>			
<p>Would it be appropriate to hold a Short Sharp Inquiry or a Task Group? (please tick relevant box)</p>	<p><b><u>Task Group</u></b></p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>Short Sharp Inquiry</p>	

**OFFICE USE ONLY - TO BE COMPLETED WHEN THE TOPIC PROPOSAL IS ACCEPTED**

<b>Evidence</b>	
Key documents, data, reports	
Possible Site Visits	
Is a general press release required asking for general comments/suggestions from the public?	
Is a period of public consultation required?	
<b>Witnesses</b>	
Officers	
Councillors (including Portfolio Holder)	
Any External Witnesses	

## **Potential Joint Working Arrangements**

**Membership:** To be chaired by a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny function from the Council that proposed the topic.

Appoint a Vice Chairman (from the other Council).

6 Members made up of three from each Council. Each Member should be a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Board/ Committee on this occasion.

A Quorum of three be in place with at least one Member from each Council present.

**Venue:** alternate between each Council.

1. Verbal updates be given to the respective Overview and Scrutiny functions by the lead member with the final report being considered by both prior to it being considered at Cabinet / Executive.
2. Consultation with Portfolio Holders – both relevant Portfolio Holders should be invited to attend if considered appropriate.
3. The meetings will be private informal meetings as standard practice at both venues.

### **Summary of Meetings**

#### **Meeting 1 (22/11/16)**

This initial meeting was used as an introduction into how the Group would work together as it was the first time that Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Councils had carried out joint scrutiny. The group looked at the terms of reference and discussed how best to approach its investigation.

#### **Meeting 2 (07/12/16)**

The Group interviewed the Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development together with the Human Resources and Development Manager, looking in more detail at the results of the Staff Survey and the Cultural Referendum which was due to take place on 16<sup>th</sup> December, together with details around how the survey had been promoted, who decided the questions which were asked, whether the responses had provided the information that officers expected and actions which had arisen from the results. Members were keen to ensure that the Action Plan provided was monitored and the actions carried through to completion in a timely manner.

Members had also asked for additional information in respect of shared services as a number of Members had highlighted at the previous meeting that they were not clear on the arrangements and which areas were and were not shared.

#### **Meeting 3 (06/02/17)**

Members had been informed that a Programme Board had been established to ensure that the results of the Staff Survey were appropriately considered. Following analysis and discussion of the survey results the Programme Board agreed that the data would be considered at both Corporate and Service level. Three corporate work streams were established and headed up by key officers -, organisational culture, people management and meeting our customers' needs. (It was noted that Representatives from Human Resources, Organisational Development and the Trade Unions (Unison, GMB and UCATT) were also members of the Programme Board.)

At this meeting the Group interviewed the key officers involved in all of this work, the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development and the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support.

It was noted that at a service level Heads of Service had been provided with data for their own areas and had analysed this data and developed action plans with clear timescales to specifically address the three areas of greatest improvement/decline compared to the previous survey, whilst also focusing on any areas that they felt needed to be addressed within their services.



Detailed information was provided in respect of the thinking behind the Cultural Referendum (and the work of the Organisational Culture Work Stream) which had taken place, together with an update on the results and how and when these would be shared with staff and Members.

Members were also provided with the action plans which had been set up to ensure a number of areas picked up within the results of the Staff Survey were addressed in an appropriate and timely manner. Members were keen to ensure that this was monitored and feedback given regularly to both Members and staff to demonstrate that their concerns had been taken seriously and were being addressed.

## Meeting 4 (22/02/17)

Members had asked, at the previous meeting, for information in respect of staff sickness absence and whilst this had been provided. There were a number of discrepancies which it was agreed would be addressed at the next meeting when the relevant officers would be invited.

The group took the opportunity to look at the Meeting Customer Needs survey, which was shortly to be issued to staff. Whilst Members understood the need to resolve some of the concerns raised by staff within the original survey, they were keen to ensure that staff were not inundated with different consultations which could lead to survey fatigue and an inclination not to continue to participate. Again, Members were also concerned that yet another survey would lead to further actions needing to be taken in addition to those which had been highlighted within the original survey.

Members discussed the detailed information which had been provided in respect of the Organisational Culture Work Stream which had been tabled at the previous meeting. The Group believed the papers provided were very academic and found it difficult to see how this could relate to the culture within the Council, being mindful of such a variety of areas within it. Members also questioned how the Council could make this work and measure it successfully. Members discussed whether the culture could be regarded as a result of current “management” practices and processes, for example target setting, task orientated objectives, rewards and recognition, budget costs and public perceptions. It was noted that culture within the work place was a matter which had been subject to extensive academic research and Members made reference to Kurt Lewin’s Change Model in particular. This model uses a principle of identifying the current culture, “unfreezing” it and “refreezing” it in order to make the changes necessary.

## Meeting 5 (22/03/17)

The Head of Business Transformation and Organisational Development and the Human Resources and Development Manager attended this meeting to go through the staff sickness data. The Group were keen to explore whether there was any correlation between this and the results of the staff survey. It was agreed that it was difficult to make any link between the two and Members discussed in detail with officers the system of recording sickness and annual leave. The group was informed that this would be done in future through the introduction of a new HR21 system, which would also be able to draw down specific data on a “real time” basis. Although

it was acknowledged this would only be accurate if the system was used correctly and the data inputted regularly.

Members were also provided with details of actions being taken to increase the responses to future staff surveys. This was broken down into individual teams and showed Members that officers had considered a number of ways of address this and tailoring these to the needs of individuals where necessary.

## Chairman's Meeting with Chief Executive (06/04/17)

The Task Group were keen not to duplicate any work which was already been undertaken by the Programme Board (or the supporting Work Streams) or to make recommendations or suggestions which related to work which was already underway. It was therefore agreed that it would be useful for the Chairman to meet with the Chief Executive (as lead officer of the Programme Board) to discuss the progress of the Task Group and to receive an update in respect of the Programme Board and the Work Streams, as it was clear from the information the Group had received most recently that a significant amount of work was already being carried out.

During those discussions it was established that a further staff survey needed to be done later in 2017 and would not follow the same format as the previous ones. It was further acknowledged that different areas had different needs and as such a standard, across the board approach would not be appropriate for all staff, as some areas would clearly have different objectives to work towards; one area of the Council was wholly customer focused and customer facing whilst the other was classed as enabling services, which supported those front facing services. For these reasons future surveys would need to recognise the objectives and aims of each service.

It was clear from speaking to the Chief Executive that the Performance Board had a lot of on-going work to do but had made a start. It was clear from the information provided that much of the Task Group's investigations were becoming out of date and superseded by further actions. For example, time has been spent by the Performance Board in looking at reasons why staff had not completed the survey.

From the information provided it was clear that the role of the Task Group was changing and that it could help support increasing the number of surveys completed, and move its focus from trying to find out why 75% didn't fill it in to ensuring that the numbers that completed the next one were increased. The Group could also take a role in monitoring the work of the Performance Board and the Work Streams to ensure that the work that has been discussed had actually been carried through.

The role of Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff was discussed which would include involvement in the preparation of the next survey and attend staff briefings with the Chief Executive to show that Members are there to support staff and want to hear their views.

## Meeting 6 (26/06/17)

Members held one final meeting at which they discussed the report and recommendations and made a number of tweaks to the recommendations and report content. The Lead Councillor for Supporting Staff role was also discussed at some length as some Members' raised concerns around whether this was in fact something which should be picked up by the relevant Portfolio Holder rather than a member of the Overview and Scrutiny function.

It was agreed that the report would firstly be presented at the Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting at Bromsgrove due to be held on 22th August followed by the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its September meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

22nd August 2017

#### SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION PROPOSAL – HOSPITAL CAR PARKING CHARGES

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Margaret Sherrey
Portfolio Holder Consulted	No
Relevant Head of Service for Overview and Scrutiny	Claire Felton – Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services
Wards Affected	All wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	No – not at this stage
Non-Key Decision	

#### **1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Board are requested to investigate the Planning delegations within the Council’s Constitution. This follows a notice of motion put forward by Councillor P. M. McDonald at the Council meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2017, as follows:

*“This Council calls upon all local hospitals to stop charging for parking, that in reality is financially punishing people for receiving treatment or visiting loved ones”*

Following discussion at the Council meeting it was agreed that the item would be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board for further consideration.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Board considers the request and resolves one of the following:
- (a) that the request is included on the work programme and the Board undertakes the investigation, at a future date to be determined; OR
  - (b) that a Task Group is established to undertake a more in-depth investigation, appoint a Chairman for the Task Group, discuss broad terms of reference and set a time scale for completion of the investigation; OR
  - (c) that further information be requested from a relevant source before deciding whether or not further investigation is required; OR
  - (d) that no further action is taken.

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

22nd August 2017

---

### **3. KEY ISSUES**

#### **Financial Implications**

- 3.1 There are no financial implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of the subsequent investigation undertaken.

#### **Legal Implications**

- 3.2 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report, however, if the proposal is accepted, any implications would be considered as part of the subsequent investigation undertaken.

#### **Service/Operation Implications**

- 3.3 A request from full Council has been made to consider the issue of charging for car parking at hospitals, following a notice of motion.
- 3.4 If the Board decides that it does wish to investigate this topic further, it then needs to decide whether it is appropriate for the Board itself to undertake the investigation or whether a more in-depth investigation is required and a task group or short sharp preview established.
- 3.5 A further option is for the Board to request further information on the topic from a relevant source to assist Members in deciding whether it is a topic it wishes to investigate further.
- 3.6 Alternatively, the Board could decide that it is not a topic it wishes to investigate, in which case no further action would be required.

#### **Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications**

- 3.7 N/A

### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 4.1 N/A

### **5. APPENDICES**

Minute Extract from the Council meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2017 (to follow).

### **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

22nd August 2017

---

### 7. **KEY**

None

### **AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: Amanda Scarce – Democratic Services Officer  
E Mail: [a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:a.scarce@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01527 881443

This page is intentionally left blank



## Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Wednesday, 19 July 2017 - 10.00 am

### Minutes

#### Present:

Mr P A Tuthill (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mr G R Brookes, Prof J W Raine, Mr C Rogers, Mr A Stafford, Mr T Baker, Mrs A T Hingley, Cllr Mike Johnson, Mrs F S Smith and Mrs N Wood-Ford

#### Also attended:

Simon Trickett, NHS Redditch and Bromsgrove and Wyre Forest Clinical Commissioning Groups  
Dr C Ellson, South Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Group  
Claire Austin, Future of Acute Hospitals in Worcestershire Programme  
Vicky Morris, Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
Sarah Smith, Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
Graham James, Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
Simon Adams, Healthwatch Worcestershire

Sheena Jones (Democratic Governance and Scrutiny Manager) and Jo Weston (Overview and Scrutiny Officer)

#### Available Papers

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. Presentation handouts for Item 6 (circulated at the Meeting)
- C. The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 April 2017 (previously circulated).

(Copies of documents A and B will be attached to the signed Minutes).

#### 849 Apologies and Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Meeting, especially Councillor Summers from Herefordshire Council and Councillor Redford from Warwickshire County Council who were invited to participate in the discussions.

Apologies were received from Mr P Grove, Mrs M A Rayner, Mr R P Tomlinson and Mrs S Webb.

#### 850 Declarations of Interest and of any Party Whip

Mrs P Agar declared an interest as her husband was employed as a hospital porter.

<b>851 Public Participation</b>	None.
<b>852 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b>	The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 April 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
<b>853 Constitutional Matters</b>	The Democratic Governance and Scrutiny Manager advised the Committee that Councillor Frances Smith had been nominated by District Council Representatives to stand as Vice Chairman. The nomination would go to the 14 September 2017 County Council for appointment.
<b>854 Future of Acute Hospital Services in Worcestershire</b>	<p>Attending for this Item were:</p> <p><u>Future of Acute Hospital Services in Worcestershire (FoAHSW) Programme</u></p> <p>Simon Trickett, Interim Chief Officer of Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG and Wyre Forest CCG Dr Carl Ellson, Chief Clinical Officer, South Worcestershire CCG Claire Austin, Communications and Engagement Lead for FoAHSW</p> <p><u>Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust (WAHT)</u></p> <p>Sarah Smith, Director of Strategy, Planning and Improvement Dr Graham James, Divisional Medical Director of Surgery</p> <p>The Chairman explained that the Chief Executive of Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust was unable to attend and that arrangements were in place for Members to meet with her soon.</p> <p>By way of presentation and for the benefit of new Members, the Committee was reminded that the project to review acute hospital services began in January 2012, concluding with the CCGs' decision on 12 July 2017. Over this time, the original NHS Bodies involved had ceased to exist and there had been numerous hurdles along the way. However, HOSC had been kept apprised of developments at each stage.</p> <p>Recent key milestones included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the West Midlands Clinical Senate decision in June 2016 approving the Clinical Model, Assurance and Review by NHS England, leading</li></ul>

to

- their decision in January 2017 to approve Public Consultation
- the extensive twelve week public consultation during the Spring of 2017
- the CCGs Committee in Common on 12 July 2017 where all three Boards unanimously agreed the proposals without amendment.

The twelve week consultation ran from 6 January 2017 and engaged with over 5,700 people, across a variety of media. 42 meetings and drop in sessions were arranged, nearly 3,000 online surveys were submitted, views on social media were considered and HOSC was able to influence further engagement, including with neighbouring Local Authorities and hard to reach local communities. In addition, it was noted that HOSC commented on the consultation documentation before publication.

Overall, it was stated that there was a good understanding of the proposals and responses showed general support of the key principles behind the plans, distinguishing between planned and emergency care. However, there were a number of common areas of concern, including:

- Loss of services from the Alexandra Hospital in Redditch
- Transport
- Capacity
- Quality of services across the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals.

Residents were already aware of the temporary emergency changes to services such as maternity provision and inpatient paediatrics at the Alexandra Hospital, but queried what impact these changes would have on a permanent basis.

Following consideration of all of the feedback, the Programme Board put forward twelve recommendations to the Governing Bodies of the three Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups at their Committee in Common on 12 July 2017. The Committee unanimously approved all twelve recommendations, concluding this stage of the Programme.

The next stage would be implementation of the recommendations, which would be led by WAHT over the coming years. A decision was due shortly to establish whether a capital bid of £29.6m from NHS England had

been approved. If approved, all changes would be fully implemented by 2020.

With specific reference to maternity services, it was planned to deliver ante and post natal care locally, ideally through primary care. An earlier suggestion to provide a midwife led unit in the north of the County had been ruled out prior to consultation as it was not considered to be sustainable. However, this proposal would be reviewed in the light of predicted population growth.

The Clinical Commissioning Groups Governing Bodies would monitor the impact and progress against specific recommendations. It was announced that from 1 August 2017, the three CCGs would have one Accountable Officer across all of the organisations, with Simon Trickett taking that role.

In the ensuing discussion, the following key points were made:

- Members were concerned about the lack of stable leadership in WAHT. However, it was encouraging to learn that after two years of interim appointments, the Board and Executive team was now substantive and was moving forward in a much stronger position following the appointment of the Chairman and Chief Executive
- A culture change was required to promote positive behaviours across all levels of the organisation and steps had been taken to promote this now
- When asked what the alternative was if the £29.6m capital funding bid was not successful, it was clarified that to implement the changes properly, it would have to be approved
- Questions were raised about the lack of physical space and it was acknowledged that this was a constraint. However, better use of existing space was possible, including plans for a link bridge to join existing buildings to increase capacity at the Worcestershire Royal Hospital site. The Committee sought assurance that the proposals for this would be publicised and explained at the appropriate stage
- Whilst discussing transport and the results from the trial Hospital Hoppa bus, it was noted that a Department of Transport bid had been submitted to establish a community transport option, which would be based on Home to Hospital and possibly become more integrated to include other appointments. This was due to start in Worcester and Redditch, then in Wyre Forest, with potential

to expand into other areas. However, it was stated that no provision could be run free of charge due to regulations governing transportation

- Some Members required reassurance that appropriate plans were being put in place to futureproof hospital services, including appropriate funding, in the knowledge of committed housing and business developments. It was asked whether the current position was as a result of lack of understanding at the time
- NHS Representatives suggested that Worcestershire's position was not unique and sustaining a clinical workforce was a challenge for many NHS Trusts nationally
- It was reported that there was good monitoring of commissioned services and the CCGs would continue to work with partners across the health economy to ensure a collaborative health system
- Members felt it was unfortunate that the County media sometimes misreported news items, especially given the valuable role they had in informing the public of changes
- Members were interested in the implementation of the recommendations and to see what impact there was, especially in relation to waiting times and use of trolleys.

The Chairman thanked those present for a useful discussion and confirmed that the HOSC noted the CCGs decision. In addition, the Committee was supportive of the decision and looked forward to updates during the implementation stage of the Programme.

## **855 Quality of Acute Hospital Services - Update**

Attending from Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust (WAHT) were:

Vicky Morris, Chief Nursing Officer

Sarah Smith, Director of Strategy, Planning and Improvement

Dr Graham James, Divisional Medical Director of Surgery

The Chief Nursing Officer talked through the actions she had taken since her appointment to the Trust Board four months previously and referred to the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP), attached to the Agenda, which had been approved by the Trust Board following the Care Quality Commission (CQC) published reports.

It was noted that the QIP was a working document and a product of a number of different reports to ensure a consistent and clear approach for all stakeholders. It

would be updated monthly and reported to each Trust Board whilst WAHT was in special measures.

There were six themes within the Plan, with the common goal of continuous improvement:

- Deteriorating Patient
- Operational Improvement
- Governance
- Patient Experience and Engagement
- Safe Care
- Culture and Workforce.

In the discussion that followed, key points included:

- Members were interested to know how complaints were handled and were informed that the current response time was very poor and unacceptable. Further information was requested
- Staff training was vital and was increasingly available online, resulting in a positive outcome as it could be completed to suit the individual working pattern
- When asked about the level of staff morale, the Chief Nursing Officer stated that it was poor on her arrival, however, she had made great efforts to be more visible and visit departments, also resulting in positive promotion and value at Board level. In addition, it was important to celebrate success, which had been introduced
- Uncertainty over the FoAHSW programme had not helped with staff morale, therefore, improvements should now be seen more quickly
- When asked what help was available to staff to ensure their own health and wellbeing, it was noted that staff had access to liaison services
- Improving quality was key and ensuring that there continued to be a consistent approach across all disciplines was a challenge. However, compliance was achievable in time and a robust system of monitoring had been introduced
- Concerns were raised about capacity, especially as the full hospital protocol had been implemented on three occasions recently.
- Members were reassured to hear about the plans already in place and the monitoring arrangements which the Trust Board had approved. The Committee also acknowledged that the CQC had no concerns about the care of patients.

Simon Adams, the Chief Operating Officer of Healthwatch Worcestershire was invited to comment and

reported that following the CCGs decision, improvement should now be immediate. He referred to the improvement in dealing with fractured neck of femur as an indication where performance had improved from one of the worst to one of the best performing Trusts. He also reminded members about the Healthwatch report 'Care in the Corridor' which made 38 recommendations to the Trust.

The Chairman thanked everyone for a useful discussion and looked forward to quality updates at regular intervals. The reputation of the Trust was crucial to the reputation of the County.

The HOSC Chairman concluded the meeting by suggesting that the Committee should have a number of key objectives and advised he would share these for discussion outside of the meeting.

The meeting ended at 11.45 am

Chairman .....

This page is intentionally left blank



# **CABINET LEADER'S**

# **WORK PROGRAMME**

**1 SEPTEMBER 2017 TO 31 DECEMBER 2017**

**(published 1 August 2017)**

This Work Programme gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken in the coming four months by the Council's Cabinet

(NB: There may be occasions when the Cabinet may make recommendations to Council for a final decision e.g. to approve a new policy or variation to the approved budget.)

Whilst the majority of the Cabinet's business at the meetings listed in the Work Programme will be open to the public and media organisations to attend, there will inevitably be some business to be considered that contains confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information.. This is called exempt information. Members of the public and media may be asked to leave the meeting when such information is discussed.

If an item is likely to contain exempt information we show this on the Work Programme. You can make representations to us if you consider an item or any of the documents listed should be open to the public.

The Work Programme gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken by the Council's Cabinet, or full Council, in the coming four months.

**Key Decisions** are those executive decisions which are likely to:

- (i) result in the Council incurring expenditure, foregoing income or the making of savings in excess of £50,000 or which are otherwise significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
- (ii) be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the district;

**Key Decisions** will include:

1. A decision which would result in any expenditure or saving by way of a reduction in expenditure of £50,000 provided the expenditure or saving is specifically approved in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
2. A virement of any amount exceeding £50,000 provided it is within any virement limits approved by the Council;
3. Any proposal to dispose of any Council asset with a value of £50,000 or more or which is otherwise considered significant by the Corporate Property Officer;
4. Any proposal to cease to provide a Council service (other than a temporary cessation of service of not more than 6 months).
5. Any proposal which would discriminate for or against any minority group.

The Work Programme is available for inspection free of charge at Parkside, Market Street, Bromsgrove, B61 8DA from 9am to 5pm Mondays to Fridays; or on the Council's web-site [www.bromsgrove.gov.uk](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk)

If you wish to make representations on the proposed decision you are encouraged to get in touch with the relevant report author as soon as possible before the proposed date of the decision. Contact details are provided, alternatively you may write to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, Parkside, Market Street, B61 8DA or e-mail: [democratic@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

The Cabinet's meetings are normally held every four weeks at 6pm on Wednesday evenings at Parkside. They are open to the public, except when confidential information is being discussed. If you wish to attend for a particular matter, it is advisable to check with the Democratic Services Team on (01527 881409) to make sure it is going ahead as planned. If you have any queries Democratic Services Officers will be happy to advise you.

The full Council meets in accordance with the Councils Calendar of Meetings. Meetings commence at 6pm.

## **CABINET MEMBERSHIP**

Councillor G. N. Denaro	Leader of the Council without Portfolio (Retaining Overarching Governance/Policy and Performance/HR)
Councillor K. J. May	Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, the Town Centre and Strategic Partnerships
Councillor B. T. Cooper	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling
Councillor M. A. Sherrey	Portfolio Holder for Health and Well Being and Community Safety
Councillor C. B. Taylor	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Strategic Housing
Councillor P. J. Whittaker	Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Cultural Services, Environmental Services and Regulatory Services

<b>Decision Including Whether it is a Key Decision</b>	<b>Decision Taker including Details of Exempt Information (if any)</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List</b>	<b>Contact for Comments</b>
New Homes Bonus Grants Community Scheme – Recommendations on awards of funding	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Revised Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2017/18-2019/20 (including Economic Development Investment limits)	Cabinet (potential recommendations to Council)	6 September 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Review of Whistleblowing Policy	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Burcot Lane Site Future Development Key Decision	Cabinet (potential recommendations to Council, may be a partial Exempt item )	6 September 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor G. N. Denar
BDC Responses to Wyre Forest Preferred Option Plan & Worcs Rail Investment Strategy	Cabinet (potential recommendations to Council)	6 September 2017	Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Mike Dunphy 01527 881325 Councillor C. B. Taylor

Decision Including Whether it is a Key Decision	Decision Taker including Details of Exempt Information (if any)	Date of Decision	Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List	Contact for Comments
Additional Income to Bromsgrove DC from provision of Garden Waste Service to Redditch BC	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Head of Environmental Services	Guy Revans 01527 64252 ext 3408 Councillor P. J. Whittaker
Financial Monitoring Report Q1 2017/18	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Flexible Homelessness Support Grant	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Head of Community Services	Derek Allen/Amanda Glennie 01527 881278 Councillor C. B. Taylor
Human Resources and Organisational Development Policy	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Head of Business Transformation and organisational Development	Deb Poole 01527 881256 Councillor G. N. Denaro
Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group	Cabinet	6 September 2017	Report of the Head of Legal, Equality and Democratic Services	Amanda Scarce 01527 881443 Councillor G. N. Denaro

<b>Decision Including Whether it is a Key Decision</b>	<b>Decision Taker including Details of Exempt Information (if any)</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List</b>	<b>Contact for Comments</b>
Council Tax Support Scheme	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda Singleton 01527 881421 Councillor B.T. Cooper
Business Rates Local Discretionary Relief Scheme	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Head of Customer Access and Financial Support	Amanda Singleton 01527 881421 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Industrial Units Investment Outline Business Case	Cabinet (Potential recommendations to Council, may be an Exempt item)	4 October 2017	Report of the Chief Executive	Dean Piper 01562 732192 Councillor K. J. May
Centres Strategy	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Chief Executive	Cheryl Welsh 01562 732189 Councillor K. J. May
Commercialisation and Financial Strategy	Cabinet (potential recommendations to Council)	4 October 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper
Review of Financial Regulations and Contract Procedures	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Executive Director Finance and Resources	Jayne Pickering 01527 881400 Councillor B. T. Cooper

<b>Decision Including Whether it is a Key Decision</b>	<b>Decision Taker including Details of Exempt Information (if any)</b>	<b>Date of Decision</b>	<b>Documents submitted to Decision Maker / Background Papers List</b>	<b>Contact for Comments</b>
Change in Planning Fees Categories for Pre Application Advice	Cabinet (potential recommendations to Council)	4 October 2017	Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration	Ruth Bamford 01527 881202 Councillor C. B. Taylor
Bromsgrove Sports and Physical Activity Strategy	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Head of Leisure and Culture	John Godwin 01527 881762 Councillor P. J. Whittaker
Bromsgrove Energy Efficiency Fund - Extension	Cabinet	4 October 2017	Report of the Head of Community Services	Judith Willis/Kath Manning 01527 587094 Councillor C. B. Taylor
Social Media Task Group	Cabinet	1 November 2017	Report of the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services	Amanda Scarce 01527 881443 Councillor G. N. Denaro
CCTV Short Sharp Review	Cabinet	1 November 2017	Report of the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services	Amanda Scarce 01527 881443 Councillor M. A. Sherrey

Page 51

Agenda Item 13

This page is intentionally left blank



## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD

### WORK PROGRAMME

2017/18

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board considers and agrees the work programme and updates it accordingly.

#### ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>
Was 31/07/17 <b>NOW 22/08/17</b>	Burcot Lane Site Redevelopment	Picked up from Cabinet Leader's Work Programme 13/06/17
	Industrial Units Investment Outline Business Case	Picked up from Cabinet Leader's Work Programme 13/06/17
	Update report in respect of the Council's Economic Priorities	Picked up from Cabinet Work Programme and following presentation at meeting held on 13/02/16
	Staff Survey Joint Scrutiny Task Group – Final Report	
	Task Group Updates - Social Media Review of CCTV	
	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader's Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>18/09/17</b>	Dolphin Centre – update on the work with displaced Groups.	Follow up from meetings held on 13/2/17 and 27/03/17.
	Parking Enforcement – additional information (Verbal)	Follow up from Council notice of motion 26/4/17 referred to O&S on 26/6/17
	O&S Recommendation Tracker	

# Agenda Item 14

Date of Meeting	Subject	Additional Information
	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates - Social Media Review of CCTV	
	Artrix SLA Annual Update Report	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>30/10/17</b>	Planning Backlog Data up to 30/09/17	
	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Social Media Task Group Final Report	
	CCTV Short Sharp Review Final Report	
	Task Group Updates	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>27/11/17</b>	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>11/12/17</b>	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>15/01/18</b>	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	O&S Recommendation Tracker	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny	

Date of Meeting	Subject	Additional Information
	Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>12/02/18</b>	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>26/03/18</b>	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	Scrutiny of the Crime and Disorder Partnership.	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	
<b>23/04/18</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Board Annual Report and Review of the Work of the Board (including the role of the working groups).	
	Working Group Updates – Finance & Budget Measures Dashboard	
	Task Group Updates	
	WCC Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – update from Representative	
	Cabinet Leader’s Work Programme	
	O&S Board Work Programme	

### **Updates Received - Monthly**

The Council’s representative on the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (who must be a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Board) provides a verbal update to the Board each month.

The Council’s representative on any Joint Scrutiny Task Group’s will be expected to provide an update (verbal or written) on the work of that Group at each Board meeting.

The Chairman of any Working Group, Task Group or Short Sharp Review set up by the Board will be expected to provide a written or verbal update in respect of the work being carried out and progress of the investigation by the Group Members.

## **Reports to be Received by the Board (at its discretion)**

Write Off of Debts Report	(last report received 27/06/16)
Sickness Absence Performance - biannually	(last report received 31/10/16)
Making Experiences Count	(last report received 27/06/16)
Summary of Environmental Enforcement	(last report received 08/08/16)

## **Planning Backlog Data**

Received 6 monthly as follows:

- 31<sup>st</sup> March - to be received at April/May meeting
- 30<sup>th</sup> September - to be received at October/November meeting

## **Scrutiny of Crime & Disorder Partnership**

The Board must hold at least one meeting at which it considers the scrutiny of Crime and Disorder Partnership.

## **Areas for further discussion and possible inclusion within the Work Programme carried forward from the 2015/16 Training Event**

- Community Transport facilities
- Planning Issues – Particularly enforcement
- Local Plan Development
- Residential developments causing traffic problems
- Social Housing issues
- Lack of affordable social housing for young people
- BDHT addressing issues re sites.
- Youth provision
- Town Centre shops
- Town Centre Regeneration

When considering topics for investigations Members may wish to take into account the Council's Strategic Purposes as detailed below:

# Our Strategic Purposes for Bromsgrove



*Help me to live my life independently*

*Help me to be financially independent*

*Keep my place safe & looking good*

*Help me find somewhere to live in my locality*

*Provide good things for me to see, do & visit*

*Help me run a successful business*

**Support services enable us to deliver our purposes**

**Bromsgrove District Council**  
[www.bromsgrove.gov.uk](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk)

For more information view the Council Plan at:  
<http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/cms/council-and-democracy/council-plan.aspx>

This page is intentionally left blank